

am prepared to allow an hour for the reading of this statement. The hon. Minister has laid the statement on the Table of the House. I do not know why when the statement is there, this kind of impatience should be shown; I cannot understand it at all. Hon. Members forget what they represented earlier.

to the conclusion that the matter will end there, but it behoves the Government to look carefully into the genuine grievances of the employees, and even at this belated hour to listen to the request repeatedly made by the leaders of labour, namely, to sit round a table and hammer out the differences between the two parties.

12.09½ hrs.

RESIGNATION OF A MEMBER

Mr. Speaker: I have to inform the the House that Dr. Gopalrao Khedkar has resigned his seat in Lok Sabha with effect from the 5th August, 1960.

For a moment, I shall recollect very briefly the background which led to the strike. The Pay Commission's recommendations generated great dissatisfaction among the employees, and added to that, there was Government's delay in arriving at decisions on these. It is a matter of deep regret that the recommendations of the Pay Commission, and particularly the recommendations in respect of the most important items, were based on wrong data supplied to the Commission. I do not know who was responsible for that. Matters such as data to the effect that a worker can ordinarily procure two major meals for 56 nP per day are certainly bound to lead the Commission to erroneous conclusions. The workers had a right to disagree with the decisions of the Government. But before going into that, I must point one thing out to this House and dispel an erroneous impression that has been created, namely, that the leaders who sponsored the strike were really trying to eke out a political advantage for their party and that this was not an industrial dispute. I maintain with all the emphasis at my command that if at all there could be an industrial dispute, this was one. This was a *bona fide* and genuine dispute. The labour leaders made repeated efforts at negotiations, and I speak from record. My hon. friend, Shri Nath Pai, speaking in this House on the 17th December 1959, on the Report of the Pay Commission, stated as under:

12.10 hrs.

STATUTORY RESOLUTION RE:
ESSENTIAL SERVICES MAINTENANCE ORDINANCE AND MOTION RE: STRIKE OF SOME CENTRAL GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES

Shri Naushir Bharucha (East Khandesh): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move the following Resolution:

"This House disapproves of the Essential Services Maintenance Ordinance, 1960 (Ordinance No. 1 of 1960) promulgated by the President on the 8th July, 1960".

Sr. in inviting this House to disapprove of the Ordinance—Ordinance No. 1 of 1960—I am not asking the House to hold a *post-mortem* examination on the strike situation, but in fact I am requesting the House to consider the grave questions of our policy towards a healthy development of trade unionism in this country, the question of the efficient working of the Government machinery and indeed also the question of the success or failure of our Third Five Year Plan.

The Government's momentary victory over labour must not lead them

"I would appeal to the Home Minister, the Finance Minister and the Railway Minister that it is not too late to try to sit with the representatives of the employees.

[Shri Naushir Bharucha]

That is what the Pay Commission has recommended. One of their good suggestions is the Whitley Council suggestion, and a general council for all. I hope the Home Minister is going to accept that. That will be an opportunity to sit down, to discuss and to modify those anomalies, where they are wrong, and to do justice to the Government employees...

"If we take this caution, we may find a way whereby the legitimate grievances of the Government employees can be redressed, and justice even at this late hour can be done to them, and we may have a thing which we badly need, an efficient, loyal and dependable service on which alone depends all our dreams for a better and richer India".

I ask this House, how can it be afterwards said, when repeated approaches by labour leaders were turned down by Government, that they were merely seeking political advantages? Approaches were made to the Prime Minister, the Home Minister, the Railway Minister and the Labour Minister. While the Labour Minister showed some sympathetic approach, it appeared that he was helpless in the face of the unanimous decision of the Cabinet, and ultimately all efforts at negotiation were rejected.

The various labour Unions did not rush into the strike. The National Federation of Posts and Telegraphs, the Defence Employees' Federation, the All-India Railwaymen's Federation and the Confederation of Central Government Employees all passed resolutions requesting the Government to look into the anomalies which undoubtedly were created by the recommendations of the Pay Commission. The Joint Council of Action was formed in April 1960. But before any strike was called, they requested the hon. the Prime Minister to intervene. It was a matter of misfortune for

them that the Prime Minister was busy with the Commonwealth Prime Ministers' Conference. But in deference to the preoccupations of the Prime Minister, the Joint Council postponed the strike call. When all efforts failed, there was no other way left open to them, and my hon. friend, Shri Nath Pai, and my friends, Shri S. M. Joshi and Shri Peter Alvares, gave a strike call. If they had not done that, I would have called them shirkers of their duty. It was their plain duty to have done so, or to abandon their posts as leaders of labour.

I have read today that the Prime Minister has expressed a view that strikes are outmoded in essential services and said that in Russia strikes have been banned. I do not know since when the hon. the Prime Minister has become so much enamoured of the labour policy of Russia. To ban strikes without built-in safeguards for arbitration, which would automatically come into operation, would mean reducing the position of the employees to that of bonded slaves.

I shall briefly speak on the demands which were placed by the employees before Government. The incorrect impression created in the country by the Government propaganda machinery that this was a political move should be dispelled. What did the labour leaders ask for? They say, 'We want a need-based minimum wage and, secondly, linking of the dearness allowance to the price index'.

Mr. Speaker: Should we go into all those items mentioned in the Pay Commission's Report?

Shri Naushir Bharucha: No, Sir, not that.

Shri Rajendra Singh (Chapra): That is quite necessary.

Mr. Speaker: The Pay Commission's Report was discussed in the House

and arguments for and against were advanced; hon. Members said that it did not go far enough and so on while the Government had their own answer. Now arising out of their recommendations, the employees were not satisfied and they started a strike. An Ordinance was promulgated. Now that Ordinance has to be revoked. We are not going into the merits—whether it was right or wrong. The hon. Member himself started by asking whether any restriction or ban on strikes ought or ought not to be imposed on essential services. That is the only point here. We are not going into the details of the demands, whether they ought or ought not to be admitted.

Some Hon. Members rose—

Shri Nath Pai: What you have said a ruling...

Shri Rajendra Singh: The Ordinance and matters connected with it have to be discussed.

Shri Nath Pai: What you have said is absolutely appropriate. But may I point one thing? This is with regard to your own ruling. When the Home Minister asked permission to move his own motion, you suggested that the two would be taken jointly. He refers to the strike and my hon. friend refers to the Ordinance, and any speaker will have to combine the two. One cannot be separated from the other.

May I, therefore, submit that all the matters pertinent to and relevant to the strike and the Ordinance be allowed to be raised, because this is the only opportunity of dealing with them?

Shri Vajpayee (Balrampur): May I suggest that the Home Minister be requested to move his motion so that both can be taken up jointly?

Mr. Speaker: Both are taken up jointly.

Shri Vajpayee: But he has not moved his motion.

Shri A. K. Gopalan (Kasergod): It was on this basis, that the two motions would be taken together, that I had also tabled a motion, on both. We were told that everything connected with them could be taken up and discussion allowed on both the motions.

Mr. Speaker: The other day when I was giving the ruling, some hon. Member interrupted me—I think Shri S. M. Banerjee or some other hon. Member; I do not remember exactly. Then I said that so far as the dissatisfaction with respect to the recommendations of the Pay Commission was concerned, it would not form the subject-matter of discussion today.

So far as the hon. Home Minister's motion is concerned, it says:

"That the situation arising out of the recent strike of some Central Government employees and the action taken by the Government of India in connection therewith be taken into consideration".

There was a strike. The promulgation of the Ordinance was followed up by arrests and so on, treating the strike as illegal.

Therefore, the only point for consideration is whether this Ordinance ought to have been promulgated prohibiting the right to strike or, whether, as the other trade unions have ordinarily got the right to strike these people should also have the right or whether this strike was a legal or an illegal one. If we go into the other things then it will be endless; not only today or tomorrow but the whole of the year will have to be devoted. The demands and the manner in which the Government has met the demands is an independent matter which has been discussed and disposed of by the House. The only question now is whether this action ought to have been taken or whether as the other

[Mr. Speaker]

strikes have been allowed this must have also been allowed to continue and should not have been declared illegal etc. Some said that there was beating resorted to. Certainly, I will allow all that to be discussed. (Interruptions).

Shri Prabhat Kar (Hooghly): Sir, I gave notice for a discussion of the statement of the hon. Finance Minister which he laid on the Table regarding the implementation of the recommendations of the Pay Commission. You kindly said that this matter will be discussed on the 8th and 9th and then the statement may be taken up. Naturally, when considering this we have to go into the work of the Pay Commission and its findings. (Interruptions).

Shri A. K. Gopalan: When we discuss the strike, the legality or the illegality of it, certainly, we will have to go into the causes that led to it. If we do not go into the causes of the strike, then, we cannot say whether it is legal or illegal. As Shri Bharucha has pointed out, the Industrial Disputes Act is there. So, if you restrict the discussion it will not be possible. When we speak about the strike, we have to speak about what all happen, what were the causes of the strike, whether Government had done everything to see that the strike was averted and all that. We have to see all aspects of the question. So, without going into the reasons, what were the demands and all that, there is no use of the discussion.

Shri Asoka Mehta (Muzaffarpur): May I point out, Sir, that there are 3 separate things before us? We have to decide what we are going to discuss. The first thing is Shri Naushir Bharucha's motion about the Ordinance. Either after that or simultaneously with that you have to decide about the motion which is going to be moved by the hon. Home Minister where we are going to consider this

question of strike. And, the third question is the statement made by the Finance Minister, wherein certain new scales of pay have been provided to the government employees. It has to be decided as to what are the things that are going to be discussed or covered within the ambit of the discussion.

I think Shri Naushir Bharucha has first of all to make out his own case against the Ordinance and then the Home Minister will make out his own case about the strike. Whether the third thing also has to be discussed or not, I do not know. But, you said the other day, that these things will be taken up together. There is the question whether Shri Bharucha is entitled to take up both these things together now or only after the Home Minister has had his say. But the rest of the Members will be free to take these things together. That, to my mind, is the only narrow point on which you have to give your ruling.

Mr. Speaker: What I also understood was that. I said the other day—and I stick to it—that both these can be discussed together. As soon as Shri Bharucha concludes his speech I will put his motion before the House and then I will call upon the hon. Home Minister to make his motion also and both of them will be discussed. Because Shri Bharucha will not have an opportunity after the Home Minister has made his motion I will allow him to refer to all that he has to say about that also treating it as having been moved already. That I can do. But, so far as the going into the details of the demands of the employees, how far they have been met, whether these had the right to strike etc. is concerned it is not right. Whether these services ought to have been made Essential Services or not is the main point. There can be difference of opinion on that.

Shri Asoka Mehta: There is still a difficulty. We shall have to find out

whether it was inevitable that the strike should have been there, whether enough efforts were made either by the strike leaders or by the Government to see that the strike did not take place. Somewhere the onus of responsibility has to be put, on one side or the other, or, perhaps, on both sides. But it is incumbent upon this House to explore the pre-strike circumstances to find out whether such a calamity or contingency should have ever confronted the country. That is wholly relevant to the discussion of the Ordinance. (*Interruptions*).

Shri Nath Pai: A very small submission, Sir.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Home Minister. I want to dispose of this. (*Interruptions*). I said both these will be taken up together. The main question is whether these ought to be made Essential Services or whether the right to strike, of the employees even in the Secretariat, ought to be as unrestricted as the right to strike of a factory worker—whether these should be declared Essential Services or not. Whether the demands were right or not is not the subject-matter of this.

But, so far as the other question is concerned the statement of the hon. Finance Minister that he accepts certain recommendations—it is a different matter. It should not be brought up here. If necessary, I will give a couple of hours separately for the discussion of that thing. I will dispose of that separately. I do not want to bring the entire gamut of the demands and all that here. I will allow an opportunity. As I said the other day, we will not find an end to it. So far as the Pay Commission Report is concerned, it has been discussed. Some people who are not satisfied with it may resort to strike. When discussing the action taken on the strike if the same matters regarding the Pay Commission Report are brought in, then once again, a person may start a strike and once again the question of a

Pay Commission will come up. (*Interruptions*).

Order, order please. Why is the hon. Member impatient?

Shri Rajendra Singh: Let the Chair be not obstinate, Sir.

Mr. Speaker: This is improper. The hon. Member must withdraw his remark. There is no question of being obstinate.

Shri Rajendra Singh: I withdraw, Sir. (*Interruptions*).

Mr. Speaker: I have to decide what the scope of the discussion ought to be. I hold this view; I am prepared to alter it. I am prepared to hear Shri Nath Pai or any other Member. (*Interruptions*). What I feel is this. That is why I said even the other day that it will be endless. Any person who is not satisfied can start another strike; I do not know whether it is right or wrong. Supposing he starts it are we to bring it once again before the House. There may be one person or a number of persons or even a small group who may not be satisfied, even though the matter has been disposed of. That is the point.

The Ordinance is a different matter. The question is whether this Ordinance should be passed and a Bill should follow it up to make the strike illegal because these are made essential services. Whatever action was taken with respect to the Ordinance is another matter. Therefore, I think the scope of these two motions being taken together relates only to the Ordinance, whether these ought to be declared Essential Services or not.

Hon. Members would remember that on a prior occasion when the postal employees went on strike a similar Ordinance was passed which was followed by a Bill which was passed by this House and then went up to the other House. Therefore, the main point is whether these ought

[Mr. Speaker]

to be treated as Essential Services and whether the rights of the workers or employees in other factories or other institutions to go on strike should also be conferred on government employees or not. This is what I consider to be the simple point. I am prepared to hear Shri Nath Pai and other hon. Members one after the other.

Shri Nath Pai: After your clarification, Sir, much of the confusion should be removed. But there is only one small point which, anyhow, remains; and it is this. You were pleased to say that Shri Naushir Bharucha should confine himself as to whether these services should have been declared essential or not. May I beg to differ on this small point? His Resolution says that this House disapproves of this Ordinance. For this purpose he will have to establish two main things. One is whether an Ordinance is the normal way of dealing with a situation like this because an Ordinance presupposes the legislative power being used by the Chief Executive of the country. That is one thing. The other is whether under the circumstances the powers assumed by the Chief Executive were adequate. In proving both these points, that is, (a) whether the ordinary law of the country was enough and an Ordinance was not necessary, and (b) the powers assumed by the Executive were disproportionate taking into consideration the emergency, he will have to refer to all the precedent conditions that led to this development.

Mr. Speaker: Shri Gopalan. I will call only one spokesman from one group.

Shri A. K. Gopalan: Sir, when we speak about the strike it is our duty to see whether it was legal or illegal. There was every reason why the employees should strike. It is our duty to show that certain actions were taken which would lead them only to strike work and do nothing else. I do not say that we should

go into all the items recommended by the Pay Commission. But what were the issues that provoked them to strike? Did the Government do all that they could to set them right so that there might be no strike? As far as the strike is concerned there are certain things and we will have to refer to the Pay Commission's recommendations and the background of the strike which led the employees to strike. At least those reasons must be discussed here and an opportunity must be allowed to those who feel that it was the fault of the Government but for which there would not have been a strike. There should not have been an Ordinance. It is not that I want to take up the Pay Commission's recommendations, one by one and say that some were right or some were wrong. But if you say that nothing about the Pay Commission should be referred to—some of the recommendations and the Government action thereon were the cause of the strike—I do not know what can be discussed.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Member will answer one question. The recommendations were before this House. Some hon. Members made representations. Of course they always consult those employees to get as much information as possible... (*Interruptions.*) We will assume that one matter was discussed and one demand, which was let us say, the most important demand was not acceded to by the Government. Then, that very demand is put up once again by the employees. No new demand has arisen apart from the Pay Commission recommendations which were thrashed out in this House. The same demands were made at one stage and were refused at that stage. Will the same demands be the subject-matter once again merely because some other persons start a strike? He says: I was not able to convince you here; the Government is not able to be convinced: I will now take to direct action and force the issue once again; let us go into the same matter again

and then say that they ought not to have taken those steps and armed themselves with these powers and so on.

Shri A. K. Gopalan: I will take an instance: holding the price line and seeing that the prices do not go up. That was one demand. Certain things did happen as far as the prices also are concerned. It may be that the rise in prices may be a little but when it goes up further the same point has to be taken up again and the same point has to be said after these 28 months or 20 months. There are certain changes that have taken place. Though at that time the Government might have said that they did not accept them, there is every reason why the Government should accept those demands now and have them reviewed because several months have elapsed and things have changed.

Mr. Speaker: I will ask the hon. Member this question: Was it not contended even then that there was no sliding scale and that there must be a sliding scale and allowances should go up according to the price rise? Was it not one of the objections to the recommendations of the Pay-Commission? How has a new situation arisen today?

Shri A. K. Gopalan: A new situation had arisen today and please allow us to point out that new situation. We can make an appeal to the Government for that reason to make a review. Even though we have discussed it earlier and the Pay Commission did not accept our demand and the Government did not accept it, are we forbidden from making another appeal and showing reasons why it must be accepted?

Raja Mahendra Pratap (Mathura): Sir, on a point of order. Can we not investigate those ideas which led our leaders to strike? What were the origins of the ideas which captured the minds of our trade union leaders? We should discuss that also.

Acharya Kripalani (Sitamarhi): I submit that the contention of the labour leaders is that Government, in handling the situation, committed certain mistakes and having committed those mistakes in order to cover them, they passed the Ordinance. Is it not open to the man who objects to the Ordinance to say that such and such mistakes were committed by the Government? That is all. There is no other question.

Shri A. K. Gopalan: Last time when we discussed with them, certain things were not accepted by the Government. After that, Government had accepted certain things. In the 15th Labour Conference, the Government were themselves a party. This has not been discussed. That was one of the demands.

Mr. Speaker: I am going to allow a discussion separately so far as this matter is concerned . . . (Interruptions.)

Shri Rajendra Singh rose—

Mr. Speaker: Order, order, He does not know the rules or decorum. He ought not to be impatient like this. I would like to hear the hon. Home Minister regarding the scope of the discussion.

The Minister of Home Affairs (Shri G. B. Pant): I really had thought that Shri Bharucha was to speak on his motion relating to the Ordinance and as to why he thought the Ordinance should not have issued. But he has referred to many matters which had been, at least partly, subject of discussion in this House. So far as the scope of this motion is concerned, I think we are concerned here with the strike and the action taken thereon and the proposals made by the Government in that regard. I do not see how we can reopen all the issues that were discussed previously but I am entirely in your hands.

Mr. Speaker: It is agreed that so far as Shri Bharucha's motion is concerned it relates only to the Ordinance, whether it is right or wrong and the services should be classified as essential services or not and so on. He is also entitled to say whether without resort to an Ordinance, they could have used the ordinary law of the land. The other question arises in view of the motion that has been tabled by the hon. Home Minister that the strike situation be taken into account. They want to refer to the immediate causes of the strike. Naturally, as Shri Gopalan has said, they should not refer in detail to all those recommendations which were originally placed before the House; there has been enough discussion so far as those matters are concerned. Some of the more important recommendations and some changes that have been effected and which have arisen out of the motion made by the hon. Home Minister that the strike situation be taken into consideration may be referred to and to that limited extent I will allow them. Let them not go on referring to them in great detail.

The Prime Minister and Minister of External Affairs (Shri Jawaharlal Nehru): In all humility I ask whether it is desirable to continue this habit of reading out speeches from manuscripts?

Shri Rajendra Singh: Who is reading out? What is his information?

Shri Naushir Bharucha: Mr. Speaker, I intended to make some observations in relation to these demands only for the limited purpose of making out a case that not only this Ordinance was not necessary but to show how the Government has done great injustice to them... (An Hon. Member: Question)... (Interruptions) but how very reasonable the workers were and how their reasonableness was accepted by the Government themselves. Still they have suppressed the strike and promulgated the

Ordinance. Only for that limited purpose, I agree fully with you that this is not the time when we can go over the 500 pages of the Pay Commission's Report.

The major two demands, I mentioned, were the minimum wages and the linking of dearness allowance to the cost of living index. Sir, it will be recalled that at the 15th Indian Labour Conference held in Delhi from the 11th to the 12th July 1957 five honourable Union Ministers were present—Shri Nanda, Shri Morarji Desai, Shri Jagjivan Ram, Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri and Sardar Swaran Singh—and what was agreed to there was that with regard to the fixation of minimum wage it was to be 'need based' and should ensure the minimum human needs of the industrial worker irrespective of any other considerations. Sir, I emphasise the words "irrespective of any other considerations". Whether the Government's capacity to pay was there or not or whether in a developing economy they can pay or not, that is not the point.

The Minister of Finance (Shri Morarji Desai): Sir, may I say that I was not present when the decision was taken by the Conference? I was present only when the conference was opened; afterwards I was not present at all.

Shri Prabhat Kar: It is the collective responsibility of the Government.

Shri Rajendra Singh: When it was sponsored the Finance Minister was there, but when the decision was taken he was not there.

Shri Naushir Bharucha: Sir, it is immaterial for my purpose. All the five Ministers may say that one by one they left the conference, I do not mind. I am reading from the summary of the proceedings. It was further decided that whenever the minimum wage fixed went below the recommendations it will be incumbent upon the authorities concerned to

justify the circumstances which prevented them from adherence to the laws laid down. Now, Sir, that means the onus of justifying lay upon the Government. Far from discharging that onus they have come out with the Ordinance on the employees.

The second point that I am making is this. In this particular conference, in his opening speech the Labour Minister said:

"We are going to consider the question of wage policy. I have been expressing a feeling on every occasion that in spite of the increase in wages in recent years in money as well as in real terms, the workers earnings and their standard of living are too low. I adhere to this."

That was in 1957. I do not know whether he adheres to that now or he has abandoned that. But the fact remains that in making a demand for a 'need-based' minimum wage, the strike leaders who sponsored the strike were making a reasonable demand which the Union Government Ministers agreed was reasonable. There was nothing unreasonable in that.

Then I come to the question of linking dearness allowance to the cost of living index figures. It will be recalled that this Government has foisted on the textile industry the principle that D.A. must be linked to the cost of living index figure. It appears what is good for the private sector is certainly not good for our welfare State. Sir, I ask this hon. House, can you accuse the leaders of the strike as being unreasonable if they have adopted a policy and made a demand in respect of dearness allowance, which policy is being enforced on the textile industry by the Government themselves.

Sir, it has been stated that this was a political strike. I strongly repudiate that. As I said, there was nothing in

it that was political. It was really and truly an industrial dispute. I ask the hon. Minister and the Government whether they still stand by the principle of having a need based minimum wage or have they abandoned it. Secondly, why was it that the hon. Labour Minister or the other Ministers at the Labour Conference did not make it quite clear that they did not agree to it? Why did they mislead the workers' representatives. Also, I want to know if the five Ministers present at the conference—they must have been present at one time or the other and it should have been surely the duty of any one of them—cared to have it recorded in the proceedings that they were not agreeable to this principle. None of them did so, and it is too late in the day now for them to turn round on the employees and say that their demands are unreasonable.

The strike developed. To my mind, Sir, it was a symptom of frustration at the Government's refusal and persistent refusal to sit round and talk with the employees. It was a result of desperation; in fact, it was a struggle for survival. The President promulgated the Ordinance, and immediately the entire machinery of the Government went into operation to crush the strike. No less than 19,000 employees were arrested, instantaneous dismissal of temporary hands took place, dismissal notices by the thousands were served and thousands were forcibly evicted from their houses, the police committed and indulged in excesses. At Doha alone, Sir, people were shot down in their houses (*Interruption*). I ask this Government, even if a man goes on strike does that entitle the Government to justify firing? I am glad that the Government of Gujarat have ordered an enquiry into it, we shall await its findings.

Sir, the labour leaders were deliberately humiliated. May I point out to this Government one thing? I have got here a publication called *Current* dated 20th July, 1960 (*Interruption*).

[Shri Naushir Bharucha]

May I point out, Sir, I have not known *Current* to be hostile to the Government. Even if *Current* lies, pictures would not lie. Here we find Shri S. M. Joshi being dragged away like an ordinary criminal by a sub-inspector. Here is the humiliating scene of Shri Nath Pai being pushed and taken away to a police van. I ask whether this element of humiliation was absolutely necessary in the performance of Government's duty in maintaining law and order.

An Hon. Member: Legacy of the British rule.

Shri Naushir Bharucha: It is a matter of pity that instead of sitting round with the employees and talking out things the Government let loose their entire mass propaganda machinery on the employees.

I am sorry to say that in this deplorable episode the INTUC played a part which was miserable and anti-labour. The INTUC have repaid the Government handsomely for the favours shown to them. The INTUC issued a leaflet saying that the strike was wrong, the labour leaders should have sat with the Government and discussed things at a round table conference etc. This was precisely the policy which our hon. friend Shri Nath Pai and Shri S. M. Joshi and Peter Alvares wanted to follow but the Government rejected it.

Then, the strike had to be called off, and I think I must congratulate my hon. friend Shri Asoka Mehta on the bold lead that he took rather than involve more and more employees on a strike which was foredoomed to failure because of want of resources with the strikers and so many other things. He had the courage of conviction to step in and prevent further hardships on the employees. He called off the strife. The Government had their un-conditional surrender. I do not know since when the Government have started using this war

language. Was it a settlement of a strike or was the Government waging a war to the bitter end with its employees?

Sir, the Ordinance has been promulgated as an extraordinary remedy. Instead of promulgating the Ordinance the Government could have taken action under sections 10, 22, 23 and 24 of the Industrial Disputes Act. Why was that not done? Had the Government no desire to adopt their own machinery for the resolution of industrial disputes? The Ordinance is an extraordinary remedy. In 1949 when the United Kingdom was faced with a dock labour strike of country-wide dimensions—U. K. would have been starved within six weeks for want of imports of foodstuffs—did the Government promulgate an Ordinance and resort to a machinery which this Government has resorted to to suppress the strike?

What does this Ordinance do? It defines Essential Services as any service in the sweet will of the Government. It prohibits strikes in essential services. It declares the strike, which was lawful in its inception, as illegal with retrospective effect. It creates an offence with retrospective effect. It punishes workers with imprisonment with retrospective effect. It overrides all the provisions of the Criminal Procedure Code. It overrides all the provisions of the Industrial Disputes Act and all other laws except the Preventive Detention Act of which the Government appear to have made copious use.

With regard to the definition of "essential service", the Government say what is essential service is a service which "in their opinion" is essential. The Privy Council has held that whenever the words "in their opinion" are used in any legislation it really means that the high court or any court has no power to enquire whether the Government is right or wrong and whether there are sufficient grounds.

for coming to that opinion. Therefore, this provision is absolutely arbitrary.

Similarly, clause 3 prohibits a strike in the public interest. What is public interest has been interpreted in 52 *Supreme Court Journal* at page 446. It says that it is a very elastic term and that anything can come under it. Here, may I remind this House of a similar strike in essential services in Bombay in 1949 of which I am sure the hon. Shri Morarji Desai who was then the Chief Minister or Home Minister of Bombay is amply aware? The sweepers in Bombay went on strike for five months and my hon. friend Shri Morarji Desai imprisoned 2,000 sweepers, saying that they had no right to go on strike in an essential service. The Government made it a point of law to be contested and I took up the challenge and said that they the workers had right to strike. 2,000 people were convicted. We went to the high court and in its judgment the High court held that workers in essential services had the right to go on strike. The hon. Chief Justice, Mr. Chagla, said, "Do I take, in this year of grace, 1949, the Advocate-General to mean that the Government had instructed him to say that in the essential services the workers were bonded slaves?" The expression "bonded slaves" was used by the Chief Justice. They are not bonded slaves just because they happen to be in essential services. Now, the ordinance wants to circumvent this right to strike in essential services which has been established. That judgment was in regard to *Kashya Vithal v the Province of Bombay*.

The strike which was legal at the inception has been made illegal by the Ordinance with retrospective effect, by the use of the words, "before or after the issue of the Order." Many unions gave notice of strike before the Ordinance, now the ordinance makes such notices illegal with retrospective effect. Then automatically the union becomes liable to have its recognition withdrawn. A trade union cannot give a notice of a strike which is ille-

gal. But having given a strike notice, at a time when it was legal, today, you make it illegal with retrospective effect, which means that you render the union punishable with a penalty in the form of withdrawal of recognition, merely because you have chosen to enact the Ordinance in the way it is done. Thus, the *bona fide* exercise of a fundamental right by a Union is made the excuse for the withdrawal of the union's recognition.

Then comes clause 4 of the ordinance which inflicts penalty with retrospective effect in violation of article 20 (1) of the Constitution, which says:

"No person shall be convicted of any offence except for violation of a law in force at the time of the commission of the act charged as an offence....."

The ordinance goes beyond all these things. Then clause 7 overrides the Criminal Procedure Code which is intended to safeguard the liberty of the individual so that nobody can be arrested without the issue of a warrant. This ordinance knows no distinction between cognizable and non-cognizable offence or anything whatsoever

Then, clause 8 overrides the Industrial Disputes Act. May I know whether the Government of India have adjured by statute the principle of resolving industrial disputes by arbitration? Clause 8 overrides all other laws. I ask this House whether this House can approve of an Ordinance which overrides all known laws of the country, which adjures the Constitutional methods of solving industrial disputes by negotiation, which imperils the growth of sound trade unionism in this country and reduces the worker to the position of a bonded slave?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Member's time is up.

Shri Naushir Bharucha: I shall conclude with an appeal to the Government. There has been too much discretion left with the heads of the Government. This House has a vital responsibility. Can it merely rubber-stamp the Ordinance and give it its approval? I ask this question because principles and policies for the development of trade unionism on healthy lines and for resolving all industrial disputes in a peaceful way may be laid down. Do we have the statesmanship to build up conventions to respect the law, or do we desire merely to keep under our feet two millions of our Government employees? The remedy, to my mind, would be, there should be no banning of strikes in essential services. Only those cases must be dealt with harshly—here I fully agree—where there has been violence or intimidation or instigation to violence or sabotage. All cases merely of absence from duty must be withdrawn. A sort of general amnesty should be declared. No black remarks on service records should be placed. No victimisation should be allowed, especially of local trade union leaders. Temporary hands should be reinstated. There should be no breaks in service. There should be no withdrawal of trade unions' recognition. Even the Pay Commission has not recommended any such withdrawal. Discretionary powers of Departmental heads should be withdrawn and the Government should sit round a table and discuss the entire situation with labour leaders.

I would ask this House to remember that there can be no justice in a struggle between the Government and its employees so long as the Government tramples down on human sentiments of the employees and so long as those who have asserted their trade union rights remain entangled in the tatters of their trade union privileges. In politics, there is no permanent victory and no permanent defeat. In the words of Lord Buddha that victory is best in which neither side is defeated.

Sir, I invite the House to approve my resolution.

Shri K. N. Pandey (Hata): I may put one question. Did he ever consult the INTUC before taming any decision for the strike? If not, why should the INTUC be blamed? Instead of being ashamed of unpatriotic work, you are now blaming the others and—(Interruptions)—statutory,....

Mr. Speaker: Order, order.

Shri Rajendra Singh: They raised black flags.

An. Hon. Member: Black sheep.

Mr. Speaker: If the hon. Member persists in this kind of unruly conduct, in the House, I will have to ask the hon. Member to keep himself out of the House.

Shri Rajendra Singh: The hon. Member branded us as blameworthy, and.....

Mr. Speaker: Will he sit down or go out of the House? Hon. Members have been hearing the speech. Shri Naushir Bharucha was speaking and I wanted to tell him that he need not refer to any other aspect of the matter. I know this sort of trouble would come in. Another hon. Member who is interested referred to INTUC. It is natural. The hon. Member wants to know whether INTUC was consulted or not. But what is this kind of getting up and then trying to protest?

Shri Rajendra Singh: The hon. Member referred to.....

Mr. Speaker: If the hon. Member persists, I would ask him to withdraw from the House. He need not refer to it.

Shri Rajendra Singh: He did so.

Mr. Speaker: He may do so in answer to what Shri Naushir Bharucha said. I shall place the motion before the House.

Shri Braj Raj Singh (Firozabad): Sir, before you place the motion, I should like to point out that calling somebody traitor in the House is not proper. If my hon. friend has called anybody traitor, he must . . . (*Inter-ruptions*).

Mr. Speaker: I do not know. Did he say traitor? . . . He said "unpatriotic".

Shri Nath Pai: Possibly, he might have said so. Let him repeat the question, I could not hear because of the noise.

Mr. Speaker: I do not think he said traitor in respect of any Member of the House. It is only the word "unpatriotic" that he used. Of course, any hon. Member can say "unpatriotic". (*Laughter*) Motion moved:

"This House disapproves of the Essential Services Maintenance Ordinance, 1960 (Ordinance No. 1 of 1960) promulgated by the President on the 8th July, 1960."

There are no amendments to this Resolution. I now call upon the hon. Minister of Home Affairs.

Shri G. B. Pant: Sir, I beg to move:

"That the situation arising out of the recent strike of some Central Government employees and the action taken by the Government of India in connection therewith be taken into consideration."

Sir, the motion which I have just placed before the House is an altogether non-controversial one. Shri Bharucha, who spoke on his resolution made a speech which covered much wider ground than would be relevant for the purposes of his resolution. He

referred to various matters and I was rather perplexed whether he could appreciate the significance of the general strike or the magnitude of the peril which it necessarily involves. He was talking of the ordinance, but then, he just touched it on the fringe and said nothing particularly about it.

13 hrs.

So far as the ordinance is concerned, it embodies only the provisions of the Bill that was passed by this House in 1957. At that time, there was a threat of a strike by only one of the essential services, i.e. Posts and Telegraphs. The House examined the position and after having given full thought to all aspects of the piece of legislation placed before it and also to the necessity—the imperative necessity—of maintaining the Posts and Telegraphs in proper order and running that service in a regular way, it passed that law. So far as this House is concerned, that Bill is still there; it is pending in the Upper House

The position today, or rather at the time when this essential ordinance was introduced—I call it essential ordinance, instead of calling it an ordinance for the maintenance of essential services, because it was an inescapable necessity. So, when this ordinance was issued, the situation was really grave. Shri Bharucha said that we should not think that we have achieved a victory over labour. He might be thinking of victory or of defeat, but to me it is not a matter at all of any pleasure that Shri Bharucha should appear in the scene as an advocate of even a section of the Government servants. I feel that my relations with them are more intimate and my desire to serve them and to do the best for them is much more sincere than that of any other person whatsoever.

Shri Naushir Bharucha: Hence the ordinance.

Shri G. B. Pant: But the Government servants as well as the Government have to bear the interest of the

[Shri G. B. Pant]

entire community in mind. It is their primary duty to see that whatever step they take enures to the benefit of the people of the country as a whole.

Government servants are not like industrial workers. Shri Bharucha said, it was a sort of an attack on labour unions as such. He is doing some injustice to the public servants when he places them on an even category with the industrial workers in factories and other places. They are here as trustees of the nation and it is their duty and function to serve the nation. Whatever allowances they get are not necessarily adequate, because in a country the measure of adequacy cannot be determined on theoretical grounds. It has to be related to the conditions prevailing in the country.

Shri Bharucha said that it was a bad law that we have passed. Has he any idea of the magnitude of the problem with which the country was faced? Has he any idea of the dreadful consequences that would have followed if this strike had succeeded? Would he even now like the railways, the posts and telegraphs, the defence installations and all other essential services connected with these and others to be paralysed? Can he lead a civilised life even for a day if he is faced with such a situation? What would be the effect on society in general? How would our economic and social life be disrupted completely? How could the very serious problems, whether within or outside the country that are facing us, be solved even in a very inadequate manner, if such a situation actually arose? I think he will concede that it would be a tragedy and a disaster and it would only lead not only to what some people might wish—the Government being placed in a difficult position—but to chaos and disorder, with the result that the aspirants, whosoever they may be, will not be able to find a foothold even here. So, he should have given some thought to this aspect of the problem.

When an ordinance was justified when there was a threat from only one of the essential services and those connected with that movement were sensible enough to withdraw it after the ordinance had been passed, here we are concerned not with the threat by one, but by a very large number of unions and there, we have a committee of action, whether it is called a combined committee or what else...

Some Hon. Members: Joint Council of Action.

Shri G. B. Pant: Yes; joint council. Anyway, it was not called a joint conspiracy, it was a joint committee of action. A joint committee for action, dominated mostly by people who do not belong to the services, in order to incite the services to go in for a strike does not look very appropriate.

Shri Rajendra Singh: While advocating the cause of your trade union.. (Interruptions).

Shri G. B. Pant: Sir, what would have been the result, I was just saying, if the strike had succeeded? We have many cities which have not got stock of food for more than three or four days. Thousands and thousands would have to starve there. At the same time, our water works, our electricity, our industries depend on the supply of coal. If coal did not reach them for three or four days, there will be no water to drink in cities, there will be no light and there would be nothing but anarchy and chaos.

So, if an Ordinance like this was valid, permissible and necessary in 1956, it is much more so today. And then there is another salient feature about it. In 1957 when the threat of the strike was held out, it was because the Government servants had not got any sort of relief or increment. Here, this strike threat is held out because they have got something, because they have been given something and because, in the mean-

time, their emoluments have been increased and raised. And what was the basis on which we were told this strike was launched? It is said that we did not turn down the recommendations of the Pay Commission, its basic and fundamental recommendations. What was the Pay Commission's composition? It was presided over by a Judge of the Supreme Court. It had an economist of repute, who perhaps is well known to many of the members on the other side. It had also a Vice-Chancellor who had been the Chairman of the Public Service Commission and others who are equally esteemed. A Commission like that, after having heard everybody, including the leaders of the Opposition parties, reaches certain conclusions and makes certain recommendations. These two issues were placed before that Commission, that the Resolution of the 15th Labour Conference must be accepted by the Commission. Well, I may say that even responsible members of the opposition parties, at least some of them, for whom I have enough of regard, did not consider that it was a feasible proposition.

Shri Chintamani Panigrahi (Puri): Who are they?

Shri Rajendra Singh: Who are they?

Shri G. B. Pant: You are not one of them! It was conceded by all sensible and reasonable persons that this could not be done. But what has been done? The basic pay, which used to be Rs. 30 or Rs. 35 has been raised to Rs. 70. With Rs. 10 as dearness allowance it comes to Rs. 80. And there are other things which they have forgotten, that there are annual increments which are double of what they used to be and the maximum has been raised to Rs. 85 plus 10. That is to say, the real scale of emoluments now will vary between Rs. 80 and 95. There is the guarantee of pension and there is that security in Government service. I venture to think that anyone who is

outside Government and getting Rs. 150 would be quite glad to change his place with a Government servant getting a sum of Rs. 95.

Shri Braj Raj Singh: For extra payment?

Shri G. B. Pant: That would prove how it was something which gave them much greater benefit than what the workers even in private industry are enjoying today. The Pay Commission has discussed the matter fully and it is said that in private industries in many places the minimum pay comes to only Rs. 70; in others it may be even less. So, even in comparison with them it has been quite high.

Then we have to consider that the result of the recommendations of the Pay Commission will be that nearly Rs. 45 crores will be added to the annual bill of salaries and later it will rise to Rs. 55 crores. That means during the period of five years of the Third Plan Rs. 250 crores will have to be paid in addition on account of the recommendations made by the Pay Commission and accepted by Government.

Then the whole matter has to be considered also from the aspect of other Government servants and also the mass of the people living in the country. If a Government servant is entitled to a minimum salary for his bare maintenance, then every citizen is entitled to that.

An Hon. Member: Do it.

Shri Prabhat Kar: You are failing in your policy.

Shri Rajendra Singh: Better resign if you cannot do it.

Shri G. B. Pant: It is not our failure but it is the success that we are achieving in adding to the national income and to the per capita income.

Shri Chintamani Panigrahi: By taking more.

Shri G. B. Pant . . . in spite of the obstructions and impediments from various other quarters.

Shri Prabhat Kar: The result is known to everybody.

An hon. Member: You are the cause for that.

Shri G. B. Pant: Now the salary that a State Government servant is getting is much less than what the Central Government servant is getting. A local body employees is getting only half of what they are getting. There are so many millions of people.

Shri Tangamani (Madurai): What about the agricultural labour?

Shri G. B. Pant: I think some of my colleagues on the other benches should not shout very loudly. They can ask Shri Gopalan what steps the Communist Government in Kerala took when the N.G.O. Government servants, teachers who were under training and others, held out a threat of strike. What did they say?

What did they say? What did Shri Achuta Menon say? What were the statements issued by the Kerala Government? How many.....

Shri A. K. Gopalan: I can reply to that.

Shri G. B. Pant: Of course, you can do that. When I put the question, I do not want to guide you. But the answer will not help you.... (*Interruption*).

They said that they could not give any further relief though the salary that they were getting was much less than what the Central Government servants had been getting then and it would be much less as compared with what they will be getting now.

The Government does not pay anything out of any profit. If you pay your servants more, you have to take

more from the people and perhaps more from those whose conditions is, as compared with our servants at the bottom of the ladder, poorer and more pitiable. Should you take away from Peter who has no clothes on his body even the loin-cloth that he has so that the other man may have a tie.... (*Interruption*)? That is the position which, I think, could be accepted.

What the Government did was acclaimed by the people from one and to the other.... (*Interruption*). The strike was condemned by every sensible person.... (*Interruption*). For the first time after Independence the citizens of this country shed off their placidity and came out in the open to condemn this strike..... (*Interruption*). Thousands and thousands offered their services and apart from that more than four-fifths of the Government servants did not go on strike even for half an hour. If it was something done in their interests.....

Shri Chintamani Panigrahi: And you arrested 19,000!

Shri G. B. Pant: We arrested 19,000 but you are still out. We let out all those who, I think, had organised the strike as we thought that thereby good sense will prevail. But that hope seems to have belied altogether. We did that and in that way we had the support of the entire people. Are they going to defy the people? Are they the representatives of the people and is that their function..... (*Interruption*)?

Shri Naushir Bharucha: Who?

Shri G. B. Pant: The hon. Members on the opposite side who are shouting the most. There may be a difference of opinion. I do not say that every word that I am saying must be accepted by everyone, but why become so impatient and so vociferous when the entire country has proved as to what was right and when the

people have demonstrated by their behaviour as to what was wrong and what should never have been contemplated or thought of? Then, the vast majority of the Government servants have themselves given a reply. That reply has been given by this that more than 80 per cent. were present every day and there was hardly any place, except perhaps in some parts of Bengal and Gujarat and in Bombay City where we have all sorts of elements.... (*Interruption*), except in the e places, where the normal working of the essential services was interfered with.

Here, in Delhi when we get up on the morning of the 12th July, we were told that every train had been running to a minute all the night, that every letter had been regularly posted and that everything was being done in a manner which showed greater efficiency and promptness than in normal times.... (*Interruption*). Such were the reports from various other States.

This is what happened. These are real things. These are facts and they cannot be questioned. There were people who had told that somebody was not handled properly. I would not like anyone to be mishandled nor any subject to be mishandled, whether it be animate or inanimate. But so far as this particular things goes, there were at least 135 cases of sabotage and more than 200 cases of intimidation, obstruction and so on. Abusive language was used in various places. Those whom we held in the highest respect were the subject wild slogans.... (*Interruption*). Then there was also in some places this much that effigies of some of the responsible... (*Interruption*) leaders in this country were taken round, beaten on the way and ultimately burnt to ashes. I have not heard a word of condemnation from anyone so far.... (*An Hon. Member: Where was it?*) not from those who organised the strike nor from others who were interested in it. But I will not read out the long list that I have with me of what was done in the course of the strike.

I say that if the Government had not taken the steps that it did then we would have lost all that we had gained since the achievement of independence. That is not my judgment. That is the judgment of the entire country and the way they worked, the way they offered their services and the way they supported those who were working proves that it was not only an offer in words, but there was for the first time stimulated in the country a sincere and earnest desire to be actively of service to the State and to the people.

The public services are there to serve the people. When they refuse to take coal to the water works, when they refuse to transport food to the starving people, it is an unpardonable offence. But they are our own people. We cannot be very strict with them. They belong to the large family to which we also happen to belong for the time being. So what causes me regret is the loss that has been inflicted on them. They have lost more than Rs. 70 lakhs in wages. The Government has lost more than Rs. 4 crores in its earnings during the four or five days of the strike. There has been a national loss in various departments (*Interruption*) industries and the like, so that it is difficult to give a correct estimate of it.

Now, apart from the merits of the question, there is a fundamental issue before us, and it is this. When a matter of this type is referred to a high-powered Commission like the Pay Commission and its basic recommendations are turned down by the Government, then what is the precedent that we will be setting up? How can we justify any departure from the recommendations made by such a high-powered committee, after such a Commission had given full opportunity to every body, whatever be its political views, to express its opinion? Now, these are the basic recommendations.

[Shri G. B. Pant]

It has been said that the Prime Minister had refused to meet the leaders. That is not correct. What the Prime Minister had said, and what any reasonable man will accept as being the very minimum that has to be accepted, was this that so far as the basic recommendations are concerned we cannot discuss them, because if the foundations are undermined, then the entire structure falls down. But the Prime Minister was always prepared to consider matters within the framework of the recommendations of Pay Commission, and those who have been glibly talking about it have perhaps forgotten all that he said in his broadcast to the nation. Well, perhaps they did not listen to it, or if they listened to it they did not allow his words to enter their minds, much less their hearts. But everyone else in the country was moved, was touched. And even there he has said that matters can be discussed within the framework of the Pay Commission's report.

And it is said that there were no talks. There were talks between the Labour Minister and the leaders of the Committee of Action, not as members of the Committee of Action but as respected individuals; because, the Committee of Action cannot be recognised by any Government and it cannot have talks with the Committee of Action as such, because there is a principle involved in it. And there can be no room for militancy in the services. They have to function under the code prescribed for them. They have to be disciplined, not in the interests of the Government but in the interest of the country. We have to raise the standard of efficiency, *Per capita* efficiency and *per capita* productivity in the country. Therein lies the real key to the maintenance of a proper price line too. If everyone can produce more, then there can be no difficulty in maintaining the price line. But if everyone is asked to go slow while in work, or if everyone is advised to strike everyday, one gets an

opportunity to go in for a little violence and then the difficulties increase.

But again, the question which arises is as to who is responsible, who would be responsible. I do not say that we have no responsibility so long as we are here. But in these matters it must be understood that others also have a certain responsibility.

There was another reference here—somebody said, I think it was Mr. Naushir Bharucha—that the Prime Minister had said that in Russia there was no right of strike. And he said, "But when did the Prime Minister come to like Russia and so on. I do not know". The Prime Minister has never been against Russia; Mr. Bharucha may have been. So, if Mr. Bharucha has greater regard or affinity for another country, say U.S.A., where all strikes of government servants are not only prohibited by rules but are regarded as penal offences, I will just acquaint him with what one of the greatest statesmen of the United States of America, which is not alike Russia and which belongs to a different school, has said in this respect.

Shri Naushir Bharucha: What I said was that in that case pay them the U.S. scales and then prohibit the strikes.

Shri G. B. Pant: So far as I am aware, there have been frequent changes in salary in our country, and there have been attempts to raise the salary from time to time. But I do not know if the public servants there have ever pressed for a minimum wage which should be higher than the minimum wage which the lowest in the country enjoys. Well, there at least he will have no objection on the ground that what I am now placing before him comes, not from Russia, but from U.S.A.

President Roosevelt sent a letter to the President of the National Federation of Federal Employees in 1937 in which he said:

"Particularly I want to emphasise my conviction that militant tactics have no place in the functions of any organisation of government employees. Upon employees in the Federal Service rests the obligation to serve with the whole people whose interest and welfare require orderliness and continuity in the conduct of government activities. This obligation is paramount. Since their own services have to do with the functioning of the Government, a strike of public employees manifests nothing less than an intent on their part to prevent or obstruct the operations of Government until their demands are satisfied. Such action, looking towards the paralysis of Government by those who have sworn to support is unthinkable and intolerable. It is therefore with a feeling of gratification that I have noted in the constitution of the National Federation of Federal Employees the provision that under no circumstances shall this Federation engage in or support a strike against the United States Government."

Well, there are many other countries....

Shri Rajendra Singh: Those conditions in the United States do not apply in this country

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. I warn this hon. Member that unless he keeps quiet and does not interfere or interrupt, I will be obliged to ask him to keep out of the House for the rest of the day. I cannot put up with this.

Shri Rajendra Singh: All right, I will go out.

Mr. Speaker: He will keep out of the House. I hereby direct the hon. Member to withdraw from the House for the rest of the day.

Shri Rajendra Singh: All right, I am going out if that is the way you want to conduct the proceedings.

13.40 hrs.

(*Shri Rajendra Singh then left the House.*)

Mr. Speaker: I am aware that this is a very vexed subject... (*Interruptions*). Order, order Hon. Members cannot go on interrupting like this. I have allowed Shri A. K. Gopalan. I shall try to give all the Groups here an opportunity. But this is not the manner in which one should go on interrupting. Nothing is gained by this.

Shri G. B. Pant: I really did not think that the proposition that I have placed before the House would call for all that I have said, but the speech of Shri Naushir Bharucha made it incumbent upon me to clear up certain points.

I may say that the withdrawal of the strike was a formal one, because before that most of the unions had already withdrawn their notices and there was hardly any possibility of the strike dragging on for another day or two. We received the news of the withdrawal of the strike with a certain amount of relief because we did not want even a few of our servants to suffer under the influence of others. So, we received it with relief. It is my pleasant duty today to express my appreciation of the loyal and devoted services rendered by the large number of Government servants in spite of all the persuasive and coercive methods that were employed against them.

I am also grateful to the various State Governments for the masterly way in which they handled the situation. The whole administration worked as one unit with a determined purpose in a methodical way, and for that I think we have to be grateful to them. That showed and demonstrated the capacity of the Governments of this country—all of them happened to be now associated with the Government—to handle any crisis and I am also thankful for anything about that attitude of the public.

[Shri G. B. Pant]

convey the sentiments that I have, not because of the co-operation that they gave, but because of the revival of that spirit which seemed at one time to have been completely suppressed. I would not say anything about other leaders who helped us. If I mention labour leaders, there will be, I think a furore somewhere. So, I will not. But I regret that all this should have happened.

Now it is our desire to do all we can to avoid anything that may lead to any misunderstanding between the Government and its employees because the relations between them should be of utmost cordiality; there should be mutual confidence and the Government servants should have greater trust in the Government than in anybody else. That is the task which now faces us. We have, on the one hand, issued instructions that those who had been arrested, or those who had even been convicted, or those who have even been suspended, should be dealt with leniently, and should be punished only to the extent it is necessary in public interest and for the maintenance of discipline and efficiency and also for avoiding a repetition of such scenes. That is what we want to do. And I can say that action has already been taken on these lines, and large numbers have been already released, or now allowed to resume duty, but there also the action taken by us is not final. We have now to devise means so that there may be no strikes. Strikes are going to be banned in public services; and neither the railways nor Posts and Telegraphs can indulge in such a sort of suicidal and dreadful upheaval. But we will have a sort of different industrial code for them, so that they may have their unions, but the unions should consist of the services themselves. Also, we propose that there should be some definite machinery in all branches of the services for conciliation, negotiation, settlement, and where necessary, reference to

arbitration, so that things may proceed harmoniously and justice may be done to all.

I think the Government wants to do its best by its services. It has accepted the recommendations; it has even given some of the public servants more than what has been proposed by the Commission. It has also accepted the proposal for review of the position when there is a persistent rise of ten points in the index of prices for twelve months, and it is possible that the Government may take a decision that at least half of such rise or the loss or hardship due to it should be neutralised automatically, and for the rest, if necessary, a reference may be made to an impartial body.

What I have said, I think, proves, if anybody has any doubt anywhere, Government's earnest desire to do its best by and for its servants and at the same time to do by the people at large, to whom it owes primary responsibility, what is due to them.

Mr. Speaker: Motion moved:

"That the situation arising out of the recent strike of some Central Government employees and the action taken by the Government of India in connection therewith be taken into consideration."

Shri Vajpayee: I beg to move:

That for the original motion, the following be substituted, namely:

"This House having considered the situation arising out of the recent strike of some Central Government employees and the action taken by the Government of India in connection therewith, is of the opinion that because of its failure to accede to the reasonable demands of Government employees it is the Union Government that has been primarily

responsible for precipitating the strike and further regrets—

- (a) that the Government have gone back on its commitments regarding the decisions taken at the Fifteenth Labour Conference in regard to the fixing of a minimum wage;
- (b) that the Government have failed to keep the price line in check and have refused to link Dearness Allowance with rise in price index;
- (c) that Government announced concessions to Railway employees and acceptance of Pay Commission's recommendations for employees only when the strike became imminent;
- (d) that the Prime Minister refused to meet representatives of the employees;
- (e) that notwithstanding its affirmation that it proposed to treat the Pay Body's Report as an award, the Government altered the recommendations at will, and made haste in implementing specially those recommendations that were unfavourable to the employees;
- (f) that notwithstanding the unconditional calling off of the strike, the Government refuses to release and reinstate employees who participated in strike;
- (g) that wide arbitrary powers of dealing with employees who participated in strike have been given to officials; and
- (h) that recognition of various Unions participating in the strike should have been withdrawn." (1)

Shri B. K. Gaikwad (Nasik): Sir, I want to move my amendment with slight modification. There appears to

be a misprint in my amendment. In the last but third line, it should read "who did not participate" instead of "who participated".

Mr. Speaker: It can be moved subject to the modification.

Shri B. K. Gaikwad: I beg to move:

That for the original motion, the following be substituted, namely:

"This House having considered the situation arising out of the recent strike of some Central Government employees and the action taken by the Government of India in connection therewith disapproves of the conferring of wide powers on some officers of the Central Government for taking action against the employees, particularly Scheduled Castes, who did not participate in the strike and the behaviour of such officers towards the strikers." (4)

Shri Tridib Kumar Chaudhuri (Berhampur): I beg to move:

That for the original motion, the following be substituted, namely:

"This Housing having considered the situation arising out of the recent strike of some Central Government employees and the action taken by the Government of India in connection therewith disapproves of the decision of the Government to withdraw recognition of all Central Government Employees Unions, including such well established Unions as the All India Railwaymen's Federation, the National Federation of Posts and Telegraphs Employees, the All India Defence Employees Federation and the Confederation of Central Government Employees, for participation in the strike and the launching by the Government and the heads of departments concerned such punitive measures as suspension and

[Shri Tridib Kumar Chaudhuri]
discharge of employees on a mass
scale in spite of the strike being
withdrawn unconditionally."
(2)

That for the original motion, the
following be substituted, namely:

"This House having considered the situation arising out of the recent strike of some Central Government employees and the action taken by the Government of India in connection therewith disapproves of the entire policy of the Government in handling the strike and regrets the failure of the Government for not meeting the just demands of the strikers and creating thereby a condition favourable for the withdrawal of the strike through a negotiated settlement with the Employees' Unions concerned."
(3)

Shri Kasliwal (Kotah): I beg to move:

That for the original motion, the following be substituted, namely:

"This House having considered the situation arising out of the recent strike of some Central Government employees and the action taken by the Government of India in connection therewith, approves of the various measures taken by Government in this regard." (5)

Shri Jaganatha Rao (Koraput): I beg to move:

That for the original motion, the following be substituted, namely:

"This Housing having considered the situation arising out of the recent strike of some Central Government employees and the action taken by the Government of India in connection therewith, approves the action and the stand of the Government of India thereon." (6)

Shri S. M. Banerjee (Kanpur): I beg to move:

That for the original motion, the following be substituted, namely:

"This House having considered the situation arising out of the recent strike of some Central Government employees and the action taken by the Government of India in connection therewith, is of the opinion that Government failed to have a peaceful negotiated settlement which was responsible for the All India strike and further regrets,—

- (a) that Government have not respected the unanimous decisions of the Fifteenth Labour Conference regarding minimum wage;
- (b) that Government have failed to hold the price line and in its absence to link the Dearness Allowance with cost of living index;
- (c) that Government have failed to concede the legitimate demands of the Central Government employees regarding restoration of concessions withdrawn by the Pay Commission;
- (d) that the Prime Minister refused to meet the members of the Joint Council of Action;
- (e) that wide arbitrary powers were given to officials to deal with the strike;
- (f) that even after calling of the strike the Government refuses to release and reinstate employees who participated in the strike; and
- (g) that recognition to various Unions and Federations who participated in the strike should have been withdrawn." (7)

Shri T. B. Vittal Rao (Khammam):
I beg to move:

That for the original motion, the following be substituted, namely:

"This House having considered the situation arising out of the recent strike of some Central Government employees and the action taken by the Government of India in connection therewith, is of the opinion that the Government of India is solely responsible for precipitating the strike by refusing to accede to the just demands of the Central Government employees for linking of Dearness Allowance with the cost of living index and further disapproves of the policy of withdrawing of the recognition accorded to All India Railwaymen's Federation, the National Federation of Posts and Telegraphs Employees, Civil Aviation Department Employees Union and All India Income-tax Employees Association" (8)

Shri A. K. Gopalan: I beg to move:

That for the original motion, the following be substituted, namely:

"This House, having considered the situation arising out of the recent strike of some Central Government employees and the action taken by the Government of India in connection therewith, regrets that—

(a) the Government refused to negotiate with the representatives of the Central Government on the most important questions of linking of dearness allowance with cost of living index and the progressive realisation of a minimum wage calculated on the basis of the decisions of the Fifteenth Indian Labour Conference;

(b) the Prime Minister did not agree to meet the Standing Committee of the Joint

Council of Action of the Central Government employees;

- (c) that the Government instead of meeting the just and reasonable demands of the employees and dealing with them in a democratic way befitting our traditions, professions, resorted to severe repression, trampling under foot all democratic values and creating a regime of terror;
- (d) that the Government has failed to take and is still refusing to take any positive steps which will arrest the enormous increase in prices taking place causing untold suffering to all the fixed income groups including the entire working people of the country;
- (e) that the Government has gone back on the assurances it held out to the representatives on the eve of the strike;
- (f) that the Government while saying that it wants to treat the Second Pay Commission Report as an award, in fact modified a number of its recommendations to suit their convenience;
- (g) that in spite of repeated public assurances, the Government is resorting to vindictive attitude towards the employees and is victimising thousands of them on flimsy and unjustifiable grounds; and
- (h) that the Government is withdrawing recognition from the representative unions which enjoy the support of the employees." (9)

Mr. Speaker: All these amendments are now before the House, subject, of course, to my finding out whether any particular portion is out of order.

[Mr. Speaker]

Now, I shall call upon Shri A. K. Gopalan to speak. So far as Leaders of the Groups are concerned, I may permit them to speak up to half an hour each. So far as the others are concerned, they will be given not more than fifteen minutes each.

Shri A. K. Gopalan: The Central Government employees' strike was an unprecedented event of the recent times. The conduct of Government before the strike, during the time of the strike, and after the strike, has been something which has shocked the conscience of every honest man in this country, barring some, perhaps, on the other side.

There was official propaganda to belittle the wide extent of the strike. There was also an attempt to screen from the public the accumulated discontent among the Government employees. But, notwithstanding all this terror, the Ordinance and also the appeal that was made by the Prime Minister, the Central Government employees, nearly a million of them, struck work.

After hearing the speech of the hon. Home Minister, I feel disappointed. Instead of understanding and reviewing the situation, he has certainly made a speech which has given me the impression that the lessons of the strike have not been understood by Government. He said in the course of his speech that the Government servants had been incited. I want to ask him, how, in spite of the appeal made by the Prime Minister, in spite of the Ordinance and in spite of all the terror that had been created and knowing that if they went on strike, bad consequences will follow, the Central Government employees did go on strike. After all, these Central Government employees have been serving Government for the last so many years. Is it contended that because of the incitement by half a dozen people, lakhs and lakhs of these Central Government employees went on strike? If

the hon. Home Minister contends like that, then it only means that certainly the relations between the Central Government as the employer and the Central Government employees as the employees are very bad, and the Central Government have not won the confidence of lakhs and lakhs of Central Government employees all over the country.

If, for the last thirteen years, they have not been able to win the confidence and affection of the employees, in spite of the fact that every time they had been given increment in wages and other things, I think it is high time that Government should realise that they cannot function with their employees, and, they should quit.

What was the root-cause of the strike? In spite of the appeal made by the Prime Minister, why did the Central Government employees go on strike? This was what we expected Government at least would understand and look into. We expected a minimum sense of responsibility on the part of Government, instead of self-righteousness. But, that was the theme of the speech of the Home Minister. The Home Minister has said that Government were all right, and it was only some political parties, it was only the Opposition parties which incited lakhs and lakhs of employees to go on strike. He also wanted to belittle the extent of the strike, and he said that many were there who did not go on strike.

It may be that merely a million of the employees have gone on strike. But we have not forgotten the case of Dr. Joseph. There may be many like Dr. Joseph who, due to frustration, may be thinking of committing suicide. Due to fear, some of them may not have joined the strike. Due to terror and due to so many other intimidations and other things, many of them may not have joined the strike. Does it mean that Government should not understand the

magnitude of the situation and why in spite of the terror of the Ordinance and the appeal made by the Prime Minister, lakhs and lakhs of employees went on strike? After all, it is their own employees who have been working with them for the last so many years, who have gone on strike. But the Home Minister has not referred to this point at all in his speech, and he has instead side-tracked the issue.

He has said that it is not because of discontentment, it is not because the Central Government employees had any grievance or suffering, it is not because they had any reasonable demands to make, but it is because of incitement that the Central Government employees went on strike. Also, Government viewed it as a rebellion inspired by somebody outside.

Although I would not like to go into the details about the Pay Commission's recommendations etc., I would like to point out the reasons which prompted them to go on a strike. When the First Pay Commission's report was submitted, the Central Government employees wanted that report must be implemented fully, but it was not fully implemented. Ever since 1946 when there was a strike and the Government appointed a Pay Commission and the Pay Commission gave their recommendations, the Central Government employees have been agitating over his issue. They wanted that the recommendations of the First Pay Commission should be fully implemented, and they waited for some time. They thought that Government would do something in the matter, but when they found that nothing was done, they gave a strike notice in 1957. They gave a strike notice because they had found that it was only after a big pressure that Government would move.

Even as far as the recommendations of the Second Pay Commission are concerned, why is it that certain changes and modifications have been

made only after the strike and not before the strike? Why is it that before the strike, Government did not announce that they were going to make some modifications? And why did they do so after the strike?

It was because there was the pressure of the strike. Even in 1957, it was only after the strike notice was given that the Second Pay Commission was appointed, and it was only then that an interim relief was given. So, this time also, as usual, Government have made the employees understand that it is only after pressure that they would move; and due to the united pressure of the Government employees, Government have moved. It was only to bring pressure on Government and to make Government understand that they are united and they want that the reasonable demands of the Government employees must be accepted by Government, that they went on strike.

As far as the strike is concerned, two important issues arise out of it. The Home Minister has said that Government are giving something more to the employees. But he did not see the other side of the picture. What is the use of giving Rs. 10 more, if they are not able to hold the price-line? What is the use of giving Rs. 10 more to the worker, if the price of cloth rises by 40 per cent, if the price of sugar rises, and in fact, he cannot get it in the open market but has to purchase it in the black market, or if the prices of the other essential articles rise by 20, 30 or 40 per cent? What the Central Government employees have been saying from 1947 is that if they must be benefited by the small increase that is given by Government, then, certainly, Government must hold the price-line.

The most important things are the holding of the price line and the giving of a need-based minimum wage. In spite of the Home Minister's threat that Government will ban

[Shri A. K. Gopalan]

strikes and will not allow the employees to do anything, if the Government are not going to do anything to hold the price line and to give them a need-based minimum wage, I am sure the Central Government employees and other sections of the working class will certainly be demoralised and will be frustrated, and then I do not know what they will do.

It is not a question of force or pressure; it is not a question of an Ordinance. The question is of meeting the two main demands. Can the Home Minister say that there is a need based minimum wage as far as the Central Government employees are concerned, according to the First Pay Commission Report? The First Pay Commission Report had definitely indicated what is a poverty-line wage and what is above that.

To these two most important demands, the Government's answer was: no question of talking about a need-based minimum wage and no question of linking the D.A. with the cost of living index. If there is no question of discussing the cost of living index and the rise in that index and linking it with D.A., what is the use of giving D.A.? If the cost of living index goes higher and higher and Government are not able hold the price line, certainly the wages also must increase. If a Central Government employee who bought 50 yards of cloth before wants to buy the same 50 yards of cloth now—with more mouths to feed and more family burden—he must pay six annas per rupee more than he paid last time. Can he afford it? He wants not merely the slogan of a socialist pattern of society. He had been hoping all these 13 years that there would be a rise in his standard of living.

Now he wants to see that his standard of living does not go down. He wants to hold it, and live in the way he used to. That is the reason

why these two demands have been put forward. As far as the Second Pay Commission was concerned, they found that it was a planned attack and offensive on their purchasing power, on the existing level of their wages. What is the reason given by the Government for not accepting the demands? As explained by the Home Minister, they say it is an award by a Pay Commission presided over by an honoured Judge and they cannot change the award. I want to ask the Home Minister, what about the Bank Award, what about the Chagla Report and what about other Reports? What about the S.R.C. Report? Government have accepted some recommendations and rejected some recommendations.

In all these bodies presided over by eminent Judges, wherever Government want to accept certain recommendations in their interest, they accept, and wherever they do not want, wherever they want to reject, they reject. They say, 'This is an award; we must respect it and so we cannot make any changes'. If this is true even as far as the Second Pay Commission's Report is concerned, have not the Government made some changes? Why did they make those changes? They made those changes because an award is not something that cannot be changed. After all, the Second Pay Commission was not to take away the rights of the Central Government employees. Unfortunately, in the shape of recommendations, whatever right, the Central Government employees had was taken away from them.

The employees thought that the Second Pay Commission, taking into account the rise in the cost of living and rise in prices, would certainly do something as far as the two important demands were concerned. But they were disappointed because nothing was done.

What did the Government do? Government promulgated an Ordinance. Before the Ordinance was

promulgated, as Shri Naushir Bharucha has explained—I do not want to go into the details—the employees tried their level best to come to a settlement. They waited for the Prime Minister to return from abroad. They decided in June that they would not strike but would discuss the matter with Government, hoping for a settlement. But the Prime Minister on his return did not even talk to them. At least, he should have called them and told them, 'I am not going to discuss these two basic issues; but if there are other issues, certainly we can talk about them.' That is the way of democracy. It is not only in speech that democracy should be there; the question of democracy comes also in the behaviour towards the employees.

So the Central Government employees thought that there was no question of even reopening the two important things. The Government's attitude was: 'You are employees in essential services. So you cannot say anything about what we give you. Whatever your difficulties are, if you tell us we will give you something, and then if you are not satisfied, you must work in the public interest'. This is the answer that the Home Minister has given us.

He says that the economic and social life of the country will be disrupted. Who is disrupting the economic and social life of the country? It is not the Central Government employees who are doing it. It is the profiteer, the black-marketeer and the hoarder—they are there, and the Government are supporting them—who are disrupting the economic and social life of the country. It is they who are responsible for the rise in prices. It is they who are responsible for retarding the progress of the Plan also.

We have seen how in the Second Five Year Plan, because of the increase in prices, the targets of the Plan have had to be cut down. There was no emergency at all. While discussing the Ordinance, it has been

pointed out that if the object of the Government was to stop the strike and to see that they were punished, then the Industrial Disputes Act would have been invoked. But there was an Ordinance promulgated. Why? Because Government wanted to break the morale of the Central Government employees; they wanted to break their unions; they wanted them not to make an effort at collective bargaining for their demands. That was the reason why an Ordinance was promulgated.

I do not go into the legal question because I have no time. But as far as the Ordinance is concerned, it is certainly against the Constitution. The fundamental rights given to the employees by the Constitution have been denied to them.

I want to quote here what the Prime Minister said some years ago and what he felt about strikers and black-legs. This is what he said:

"I was vastly excited, and my sympathies were naturally all on the strikers' side. The collapse of the strike, after a few days, came almost as a personal blow. . . I saw the haggard and pinched faces of the men and women and children, and more revealing still, I saw many of the strikers and their wives being tried in the local or county court. One case especially angered me! three or four women, with babies in their arms, were brought up in the dock for the offence of having jeered at the black-legs (now called 'volunteers' in our country)".

This was what he said with reference to the general strike in England in 1926. These are not the follies of youth but the noble sentiments expressed by the Prime Minister.

Shri Goray (Poona): He was not Prime Minister then.

Shri A. K. Gopalan: He was not Prime Minister then. But he has

[Shri A. K. Gopalan]

expressed noble and patriotic sentiments. He said black-legs were called 'volunteers' in our country. I tell him that these are noble sentiments expressed by him about the strikers and he has to treat the strikers in this country accordingly.

Shri Achar (Mangalore): Was it a strike of government servants?

Some Hon. Members: Yes.

Shri Tangamani: Yes, the whole country was affected by it.

Shri A. K. Gopalan: Suppose the workers stopped work for one or two days. I say, more disturbing than stoppage of work by the employees is the calculated, planned assault on the nation's economy by profiteers. It is the Government which have helped them by their failure to hold the price line. To this most important thing, the Government are blind.

If an Ordinance was promulgated to deal with those who are responsible for this increase in prices, the whole people and the Central Government employees would have been behind the Government. Then certainly there would have been no strike. The case of the employees is: 'Either hold the price line—do not give us anything more, if you are able to hold the price line—or if you are not able to hold the price line, give us something so that we may be able to live as before.'

Sir, as I have no time I do not go into the other aspects of the question. During the time of the strike certain things happened. I want to explain them. It was a most peaceful strike. I do not know whether there was any case of violence at all. The Home Minister of Kerala has given an open statement that there was no violent speech there. And, so many other States have stated that there was absolutely no violence. It was a strike in which lakhs and lakhs of people all over India were involved.

The Supreme Court and the L.A.T. have held that mere going on illegal strike does not confer the right on the employer to dismiss the employee. As a model employer, what has Government done? There have been indiscriminate dismissals.

I will give you some instances. In Madras a doctor was arrested. The doctor was coming out of the General Hospital and then the police asked him why he was standing there. He said he was waiting for the bus; but he was taken in the police van to the police station. Somebody saw him and went to the hospital and told the sergeant that he was a doctor and he was released. That is what they did.

The Ordinance was there. Whom did they arrest? Because the Ordinance was there the police officers and the departmental officers could do everything they liked. In the office of the D.A.G.P. & T, Nagpur they heard that one Viswanathan misbehaved. They passed orders of suspension on one S. Viswanathan. This S. Viswanathan was one who was a very loyal servant. He was a loyal person who did not strike and who attended to his duty. He asked: 'Am I to be punished because I did not go on strike?' There were five Biswanathans there. So, when he complained orders of suspension were passed on all the Viswanathans.

There is another instance. . .

Mr. Speaker: I would like to know from the hon. Member the persons who committed these mistakes did not recognise the identity of the Viswanathan—did they not differentiate between one Viswanathan and the other. Were they not also government employees? (*Interruptions*).

Shri A. K. Gopalan: There was no Viswanathan who went on strike. It was only on suspicion that it was done. Somebody said one Viswanathan was there. So the punishment was given.

Mr. Speaker: The person who gave notice of suspension was also a government employee.

Shri A. K. Gopalan: Yes. I do not say it is the Government. I only show how it leads them to behave because the Ordinance was there and it gave them powers to do as they liked.

Shri T. B. Vittal Rao: They will be promoted tomorrow.

Shri A. K. Gopalan: There is another example of this suspension notice being given. One of the first persons to be arrested was one Nirmal Bhattacharjee, an M.L.C. He is a Professor and an M.L.C. He was one of those persons who were suspended.

Shri C. K. Bhattacharya (West Dinajpur): He happened to be the President of the Union.

An Hon. Member: So, you have the right to suspend him!

Shri C. K. Chattacharya: It is not for nothing that his name has come in.

Shri A. K. Gopalan: Shri Mukundan DET, Telephones, Madurai used abusive words against girls and suspended 4 girls and suspended 6 youths. He abused them in such a way that he was asked to behave properly with the ladies. I do not want to say other things; when they protested they were suspended.

An Hon. Member: Wherefrom?

Shri A. K. Gopalan: Madurai.

As far as the case of Kerala is concerned, there is a Coalition Government. They say there was no victimisation. There was vindictive action. In Alwaye there were 36 arrested, 36 convicted and 36 were dismissed. In Palghat there were 232 arrested, 151 convicted, 124 were dismissed; in Calicut, 235 were arrested, 118 cases were pending and 219 were suspended; and everywhere this was the case. About

10,000 people were suspended or dismissed in Calcutta.

I have got a list of these from all the States. Both the State Governments and the Central Government said that they were not going to take vindictive action. But the action of the departmental heads show that even those who did come to their work and who did not strike were punished.

I want to put before some peculiar features of what happened. The police were permitted to withdraw the cases of 216 persons in Trichur but the D.I.T. who was the Special Officer for the strike does not want them to withdraw the case and so these cases are not being withdrawn.

In Poona when the camp was rounded 137 R.M.S. workers were taken by the Police and their radio set was also taken. In Calcutta on the 20th July, a permanent Telephone operator was struck several times by a switchboard by a supervisor; and on complaining the P.T.O. served him with a suspension order. In Indore the permanent employees taken on duty on 15th July 1960 were dismissed on 25th July 1960. No charge-sheet or no show cause notice was served on them. In Nellore all the post offices were closed except the head office; and on 4th July 1960 they were closed on orders issued by the Superintendent and when there was no question of staff going on strike, still one postmaster was suspended. Employees who did not go on strike were also suspended. In Madurai and Kerala very few cases were withdrawn. Out of 1400 cases in Kerala 217 have been convicted and 230 cases have been withdrawn. About 100 girls were arrested. In Kerala cases are still pending.

I am not able to give all the points because I have no time. The effect of the Ordinance was such that it was not merely a question of the government employees going on strike being punished. The departmental heads:

[Shri A. K. Gopalan]

report to the police and the police take action against them and send report to the department and they are taking action then. I want to know from the hon. Home Minister whether there is any truth in the statement that there will be no vindictive attitude adopted? Will all those workers against whom action has been taken be taken back? That is not known.

As far as the strike was concerned there were lathi charges in many places. There are reports that in some places there were secret trials and sureties were threatened and advocates were threatened. In the Ordinance it was said that anybody who gives money to a strike will be punished. Suppose a striker is hungry and you give him money for his food you will be punished.

In Calcutta Y. M. C. A. there was a search of the telephone operators...

Mr. Speaker: I would ask the hon. Member one thing. I have allowed him to refer to a number of cases. How is the hon. Minister or for the matter of that any hon. Minister, to answer these things unless the details are given to him so that he may know them and try to answer them or meet the charges? Have they been sent to him?

Shri G. B. Pant: They have not been sent.

Mr. Speaker: Normally, under our Rules, whenever a reference is made to individual cases, the Minister must be appraised of these cases; otherwise, you are not entitled to raise them.

Shri A. K. Gopalan: Then, will you please allow me to place a record of all these things on the Table of the House so that he may examine them?

Mr. Speaker: No, no.

Shri A. K. Gopalan: I want to tell the hon. Home Minister how these things are happening.

Mr. Speaker: Quite right. But all that I say is that the hon. Member knows the rules. Before he refers to individual cases he must prepare a list of the cases and send them to the Minister so that he may also come prepared to answer or meet the charges. That is all.

Shri A. K. Gopalan: I want to say this. This is a copy of the speech delivered by Shri O. K. Ghosh, Accountant-General, Maharashtra. He said:

"You must now realise that I can take any disciplinary action I want against those who went on strike. Your fate is in my hands and whatever I do, I will have the support of Delhi."

I want the Home Minister to see that I am not dealing with the cases. I only want to say that as far as the whole strike was concerned, so far as the behaviour of Government during the strike is concerned, this is the picture. This was not a political war against Government; it was not a political struggle; it was an economic struggle. The employees wanted to have bread and butter. The government employee wanted to improve his standard of living.

What did the A.I.R. do? What was the role of the A.I.R. The All India Radio gave news supplied to it but which was not correct. What was its role? It gave false news to the people in this country, saying things which were not happening. In places where the strike took place, it said that there was no strike. Why should the Government stoop to this level? Is not Government responsible for this?

As far as the P.T.I. is concerned, Government gave some information and it was published. The Press Trust of India became the Press Mistrust of India. The whole people had been misled. There is only one national agency in the country and it should not have done like that. The P.T.I.

and the A.I.R. were giving the people false information and did not keep the people informed of what was happening and the Government's aims were thus fulfilled. Is this the way to treat the employees? They must be treated with dignity and honour. They have withdrawn the strike. Is this the way in which the departmental heads are to treat the workers?

They say openly that they have got powers and they will do what they like. Is the Government going to leave everything in the hands of the departmental heads? The hon. Home Minister himself has said that the Government wants people to work efficiently. Certainly, if that is so, these things must not be allowed to be done by the departmental heads.

This is not the first time that there has been a strike. In 1946, there was the P. and T. strike. There was no victimisation. The strike went on for three weeks. How is it that the Government wants to be so vindictive this time that there is no sense of dignity or honour when people work in their offices. I want to know whether it is the order of the Government. Shri O. K. Ghosh, the Accountant General of the Maharashtra State says:

"I am not going to show any leniency to your Association leaders. I will give all of them the ultimate penalty. They have been bravely organising the Strike and now let them bravely take what I give them..... Of course even if somebody is a bad worker, I will give him all consideration if he has not joined the strike...."

I want to know if this is the policy of the Government. Will the Government review the whole thing? I will request the Home Minister to review these actions of the departmental heads. Thousands of people are involved. It is not a hundred or even two hundred. They are suspended and dismissed.

686(ai) LSD—6.

Shri Raghunath Singh (Varanasi):
They should be.

Shri A. K. Gopalan: Thousands of people are going to the court. If things are done at this rate, discontent will spread in the country. So, I request the hon. Home Minister to review these cases before the 15th of August.... (Some Hon. Members: No) We are celebrating the Independence Day. The employees went on a strike for a cause which they thought dear to them; it was concerned with their life. They went on strike and they have withdrawn the strike. Now, let the Government be magnanimous and let them see that all of them are in their offices before the 15th of August. If this vindictive attitude is continued, it is not good for the country or for our national reconstruction work and it is not good for the people of the country.

सेठ गोविन्द दास (जबलपुर) : अध्यक्ष जी, मैं ने अभी बड़े ध्यान से श्री भरूच जी का भाषण सुना और श्री गोपालन जी का भाषण सुना। भरूचा जी ने अपने भाषण में राष्ट्रपति के अध्यक्ष का विरोध किया और मजदूरों की मांगों का समर्थन। साथ ही अपने समर्थन में उन्होंने करेट के सदृश महान् पत्र के उद्धरण दिए। मैं समझता हूँ कि करेन्ट का नाम लेने के बाद अब उन के भाषण के सम्बन्ध में कुछ न ही कहा जाये, तो अच्छा है।

जहाँ तक गोप लन जी के सम्बन्ध है, उन्होंने मजदूरों की कुछ मांगों का उल्लेख किया और उन मांगों के कारण इस हड़ताल को उचित बताया। मैं समझता हूँ कि जहाँ तक उन के दल, साम्यवादी दल, का सम्बन्ध है, उन की ओर उन के दल की सच्ची जन्म भूमि रूस और चीन है। मैं यह ज नना चाहूँ: हूँ कि ऐसी मांगों के ऊपर यदि रूस और चीन में हड़ताल की बात कही जाती, तो उन बातों के कहने वालों या ऐसे किसी दल की क्या स्थिति होती। वे माने जाय एंटी-सोशल- और कांटेटर-रेवोल्यूशनरी

ए० माननीय सदस्य : हिन्दी में इस के लिए क्या शब्द है ?

सेठ गोविन्द दा : हिन्दी में यह है — जो समाज के विरुद्ध तत्व हों, जो क्रांति के विरुद्ध तत्व हों

डा० राम सुभग सिंह : (सहसराम) : प्रतिक्रियावादी ।

सेठ गोविन्द दास : प्रतिक्रियावादी तत्व । हिन्दी में उनका यह अनुवाद है । मैं अंग्रेजी के इन शब्दों का इसलिये प्रयोग कर रहा हूँ, जिस से श्री गोपालन जी को ये शब्द समझ में आ जायें ।

Shri Tangamani: If you want him to follow your speech, you should speak in English.

सेठ गोविन्द दास : यदि वहाँ यह सब होता, तो उन की क्या हालत होती, यह मैं उन्हीं से जानना चाहता हूँ ।

श्री गोपालन जो ने हमारे प्रधान मंत्री के एक कथन का भी उद्धरण दिया, जो किसी दूसरी परिस्थिति में, किसी अन्य समय कहा गया था । उन के उस उद्धरण को सुन कर मह कवि मिल्टन के पैडाइज लास्ट का, जो उन का एक महान् काय माना जाता है, एक प्रसंग मुझे स्मरण आ गया । मिल्टन के पैडाइज लास्ट में एक जगह लिखा है कि कभी-कभी शैतान भी बाइबल का उद्धरण देते हैं ।

गोपालन जी ने अपने भाषण में यह भी कहा कि यह हड़ताल आर्थिक हड़ताल थी, र जनैतिक हड़ताल नहीं थी । मैं उन से कहना चाहता हूँ कि

Shri Muhammed Elias (Howrah): On a point of order, is it fair for an hon. Member to say that the Deputy Leader of the Communist Group is a

shaitan? He has given the example in such a way. It should not be in such a way.

Shri Vajpayee: The hon. Member does not know Hindi.

Shri Muhammed Elias: I can follow Hindi very well. (*Interruptions*).

सेठ गोविन्द दास : उन्होंने उस हड़ताल को आर्थिक हड़ताल बतलाया । अच्छा होता यदि गोप लन जी उस हड़ताल के दौरान में जरा जबलपुर जा कर देखते ।

14.29 hrs.

[*DR. SUSHILA NAYAR in the Chair*]

श्री मोहम्मद इलियास : माननीय सदस्य ये सब बातें श्री गोपालन को कह रहे हैं । यदि वह चाहते हैं कि श्री गोप लन उन की बातों को समझें, तो वह अंग्रेजी में बोलें ।

Seth Govind Das: I am not giving way.

जबलपुर में हमारे सुरक्ष. के कारखाने हैं । यदि गोपालन जी वहाँ आकर देखते, तो उन को मालूम होता कि यह हड़ताल आर्थिक हड़ताल थी, या राजनैतिक हड़ताल थी ।

उन्होंने बर बार गृह मंत्री जी से हड़ताल का मुख्य कारण पूछा । गृह मंत्री जी तो आगे चल शायद उस कारण को बतायेंगे, मैं उन्हें बता देता हूँ वह कारण । हड़ताल का मुख्य कारण था उन के दल की गद्दारी के काम । मैं उन को गद्दार नहीं कहता, देश-द्रोही नहीं कहत, ट्रेटर नहीं कहता । किसी को गद्दार, देश-द्रोही या ट्रेटर कहना एक बात है, लेकिन उस के कामों को गद्दारी के काम कहना, देश-द्रोही के काम कहना, और ट्रेटर पने के काम कहना एक अलग बात है । मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि उन के दल का इतिहास इसी प्रकार का इतिहास रहा है । १९४२ के आन्दोलन में उन के दल का यही इतिहास रहा ।

उस के बाद जब चीन का हमारे ऊपर आक्रमण हुआ, उस समय उन के दल का यही इतिहास रहा और इस हड़ताल के अवसर पर भी उन के दल का यही इतिहास रहा। एक कारण तो यह है और दूसरा कारण, अध्यक्ष जी, मैं अपने प्रधान मंत्री, पंडित जवाहरलाल जी को मानता हूँ। (Interruptions) जी हाँ, इस हड़ताल का कारण। एक बड़ी बात मैं उन के सामने कह रहा हूँ। उन को देख कर मुझे वाल्मीकी जी ने राम यण मे राम का जो वर्णन किया है, वह याद आ जाता है। राम के वर्णन में वाल्मीकी जी ने लिखा है—“वज्रदपि कठोरणि मृदूनि कुसुमादपि”। लेकिन हमारे प्रधान मंत्री जी के सम्बन्ध में “मृदूनि कुसुमादपि” ठीक है, यानी कोमल पुष्पों के सदृश उन को जो रख है वह रख ऊपर आ जाता है। अगर उन्होंने अपनी इसी प्रकार की उदरता नीति का स्वराज्य के बाद पालन नहीं किया होता, तो मैं उन से कहना चाहता हूँ आप की मर्कत, कि यह हड़ताल नहीं होती। उन्होंने अत्यन्त उदार नीति का पालन किया। हर दल हमारे लिये एक सा है—कांग्रेस दल भी वैसा ही है, कम्युनिस्ट दल भी वैसा ही है, अमुक दल भी वैसा ही है। इसी का नतीजा है कि हड़ताल हुई। मैं दो कारण इस हड़ताल के मानता हूँ—एक कारण हमारे साम्यवादी दल का काम और दूसरा हमारे पंडित जी की उदार नीति।

मैं ऐसे स्थान से आता हूँ, जो सुरक्षा के कारखानों से भरा हुआ है। खमरिया की आर्डिनंस फ्रैक्टरी हमारे इस देश की ही सब से बड़ी फ्रैक्टरी नहीं है, वह एशिया की सब से बड़ी फ्रैक्टरी है। गन कैरिज फ्रैक्टरी दूसरा कारखाना है और सेंट्रल आर्डिनंस डिपो तीसरा। हमारे यहां पर सुरक्षा के कारखानों का जाल फैला हुआ है। मैं वर्षों से, जब हमारे महावीर त्यागी जी, जो मेरे पास बैठते हैं और इस समय यहां नहीं हैं सुरक्षा मंत्री थे, उन से

कहा करता था, मेनन साहब से कहा करता था, सुरजीत सिंह मजीठिया जी से कहा करता था, रघुरामैया जी से कहा करता था कि इन फ्रैक्टरियों में हमारे इन साम्यवादी लोगों का क्या हाल है और वे हमेशा कहा करते थे कि हमारे लिए तो सब एक से हैं। यह हड़ताल कितनी दूर तक आर्थिक थी और कितनी दूर तक राजनैतिक थी, इस का अनुभव मुझे है, क्योंकि मैं जबलपुर में रहता हूँ, जो जबलपुर घिरा हुआ है इस प्रकार के कारखानों से। वहां पर बड़ी बड़ी तैयारियां हुई थीं। सेंट्रल आर्डिनंस डिपो के सम्बन्ध में खबर आती है कि वह डाइनामाइट किया जाने वाला है और अगर वहां पर आग लगती, तो जबलपुर शहर का भी पता नहीं लगता। हमारे पास धमकी की चिट्ठी आई—तुम्हारे मकान में आग लगा दी जायेगी, ११ तारीख को १२ बज कर एक मिनट पर रात को मैं मार डाला जाऊंगा, मैं जानूँ क्या क्या। अतः यह हड़ताल कहां तक आर्थिक थी और कहां तक राजनैतिक, उस का मुझे अनुभव है। सरकार ने कुछ कार्रवाई की और जिसके सम्बन्ध में हमारे गोपालन जी ने इतनी निन्दा की, उस के बारे में, मैं तो सरकार की इस समय की मुलायमित की कार्रवाई थी, उस को देख कर दंग रह गया। सरकार की कार्यवाही ऐसी हड़ताल के बावजूद भी मुलायम से मुलायम हुई है, अगर रूस या चीन में इस प्रकार की हड़ताल होती या हड़ताल की धमकी दी जाती तो वहां की सरकार क्या कार्रवाई करती, इस पर जरा हमारे दोस्त विचार करें (Interruption)। सरकार के इस समय के कड़े रख की, जो थोड़ा बहुत कड़ा रख रहा है, पूरा कड़ा रख वह भी नहीं रहा है, मैं भूरि भरि प्रशंसा करता हूँ। जहां तक दूसरे राजनीतिक दलों का सम्बन्ध है, उन में साम्यवादी दल के बारे में मैं ने निवेदन कर दिया है कि दयनीय स्थिति एक दूसरे दल की रही है। आचार्य

[सेठ गोविंद दास]

कृपालानी जी का मैं बड़ा आदर करता हूँ फिर भी मैं समझता हूँ कि सब से दयनीय स्थिति उन के दल की रही है। मेरी समझ में नहीं आया कि आखिर प्रजा समाजवादी दल का क्या रुख था उस सारी हड़ताल के मामले में ? अशोक मेहता जी जिनको मैं बड़े आदर की दृष्टि से देखता हूँ, एक मुद्दत के बाद तो विलायत से लौटे, लौटते ही बम्बई में एक वक्तव्य झाड़ दिया हमारे प्रधान मंत्री जी के विरोध में, फिर दिल्ली आए, यहाँ पर न जाने क्या करने के लिये? तो प्रजा समाजवादी दल की जो स्थिति रही उसे मैं अत्यन्त दयनीय स्थिति मानता हूँ। क्या स्थिति थी, आखिर तक मेरी समझ में नहीं आया। तो साम्यवादी दल की यह स्थिति, प्रजा समाजवादी दल की यह स्थिति अब महत्वपूर्ण एक कांग्रेस दल मात्र रह गया था, आई० एन० टी० यू० सी०, तो कांग्रेस का ही अंग है। कांग्रेस ने इस देश को स्वराज्य दिलाने का प्रयत्न किया था, उसकी क्या स्थिति रही यह हमें देखना है। यह पंडित जी भी जानते हैं, आप लोग भी जानते हैं और मुझे इस बात का गर्व है कि कांग्रेस जिस प्रकार की देश भक्त संस्था शुरू से रही है, उसी देश भक्ति का उसने परिचय फिर दिया और हड़ताल को यदि नहीं होने दिया तो उसका सारा श्रेय या बहुत दूर तक श्रेय कांग्रेस दल को है। फिर इसका श्रेय इस देश की जनता को भी है।

श्री बजरंग सिंह : भी ?

सेठ गोविंद दास : जी हाँ, क्योंकि हम तो कांग्रेस दल और जनता में कोई अन्तर नहीं मानते हैं। हम मानते हैं कि कांग्रेस दल ही जनता है और जनता ही कांग्रेस दल है।

जहाँ तक जनता का सम्बन्ध है, हमारे गृह मंत्री जी ने अभी बताया कि जनता का

किस प्रकार सहयोग रहा। यह भी कहा जाता है कि हड़ताल वापिस ले ली गई। यह बात सुन कर मुझे एक कहावत याद आती है --रिपट पड़े तो हर गंगा। जब हड़ताल खत्म हो गई थी, तो वापिस लेने का प्रश्न ही कहाँ था, मेरी समझ में नहीं आया। और अब इस बात पर कि हड़ताल वापिस ले ली गई, हड़तालियों से अच्छे सलूक की, मुलायमियत के सलूक की बार-बार अपील करना, इस में मुझे बड़ा भय दिखाई देता है और यह भय मुझे सब से अधिक पंडित जी से है। डित जी की मुलायमियत की, उदारता की जो नीति रही है, वही यदि फिर हुई तो भविष्य में मुझे बड़ा भारी खतरा नजर आता है।

मेरे इस सम्बन्ध में कुछ सुझाव हैं। भ्रूचा जी ने कुछ सुझाव रखे हैं और कुछ सुझाव मैं भी रखना चाहता हूँ। भ्रूचा जी के प्रत्येक सुझाव का मैं विरोध करता हूँ, तहे दिल से विरोध करता हूँ और अपनी ओर से कुछ एक सुझाव रखना चाहता हूँ। पहला सुझाव मेरा यह है कि जरूरी नौकरियों के अन्दर हड़ताल अवैध कर दी जाए और इस सम्बन्ध में कानून बना दिया जाए जो शायद बन भी जाएगा, ऐसी मुझे आशा है। वह कानून कितना सख्त बनता है, यह प्रश्न है। वह सख्त से सख्त कानून बनना चाहिये।

दूसरा मेरा यह कहना है कि सुरक्षा के कारखानों में जो मजदूर संघ हैं, लेबर यूनियंस हैं, उनको सरकार न माने (Interruption) सुरक्षा के कारखानों के जो मजदूर संघ हैं, लेबर यूनियंस हैं, उनकी ओर दूसरे कारखानों में जो लेबर यूनियन हैं, उनकी अलग अलग अवस्थायें हैं। हमारे देश में स्वराज्य के बाद से सब से आवश्यक विषय हमारे देश की सुरक्षा का है और सुरक्षा के कारखानों में, इन लेबर यूनियंस को,

इन मजदूर संघों को कभी मान्यता नहीं दी जान चाहिये . . .

श्री राज राज सिंह : काशी नाथ पांडे जी वाली को भी नहीं ?

संठ गोविन्द दास : तीसरा मेरा कहना यह है कि जिन्होंने हड़ताल में भाग लिया, आज वे बड़ी अपीलें कर रहे हैं, बड़े निवेदन कर रहे हैं। लेकिन उनके हृदय में क्या है, यह हम जानते हैं। उनके प्रति यदि किसी प्रकार की मुनायमियत का बरताव हुआ तो यह उनके प्रति अन्याय होगा जिन्होंने किसी बात की भी परवा न करके देश का साथ दिया, सरकार का साथ दिया। हड़ताल करने वालों के साथ मुनायमियत का व्यवहार उन लोगों के प्रति अन्याय है जिन्होंने इस हड़ताल के मौके पर हमारा और सरकार का साथ दिया। इसलिये उनके साथ कड़े से कड़ा व्यवहार होना चाहिये और उनके साथ किसी प्रकार की मुलायमियत का व्यवहार नहीं होना चाहिये।

मैं एक बात और कहना चाहता हूँ। प्रजातंत्र के रहते हुए, यहां मिनिस्टरी रहते हुये, अगर अभी से हम ने इन बातों के ऊपर ध्यान नहीं रखा तो बालिग मताधिकार तो बरकरार रहेगा, हम लोग चुने हुए लोग यहां बैठे रहेंगे, मिनिस्टरी भी बैठी रहेगी, लेकिन मिनिस्टरी के बने रहते हुए भी, मिनिस्टरी का खात्मा हो जाएगा और प्रजातंत्र की समाप्ति हो जाएगी, इसलिये बहुत बड़ा खतरा है जिस की तरफ मैं आपका ध्यान आकर्षित करना चाहता हूँ।

लेकिन इन सब बातों के साथ साथ मैं यह भी निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि मजदूरों की जो उचित मांगें हैं, उनके जो उचित कष्ट हैं, उनकी तरफ भी ध्यान दिया जाना चाहिये। मैं हमेशा खमरिया

की निसबत और हमारे यहां की जो-जो दूसरी फैक्ट्रियां हैं, उनकी निसबत कहा करता हूँ। मैंने अभी कुछ दिन पहले सरदार सुरजीत सिंह मजीठिया को वहां बुलाया था, मैंने श्री रघुरामैया को भी बुलाया था। वहां पर कुछ जगह ऐसी अवस्था है कि मजदूरों के लिए रहने के लिये न अच्छे घर हैं, न उन घरों में रोशनी है। उन घरों को जाने के लिये जो सड़कें हैं उनमें बत्ती नहीं है। उनमें गड्डे हैं जिन में बरसात के दिनों में लोग गिर पड़ते हैं। इन सब में सुधार होना आवश्यक है। खमरिया फैक्ट्री में जो मजदूर काम करते हैं, उनके लिये शिक्षा का कोई समुचित प्रबन्ध नहीं है। हजारां लड़के वहां पर बिना शिक्षा जा रहे हैं। खमरिया फैक्ट्री जबलपुर से बहुत दूर है और लड़के जबलपुर आ कर नहीं पढ़ सकते। इसलिये वहां पर कम से कम प्राथमिक शिक्षा का प्रबन्ध होना चाहिये। वहां के जो अस्पताल हैं उनकी खराब हालत है, उसकी तरफ आपका ध्यान जाना चाहिये। इस प्रकार के जो मजदूरों के कष्ट हैं, वे केवल जबलपुर में हैं या खमरिया फैक्ट्री में हैं, यह मेरा कथन नहीं है, अनेक स्थानों पर हैं। उस तरफ पूरा पूरा ध्यान देना आवश्यक है।

जहां तक वेतन वृद्धि का सवाल है, मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि वेतन वृद्धि जो मजदूर खेतों पर काम करते हैं, उनकी तरफ देख कर की जाए। यह नहीं कि शहरों के और सरकार के जो कर्मचारी हैं उनकी तो अन्धाधुन्ध वेतन मिलें, महंगाई भता मिले, दूसरे भत्ते मिलें, सब कुछ मिले और उनके अनुपात से जो खेतों में काम करते हैं उनके वेतन बहुत कम हो जाए . . .

श्री मोहम्मद इलियास : आप इतना क्यों लेते हैं ?

संघ श्री गोविन्द दास : हमारे देश में जो गरीबी है, उस गरीबी की तरफ ध्यान दे कर, जो सी में से अस्सी व्यक्ति गांव में रहते हैं, खेती पर निर्भर करते हैं, उनकी क्या आग्रह है, उस तरफ ध्यान दे कर, महंगाई के और वेतन वृद्धि के सारे मामले को देखा जाए। यह एक तरफ न हो जाए, सन्तुलित रहे।

अन्त में मेरा आप से यह निवेदन है कि इस समय जो निर्माण का काम चला हुआ है, इस समय जब कि चीन का हमारे देश पर आक्रमण हुआ है, इस प्रकार के जो काम हैं, हड़ताल के या इस प्रकार के दूसरे काम, उनकी तरफ हमें बड़े ध्यान से देखना होगा, पूरी कड़ाई के रूख से हम को काम करना होगा। इस सम्बन्ध में आपकी मार्फत मैं पंडित जी से विशेष रूप से निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि उनका जो "मृदूनि कुमुमादपि" का ख हमेशा रहता है उसका स्थान थोड़ा "वज्रादपि कठोराणि" वाली नीति को लेना होगा। साथ ही जो हमारे मजदूरों की उचित मांगें हैं, जो उनकी तकलीफें हैं, उनको भी दूर करना होगा। तभी यह मामला निपट सकेगा।

इन शब्दों के साथ मैं भरूचा जी के प्रस्ताव का विरोध करता हूँ और सरकार ने इस समय जिस नीति का अवलम्बन किया है, उसका हृदय से समर्थन करता हूँ।

Shri A. P. Jain (Saharanpur): Madam Chairman, the hon. Member Shri A. K. Gopalan asked a question from the Home Minister as to why the Government servants had gone on strike. He said that it indicated a want of confidence on the part of the Government employees in the Government, it also indicated a sense of dissatisfaction. Now, if I were to answer his question, I will say that the entire speech of Shri Gopalan

explains how the Government employees were persuaded by certain politicians and political parties to go on strike. Even so, it was only a part of the Government servants, not more than 20 per cent. of the entire force, who gave notice of strike.

Shri Gopalan in his speech referred to two major demands, namely, dearness allowance and the need-based minimum wage. The Prime Minister in his broadcast has made it clear that the financial implications of these two demands are of the order of about Rs. 700 crores to Rs. 750 crores in the Third Five Year Plan. Now, any political party or any politician who ignores the paying capacity of the Government and bases the demand on one-sided or absolute considerations would be held responsible of not taking recognition of the real situation.

Now, these two demands have a history behind them. It has been stated in this House both by the Home Minister and others that in 1957 a strike notice was given, that strike notice was withdrawn and the Pay Commission was appointed. Both the Government and the employees agreed to the appointment of the Pay Commission. The very fact that the strike notice was withdrawn indicates an implicit or may I say an express acceptance of, you may call it, the verdict, award or recommendations of the Pay Commission as a solution of the dispute.

Both these matters, that is, the question of dearness allowance and how it should be neutralised as also the question of the need-based minimum wages were urged by the employees' representatives before the Pay Commission. The Pay Commission after taking into account the paying capacity of the Government and the financial implications of demands came to the conclusion that neither of those pleas of the employees could be accepted. The plea of the employees with regard to dearness allowance was that when there is a

rise in the cost of living index, which was accepted at 115 for the basic purposes, then the rise should be neutralised by an increase in the dearness allowance. That principle was not accepted by the Pay Commission. The Pay Commission recommended that if during a period of twelve months the rise in the cost of living index was of the order of ten points over 115, in that case the Government should take up that question and try to neutralise the rise in the cost of living to the best possible extent. The Pay Commission further expected that the Government would take such action, as would not allow the standard of living of the low wage group to be adversely affected.

Now, that was one part of it. So far as the need-based minimum wage was concerned, the Commission refused to accept what was decided at the 15th Labour Conference. They made an enquiry from the Government as to whether it had accepted the recommendations of the 15th Labour Conference in regard to need-based minimum wage, and the Government replied that they were not committed to it. But the effect of, what I have said, namely, that these two pleas were urged before the Pay Commission and the Pay Commission did not find it possible to accept them, would mean that the employees had lost their case on those issues.

Then, Madam, what is the justification for raising up those pleas again, because it is this justification which will determine whether this strike was a labour strike, an industrial dispute, or it was something more, a political dispute, something out of which the political parties wanted to cash political advantages?

Now, this award was not accepted. Let us examine it from another point of view. Madam, I have got here a pamphlet issued by the Hind Mazdoor Sabha on the strike. It has been issued by the President of the Hind Mazdoor Sabha. It lays down what I consider to be a very reasonable

criterion for judging whether the strike was a labour dispute, an industrial dispute, or it had some political motives behind it. I will read out a portion from this pamphlet. On page 3 it says:

"...the terms of this dispute should be of such a character as is impossible for Government to concede, and that the efforts for a negotiated settlement must be conducted in such a manner as to make it impossible for the strikers and Government to find a common measure of agreement."

So, these are the two conditions.

Shri Asoka Mehta: Will the hon. Member please read the whole paragraph?

Shri A. P. Jain: I will read it out. It says:

"If there is an attempt to stage a 'civil rebellion' and 'upset civil authority' through the medium of a trade union dispute then it stands to reason that the terms of this dispute should be of such a character as is impossible for Government to concede,..."

That is one criterion.

Shri Raghunath Singh: That is quite clear.

Shri A. P. Jain: The other criterion is:

"and that the efforts for a negotiated settlement must be conducted in such a manner as to make it impossible for the strikers and Government to find a common measure of agreement."

This is the second condition.

Shri Vajpayee: But the facts are otherwise.

Shri A. P. Jain: The hon. Member should have a little patience.

Shri Raghunath Singh: It is very clear. It is a counter-revolution.

Shri A. P. Jain: It is clear that the Hind Mazdoor Sabha itself admits that if these two criteria are satisfied, then it would be a civil rebellion. Let us see the first thing. I have already stated that the financial implications of the acceptance of these two demands, namely, the dearness allowance and the need-based minimum wage, would be of the order of Rs. 700 crores. Can the Government pay this sum? The Pay Commission has come to the finding that for some years past the Government budget has been deficit and if there is an additional burden imposed on the Government's resources, on account of the increase in pay and wages, then fresh taxation will have to be imposed. We have also the broad outline of the Third Five Year Plan. It also indicates the need for heavy taxation, both by the Central Government and by the State Governments for developmental purposes. So, it is obvious that the demand made on behalf of the workers was a political demand, an impossible demand, which the Government could not fulfil; and therefore, the first criterion is satisfied.

Now, let us come to the second criterion. The Joint Council of Action wrote to the Prime Minister that they wanted to see him. They wrote on the 10th June, 1960. The Prime Minister wrote back to the effect that this action, the formation of the Joint Council of Action, would come further in the way of the Prime Minister meeting any deputation on the subject. But what happened later on? The Government made a retreat; they wanted to accommodate the employees.

Shri Tyagi (Dehra Dun): That was a mistake.

Shri A. P. Jain: It may have been a mistake or it may have been an exhibition of friendliness and goodwill. The Labour Minister met this

very Joint Council of Action, discussed the dispute with its representatives and wanted to come to a compromise. Not only that. He went further than what the Pay Commission had recommended with regard to the dearness allowance. What was it that he accepted? He accepted Shri Feroze Gandhi's formula which was somewhat like this: in case during a period of twelve months, the cost of living index, treating 115 as the base, went up by ten points, then the Government will neutralise 50 per cent. of the rise in the cost of living index. Further, any rise over and above 50 per cent. will be submitted to an arbitrator and his award will be acceptable to the Government. What more did they want?

Shri Naushir Bharucha: He says, "No."

Shri A. P. Jain: He says it is correct. What more could the Government do in the circumstances? After all, the resources of the Government are limited and when there is a dispute between the employer and the employee, the matter goes to arbitration. Therefore, I submit that if you look at it from either of the two criteria, it will be clear that they had placed an impossible demand and they were not amenable to reason.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: What was the impossible demand?

Shri A. P. Jain: I have explained it already. If you were not here, I cannot help it.

Mr. Chairman: Shri S. M. Banerjee will have his chance to speak. Let him wait.

Shri A. P. Jain: Let us take another aspect of the problem. In the pamphlet from which I quoted, I find another statement. It says at page 3:

"If a part of the leadership of the J.C.A. reflected certain political associations it was merely accidental."

How did these politicians drop in? Was it from that they dropped from Heavens or were pulled out from the jack box? There were ten members of the standing committee of the Joint Council of Action. What is the composition? Six of them are not Government employees.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: Ex-Government employees.

Shri A. P. Jain: Only four of them are Government employees. A number of them, practically 50 per cent, are politicians. What happened was this. The politicians or the political parties wanted to cash political advantage. They found out the device of a joint council, because under the Government servants' association rules,—outsiders could not be members of the Government servants' associations. But outsiders could find a place in the unions of Railways, Posts and Telegraphs and industrial units. So, they found out this device to come in through the joint council of action. They came in there and they got the control of activities, some were operating from behind; some others were operating on the front, with the result that this strike ceased to be a strike by Government servants and became a political strike in the fullest sense of the term. It had to be dealt with as a political strike.

Is that not a justification for the promulgation of the ordinance? The Indian Industrial Disputes Act is there. Section 10 of that Act deals with strikes in the essential services. But is this a labour strike? That is the question before us. The House has to decide whether it was an industrial dispute. From what I have stated, from the circumstances of the case, from the manner in which it was conducted, it is clear that it was not an industrial dispute, and therefore, it had to be dealt with in a comprehensive manner and effectively.

On this question, I would like to quote my hon. friend Shri Asoka Mehta. He said that a strike of this

nature is short and swift. If it ends in success, it ends in success in a short time, or it fails. That is what happened. The strike could not gather force. The Government employees soon realised that they should fight the people of India, and that it was a strike against the people of India. Therefore, the majority of them—four-fifths of them—did not respond to the call for strike, and even those who responded to the call soon felt that it was wrong on their part that they should have become a victim of certain manipulations and certain devices and therefore they withdrew.

The intentions of the political parties must be judged from the attitude they took when the strike began, and not from what they subsequently did. They became shaky when they found that they had not adequate strength behind them. One of the pleas urged in this pamphlet is that, they gave up the issue for need-based wages. They did so because they did not find support for it. If I do an action, my intention will be judged by the motives that actuated me at the time when I started the action, and not by the subsequent events. If it is to be judged by a subsequent action, at one stage, the I.C.A. withdrew the strike unconditionally. Does it mean that there was no demand? That cannot be the position. Before they took a final decision to go on strike, the position was very clear. I.C.A. insisted on the neutralisation of the increase in the cost of living whenever the cost of living went up and on the need-based wages, worked out on the basis of the fifth labour conference. If these two conditions are treated as basic, then it was an impossible demand. I must congratulate the Governments both at the Centre and in the States, on the effective manner in which they have handled the strike situation. I am not going to deny that there may have been cases of excess here or there. Some officer of the Government may have been carried away by over-enthusiasm. When

[Shri A. P. Jain]

things happen on such a vast scale, no Government can guarantee that there are not exceptional cases of excesses. But the broad fact is that generally a policy of moderation and of dealing with the situation with the minimum force was followed.

I must also pay a tribute to those Government servants—80 per cent. of them—who were not led away by other political parties and who stuck to their work. I must pay a tribute to the Indian National Trade Union Congress.....

Shri Nath Pai: Now the cat is out of the bag. (*Interruptions*).

Shri A. P. Jain: ... who realised the correct implications of the strike and refused to fall in line with people who were trying to disrupt the social structure of the country. I pay my tribute to the hundreds of thousands of people who volunteered their services and said openly that the strike was wrong.

It is for the first time, as the Home Minister said, since India became independent, that the nation as a whole rose against the disruptive activities of certain political parties. That is a good sign.

Shri Nath Pai: The Home Minister never said that.

Shri A. P. Jain: It requires a little understanding to appreciate what the Home Minister said.

I come to the last point. What should be the attitude of the Government now? The Home Minister said that the Government would not be vindictive. I wholly endorse it. After all, against whom are you going to be vindictive? This is in the nature of a home quarrel or what might be called a civil dispute. I would not call it a civil war, but a civil dispute. The Government and its employees will continue to work together and

anything which leaves a feeling of recrimination or bitterness will not be a good thing. Therefore, on the whole, the approach must be a friendly approach, an approach of forgiving those people who were misled. Yet, there may be a certain type of people who deliberately took part either in sabotage or in violence or who deliberately wanted to instigate the strike and disrupt the social structure. They will have to be dealt with on a different level, because no one should get the impression that he can escape free after indulging in all kinds of anti-social work.

With regard to unions, so far as the Civil Servants Associations are concerned, politicians and outsiders cannot become members. That rule is good, but there is a little lacuna in it, as they can overcome the general rule by creating the joint council of action. I think it is time Government may apply its mind; and plug this loophole. That is, these associations should not indirectly be allowed to be associated with or become a tool of political parties.

The present position with regard to essential services is that railways, posts and telegraphs, ordnance factories and some other departments were by ordinance declared to be essential services. I wholly endorse the action of Government in declaring them as essential services, because otherwise, it would have led to serious trouble including the disruption of the society. The position is that recognition of these unions who went on illegal strike has been withdrawn. But essential services are, after all, industrial concerns and it will not be good on the part of Government to deny recognition to these unions permanently, if they make necessary amends. If they could not make amends, new unions should be created. Unions must be there in industrial enterprises, so that they may present their collective views before the Government.

Shri Tangamani: Government cannot create unions.

Shri A. P. Jain: Workers themselves will create, not that we will create unions and they should be recognised. The position is clear. If these unions which misbehaved in the past make amends, if they agree to abide by law, then the withdrawal of recognition may be reversed. If, on the other hand, they insist that they have a right to go on illegal strike, let other unions be created and let them be recognised. That is the position for which I am urging. But the politicians must be kept out of these unions, whether they are Congressmen or Communists or PSP members. They should not be allowed to enter those unions. These unions should have no right to go on strike, but then it is necessary to provide a machinery for negotiations and conciliation and arbitration because, after all, you cannot refuse to redress the legitimate grievances of workers. You have to remove them.

There may arise the question whether the Government should abrogate its right of sovereignty and accept the award just as it is binding on a private employer and employee. I think ordinarily no Government or sovereign body can abrogate its right of taking ultimate decisions, but there are ways in which this ultimate right can be exercised. For instance, if there is a perverse or dishonest award, let that award come before Parliament, so that Parliament may refer it back to another tribunal and see that a proper award is given. There must be an assurance in the mind of the labour that the Government will abide by all reasonable awards.

Now I come to 17,000 or 19,000 employees who have been arrested. Everybody, who has been arrested, was not necessarily guilty of serious offence. There are those who were guilty of serious offences and there are those who were not so guilty. It will not do good to anybody to punish a small man—a postman, clerk or

chaprasi—who may have been misled, unless he was guilty of sabotage or violence or anything of the kind. Ordinarily, these small men must be shown considerable leniency and serious punishment or prosecution should be confined only to those who have been guilty of sabotage, violence or gross misbehaviour or to those who have instigated or prompted the strike. With the exception of these classes—their number should not be large—the cases against others must be withdrawn.

Therefore, the policy of the Government should be that while it should not adopt an attitude, which may encourage the recurrence or the repetition of what has happened in the past, at the same time, it must be one of moderation and liberality towards its employees.

Shri Asoka Mehta: Madam Chairman, it is with a certain amount of reluctance that I participate in this discussion, partly because I have said quite a lot about this outside this House before and partly because I find myself out of tune with the general trend of discussions in the House. I feel that a situation which is already somewhat complicated, which needs to be handled with care and understanding, is sought to be made more difficult by importing into it not only heat of eloquence but heat of political antagonism. I was surprised that so senior a Member of this House as my hon. friend, Shri Ajit Prasad Jain should have said that this was a political strike....

Some Hon. Members: Shame, shame.

An Hon. Member: It was a lie.

Shri Nath Pai: That is a white lie.

Shri Asoka Mehta: a political strike in which the Praja Socialist Party, of which I have the privilege to be the Chairman, was directly and deliberately involved. I repudiate that suggestion with all the sincerity and all the integrity at my command.

[Shri Asoka Mehta]

(Interruptions). Madam Chairman, either I am going to be listened to or I am not interested in speaking. I have not said one word which would hurt others' feelings. However, in this House serious charges have been hurled against my party and so either this House will give me an opportunity to clear those charges, or I am not interested in speaking at all.

Madam Chairman, take the Praja Socialist Party. There are some members of the party, distinguished members of the party, occupying important positions in the trade unions, who have been occupying important positions for a long time. They discharged their responsibilities as the trade unions advised them to do. There are other members of the Praja Socialist Party, equally distinguished, who occupy important positions in the administration, at least in one State of India. They also discharged the responsibilities in the administration as they were expected to do. I hope Shri Ajit Prasad Jain knows this much, if it were the deliberate policy of the Praja Socialist Party to create a civil rebellion in the country I would not have been out of the country and I have that moral courage to be in the country to lead that civil rebellion if it is decided upon, nor my colleagues in one of the States of India would have carried out the responsibilities with that firmness of purpose and that loyalty to their offices and to their responsibilities that they showed. And I have not asked, my party has not asked, for any explanation from them. I am sorry that such a good friend of mine as Shri Ajit Prasad Jain should have made an innuendo that I returned from abroad and finding that the strike was fizzling out I sought to salvage the lost situation.

Shri A. P. Jain: I did not say that. I said that you took a different attitude.

Shri Asoka Mehta: You did.

Shri A. P. Jain: I said that after you returned you modified it.

Shri Asoka Mehta: I am prepared to face any kind of scrutiny, but I would beg of him not to indulge in innuendos of this kind. I repeat once again that this was not a political strike, this was a strike in which the Praja Socialist Party was not interested one way or the other, this was a trade union strike and I dare anyone to challenge that statement with facts, not with innuendos.

Shri C. K. Nair (Outer Delhi): Have you got a hand in it? I want a clarification.

Mr. Chairman: Order, order. That he can do when his chance comes, if need be.

Shri Asoka Mehta: I would like to point out—the Prime Minister is here; he has shown great understanding in this matter and it is to him that I am expressing the next few words and I know that he will not misunderstand me; I do not know about the other sections of the House. In the last 12 or 13 years unfortunately we have not handled our industrial relations with our employees in the manner in which we should have done. After the first Pay Commission, you are well aware, Madam, not only the real wages of the Government employees have not increased by a single Naya Paisa but out of 13 years for 11 years the real wages went down and, therefore, there was the question of dearness allowance. There was no question of giving them more pay. It was a question of maintaining the standard of living that had been given to them in 1947.

In the first Pay Commission's Report two things were suggested among various other things. One was a formula whereby the dearness allowance was to be calculated. Secondly, there was a suggestion that there must be a machinery whereby disputes can be settled. Neither of these two things

was implemented and not only was that formula not accepted but no alternative formula was evolved. And what was the result? In 1948 the shortfall in the real wages of the workers was to the extent of Rs. 12 or 20 per cent. I am quoting from the *Eastern Economist*, which is not a friendly journal to the strikers—which means that if you look at the income that the lowest paid State Government employees were getting, the erosion in the meagre standard of living was to the extent of 22 per cent. They had to give a notice of strike in order that any attention would be paid to their demands. Again in 1951 and again in 1957 strike notices had to be given. Even this Pay Commission was appointed only when a notice of strike was given. I say this is a bad thing. We taught our employees, we created in them the habit that the Government is likely to move or respond only when they give notice of strike. We taught them the policy of brinkmanship, and the Government also responded only when they found they were confronted by strike notice. If the Government on the one side and the trade unions on the other get into the habit of pursuing the policy of brinkmanship, some time or other one or the other is likely to tumble over the brink. And this is something which has happened in other countries also.

Madam, may I invite your attention to what happened in the United Kingdom in 1926? I am quoting from a very objective record, the *Annual Register* of 1926 of the United Kingdom:

"A great majority of the responsible trade union leaders were personally strongly averse to such an extreme course. They thought, no doubt, that the Government would shrink from the challenge as it had shrunk in previous July (1925). In this they miscalculated. The truth was that in the Government also there was a section, no less eager than the militant trade unionists for a trial of

strength, and these saw to it that the strike menace should be carried out, little as this was desired by those who launched it."

There was this tragic miscalculation in England in 1926 and there was the tragic miscalculation in India in 1960. These tragedies can be averted only if we are going to set up a machinery and if we are going to show some alertness in this matter.

What happened? I was surprised that during the last few days only when the Prime Minister himself began to take interest in the matter serious efforts were made to find out what were the grievances of the employees and how to settle them. Till then the various Ministries were sitting tight but then they started working day and night and one particular Ministry not only worked out the new scales of wages but rushed them to the various establishments by aeroplane. Now, it is very creditable that this was done. But why was it not done earlier? Why was the spirit not created, why was the assurance not created that it is not necessary, as far as this Government is concerned, for anyone to threaten with strike notice? Why was there not the kind of machinery whereby these things could be settled? The Prime Minister himself, on more than one occasion, has stated that this is something which has to be corrected. All that I am saying is that when we sit in judgment over the strikers we have got to recognize this, the accentuating circumstances. I have no desire to condemn the Government but because the strikers are sought to be condemned—I am not happy about many things but I would say this—before we condemn, if we want to improve certain things we must realise that the Government and the Parliament were also responsible for a situation where this kind of miscalculations could take place.

Secondly, how many people gave strike notice? According to Government's own figures 133 unions gave strike notices, having a total

[Shri Asoka Mehta]

membership of 5,57,338, which means the strike notice was given by less than 25 per cent of the employees.

Therefore whether just 25 per cent of the employees could have created a civilian rebellion is a matter that needs to be carefully considered.

When it is said that 80 per cent did not go on strike, may I point out that 75 per cent. had from the very beginning declared that they were not interested in the strike? Only less than 25 per cent had given the strike notice. I do not know how many people went on strike. The Government's figures are two lakhs and odd, which means that even of those who gave the notice only 50 per cent. went on strike. Was this in the nature of a civilian rebellion?

Let us remember that as far as the dearness allowance is concerned, except when my hon. friend, Shri Feroze Gandhi came on the scene—all honour to him; I am proud of the fact that there are non-official hon. Members in this House who are capable of playing such a vital, such a courageous and such a decisive role in solving the problems of our country—it was only when he stepped in that a formula was evolved. Whether that formula is satisfactory or not is another matter. I will go into that in a minute. But why is it that all these years, for eleven years out of 13 years the real wages of the workers pegged at 1947 level had been eroded by as much as Rs. 12 to the maximum and by as little as Rs. 3 to the minimum? For eleven out of thirteen years these people have suffered a chronic erosion of their meagre standard of living. Surely something should have been done about it. It was done only when Shri Feroze Gandhi stepped into the picture. Unfortunately because of some misunderstandings, it appeared to be something too late.

There was this question of a need-based wage. Some years back the Government of India had done me the

honour of appointing me to a Fair Wages Committee. At that time we formulated certain principles of fair wages. We deliberately refrained from quantifying those principles because, I believe, the moment you try to quantify these things you get into all kinds of difficulties. I had told the hon. Labour Minister after I had learnt about the conclusions reached by the Fifteenth Labour Conference that any quantification is likely to create all kinds of difficulties. I had told over and over again my trade union friends that this is a demand which cannot be put forward very lightly. I believe it was as a result of a constant pressure which I had exercised on my trade union friends that they ultimately said, "All we want is that the Government should give an assurance that they will move in this direction." That assurance, of course, should always be there, namely, that we want to move towards a need-based wage.

I believe Shri A. P. Jain was not correct when he said that Rs. 700 crores were demanded by them. If they demanded that, I will be with him in saying that it is not a legitimate demand. But you cannot dismiss that demand without at the same time conceding, and conceding decisively, their right to have adequate dearness allowance. I cannot understand how the Government can say, "We will give 50 per cent.". Why should they suffer? Their standard of life is pegged only to 1947 income. After that we have had two Plans. The national income has increased by 42 per cent. Surely the least we can do to them is to see that their standard of life will not be depressed any further. I cannot understand the hon. Home Minister saying that it is even now only 50 per cent. Shri Feroze Gandhi's formula was minimum 50 per cent; now it has become just 50 per cent.

Shri Feroze Gandhi (Rae Bareli): National income has increased by 42 per cent. during 1951—61. There is still a gap between 1947 and 1951.

Shri Asoka Mehta: It was a period of war damage and rehabilitation. I do not want to take advantage of that period. But during the two Plan periods, the national income has gone up by 42 per cent.

It is not that after the strike failed that they withdrew this demand for a need-based wage. This demand for need-based wage, I am told by Shri Nath Pai—I was not here; he will clarify the position—was given up even before the strike action was taken. Probably there Shri Feroze Gandhi will be in a better position to enlighten us because he was in the midst of it. The crucial question is how and in what manner will this dearness allowance be given. Cost of living indices come up only after three, four or five months. First there has got to be a period of twelve months. Then there has to be an average rise of ten points—not just ten points but an average rise of ten points. That means that if in some months it has been only six points there must be other months where it has been 14 points. It has to be an average rise of ten points. It will become apparent only after 16 or 18 months when the cost of living indices are available. How are these people to live? I would like to find out that. Is this ten point something sacrosanct?

15.25 hrs.

[SHRI MULCHAND DUBE *in the Chair*].

If there is a perceptible and significant increase which is going to erode in their cost of living, Government should be willing to respond. I have no doubt in my mind that the hon. Prime Minister, if he has the time and whenever he has the time and he has sought to apply his mind to the question, has always responded to in a manner in which the employees want him to respond. Therefore I am pained to find that from the Congress Benches he is being told, "Do not be what you are. Be what we want you to be." I think it will be a tragedy for the country when the hon. Prime

Minister has to shape himself into a distorted image.

Then this Ordinance was there. What happened during the strike, how the Ordinance was used—I have no desire to go into all that. But may I point out that I was somewhat surprised—perhaps the hon. Prime Minister must have received this information—when I got this telegram from Rajkot, namely,—

"Deeply shocked at the arrest of Editor Jai Hind Daily Rajkot under Ordinance after three weeks of employees' strike withdrawn. Proprietor and Bhavnagar Correspondent earlier arrested."

I do not know how the Ordinance could be used after three weeks to arrest an editor of a newspaper.

Again, I have no desire to give you here all kinds of harrowing accounts of what happened. In matters like this people suffer. Probably there was suffering on both sides. I do not know. I am not going therefore to say that there was suffering and you were responsible for that suffering. But we have to realise what is happening. I find that in one particular office of the Government—I will not name what that office is—one Shri T. Vishwanathan was to be suspended. Unfortunately, the notice was served on another Shri T. Vishwanathan, who was a loyal worker.... (*Interruption*). Then when they found that there were six T. Vishwanathans in that office, orders were issued that all the six T. Vishwanathans should be forthwith served with notices of suspension. As I said, I will not mention where it happened and what this office is. But this kind of a thing.....

The Deputy Minister of Finance (Shri B. R. Bhagat): Five or six?

Shri Asoka Mehta: May be five; may be six; may be four. I do not know. I do not want to waste my time on that.

[Shri Asoka Mehta]

Then I take the question of bail. Whether people went on s'rike, whether that was right or wrong, whether in essential services people should have the right to go on strike or not, they are different questions. But the point is: Is it necessary to demand a bail of Rs. 10,000 or Rs. 20,000 before a person is released? That has happened in Bihar. It may be one case, but I am told—again, I have not been able to check up everything because it is impossible to check up everything; but if this is wrong I will be very happy . . .

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty
(Basirhat): They were handcuffed also.

Shri Asoka Mehta: Because the hon. Prime Minister used the expression civil rebellion—I do not know in what context did he use it—suddenly the whole machinery reacted in that manner. The hon. Prime Minister, I do not think, conceived of it as a civil rebellion which had to be crushed. But people down below thought that the green signal had been given. That is the reason why in the post-strike period it is absolutely necessary that we are very careful in seeing that the damage that has been done is undone.

What is happening? There is automatic break in service. Again, orders are being issued from time to time. Things may have improved. I do not know. But I am told that there are automatic breaks in services in certain departments. What would be the result of this automatic break? They lose not only all their accumulated leave, but they lose all the leave to which they are entitled when they retire. They lose heavily as far as their provident fund and their gratuity are concerned, as also they lose their seniority. To what extent is the person to be penalised assuming that he went on a strike which was wrong? What is going to be the extent of the penalisation? How many people were suspended? How many people have

been thrown out? What kind of punishments are being meted out? Before anyone had said anything, I said that those who have been proved guilty of sabotage and of indulging in violence must be punished. I said that. Nobody had asked me to say that. As a matter of fact the pressmen before whom I said that turned round and said, "What kind of a politician are you that you are indulging in this kind of thing?" I said that I wanted to be scrupulously fair to the Government as well as to the strikers. I believed that it would not be proper to go to the Government and say that even those who have been proved guilty of sabotage and violence should be taken back. But let us not make use of this occasion by saying that political forces are working behind the strike, that this was an effort, a deliberate effort, as one of the officers is reported to have said, that the strike leaders wanted to throw out Prime Minister Nehru from the Prime Ministership. I think when my hon. friend like Shri Ajit Prasad Jain thinks it is a political strike, well, it is this which makes that particular officer—again, I will not name him or mention the name of the office where it happened—it is this which will give a licence to them to say those things, because no less a person than a senior Member of this House like Shri Ajit Prasad Jain says this.

This is a movement where restraint is needed, where sympathy, and liberalism has to be shown. The Prime Minister has said that for a long time it was not possible for the Government to accept that in the disputes between itself and its employees the principle of arbitration should be accepted. As a matter of fact, some months back, when the employees of the State Bank of India had gone on strike, if I am not mistaken, I believe the whole negotiations were broken on this particular point. Now I am happy to find that the principle of arbitration is being accepted.

The Praja Socialist Party is being maligned. Shri Nandaji or Shri Jagjivan Ram will bear me out when

I say that, Shri Jayaprakash Narayan, when he was the distinguished leader of the Praja Socialist Party had been to one of the Ministers, and when he was the President of the All India Railwaymen's Federation he suggested that the whole nature of the trade union movement in the Railways should be changed. And he suggested that outsiders should be out of it. Many of the things that we are discovering today in our wisdom, Shri Jayaprakash Narayan, when he then was a member and the leader of the Praja Socialist Party, had placed before the Government. And Government had not thought it necessary to look into them.

So let us not condemn a particular party. If we condemn it, let all the facts come out. Again, I am not blaming the Government. Probably for Government the situation was not ripe at that time. Probably each one of us, all of us, are so accustomed, living as we do in these difficult, dynamic, fast-changing, fast-moving times, that we are able to come to grips with a problem only when we are confronted with it in all its seriousness. Therefore, if this kind of an arrangement is to be made let us not put the wrong foot forward. Let us not start by saying that we are going to ban strikes.

What has the Pay Commission said? The Second Pay Commission has said that the necessary institution should be created and the workers themselves will abjure the strike. What happened in England? In England, we find the Government, having crushed the general strike of 1926, thought it could introduce the Trade Disputes Act of 1927. The Trade Disputes Act, 1927 took away many of the rights the employees were enjoying there. But what was the result? In two years that Government was pushed out of power and those very provisions were changed by 1929. And if there are no strikes among government employees today in England it is not because there are legislative measures

to prevent them from doing it but it is because of the maturity of the working classes.

We have got to help the working classes to become mature. And that section of the House and this section of the House, at least a part of this section of the House, is determined, is anxious to co-operate with the Prime Minister to see that that kind of maturity is brought about into the working classes. But it will not come if we are going to egg him on and say, "your instincts are liberal, but go against your instincts, against your intelligence, against your good feelings, and try to make use of this opportunity to crush the poor workers, so that they may not dare to look at any party except the party in power". That, I say, would be a greater tragedy than the tragedy of the strike; because, it would strike at the very foundations of the political institutions that we have sought to build up for a long period of time.

Therefore I would say, let us not talk about banning strikes. Let us try and reorient, reorganise, re-formulate the trade union movement among the government employees. I have often told Nandaji that it is necessary to do it even among other employees. I think our trade union movement, like agriculture, suffers from a tragic fragmentation. There is great need for consolidation of the trade union movement. There is great need for creating those institutional devices whereby the workers may be able to undertake the responsibilities that we are anxious to give them. That, however, is a separate problem.

Here let our approach be constructive. Let it not be one of trying to get over the backs of people who, we think, should not have done what they have done. They did it because there was a whole background. They did it because there was a certain situation. As I said, what happened in England also? There was a misunderstanding and a situation where a misunderstanding was possible.

[Shri Asoka Mehta]

I would therefore beg of the Prime Minister and beg of his colleagues that this particular situation may be utilised for the purposes of straightening out our industrial relations, for the purposes of creating an atmosphere of mutual trust and goodwill which can be created, and needs to be created, and not for the purposes of settling any scores, and not in a spirit of vindictiveness and political vendetta.

Dr. Sushila Nayar (Jhansi): Mr. Chairman, Sir, Shri Asoka Mehta has taken great pains to prove to us that this strike was not in the nature of a civil rebellion. I agree that it did not prove to be a civil rebellion. But suppose what they had contemplated had taken place, suppose the government servants had responded to the call of the so-called Joint Action Committee, and suppose the government servants in the Railways, the Postal Services and all the other government services had gone on strike, could the government of this country have been run? Can any Government be run under those circumstances?

I am inclined to think that the Praja Socialist Party did not intend the strike to be a political strike, but I am afraid they played into the hands of those who wanted it to be a political strike. I wish to submit that the Praja Socialist Party has some wise men like Shri Jayaprakash Narayan, who used to be in that party, and Shri Asoka Mehta. (An Hon. Member: What about the rest?) But if he wants us to believe that the Praja Socialist Party consists of all wise men, I beg to disagree.

I believe there was a miscalculation on the part of those who called the strike, and there was a miscalculation on the part of those small numbers of government servants who did respond to that strike. I understand that the number of Central Government Employees who went on strike was even less than 20 per cent mentioned by Shri Ajit Prasad Jain. Of the

people who gave the strike notice, I understand that 50 per cent withdrew the notice after the Ordinance was introduced.

I believe it was absolutely necessary that the Ordinance be issued. This action of the Government indicated clearly to the workers that the Government was not going to tolerate the strike. What does the government of a country, the democratic government of a country, consist of? Is it the Prime Minister and his Cabinet? Is it the Cabinet plus the few top Secretaries of the Government? No. All the employees of the Government constitute the government. And the government servants going on strike in this manner can result in nothing but chaos and anarchy and something worse than civil rebellion.

We heard this morning from the Home Minister that in four or five days the economic loss to the country was of the order of four to five crores of rupees. Can we afford this economic loss? We are starved of resources and need every rupee we can get for our social services, economic planning, communications and so on. Can any one take it lightly that a loss of Rs. 4 to Rs. 5 crores occurred as a result of a very limited strike on the part of very few Government employees for only four to five days? The Government of India acted wisely in coming out clearly and firmly and telling the Government servants that it meant business, that it would not tolerate a strike, and thus averted a catastrophe which might have had results beyond anybody's calculations, including the leaders of the P.S.P. who were party to this strike—I mean Shri Nath Pai.

The people of this country, as the Home Minister said, responded magnificently, and they indicated in no uncertain terms that they were not in sympathy with the strikers. Why did they do that? If the cause of the strikers was just, they would have sympathised with them. We are in

sympathy with the strikers to the extent that prices have risen, but the rise in prices has affected everybody, not only the Central Government servants but also the State Government servants, school teachers and all those groups whose income is inelastic, who comprise the salaried group. The servants of the Government of India are somewhat better off than the employees of the State Governments, and the less said about the employees of the District Boards and Municipalities the better. The taxation proposals of Shri T. T. Krishnamachari which raised a furore in the country contemplated an increase in taxes of Rs. 180 crores a year. Out of that Rs. 160 crores have already gone into wages of the Government servants. Where is the money left for the Plan? Unless we find the money for the Plan, how is the prosperity of the country to be brought about, including the prosperity of the Government servants? Therefore, it was absolutely necessary for the Government to clarify the position to the Government servants and the country that this kind of strike would not be tolerated. The result was that the people of the country rallied round the Government, and the vast majority of the Government servants also rallied round the Government. They realised that they had made a mistake, and they tried to rectify that mistake.

The question is: should those who went on strike and those who did not be all treated alike? I am glad that Shri Asoka Mehta agreed that all those guilty of sabotage, violence, acts of intimidation etc., should be severely punished. I believe they will not be taken back into service, and I hope the Government will stick to that resolution. So far as the others are concerned, justice demands that some distinction be made between those who fell a victim to the persuasion or intimidation, and those who loyally stuck to their jobs and went to work irrespective of the risk that they incurred for themselves and their families. I do not say that the former category should be severely dealt with. Let there be a very mild punishment, some

kind of warning given to them that Government does not approve of their action, and let there be some indication to the loyal Government servants that Government appreciates their loyalty.

I believe Government must make a distinction between different categories of Government servants. There are Government servants who are today engaged in industrial projects like the steel factories, the telephone factory, the Chittaranjan locomotive factory etc. Government must categorise the services and indicate to the workers which are industrial concerns and which are the essential services. Men who run the railway trains should not be allowed to go on strike.

The question whether the Government servants should have unions is also something that needs very careful consideration. It would be much better if they have some form of Government servants' associations in different departments rather than unions, because the word "union" carries a certain import, a certain connotation, and makes the members of the union feel that they are entitled to all the rights which labour union members are entitled to. Let those who are employed in the industrial concerns have their unions under whatever conditions Government thinks fit.

I believe those employed in ordnance factories must be treated differently. Ordnance factories are as much a part of the defence apparatus as the army of the country. If the army of the country cannot be allowed to go on strike or form unions, I believe the workers of the ordnance factories should be treated in exactly the same manner. There is no reason why they should be permitted to form unions, have trade union rights, the right to go on strike etc. I think it is entirely wrong. Just as the police and army cannot go on strike or form unions, the ordnance factory workers should be prevented from these activities.

If we have associations of Government servants, some kind of mediation apparatus will be necessary to look

[Dr. Sushila Nayar]

into their grievances and deal with them. The Government has made certain proposals regarding the increase in dearness allowance as a consequence of continued increase in prices. I wish to submit to the Prime Minister and the Home Minister that it should be laid down as a rule that within six months of the declaration of any award, whatever has been accepted of the award must be implemented. Let it not drag on. I entirely agree that if the Government servants could sit and work overtime and work out the new pay scales after the threat of strike, they could have done it earlier also if its importance had been realised, if we thought it was something that should be done without delay.

Secondly, it is necessary that we do everything possible to check the prices. This morning's newspapers carried a headline saying that the cotton mills have declared a decrease of ten per cent. in prices. On going through the same column we find that the Chairman of the Cotton Mills Federation says that during this period the increase in prices of coarse cloth not wearable has been 50 per cent. and in coarse and medium cloth wearable 40 per cent. If we read further, it is most interesting to find him to say that the rise in the price of cotton accounts only for 2.5 per cent., and the rise in wages for a little more than 2 per cent., of the rise in prices of cotton fabrics. This means that these two items together account for a total increase of less than five per cent., and yet the rise in price has been 40 and 50 per cent., according to their own admission. Why have we allowed it?

He further says that the total increase in the production cost of medium and lower variety is 21 per cent. and of higher medium variety 18 per cent.

Shri Damani (Jalore): What the hon. lady Member has said, namely that the rise in cotton prices was 2.5 per cent. is not correct; it was actually 22.5 per cent.

Dr. Sushila Nayar: If it was 22 per cent, then my hon. friend must realise that the total increase in the cost of production could not be 18 and 21 per cent. It can, therefore, be only 2.5 per cent. and 2 per cent as reported in newspapers. God only knows how this increase of 21 per cent in the prices came about. The two major factors, namely the price of raw material and the rise in wages do not account for more than five per cent. How has the rest of the increase come about? That has to be enquired into. Even if we accept that the total increase has been 18 per cent. and 21 per cent. respectively, on what basis did they increase the prices by 40 per cent. and 50 per cent?

There is the Tariff Commission's formula for fixing prices. But has anyone gone into the Tariff Commission's formula? Why cannot our inspectors go and put the price-lists on display at the shops and distribute leaflets to the public and tell them that this is the right price of the articles. Why did we allow these businessmen to go and exploit the common man in this country in this fashion? Something has got to be done about it, and the sooner we do it, the better will it be for all concerned.

I have said it already that I have no sympathy for those who organised the strike; I have no sympathy for those who indulged in sabotage and violence and intimidation; I have no sympathy for those men who take Government's wages, work for Government, have their wherewithal as a result of Government service and yet had the audacity to go on strike and shout slogans of *Murdabad* against the leaders of Government. I think it is entirely wrong and it should not be done.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: My hon. friend's sympathy is with the dacoits.

Dr. Sushila Nayar: Those leaders who went and incited the workers in that fashion, I believe, are guilty of

very serious wrongs. They are doing wrong against the workers and against the people of this country, leave aside the Government of this country. I am glad that the Prime Minister refused to meet the so-called Joint Council of Action. The Prime Minister for once showed very firm determination that this strike shall not be allowed, and the people of this country welcomed it because the people of this country want to be governed, and governed properly, fairly and with determination. Therefore, the people of the country rallied round the Prime Minister and his Government and the strike fizzled out.

As I have said already, we have to evolve a machinery for settling the disputes. We have to take action which will make it clear to those who have fallen a prey to the misguidance given by certain leaders, that what they have done is not good and that they shall not do it in the future. As has been already admitted by all parties, those who are guilty of all kinds of serious offences must be seriously dealt with.

We must also do everything to hold the prices, to control the prices, and to prevent undue profiteering on the part of some of our profiteers in this country and thus cut the ground on which such strikes can flourish so that they cannot come about in the future.

श्री काशीनाथ पांडे : सभापति महोदय, मैंने अशोक मेहता जी का भाषण सुना । वह बड़े जोर से कह रहे थे कि जो देश के अन्दर यह आन्दोलन चला उसमें कम से कम पी० एस० पी० का कोई हाथ नहीं था यह तो बिल्कुल आर्थिक लड़ाई थी और राजनीति से इसका कोई सम्बन्ध नहीं था । मैं इसकी डिटेल् में नहीं जाना चाहता कि यह आर्थिक लड़ाई थी या इसका राजनीति से कोई सम्बन्ध था या नहीं । लेकिन जिन्होंने चीन के ब्राडकास्ट को सुना होगा वह कह सकते हैं कि यह हमारे गवर्नमेंट सर्वेड्स की

बड़ाई चीन की लड़ाई हो गई थी । मैं पूछना चाहता हूँ कि जिस समय चीन का ब्राडकास्ट हुआ तो क्या किसी भी पी० एस० पी० के आदर्मी ने यह कहा कि चीन अपनी सहानुभूति अपने देश में रखे, हम अपनी लड़ाई लड़ लेंगे । बल्कि उनको तो उससे बड़ी खुशी हुई होगी ।

Shri Nath Pai: May I give an explanation? (*Interruptions*) The Chair has called on me to speak. On a point of personal explanation, I am very grateful to you for allowing me to speak. The insinuation is too serious to be allowed. I am not interrupting anybody, but this kind of insinuation is too serious to go unchallenged. (*Interruptions*) The Chair has given me an opportunity to explain. Mr. Chairman, may I continue? When we found that a country that has been persistently entertaining hostile intentions towards our motherland was trying to exploit what was purely an internal quarrel with what we called our Government and a national Government, I made a statement on behalf of all my colleagues, that is, on the 10th of last month, and that was published in the entire national press. This was what I wanted to point out. These were more or less the very words:

“Let not China try to derive any comfort from an internal quarrel which we are having. Let them not continue the slander of our Prime Minister whom we regard as our leader when he faces China. And we warn China that it is the glory and strength of a democracy . . .”.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. Member should not make a speech now.

Shri Nath Pai: It is not a speech, but it is a defence.

Mr. Chairman: Now, Shri Ramsingh Bhai Varma.

Shri Nath Pai: Let me complete my sentence.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. Member has made a statement already and that is enough.

श्री काशीनाथ पांडे : हो सकता है कि आपने कोई स्टेटमेंट दिया हो

Shri Nath Pai: Then withdraw that statement.

श्री काशीनाथ पांडे : मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि एक साहब ने कहा कि आई० एन० टी० यू० सी० का रोल बड़ा मिजरेबिल था। मैं इस विषय के विस्तार में बाद में जाऊंगा। मैं अभी इतना कहना चाहता हूँ कि अभी जो एक साहब ने कहा कि आई० एन० टी० यू० सी० का रोल मिजरेबिल रहा, यह बात सही नहीं है। मैं इस समय यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि अपने सूबे उत्तर प्रदेश में हमने काम करना अपना फर्ज समझा। वहाँ पर हमारे साथ सैकड़ों या हजारों ही नहीं हमारे साथ जनता है। अगर जनता साथ न देती तो क्या आई० एन० टी० यू० सी० चल सकती थी? क्या उस हालत में आई० एन० टी० यू० सी० जिन्दा रह सकती थी? यह संस्था जिन्दा रह सकती है देश के हित में, राष्ट्र के हित में कुछ थोड़े हजार व्यक्तियों के हित में नहीं।

एक माननीय सदस्य : शूगर मिल मालिकों के हित में।

श्री काशीनाथ पांडे : मैं आपसे कहना चाहता हूँ कि जहाँ तक आई० एन० टी० यू० सी० का सवाल है, आप यह भूलिये नहीं कि ३ जून, १९४७ को जिस समय कि आई० एन० टी० यू० सी० की नींव रखी गई उस समय उस मीटिंग में आचार्य कृपलानी जी भी मौजूद थे और उस समय यह महसूस किया गया कि देश के अन्दर आज जो सरकार है उसमें ऐसी फोर्सों को एलाऊ नहीं किया जा सकता जो देश के अन्दर उत्पात मचाने वाली हों और इसी दृष्टिकोण से आई० एन० टी० यू० सी० का जन्म हुआ।

आई० एन० टी० यू० सी० ने अपनी ड्यूटी की और आज भी उसने देश के हित में काम किया है। मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि अगर देश में स्ट्राइक सफल हो गया होता तो जनता को भूलों मरने से आप कैसे बचाते। उससे जो आर्थिक हानि होती उस पर तो मैं बाद में आऊंगा। आप गेहूँ और चावल के दाम के लिये चिल्लाते हैं, अगर रेलवे काम न करती तो आप सोचिये कि गल्ला किस भाव में बिकता। ऐसे वक्त में आई० एन० टी० यू० सी० ने देश का साथ दिया और इसके लिये उसकी शिकायत नहीं की जा सकती।

मैं केवल एक बात पूछना चाहता हूँ। अगर देश के अन्दर कास्ट आफ लिविंग ऊंची हुई है तो क्या केवल गवर्नमेंट सर्वेस पर ही इसका असर पड़ा, क्या दूसरी इंडस्ट्रीज में काम करने वालों पर इसका असर नहीं हुआ। अशोक मेहता जी ने कहा कि १५वीं लेबर कानफरेंस ने नाम्स के बारे में निर्णय किया था यानी कि तीन कंजम्प्शन यूनिट के आधार पर एक मजदूर का वेतन तै होना चाहिये। उन्होंने इस पर बहुत जोर दिया। मैं पूछना चाहता हूँ कि तीन नाम्स बेसिस पर क्या टैक्सटाइल इंडस्ट्री में वेज फिक्स हुए। जब इंडस्ट्री ऐसा नहीं कर सकती तो सरकार कैसे कर सकती है और कैसे इतना पैसा दे सकती है। अगर सरकार ऐसा करना चाहे तो उसको साढ़े सात सौ करोड़ रुपया अमरीका से कर्जा लेकर सरकारी कर्मचारियों को देना होगा और देश को बेचना होगा। क्या जनता इसको पसन्द करेगी। क्या ऐसा करने से देश की सेवा हो सकती है। अगर आई० एन० टी० यू० सी० ने इस समय सरकार का साथ दिया तो आप उसको कैसे बुरा कह सकते हैं। लोगों को यह समझना चाहिये था कि इस हड़ताल के क्या रिपरकशन हो सकते हैं। एक मांग पेश करके थोड़े समय के लिये लोगों की सहानुभूति प्राप्त की जा सकती है लेकिन आज हमारे देश में प्रजातंत्र की रक्षा के लिये यह

जरूरी है कि देश को सच्ची बात बताई जाए। ऐसा होगा तभी देश में प्रचातंत्र की रक्षा हो सकती है। अगर हम गलत बातें कह के लोगों की सहानुभूति हासिल करने की कोशिश करेंगे तो जब उन बातों का एक्सपोजर होगा तो लोग हमारे खिलाफ हो जायेंगे और जनता हमारा साथ नहीं देगी।

मैं आपसे कहना चाहता हूँ कि जब स्ट्राइक फेल हो गया तो एक कम्युनिस्ट साहब मेरे पास लखनऊ आए। उन्होंने कहा कि मेरा नाम न बतलाना, इसलिये मैं उनका नाम नहीं लेना चाहता। उन्होंने कहा कि आज जो यह स्ट्राइक हुई है वह गवर्नमेंट की वजह से हुई है। मैंने पूछा कैसे, तो उन्होंने कहा कि अगर शुरू में गवर्नमेंट ने हमको राइट आफ एसोसिएशन न दिया होता तो यह चक्कर ही पैदा न होता और हम इस चक्कर में न पड़ते। बात यह थी कि वह निकाल दिए गए थे। मैं यह नहीं कहता कि एसोसिएशन का राइट ही न दिया जाए। यह ठीक है कि आज उसका गलत इस्तेमाल हुआ है। मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि जो हमारी लेबर पालिसी थी उसमें यह था कि चाहे कोई देश के हित में काम करे या अहित में, सब के साथ बराबर का व्यवहार किया जाना चाहिए। और जहां तक लेबर मिनिस्ट्री का ताल्लुक है उसने ऐसा ही किया। साल भर पहले आई० एन० टी० यू० सी० ने स्मेल किया कि डिफेंस अंडरटेकिंग्स में खतरा आने वाला है। जब से बार्डर का झगड़ा हुआ है तब से सेब-टाज होना शुरू हो गया है। आई० एन० टी० यू० सी० ने डिफेंस के मजदूरों का नेशनल फेडरेशन बनाया जिसको आज तक रिकॉगनीशन तक नहीं मिला है। मैं आपसे कहना चाहता हूँ कि कानपुर में बनर्जी साहब की बहुत ताकत थी लेकिन नेशनल फेडरेशन की वजह से उनकी हिम्मत नहीं पड़ी हड़ताल कराने की। और अन्त में उनको फेस सर्विंग के लिये अपने को अरेस्ट कराना पड़ा। यह हालत हो गई थी।

अगर जनता इस चीज को बुरा समझती तो आपके पास कोई प्रस्ताव आना चाहिये था कि कानपुर के सिटीजन इसको बुरा समझते हैं कि स्ट्राइक कामयाब नहीं हो सका और आई० एन० टी० यू० सी० ने इसका विरोध करके गलत काम किया। लेकिन हो यह रहा है कि स्ट्राइक नहीं हो सका इसके लिये लोग आई० एन० टी० यू० सी० को धन्यवाद दे रहे हैं। और लोग महसूस कर रहे हैं कि अगर इसी तरह से लेटीट्यूड दिया गया और लीनिअंट व्यू लिया गया तो किसी वक्त खतरा हो जाएगा। लेकिन मैं अर्ज करना चाहता हूँ कि आप आई० एन० टी० यू० सी० के साथ भी वैसा ही व्यवहार न करें जैसा कि औरों के साथ। आज हम देखते हैं कि जो पाप इन लोगों ने किए है उनका फल हमको भोगना पड़ रहा है। अब गवर्नमेंट की यह पालिसी हो रही है कि इन यूनियनों में आउटसाइडर न हों। आप देखें कि आउटसाइडर तो दोनों तरफ हैं। एक कांस्ट्रक्टिव काम करते हैं तो दूसरे डेस्ट्रक्टिव काम करते हैं। अगर रेलवे में स्ट्राइक नहीं हुआ तो यह आउटसाइडर्स की वजह से ही, अगर डिफेंस यूनियंस में स्ट्राइक नहीं हुआ तो आउटसाइडर्स की वजह से। जहां हमारी यूनियन मजबूत थी वहां पर स्ट्राइक नहीं हुआ।

16 hrs.

और मैं एक बात कहना चाहता हूँ कि ११ जुलाई के स्ट्राइक को तो छोड़िए, १४ जुलाई को जो यह लोग एक टोकिन स्ट्राइक करना चाहते थे उसको भी कानपुर में नहीं कराया जा सका। ऐसा आई० एन० टी० यू० सी० की वजह से ही हो सका।

Shri S. M. Banerjee: Let there be a referendum, and if INTUC Unions in Defence get 10 per cent, I shall dissolve my Unions. They have no following.

श्री काशीनाथ पांडे : आज जरूरत इस बात की है कि आई० एन० टी० यू० सी०

[श्री काशीनाथ पांडे]

को मजबूत बनाया जाए । हाउस में यह कहना दूसरी बात है कि इसका काम मिजरोबिल रहा लेकिन आप जनता से जाकर पूछिए ।

मैं केवल यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि आपको एक कंडीशन ले डाउन करनी चाहिए कि जहाँ तक रिकॉगनीशन का सवाल है सब आउटसाइडर्स को बन्द न करना चाहिए । ऐसे रूल बनाने चाहिए कि जो आउटसाइडर कांस्ट्रिक्टव लाइन पर काम करने के लिए राजी हों उनको काम करने दिया जाए और जो उस के लिए राजी न हों उनको न काम करने दिया जाए ।

श्री अजित प्रसाद जी ने एक बात कही कि जो लोग यह कहें कि आगे हम ला एबाइडिंग रहेंगे उनको रहने दिया जाए । लेकिन मैं तो इसको ठीक नहीं समझता क्योंकि श्री तो सब कह देंगे कि हम ला एबाइडिंग रहेंगे लेकिन बाद में वैसा नहीं करेंगे । इसलिए मैं कहता हूँ कि इसके लिए कंडीशंस ले डाउन कर देना चाहिए ।

दूसरी बात मैं अर्ज करना चाहता हूँ वेज के सम्बन्ध में । मैं समझता हूँ कि आज कास्ट आफ लिविंग बर्दा है इसका एम्पलाईज पर असर पड़ा है । इसका हल केवल आर्डिनेन्स से नहीं हो सकता । सन् १९२६ से पहले हमारे देश में कोई ट्रेड यूनियन ऐक्ट नहीं था । बिल्कुल जंगल ला था । लेकिन तब भी लोगों ने महसूस किया कि एसोसिएशन बनना चाहिए । १९२६ में ट्रेड यूनियन ऐक्ट बना । और एसोसिएशन बनने लगे । मैं आपसे कहना चाहता हूँ कि जिन लोगों ने इस स्ट्राइक में भाग लिया है वे भी आपके बच्चे हैं । यह ठीक है कि जिन लोगों ने सेवटाज किया उनके खिलाफ कार्रवाई की गयी । लेकिन बहुत से लोग ऐसे हैं जिनके हालात की आपको जांच करनी चाहिए ताकि गलत तरीके से किसी को

सजा न हो जाए । आप उनके पिता हैं और वह भी आपकी तरफ देख रहे हैं ।

एक चीज मैं आपसे और कहना चाहता हूँ । जिन अंडरटेकिंग्स को आप एसोसियल सर्विस कहते हैं उनमें आप हड़ताल का राइट बन्द करने जा रहे हैं उनमें भी लोगों की ग्रीवांस हो सकती हैं । किसी भी स्वस्थ आदमी को जैसे जुकाम हो सकता है वैसे ही उनके भी कुछ ग्रीवांस हो सकते हैं । उनको रिड्रेस करने के लिए भी कोई व्यवस्था होनी चाहिए । चाहे आप शुरू में उसके लिये कंसलिएशन करें और बाद में आरबिट्रेशन करें या शुरू ही से आरबिट्रेशन कर दें । मैं सिर्फ यही कहना चाहता हूँ ।

आखिर में मैं श्री भरूचा साहब के मोशन का घोर विरोध करता हूँ और गवर्नमेंट ने जो एक्शन लिया उसका पूरी तरह से समर्थन करता हूँ ।

Shri M. R. Masani (Ranchi-East):
Mr. Chairman, I thought that, after the speech of Shri Asoka Mehta which set a very good tone for our discussion, we should go out of our way to avoid recrimination and, as far as possible, ascertainment of the guilt of various parties. I would, therefore, like to start by considering the fundamental principles which bear on an occasion like this.

It appears to me that the tragedy which we are discussing is, like all real tragedies, not a clash between right and wrong, but between right and right. There are two kinds of right principles or logic which have come into collision on an occasion like this. On the one side, the Fundamental Rights in our Constitution give every citizen the right of freedom of association and the right to deny his labour. These are very sacred rights and any attempt to deny them must be very carefully considered and very carefully limited.

Pandit K. C. Sharma (Hapur): Not to apply to Government.

Shri M. R. Masani: I will come to that. Let the hon. Member be a little patient.

Similarly, the Directive Principles of our Constitution lay down certain economic policies like giving everyone a living wage; and certainly, as Shri Asoka Mehta argued, the erosion of the real wages of low-paid employees is something that we should do everything possible to avert. These are the principles—the right of freedom of association and the right to strike, which distinguish a free man from a bounded slave, and also the right to certain minimum standards.

On the other hand, there is an other equally valid principle, and that principle is that of the normal functioning of a community. The British phrase has it. 'The King's Government must be carried on', and in our own country, the President's Government must proceed, and anything that disrupts the normal, ordered life of the community or of society has to be eschewed. From this the corollary follows that our civil services and State employees—I am talking of the civil services proper, the Secretariat establishment, and not of industrial workers—must be immune from political influence or political affiliation. From that also follows a corollary that their associations and unions, when recognised, should be confined to those who belong to these vocations.

So here there are two principles or two logics coming on this occasion into violent conflict. We should try to understand each point of view and find out how much merit there is in those who espouse these respective points of view.

Now, there is one party in this country, one body of people in this country, about whom we are all unanimous there can be no criticism, and that is

the common people of our country. The common people of our country have, as everyone has said so far, rallied in defence of the normal functioning of the community and the carrying on of the President's Government. It does not mean that the public condemned the strikers' economic demands or that they did not find justice in them. But it did mean this—that on this particular occasion, public opinion asserted itself overwhelmingly behind those whose duty it was, for the time being, to maintain the ordered existence and the survival of the community. So at least there is one party who are the real victors, to whom our congratulations go, and they are the common people of India.

Now, so far as the protagonists to the dispute are concerned, the Government and their employees, as I said the other day, each had a principle which they followed; but they were not able to check these from coming to a collision.

So far as the employees are concerned, their case is that their real incomes had been eroded by a constant process of a rise in prices. Shri Asoka Mehta has made out that case clearly and I will not cover that ground. It cannot be denied that they had a valid claim to compensation to maintain their real incomes, not to ask for more money but at least to be safeguarded that what they get in 1947 would be the real wages they would continue to get. What is the root cause of this difficulty?

The rise in prices followed from governmental policy. It followed from the pattern of planning to which this country has been led during the past decade. This pattern of planning has built in it, has inherent in it, inflation. This has been pointed out from the very beginning of the Second Plan by a number of people like Prof. Shenoy who dissented from his colleagues in the Panel of Economists to point out that if this Plan was sought to be put through there would be a rise in prices

[Shri M. R. Masani]

and inflation. This warning was ignored by Government. This warning was repeated on the floor of this House by many of us from 1957 onwards. By deficit financing, by excessive taxation, by the imposition of exise duties on the necessities of life, by obsession with capital incentive projects like steel plants to the neglect of the wants of the community, this Government has almost deliberately set in motion a process of inflation.

The employees who are low paid come before the Government and ask for compensation. Is it fair, the employees say, to ask others to be generous rather than those who like Government themselves are rich and powerful? There is no denial that the employees' basic demand of 100 per cent. compensation is justified in principle.

Similarly, who has created this enormous class of underpaid civil servants? It is alleged that three clerks today do the work and one clerk could do perfectly satisfactorily in our Secretariat. On whom does the burden lie of creating this huge army of under-paid and under-worked people? If one clerk had been there he could have been paid much more. You have today three under-paid and under-worked clerks. The entire responsibility for this enormous loss in civil expenditure, which one Finance Minister after another has been unable to control, this expansion of bureaucracy which far exceeds anything that Prof. Parkinson ever dreamt about, is again the responsibility of the Government of the day. So, this is the economic root cause of the strike and this responsibility must lie squarely on the shoulders of the Government.

Then, we come to the immediate crisis. Faced with this demand Government appointed a Pay Commission. The Pay Commission made its report and, as the Home Minister has pointed out, with some modifications, those recommendations were accepted. But, the Pay Commission, if I may point

out is not a judicial tribunal. The Pay Commission was an advisory body. Its terms of reference asked it to take into account not only the justice of the employees' claims but all the political and economic factors that go into the making of governmental policy. And, like men of affairs, like practical men, although they saw the justice of what the employees were entitled to, they also saw the practical difficulties in the way of those demands being met. And so they tried to reconcile the conflicting points of view.

The point I am making is that reference to the Pay Commission which the Home Minister rightly called "a high-power body" was not a reference to a judicial tribunal whose award would be binding. There is a very big difference between these two things.

I am making this point because I was very happy to hear from the Home Minister this morning that, at long last, Government have agreed that in their disputes with their employees where necessary, they will bow to the rule of law. Hitherto they were arrogant enough to behave like Louis the XIV and say 'L'etat C'est moi', I am the State. I have heard Ministers of this Government say that they would not go to arbitration because government itself is the law. That is perfectly all right when the Government is a judicial body. Certainly, it has the sovereignty of law. But, when Government becomes an employer, when the Government opens factories and runs railways, then, it ceases to be sovereign and it becomes like any other employer: somebody whose duty it is to conform to the norms of civilised society. I am very happy that, at long last, three years too late, they have bowed to this principle after this very hard knock which all of us had had to suffer.

In this very House, three years ago, on behalf of the Independent Parliamentary Group to which I then belonged, I moved an amendment, a simple amendment saying that before a strike is declared unlawful, Govern-

ment should agree to refer it to an arbitration or adjudication. To my regret the hon. Minister of State who is sitting opposite, refused to accept that amendment on the plea that Government could not accept arbitration. Everything must be left to their discretion, to their wisdom as to what they would do in the end. This is what led to the strike. If, in that Bill, a clause for arbitration had been put in, I make bold to say that that there would not have been the strike in the last few weeks. However, let us be glad that, as Shri Asoka Mehta put it, faced with a major catastrophe, the consciousness of the rightness of what Gandhiji used to call the rule of law, has been at long last accepted by Government in their disputes with their employees. It is a great advance for Government and the employees and for our country as a whole.

Now, this is the position. I have said what needed to be considered from the employees' point of view. Now, let me say a word from the other side. I think that, on the eve of the strike when certain concessions were made which amounted, as far as I understand, to the linking of wages with prices in principle, 50 per cent. neutralisation of the rise in the cost of living and an agreement to go to arbitration, as I understand it, in respect of the balance, I think, at that point, any strike became unjustifiable. And I am very sorry that my hon. friends who led that strike did not at that moment reconsider the position and realise that the interests of the workers of the country would not benefit by imposing a strike on the country when so much had been gained and so little remained to be obtained. I believe, therefore, that the strike was thoroughly ill-advised and unjustified. I do feel this—that those who led that strike did not give enough weight, as the Home Minister put it this morning, to the enormity of the peril to the country and the problems it would create. I think, at that point, statesmanship and good leadership would have lain in resiling from the strike

and progressing further with negotiations. After all, leadership consists in guiding followers right and not in doing what, at the moment, might be popular with them. I do feel that the leaders of the strike, at that moment, resorted to that very well-known Leftist weakness of tailism, they followed the followers without correcting them and giving them a proper lead.

When the Ordinance was passed—and I agree that Ordinance is a lawless law; we have been brought up on that phrase when the British Government passed its Ordinances—we had to bow to the rule of law. We did always say that they are lawless laws. When Parliament was not in session and the law which had been passed had lapsed, they had to bring up this Bill in the form of an Ordinance. Assuming all that, and that an Ordinance goes against the spirit of the rule of law because Parliament had no chance to sit over it, I still say that the duty of the strikers and their leaders at that point was to have called off the strike. In a democracy we have to bow to the law whether we like it or not, whether for the moment we believe it is fair or not. I do feel that the leaders of the strike failed in their duty at that point of time in not bowing to it, accepting it for the time being and trying to argue against it and trying to change it when Parliament met. Then, I think their position today would have been immensely superior before the House and the country, in appealing to Parliament to reject this Ordinance and give them justice. I think the fact that they went on strike and that Shri Bharucha's motion has come at the end of a strike that was called off a strike that had failed because the people of this country would not go along with them, has done their cause no good.

I would like to conclude by stating what appear to be certain valid conclusions that follow. We were told by the Home Minister this

[Shri M. R. Masani]

morning that Government propose to ban strikes of government employees. Or, did he say civil services? (*Interruption*). It is very important—the word he used—and the category of servants. I would like to make a respectful suggestion that before we put in this word in the Bill that is to come before us, we should examine it carefully on merits. It is an important thing to distinguish between different classes of government employees. One rule or one yardstick will not serve for different categories of government employees. I am sure the Labour Minister is aware of the international legislation on this subject. There are civil servants proper who work in the Secretariat; they are one category. There are workers in essential enterprises, who are another. And, then, there are the normal, common industrial employees of Government and particularly of a Government that barges unnecessarily into producing things. These employees, the third category, are no different from any other private employees and no attempt should be made to distinguish between the ordinary industrial employees of government and these who work in other factories. But in the case of the first two, civil servants and the essential services, I think the Government would be entitled to come before us with a set of proposals distinguishing them from normal employees and limiting their rights but also defining the procedures by which alternative remedies could be given to them.

Shri Naushir Bharucha: You do not want to ban strikes?

Shri M. R. Masani: I do not want the banning of strikes. I would come to it later. In regard to the recognition of association or unions of the first two categories of people, Government would have every right to say that membership and leadership should be limited to the actual employees and that outsiders, whatever their political affiliation—even Shri Kashinath Pandey—should not be

allowed to lead them. That follows from what I said earlier—that civil servants must be immune from political affiliation or interference.

Thirdly, in regard to the banning of strikes about which Shri Bharucha is anxious, I would like, in the spirit of what Shri Jayaprakash Narayan has said, to try to avoid a resort to such a ban. I believe it is legitimate in a democracy to ban strikes in a very limited sphere like the essential services.

In this connection, may I say that I hope the Prime Minister was misquoted this morning when it was reported—I hope wrongly or inaccurately reported—that he told a Congress Party meeting that he for one had never criticised the Soviet dictatorship for banning all strikes by all workers? Once we ban strike by all the workers we become a totalitarian dictatorship and cease to be a free society. I do believe the Government have no such intention. Therefore, let us limit the truncating of the right to strike to essential services and civil servants proper. In regard to these, I would prefer Shri Jayaprakash Narayan's approach—trying to get an agreed formula for arbitration, if you like compulsory arbitration as in Australia, because we know compulsory arbitration automatically prevents a strike. There could no longer be strike once compulsory arbitration or voluntary arbitration is agreed to. I would suggest to all concerned, including those who led the Government employees to agree to the principle that all disputes between them and the Government should be justiciable and should go to a tribunal of some kind chosen with the consent of both parties. Once it is done, it is obvious that the right to strike has been forsworn and adjured and therefore, a legal ban may or may not be necessary. If it is, let it be a formality but let it follow rather than precede the other remedies. I advanced the proposition three years ago and I am glad it is being

accepted. You cannot deny a man the right to deny his labour unless you give him the right to a judicial recourse. Once this has been accepted, you can illegalise strikes in these limited spheres of activity.

Lastly, may I say that I think what we need now is the healing touch. We do not need a war of vindictiveness. I am glad to see from the speech of the hon. Home Minister that that spirit is completely lacking. The same spirit should be shown on this side because the losers quite often are more vindictive than the winners and therefore what Shri Asoka Mehta said to those benches applies as much to those who sit on this side of the House. In the larger interest of the country we should consider the proposals which the Government bring before us to see that there is no repetition of this kind of incident, but I say that this incident is one which could have been avoided if three years earlier the same spirit that now animates the Government benches had been available.

श्री वाजपेयी : सभापति महोदय, इस बात से इंकार नहीं किया जा सकता कि केन्द्रीय कर्मचारियों की हड़ताल के लिये केन्द्रीय शासन बहुत अंशों में जिम्मेदार है। वेतन आयोग की रिपोर्ट के प्रकाशन के पश्चात् जिम्मेदार कर्मचारियों के परामर्श के बिना ऐसे परिवर्तन किये गये जो कर्मचारियों के हितों के प्रतिकूल थे। आज कहा जाता है कि वेतन आयोग की रिपोर्ट एक पंच का फैसला था। यदि वह पंच का फैसला था तो भी उसमें एक तरफा परिवर्तन नहीं किया जाना था। शनिवार की छुट्टी का सवाल है या एक जुलाई से कर्मचारियों को सुविधायें देने का प्रश्न था। सरकार ने उनमें मनमाना परिवर्तन किया। वेतन आयोग ने सिफारिश की थी कि एक शनिवार को पूरा काम होना चाहिये और एक शनिवार को पूरी छुट्टी किन्तु केन्द्रीय सरकार ने उसे दन दिया। एक जुलाई से जो सुविधाएं

लागू की जानी चाहिये थीं उन्हें ३१ दिसम्बर तक हटा दिया गया। मैं नहीं समझता कि केन्द्रीय सरकार ने उस रिपोर्ट को एवार्ड मान कर अपना कार्य आरम्भ किया और अगर यह मान भी लिया जाय कि वेतन आयोग की रिपोर्ट एक एवार्ड था तो इस प्रकार के उदाहरण मौजूद हैं कि जब सरकार ने एवार्डों में परिवर्तन किया है। बैंक एवार्डों में परिवर्तन के विरुद्ध श्री गिरि ने अपने पद से त्यागपत्र दे दिया था। यदि बैंकों के, मिलमालिकों के पक्ष में किसी एवार्ड में परिवर्तन हो सकता है तो कोई कारण नहीं है कि २२ लाख कर्मचारियों के हितों का विचार करते हुए अगर पे कमिशन की रिपोर्ट एक एवार्ड थी तो उसमें भी कोई संशोधन क्यों नहीं किया जा सकता था। उसमें भी संशोधन किया जा सकता था। लेकिन मुझे शिकायत है कि सरकार ने उसे एवार्ड नहीं माना और यह शिकायत हमारे आई० एन० टी० यू० सी० के नेताओं को भी है कि कमिशन ने कुछ ऐसी सिफारिशों की थीं जो पहले कमिशन की सिफारिशों के खिलाफ जाती थीं। पे कमिशन की रिपोर्ट में कुछ ऐसी भी सिफारिशें थीं जिनमें कर्मचारियों की सुविधाओं में जो उन्होंने वर्षों संघर्ष करने के पश्चात् प्राप्त की थीं, कटौती कर दी गई थी। क्या यह स्वाभाविक नहीं थी कि सरकार उन सिफारिशों को लागू करने से पहले केन्द्रीय कर्मचारियों के प्रतिनिधियों को बार्ता के लिये बुलाती? क्या पहले पे कमिशन की रिपोर्ट एक एवार्ड नहीं थी? क्या उसमें मंहगाई भत्ते के सम्बन्ध में जो सिफारिश की गई थी उसे सरकार ने लागू किया? क्या उस सिफारिश को लागू करने के लिये जिस प्रकार की मशीनरी की स्थापना की जानी थी, सरकार ने लागू किया? हमारी सरकार ने पहले पे कमिशन की रिपोर्ट को खटाई में रक्खा क्योंकि वह कर्मचारियों के हित में जाती थी और दूसरे पे कमिशन

[श्री वाजपेयी]

की रिपोर्ट को पंच परमेश्वर का फैसला कर लागू करने की कोशिश की। मेरा निवेदन है कि अगर दोनों वेतन आयोगों में मतभेद था और अगर दूसरे वेतन आयोग की सिफारिशें ऐसी थीं जिनमें कि कर्मचारियों की वर्तमान सुविधाओं में कटौती होती है तो उस के सम्बन्ध में केन्द्रीय कर्मचारियों के प्रतिनिधियों से मिलने में किसी प्रकार की आपत्ति नहीं होनी चाहिये। ज्वाइंट कौंसिल आफ एक्शन बाद में बनी। जब इस सदन में वेतन आयोग की रिपोर्ट पर विचार हुआ और एक प्रश्न के रूप में वित्त मंत्री महोदय से पूछा गया कि क्या आप केन्द्रीय कर्मचारियों के प्रतिनिधियों को बुला कर बात करेंगे तो वित्त मंत्री जी ने साफ इंकार कर दिया। उन्होंने कहा कि बात जो होनी थी वह पहले हो गई। अब तो रिपोर्ट आ गई है और हम उसे लागू करेंगे। मेरा निवेदन है कि यह रवैया बहुत ही गलत था और इसलिये केन्द्रीय सरकार इस हड़ताल को निमन्त्रण देने के लिये जिम्मेदार है। ज्वाइंट कौंसिल आफ एक्शन का निर्माण बाद में हुआ और मैं समझता हूँ कि हमारे प्रधान मंत्री जी जानते थे कि वित्त मंत्री जी ने केन्द्रीय कर्मचारियों के प्रतिनिधियों से मिलने से इंकार कर दिया है। उस समय हड़ताल की कोई बात नहीं थी और शायद लोगों के दिमाग में हड़ताल का विचार भी नहीं था और अगर उसी समय केन्द्रीय कर्मचारियों के प्रतिनिधियों से सरकार की बातचीत हो जाती तो हड़ताल की नौबत न आती। मगर सरकार ने हठधर्मी का रुख अपनाया जिसका परिणाम यह हुआ कि हमें हड़ताल के दुर्भाग्य का सामना करना पड़ा। मैं हड़ताल को दुर्भाग्य कहता हूँ। यह केन्द्रीय सरकार के लिये भी दुर्भाग्य की बात थी, और जिनके हाथों में केन्द्रीय कर्मचारियों का नेतृत्व था उनके लिए भी दुर्भाग्य

की बात थी कि हमको देश में हड़ताल का दृश्य देखना पड़ा। लेकिन मेरा निवेदन है कि अगर सरकार चाहती तो हड़ताल को टाल सकती थी।

मैंने केन्द्रीय कर्मचारियों के नेताओं से बातचीत की। वे नहीं सोचते थे कि हड़ताल करनी पड़ेगी यहां तक कि उन्होंने हड़ताल की तैयारी भी नहीं की थी। उन्होंने हड़ताल के लिये कर्मचारियों को प्रोत्साहित भी नहीं किया था। मैं आपसे कहना चाहता हूँ कि अगर उन्होंने केन्द्रीय कर्मचारियों को हड़ताल के लिये तैयार किया होता तो आज आप यह दावा नहीं करते कि केवल २० फीसदी कर्मचारियों ने ही हड़ताल की है। भले ही २० फीसदी न हड़ताल की हो मगर जो उन की मांगें थीं उन के पीछे सारे केन्द्रीय कर्मचारियों की सहानुभूति थी और रहेगी। वे समझते थे कि समय रहते बुद्धिमानी काम आयेगी और हमारे प्रधान मंत्री जी कम से कम मिलने से इंकार नहीं करेंगे और अगर मान लीजिये कि ज्यों ने ज्वाइंट कौंसिल आफ एक्शन बना भी ली तो उस से कौन सा आसमान सिर पर टूट पड़ा। हमारे प्रधान मंत्री जी कहते हैं कि वे पिछले ४० साल से हर व्यक्ति से हर जगह मिलने को तैयार हैं। अब यह केन्द्रीय कर्मचारियों के प्रतिनिधि उन्हीं के अनुयायी हैं और उन के नेतृत्व में देश का निर्माण करने के लिये प्रयत्नशील हैं। अगर उन्हीं ने संघ संमिति का निर्माण करके गलती की तो प्रधान मंत्री जी को दूसरी गलती उन से मिलने से इंकार कर के नहीं करनी चाहिये थी और उन से मिलने से इंकार कर के सरकार ने बातचीत का दरवाजा बन्द कर दिया। उस से एक असन्तोष की भावना फैली और केन्द्रीय कर्मचारियों के जो नेता थे उन के लिये एक असमंजस पैदा हो गया कि क्या करें और क्या न करें। मैं समझता हूँ कि परिस्थितियों से मजबूर

हो कर उन्होंने ने हड़ताल का फैसला किया। मैं श्री नाथपाई से हड़ताल के एक दिन पहले मिला था और मैं ने निवेदन किया था कि श्री फीरोज गांधी का फार्मुला मान लेना चाहिये। यद्यपि वह पूरी तरह से केन्द्रीय कर्मचारियों की मांगों का समर्थन नहीं करता। लेकिन जब सरकार हठधर्मी पर अड़ी थी और अपनी सारी सामूहिक शक्ति के बल पर हड़ताल को कुचलने पर तुली थी तो मैं ने श्री नाथपाई को कहा था कि फीरोज गांधी का फार्मुला मान लेना चाहिये मगर हमारे जो इताली नेता थे उन को डर था कि और हम ने कुछ ऐसी चीज मान ली जिसे कर्मचारियों ने पसन्द नहीं किया तो फिर हमारे लिये कठिनाई पैदा होगी। मैं समझता हूँ कि यह नेतृत्व का सवाल नहीं है और जिन के कि हाथों में शासन की बागडोर है उन्हें भी इस स्थिति को समझना चाहिये था। लेकिन उन्होंने ने नहीं समझा और जो हड़ताली नेता थे वे ऐसी परिस्थिति में फंस गये कि उस से बहार नहीं निकल सके। मैं ने श्री नाथ पाई को सुझाव दिया था कि अगर उन्हें हड़ताल करनी ही हो तो वे एक दिन की हड़ताल करें, अनिश्चित समय की हड़ताल न करें। केन्द्रीय सरकार के कर्मचारी अगर शासन की नीतियों के विरोध में अपना रोष प्रकट करना चाहते हैं तो एक दिन की टोकन स्ट्राइक करें, और उन का विरोध प्रकट हो जायेगा और अनिश्चित काल की हड़ताल से जो भयंकर परिणाम होंगे उन दुष्परिणामों से भी वे बच जायेंगे लेकिन मालूम ऐसा लगता है कि चीज उन के हाथ से फिसल गई और हड़ताल हो गई।

सभापति महोदय, मेरा निवेदन है कि हमारे प्रधान मंत्री जी ने जो रेडियो पर भाषण दिया उस का कर्मचारियों पर बड़ा प्रभाव हुआ क्योंकि उस में भावुकता थी। उस में उन्होंने ने दो तस्वीरें खींची थीं। एक हिमालय की चोटियों पर काम करने वाले मजदूरों जवानों की तस्वीर और एक मैदानों में दफ्तरों में कलम की तलवार से जूझने वाले कर्मचारियों

की तस्वीर थी। मुझे खेद है कि यह तस्वीरें उन्होंने ने इस तरह से पेश की थीं कि सेना में काम करने वाले जवानों और सिविल एम्प्लोईज के बीच में एक दरार खड़ी कर दी। यह देश के लिये बड़े ही दुर्भाग्य की बात थी। जो भी कर्मचारी हैं वे सब सरकार के कर्मचारी हैं, देश के सेवक हैं। उन में इस तरह का कोई भेद भाव नहीं किया जाना चाहिये और मेरा निवेदन है कि दो तस्वीरें केवल पहाड़ की चोटियों पर तैनात जवानों की और मैदानों में काम करने वाले सिविल एम्प्लोईज

ही नहीं बल्कि दो तस्वीरें पहाड़ की चोटियों पर भी मिल सकती हैं और दो तस्वीरें मैदान में भी मिल सकती हैं। जवानों और अफसरों की तनख्वाहों के बीच का भारी अन्तर पहाड़ की चोटी पर भी मिल सकता है और मैदानों में भी मिल सकता है। अगर सरकार मानती है कि एक कर्मचारी का न्यूनतम वेतन ८० रुपये होना चाहिये तो मेरा कहना है कि अधिक से अधिक वेतन ८०० रुपये होना चाहिये। क्या सभी पार्टियां इस बात से सहमत नहीं हैं कि एक दूसरे में आमदनी का अन्तर १ और १० के बीच में होना चाहिये और अगर आप मान लेते हैं कि आमदनी में १ और १० का अन्तर न हो कर आज की परिस्थितियों में १ और २० के बीच में होना चाहिये तो भी अधिक से अधिक वेतन अगर आप न्यूनतम वेतन ८० रुपया मानते हैं तो वह १६०० रुपये से ज्यादा नहीं हो सकता। मगर एक चौथे दर्जे का कर्मचारी तीस, चालीस रुपए पा सकता है और एक बड़ा अफसर तीन हजार, साढ़े तीन हजार रुपये पा सकता है। यह चीज है, जो कर्मचारियों के हृदय में खलती है और अगर यह भेद रहता है, तो सरकार कानून बना कर हड़ताल को नहीं रोक सकती। महाभारत में कुन्ती ने कहा था कि मेरे पुत्र भूखे हैं, इस का मुझे दुख नहीं है, मगर जब मैं कौरवों के पुत्रों को राजसी ठाठ में देखती हूँ, तो मेरे हृदय में रोष की लहर दौड़ जाती है। यह स्वाभाविक भावना है, सभापति जी, और

[श्री बाजपेयी]

केन्द्रीय सरकार को प्रथम करना चाहिए इस भेद को कम करने का। ऊंची से ऊंची तब्दीगह तथ नहीं की गई, मुनाफे पर कोई रोक नहीं लगाई गई। आर्डिनेंस जारी किया गया केन्द्रीय कर्मचारियों के खिलाफ अगर आर्डिनेंस कपड़े के धाम बढ़ाने वाले मिल-मालिकों के खिलाफ जा भी नहीं हो सकता। मेरा निवेदन है कि यह जो प्रथम था, वह कोई सिविल पैबेलियन का प्रथम नहीं था। यह बड़े दुर्भाग्य की शब्दावली है, जिस का हमारे प्रधान मंत्री ने प्रयोग किया लेकिन आज देश में चारों ओर असन्तोष का वास्तव फैली हुई है। ये तीसरे और चौथे दर्जे के केन्द्रीय कर्मचारी, विश्वविद्यालय में भर्ती होने के लिए स्थान न पाने वाले विद्यार्थी। यह असन्तोष कोई भी चिंतागी पा कर भड़क सकता है। आवश्यकता इस बात की है कि हड़ताल हमें एक झटके का काम दे। अगर हड़ताल का स्वागत किया जाये इस दृष्टि से कि उस ने हमें एक शाक ट्रीटमेंट दिया है, सारे देश को, सरकार को था, और अगर हम इस से लाभ उठाएँ और ऐसी नीतियों का निर्धारण करें कि जिन से देश में मंहगाई न बढ़ने पाए, तो यह सब के लिए अच्छा होगा। अगर सरकार जीवन की आवश्यक वस्तुओं की कीमतों पर रोक लगाने में सफल नहीं होती, तो फिर वेतन और भत्ता बढ़ाने की मांग खड़ी होगी और सरकार का कोई कानून उस मांग को नहीं रोक सकता। मैं यह जानना चाहता हूँ कि सरकार हड़ताल की घमकी के ऊपर ही काम क्यों करती है। पे कमीशन की रिपोर्ट साल भर अलमारी में बन्द पड़ी रही, मगर उसे लागू नहीं किया गया। जब हड़ताल का संकट फिर पर आ गया, तब फिर फ़रमान जारी किए जाने लगे। हमारे प्रधान मंत्री जी ने भी अपने ब्राडकास्ट भाषण में इस बात पर खेद प्रकट किया है कि पे कमीशन की रिपोर्ट

को लागू करने में देर हुई। इस देर के लिए कौन जिम्मेदार है ?

एक माननीय सदस्य : सरकार।

श्री बाजपेयी : अगर सरकार जिम्मेदार है, तो सरकार को अपने तौर-तरीके बदलने चाहिए। हड़ताल को रोकने के लिए कानून बनाने की जरूरत नहीं है। जिन कारणों से हड़ताल होती है, उन कारणों को दूर करने की जरूरत है। हड़ताल रोग का कारण नहीं है। हड़ताल तो रोग का प्रकटीकरण है और अगर कारण दूर किए जायेंगे, तो फिर प्रकटीकरण बन्द हो सकता है। मेरा निवेदन है कि सरकार इस प्रकार की व्यवस्था करे, इस प्रकार की मनीतरी बनाए, जिस में केन्द्रीय कर्मचारियों के साथ अगर मत-भेद होते हैं, तो मिल कर, बैठकर, उन पर बात-चीत की जाये, उन्हें गुलज़ा लिया जाये और अगर मत-भेद हैं, तो उन्हें अनिवार्य पंच फ़ैसले के लिए नीप दिया जाये, कम्प्लैसमरी अरबिट्रेशन के लिए मौप दिया जाये। मैं समझता हूँ कि फिर हड़ताल की कोई आवश्यकता नहीं होगी। इस मामले में भी अगर सरकार चाहती, तो इंडस्ट्रियल डिस्पूट्स एक्ट की धारा १० के अनुसार हड़ताल को वर्चुअली बन्द कर सकती थी और सारे मामले को पंच-फ़ैसले के लिए हीप सकती थी। मगर शायद सरकार जोर-आजमाई करना चाहती थी और मुझे खेद है कि जिस ढंग से आई० एन० टी० यू० सी० ने काम किया। जब हड़ताल वापिस ले ली गई और रेलवे कर्मचारी लखनऊ के वर्कशाप में काम करने गए, तो वहाँ के डिपार्टमेंटल हूड ने उन्हें कर्मचारियों को अन्दर जाने दिया, जिन्हें आई० एन० टी० यू० सी० वालों ने दरवाजे पर खे हो कर कहा कि हाँ, वे जा सकते हैं, दूसरे नहीं जा सकते हैं।

कुछ माननीय सदस्य : शोम, शोम।

कुछ माननीय सदस्य : गलत है।

कुछ माननीय सदस्य : ठीक है।

श्री काशीनाथ पांडे : यह बिल्कुल गलत है। माननीय सदस्य यह प्रतिज्ञा कर सकते कि वहां पर आई०एन०टी०यू०सी० ने कुछ किया है।

श्री वाजपेयी : सभापति जी, मैं उस दिन लखनऊ में था। यह प्रत्यक्ष आखों देखी हुई बात है और आई०एन०टी०यू०सी० को चाहिए कि जरा अपने नेताओं को सम्भाल कर रखें। केन्द्रीय कर्मचारियों का विश्वास प्राप्त करने का यह तरीका नहीं है। बदले की भावना, प्रतिशोध की भावना ले कर आप कर्मचारियों का विश्वास प्राप्त नहीं कर सकते। मेरा निवेदन है कि जो कुछ हो गया, वह पुरानी गाथा थी, क दुःस्वप्न था, जिस को हमें भूल जाना चाहिए और नए सम्बन्धों का श्रृंगार करना चाहिए। मगर इस के लिए जो गिरफ्तार हैं, जेलों में पड़े हैं, नौकरियों से निकाले जा रहे हैं, उन्हें वापस लेना चाहिए। और हिंसा का अर्थ यह ना लगाया जाये कि अगर किसी ने हड़ताल के लिए कहा, तो वह हिंसा में आता है और अगर किसी रेलवे कर्मचारी ने काम छोड़ने से पहले इंजन का कोयला निकाल दिया तो कहा कि तुम ने सैबोटिज किया।

रेलवे मंत्री (श्री जगजोवन राम) : और क्या है ?

श्री वाजपेयी : तो क्या वह रेलवे कर्मचारी इंजन का कोयला इंजन में ही छोड़ देता ? वह भी सैबोटिज होता, क्योंकि उस से इंजन खराब हो जाता। मेरा कहना यह है कि सैबोटिज और वायर्लेस की परिभाषा इतनी लम्बी मत बनायें कि सरकार के जाल में सब फँस जायें।

श्री अ० मु० तारिक (जम्मू तथा काश्मीर) : जनाब चैयरमैन साहब, मैं मिस्टर नौशीर भलूवा को उस तहकिकी का मुखालिफत

करता हूँ, जिस को उन्होंने इस ऐवान में लाया है। आपोजीशन पार्टीज के जिन जी-इज्जत मेम्बरान ने एस ऐवान में तकरीरें कीं, उन्होंने मुस्तलिफ बातों को हमारे सामने रखा। एक तो यह कि हुकूमत ने पे कमिशन की सिफारिशत को बहुत जल्दी अमल में नहीं लाया है। दूसरी यह कि जिन लोगों ने गलती की है, उन से गलती हुई है और यह गलती वगैर सोचे समझे हुई है, अचानक एक हादिसा हुआ है, उन के साथ रहम किया जाये, उन को जेलों से वापस लाया जाये और उन के साथ अच्छा सलूक किया जाये। तीसरी बात इस ऐवान में श्री अशोक मेहता ने रखी और वह यह कि यह हड़ताल बिल्कुल गैर-सियासी थी और प्रजा सोशलिस्ट पार्टी का बहैसियत एक जमायत इस से कोई ताल्लुक नहीं था। अशोक मेहता साहब की मैं इज्जत करता हूँ, इस लहाज से कि वह बहुत पुगने सियामी वर्कर हैं, लेकिन आज उन की तकरीर की सुन कर मुझे सल्ल अफसोस हुआ है और वह इस लिए कि जिस तरह और जिस अंदाज से उन्होंने लाताल्लुकी का इजहार किया, उस पर कोई शफ्त यकीन नहीं कर सकता। यह हड़ताल सिर्फ सियासी थी। यह सिर्फ हड़ताल नहीं थी, बल्कि एक किस्म का ऐलाने-जंग किया गया इस मुन्क की हुकूमत के खिलाफ। इस ऐवान के जी-इज्जत मेम्बरान उन दिनों की रिपोर्टस को देखें, अखबारी रिपीटस को देखें कि श्री नाथ पाई सुबह दिल्ली में हैं और शाम को बम्बई में हैं, हवाई जहाज से जा रहे हैं, रेल से जा रहे हैं, अफरा-तफरी मचाई जा रही है, लोगों में एक खास किस्म का हैजान पैदा किया जा रहा है बिल्कुल उस अन्दाज से जब किमी मुल्क पर कोई बाहर की ताकत हमला कर रही हो और उस हमला करने वाली जमायत का मार्शल या कमांडर-इन-चीज एक महाज से दूसरे पर जा रहा हो।

श्री बजर्राज सिंह : मिनिस्टर साहबान रोज हवाई जहाज पर आते जाते हैं। वे किस पर हमला करने के लिए जाते हैं ?

श्री अ० मू० तारिख : यह और बात है कि हालात ने और इस मुल्क के रहने वालों ने और हकूमत ने उनकी मकरूह साजिश को, जो इस मुल्क का निजम दरहम नरहम करने के लिए की गई थी, नाकाम बना दिया और वे आज बिल्कुल एक मुजजिम की हैसियत से, एक ऐसे आदमी की हैसियत से, जो कि जहनी तोर पर नाबालिग हो, हम से दरखास्त करने आए हैं, इस एवान से दरखास्त करने आए हैं कि रहम काजिए। उन को उस वक्त सोचना चाहिए था कि वे मुल्क को किस तबाही की तरफ ले जा रहे हैं, जिस वक्त उन्होंने स्ट्राइक का नारा लगाया और यही नहीं, बल्कि लोगों का मजबूर किया तहरीक चलाने पर, अफ़सरी पर हमले किए, हमले करवाए उन लोगों पर, उन गरीबों वर्कर्स पर, जो इस मुल्क के वफ़ादार शहरी हैं और जो चाहते थे कि हुकूमत का काम रुकने न पाए। हकीकत यह है कि हमारे सामने जो तबारीख है, वह यह है कि पिछले चन्द महीनों से—तकरीबन एक साल से— इस मुल्क की सियासत में जो रोग पी०एस० पी० ने पैदा किया है, हमारे ताल्लूकात जिस अन्दाज से हमारे हमसाया मुल्कों से खराब करने के लिए पी०एस०पी० ने कौशिश की है, वह किसी और ने नहीं किया। जब उन लोगों को शिकस्त हुई और ऐसी शिकस्त हुई कि उन का एक सिधामी जमायत की हैसियत से इस मुल्क में कायम रहना नागवार हो गया, तब उन्होंने स्ट्राइक का बहाना बनाया। यह और बात है कि कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी भी इस चकमे में आ गई इस लिहाज से कि वे मजदूरों के रहनुमा हैं, इस लिहाज से कि उन की एक थ्योरी है कि इस दुनिया में हमेशा, चाहे गलत हो या दुस्त, अपनी जमायत का कायम करने के लिए कम्युनिस्टों का मजदूरों का साथ देना पड़ता है। कम्युनिस्टों का यह नज़रिया दुस्त हूंगा, लेकिन मजदूरों को गलत रास्ते पर डालने के लिए उनका इश्तराक एरु ऐनी जमायत से हुआ जिस ने हर मौके पर उन को इस मुल्क का गद्दार कहा, यह कहा

कि इन का हर एक जो होता है, वह इस मुल्क की सियासत के मुताबिक नहीं होता है, बल्कि किसी बाहर की ताकत से होता है। इस में जाहिर होता है कि किस तरह इस मुल्क में मुखालिफ जमायतों का इश्तराक हो सकता है। मलतलब यह था कि इस मुल्क की इडमिनिरट्रेशन को खत्म किया जाए। स्ट्राइक इसलिए नहीं थी कि यहां के मजदूरों को, यहां के आर्डिनरी वर्कर्स को या मामूली अफसरों को कोई फायदा पहुंचाया जाए। यह जंग सिर्फ सिधामी जंग थी।

हमें चाहिये कि हम उस वक्त जो बयानात निकाले गए उनको देखें। खुद पी० एन्ड टी० वर्कर्स दिल्ली के जनरल सेंक्रेटरी ने जो बयानात दिये उन में उन्होंने श्री नाथ पाई के रोल को बंकाब किया और बताया कि किस तरह वह जिस बात को एक्शन कमेटी में कहते हैं उन को बाहर बिल्कुल नहीं कहते हैं, उसकी मुखालिफत करते हैं किस तरह से उन्होंने छोटे छोटे वर्कर्स को गलत बातें बता कर, गलत वाक़ात की बिना पर गलत रास्ते पर ला खड़ा कर दिया, यह किसी से छिपा नहीं है। मैं समझता हूँ कि इस मुल्क में रहने वाले लोग मुबारिकबाद के मुस्तहिक हैं जिन्होंने कि इस साजिश को, इन स्ट्राइक को नाकाम बना दिया है।

अब हमारे सामने मसला यह है कि हम उन लोगों के साथ जिन्होंने यह स्ट्राइक की, क्या सज़ा करें, हम इस मुल्क में उनके साथ क्या ख़य्या अख़्यार करें। यह ठीक है कि वे भी इस मुल्क के शहरी हैं, उनमें बहुत से अच्छे लोग भी हैं, छोटे छोटे लोग भी हैं, समझदार लोग भी हैं। कुछ लोग ऐसे भी हैं जो गलत रास्ते पर चले गए किसी एक्शन की वजह से, मजदूरों के डर से, हमले के डर से। मैं हुकूमत के सामने तजवीज़ रखना चाहता हूँ कि ऐसे लोगों के साथ जिन्होंने स्ट्राइक में हिस्सा लिया जायज सलूक किया

जाए। उनके जो मुताबिकता हैं, उनको देखा जाए, उनकी जो शिकायत हैं उनको दूर किया जाए और इसमें कोई शक नहीं है कि उनको देखा जाएगा। बहुत से मजदूर हैं जिनको बहुत दूर जा कर बसाया गया है और उनकी मुश्किलात पर गौर होना चाहिये। जिस हद तक नुमकिन हो सके उनके एलाउसंज में, उनकी तनख्वाहों में इजाफा होना चाहिए। लेकिन मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि जिन लोगों ने स्ट्राइक को अपने सियासी मकसिद के लिए चलाया उनके साथ किसी किसम का रहम न किया जाए, उनके साथ बिल्कुल वही सलूक किया जाए जिस की कानून इजाजत देता है।

एक और बात कही जाती है। कहा जाता है कि हमारे वजीरे आजम बहुत अच्छे आदमी हैं, बेचारे बहुत नेक हैं, शायद वह नमी कर जायें। मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि इस तरह की कोई नमी नहीं होनी चाहिये। यह हकूमत कोई तानाशाही हकूमत नहीं है, अकबरशाही नहीं है जहाँ जंजीर खींच कर इंसानों को बांधा जा सकता है। यहाँ पर कबानिनी चलते हैं। अगर कोई शरस किसी का दांत तंगड़ता है, तो उसके लिए कानून है और कानून के मुताबिक जो सजा उसके मिल सकती है, मिलनी चाहिये। अगर वजीरे-आजम बहुत अच्छे आदमी हैं, बहुत नेक आदमी हैं, बहुत जरीफ आनी हैं तो इतना यह मतलब नहीं है कि किमी ऐंसे शरस के साथ जिसने मुत्क के आइन के साथ, मुत्क के निजाम के साथ सहाय्य करने की कोशिश की उसको माफ कर दिया जाए।

वाजपेयी जी ने कहा कि वजीरे-आजम साहब ने मुताबिकता में इन्कार किया। मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि उस शरस के साथ मुलाकात हो सकती है जिस के साथ कोई जवाजियत हो, जो शरस दोगती का हाथ बढ़ा कर आए लेकिन ऐंसे शरस के साथ ऐसी जमायत के साथ कैसे वजीरे-आजम मुलाकात कर सकते हैं जो धमकी देती हो, हकूमत का तख्ता उलटने

की कोशिश करती हो हड़ताल के नकशे के तहत। यह सब जानते हुए अगर वजीरे-आजम उनको मुलाकात बरूशते तो न मालूम बाहर के लोगों में जा कर क्या कहा जाता कि वह इतने कमजोर निकले कि इश शान के साथ उन्होंने हम लोगों को र्मि.ब किया और इसको ले कर फिर से लोगों में तफरका पैदा करने की कोशिश शुरू हो जाती। हम एकशन उसका जो इस हड़ताल को दबाने में हमारी हकूमत ने, एडमिनिस्ट्रेशन ने, वजीरे-आजम ने और दूसरी जमायतों ने लिया तारीफ करते हैं और उन सब को इस के लिए मुबारकबाद पेश करते हैं। इसके साथ ही मैं उस तजवीज की जो श्री भरूचा साहब ने हाउस के सामने पेश की है, मुखालिफत करता हूँ।

[شری اے - ایم - طارق - جموں
تعلما کشمیر) - جناب چیمبرمین
صاحب - مہن مسٹر نوشیر بھروچہ
کی اس تحریک کی مخالفت کرتا
ہوں جسکو انہوں نے اس ایوان میں
لایا ہے - آپوزیشن پارٹیز کے جن ذی
حزت ممبران نے اس ایوان میں
تقریریں کیں انہوں نے مخالفانہ باتوں
کو ہمارے سامنے رکھا - ایک تو کہ
حکومت نے پتے کمیشن کی سفارشات
کو بہت جلدی عمل میں نہیں لایا
ہے - دوسری یہ کہ جن لوگوں نے غلطی
کی ہے ان سے غلطی ہوئی ہے اور یہ
غلطی وغیرہ سوچے سمجھے ہوئی ہے -
اچانک ایک حادثہ ہوا ہے - ان کے
ساتھ رحم کیا جائے - ان کو جیلوں سے
واپس لایا جائے اور ان کے ساتھ اچھا
سلوک کیا جائے - تیسری بات اس
ایوان میں شری اشوک مہتہ نے رکھی

[شری اے۔ ایم۔ طارق]

اور وہ یہ کہ یہ ہوتال بالکل غیر سیاسی تھی اور پرجا سوشلسٹ پارٹی کا بحیثیت ایک جماعت کے اس سے کوئی تعلق نہیں تھا۔ اشکوک مہتہ صاحب کی مہیں عزت کرتا ہوں اس لحاظ سے کہ وہ بہت پرانے سیاسی ورکر ہیں لیکن آج ان کی تقریر کو سن کر مجھے سخت افسوس ہوا ہے اور وہ اس لئے کہ جس طرح اور جس انداز سے انہوں نے لا تعلق کا اظہار کیا اس پر کوئی شخص یقین نہیں کر سکتا۔ یہ ہوتال صرف سیاسی تھی۔ یہ صرف ہوتال نہیں تھی بلکہ ایک قسم کا اعلان جنگ کیا گیا اس ملک کی حکومت کے خلاف۔ اس ایوان کے ذی عزت ممبران ان دنوں کی رپورٹس کو دیکھیں۔ اخباری رپورٹس کو دیکھیں کہ شری نانہہ پائی صبح دہلی میں ہیں اور شام کو بمبئی میں ہیں۔ ہوائی جہاز سے آ رہے ہیں۔ ریل سے جا رہے ہیں۔ افزا تفری مچھائی جا رہی ہے۔ لوگوں میں ایک خاص قسم کا ہیجان پیدا کیا جا رہا ہے بالکل اس انداز سے جب کسی ملک پر کوئی باہر کی طاقت حملہ کر رہی ہو اور اس حملہ کرنے والی جماعت کا مارشل یا کمانڈر ان چیف ایک معاذ سے دوسرے معاذ پر جا رہا ہو۔

श्री ब्रज राज सिंह : मिनिस्टर साहवत
रोज हवाई जहाज पर आते जाते हैं। वे
किस पर हमला करने के लिए जाते हैं ?

شری اے۔ ایم۔ طارق۔ یہ اور بات ہے کہ حالات نے اور اس ملک کے دہلے والوں نے اور حکومت نے انکی اس مکروہ سازش کو۔ جو اس ملک کا نظام دوہم برہم کرنے کے لئے کی گئی تھی۔ ناکام بنا دیا اور وہ آج بالکل ایک ملازم کی حیثیت سے۔ ایک ایسے آدمی کی حیثیت سے۔ جو کہ ذمعی طور پر نابالغ ہو۔ ہم سے درخواست کرنے آئے ہوں۔ اس ایوان سے درخواست کرنے آئے ہیں کہ رحم کیجئے۔ ان کو اس وقت سوچنا چاہئے تھا کہ وہ ملک کو کس تباہی کی طرف لے جا رہے ہیں جس وقت انہوں نے سٹرائک کا نعرہ لگایا اور یہی نہیں بلکہ لوگوں کو مجبور کیا تحریک چلانے پر۔ افسروں پر حملے کئے۔ حملے کروائے ان لوگوں پر۔ ان غریب ورکرز پر جو اس ملک کے وفادار شہری ہیں اور جو چاہتے تھے کہ حکومت کا کام رکھے نہ پائے۔ حقیقت یہ ہے کہ ہمارے سامنے جو تواریخ ہے وہ یہ ہے کہ پچھلے چند مہینوں سے۔ تقریباً ایک سال سے۔ اس ملک کی سیاست میں جو روگ پی۔ ایس۔ پی۔ نے پیدا کیا ہے۔ ہمارے تعلقات جس انداز سے ہمارے سیاسی ماحول سے خراب کرنے کے لئے پی۔ ایس۔ پی۔ نے کوشش کی ہے۔ وہ کسی اور نے

نہیں کیا - جب ان لوگوں کو شکست ہوئی اور ایسی شکست ہوئی کہ ان کا ایک سیاسی جماعت کی حیثیت سے اس ملک میں رہنا ناگوار ہو گیا تب انہوں نے سٹرائیک کا بہانہ بنایا - یہ اور بات ہے کہ کمیونسٹ پارٹی بھی اس چکے میں آ گئی اس لحاظ سے کہ وہ مزدوروں کے دشمن ہیں اس لحاظ سے کہ ایک تحریری ہے کہ اس دنیا میں ہمیشہ - چاہے فلفط ہو یا درست - اپنی جماعت کو قائم کرنے کے لئے کمپونسٹوں کو مزدوروں کا ساتھ دینا پوتا ہے - کمپونسٹوں کا یہ نظریہ درست ہوگا لیکن مزدوروں کو فلفط راستے پر ڈالنے کے لئے انکا اشتوان ایک ایسی جماعت سے ہوا جس نے ہر موقع پر انکو اس ملک کا غدار کہا - یہ کہا کہ ان کا ہر ایکٹ جو ہوتا ہے وہ اس ملک کی سیاست کے مطابق نہیں ہوتا ہے بلکہ کسی باہر کی طاقت سے ہوتا ہے - اس سے ظاہر ہوتا ہے کہ کس طرح اس ملک میں مخالف جماعتوں کا اشتوان ہو سکتا ہے - مطلب یہ تھا کہ اس ملک کی ایڈمنسٹریشن کو ختم کیا جائے -

سٹرائیک اس لئے نہیں تھی کہ یہاں کے مزدوروں کو - یہاں کے آرڈینری کلاس کو یا معمولی افسروں کو کوئی فائدہ پہنچایا جائے - یہ جنگ صرف سیاسی جنگ تھا -

ہمیں چاہئے کہ ہم اس وقت جو بیانات نکالے گئے ان کو دیکھیں - خود ہی - اینڈ تی - ورکرس دلی کے جنرل سیکریٹری نے جو بیانات دئے ان میں انہوں نے شہری ناتہ پائی کے رول کو بے نقاب کیا اور بتایا کہ کس طرح وہ جس بات کو ایکشن کمیٹی میں کہتے ہیں اس کو باہر بالکل نہیں کہتے ہیں - اس کی مخالفت کرتے ہیں - کس طرح سے انہوں نے چھوٹے چھوٹے ورکرس کو غلط باتیں بتا کر غلط واقعات کی بنا پر غلط راستے پر لا کھڑا کر دیا - یہ کسی سے چھپا ہوا نہیں ہے - میں سمجھتا ہوں کہ اس ملک میں دھمے واے لوگ مبارکباد کے مستحق ہیں جنہوں نے اس سازش کو - اس سٹرائیک کو ناکام بنا دیا ہے -

اب ہمارے سامنے مسئلہ یہ ہے کہ ہم ان لوگوں کے ساتھ جنہوں نے یہ سٹرائیک کی کیا سلوک کریں - ہم اس ملک میں ان کے ساتھ کیا رویہ اختیار کریں - یہ ٹھیک ہے کہ وہ بھی اس ملک کے شہری ہیں - ان میں بہت سے اچھے لوگ بھی ہیں - چھوٹے چھوٹے لوگ بھی ہیں - سمجھ - دار لوگ بھی ہیں - کچھ لوگ ایسے بھی ہیں جو غلط راستے پر چلے گئے کسی ایکشن کی وجہ سے - مجبوری کے قہر سے - حملے کے قہر سے - میں حکومت کے سامنے ایک تجویز رکھنا چاہتا ہوں کہ ایسے لوگوں کے ساتھ

[شری اے ایم - طارق]

جنہوں نے سٹرائک میں حصہ لیا
جائزہ سلوک کیا جائے۔ اے کے جو
مطالبات ہیں ان کو دیکھا جائے۔ ان
کی جو شکایات ہیں ان کو دور کیا جائے
اور اس میں کوئی شک نہیں ہے کہ
ان کو دیکھا جائیگا۔ بہت سے مزدور
ہیں جن کو بہت دور جا کر بسایا گیا
ہے اور ان کی مشکلات پر غور ہونا
چاہئے۔ جس حد تک ممکن ہو
سکے ان کے الٹراس میں۔ ان کی
تلفواہوں میں اضافہ ہونا چاہئے۔
لیکن میں کہنا چاہتا ہوں کہ جن
لوگوں نے سٹرائک کو اپنے سیاسی
مقاصد کے لئے چلایا ان کے ساتھ کسی
قسم کا رحم نہ کیا جائے۔ ان کے ساتھ
بالکل وہی سلوک کیا جائے جس کی
قانون اجازت دیتا ہے۔

ایک اور بات کہی جاتی ہے۔
کہا جاتا ہے کہ ہمارے وزیر اعظم بہت
اچھے آدمی ہیں۔ بیچارے بہت
نیک ہیں۔ شاید کچھ نرمی کر
جائیں۔ میں کہنا چاہتا ہوں کہ اس
طرح کی کوئی نرمی نہیں ہونی چاہئے
یہ حکومت کوئی نانا شاہی حکومت
نہیں ہے۔ اکبر شاہی نہیں ہے جہاں
زنجیر کھینچ کر انصاف ماننا جا سکتا
ہے۔ یہاں پر قوانین چلتے ہیں۔
اگر کوئی شخص کسی کا دانت توڑتا
ہے تو اسکے لئے قانون ہے اور قانون کے
مطابق جو سزا اس کو مل سکتی ہے

ملنی چاہئے۔ اگر وزیر اعظم بہت
اچھے آدمی ہیں۔ بہت نیک آدمی
ہیں۔ شریف آدمی ہیں تو اسکا یہ
مطلب نہیں ہے کہ کسی ایسے شخص
کے ساتھ جس نے ملک کے آئین کے ساتھ
ملک کے نظام کے ساتھ فداوی کرنے کی
کوشش کی اس کو معاف کر دیا
جائے۔

واجہائی جی نے کہا کہ وزیر اعظم
صاحب نے ملاقات سے انکار کیا۔ میں
کہنا چاہتا ہوں کہ اس شخص کے
ساتھ ملاقات ہو سکتی ہے جس کے ساتھ
کوئی جوازیت ہو۔ جو شخص دوستی
کا ساتھ بڑھا کر آئے لیکن ایسے شخص
کے ساتھ۔ ایسی جماعت کے ساتھ کیسے
وزیر اعظم ملاقات کر سکتے ہیں جو
دھمکی دیتی ہو۔ حکومت کا تختہ
الٹنے کی کوشش کرتی ہو ہوتال کے
نقشہ کے تحت۔ یہ سب جانتے ہوئے
اگر وزیر اعظم ان کو ملاقات بخشتے تو
نہ معلوم باہر کے لوگوں میں جا کر کیا
کہا جاتا کہ وہ اتنے کمزور نکل آئے کہ
اس شان کے ساتھ انہوں نے ہم لوگوں کو
رسیو کیا اور اس کو لے کر پھر سے لوگوں
میں تفرقہ پیدا کرنے کی کوشش شروع
ہو جاتی۔ ہم اس ایکشن کا جو اس
ہوتال کو دبانے میں ہماری حکومت
نے۔ ایڈمنسٹریشن نے۔ وزیر اعظم
نے اور دوسری جماعتوں نے لیا تعریف
کرتے ہیں اور ان سب کو اس کے لئے

مبارکباد پیس کرتے ہیں - اس کے ساتھ ہی میں اس تجویز کی جو شہی بہرچا صاحب نے ہاؤس کے سامنے پیش کی ہے - مخالفت کرتا ہوں -

श्री रामसिंह भाई बर्मा (निमाड़) :
सभापति महोदय, सब से पहले में जनता को मुबारिकबाद देता हूँ कि: जिस ने इस राजनीतिक षडयंत्र को अच्छी तरह से समझ कर हमारे देश को श्रीर सरकारी कर्मचारियों को एक बड़े खतरे से बचा लिया है।

श्रीमान, सवाल यह आज पैदा नहीं होता है कि सरकारी कर्मचारियों को क्या मिलना चाहिये और क्या नहीं मिलना चाहिये। सवाल यह पैदा होता है कि हड़ताल किस आधार पर हुई और हड़ताल के बीच में किस ने क्या क्या किया। यह इताल राजनीतिक थी, इसमें कोई सन्देह नहीं है। यह आर्थिक हड़ताल नहीं थी। मैं श्री अशोक मेहता जी की ईमानदारी पर जरा भी शक नहीं करता हूँ। उन्होंने कहा है कि प्रजा सोशलिस्ट पार्टी का इसमें कोई हिस्सा नहीं था। यह बात ठीक हो सकती है। लेकिन सवाल यह है कि आज प्रजा सोशलिस्ट पार्टी की क्या हालत है, यह समझ लेना चाहिये। श्रीमान, मैं एक उदाहरण देना चाहता हूँ। बरसात के दिनों में यमुना जी के अन्दर बहुत पानी चढ़ता है आ रहा था और बहुत से जानवर बहते हुए आ रहे थे। उसके किनारे दो साधु खड़े हुए थे। यमुना जी के पानी में एक रीछड़ी भी बहती आ रही थी। उन साधुओं ने समझा कि यह कम्बल है। एक साधु यमुना जी में कूदा और उसने जा करके कम्बल को पकड़ा लिया और उस ने उस साधु को पकड़ लिया। रीछड़ी ने उस को पकड़ लिया और उसने उसको पकड़ लिया अब वह रीछड़ी साधु के दोनों हाथ पकड़ कर बहने लगी। दूसरा साधु जो किनारे खड़ा था कहने लगा कि अगर कम्बल नहीं

आता है तो इसको छोड़ दे, नहीं तो बह जाएगा। उस साधु ने दबाव दिया कि मैं तो इसको छोड़ूंगा मगर यह भी तो मुझ को छोड़े, इपी ने तो मुझे पकड़ कर रखा है जो छोड़ नहीं रही है। यही हाल प्रजा सोशलिस्ट पार्टी का है। वह जो कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी के चुंगल में फंस गई है, उसने वह निकाल नहीं पर रही है और इसका नतीजा यह हो रहा है कि प्रजा सोशलिस्ट पार्टी का सारे का सांग जो प्राथम है, सारी की सारी उसकी जो नीति है, उसको वह भूल गई है। यह बात मैं दावे के साथ कह सकता हूँ और इसके मेरे पास सबूत हैं।

वाजपेयी जी ने एक बात कही है कि साहब एन वक्त तब: इनकी हड़ताल की तैयारी नहीं थी। मैं समझता हूँ कि यह ठीक है। इन्होंने ब्रैन्ट ले लिया, हड़ताल की घोषणा भी कर दी, यह सब मैं मानता हूँ। लेकिन मैं समझता हूँ कि इससे बढ़ कर अग्रकर गद्दारी कर्मचारियों के साथ और क्या हो सकती है कि एक तरफ आग लगाते जा रहे हैं, कहते जा रहे हैं कि फलां तारीख से हड़ताल हो और दूसरी तरफ कोई तैयार नहीं है! इसका मतलब यह हुआ कि यह राजनीतिक हड़ताल थी, ट्रेड यूनियन हड़ताल नहीं थी।

अब हमें देखना है कि कर्मचारियों की क्या डिमांड्स थीं, शासकीय कर्मचारियों की क्या डिमांड्स थीं। इसमें कोई शक नहीं है कि उनको तकलाफें थीं, उनको कष्ट थे और उनको दूर कराने के लिए एजिटेशन हुआ। आई० एन० टी० यू० सी० तथा दूसरी ट्रेड यूनियंस ने भी उनको दूर करने की मांग की। उस एजिटेशन के आधार पर पे कमिशन कायम हुआ। अगर उस वक्त पे कमिशन कायम नहीं होता और सरकार मुनने के लिए तैयार नहीं होती तो मैं मानता हूँ कि हड़ताल का सवाल, गम्भीर रूप में पैदा हो सकता था। लेकिन लेबर पालिसी इस पार्लिमेंट ने पहली योजना में और दूसरी योजना में तय की और वह थी कोलेक्टिव बारगेनिंग की। कोई भी सवाल अगर पैदा होता है ट्रेड यूनियंस और

and Strike

and Strike

[श्री रामसिंह भाई वर्मा]

एम्प्लायर में तो उसका हल कलैक्टिव बारगेनिंग से हो सकता था, आपस में बातचीत करके हो सकता था। अगर कोई डिस्पूट आपस में सेंटल नहीं होता तो उसको इलाज यह बताया गया कि उसको आर्बिट्रेशन के लिए सौंपा जा सकता है, ट्रिब्यूनल को सौंपा जा सकता है, वेज बोर्ड और पे कमिशन कायम किया जा सकता है। इस केस में श्रीमान् सरकार ने पे कमिशन कायम किया और पे कमिशन कायम करने के बाद फिर हड़ताल का सवाल ही नहीं पैदा होता। यह बात जरूर है कि पे कमिशन ने जो कहा उसको सरकार को मान लेना चाहिये था और एम्प्लायीज को भी मान लेना चाहिये था। अगर पे कमिशन ने जो कहा है उसको आर्बिट्रेरीली बदल दिया जाता है, अपनी मर्जी से बदल दिया जाता है तो फिर कर्मचारियों को भी यह अधिकार हो जायेगा कि वे भी दूसरी बात मनवाने के लिए सरकार पर जोर डालें और उसको बदलवायें।

हमारे प्रधान मंत्री ने हड़ताल के पहले एक ब्राडकास्ट किया। मैं समझता हूँ कि उस वक्त हमारे प्रधान मंत्री पहल बार झुके। मेरी जीवन में उनका इस प्रकार झुकना पहला मौका था। लेकिन मैं समझता हूँ कि देश के इंटरैस्ट में झुकना भी पड़ता है और झुकना चाहिये भी। उन्होंने बड़ी नम्रता के साथ कहा कि बातचीत हो सकती है, चर्चा के लिए दरवाजा खुला है, उसके लिए हम हमेशा तैयार हैं। मैं निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि हमारे प्रधान मंत्री हड़ताल के विरोधी नहीं हैं। जब से मैंने होश सम्भाला है मुझे अच्छी तरह से याद है कि उन्होंने कभी जायज हड़ताल का विरोध नहीं किया है। जब भी देश के अन्दर संकट आया है और जब वह प्रधान मंत्री भी नहीं थे, कांग्रेस के प्रेजिडेंट कभी रहे कभी नहीं रहे, और हड़ताल हुई है तो उन्होंने जायज हड़ताल को बराबर उसका समर्थन किया है। जब आई० एन० टी० यू० सी० नहीं थी, ट्रेड यूनियन कांग्रेस थी, उस वक्त एक मौका ऐसा

आया जब कि वह बाहर से जब अलाहाबाद आये थे तो वहाँ के रेलवे कुलियों ने हड़ताल कर रखी थी। जब वह स्टेशन पर पहुँचे तो कुलियों ने कहा कि श्री जवाहरलाल नेहरू जी आये हैं और उनको सामान उठाने के लिए कोई कुली नजर नहीं आ रहा है चलो उनका सामान तो उठा दें, तो उस वक्त प्रधान मंत्री नेहरूजी ने कहा कि मेरा सामान मत उठाना, मैं हड़ताल को नहीं तोड़ने दूंगा। तो मेरा निवेदन यह है कि प्रधान मंत्री जी अपनी स्थिति को एक तरफ रख कर हमेशा ही एम्प्लायीज की तरफ झुके हैं।

बल्कि मेरा उनके खिलाफ एक चार्ज भी है, आई० एन० टी० यू० सी० वालों का चार्ज भी है कि आप ने आई० एन० टी० यू० सी० को कमजोर कर दिया है। आई० एन० टी० यू० सी० सही नीति पर चलती है। आप ने लेबर पालिसी जो ठहलाई है पंच वर्षीय योजनाओं के लिये, इंडियन लेबर कांफरेंस ने जो पालिसी ठहलाई है, उस के अनुसार हम चलते हैं। मैं आप से यह निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि हमारे विरोधी पार्टी वाले जो यूनियनों चला रहे हैं। हमारा एक यूनियन है इन्दौर में। उस यूनियन के मुकाबले में सारी यूनियनों को मिला कर आप बता दें कि उन के पास क्या प्रापटी है, क्या साधन हैं। लेकिन आप लोग तो ऐन वक्त तक हड़ताल के लिये तैयार नहीं थे। हड़ताल हम ने चलाई है और उस वक्त मैं चलाई है जब नन्दा जी हमारे लीडर थे और गांधी जी, पंडित जी और आचार्य कृपालानी जी के आशीर्वाद ले कर हम हड़ताल के लिये दो, दो, तीन तीन महीने पहले से तैयारी करते थे। रात के ११, ११ बजे तक मजदूरों के घर पर जाते थे, नन्दा जी हमारे आगे होते थे। मुबह ४ बजे उठ कर मुहल्लों में पहुँचते थे, और इस तरह स दस दस महीनों तक हड़ताल चलाई है। यह क्या हड़ताल है कि नेता पहले ही जा कर जेलों में बैठ गये? आगे होते ही नहीं। जैसे एक बुढ़िया होती है,

जब कोई बुद्धिया की ओर देखता ही नहीं, कोई उस की सुनता नहीं, लड़कें नहीं सुनते, दूसरे नहीं सुनते, तो बुद्धिया कहती है : "हे भगवान, मुझे उठा लो", उसी तरह से यह है कि "हे जेल वालो, हमें उठा लो"। कुछ उससे लेना नहीं कुछ देना नहीं। यह हाल है हमारे बिरादरों का और ट्रेड यूनियन मूवमेंट चलाने वालों का।

अभी हमारे अशोक मेहता साहब ने एक बड़े मजे की बात कही कि साहब २० प्रतिशत कर्मचारियों ने नहीं ५० प्रतिशत कर्मचारियों ने हड़ताल की उन्होंने बताया कि टोटल एम्प्लायीज में से २५ परसेन्ट ने बैलट दिया और उन "२५ परसेन्ट बैलट देने वालों में से ५० परसेन्ट ने ही हड़ताल की। यह तो केवल साढ़े बारह परसेन्ट हुए, २० परसेन्ट भी कहां हैं ? अशोक मेहता साहब ने कहा कि ५० परसेन्ट ने हड़ताल की। लेकिन नहीं, अशोक मेहता साहब के हिसाब के अनुसार तो सिर्फ साढ़े बारह परसेन्ट लोगों ने ही हड़ताल की।

श्री अशोक मेहता : अशोक मेहता के नहीं, जनाब, सरकार के हिसाब के मुताबिक।

श्री रामसिंह भाई वर्मा : मैं ने आप की बात सुनी है, सरकार के फिगर्स नहीं देखे।

श्री अशोक मेहता : आप अखबार नहीं पढ़ते, अखबार पढ़ते ता पता लगता कि सरकार क्या कहती है।

श्री रामसिंह भाई वर्मा : सवाल यह है कि कुल २२ लाख एम्प्लायीज दरअसल हैं और उन के अन्दर से सिर्फ २ लाख एम्प्लायीज ने हड़ताल की और वह हड़ताल हो गई। बड़े मजे की बात है। अभी तक मैं विरोधियों से सुनता आया था बाहर और इंडियन लेबर कांफ्रेंस में भी कहा जात था कि अगर किसी यूनियन की २५ परसेन्ट मेम्बरशिप होती है तो उसे मान्यता क्यों देते हो ? ७५ परसेन्ट पर २५ परसेन्ट को क्यों लादते हो ? लेकिन यहां साढ़े बारह परसेन्ट

को लादने की कोशिश की। यह आप का हिसाब है ? फिर हड़ताल करा कर ये लोग बैठ गये और कहते हैं कि राजनीतिक हड़ताल नहीं थी। मैं हड़ताल के दर्म्यान सारे हिन्दुस्तान में घूमा हूं। कम्यूनिस्ट पार्टी के लोग बम्ई करते थे, कलकत्ते के अन्दर बलियां गुल कर मीटिंग करते थे, इन्दौर में मीटिंग करते थे और यह कहते थे कि हमें तो सरकार को उलटना है। मैं मानता हूं कि सरकार को उलटना है, लेकिन किस तरह से सरकार को उलटना है ? जनता को आप खतरे में डालकर अगर आप को कांग्रेस पार्टी को खत्म करना है तो कीजिये न। आप लगाइये ताकत। लेकिन दम नहीं, कोई शक्ति नहीं। लेकिन आप खत्म किस को करने जा रहे हैं ? आप देश के गरीब वर्ग को जो कि देश को बनाने जा रहा है, उस को खत्म करने जा रहे हैं। आप ने क्या ठहराया ? आप ने यह ठहराया कि जो हमारे स्वयंसेवक डाक बांटने जाते थे मुहल्लों में उन को मारा जाये। मैं मानता हूं कि हम रे पंडित जी और होम मिनिस्टर के पास आई० डी० सी० की रिपोर्ट आई होगी कि उन लोगों ने पब्लिक मीटिंगों में कहा कि जो डाक ले कर आते हैं उन से डाक छीन लीजिये और स्वयंसेवकों को मारियें। बड़े दुःख की बात है, चलती हुई ट्रेनों के सामने बैठ और लेट कर गाड़ियों को रोकना और पैसेन्जर्स पर पत्थर फेंकना, यह आप की ट्रेड यूनियन मूवमेंट है या गुंडागिरी है ? इसे कोई भी ट्रेड यूनियन मूवमेंट नहीं कह सकता। ट्रेड यूनियन मूवमेंट इस का नाम है कि हम कहते हैं कि फलां तारीख से हड़ताल होगी और हम हड़ताल के लिये सरकार पहले से पूरी पूरी तैयारी करें जवाबदार बनें। जो हड़ताल करना चाहता हो वह खुशी से बाहर रहे और जो न करना चाहता हो वह अन्दर जाय। सही टेस्ट यह है। इस के थलावा कुछ नहीं। वैसे तो डाकू भी काम करते हैं और अपना अलग तरीका रखते हैं।

17 hrs.

सारे लोग काम करते हैं। गांधी जी ने हमें एक तरीका समझाया। प्रजा सोशलिस्ट पार्टी

[श्री रामसिंह भाई वर्मा]

भी उस की हमी है। वे भी अब जबर्दस्त गांधीवादी बन गये हैं। जब सन् १९१९ में अहमदाबाद के अन्दर मजदूर संघ स्थापित करके व्यवस्थित संघ चलाने की बात आई और गांधी जी से हम ने उस क उद्घाटन कराया; तो गांधी जी ने एक बात कही कि देखो, इस तरह के संगठन बनने के पक्ष में मैं नहीं हूँ अगड़ा करने के लिये मजदूरों का आप एक संगठन कर अगड़ालुओं का टोल बनायें। यह गलत बात है। आप मजदूरों का संगठन कीजिये, लेकिन उन्हें समाज का उपयोगी अंग बनाइये। ट्रेड यूनियन के सामने यह पहली मिसाल रक्खी गांधी जी ने, जिसे प्रजा सोशलिस्ट पार्टी को भी ले कर चलना चाहिये। हमारे सोशलिस्ट भाई जो बैठे हुए हैं, जो खुद गांधी जी की बात करते हैं, उन को भी समझना चाहिये और हम को भी समझना चाहिये। हाँ, एक बात हम मान सकते हैं कि कम्यूनिस्टों के सामने देश का कोई सवाल नहीं, उन के सामने हिन्दुस्तान के हित का कोई सवाल नहीं, उन की कोई नेशनल पालिसी नहीं है, लेकिन आप हम सब के सामने तो ऐसा नहीं है। यहां पर मैं जोश में नहीं बोल रहा हूँ, मैं होश में बोल रहा हूँ। मैं अपने मित्रों से यह पूछना चाहता हूँ कि जब आप ने स्ट्राइक काल किया तो क्या वह पे कमिशन रिपोर्ट से सम्बन्धित था। अशोक मेहता जी ने, श्री नौशीर भरूचा ने और बहुत से मित्रों ने इंडियन लेबर कॉर्फ्रेस की की बात की कि १५वें लेबर कॉर्फ्रेस में जो अमुख अमुख निर्णय हुए हैं उन के अनुसार डिअरनेस अलाउंस और मिनिमम वेजेज का फिक्सेशन नहीं हुआ है। मैं इसी बात के ऊपर जोर दे रहा हूँ कि इंडियन लेबर कॉर्फ्रेस में यह भी निर्णय हुआ है कि इस के सम्बन्ध में सही प्रोसीजर कौन सा है। सही प्रोसीजर यह नहीं है कि पंच ने एक फैसला दिया और आप यह कहें कि पंच ने अपने फैसले में चूँकि यह बात नहीं कही है इस लिये हम हडताल करते हैं। उस में यह चीज नहीं है

कि कोई पंच या ट्राइब्यूनल अपना फैसला दे, उस के बाहर की बात कही जाय। आप कहते हैं कि बोर्ड या पे कमिशन ने चूँकि अपनी रिपोर्ट में यह बात नहीं लिखी इस लिये इस तरह से होना चाहिये। पे कमिशन ने इस में कहा है डिअरनेस अलाउंस के बारे में भी कि उस को किस तरह से कास्ट आफ लिवांग इंडेक्स में लिंक किया जा सकता है और यह कि मिनिमम वेजेज हमारी किस आधार पर होनी चाहियें।

मैं श्री अशोक मेहता साहब की बात कहता हूँ, वे टैक्सटाइल वेज बोर्ड के अन्दर थे। मैं वह शब्द था जिमने टैक्सटाइल के सम्बन्ध में सबसे अधिक व्यवस्थित केस फिगर्स के साथ उनके सामने रक्खा। बल्कि वेज बोर्ड ने डेढ़ दिन तक मुझे सुना और लगभग एक घण्टे के अन्दर मिल मालिकों का केस खत्म हो गया। मैंने १८० रु० की मांग की है टैक्सटाइल के अन्दर। जो डा० आयकराण्ड का फार्मूला है कास्ट आफ लिवांग इंडेक्स के बारे में, उसके सम्बन्ध में मैंने एक पुस्तक छाप कर मेहता साहब को दी है कि उमे शुरू से कर आखीर तक एक एक शब्द पढ़ कर देखिये जो कि मैंने वेज बोर्ड के सामने रक्खा था। मैं मेहता साहब से पूछना चाहता हूँ कि क्या वेज बोर्ड की रिपोर्ट में आपने डिअरनेस अलाउंस को कास्ट आफ लिवांग इंडेक्स के साथ लिंक किया है। क्या डा० आयकराण्ड के फार्मूले के अनुसार मिनिमम वेज इतनी होनी चाहिये हि भी उसमें दिया है। मैंने तो इतनी बोगस रिपोर्ट कोई नहीं देखी जितनी कि टैक्सटाइल वेज बोर्ड की रिपोर्ट है। मैंने मेहता साहब से बातचीत की कि मैं टैक्सटाइल वेज बोर्ड के बारे में यह जानना चाहता हूँ कि आपने जो ६ रु० और ८ रु० दिये हैं वह किस बाजीगर के डब्बे से निकाले? आखिर आपकी यह रिपोर्ट किन सिद्धान्तों पर आधारित है।

सारी रिपोर्ट को पढ़ जाइये पर आपको कुछ पता नहीं लगता जैसे कोई सारी रामायण पढ़ जाने के बाद पूछे कि सीता रामकी कौन थी या राम सीता के कौन थे । मैं तो टैक्सटाइल वेज बोर्ड को बात कहता हूँ । सीमेंट वेज बोर्ड को बात कहता हूँ और शुगर वेज बोर्ड की बात कहता हूँ । फिर वे कमीशन के सम्बन्ध में ही यह सिद्धांत क्यों ? आज यह हालत नहीं है देश में कि आप बाल की खाल निकालने जाएं । हमने देश में समाज की स्थापना का प्रस्ताव कर डाला है । लेकिन हमारे पंजित जी के पास कोई अला-उद्दीन का चिराग तो नहीं है कि जिसके घिसने ही देश में समानता हो जाएगी । उस तरफ हमने बढ़ना शुरू कर दिया है । हम उस तरफ बढ़ रहे हैं । जिसके लिये हमें कठिन परिश्रम करना है ।

मैं निवेदन करूंगा कि हमारे भरूचा साहब कानूनी पंडित हो सकते हैं लेकिन वह लेबर के पंडित नहीं हैं यह मैं दावा कर सकता हूँ । मैं उनसे पूछना चाहता हूँ कि लेबर पालिसी चीज क्या है । मैं यह निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि इण्डियन लेबर पालिसी जितनी शुद्ध और पवित्र है और क्लीयर है वैसे आपको दुनिया के किसी देश में नहीं मिलेंगी । यह मान्नी हुई बात है कि इस पालिसी को इम्प्लीमेंट करने के लिये श्री नन्दा जी ने इतने प्रयत्न किये हैं कि डांगे जी ने बार बार मीटिंगों में कहा है कि नन्दा जी ने लेबर पालिसी को बहुत सुन्दर ढंग से चलाया है । श्री एम० एम० जोशी ने और श्री डांगे जी ने नैनीताल कानफरेंस में यह बात भी कही थी कि नन्दा जी को तो मजदूरों का जब झगड़ा हो तो उनमें पंच बनाया जाए । लेकिन बात यह है कि जो अंगूर हाथ नहीं लगे वे खट्टे हैं । आज आपको इण्डियन लेबर पालिसी इतनी गलत दिखायी देने लगी है । इसका कारण यह है कि आपने अपना चेहरा फूटे शोशे में देखा है और इसलिये आपको अपने तरह तरह के रूप दिखायी देते हैं । और आप अब यह सोचने के लिये मजबूर हो रहे हैं कि हड़ताल के सम्बन्ध

में आप वर्कर्स को क्या जवाब दें । आपने हड़ताल करा दी और हड़ताल कराना बहुत आसान है लेकिन हड़ताल को चलाना बहुत कठिन है । और उसके बाद फिर से श्रमिकों के बीच में खड़ा होना और भी कठिन है ।

17:07 hrs.

DISCUSSION RE: RISE IN PRICE OF CLOTH

Mr. Chairman: The House will now continue the discussion on the rise in the price of cloth raised by Shri Rameshwar Tantia on the 5th August, 1960. Time allotted is a hours, time taken 1-05 hours, balance 0-55 minutes.

श्री ब्रजराज सिंह (फिरोजाबाद) : सभापति महोदय, मैंने भी कपड़े की कीमतों के सम्बन्ध में एक प्रस्ताव दिया था । लेकिन क्योंकि यह प्रस्ताव मंजूर हो गया इस लिये उस पर चर्चा न हो सकी कपड़े की कीमतें कैसे बढ़ीं और सरकार का ऐसी सूत में क्या कर्तव्य है इस पर मैं कुछ निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ ।

कहा जाता है कि कपड़े की कीमतें सिर्फ पांच फीसदी बढ़ी हैं । लेकिन जब यह कपड़ा उपभोक्ताओं के पास पहुंचता है तो किसी किसी जगह तो उसकी कीमत में तीस और चालीस प्रतिशत की वृद्धि हो गयी है । पिछले दो तीन महीने से यह चीज चल रही है । लेकिन सरकार इसके लिये केवल प्रार्थना, अपील और निवेदन भर करती है । वह कोई ऐसी चीज नहीं कर रही जिनकी कि हम यहाँ चर्चा कर रहे हैं । जब मजदूरों का सवाल आता है या सरकारी कर्मचारियों का सवाल आता है तब तो सरकार आर्डिनेन्स लागू करके हड़ताल को दबाने की कोशिश करती है, लेकिन कुछ मिल मालिक सारे देश की जनता को कपड़े के मूल्य बढ़ा कर और इसी तरह से दूसरी आवश्यक चीजों के मूल्य को बढ़ा कर शोषण करते हैं तो सरकार सिर्फ हाथ जोड़ कर उनके सामने निवेदन करती है,