

[डा० सुशीला नायर]

के लिए, मृत्यु दण्ड की सजा है। कहते हैं कि मृत्युदण्ड किसी को भी नहीं दिया गया है और इस का कारण यह है कि इतनी कड़ी सजा रखी गई है कि उस के भय से ही एडलट्रेशन वहां नहीं होता। न दवाओं में होता है और न ही खाने पीने की चीजों में। मैं समझती हूँ कि यह जो क्लॉज ४ में डिस्ट्रेंट पनिशमेंट की बात रखी गई थी यह बहुत सोच समझ कर रखी गई थी। मंत्री महोदय के जो ड्राफ्ट्समैन हैं, उन्होंने ने बड़े सोच समझ कर इस को रखा था और इस एक क्लॉज के जरिये इस कानून में बाकी जो कमजोरियाँ थीं, उन को दूर करने का, उन को ठकने का, उन को मेक अप करने का प्रयत्न इस बिल में किया गया था। लिहाजा इस को इस में से न निकाला जाय।

बाकी जो दूसरी दो एमेंडमेंट्स हैं उन का मैं स्वागत करती हूँ। एक तो क्लॉज २ में डायरेक्टली और इंडायरेक्टली ऐड करने की बात है वह बहुत अच्छी है, वह बहुत उपयोगी सुझाव है। इसी प्रकार से एक्सप्लेनेशन निवाल देमे का सुझाव भी उपयोगी सुझाव है। मगर क्लॉज ४ को रहना चाहिये। क्लॉज ६ का जो एक्सप्लेनेशन दिया माननीय मंत्री महोदय ने उस का मतलब यह है कि इस कानून के बावजूद कुछ लोग ऐसे होंगे जो दहेज देंगे और शायद बहुत से लोग देंगे और लेंगे, ऐसी सूरत में दहेज लेने वाले को आप सजा दे सकते हैं मगर जो लिया या दिया वह कम से कम लड़की के पास चला जाय, इतना प्राविजन वे धारा छ में रखना चाहते हैं.....

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय : क्या आप खत्म कर रही हैं या अभी बोलना चाहती हैं क्योंकि दूसरा बिजनेस हम को अब लेना है।

डा० सुशीला नायर : अभी मैं एक मिनट में खत्म कर रही हूँ।

इसलिये भी मैं समझती हूँ कि यह आवश्यक है कि धारा ४ को जैसी वह थी वैसे ही वापिस इस में रखा जाय ताकि

इस कानून का जो मुद्दा है, जो उद्देश्य है, वह पूरा हो सके।

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: This discussion will continue tomorrow.

15.02 hrs.

MOTION RE: REPORT OF PAY COMMISSION—Contd.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: We shall now take up further consideration of the following motion moved by Shri Narayanankutty Menon on the 17th December, 1959, namely:

"That this House takes note of the Report of the Commission of Enquiry on Emoluments and Conditions of Service of Central Government employees, Government Resolution thereon and the statement made by the Finance Minister in the House on the 30th November, 1959."

Shri Harish Chandra Mathur may continue his speech. Time taken by him is ten minutes.

Shri Harish Chandra Mathur (Pali): That is lost in the vacuum. I do not know whether anyone knows what I have said.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The hon. Member knows it.

Shri Harish Chandra Mathur: I do not know whether I can maintain that continuity or not.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, I had stated that the Pay Commission had to make its recommendations in a particular context. As a matter of fact, even in the terms of reference it had been enjoined upon the Pay Commission to take into consideration the historical background, the economic conditions in the country, the implications and requirements of the development of planning and also the disparities in the standards of emoluments of Central Government employees, on the one hand, and the

employees of the State Governments, on the other, and the local bodies as well.

Now, it is stated by certain hon. Members that the Pay Commission was inhibited by these very terms and conditions. Of course, it could never be expected that the Pay Commission could be made to make its recommendations in a vacuum, but the very important point which has to be borne in mind is that the Pay Commission itself has made it absolutely and abundantly clear that it will not permit itself to be distracted by any extraneous considerations if the revision of the grades and the raising of the emoluments were considered to be necessary as a fair deal to the Central Government employees. The Pay Commission has positively stated in the report that it was not going to be distracted by any of those conditions; if it thought that the emoluments must be raised it will make a definite recommendation to that effect.

But, while the Pay Commission has taken all these factors into consideration, we must also bear in mind that this Pay Commission was born, as a matter of fact, out of the discontent among the services. It was because of certain threatened strikes, because of certain agitations which were threatened and because of certain representations that were made that the Pay Commission was born.

What is the position today? Even though the report of the Pay Commission is before the entire country we find almost the same discontent amongst the services. I do not know of any organisation or any association which has given expression to satisfaction at the recommendations of the Pay Commission. We might also take note of the fact that there are certain independent observers. Most of the leading papers have given a fair comment and have, as a matter of fact, considered the recommendations of the Pay Commission as fair.

I wish to pinpoint this particular matter. How is it that in spite of

this comment from certain independent sources, in spite of the great labour and thought which have gone into these recommendations of the Pay Commission, in spite of the fact that as a direct result of the implementation of these recommendations of the Pay Commission we will have to incur an expenditure of about Rs. 40 crores, as has been indicated in the report itself, there is discontent among the services? This is a matter which calls for immediate attention.

I think the unfortunate factor is that there has been no real understanding between the Government or the senior officers, I would say, on the one hand, and those who have been employed, on the other. It is absolutely essential that there is a much better understanding brought about between the Government and the employed. The Pay Commission has, in particular, referred to these associations in this context, and it is only in this context that I would like to support the need for a certain machinery to be put up which would bring about a real and better understanding between the services and the Government, because today the position is entirely different from what it was earlier. Now the interests of the Government and the interests of the services should be almost identical. There are no two different interests. They are serving no alien government. In a way, these services constitute the Government. It is only the government services which should have a better understanding of the entire situation in the country.

If we look at the wage bill we will find that out of Rs. 650 crores, which is the total revenue of the Centre, more than Rs. 550 crores goes only on the pay bill. I wonder if this country can afford to pay anything more to the services in the present context. And yet, this simmering discontent is there. It is my feeling that the Government, the Ministers, the leadership has failed to inspire that faith and confidence in the services.

[Shri Harish Chandra Mathur]

They have not been able to establish an intimate contact with the services. They have not been able to make a sense of responsibility felt by the services. I think this psychological change, a change of the mental attitude between the services and the government must be brought about. This is the most important factor as I see it.

I will now come to four or five important recommendations to which I attach greater importance than to the others. It is absolutely difficult to deal in *extenso* with this vast report which has raised so many interesting points, but I would like to refer particularly to the disparities in the standards of emoluments between the Central Government employees and the State Government employees. To my mind, this state of affairs is absolutely intolerable. There is no justification whatsoever, as I could see it, that the salaries for the same job with a man with the same qualifications should be different at the State level and it should be much different at the central level. The Finance Minister's argument is that it depends upon the resources and that he would have absolutely no objection if the State Governments were to raise the emoluments of their employees. He even goes further to the extent of saying that they might under certain conditions and terms give 50 per cent. assistance to allow the State Governments to raise the standard of remuneration of their services. This talk about resources is not understandable to any sensible men. What are these resources? Are the resources of the States and the resources of the Centre in any watertight compartments? What is the basis for making certain avenues available to the States and taking all the flexible and the important avenues of income by the Centre? I think this demarcation about the resources is absolutely artificial and arbitrary. Even the first pie that goes into the treasury should go to remove the disparities between the emoluments in other

sectors as compared to the emoluments to the Central Government employees. I would not be happy even if a single penny is spent by the Central Government in raising the emoluments of those persons who are already getting a little more than what the employees in the State Governments are getting.

There is no justification for this disparity. I think this country as a whole must be taken into consideration. This is a Republic. The resources of the States and the resources of the Centre are the resources of this country, and the citizens of this country must be treated alike. There is absolutely no justification whatsoever for treating some sections differently and telling them: "Here are the resources which we give to you and you make up". I would like the Central Government to tell us whether the States are not making their very best efforts to raise the resources? Can they point out to any State and say, "Here is the source and it is a source which you have not tapped. It must be tapped"? If the States fail to come up to the expectations of the Centre and if they are not really earnest and sincere in raising the resources, the Central Government could have a certain complaint. But the employees should not for any such reason suffer in any way. I think therefore that the resources of the country as a whole should be taken together and this disparity should be done away with. The earlier it is done, the better.

In this connection, I am glad that even the Speaker of this House had thought it necessary to go out of his way to make this point, while speaking at some place, possibly in Andhra or somewhere, and pointing out that there was no justification for this disparity between the emoluments of the Central Government employees and those of the State Government employees.

Secondly, I will come to the question of disparities between the lowest paid employee and the maximum pay that is given to the best of our services.

Here I am quite clear in my mind that a section of our services which is bracketed between Rs. 100 and Rs. 300 is not happy. The Pay Commission has brought out very interesting facts and figures and I do not wish to ignore those facts. I am fully conscious of those facts, and they are that our Government employees are paid favourably and better than what is given to the employees in the private sector. There has been a great feeling that the industries are paying much better to their employees. But when we take note of the entire situation we find that the Government services are paid better than those in the private sector, except for a few jobs here and there and except in the case of half a dozen firms.

Another important factor is the output of work and discipline in spite of lower emoluments. In the private sector, discipline and output are much better. These facts have been brought out in this report and it is here that the services must pay particular attention. It is here that the associations must pay particular attention.

When we come to the question of emoluments, if we look to the budget of the families of employees between Rs. 100 and Rs. 300, we will find that there is a justification for constant effort to improve their emoluments, and we must do it. But while I say that we must do something to improve their emoluments, I am very clear in my mind that we should do nothing to bring down the emoluments of those who are getting Rs. 2,000 to Rs. 3,000. I think we are paying too little even to those people. The disparity is not as large as 28 times, as is being made out. My definite feeling is that we must take the minimum of the man at the lowest rung and then compare it with that of the others. He gets roundabout Rs. 80 to Rs. 100 and the least pay of the best of our services, the IAS, is Rs. 400. So, the disparity is only four times. Why do we take the minimum of the lowest man and the maximum of the man who gets the highest salary? Do we want to see that our best talents in the country

should have no attraction whatsoever in the matter of their emoluments?

I think this question of disparities possibly arose first from the USSR. Anybody who has made a little study of it could understand it. It was correct that more than 20 years back in the USSR they thought that nobody should get more than 500 roubles and the people should get according to their needs. If you examine the pay structure you will find that they have now learnt a lesson to their cost and they have revised the entire notion today. I can say that in the USSR, the lowest minimum is 370 roubles or 400 roubles. We have to take into consideration the various conditions. I am not oblivious of them, namely, the conditions of housing, etc. But the fact stands that there are people who get 400 roubles at the minimum and there are those who get as much as 25,000 to 30,000 roubles.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I think the minimum now is 600 roubles.

Shri Harish Chandra Mathur: The minimum pay, as seen since last week, is about 400 roubles. When I visited that country in 1954, I tried to make a little study of the pay structure there. I think they might have revised it to 600 roubles but I am also sure that the maximum has also gone up.

Shri Narayanankutty Menon (Mukandapuram): May I know in what category of employees does this pay of 30,000 roubles obtain? Is it for the technicians?

Shri Harish Chandra Mathur: That is another point which I have been stressing very strongly. It is not only in response to my hon. friend's provocation that I am saying this. I have been saying this a number of times on the floor of this House and on the floor of the other House. I know who are the people who are getting such salaries. That is a very important factor. But I am talking about the question of disparity at the present moment. Let the ghost of disparity be buried for all time.

[Shri Harish Chandra Mathur]

Let us understand that we must provide incentives for the people and unless and until we provide those incentives, you cannot have the right type of people. Even in the U.S.S.R. they found it absolutely necessary to provide these incentives. It is not only in the U.S.S.R. but in all developing countries the maximum goes only to those people who do the creative work, the people who are technologists, scientists and engineers. This type of people must get a much higher salary. If that is the idea with which my hon. friend has just intervened, I entirely agree with him. I have been saying it all the time. That is absolutely necessary. It is not that it is true only in the U.S.S.R. It is true in all developing countries. Of course, the salary of the I.C.S. and the I.A.S. here is just a hang-over which we have taken from the past. But they do a very useful work.

Shri Braj Raj Singh (Firozabad): But they do no creative work.

Shri Harish Chandra Mathur: There is the least doubt that an engineer must get more. It is unfortunate that here a Chief Engineer starts on just Rs. 1,500 or Rs. 1,600. It is really unfortunate. An I.A.S. officer, in his fifth, sixth or seventh year of service gets Rs. 1,800. There are people who have hardly put in ten years' service but who have been able to get Rs. 2,250. If you take the statistics from the various States you will note these things. As a matter of fact, I quite know that the grade is Rs. 400—800 in the first instance, and then the grade is Rs. 800—1,800. I understand it. But what is the present position? There are quite a number of people who have hardly put in ten to fifteen years' service and who are getting Rs. 2,250. At least I can show you instances in Rajasthan State.

Shri Braj Raj Singh: In the Centre also, there are certain posts like that.

Shri Harish Chandra Mathur: I submit we should do nothing to kill the incentive of the people by bringing down the maximum. We should

try to pay much better salaries than at present to our employees, but the trend must be changed. It must be for the technologists, artists with creative genius and only for those who are there to assist in the development of the country. Of course, we will have to balance it. I do not mean to say that the administrative services do not play an important role. I know of an institution where the director who is in administrative charge of the institute gets only 3,000 roubles, whereas a visiting professor, who does professional work, gets much more. Our process is just the other way. It is because of the historical background. We must reverse the process. The difficulty, unfortunately, is that the entire administration is in the hands of those people who are affected. They cannot see that the trend must be changed. I hope Government will take note of it.

I am glad the President himself has made a little mention of it in his address. I understand he found it necessary to write a letter to the Prime Minister about scientists and engineers. Even in the U.P.S.C. reports, they mention that the clamour for the administrative services still continues and the engineers want to go to the administrative services. I tried to put questions on this particular subject. Let us understand it clearly. While it is very necessary to give relief to the bracket between Rs. 100 and Rs. 300, we must not try to pull down the higher salaries which we are giving. Of course, there should be a complete change in the trend; the trend should be for creative purposes.

Then, I have not been able to see much sense about the classification of cities. Bombay and Calcutta are in A class whereas Delhi is in B class. Are you going merely by population or by the actual living conditions and the index of prices? I submit there is absolutely no justification for this sort of classification. Everyone

knows that the *per capita* income in Delhi is highest, and that the cost of living in Delhi is no less than in Bombay and Calcutta. What justification is there for keeping Delhi down? Even if we take the census, Delhi should be included in A category. I am not pleading for Delhi alone; I am pleading for the principle to be accepted. You will be surprised to know that I have my establishment both here and in Jaipur and my Jaipur establishment costs me more than the Delhi establishment (*Interruption*).

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Here the hon. Member lives as a Member of Parliament; there he leads a better life!

Shri Harish Chandra Mathur: If anybody is to be envied, I think, it is the Members of Parliament and the Ministers, considering all the facilities which are being given to them. So, this classification must be looked into. I wish the Minister makes up his mind about revising this classification. Delhi must definitely be included in A category. I think possibly because most of the Central Government employees are centred in Delhi, they have been trying to keep the wage bill down, arbitrarily fixing the classification and purposely keeping Delhi down. Otherwise, there is absolutely no justification for this. Similarly, when the Central Government employees in Jaipur wrote to the Auditor General, he said, "The Pay Commission is looking into it; we will consider it afterwards". I submit that there is unnecessary discontent among the employees, because we do not take decisions in the right time. If we take decisions in right time, half of the discontent would be over. There is no reason why we should not take the associations of employees into confidence and make them explain their difficulties, because they are as responsible citizens of this country as we are.

My last point is about the age of superannuation. In its report, the Pay Commission has really given valuable data on the subject and re-

commended that the superannuation age should be raised to 58. If you will look into the history of this particular problem, you will find that with the solitary exception perhaps of Indonesia, all over the world, by stages the superannuation age has been raised from time to time. In some places it is 60, in some 58 and so on. I think England has revised it three times. What is the justification for your not accepting a recommendation which is backed and supported by solid facts and arguments? Who wants to retire at 55? I am 55 now.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Therefore he is in the Parliament.

Shri Harish Chandra Mathur: Do you want to enforce idleness on me now because I am 55? When the poor employees are fit and mature, you want them to retire. Longevity of life is there. The only argument advanced is, it will shut off avenues of promotion and there will be more of unemployment. This is just playing on the sentiments of the younger people. I have got a number of relations who are in Government service and who are young. So, my vested interest lies in seeing that the younger people get a better chance. But, if you look to reason and merit, there is absolutely no justification. As a matter of fact, it has been made out by the Home Ministry more than once that they are so short of personnel and they are making emergency recruitment and all that. I find youngmen with hardly 5 or 6 years' service working as District Magistrates today. I do not know about the Central Services, but so far as I.A.S. is concerned, the position is just the reverse. It is entirely different. We are not finding people and it is with reluctance that we are forced to push up our youngsters to jobs which they should occupy only after 5 to 10 years. The criterion laid down was that he must spend 6 years in the grade of Rs. 800 and after 6 years he gets the next grade. But I know of two instances. Immediately he gets into the Rs. 800 grade, he

[Shri Harish Chandra Mathur]

is not supposed to be a Collector or Joint Secretary....

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Even if I ignore the time which he has appropriated to himself, his time is up.

Shri Harish Chandra Mathur: I will finish in one minute.

Apart from my personal experience, I submit that this business of extension is the most demoralising thing which the Government can do. There should not be any question of grant of extension after 55. You can even say "55 and no more". I am prepared to concede even that. But I am not prepared to concede this business of extension after the age of 55. The previous Chairman of the U.P.S.C. wrote to the Home Ministry very strongly on this point more than once. We all know how these officers who are about to retire find themselves. Everyone is trying to get an extension, and this extension is completely demoralising the officer at the fag end of his career. So, I plead that we must raise the age from 55 to 58, and if you do not agree to that, then there should absolutely be no extension and every one must retire at the age of 55. I am not at all prepared to have this patronage. This is only a distribution of patronage, favouring certain people. It is only demoralising certain people who want to seek advantage here or there in the last two or three years of their official career when they are in the best positions, when they are in the most important positions they can get. It completely demoralises the officers and leads to very unhealthy traditions. Therefore, I am strongly opposed to any extensions being given, but, at the same time, I strongly plead that the superannuation age should be raised from 55 to 58.

Shri U. C. Patnaik (Ganjam): The first Pay Commission of 1946-47, the Varadachariar Commission, suffered from certain handicaps. It did not have sufficient statistics or adequate data. It submitted its report within a year. But the present Pay Com-

mission had the advantage of sitting for a much longer time and it had the advantage of having before it the Varadachariar Commission's report, complete up-to-date data and statistics, about 4,700 representations and ample evidence. In spite of all this, the Report, though it has satisfied, to some extent, some people, on the whole, has not been satisfactory, has not satisfied all the Central Government employees and has created hardships in their minds.

I will simply refer to a few salient points, because this is a subject on which many hon. Members are anxious to speak. I will refer, in the first instance, to the minimum wage that has been given. In the tripartite conference of the 15th Labour Conference in Delhi in 1957, with the hon. Labour Minister in the chair, after considering reports from Government, representations from labour and employers, it was given out that the minimum wage should be about Rs. 125 to 137/8- or thereabouts. They calculated the minimum wage on the basis of three consumption units, that is, earner plus three, and they put it down at Rs. 125 to 137— about 72 yards of cloth, that is to say, 18 yards of cloth per person, 47 ounces of foodgrains, that is, 2,800 calories and so on. But the estimate now accepted is that of Dr. Patwardhan, about 32 ounces, giving about 2,600 calories. The difference between the old calculation and the present one is that no meat, fish or egg, reduced quantities of vegetables and milk and replacement of fruit by groundnut. The total has been put down at 56 nP. There are two objections to this. Firstly, the caloric value and the weight of food has been reduced and, secondly, what is much worse, the price of the food is put down at 57 nP; that is, about 15 ounces of cereals and so on and so forth, all coming to 57 nP. I would submit that this is not a proper calculation, and I would request the Commission, or the members opposite, to tell us how is it possible to have

all these items for 57 nP. Of course, you have substituted groundnut for fruits, but even then how is it possible to have this food for 57 nP in Delhi in 1958?

It is quite within Government's rights to appeal to the country in the name of development expenditure, in the name of defence expenditure now going up, in the name of developing the country's resources, and ask us to tighten the belts and to say that we should get on with less than what we actually require. Of course, it is expected that they would give us the lead by setting the examples themselves. But, apart from that, we cannot understand them when they say that they are giving a fair deal by saying that all these calories and all these things can be had for 57 nP in Delhi, and that the minimum expenditure for a family would be only Rs. 70 to 80, and not Rs. 125 to 137.

Another important point is the difference between the announcement of the Labour Ministry in that tripartite conference with the hon. Labour Minister in the Chair, and the present announcement by the Finance Ministry. I would submit that it is for the two Ministries to come to a decision. But, then, to tell us that what was decided upon by Nandaji and his tripartite conference...

Shri Narayanankutty Menon: And also Shri Morarji Desai.

The Minister of Revenue and Civil Expenditure (Dr. B. Gopala Reddi): When he was not present.

Shri U. C. Patnaik: To tell us that it should not be what was decided in that conference but it should be something much less is not the proper way of tackling the subject, and I submit that Government ought to revise this low pay structure.

Then, about the maximum, my hon. friend from Rajasthan who just preceded me, tried to make out an elaborate case for having the present higher ceilings, and he was saying

that the trend in every country is to raise the higher emoluments of persons in higher places. My submission is that there was a time when the ruling party, or the predecessors of the ruling party, had stated that the maximum should be Rs. 500 per month. It was in the Karachi Congress, when Mahatma Gandhi, the father of the nation, was present that it was laid down that the maximum amount should be Rs. 500. The previous pay commission, the Varadachariar Commission, had put it down at Rs. 2,000. Now we are told that, on various grounds it cannot be reduced even to the level recommended by the Varadachariar Commission and that it should be what it is. While we are talking of retrenchment at the lower levels, while we are talking of the pay structures at the lower levels, we are going on expanding our higher services in numbers as well as in salaries.

It has come up before this House on several occasions that a number of higher-salaried posts are being created from day to day, carrying Rs. 3,000 to 4,000 and that, at the same time, we are told that we are sticking to certain principles in life and so on. I am not worried that people are getting Rs. 4,000 to 5,000. It is true that hon. Ministers are getting good salaries in spite of what the father of the nation had laid down for them. It is true that the I.C.S. officers and others are getting higher salaries. I am not worried about it. But the main question is the disparity between the higher scales and the lower scales. An hon. Member has just told us that the disparity is not much. He asked us to take the higher salary of the lowest cadre and the lowest salary of the highest cadre and said that the disparity is only four or so. I submit that it is not a realistic picture. The disparity is much more than that exists in any other country. It is a very important thing that the disparities between the higher scales and the lower scales should not be so much as it is. Apart from the political professions and promises of the

[Shri U. C. Patnaik]

country during the period of struggle, apart from various other reasons, I would submit that the disparity should be brought to the minimum.

At the same time I would also submit that one of the important ways of avoiding disparity and one of the important methods of trying to do justice to one and all should have been not merely to think of the pay-scales but also to think in terms of the cost of living. You, Sir, know that the cost of living is increasing day by day. Prices of foodstuffs are soaring like anything. Blackmarketing is going on. Clothing has become very costly. It is for Government to focus attention not merely on the pay scales and other amenities to be given to Government servants but also to remove all heart-burning and trouble by trying to minimise the prices of at least the necessities. It is quite possible to so regulate our marketing system that certain essential commodities would be made available at fair prices and you can go on taxing luxuries like anything. But till now there has been no attempt to do that. On the other hand we get complaints everywhere that it is in the necessities of life that corruption, black-marketing and soaring prices are going on. What is it that we are doing to see that the necessities of life and the barest minimum requirements of food and clothing are put down at a fairly good price? Is it not possible for Government to think of regulating that? Unless you regulate that, it is going to cause still more discontent day by day. Not only that, as my hon. friend who preceded me told us, there is more discontent because State subordinates with the same qualifications and with the same experience do not get the same rate as the Pay Commission is giving. These are things which have got to be looked into and unless the essential basic factors are taken into consideration nothing can be done.

Then, with your permission, I would submit a few points about the Defence employees. Of course, the

case of Defence employees, who are in uniforms, is now being considered by the Raghuramaiah Committee and I hope the Raghuramaiah Committee will give its decision very soon because the position that while the people in civil services and civilian personnel in Defence services are slightly better off than they were before, the Defence employees should continue to have a raw deal is not desirable. So, I would appeal to the Raghuramaiah Committee to come to a decision very soon and rationalise the pay structure in the Defence organisation.

But there are a number of civilian Defence employees whose cases were considered both by the Central Pay Commission of 1946-47 and by the present Pay Commission. One of the most difficult things for them is that they have no security of service. We have been told that about 68 per cent. of these Defence employees are temporary hands. They have no permanency of service. Out of 2,53,000—in 1945 it was about six lakhs—we are told that 68 per cent. are still temporary. In 1954, Shri Tyagi, who was at that time M.D.O., had announced that about 50 per cent. people in the old factories and about 40 per cent. in the new factories would be made permanent. But till now we have not heard of it. In the meantime there were two committees, which were set up, to consider the problems of the Defence employees. One was the Kalyanwalla Committee and another was, I think, the Sahni Committee. We do not know at what stage they are. But apart from it my submission is that the Defence organisation should make up its mind as to what permanent cadre they will require.

Now we are being told that the Ordnance factories are expanding, that production is increasing and this and that, whereas 68 per cent. of the people, who have been working there since 1949, are still on temporary posts and have not been confirmed. My submission is that while you are thinking of expansion of the indus-

trial potential of the Defence organisation, Government should also consider the necessity of giving the employees security of service. They should be assured that after they complete the probation they will be absorbed in service. It is no good having them for years and years together without giving them the security of service.

There is one particular organisation where people have been working since 1941, 1942 and so on. They are put down as extra temporary servants and are treated to have started only some time in 1949. That is another point that has got to be considered. It should be seen that all these people who have been in service for the last so many years are given some sort of security and are treated as permanent employees. I would submit that it is for the Defence to make up its mind and say as to what is going to be its normal peace time strength, what is going to be the strength of the M.E.S., what is going to be the strength of the E.M.E., what is going to be the strength of the civilian officers, gazetted and non-gazetted, in the different factories and Ordnance depots and all those organisations and what is going to be the strength of the civilians in the Army, Navy and Air Headquarters. These are things that have got to be finalised and they have got to make up their minds. As we have been complaining in this House from time to time, it is unfortunate that our Defence organisation or the Defence Ministry is unable to chalk out its programme and find out its target and to say that this will be the peace time strength, this will be the war time strength and so on. They are not doing that.

Then there are also some minor things. For instance, the Pay Commission has not dealt with extra temporary establishment. Then there has been no calculation as to what will be the piece rates in the Ordnance factories and how the Report

will affect the cost of production because that is a figure that can be changed from time to time. Then there is the difficulty about the privilege ticket order which was previously once a year to anywhere in India for rest and recoupment but now it is only to one's home place and that too if it is over 250 miles.

These are some of the defects in the Pay Commission's Report that have got to be examined. In particular, the civilian officers of the Defence organisation who are getting a step-motherly treatment have got to be given proper treatment. The other Pay Commission's Report should come. Apart from everything else, no number of Pay Commission's Reports will help the people unless Government takes an active part in co-ordinating the various departments and proper cost of living is assured and the minimum food and clothing requirements are properly priced.

श्री प्र० ना० सिंह (चन्दौली) : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, द्वितीय वेतन आयोग के बैठायें जाने के समय इस बात की उम्मीद की जाती थी कि केन्द्रीय कर्मचारियों का मसला या उन के अन्दर जो असन्तोष है वह दूर हो जायगा। लेकिन हमें इस बात का दुःख है कि द्वितीय वेतन आयोग की रिपोर्ट आने के उपरान्त और साथ ही साथ गवर्नमेंट ने उन सिफारिशों को जो लागू किया, उस के बाद, वह असन्तोष और बढ़ा है। हम यह भी महसूस करते हैं कि सारे देश में जिस तरह से वेतन आयोग की सिफारिशों के बारे में तथा सरकार ने जिस तरह उन को लागू किया है, उस से आज तमाम केन्द्रीय कर्मचारी एक मत से इस राय के हैं कि वेतन आयोग की सिफारिशें जो हुई हैं और सरकार ने जिस तरह से उन को लागू किया है, उसे हमें मानना नहीं चाहिये, उन को माना नहीं जाना चाहिये।

[श्री प्र० ना० सिंह]

मैं ने प्रधान मंत्री का एक वक्तव्य भ्रखबारों में पढ़ा था जोकि उन्होंने एक प्रेस कान्फेंस में दिया था जिस में उन्होंने ने सलाह दी थी केन्द्रीय कर्मचारियों को कि देश पर आए संकट के मौके पर उन्हें संयम से काम लेना चाहिये । मैं इस अवसर पर यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि सन् १९५१ में जब रेलवे कर्मचारियों ने हड़ताल का नोटिस दिया था तो उस समय काश्मीर के खतरे का नाम उठाया गया था । सन् १९५७ में जबकि केन्द्रीय कर्मचारियों ने अपनी आवाज बुलंद की तो उस समय आर्डिनंस और दमन की घमकी दी गई । उस वक्त उन की न्याययुक्त मांगों को कुचलने का प्रयत्न किया गया और आज देश को खतरा होने के नाम पर पुनः इस बात का प्रयत्न किया जा रहा है कि केन्द्रीय कर्मचारियों का जो वाजिब और सही असन्तोष है उस को ठीक तरीके से खत्म न किया जाये ।

15:15 hrs.

[DR. SUSHILA NAYAR in the Chair]

बल्कि उस की जगह पर इस बात का प्रयत्न किया जा रहा है कि उस से जबर्दस्ती काम कराया जाय । माननीय सभानेत्री महोदया, मैं आप के द्वारा माननीय मंत्री जी से यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि वे असन्तोष के कारण को ढूँँ । आखिर क्यों इतना असन्तोष है आज केन्द्रीय कर्मचारियों में । इस कारण को ढूँँना लाजिमी तौर से सरकारी पक्ष के निये जरूरी है । हम इस बात को देखते हैं कि जो आज केन्द्रीय कर्मचारियों को मिले हुए हक हैं, या जो उन को मिली हुई आसाइशें हैं उन को सेकेन्ड पे कमीशन के द्वारा छीनने की कोशिश की जा रही है । साथ ही साथ सरकार ने जो रवैया अपनाया है उस के द्वारा कर्मचारियों के हकों पर भी कुठाराघात हुआ है ।

जहाँ तक मौजूदा सरकार का खवाल है, वह अपने को सोशलस्ट स्टेट कहती

है । लेकिन मैं मौजूदा सरकार के मंत्रियों से पूछना चाहता हूँ, विशेष तौर से जो मौजूदा सरकार के नुमाइन्दे हैं उन से पूछना चाहता हूँ कि सोशलिस्टिक स्टेट कहलाने के बाद, डिमाक्रेटिक सोशलस्ट स्टेट कहने के बाद भी जब वह मेहनतकशों की सहूलियतों को कम करती है, उन को मिली हुई आसाइशों को छीनती है तो भी क्या आप को सोशलस्ट स्टेट कहलाने का हक है ? इस बात का जवाब आप हमें दें ।

मैं इस बात को कहता हूँ कि सरकार ने खुद बतलाया है कि केन्द्रीय सरकार के कर्मचारियों का वर्क लोड बढ़ाया गया । २३ सार्वजनिक छुट्टियों को १६ किया गया, जो कैजुअल लीव पंद्रह दिन की मिलती थी, अब १२ दिन रह गई है । जो चार शनिवार आधे आधे दिन के होते थे उन में से तीन को पूरे दिन का कर के सिर्फ एक शनिवार की छुट्टी रखी है । तो मैं तो कहना चाहता हूँ कि जो हक आप ने दिया था, जो उन के जीवन में आप ने आसाइशें पैदा की थीं कि मेहनत करने के बाद वे अपनी जिन्दगी को अच्छी बना सकें, जो सुविधायें मिली हुई थीं उन को, उन को सेकेन्ड पे कमिशन ने छीन लिया । जो रिक्मेन्डेशन सेकेन्ड पे कमिशन ने किया, उन की रिपोर्ट को लागू कर के केन्द्रीय कर्मचारियों के हकों पर सरकार ने कुठाराघात किया है । ऐसी हालत में यदि केन्द्रीय कर्मचारियों ने असन्तोष जाहिर किया, या अपना विरोध जाहिर करते हैं, प्रदर्शन करते हैं तो मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि उन्होंने ने बिल्कुल वाजिब किया है ।

मैं इस सदन के सामने यह भी कहना चाहता हूँ कि जिस तरह से केन्द्रीय कर्मचारियों का वर्क लोड बढ़ाया गया उस से तो दूसरे पूंजीपति लोग लाभ उठावेंगे । सरकार तो एक माइस एम्प्लायर है, सरकार के माइस एम्प्लायर के रहते हुए जो दूसरे कैपिटलिस्ट हैं, पूंजीपति हैं इस बेश के,

बे भी अपने यहां कामके घंटों को बढ़ावे की कोशिश करेंगे, जिस तरह से कि केन्द्रीय कर्मचारियों के सिलसिले में सरकार ने बढ़ाया है। इसलिए यह असन्तोष केवल केन्द्रीय कर्मचारियों का ही नहीं है, बल्कि उन के साथ साथ उन मेहनतकशों का है जो भ्राज फैक्ट्रियों में काम करते हैं या दूसरी जगहों पर काम कर रहे हैं, जिन को उठाने के सिलसिले में लोग यहां भ्रान्दोलन कर रहे हैं।

इस के साथ साथ मैं इस बात को भी सदन के सामने रखना चाहता हूँ कि लेबर कांफरेंस में गवर्नमेंट के लोग भी शामिल थे। जब उस कांफरेंस ने मिनिमम वेज को १२० या १२५ के ऊपर रखने की सोची, तो कम से कम मिनिमम वेज तो सब की होनी चाहिये। फिर भी जिस तरीके से ५ ६० का इजाफा हुआ, जिस को इंटेरिम रिलीफ मिला कर ७५ ६० मिलते थे उस की जगह पर ८० ६० मिलने की बात की गई, जो १५० और ३०० ६० के बीच में पाते थे उन को ३० डिअरनेस भ्रलाउंस देने की बात हुई, उस को देखते हुए मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि जिस तरह से जीवन के खर्चों में बढ़ोतरी होती जा रही है, उस को देखते हुए सरकार की तरफ से यह कहना कि योजनाओं और डेवेलपिंग एकानमी के कारण देश में हमारी स्थिति ज्यादा बढ़ती नहीं है, बिल्कुल वाजिब और उचित नहीं होगा। इस वजह से कि भाव को बढ़ने से रोकने की जिम्मेदारी सरकार के ऊपर है। यदि चावल का भाव बढ़ता है, कपड़े का भाव बढ़ता है, दूसरी जरूरी चीजों का दाम बढ़ता है, तो उसे रोकने में सरकार नाकामयाब रही है। जो लोग भ्राज इस देश में मेहनत कर के देश को उठाने में लगे हुए हैं, उन के सिलसिले में इस चीज को लागू करना ठीक नहीं होगा। इसलिये मैं समझता हूँ कि सेकेन्ड पे कमिशन के द्वारा जो ७० ६० बेसिक सैलरी रखी गई और १० ६० डिअरनेस भ्रलाउंस रक्खा गया या जो नीचे के कर्मचारियों के लिये

५ ६० की बढ़ोतरी की गई है, १५० और ३०० ६० के बीच में पाने वालों के लिए यदि १५ ६० की बढ़ोतरी होती है, तो वह बहुत नाकाफी है। इस सिलसिले में सरकार को गौर करना चाहिये।

इस के साथ ही साथ सरकार को यह भी सोचना चाहिये कि भ्राज जो स्थिति है उस स्थिति को देखते हुए, जैसाकि भ्रमी सरकारी पक्ष के एक सदस्य ने कहा, जहां तक थोड़ी तन्स्वाहों के पाने वालों का सवाल है इंसेंटिव के रूप में कुछ दिया जा सकता है, त्रिएटिव सविस के रूप में कुछ दिया जा सकता है, लेकिन बड़ी बड़ी तन्स्वाह वालों को ऐडमिनिस्ट्रेटिव रूप में कुछ नहीं दिया जाना चाहिये। इस सिलसिले में मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि तन्स्वाह बड़ी दें या छोटी दें, लेकिन कम से कम जब भ्राप अपने को सोशलिस्ट स्टेट कहते हैं तो सोशलिस्ट स्टेट कहलाने के नाते भ्राप को छोटी तन्स्वाहों और बड़ी तन्स्वाहों में कुछ रिश्ता कायम करना चाहिये। वह इतना बड़ा फर्क न हो जिस के देखने से लगे कि नीचे का जो भ्रादमी है वह पिस रहा है। उस को अपने जीवन की रोजमर्रा की जो भ्रासाइशें हैं वह भी नहीं मिलती हैं, और दूसरी तरफ भ्राप इतनी लम्बी तन्स्वाहें देते हैं कि जिन को देख कर नीचे के भ्रादमी हमेशा सफर करते रहे। इसलिये सोशलिस्ट स्टेट होने के नाते भ्राप को जो बड़ी तन्स्वाहें हैं और जो छोटी तन्स्वाहें हैं उन में कुछ रिश्ता कायम करना चाहिये। उन के बीच में जो बड़ा से बड़ा रिश्ता हो सकता है वह १ और १० का हो सकता है, इस से ज्यादा नहीं।

इस के साथ साथ मैं कुछ रेलवे एम्प्लायीज के बारे में भी कहना चाहता हूँ। सेकेन्ड पे कमिशन रिपोर्ट भ्राने के बाद जो रेलवे एम्प्लायीज की मेडिकल फेसिलिटीज थीं वह भी खत्म होती जा रही हैं। कट्टिब्यूटरी हेल्थ स्कीम के भ्राने से रेलवे एम्प्लायीज को वे सुविधायें नहीं रह गई हैं। इस के साथ साथ उन के पासेज का सवाल है, वह

[श्री प्र० ना० सिंह]

सुविधा भी प्राप्त उन से छीन रहे हैं। ओवर टाइम का सवाल है। इस सिलसिले में कहा गया कि जो स्टाफ रेलवे में काम करता है यदि वह ४५ मिनट तक ही ज्यादा ओवर टाइम करते हैं तो उन को एक्स्ट्रा पेमेंट नहीं होगा। मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि हम को इन्साफ के आधार पर ओवर टाइम देने का मामला तय करना चाहिये। ऐसा नहीं होना चाहिये कि यदि हम ने किसी से ४० मिनट तक जबर्दस्ती ज्यादा काम करवाया तो हम उस को कुछ न दें। सिर्फ ४५ मिनट के बाद ही दें, उस के पहले का कोई ओवर टाइम नहीं दें। अगर आप नहीं बेते हैं तो सीधे सीधे बर्क लोड बढ़ाना चाहते हैं। इसी के साथ साथ रेलवे एम्प्लायीज के क्वार्टरों के रेंट का सवाल है। सेकेन्ड पे कमिशन ने उस में इजाफा किया है। इन सब चीजों को देखते हुए मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि सेकेन्ड पे कमिशन की तरफ से जो सिफारिशों सदन के सामने हैं और जिस तरह से सरकार ने उन को इम्प्लिमेंट किया है, उस से असन्तोष का होना स्वाभाविक है।

इस के साथ ही साथ मैं एक बात और कहना चाहूंगा। सेकेन्ड पे कमिशन रिपोर्ट में जहाँ तक केन्द्रीय सरकार के कर्मचारियों के राजनीतिक अधिकारों का प्रश्न है, उस के सम्बन्ध में यह कहा गया है कि जो सविद्य कंडक्ट रूल्स हैं वह उसी तरह से रहने चाहियें। मैं इस चीज को कहना चाहता हूँ कि चूँकि आप अपने को सोशलिस्ट स्टेट कहते हैं, आज रेलवे का राष्ट्रीयकरण हुआ, इंडियोरैस का राष्ट्रीयकरण हुआ, कल बैंक का नेशनलाइजेशन होगा, दूसरी फील्ड्रीज का नेशनलाइजेशन होगा, यदि आप इस तरह से पोलिटिकल राइट्स को छीनते जायेंगे तो जो सरकारी उद्योग बंधों में लगे हुए लोग हैं, मजदूर हैं, उन की प्राप्ति चल कर क्या स्थिति होगी। ऐसी दशा में आप कभी भी मजदूर राज्य की स्थापना का स्वप्न, सोशलिस्ट स्टेट की स्थापना

का स्वप्न पूरा नहीं कर सकते। इस लिये पोलिटिकल राइट्स के सम्बन्ध में जो सेकेन्ड पे कमिशन की रिपोर्ट है उस के बारे में सरकार को सोचना चाहिये। आज आप ने कर्मचारियों के ऊपर इस चीज का छोड़ दिया है, सविद्य कंडक्ट रूल्स के अन्दर कि यदि उन कर्मचारियों के कोई नजदीक के रिलेटिव हैं जो कि राजनीति में भाग लेते हैं, तो वे लोग उन की रिपोर्ट सरकार को करें। आप उन लोगों से सी०आई०डी० का काम करवाना चाहते हैं। यदि उन के परिवार का कोई आदमी राजनीतिक कार्य करता है तो ऐसी हालत में उस को रिपोर्ट करनी चाहिये। मैं कहता हूँ कि जब आप सिविल लिबर्टीज की बात करते हैं, डिमाक्रेसी की बात करते हैं तब आप केन्द्रीय कर्मचारियों के सिलसिले में यदि उन के परिवार के लोग या उन के नजदीक के रिश्तेदार राजनीति में हिस्सा लेते हैं, यह नियम बनाते हैं तो यह कहां तक ठीक है। यह तो एक तरीके से उन पर दबाव डालना चाहते हैं कि वे उस में भाग न लें। आप ने पोलिटिकल राइट्स के सिलसिले में जो फैसला दिया है, वह उचित नहीं है। इस लिये मैं इस बात को कहूंगा कि और चीजें सोचने के साथ साथ सरकार को इस प्रश्न पर भी सोचना चाहिये। साथ ही साथ इस मसले को देश के खतरे के नाम पर या घमकियों या दमन के द्वारा दबाने की कोशिश नहीं करनी चाहिए और न केन्द्रीय कर्मचारियों को इन बातों को लेकर दबाने की कोशिश करनी चाहिए। जो उन के संगठन हैं, उन को आप बुलाएं, ठीक तरीके से उनकी बातों को सुनें, और उनकी स्थिति को जानने के बाद उचित फैसला करें, जिससे कि केन्द्रीय कर्मचारियों को ठीक तरह से संतोष हो सके और उनमें जो असंतोष का वातावरण है वह खत्म हो सके।

16 hrs.

Shri Sampath (Namakkal): Madam Chairman, the Second Pay Com-

mission's Report when published gave a rude shock to those who had quite legitimately expected that the Pay Commission's Report would do justice to those employees of the Government of India who had been long subjected to great injustices. The Commission, as many hon. Members who preceded me in this discussion had pointed out, has, instead of removing the causes for the suffering of the employees in the lower rung, inflicted new hardships to be borne by them.

The number of working days has been increased on the ground that many other countries in the world have more number of working days than India. Nobody can object to this; nobody can find fault with this. But when we try to draw comparisons with the conditions existing in other countries, we must do it fully and completely and all the aspects of the question should be compared and examined, because the various aspects of the question are inter-related. The Commission has chosen to compare only the aspects of working days and conveniently avoided comparing other conditions of life of the employees of those countries who do more work.

Now, what is the type of pay-scales that they are bestowed with and what is the type of pay-scales that our employees are condemned to? The housing and other facilities should also be compared. There is no use in comparing the performance of a race horse with that of the *Jatka* or *Tonga* horse without considering the attentions bestowed upon the needs and comforts of those two types of horses.

Next, I wish to draw the attention of this House to the failure of the Commission to appreciate the fairness of the principles and norms laid down by the 15th Indian Labour Conference, regarding the fixation of minimum wages. One would have expected the Government, as a model employer, to respect the decision

arrived at by the 15th Indian Labour Conference in which the Government itself was one of the three participants. The Government of India has totally rejected the decision of the 15th Indian Labour Conference, saying that the Government has not committed itself to the decision.

Another thing is that the calculations of Dr. Aykroyd are completely overruled by the Commission. According to Dr. Aykroyd, the daily requirements of a person are: rice and millets 14 oz.; pulses 3 oz.; vegetables 10 oz.; milk 10 oz.; sugar and gur 2 oz.; fish, meat, etc. 4 oz.; fruit 2 oz.—total comes to 47 oz. But, according to the Pay Commission's proposals, these work out to: cereals 15 oz.; pulses 3 oz.; vegetables 6 oz.; milk 4 oz.; sugar and gur 1.5 oz.; fish, meat, etc. nil; fruit nil; groundnut 1 oz.—the total comes to 32 oz. And the Commission makes the assertion that 32 oz. of these commodities were available in the Delhi market in 1958 for 56 nP. Apart from the adequacy of the nutritional value of these two different patterns of diet, it is amazing how the Commission could come to believe that these 32 oz. of commodities could be bought for 56 nP in Delhi. The other day also my hon. friend Mr. Banerjee challenged that he would prefer to give 76 nP to somebody to go to the market and purchase all these commodities.

Shri S. M. Banerjee (Kanpur): I said that to the Minister.

Dr. B. Gopala Reddi: Food Minister, or Finance Minister?

Shri S. M. Banerjee: Finance Minister.

Shri Sampath: This is a very unrealistic approach which has resulted in greater injustices to the employees. More than 90 per cent of the total number of Government employees belong to class III and class IV. What is it that they have gained in net, according to the recommendations of the Commission?

[Shri Sampath]

Let us take the case of class IV and class III employees of the Posts and Telegraphs Department. Class IV category of packers, peons, etc. were getting Rs. 30 salary and Rs. 45 dearness allowance, the total of which comes to Rs. 75. According to this award, they will get Rs. 70 salary and Rs. 10 dearness allowance, that is, a total of Rs. 80. They get a benefit of Rs. 5 and there will be a deduction of Rs. 5 for Provident Fund. So, the net benefit is nil.

Dr. B. Gopala Reddi: Provident Fund is their own.

Shri Sampath: As for the postmen class, in the case of those getting Rs. 35 to Rs. 47, the benefit is nil. Those who get Rs. 47 will get Re. 1 extra per month and those who get Rs. 46 will lose Re. 1. As for the head postmen grade, all of them will be losers as a result of the recommendations of the Pay Commission. Regarding the clerical grades, we find that those who are getting Rs. 60 and Rs. 170 are losing from Rs. 2 to Rs. 9 per month. As regards lower selection grade, those who were getting Rs. 160 to Rs. 250 are losing to the extent of Rs. 8 to Rs. 19 per month.

As regards the compulsory provident fund, the argument that is put forward often is that saving should be encouraged. Saving from what? Already what is given to the employees is inadequate to meet even the barest basic needs of life. One should not lose sight of the fact that generally children are not born after retirement, when they get all these benefits from the provident fund. Moreover, the purchasing power of the rupee is decreasing day by day and the interest provided is very low. At least, if the Government comes forward to contribute equal amount to the provident fund of the employees, it would hearten him to a certain extent. But the Government is not prepared to accept this.

The net result of the pattern sought to be set out by this Pay Commission

is that hereafter the employees will be terribly afraid to demand a fresh Pay Commission and the appointment of a Pay Commission will be a potential weapon in the hands of the Government to threaten its employees. It is really tragic that the Pay Commission, instead of enhancing the emoluments and other facilities to the Government employees, has sought to cut their facilities already enjoyed by them. I would request that the Pay Commission's recommendations should be revised and the Government should play its role in a very *boda fide* manner that it at least recognises the decision arrived at the 15th Indian Labour Conference regarding the fixation of minimum wages.

Shri Tangamani (Madurai): Madam Chairman, previous speakers have already stressed upon the various aspects of the Pay Commission's Report and they have characterised the Report as disappointing. When the Report was submitted to this House on the 30th of November, 1959, much was expected of that Report. After the Report was published and when the details were made known, comments have come from different quarters, not only from the employees but also from those who are not interested generally about the employees.

I would take this Report and deal with it in the following three or four aspects. Why was this Report eagerly awaited? Why was this Report expected by a large section of the employees? It is true that this Report deals mainly with the Central Government employees. But certainly, basic questions about wages, dearness allowance and other things were raised at the time of enquiry. Naturally, people thought that these basic points will be dealt with and final decisions will be given on these basic points.

One such question was the question of wages. Many hon. Members have referred to the question of wages, and pointed out how the Commission have

gone back on the unanimous decision of the tripartite conference of 1957, where certain compromises were accepted not only by the employers and the employees but also by Government. Having accepted this, now the commission go a step further and accept the recommendation of some other expert.

In this connection, I would like to mention that a special tribunal was set up for going into the question of the wages and other working conditions of the plantation workers in the Madras State. Generally, the employees were relying more upon Dr. Aykroyd's formula. It was the employers who brought Shri Patwardhan as an expert on their behalf. It is surprising that the recommendation of the expert who was invited on behalf of the employers has now been accepted in this Pay Commission's report. So, we would like to have a categorical answer from the Minister as to whether they still stand by the tripartite decision of 1957 or whether they are going to accept the recommendations of Shri Patwardhan whose recommendation has been followed in the report of this Pay Commission.

The second point is this. The First Pay Commission accepted the principle of linking the dearness allowance with the cost of living index, although Government did not follow it in spirit. It was said that for every 20 points increase in the index, there should be an increase of the dearness allowance by Rs. 5. This recommendation also was not followed by Government. But the fact remains that this recommendation was made as early as 1947, and several tribunals have followed this. So, we find that a principle which had once been accepted in 1957 and subsequently followed by the various tribunals is now sought to be taken away by this Pay Commission. On this also, we would like to know the views of Government.

I can very well understand a position like the one taken in the First Pay Commission's report. The First Pay Commission said that if all these factors were taken into consideration, then the employees might be entitled to more, but because of certain other extraneous considerations, they were fixing the minimum wages at Rs. 30 and the dearness allowance at some other figure. Now, the Second Pay Commission have gone into the decisions arrived at at the Fifteenth Indian Labour Conference and stated that the minimum wages to be paid according to that would be Rs. 125. Having accepted that, instead of saying that under the present conditions, in view of the terms of reference, it can only be Rs. 80, they want to buttress their arguments by resorting to Shri Patwardhan's recommendation. That is what I would like to point out.

Another point that I would like to mention in this connection is that although the commission's award has been disappointing, even those recommendations which are beneficial to the employees are sought to be taken away by the Central Government. I would briefly mention certain beneficial recommendations; for instance, the recommendation regarding retirement benefits is something which is beneficial to the employees. Again, the recommendation regarding the conversion of the temporary and casual employees into permanent employees is also a beneficial one. I remember that in reply to one of the questions last year, it was stated that there were 17 lakhs Central Government employees, 9 lakhs industrial and 8 lakhs non-industrial. Out of these, only 3 lakhs received more than Rs. 100 by way of remuneration or wages; and 14 lakhs were getting less than Rs. 100. Out of these 14 lakhs, slightly less than 50 per cent were either temporary or casual. It may now be one-third. Yesterday, in reply to one of the questions, the Railway Minister stated that there were 110,000 class III and class IV employees in Railways who would still come under the category of temporary. Therefore,

[Shri Tangamani]

we would like to know what time Government are going to take to convert all these temporary hands into permanent ones.

There is another recommendation about compulsory arbitration. When the two parties, namely Government and the employees, do not agree on a particular issue or issues, then the matter is to be referred to arbitration; that arbitration will be at the highest level. There will also be arbitration at different levels, namely by the creation of Whitley Councils. This particular recommendation of the Commission has not been accepted by Government, to this day.

There is again the recommendation about the age of retirement. A reference was made to this particular aspect by one of the previous speakers. According to the commission, the retirement age is to be 58, instead of 55. Even this recommendation has not been accepted by Government.

Yet another recommendation is that instead of making the employees work half a day on every Saturday, they may be made to work for a full Saturday, for 8 hours or 6 hours, as the case may be, on the first Saturday of the month; have a holiday on the second Saturday, again work for a full Saturday on the third Saturday and have a holiday on the fourth Saturday. That was the recommendation of the commission. But now Government come forward and say that they do not accept this recommendation. And they would like all these employees to work for three Saturdays continuously and have the fourth Saturday as a holiday. Simple arithmetic will show that an employee who was working for two days in a month on the Saturdays is now made to work three days in a month; in other words, he has to work for 12 full days in a year. And what is the emolument Government are giving him? Whatever emoluments that Government are giving him by the right hand, they are taking away by the left. So, even the very paltry

emolument increase sought to be given by the Pay Commission is taken away by Government's refusal to accept these recommendations.

It is true that PTO is now extended to the industrial employees. That is a welcome feature. But what is already being enjoyed by the railway employees is sought to be taken away. I do not know whether orders have been passed in this regard; if those orders are going to be passed, then there is likely to be resistance from the railway employees. Now, I think, the railway employees are getting one free pass and 6 PTO's. Now, Government are seeking to reduce it.

Shri Rajendra Singh (Chapra): Two free passes.

Shri Tangamani: Now, they are going to reduce it to one free pass and two PTO's. What the railway employees have been enjoying all along is much more than what is now sought to be given to the Central Government employees. I would suggest here that whatever is being enjoyed by them all along should not be taken away. Many of the organisations of the Central Government employees have brought to the notice of Government the various facilities they have been enjoying.

Take, for instance, the question of casual leave and holidays. They were enjoying 23 holidays and 15 days casual leave. Now, that is sought to be reduced to 16 and 12. Even here, what they have been enjoying so far is now sought to be taken away. I read in one of the journals a calculation which shows how as a result of these recommendations, an ordinary Central Government employee would get one month's wage less. We find that there is a demand by the various central trade union organisations like the All India Trade Union Congress, that if a person works for 12 months in a year, he must get 13 months' wages; in other words, one month's wage should be paid in terms of bonus. Here, the Central Government

employees were formerly working for about eleven months odd and they were getting 12 months' wages. But, today, they have to work nearly for 12 months for getting 11 months' wages; in other words, to put it in popular terms, the person will have to work for 13 months for getting 12 months' wages. So, the calculation that the additional emoluments would come to Rs. 31 crores or Rs. 41 crores is really misleading. I am just giving a reply to the point raised by Shri Harish Chandra Mathur. If you pay the employees an amount of Rs. 5 extra and take away the existing benefits, it will not enthruse them.

The First Pay Commission said that certain facilities should be given to those persons who are employed in big cities. Big cities like Bombay and Calcutta were notified as 'A' class cities. When these cities were categorised as 'A' class cities, it was based on consideration of population. The population of these cities is much more than 1½ millions. There were big cities like Madras, Delhi and Kanpur, but their population was not 15 lakhs then. Ever since 1947, the demand has been that those cities whose population is 15 lakhs or more should be classed as 'A' class cities. It is common knowledge that in respect of cities like Madras, Kanpur, Delhi and Hyderabad, the population exceeds 15 lakhs. The demand of the employees from these cities requesting that these cities may be treated as 'A' class cities is a just demand.

In the same way, the population of 'B' class cities was fixed at 5 lakhs. Those cities which were having population of less than 5 lakhs according to 1951 census are now having population exceeding 5 lakhs. I can mention the case of a city like Madura. Even in the municipal area, the population is nearly 5 lakhs. It does not extend to Greater Madura. If you take Greater Madura and Madura Postal District, certainly the population will be nearly 7 lakhs. Here is an important city which is a big industrial city. It is a city of pilgrimage. The demand of the employees

of the Posts and Telegraphs Department and the other Central Government employees to treat this city as a class 'B' city is a just demand. What does the Pay Commission say in this matter? The Commission says that they will have to wait for the census of 1961. Even after the census of 1961, they will have to wait for 2 more months or 2 more years even. But there is a proviso saying that these cities, wherever necessary, may be made into class 'B' cities. Here, there is a demand from the employees of this city to treat it as class 'B' city. There are similar cities all over India which are under class 'C' where the employees demand that they may be treated as class 'B' cities. 'C' class cities are those cities whose population is 1 lakh or more. In Tuticorin, the population has exceeded 1 lakh. Even in 1955, the population has exceeded 1 lakh. If we wait for the census of 1961, many of the benefits which are at least indicated in the Pay Commission's Report will be denied to these employees. So, I request the hon. Minister to look into this matter. I request him not to restrict the condition to cities like Bombay and Calcutta, but to extend it to other big cities.

Sir, the previous speaker referred to class IV employees. I would like to mention only one point relating to class IV employees. If we take the postmen, what we find is this. The Razaltine Committee of 1920 stated as follows:

"The Postman is drawn from a class distinctly superior to that of the ordinary menial. To be qualified for his work he must have some knowledge of script of at least 3 languages one being English; in his duty is involved considerable pecuniary responsibilities; he is in fact a small way cashier; he has to render a daily account to furnish security and to make good losses. The efficiency in the postal service very largely depends upon the Postmen. The Standing Finance Committee in one of the Report stated 'the

[Shri Tangamani]

Postmen really are a sort of inferior clerks having regard to the qualifications and other monetary responsibilities'."

Some of the Class IV employees of the Central Government have got to bear these responsibilities. They are as good as Class III employees. Does the Government feel that an amount of Rs. 80 which they have fixed would be proper emoluments for them? Certain Wage Boards have been set up in respect of certain industries and they have made certain recommendations. In respect of the cement industry the Wage Board has recommended Rs. 102 for Class IV employees. If the industrial worker in the private sector could be paid Rs. 102, I do not see any reason why the same principle cannot be extended to the employees of the Central Government also. I have indicated that 3 lakhs employees of the Central Government are drawing more than Rs. 100. 14 lakhs of Central Government employees are drawing less than Rs. 100, of whom 50 per cent are still temporary. The emoluments that some of them are now getting by way of the recommendation of the Second Pay Commission are Rs. 75 plus Interim Relief. Certain employees like the RMS employees are doing very arduous work, and some of the welfare facilities have not been extended to them. I can give details. I would like the hon. Minister to go into this question and at least give us an assurance that whatever benefits have been enjoyed by the Central Government employees before the Pay Commission was set up, would not be denied to them.

Another point which I would like to mention here is this. In all cases where a Commission is set up for fixation of wage scales, the wages are always fixed and paid with retrospective effect. They will be perfectly justified if they demand that wages may be paid from 1st August, 1956. Some of these organisations are demanding it not from 1st August,

1956 but from the date from which the interim relief was paid to them. At least, the payment should be made from 1st July, 1957. The Commission says that even in respect of those earlier months the amounts would be credited to the provident fund accounts of the employees. Since some Members have already referred to provident fund, I would not go into that. But what I would like to say in this connection is that at least the existing facilities which have been enjoyed by the Central Government employees should not be taken away from them; otherwise, it will be not only a disappointing report but it will be a very distressing report.

Mr. Chairman: Shri D. C. Sharma. He is absent. Shri Vajpayee.

श्री जाजवेयी (बलरामपुर) : मैं तो कल बोलना चाहता था लेकिन चूँकि आप चाहती हैं कि मैं आज बोलूँ, मैं आपकी बात को स्वीकार करता हूँ।

महोदया, वेतन आयोग की सिफारिशों ने बीस लाख से अधिक केन्द्रीय कर्मचारियों में बड़ी निराशा उत्पन्न की है। अनेक वर्षों से बढ़ती हुई महंगाई और बढ़ते हुए टैक्सों के पाटों में पिसने वाले कर्मचारी यह आशा करते थे कि वेतन आयोग उनकी तनखाह और भत्तों में इतनी वृद्धि करेगा कि जिस से देश की आर्थिक परिस्थितियों को ध्यान में रखते हुए वे अपना जीवन-यापन ठीक तरह से कर सकेंगे तो उनके कर्तव्यपालन के लिए भी आवश्यक है और पंच वर्षीय योजना के अन्तर्गत जीवन के स्तर को ऊँचा करने का हमने जो लक्ष्य रखा है, उसके भी अनुरूप होगा। लेकिन वेतन आयोग की रिपोर्ट के परिणामस्वरूप कर्मचारी बड़े असन्तुष्ट हैं। सरकार ने आयोग के सम्मुख जिस तरह के टर्म्स आप रेफ़रेस रखे, विचार की जो सीमा निर्धारित की, उसके कारण बहुत कुछ अंश में वेतन आयोग के हाथ-पैर बन्ध गए। लेकिन जो सिफारिशों की गई हैं, उन में से कुछ ऐसी हैं जहाँ सरकार ने ज्यों का त्यों

स्वीकार नहीं किया। कांग्रेस पार्टी में सम्बन्धित जो मजदूर संगठन हैं वे भी इस बात की आलोचना कर रहे हैं कि सरकार ने जो सिफारिशें उस के हित में थीं, उन को तो स्वीकार कर लिया, मगर जो सिफारिशें कर्मचारियों के हित में थीं उन को बदल दिया। सरकार के सम्मुख एक रास्ता यह था कि कमिशन की रिपोर्ट को जैसे का तैसा स्वीकार कर लेती और उस को कार्यान्वित करती। किन्तु यदि सरकार सिफारिशों में कोई परिवर्तन करना चाहती है तो फिर उस के लिये कर्मचारियों के जो प्रतिनिधि संगठन हैं उन से विचार विनिमय की बहुत आवश्यकता है।

छुट्टियों का प्रश्न है। सभी लोग चाहते हैं कि भारत का प्रत्येक नागरिक अधिक से अधिक काम करे, अधिक से अधिक श्रम करे, और हमारे सरकारी कर्मचारी मेहनत करने में किसी से पीछे नहीं हैं। लेकिन वेतन आयोग ने जो सिफारिश की है, विशेषतः शनिवार को काम के घंटे बढ़ाने के बारे में, उसे भी सरकार ने ज्यों का त्यों स्वीकार नहीं किया। छुट्टियां कम कर दी गईं। कुल मिला कर छुट्टियों की संख्या घटा दी गई। कर्मचारियों पर इस से कार्य का बोझ अधिक पड़ेगा। उस बोझ के उत्तरदायित्व का निर्वाह करने के लिये जो कर्मचारी तैयार हो सकते हैं, यदि बदले में उन की जो सुविधायें आज तक चली आ रही हैं, उन को कम न किया जाय, और परिस्थिति की मांग को देखते हुए कुछ अधिक सुविधायें दी जायें। लेकिन वेतन आयोग की सिफारिश के परिणामस्वरूप काम में वृद्धि हो गई और सुविधाओं में कमी हो रही है।

अभी रेलवे कर्मचारियों की बात हो रही थी। रेलवे कर्मचारियों को जो मकान दिये जाने वाले हैं अब उन का किराया जोड़ते समय जिस जमीन पर मकान बने हैं, और अगर जमीन महंगे दामों पर प्राप्त की गई है, तो उस को भी कर्मचारी से किराये के रूप में वसूल किया जायेगा। जो चिकित्सा

की सुविधायें हैं उन को भी व्यापक नहीं बनाया गया। जिन कर्मचारियों को रहने के लिये सरकार मकान दे सकी है, उन की संख्या बहुत कम है और जो शेष कर्मचारी हैं वे इस समय मकानों की कमी को अनुभव करते हैं और उस के लिये अधिक किराया देने के लिये विवश होते हैं। जो सुविधायें थीं पास या पी०टी०ओ० की उन्हें भी कम किया गया है। और मुझे पता लगा है कि रेलवे मंत्रालय ने आदेश जारी कर दिया है कि मार्च तक जो कमिशन ने कटौती के सुझाव दिये हैं उन्हीं के अनुसार फी पास और पी०टी०ओ० जारी होने चाहिये। अब यह तर्क दिया जाता है कि जो कर्मचारी रेलवे में काम नहीं करते, हम उन के लिये भी वर्ष में एक बार यात्रा की व्यवस्था कर रहे हैं, वह भी घर से आने के लिये। अब मेरा निवेदन है कि रेलवे कर्मचारी जिन परिस्थितियों में काम करते हैं, उन का थोड़ा सा विचार किया जाना चाहिये। जो सुविधायें उन्होंने वर्षा के संघर्ष के पश्चात् प्राप्त की हैं उन को छीनना नहीं चाहिये जब तक उन की सेवाओं की शर्तों में कोई अन्तर नहीं होता। आज भी रेलवे कर्मचारी रूल १४८ के अन्तर्गत एक महीने का नोटिस दे कर, बिना कारण बताये हुए नौकरी से अलग किया जा सकता है। यह सेवा की शर्तों और कर्मचारियों के साथ नहीं। उन के काम में भी अन्तर है। डाक और तार विभाग के कर्मचारी भी एक विशेष तरह का काम करते हैं। रात को रात और दिन को दिन नहीं समझते और अपनी संगठन शक्ति से जो सुविधायें उन्होंने प्राप्त की हैं, वे अपने कर्तव्य का ठीक तरह से निर्वाह कर सकें, इस के लिये उन की आवश्यकता है। सरकार उन्हें भी कम करने जा रही है। कुछ मिलना तो अलग रहा, और कर्मचारियों की जब में से कुछ जा रहा है। चौबे जी चले थे छब्बे बनने मगर रह गये दुबे। कर्मचारी कुछ प्राप्ति की आशा करते थे मगर उन के सामने सुविधाओं की कमी का सवाल खड़ा है। मैं मंत्री

[श्री वाजपेयी]

महोदय से कहना चाहूंगा कि पे कमिशन की सिफारिशों ने कर्मचारियों को असन्तुष्ट किया है। यदि वर्तमान मुविधाओं में कमी की गई तो उस की प्रतिक्रिया होनी स्वाभाविक है और यदि कर्मचारियों ने मुविधाओं की रक्षा के लिये कोई ऐसा कदम उठाया जिस से सरकार को पता लगे कि वे अपनी मुविधाओं को छोड़ने के लिये तैयार नहीं हैं, तो मैं समझता हूँ कि वह उन का बिल्कुल न्यायोचित कदम होगा।

हमारे प्रधान मंत्री ने ३० जनवरी को नई दिल्ली की एक सभा में भाषण करते हुए कर्मचारियों में अपील की है कि वे देश के व्यापक हितों का ध्यान रखें। मैं समझता हूँ कि पंचवर्षीय योजना की सफलता के लिये जितना अधिक श्रेय कर्मचारियों को है उतना और किसी को नहीं। सरकार दावा भी करती है कि योजनायें सफल होती जा रही हैं। लेकिन यह बड़े आश्चर्य की बात है कि उन योजनाओं के चलते कर्मचारियों का जीवन स्तर कम होता जा रहा है। महंगाई बढ़ रही है। सरकार जिस तरह की अर्थ नीति अपना रही है उस में महंगाई कम हो जायेगी, यह आशा करना भी ठीक नहीं होगा। मुद्रास्फीती के लक्षण बिल्कुल स्पष्ट हैं और अभी हम ने देखा कि अनाज के दाम बढ़े, कपड़े के दाम बढ़े, जीवन की आवश्यक वस्तुओं के मूल्य में वृद्धि हो रही है और उस वृद्धि से अगर अब से अधिक कोई वर्ग परेशान हो। है तो वह सरकारी कर्मचारियों का होता है जिन्हें बंधी बंधाई महीने की तनखाह मिलती है। और उन के सम्बन्ध में यह अंक रक्खे जाते हैं कि वे ५६ नये पैसे में दिल्ली में भोजन कर सकते हैं। कमिशन इस परिणाम पर पहुँच सकता है, मगर जो मंत्री हमारे दिल्ली में रहते हैं और दिल्ली की महंगाई ने अधिक नहीं तो थोड़ा सा उन्हें भी स्पर्श किया है वे जरा हृदय पर हाथ रख कर देखें कि क्या ५६ पैसे नये में ३२ आउंस भोजन मिल सकता है। वह उन के जीवित रहने

के लिये पर्याप्त हो सकता है लेकिन उस से अधिक काम करने की प्रेरणा नहीं मिल सकती।

पे कमिशन से यह भी आशा की जाती थी कि वह सर्विस कंडक्ट रूल्स में कोई परिवर्तन करेगा। दिखाई ऐसा देता है कि हमारे कर्मचारियों को पहले कितनी मुविधा थी उस से भी शायद अब कम होती जा रही है और सरकारी कर्मचारी अब और भी बन्धनों में बांधे जा रहे हैं। जो मान्यता प्राप्त संगठन हैं उन से भी कहा जा रहा है कि बाहर के व्यक्ति को अपना पदाधिकारी न बनायें। वे कार्यालय की सीमा के भीतर सभा भी नहीं कर सकते। धीरे धीरे उन के काम करने के लिये जो प्रेरणा है उसे कम करने की कोशिश हो रही है। जब एक बार सरकार ने यह स्वीकार कर लिया कि जो कर्मचारियों के संगठन हैं वे कर्मचारियों की दक्षता बढ़ाने के लिये और शासन के साथ उन के सम्बन्ध ठीक रखने के लिये आवश्यक हैं तो मैं समझता हूँ कि कर्मचारियों के संगठनों को पूरा प्रोत्साहन दिया जाना चाहिये। पे कमिशन यदि चाहता तो सर्विस कंडक्ट रूल्स में ऐसे संशोधन करने के सुझाव दे सकता था जिन से कर्मचारी के आस पास की गतिविधियों में सामाजिक और सांस्कृतिक कामों में और अधिक मुविधा से भाग ले सकते। लेकिन ऐसा पता लगता है कि गृह-मंत्रालय ने कुछ ऐसे संगठनों का सूची बना कर रक्खी है जिसे काली सूची कहा जाता है। और सन्देश पर भी, अगर कोई छोटा सा गुप्तचर विभाग का कर्मचारी नीचे से यह रिपोर्ट कर दे कि प्रमुख कर्मचारी एक कथित संगठन के साथ सम्पर्क रखता प्रतीत होता है, तो उसे नौकरी से अलग कर दिया जाता है। मैं समझता हूँ कि देश की बदली हुई परिस्थितियों के साथ कर्मचारियों की जो सेवा की शर्तें हैं, और जो नियम हैं उन में भी संशोधन होना चाहिये।

पे कमीशन ने अपने से पहले कमीशन, वर्द्धकारी कमीशन, द्वारा महंगाई का भत्ता निर्धारित करने के लिये जो आधार निश्चित किया गया था उस को भी स्वीकार नहीं किया है। एक तरफ तो कमीशन यह मानता है कि निकट भविष्य में महंगाई को कम करना सरल नहीं होगा, लेकिन वह दूसरी तरफ मल वेतन भी नहीं बढ़ाना चाहता, क्योंकि वह समझता है कि ८० रुपये में हिन्दुस्तान में पढ़े लिखे, हट्टे कट्टे लोग मिल सकते हैं, इसलिये बेसिक सैलरी को बढ़ाने की मांग मानने के लिये कमीशन तैयार नहीं है। मैं समझता हूँ कि सरकार को अपने कर्मचारियों की तनख्वाह निर्धारित करते समय यह डिमांड और सप्लाई का नियम लागू नहीं करना चाहिये। अस्सी रुपया तो क्या, अगर वेतन और भी कम कर दिया जाये तो भी देश की परिस्थिति ऐसी है कि पढ़े लिखे लोग फिर भी काम करने के लिये तैयार हो जायेंगे। लेकिन सरकार को तो आदर्श मालिक के रूप में काम करना चाहिये। जब हम इंडस्ट्रियल वर्क्स के लिये निजी मालिक से अधिक वेतन और अधिक भत्ते की मांग करते हैं, तो सरकार के लिये आवश्यक है कि अपने कर्मचारियों को समुचित वेतन दे और महंगाई बढ़ने के साथ उन के महंगाई भत्ते में भी उसी प्रकार से वृद्धि होनी चाहिये। इस दृष्टि से प्रायोग की सिफारिशों पिछले पे कमीशन द्वारा निर्धारित आधार से भी पीछे चली जाती हैं।

जहां तक १२० या १२५ रुपये बेसिक सैलरी तै करने का सवाल है, मैं नहीं समझता कि आज की परिस्थिति में सरकार को उसे स्वीकार करने में क्यों आपत्ति होनी चाहिये। कहा जाता है कि अगर कमीशन की सभी सिफारिशों को स्वीकार कर लिया जाये, तो सरकार को ३१ करोड़ का व्यय देना होगा। मेरा निवेदन है कि कर्मचारियों से जो सुविधाएँ ली जा रही हैं, उन से अधिक काम करा के जो ग्रामदनी की जा रही है, उन के पासों में और उन के पी० टी० ग्राज० में जो कटौती

कर के बचत की जायेगी और जो अधिक काम के घंटों के परिणाम स्वरूप कर्मचारी सरकारी कोष में ग्रामदनी की वृद्धि करेंगे, अगर उस सब को जोड़ा जाये, तो सरकार ३१ करोड़ रुपया खर्च कर के घाटे में रहेगी, ऐसा मैं नहीं समझता। जो कर्मचारियों के संगठन हैं उन्होंने भी अपना कुछ हिसाब लगाया है और रेलवे के कर्मचारी यह दावा करते हैं कि वे स्वयं अधिक काम कर के कम से कम २६ करोड़ रुपया सरकार को देंगे। यह रेलवे कर्मचारियों का दावा है और मैं समझता हूँ कि इस दावे में तथ्य हैं।

श्री हरिश्चन्द्र माथुर : इस की जांच प्राप ने की होगी ?

श्री वाजपेयी : जी हां।

श्री हरिश्चन्द्र माथुर : वही तो हम सुनना चाहते हैं।

श्री वाजपेयी : अगर रेलवे कर्मचारी अधिक काम करेंगे और उन की सुविधाओं में कमी होगी, जैसा कि पे कमीशन की सिफारिशों के अनुसार हो रहा है, तो स्पष्ट है कि सरकार के कोष में बचत होगी और वह कर्मचारियों का ही योगदान होगा। लेकिन यदि सरकार को अपने कोष से भी कर्मचारियों के वेतन में या भत्ते में कुछ योगदान देना पड़ता है, तो मैं समझता हूँ सरकार को उस के लिये भी तैयार रहना चाहिये। अन्ततोगत्वा शासन तंत्र कर्मचारियों के भरोसे ही चलता है। ये कर्मचारी प्रामाणिक हों और निष्ठा के साथ अपना काम करें, हम उन से यह प्राप्ति करते हैं। इस प्राणय की अपीलें भी की जाती हैं। लेकिन इस बात का ध्यान रखना आवश्यक है कि पंचवर्षीय योजनाओं के चलते कर्मचारियों के जीवन स्तर में कमी नहीं होनी चाहिये जिस का आज संकट दिखायी देता है।

[श्री वाजपेयी]

वेतन आयोग ने जो विभिन्न सेवाओं में श्रेणियां हैं उन के लिए भी वेतन क्रम की कोई ठीक दर निर्धारित नहीं की। कोई वैज्ञानिक पद्धति के आधार पर वेतन क्रम की दरें तै की गयी हों ऐसा नहीं दिखायी देता। पोस्ट और टेलीग्राफ विभाग में और विशेष कर रेलवे में जो अलग अलग श्रेणियां हैं उनकी अलग अलग ग्रेड्स हैं और उन में उतार चढ़ाव है जिन के कारण कहीं एक दूसरे का संघर्ष होता है जो कर्मचारियों के मन में ईर्ष्या पैदा करता है, उन के काम करने की क्षमता को घटाता है। कमीशन से आशा की गयी थी कि वह इन सभी कैटेगरीज के बारे में विचार कर के उन के लिए वेतन क्रम की सिफारिश करेगी। मैं रेलवे में देखता हूँ। स्टेशन मास्टर हैं, प्रसिडेंट स्टेशन मास्टर हैं, उन की योग्यता की शर्तें अधिक हैं। उन के पास काम का भार अधिक है। मगर जो उन के ग्रेड हैं वह उन के उत्तरदायित्व के अनुकूल नहीं हैं। इस तरह के और भी उदाहरण दिये जा सकते हैं। कमीशन के लिए एक बड़ा काम था कि सेवाओं की विभिन्न श्रेणियों में जा कर उन के उत्तरदायित्व के अनुसार उन के वेतन भत्ते निर्धारित करता। लेकिन जो काम कमीशन ने नहीं किया वह सरकार कर सकती है। कुछ सिफारिशें अभी सरकार के विचाराधीन हैं। मेरा सुझाव है कि विशेषतः ऐसी सिफारिशें जो कर्मचारियों की वर्तमान सुविधाओं में कमी करती हैं, उन के संबंध में कोई अन्तिम निर्णय करने से पूर्व सरकार को कर्मचारियों के संगठनों के प्रतिनिधियों को बुलाना चाहिये, उन से बात करनी चाहिये, देश में आज जो परिस्थिति है उस के संबंध में उन को विश्वास में लेना चाहिये, और मैं समझता हूँ अगर कर्मचारियों के प्रतिनिधियों को बुलाया जायगा वार्ता की जायगी तो कोई ऐसा मार्ग निकल सकता है जिसमें कर्मचारियों को भी संतुष्ट किया जा सके और सरकार उन्हें अपना दृष्टिकोण

भी समझा दे। लेकिन अगर हमारे वित्त मंत्री दूर से बात करेंगे और कर्मचारियों को विश्वास में नहीं लेंगे, और सरकार पर कितना बोझ पड़ता है, इसी पक्ष पर बल दोगे और कर्मचारियों के अन्तःकरण में क्या प्रतिक्रिया होती है इस का ध्यान नहीं रखेंगे, तो मैं समझता हूँ कि कर्मचारियों में और भी असन्तोष पैदा होगा। ऐसी परिस्थिति उत्पन्न न हो इसलिए मेरा निवेदन है कि वित्त मंत्री जी को समय रहते कर्मचारियों के संगठनों को विश्वास में लेना चाहिये।

Shri Prabhat Kar (Hooghly): Madam Chairman, already many speakers have spoken about the recommendations of the Second Pay Commission. I feel that so far as the recommendations of the Second Pay Commission go, it has done great injustice not only to the Government employees but also to the accepted social concepts.

The Second Pay Commission was appointed on the demand of the employees and they demanded the appointment of a Second Pay Commission with a view to see that a revision is made in their emoluments because their emoluments were much less than what was required to maintain one's own commitments in the family. They did not want that immediately some *ad hoc* increase should be made by the Government. They wanted an enquiry should be made. What was the purpose for demanding this enquiry? It is a universally accepted fact and it has been admitted by the various tribunals and other commissions that the Government employees draw less than other employees in this country and their emoluments are much less than what is required to keep one's body and soul together.

The Central Government employees, as they did not want to create any complication by directly putting for-

ward their demands and asking the Government to immediately meet them, wanted that an enquiry should be made to find out what revision there should be in the emoluments of the employees. It is said that in a judicial enquiry in a court of law not only justice should be done but it should appear to have been done. The employees wanted justice to be done. I do not know what calculations they have made, but the very appearance and the fact that not only they have not been given any rise in their emoluments but there have been deductions clearly show that the demands of the employees have not been met and justice to their cause has not been done by the Pay Commission.

The year 1957, when the Pay Commission was appointed, was preceded by various awards of tribunals and Acts of Parliament. There was a certain set of accepted principles, accepted by the employers and employees and also by the judicial bodies in formulating the wage structure. It was accepted that while differing with the findings of a body the judges will always point out why they differed and where the difference is. There was the Fair Wages Committee's Report. There was the Minimum Wages Act. There were awards given by various tribunals. Apart from that, there was the 15th Indian Labour Conference. In all these, certain calculations accepted universally have been made in formulating the minimum wage for various categories of workers. But the Pay Commission has not taken any one of these into consideration. Not only that, they have not cared to say how the other judgments were wrong and why in formulating the minimum wage for the Central Government employees they have come to the conclusion which they have given in their recommendation.

It appears to me from the arguments that have been put forward that the Pay Commission was completely blind to the actual state of

affairs and the change in the social concept of the country or it was anxious only to see that no more burden may be put on the Government. It seems that they were anxious to readjust the books by debiting one page and crediting it in the other maintaining the same emoluments, make a show of it and present it before the country so that the Government may not have to spend any extra amount and at the same time there will be a readjustment of the emoluments given to the employees so far as the heads are concerned.

Secondly, in 1957, knowing the condition of the country, particularly the acute problem of unemployment, to consider the wage structure from the point of view of employment, to fix an amount by which it will be possible to get a man, I think, is not only bad but it is something obnoxious under the present concept of social change. We know very well that today because of the acute unemployment problem in the country it is easy to get a good number of educated persons on low emoluments, lower than what is granted today by the Central Government. Because you can get persons on low salaries, shall that be the criterion for deciding the minimum wage, shall that be taken into consideration when deciding the wage structure? In 1957, the second Pay Commission had taken that into consideration as to what would be the amount under which it would be easy for the Government to get persons in their employment.

Now, I do not know where there is any difference between the minimum wage given to one section of the people and that given to another section. So far as the minimum wage or the minimum requirement is concerned, it is the same, whether the man works in the private sector or in the public sector, because the commodities are not sold at different prices to an employee working in the private sector and an employee working in the public sector. The price of rice or of clothing or of anything for

[Shri Prabhatkar]

that matter is the same, and the shop-keeper does not ask his customer whether he is working in the Central Government or in the State Government or in the banking or any other industry. The cost will be the same. So, the minimum wage will be the same for every person working anywhere. But here, a calculation has been shown saying that Rs. 80 shall be the minimum wage for the Central Government employee, while it is being held by various tribunals and wage boards that even for an unskilled person the minimum wage should be Rs. 117 in all. I do not know how the second Pay Commission's recommendations can be justified when they are fixing a minimum wage. The minimum wage is not based on any other factor than the minimum requirement of a person. There have been various calculations by the wage boards, tribunals and others in fixing the minimum wage. While fixing the minimum wage for the Central Government employee, if the Central Pay Commission wanted to make a change, at least they should have given the reason why they are changing the findings of the various tribunals and boards who have fixed the minimum wage.

It is said in the recommendations that at the time of considering the minimum wage, the question of what will be the burden on the Government is a matter which has to be taken into consideration. I can understand that all these things should be taken into consideration and should be an important factor for the Commission to consider at the time of making or recommending a scale or granting any other amenities. But when they are fixing a minimum wage, how they can differ from the recommendations of the other tribunals and wage boards who have fixed a much higher minimum wage, taking into consideration the requirements of

the persons working in society and taking into consideration the abnormal rise in the price of the daily necessities of life today, is not understandable. How the Pay Commission can come to the conclusion in fixing a lower salary as the minimum wage for the Central Government employees, I have not been able to understand.

Looking at the scales recommended, as I was saying, it is purely a book adjustment. What the employees were getting under the head 'salary and dearness allowance' has been massed together and a new scale has been formulated. There the matter ends. It is a pure and simple book adjustment. Previously, it was Rs. 35. Now, it is Rs. 75, which is the starting salary. Along with dearness allowance, the total comes to Rs. 80. So, Rs. 45 plus Rs. 35 comes to Rs. 80. The minimum is Rs. 75. Formerly, the scale was Rs. 60—130. Now, it has been changed to Rs. 110—180. If we add Rs. 50 as dearness allowance, it comes to Rs. 110, and Rs. 130 was the maximum. To the maximum, if we add Rs. 55 as dearness allowance, it comes to Rs. 185. The grade has been fixed at Rs. 180 as the maximum.

As I was saying, only some book adjustment, debiting in one page and crediting in the other page has been done to make a show of some increase in the emoluments.

समाप्ति महोदय : सदन कल ११ बजे
तक स्थिति किया जाता है। श्री प्रभात कार
प्रश्नोत्तर भाषण कल जारी रहेंगे।

17 hrs.

The Lok Sabha then adjourned till
Eleven of the Clock on Friday,
February 12, 1960/Magha 23, 1881
(Saka).