

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: Is it a fact that this mine where the accident took place is under the contract system although the Implementation Committee had recommended that the contract system should not be resorted to, and that during this time, the workers were engaged in dressing another work in the dyke? Prior to that, hot water was coming out and in spite of that, the contractor insisted on the workers working there and after that the gas accident took place: is that a fact?

Shri L. N. Mishra: The hon. Member is giving details. We are expecting a report from the Inspector. When we get all the details, we shall see how the matter stands.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: Is it also a fact that the Inspectorate, although they were being phoned up by the Colliery Mazdoor Sabha, did not go to the spot till four hours after the accident was over?

Shri L. N. Mishra: I am not aware.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: This is most unsatisfactory. We would like to know if there is a court of enquiry, whether a court of enquiry is going to be set up, because this is a very disgraceful story about the management, the contract system and the Mining Department itself which has called it a non-gassy mine only a few months ago.

The Minister of Labour and Employment and Planning (Shri Nanda): The answer having been given that an enquiry is in progress, it should satisfy the hon. Member for the present. If any facts are revealed which require further action, we will certainly take.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: I want to know whether a court of enquiry has been held.

Shri Nanda: There is an enquiry. A court of enquiry is not held for every accident that occurs.

Mr. Speaker: If hon. Members who have tabled this Calling Attention notice have got any particular point for investigation, they will kindly write it out and sent to the Minister. He will pass it on.

Shri T. B. Vittal Rao (Khammam): Let us have the Inspector's report. On that we shall raise a debate.

12.19 hrs.

STATUTORY RESOLUTION RE: ESSENTIAL SERVICES MAINTENANCE AND MOTION RE: STRIKE OF SOME CENTRAL GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES—Contd.

Mr. Speaker: The House will now take up further discussion of the following Resolution moved by Shri Naushir Bharucha on the 8th August, 1960, namely:—

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

and also along with it further consideration of the Motion moved by the hon. Home Minister and the amendments that have been tabled and moved in this House. Shri Nath Pai.

Shri Nath Pai rose—

Shri M. Khuda Bukhsh (Murshidabad): On a point of order. I am stating a point of order and may, therefore, be permitted to read out from a manuscript. The Essential Services Maintenance Ordinance, 1960 has been challenged in two High Courts, namely the Madras and Calcutta High Courts, and in the process, articles of the Constitution have been invoked. Sir, it involves fundamental questions of freedom. I submit that the people of India are sovereign, and so are the Government elected by them.

[Shri M. Khuda Bakhsh]

That sovereignty is equally shared by the people and the Government.

Mr. Speaker: What is the point of order?

Shri M. Khuda Bakhsh: I am coming to that.

The people, therefore, should be left with the freedom to bring about a change of Government by peacefully and non-violently staying at home. It is their freedom with which Government dare not interfere. It is a matter of residuary sovereignty which must vest in the people. The whole matter is under judicial scrutiny and, therefore, *sub judice*. My point of order is: Can a Legislature debate a matter which is *sub judice*?

Mr. Speaker: In what courts is it *sub judice*?

Shri M. Khuda Bakhsh: In the High Courts of Madras and Calcutta.

Mr. Speaker: What is the point that has been raised?

Shri M. Khuda Bakhsh: The validity of the Essential Services Maintenance Ordinance has been questioned, and it has been said that it tantamounts to forced labour which is expressly forbidden in the Constitution.

Mr. Speaker: That is, *ultra vires* the Constitution?

Shri M. Khuda Bakhsh: That is the argument on which it has been challenged in the courts.

Shri Naushir Bharucha (East Khandesh): May I speak on the point of order, since this matter directly relates to my resolution? My submission is that the words '*sub judice*' must be very strictly and legally interpreted. It is true that the House cannot discuss a question which is *sub judice*, but what is *sub judice* is precisely the point which is raised in

a court of law and not the entire gamut of the Ordinance itself. If, according to my hon. friend, the Ordinance is being challenged by reason of the fact that under the Constitution, forced labour or veth is prohibited or forbidden, then we cannot discuss only the question whether a particular section of the Ordinance amounts to forced labour or not, but anything else can be discussed. Therefore, my submission is that if my hon. friend really satisfies the House that this was precisely the issue, then that issue need not be touched.

Secondly, the political aspect of the Ordinance certainly can be discussed, not the legal aspect, even on the question of forced labour. Therefore, my submission is that the words '*sub judice*' should be very strictly and legally interpreted.

The Minister of Home Affairs (Shri G. B. Pant): I do not fully agree with Shri Naushir Bharucha, but the resolution has been admitted, and it has already been discussed for one full day, namely yesterday, and I do not know how he can at this stage raise this point. I request you to declare the point of order as out of order.

Shri M. Khuda Bakhsh: If the point of order is upheld, then the business of the House can certainly be suspended.

Mr. Speaker: This point might have been raised yesterday. But apart from that, it is only those matters which are exactly before a court and on which the court's decision is invited, that cannot be discussed here. From what I have heard from the hon. Member, the question raised was that it would amount to forced labour and that would be against the Fundamental Rights guaranteed under the Constitution. Hon. Members will take care not to enter into the legality of this; otherwise, they can go into it.

Now, the hon. Prime Minister.

Shri Nath Pai (Rajapur): I submit that I was in possession of the floor of the House. You had called me earlier.

Mr. Speaker: I did not look this side. I shall call him next. Now, the hon. Prime Minister.

The Prime Minister and Minister of External Affairs (Shri Jawaharlal Nehru): In the course of the debate yesterday, many subjects were touched upon, the labour policy of Government, prices etc., and I suppose they were all relevant because almost anything can be brought within the scope of this discussion. I do not complain, but I think it will be better for us,—at any rate, I should endeavour to do so,—to confine ourselves to the specific points at issue in this debate. What are they? They are: consideration of the general strike, that is to say, broadly speaking, whether it was a desirable or a permissible act, and the steps Government took, and the Ordinance, and whether that also was permissible or desirable or not.

Now, in considering the question of the general strike, hon. Members went rather far afield, discussing labour policy and saying how one thing led to another, how it was the failure of Government, may be five years ago or ten years ago or a year ago or six months ago, that led to a certain state of affairs, which led to certain persons feeling that 'We should do something', which led to the sponsors of the strike to think that there should be a strike, which led to their forming a Council of Action. Of course, the stream of time goes on, and one thing leads to another. Nothing is isolated. It is rather difficult to consider anything in a completely isolated way. It is true that they are determining factors. But what we have to consider are not all those previous determining factors from the time when British rule was here, and for the last hundred years, which has resulted in the economy coming to the state which it was in when they left, and so on and so forth.

We have to consider in the existing circumstances as they existed two months ago, or three months ago or four months ago or whatever the period may be; when this call for a strike was given, in those existing circumstances, was that desirable, justified or permissible? Nothing more, nothing less; one may go into the other questions to consider the magnitude of the offence, and whether there were any extenuating circumstances. If there is a murder, there is a murder, there, the matter ends. But, in passing sentence, you will consider extenuating circumstances, no doubt. That is the first point.

So, forgetting everything that happened previously, was that general strike desirable or permissible, when the call for it was given and when it took place? And the second point is whether in view of that general strike call being given and coming, it was proper for Government to issue that Ordinance. These are two relatively simple points, although they are connected with many difficult circumstances.

Then hon. Member, Shri Asoka Mehta, warmly repudiated the idea that this was a political strike and expressed his sorrow that I had used the words 'civil rebellion' in connection with it. Without going into facts, I want to make a submission, and that is that every general strike is a political strike, and no general strike can be a general strike without being a political strike and without having far-reaching political consequences, apart from economic consequences and all that; in the nature of things, it must have that, regardless of what the sponsors may think or may not think. The sponsors of it may, in their naivety and simplicity, not see the consequences of something. That is a different matter, but I do say, and I say it with all the strength at my command that a general strike of the kind called for must essentially have wide far-reaching, political consequences, and, therefore, it is a political

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

strike in that respect. And you cannot escape from that conclusion. If that succeeds, it has tremendous political consequences; if it fails, it has not that type of political consequences, but still, political consequences and far-reaching economic consequences, causing loss to the nation and to the very unhappy persons who have been incited to go in for that strike.

That is the proposition that I would venture to ask this House to consider, this broad principle, regardless of the facts; and I submit that there can be no answer to this, to this fact that a general strike has very far-reaching political consequences, upsetting consequences, and in effect, subversive consequences. Whether they are meant or not is a matter for persons' minds, and I cannot probe into those minds, because my difficulty is this.

Shri Asoka Mehta spoke about the desirability of workers and labour generally becoming mature; true; what I am concerned with is the desirability of people who call for strikes becoming mature and considering questions with some maturity and not in this light-hearted way and not realising what the consequences are and then trying to ride a tiger when they cannot ride a donkey. (Interruptions) It is amazing; the irresponsibility of this whole thing is astounding. I am not going into the facts. The broad facts are there. Apart from the facts, the general principle I have laid down that a general strike is inevitably, in its very character, in its very consequences, a subversive act, is there. It may be justified or not; that is a different matter. But the justification of it must lead you to think and carry out a subversive act, with all its consequences.

Secondly, look at the nature of this strike. A call on the railways not to function. In other words, the vast organisation supplying food to various parts of the country to stop; the vast organisation supplying coal to our

major factories, steel plants to stop; industry to wind up, to stop. And I would venture to suggest also that we are making special efforts for the defence of the country, whether it is in our ordnance factories or whether it is on the border. It is true that some Members of this House make fun of this; some Members of this House imagine that all this is just bunkum; some Members of this House and some members of a Party in this House write and talk in the most light-hearted manner about the defence of this country and about the dangers to this country. I am amazed at the way they are carrying on intensive and continuous propaganda which does not befit any person who calls himself an Indian.

But the question is: Did those other gentlemen who sponsored the strike and who perhaps presumably do not have that outlook that the country should go to pieces, if necessary, did they think of the consequences, whether it is in the ordnance depots or whether it is on the frontier where every little bit has to be flown, food supplies etc? Every twig has to be flown there. Did they think of the consequences of the strike on that? I ventured with great deliberation to point this out to some extent in the broadcast I made prior to the strike, and I would beg of the House to consider, apart from the general principle, the actual consequences which could only be disastrous, to the food situation, to the industrial situation and to the defence situation.

One may say—as Shri Asoka Mehta said—‘You see, it was only a 25 per cent strike; therefore, it could not have such bad consequences’. I wonder if the sponsors of the strike had clearly thought out that it should be 25 per cent, no more and no less!

Shri Asoka Mehta (Muzaffarpur):
Only 25 per cent of the employees

had served notice of strike. This is the figure given by Government.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: True, I am accepting that. Did the sponsors of the strike want only 25 per cent of the government employees to serve notice?

Shri Asoka Mehta: That is obvious.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: It is not obvious. The obvious thing is that in spite of every effort of the sponsors of the strike, 75 per cent did not fall into line. I am pointing out the amazing and astounding irresponsibility of those persons who took up the strike. I say this regardless of the economic conditions; I say this regardless of the fact that the government employees may have hardships—let us deal with the hardships—regardless of the fact that they may have a valid point to raise; I say that in spite of all that, this action was a fundamentally wrong and vicious action.

What amazes me is that after this, after even seeing the failure of it, the collapse of it, even then, some of them have brazenly praised the strike and said: 'What good boys we are? We asked for the strike'. There is no element of repentance or even of intelligent discussion of any event. The least they could have done was to perform *prayaschit* for all the sins that they have committed. No, there is no evidence of doing that. There lies the danger.

All of us in our excitement—Government and the Opposition—err, but the test of a person is not that he does not err—only angels in heaven or saints may not, if there are such things; the test of a person is not that he does not err, but that he recognises his error when it takes place and tries to correct it. But among our friends on the opposite side, I have yet to find it out. I am not referring to everybody in the Opposition, but the sponsors of the strike.

I have yet to discover the least element of repentance, of an admission of error, although the error of all this stands out like a pikestaff for the whole world to see.

What is more—regardless of my views or other people's views—even they should know one basic fact, that the people of India as a whole were opposed to it. They dislike it, stood up against it and that put it down. No gleam of intelligence has entered into the heads or brains, or whatever it is, of those people.

Let us look at this. My first proposition—I repeat—is this, that a general strike must inevitably be a political strike, whatever you call it, whatever you think of it; there is no other way; it can be none else, because it has those large-scale consequences. Secondly, this particular strike, in the manner in which it was called, and everything, was inevitably to injure us and hurt basically the economy of the country, the food position of the country, the industrial position of the country and the defence position of the country. To what extent and what degree is another matter. That depended; the greater the failure of the strike, the lesser the effect on the country. That is true, but surely people who ask for a strike normally do not work for its failure. It comes in spite of them, in spite of all their efforts.

Therefore, I say it was an astonishingly irresponsible thing, a thing which could not possibly bring any benefit to those who had asked for the strike. I say 'could not', because if it fails—as any person who had thought about it would have realised that it was bound to fail—if it fails, it brings a sense of frustration on people who struck work. It always does. It brings material losses. I am not talking about the persons who misbehaved and might be punished—they, of course, suffer more—but I am talking of the general run of them, more or less innocent people who have been pushed either by hopes or fears, or whatever it is, into it. They suffer.

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

On the other hand, let us conceive of the strike succeeding in some measure—it is difficult to conceive it, it is not a strike that succeeds. Then certain political consequences flow from it, obviously. If this Parliament continued then, which it may or may not, somebody else would be sitting here in these Benches and we—this Government—would be somewhere else. All kinds of consequences flow from that and this whole process of success, if it came, would have done, for the time being, very very heavy economic damage.

Mr. Speaker: Is the hon. Prime Minister sure that there will be a Parliament then?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I said so. I said, I do not know if there will be a Parliament if a strike like this succeeds. I am not at all sure that the Parliament will function after that, or what form of Parliament, I do not know; because it is not the parliamentary way of making changes. Once you adopt the course of direct action in a general strike—not a small strike—if you adopt a general strike in that way, you hit at the roots of parliamentary and democratic government.

Therefore, I venture to say that this was an act—and I am putting it at the highest—of utterly irresponsible, immature persons who somehow got on the back of this tiger and did not know what to do. They could not get off it, and there they were. That was very difficult. It is always a difficult thing for immature people who do not know riding to get at the backs of animals. That is true.

As I have said, this strike was a wrong thing; I say, whatever the provocation for it, I put it at the highest, it was a wrong thing. And yet, what was the provocation? The provocation was that the Pay Commission had not done justice to certain claims. That was the provocation. Now, at the utmost it may be said that there can be two opinions about it.

After all the Pay Commission was not a Commission of politicians of this party or that party. It consisted of, broadly speaking, people outside party politics and all the rest, very eminent people, a very eminent judge who spent two or three years over this matter. Now, that does not necessarily mean that the Pay Commission and the Supreme Court Judge were right. But it does create a very strong presumption that they are likely to be right. I would not dare say. 'No' to them. I have not that knowledge; I have not spent 2 years of consideration. And, I may not even venture to say, disagree, if you like. But, after all, the least that can be done is to show respect to them. You may not wholly agree.

Now, where there is on this question—if you like, a very important and vital matter—some difference of opinion, on the one side, you put this Pay Commission and the Supreme Court and all that, and, on the other, state your own view. I say, your view may, perhaps, be right. But, is it right to the extent of your upsetting the country, it is right to the extent of your calling for some action like a general strike, which has all these grave consequences and which, at the same time, puts an end practically to any future procedure of Pay Commissions and the like, because no decent man is going to serve on such Commissions after that, if peace is to be thrown overboard like this. So, I put it to you how, whether on grounds of principle or on grounds of common sense, one is to justify it. I should like to know that. In justification, all the people will tell you, as Shri Asoka Mehta partly did, and others may do, Oh, this happened in 1955, this happened in 1956 and this happened in 1958. I say, I accept all that and say, in spite of all that and taking them into consideration, it was a very wrong and a very irresponsible thing to do. I am not for the moment going into arguments about that.

Let us discuss the labour policy fully; let us discuss the price policy fully and let us discuss any policy

fully. But, what has all that got to do with a general strike which upsets the country and ruins the country? And, what time did they choose for this? Just when, after a great effort, after years or months of labour, we produced the draft of the Third Five Year Plan. That is the time chosen—may be not deliberately chosen, may be accidentally chosen, whatever it is—that was the time, when all effort is being made for the country's mind to be directed into constructive channels of hard work, etc. Here was a heavy burden to carry. And they have come out to have a general strike. Is that the idea of the future of India? Is that how they are going to build up the future of India?

I have the greatest respect to hon. Members of the Opposition, but that respect does not lead me to the belief that they always think before they act, or, perhaps, that they think at all about these serious matters. It is easy for me, and I know it is easy for hon. Members to deliver speeches here. I can talk fluently and Shri Asoka Mehta can talk with his usual eloquence and vigour. That is true. I know that is a separate problem. After all, behind the speeches there are problems or behind the speeches there are conditions in this country which cannot be swept away by speeches. I put it to the House, are they going to meet or are they going to solve any one of these questions by this method of the general strike just when we are struggling hard to get out of this morass of poverty? How? By hard work, by capital accumulation, by savings and all that; and things are suggested which, practically cannot be done, unless, of course you decide to put an end to planning. No doubt that would please Shri Masani. That does not matter. (*Interruption*). Because, then, we shall arrive at that paradise of private enterprise when there are no checks and the private entrepreneur flourishes like the green bay tree. (*Interruptions*).

Shri M. R. Masani (Ranchi-East): Nobody advocates that at all, and you know it.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Unfortunately, this is our misfortune that even private enterprise which shows some intelligence in other countries, even capitalism which has become, to some extent, a modernised form of the old type of capitalists, even in countries like America or England or France or elsewhere, even that degree of modernity has not come to our capitalism.

Shri M. R. Masani: Nor to your socialism.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: And so I find with an ever-increasing amazement the type of stuff that is doled out here in the name of capitalism and private enterprise, and the type of stuff that is doled out against planning etc. which nobody in the wide world, except some persons with hardly any intelligence, can accept in any way.

Again, as I mentioned, after all when you take big steps where you have to act in a big way you have to look in a big way. I have talked about the Indian situation, about the Five Year Plan, about our frontier situation. I do not mean to say that war is breaking out on the frontier. But, it should be realised—I hope the Members of the Communist Party will also realise in spite of the various coloured goggles that they wear which prevents them from seeing straight—that these are serious matters which this country is dealing with and we are exercising ourselves to the utmost, that there are burdens that we have to carry because of this frontier and because of other things. We do not always shout about them. The fact remains that these are grave and graver burdens and graver situations we will have to face from day to day, not situations in which we can play about with general strikes and the like because we find we have a game to play.

Apart from all this, look at the larger world situation. Everyone knows or everyone ought to know that in the last 3 months or so, the

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

world situation has deteriorated greatly. Ever since the U-2 episode and failure of the summit and some other things, it goes on deteriorating. It is a dangerous situation and no man knows where the war may break out, whether it is in Africa or in Europe or in Asia. Do people realise all this when they play about with words in this House and play about with strike notices and constitute what is called a 'Council of Action'?

This is a most remarkable development in Indian life. I do not know when the Councils of Action started. I have a vague idea that they started in the student world. And, the student mentality may be excused. But, surely, after a certain age, it functions more maturely. (*Interruptions*). And, curiously enough, the Council of Action was constituted for this strike. The strike is for a period but the Council of Action continues, and meets.

Therefore, I say we have to consider these matters. I have no doubt at all that in the circumstances that arose here, that is, appeal to the strike, any government, whatever its complexion, would inevitably have had to take up that challenge. There is no choice about it.

Seth Govind Das talks about my *udar niti* and all this. I am glad if I function in an *udar* way, in a soft way. However, the point is that any Government faced with that situation inevitably had to take up the challenge. Not to take it up meant that they should resign, retire or leave it to others. It had to be done. If it had to be done, it was quite inevitable to have some legal apparatus to deal with this situation—that is, the Ordinance. It is the most extra-ordinary thing to indulge in all kinds of aggressive or even violent activities and then complaining: Oh!, we have been shown harshness; we have been put in prison; this has happened or that has happened. Nobody likes harshness. But if you take up some activity which leads to war,

war follows. It is no good expecting a one-sided war in which one party hits out and damages and does everything and the other meekly submitting. True, that is undoubtedly the policy which the great men, the great saints have advocated and I have no doubt that Acharya Kripalani who is a great student of saints and others may advocate it. But I am not aware of a Government, anywhere, of any complexion that puts up with this: to be hit and broken and for action to take place in front of the Government and ruining the Government and the country which seeks to govern and then to be told: do not hit out and do not do anything as this is against this or or that. In a situation like this, the Government is not only justified but it is incumbent upon it to take every step whatever the step may be to protect the country's interests.

Raja Mahendra Pratap (Mathura):

One word only. You are the successful Commander in this case. Ridicule not your defeated Generals.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: There is one other relatively small matter. After the Pay Commission report and after the Government's major decisions on it were announced—I do not remember the dates—I can very well understand that among the Government employees and others concerned, there was a measure of disappointment. They expected more. Maybe, if I had been in their position, I would have expected more. That is natural and I have no grievance against their feeling that way because, after all conditions in India being what they are, most people live under strains, pressures and difficulties. It may be that Government employees are better off than many. But nevertheless we do not normally go about comparing our case with others and feel that we are better and therefore, we should be happy. I admit that and it is a matter which should be separately dealt with in other ways. Anyhow, there was no talk and no mention of the strike for several

months. Oddly enough, the question that was raised and to which objection was taken was that of Saturday holidays—not, I venture to say—a major question. It may be a question to object to or not but it was not—I venture to say—a question on which to have a strike. I do not wish to express any opinion for or against Saturday holidays except that, broadly, I believe that there are far too many holidays in this country and far too little work done at all stages and ranks and unless we work much harder than we do, we do not want to produce the results we aim at. However, my point is that it was on the basis of Saturday holiday that a demonstration was made—not on anything else—and that too, months afterwards. It may be—I venture to guess—that seeing that the Saturday holiday itself had brought quite a large number of people to demonstrate, they thought: why not add something else to it and have bigger demonstrations and even bigger strikes? So, gradually, the idea of a strike came months after this originated. It is not a sudden reaction. It was coldly thought out, months after the reactions should have taken place. Then this came about.

Now, I should like to say a few words about the real thing that should concern us. The strike is over with all the harm it did and the good it did—good in the sense of making people think about these problems and discuss these problems in this way and the popular response that came about because they thought about it. That was good. But it did harm. But the main good that it had done, I hope, is that it has made us think about the future. What of the future? That is really the important thing because this business of settling things by strikes and lockouts is not the logical or a reasonable way. I have been connected enough with labour. I do not pretend to be an expert like our friends on that side but I have been connected enough with labour to realise the enormous

value that labour attaches to the strike weapon because that has saved them for the last hundred years or so from being drowned, sat upon and crushed—organisation and ultimately sometimes strikes. I am not belittling that. Nevertheless, I think the way of settling things by strikes is an outmoded way. I do not, for a moment refer to the ordinary industrial strikes. I am not suggesting that the strikes should be banned or forbidden because the fact of the matter is that strike is an inevitable concomitant of the capitalist system. If you have capitalists and have employer—employee relations, then you have to have something to protect the employee from the employers' pressures and other things.

Shri M. R. Masani: In that case how was there a strike by the steel workers at Pozuan in communist Poland?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I do repeat—strikes may occur and do occur, I believe, in communist system.

Shri Ranga (Tenali): Do they?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: But not in that big way, because they are suppressed. There too something happens which they dislike or whatever the reason may be. But I say: in theory, the socialist structure of society has no room for strikes—in theory. In practice, it may fail. It may not be perfect. But the capitalist structure is based on strikes—I say the theory of it—although in modern capitalism an attempt is being made to get out of this. But it has not gone far but in some cases it has succeeded remarkably even in America or U.K. or elsewhere. That is because people realise that the whole method of settling disputes by strike or lockouts is completely out of date and it is a foolish method. If you take up the wider international sphere, in the old days people thought that war should settle questions between nations. In spite of its folly and the terrible damage, it was in human nature to fight and to bring about a new equilibrium.

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

13 hrs.

Well, the question of war has proceeded so far that now we think in terms of nuclear war, hydrogen bombs and the like, with the result that nobody, barring a very few persons, wants big-scale war. Most people do not want even small-scale war because small-scale wars will lead to big-scale wars; that is to say, people have been forced by circumstances to come to this conclusion that national and international problems must not be settled by war because war does not settle, there is no victory, there is no defeat, there is just extinction, probably today.

Now, we think about that, but somehow or the other we are still caught up in, may I use the word, our past *karma*. We cannot get out. Nations cannot get out of their past misdeeds. And while we talk and we realise logically that war must be ended, still we arm, still we go on arming and spying at each other living on the brink of war all the time and any day it may break out. Anyhow, it is realised that it is bad.

Now, I submit to you that this kind of industrial war is also out of date. But it is no good my saying that and no good my banning this kind of thing unless we can produce an adequate substitute for the settlement of such disputes, controversies that might arise. Therefore, it becomes of the greatest importance, this constructive approach, people talking about banning this or that. I do think and I agree with my colleague the Home Minister that in regard to essential activities, essential services, strikes should particularly be avoided and should not take place because of their far-reaching consequences. In regard to Government employees the position is still more serious, it takes you still further, because they are the very structure in a Government which looks after its people. If that steel structure breaks down, then the resultant is likely to be chaotic. So that is all right. But it is essential to devise

means which can progressively, as a question or a difficulty arises, solve that. That is quite essential.

The procedure may vary. For instance, for the Government employees in the Secretariat etc. there may be one procedure. Sometimes it is referred to, particularly, as the Whitely procedure. It is practised in England and adapted in India, not copied as it is, and we must take the consequences of it, the full consequences. In other places it may be in some other way.

The point is that the world has grown so much, changed so much that these old conceptions, whether capitalist or any other or, if I may venture to say so, even the old socialist approach or the old capitalist approach, both are out of date and you have to think in terms of this new world, a world in which there is plenty or potential plenty. In our case it is potential plenty and in the case of America, England or Russia it is plenty today; whatever the other ills may be it is plenty in a way, whether they proceeded by the capitalist way or the socialist way or the communist way they have achieved plenty and they will go on adding to that plenty because ultimately, whatever their arguments may be, they are using modern science, modern technology and the rest. I am not for a moment defending anything or attacking it, I am merely stating a fact, that they have achieved plenty by the adoption of these methods

[आचार्य कृपलानी : रशियः में
तो जूते भी नहीं मिलते हैं]

I have no doubt that in India we can also and we will also achieve plenty by adopting not exactly their methods but by adopting the methods of science which is a common factor of communism, socialism, capitalism and all that. All these are rather superficial arguments behind the fact of modern science and technology and the human mind. That is the real thing. If we have

that we shall proceed and progress; plus labour because without hard work nothing can be done. All this has led to a completely different way of thinking in many places and a new sense of social responsibility has grown everywhere whether it is in the capitalist country or elsewhere. There is a sense of social responsibility growing together with the anarchism of capitalism. The sense of social responsibility is growing and eating into the old-styled capitalist method. And, of course, the whole of socialism is based on a sense of social responsibility, otherwise it has no meaning. The form it should take, again, depends on circumstances, it is not for me to lay down. Anyhow, as I said, in this new world this old-world approach of strikes, of breaking up, of breaking up in order perhaps to construct later, is not good enough, it is not logical, it is not sensible, it is not reasonable and, certainly, it is not democratic.

Shri Masani referred to democracy in a particular sense. Apparently, and that is a curious factor which has always surprised me, the leaders of private enterprise conceive of democracy in terms only of private enterprise, in terms of a capitalist structure of society, a remarkable thing because nothing can be more opposed to democracy than this chaotic private enterprise, a system which creates ups and downs and all that. It is essentially opposed to democracy. Political democracy they have got and have managed to carry on because of various reasons, science and technology and all that, with an absence of democracy in industry.

Shri M. R. Masani: You must be talking of People's Democracy.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: But the normal growth is economic democracy also. The normal growth is ultimately a stage where there is no employer, no employee, they are partners in a common concern and playing their equal parts (*Interruption*).

Therefore, it is up to us, in discussing these matters, not to lose ourselves in past disputes. We have to have post-mortems whenever deaths take place. A major death has taken place and we have the corpse of the general strike. We have to have a post mortem of it. But the real thing is the future. The major thing is how to evolve a system both for our general industry and the government employees but, for the moment, more particularly, I would like to concentrate on government employees.

Government employees, again, are of two types. There are the Secretariat type of employees, the office type, and there are the industrial employees. There are slight differences. They may be treated somewhat differently depending on circumstances. The second is the broad industrial employment which is growing and growing in India. We have to devise methods, we have to devise a machinery, not even this Pay Commission machinery, which is useful enough, but which is rather a slow-moving machine, which after many years it should be. One cannot change pays, but there are so many other things. I do believe that the real thing that the Government should pay first attention to is not so much pay and salaries but to the amenities that are offered to its employees, whether it is education, whether it is health, whether it is housing and so on. These things are more important than a little rise in salary, certainly. Amenities perhaps are more easy to give. So, that, I submit, should be the approach to this problem.

So far as this particular debate is concerned, I do submit, with all humility, that any person who would care to think about it can arrive at only one conclusion, namely, that general strikes are unreasonable in the modern day; they are bad; and this particular general strike was vicious and so foolish as to pass comprehension. It has occurred, and it is over. Let us realise that it was a bad thing and let us atone for it and perform *Prayashchita*.

Shri Nath Pai: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am reminded of an episode in the *Manusmriti* where Angiras being young was charged by those with whom he had the audacity of disagreeing, and they took the quarrel to Brahamadev. This is the *sloka* from *Manusmriti* which I venture to quote:

न तेन वृद्धो भवति येनास्य पलितं शिरः

यो वै युवाः सघ्नियानस्तदेवा स्वविरं विदुः ।

It says like this: that it is not an offence to be young, and maturity and mere grey-hair do not necessarily go together. It is the tradition of this country that we try to judge issues on their merits and not by introducing extraneous considerations into it. It was a pity that yesterday some speeches introduced a spirit of acrimony and polemics. I had hoped that we would succeed in trying to place before the country a clear record of the events that led to the strike in spite of all the ridicule and the contempt which the Prime Minister has thought fit to pour on the heads of those who, in their own way, had tried to learn from his own earlier teachings to whom he had been consistently saying that the starving men must resist, and for whom all his sympathies were reserved all these years. That we took his teachings too seriously and tried to act upon them according to our light.

But, in spite of all the unkind things which he thinks it fit that he should say, even when according to him, the battle is over, I will try to confine myself to the bare facts of the issue. Why did the strike become unavoidable? Was it an act of irresponsibility? Was it an act of all those who wanted to act in harmony with a foreign power? The simple reason, and the real reply to this is that we do not have a machinery in this country for solving disputes, for ventilating grievances, and for solving the disputes by negotiation, so that these drift into disputes and the disputes develop into conflicts.

It is true that we have a Labour Ministry and in Shri Nanda we have a man of integrity, sincerity and ability. It is a remarkable thing that all these virtues are reduced to futility because of the attitudes of the Government. May, I Sir, be permitted to quote a letter of the Prime Minister himself who agrees with this analysis, in his letter to the Chief Minister of States, dated 30th June? This is what the Prime Minister says, and here is the plea which I am raising as to why the strike became inevitable. He says :

"We have thus far not evolved any adequate machinery for the rapid settlement of disputes of this type. The Government's way of dealing with such matters is a leisurely way, and months and even years pass sometimes before we come to grips with the problem; a problem which perhaps could have been solved with greater ease, becomes more difficult. Frustration takes place and passions are aroused, and these lead to a conflict which is ultimately good for no one."

This is my plea too. This is what the Prime Minister has said in his letter to his provincial colleagues and lieutenants. (*Interruptions*). This is one tragedy of life in this country that in spite of all the lessons we never try to act unless sufficient pressure is generated. It is not a question of acting. (*Interruptions*.)

Shri Ramanathan Chettiar (Pudukottai): Sir, on a point of order. How is the hon. Member's quotation relevant? The hon. Member opposite is reading a letter purported to have been written by the Prime Minister to the Chief Ministers of the States. It is a confidential document. How can he get the document and read it? (*Interruption*).

Shri Nath Pai: The reply to that is very simple. (*Interruption*).

Mr. Speaker: Order, order, I have heard the point of order. There is no point of order. (*Laughter*).

Shri Nath Pai: May I satisfy him by saying that what the Prime Minister writes is part of national literature.

Mr. Speaker: I think it was quoted yesterday.

An Hon. Member: Yes, Sir.

Shri Nath Pai: The other point is the attitude in the higher echelons of the administrative machinery of the country. These offices reek with the stench of snobbery. The higher officials feel nothing but contempt for what they call the Class III and Class IV clerks and *babus*. Unfortunately, the others reciprocate that with lack of respect, and we get this unhappy atmosphere in our departments. But who is mainly responsible for this state of affairs?

Here, may I again have the audacity of quoting the Prime Minister on this issue also? He has said:

"Among those who have served in the I.C.S. or other inferior services, there will be many Indian or foreigners whose services we may welcome when we have become free, but of one thing I am quite sure: that no new order can be built in India so long as the spirit of the I.C.S. pervades over administration, and our public services. That spirit of authoritarianism and ally of imperialism cannot co-exist with that freedom. The new India must be served by earnest, efficient workers who have an ardent faith in the cause that they serve and are bent on achievements."

Here is again a confirmation of what I wanted to say. There was this spirit of hostility; there was the spirit of contempt towards those employees.

Thirdly, I would like to mention a very serious point. There are some people who can be generally defined as the authorities of the country who are not reconciled to the goal of socialism and who have never taken kindly to the objective that this country should march towards socialism, but who because of the fear only of the Prime Minister, as he always succeeds in bullying his allies and his associates, are paying lip-sympathy to the idea of socialism. This is why a strike becomes inevitable. This is what happened in the United Kingdom. May I quote, here from the best book on the subject *The General Strike* by Julian Symons to show why strikes become inevitable? It is said in this book:

"...some kind of showdown must take place between the Government and the trade union, was strong in the Cabinet..... Some Ministers were anxious to see the struggle, joined on almost any pretext... Thus, although there were individuals in the Cabinet who would have liked to see a negotiated settlement, both before and during the strike, they never provided a coherent opposition to the inflexible attitude to Mr. Churchill."

Well, I do not know; it will be for future historians to say who played the part of Churchill in seeing that every effort made for negotiation, every request we made for settlement, was contemptuously turned down. That will be a task for the future student of history and research to find out.

Then, because of the cumulative effect of this and because of the past experience of the employees, the situation began to develop where they were not finding any way. But still, did we become desperate? I was very pained when I listened to the Prime Minister. I could understand his anger, but I could not understand from our Prime Minister this disregard for truth. He says that the

[Shri Nath Pai]

first complaint we raised was about the salaried holidays. With your permission, I would quote a little later that he wrote in reply to my letter of the 16th January. In our letter, all the relevant issues were given in detail for his kind consideration. It is very unfair for them to come and say that "we saw some demonstration" and say, "why not add a little fuel to the fire to make fun of a general strike." This is how my plea ended:

"I feel a genuine effort should be made to thrash out acceptable solutions and the matter should not be allowed to drift. I therefore plead with you once again to take action, in convening a conference which will be charged with the task of meeting the legitimate demands of the employees where the Pay Commission has given them a raw deal."

The Prime Minister was kind enough to reply, the next day, and he stated that there was no need for such things. But to say that suddenly we come one day and demand all other things, without having given any premonition, any notice, without having made any effort to persuade the Government to see the legitimacy of our claims is patently unfair and is not in keeping with the true facts. There was this House in which a plea was made by me, which was yesterday quoted by an hon. Member. I continued my effort with all other Ministers. I had written a letter to the hon. Home Minister. The reply being marked 'personal', it will not be fair to quote from it. But the approach of the Government remained the same. What was it? It was, in the words of the Home Minister, "the fundamental issue of the sanctity of the award." The award came from a high-powered body and therefore, it must be respected. True enough. But has it been the record of the Government with regard to the Pay Commission? Had it not itself modi-

fied the recommendations of the Pay Commission? Is it even today accepting all the Pay Commission's recommendations, may I ask?

Yesterday the Home Minister said that we are going to ban the strikes. The Pay Commission has given its verdict clearly against the banning of the strike. The Pay Commission said that the present law is adequate to deal with any situation. Regarding the withdrawal of recognition, the Pay Commission has said something to which his present attitude is opposed. The Pay Commission has said that strikes need not be banned in this country, the present law is enough for it and with regard to the unions, a general liberal attitude may be adopted. Is this the respect for the sanctity of the award? When only the employee comes and says, "let us modify it to remove some of our grievances", he is accused of defying the sanctity of the Pay Commission's recommendations.

I want to ask the Government whether the same consideration was extended to all the other Commissions, particularly—as a student of law, as a very immature one, but as one who knows the law, I should ask—what has happened to the recommendations of the Law Commission presided over by the best judicial minds of the country? With contempt, they have been pigeon-holed and when we were trying to raise the same issue about some of their major recommendations, what did Government do? But we leave that aside and ask, has the Government followed a consistent policy with regard to the Pay Commissions? Had it always followed a consistent policy of upholding the sanctity of the Pay Commission, then the first Pay Commission's recommendations would not have been flouted the way they were.

I am sorry he thinks fit to use the word 'threat' in connection with a strike notice. It was the registration

Ordinance and Strike

of a protest, raising the cry of appeal and it requires a great stretch of imagination to distort it as a threat. On three occasions in 1948, 1951 and 1957, on every occasion, when everything else failed, the Government employees got up and said, "In that case, if every other door is locked and barred against us, then we may have to go on strike". It was under this accumulated pressure that grants of Rs. 10 and Rs. 5 have been made. It is a tragedy of our national life that a premium has been placed on building pressures and then only justice has been done. This happened to the first Pay Commission's recommendations and the Government could be persuaded to implement them only under accumulated pressure of all Government employees. The same happened again with regard to the second Pay Commission.

What was happening? Beginning with December to the end of June, this was the effort. We appealed to the Prime Minister to use his unparalleled authority and influence to thrash out solutions to meet legitimate grievances. It was an extraordinary thing to hear him quote a figure of Rs. 750 crores as the possible burden for the five-year period if the demands were met. May I say that two images came to my mind as I listened to his touching and moving speech? One was that of Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, the idealist of 1926, who was moved to tears at the plight of the British working class and the other of the Prime Minister of India of 1960, whom the tearful appeals of his own employees failed to move to do justice. What a tragedy it is for many that his appeal should go unheeded! There is something wrong—he makes an appeal and a large number of people think it just correct and even honourable to disregard and defy that appeal. This was not an act of mutiny or rebellion. It was a pointer to him that there may be something wrong in the approach they were making.

That appeal of the employees was distorted into a threat and having taken this wrong posture, wrong measures were adopted by the Government. The whole thing began to break, on what? Because of my obstinacy and that of my friends, because of our immaturity and our inability to ride a tiger! I have not met men who ride tigers. I quite plead I do not know how to ride a tiger. But it was not the tiger that was generated. Why distort him as a tiger?

An appeal was made to him. It was a simple question of slightly modifying the dearness allowance formula of the Pay Commission's recommendation. That formula was inadequate. Why? Let me tell them very simple economic facts. Even the *Eastern Economist*, which has been, of course, clamouring for my prosecution and so cannot be taken as very kindly to us and fond of us, points this out regarding the dearness allowance. The one crucial point on which ultimately the negotiations broke in spite of the innumerable formulae which we proposed was this. Not one formula was submitted for their consideration, but a variety of formulae. As Shri Asoka Mehta, Shri Masani and some others have ventured to point out to this House, the real wages of the employees have since 1947 gone down, while there is talk of prosperity 40 per cent increase in national income, 20 per cent increase in *per capita* income etc.?

Where is all this going? The late Dr. John Mathai had demanded one thing and we are going to repeat that demand in this House. An enquiry must be instituted into the channels into which this new wealth is finding its way. Where is this wealth going? Every year figures are given about increasing national wealth. Into whose pockets or safety vaults is this wealth going and what is the share of the average man in it?

The Home Minister in his masterful handing of rhetoric yesterday

[Shri Nath Pai]

said, it is like asking Paul to give away half his loin cloth to Peter. The Government employees was not asking them to do any such injustice. The Government employee was pleading on behalf of the millions of Pauls and Peters in this country who are going about naked, when there is an accumulation of wealth in a certain sector. May I point out, therefore, that this plea for dearness allowance being linked with the cost of living index was a most legitimate one? Here is the consolidated opinion of a paper, which is not very fond of us, I think, or of our policies:

"When the new pay scales come into effect very shortly, it is estimated that the average value of the consumer price index for 1960 might be around 125. The employee would need about Rs. 86—Rs. 6 more than his minimum pay. In order to neutralise fully the rise in price level."

So, they do not give him what he was getting in 1947, there is all this talk about growing prosperity. Is it too much of an offence, is it very anti-social or anti-national to ask not for a share in the growing prosperity, but at least let us have what we were getting in 1947.....

Shri Asoka Mehta: And given by the Pay Commission.

Shri Nath Pai: Yes. The salary of Rs. 80 is not even what he was getting in 1947. This particular paper shows how year after year there has been a gap in his real earnings. This is available at page 137, because I do not want to take your time. In every year beginning from 1947, except the two years when nature helped us with a bumper crop and there was a slight improvement, in every one of the 13 years, there was a real drop and fall in the real earnings of the employees. Is this very much convincing proof of our being very sincere about a fairer share? This is the tragedy. We thought slogans we

mouth about Welfare State, socialism and all that are seriously meant and the poor employees thought, of course, that they could make a legitimate effort to get from implemented.

It was the Government's adamant attitude on this very simple and legitimate issue of dearness allowance on which broke the negotiations. If it was a political weapon in our hands, why did you not try to prove us wrong by accepting one of the many formulae? We would have been proved wrong if you would have insisted on it. This was the only economic demand out of the six, because on the demand of the basic wage, it was fully indicated to Shri Nanda that we are not going to press, provided Government accepted the principle of it and the progressive realisation of it. It was, therefore, the Government's adamant attitude and its determination to teach a lesson to those who wanted seriously to talk about a Welfare State and a fair share that led to the strike.

I am sorry that he feels that we should come in a repentant mood. Repentant about what? Repentant about having the courage of your conviction? What was wrong in it? Times without number I stated here that it is an appeal to the Government, it is not a threat to its authority, it is not a challenge to its authority. And we made it very clear that every Government employee in this country will die, if he is a postal man, defending a postal box rather than see it fall into the hands of an enemy and if he is a railway boy he will defend each fish-plate by laying down his life rather than see it go to a foreigner. Still they come back and say "all this is disregarded contemptuously" and then an accusation is made that a foreign country would have derived benefit from this. I hope after all this earnest plea that we should sooner than later drop these unfair and unjustifiable attacks and accusations. It is very unfair.

Such a strike happened in England and how did the Government behave with regard to it? The historians say that no one-tenth of the emergency powers were employed. What happened in India? How was the strike conducted?

Shri G. B. Pant: When did the Government servants strike there?

Shri Nath Pai: I am referring to the 1926 general strike in Britain. And the attitude the Government then adopted is comparable to what happened in this country. The role played by the entire apparatus of the State turned against the employee. It was a unique spectacle. Here were small, unknown, insignificant men, we know. There was the apparatus of the Government with all its resources, with all the prestige of the man after whom this era will perhaps be named. It was an unequal fight. But was at least *Dharma* followed? Why there is talk of *Prayashchitha*? Was any regard for truth shown? What happened to the All India Radio. Mr. Speaker, this is how the BBC behaved during that episode and this is what the historians have to say:

"The attempt to maintain impartiality was genuine. The BBC broadcast messages from the General Council as well as messages from Downing Street. It quoted speeches of trade union leaders in Parliament and out of it. It referred to the *British Worker* as well as to the *British Gazette*."

Mr. Churchill was thinking that the BBC's broadcasts would be turned to full use to suppress the strike. But there were men in the BBC like Mr. Reith, after whom the lecture series were started, who had honesty and courage to say "I am not a propaganda instrument of any party or any Government. I am here to carry on the education of and information to the British people". I do not know when the All India Radio will rise to

that standard. (*Interruptions*). It has won a temporary gain, a temporary victory against whom victory has no meaning. But it has lost something permanent; and that is a tragedy for all of us. Nothing is more dangerous for a country than the people of the country should lose complete faith in the integrity and impartiality of its chief instrument, chief agency of information, and that is the tragedy by its partisan spirit the All India Radio has brought upon it.

Yesterday the Home Minister referred to some effigies being burnt. One is very pained that such things should have happened. We are as much pained as he is that such things should have happened. I condemn it and we are one with him in condemning this kind of practice. But this is an unfortunate hangover from past practices which all of us taught to our people. Let us be patient and not try to exploit this in this unjust manner. I am one with him in condemning this. But I would go deeper, in spite of my immaturity, and ask: what is this continuation of, what is this hangover of? It is the hangover of those days when we thought of doing this thing as a legitimate expression of our disagreement. I would like, therefore, not to see more, though I agree in condemning it, than there is really in it.

Then I come to the violence business. May I just narrate one small touching episode which we witnessed? They are talking of that victory over the Government employees. They are free to do that. I am sorry for any mistakes we have committed. I will reciprocate the magnanimity which he now and then brings when he is not very angry with somebody that mistakes might have been committed on either side. We might have done it. But we are not guilty of any thing, and this we cannot accept whosoever may be the accuser and when all these passions settle down, when we are a little removed from the event and when the heat is lost perhaps a better verdict will be passed. We had made supreme efforts

[Shri Nath Pai]

in seeing that in evolving solutions to the employees' demands those solutions must not be permitted even in the remotest degree to injure the larger interests of the community. We did it and if, Mr. Speaker, we failed in persuading those who had the power to listen to us it was the misfortune, it was perhaps the inefficiency of our persuasion though we pleaded in earnest. We called upon the employees in Assam not to go on strike; so also in Ladakh and in the border areas. Is this an evidence of irresponsibility? Is this a case of lack of consideration for the nation's interest?

Mr. Speaker, much back-slapping is done about the firmness of Government. We would like our Government to act with firmness. We would be very happy and we would be the first to congratulate and doress. But against whom is this firmness. But against whom is this firmness? We have never seen such a firm attitude against the Salazar's mockery of India's flag on the territory of India in Goa. We do not see such kind of firmness against the mockeries which Pakistan makes now and then of our sovereignty. We do not see such manifestations of firmness against Chou-en-Lai, who was assured "We will negotiate, negotiate, negotiate till the bitter end". When our own little Class III employee comes and begs for clemency, mercy and consideration you say "you are a rebel". He is honoured, of course, with an appellation of rebel. But the fact remains that there was a collapse not of the Government but of statesmanship.

I would like to make this point very very clear, Mr. Speaker, that if there was the slightest danger that the civilian authority would collapse we would have been the first soldiers to defend it because our quarrel is with Jawaharlal Nehru (*Interruptions*). Yes, it is so, the hon. Prime Minister. His knowledge of history is better; his politics is even better.

Bagehot, Maitland, Dicey and Laski will be turning in their graves, and he is the friend of the last, and a great student of political science too when they heard what he said just. His analysis is: if communications are temporarily jeopardised civilian authority collapses, which is an extraordinary thesis. The army was there, the police and the home guards and the entire loyalty of the country to you as Government was there, and ours was a quarrel. What is that? Ah! childish! Mr. Speaker, I do not think that when his anger subsides even he will entertain this kind of feeling. This dispute we have was not as our Prime Minister, which he remains, but as an employer, as the head of an employing agency. How can it be distorted? How can it be disregarded? How can it be completely ignored? Only yesterday, Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri said something in the House and that is the essence of our plea and it is this. The prices of textiles have gone as much as by 40 per cent. If the price is going up like that, all peasants will revolt by increasing his price and if the food prices go up the whole apple-cart of our Plan will be upset. What is being done against those people who are indulging in this kind of anti-national activities? What happened to the Essential Commodities Act which has been passed?

An Hon. Member: We are not rebels, that is the trouble.

Shri Nath Pai: What has happened to the Essential Commodities Act? After his release, when he really symbolised all the aspirations and also the agony of the country, the Prime Minister in 1946, soon after his release from Ahmadnagar said "If I have the power I would hang these blackmarketeers by the posts". This is what he said in Bombay.

An Hon. Member: Yes, nearest lamp-post.

Shri Nath Pai: I do not know in how many cases the Essential Commodities Act has been applied in this

coun ry. What check has been placed on the activities of these people who are making all these unconscionable gains?

Yesterday the Home Minister talked of Rs. 80 being given and when we asked for a little modification he thought that it was unfair and unpatriotic. Though he was extremely restrained in his language, he said "you are asking me to make the poor people bear the burden", it is the privilege of the Government employees to starve and suffer. But I ask: Is this the pattern of life for the whole society till we pass this transitional period and reach the stage of a self-generating economy? Is it being attained? He cannot be given Rs. 5 more now but we read in the papers there are people in the social welfare State who can buy cars for Rs. 80,000. What an example of fair share, social justice, profit being pegged and everybody being given a fair deal;

Since you have rung the Bell, I would say in conclusion..

Mr. Speaker: I gave him half an hour.

Shri Nath Pai: I would like to say there is no bitterness in our heart nor any animosity. There is, of course, no repentance. There is sorrow and sadness because many of our illusions have been broken for ever. I do not want to dilate about it much. We had illusion—yes, we had an illusion—that when the first concerted effort of an organised section of our community was there and when Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru was still at the helm of affairs, they would be regarded by him as allies and colleagues and they would be patted on the back by him instead of getting the big rod from him. It was to this tragic miscalculation that some hon. Members referred yesterday. Perhaps the lesson has been learnt now.

May I make an earnest plea, namely, that everything must be done by

all of us to see that there is no spirit of animosity and of conflict maintained in the departments? Let not the only monument of the Government's victory against its employees and against immature politicians.....

Shri C. K. Bhattacharya (West Dinajpur): Not against the employees but against those who wanted to mislead the employees.....(Interruption).

Shri Nath Pai: Let that not be symbolised by broken homes, by the ashes of frustrated hopes and by the smouldering fires of suppressed bitterness and disappointment. I would in the end say that it should be the endeavour of all concerned to create a new spirit of dedication, an idealism among the employees, an awareness of the glory of participating in the mighty adventure of building a new India. That will be our endeavour. I do not know if those who are supposed to be defeated should entertain such hopes. But we refuse to accept that we have done something for which we should expect forgiveness. We did the right thing and it will help democracy in this country and show that there are some small men who will raise their little voice against whosoever they may be when they have the conviction that they are standing for the right thing. This is good for India's democracy.

Shri Khadilkar (Ahmednagar): **Mr. Speaker,** Sir, I am one of those who tried their best to avert the strike on this occasion, but unfortunately we failed in that. More we should be more objective when viewing events. Instead of viewing events from a partisan angle, let us apply our minds dispassionately. Let us take the whole situation into our consideration.

In this connection some hon. Members have referred to the 1926 general strike. I would like this House to remember as to what happened in 1926 and what judgment had been passed by Professor Laski

[Shri Khadilkar]

and Mrs. Webb on that. Was it not the responsibility of the Government to give protection to the community and was it not the responsibility of the trade unions to show some sense so far as the effect on the community was concerned? I will just point out what Prof. Laski had to observe as to whether Government was justified in intervening at this juncture. I have summarised his observations because I do not want to take more time of the House. He has said:

"In this complex post-war world, there is no industrial community at the heart of which the relation between the trade unions and public is not of pivotal importance. The smooth running of social life depends upon matters like transport, communications, provision of supplies etc. If there is a breakdown in any of these services, the threat it represents to the successful maintenance of the urban life is literally overwhelming. That is why all industry that is directly clothed with public purpose cannot involve itself in a major dispute without bringing the certainty at some stage, most usually an early stage, of Government intervention."

Further, he observes:

"It is not only true to say that the Government will claim to intervene on behalf of the community, but it is also true to say that there is a general expectation where there is such a breakdown that the Government will intervene and that it is its duty to do so. The main criticism directed against the Government is that it failed to take appropriate measures to prevent the strike of 1926 from occurring at all."

I have tried to summarise what Professor Laski has observed when delivering his lectures on the trade unions' role in modern industrial

society about the 1926 strike. Similar observations have been made by another eminent British social scientist, Mrs. Beatrice Webb. She has, as the hon. Prime Minister has, said that in the nature of things if a general strike is to succeed it is to coerce the community and to that extent it coerces the community it can succeed. Therefore there was a big gulf in the trade union leadership in Britain at that time on whether such a strike should be undertaken or not. They had come to the conclusion in the end—a very objective conclusion—that because of such a strike the Labour Party did not draw any benefit. But the reaction, or the right wing in the Labour Party, of men like MacDonald succeeded to impose their policy on the Party. Many other writers have also come to the conclusion that in the end such an adventure, a trade union action of this nature should always be averted.

I am not one of those who feel that in the present context of our situation there should be no strike. That is not possible. In the nature of things, there is bound to be social conflict situated as we are and there is bound to be a strike here or there that when in the modern world the trade union movement is supposed to be conscious of its responsibility to the community, as very fervently pleaded by Professor Laski, I want to submit very humbly—and I did that to the strike leaders at the eleventh hour when my hon. friend, Shri Feroze Gandhi and myself tried to avert this tragedy for I call it a tragedy—that we do admit that had no direct political motives, but that in the nature of things it was bound to take a political colour and that Government was bound to take it as a challenge to its authority. I told them, "For Heaven's sake, let us negotiate."

It was said by a senior trade union leader in this country to me before I come to Delhi that he enjoyed the reputation of being a strike leader but

in his whole lifetime he had very rarely asked people to go on strike. He said, "Under the threat of a strike I have always negotiated and there I have made some advance. But whenever a strike was forced on me, I have been defeated, completely floored and the workers' interest were sacrificed."

At that moment when the final decision was taken, I know, many responsible leaders were hesitating. They were not quite sure whether their action was right or wrong. But it must be said to the credit of Shri Nath Pai that when all the Council were more or less dumfounded when I was co-opted at the eleventh hour to report on what happened between us and the hon. Home Minister and other negotiators, between myself, Shri Feroze Gandhi, Shri S. M. Joshi and others, the only man who spoke and spoke with a voice of determination was Shri Nath Pai. The resolution was read out by Shri Nath Pai that set everything right according to him and we dispersed in the dead of night.

An Hon. Member: What did he say?

Shri Khadilkar: I call it a tragedy for two reasons. I do not for a moment doubt the sincerity of Shri Nath Pai or of those who were supposed to be at the helm of affairs at that moment because they were sincerely hoping for the best to the last. At the first stage when negotiations took place, Shri Nanda with all sincerity had appealed and told Shri S. M. Joshi:—I know that it was told to him—that if within the scheme of things it could be settled—with his permission, I would make this disclosure—and if certain points of dispute remained behind, he would offer arbitration. I appealed to the strike leaders on that plea only and said, "All right. Heat is generated. The Government has taken it as a challenge. A rigid attitude is developing. Therefore wiser counsels should prevail and we should give some thought to what Shri Nanda has to say in whom every leader of the Action Committee had full confidence." But

the tragedy of it is that nobody listened. A spirit of some type of romantic adventure was in the atmosphere and perhaps some of the leaders felt "What happens even if we are defeated? It will go on record when the history of the trade union movement and the working class movement comes to be written that we in this country had the courage, behalf of the workers, to give a challenge because Government was not prepared to accept our reasonable demands". I can understand this attitude. Government also should appreciate this attitude. They should not draw comfort, and it would be a short-sighted policy if they feel in terms of "now that we have come out with flying colours and they have been defeated" we put things in averse gear. That is a totally wrong approach. They should think inward and examine why a situation had arisen which, as Laski has said, led people, the loyal government employees, to believe that they should follow so called 'immature leadership' and give a challenge to the leadership enthroned by the people to rule over this country with long experience and sacrifice behind them. That is a most important problem.

And here I may point out very plainly, because when we intervened and tried to do something to avert this situation, we were conscious that Government had not given serious thought to this problem at all. When the Pay Commission report was submitted to the Government, Government took several months but did not even process it. Its consequences, etc., they did not study. When it was presented to this House there was a fervent plea made from this side, "at least before implementation take counsel, invite the leaders and different trade union organisations". That plea was turned down. When it was implemented now it has become an award overnight—but when it was implemented it was implemented piecemeal. The whole report was more or less considered as the property of the Government, and whatever was found suitable was implemented.

[Shri Khadilkar]

On this point I would not blame those organisations which went on strike. Even the President of the INTUC, Shri Vasavada, who made an appeal to us—a copy came to me—complained about this. What did he have to say? He said that Government's attitude in dealing with the recommendations of the Pay Commission was objectionable. That is what Shri Vasavada had to say. And he said, "If they wanted to modify or reject any of the recommendations, they should have done so in consultation with their employees".

Now, after all this, whenever the issue was raised, it is most unfortunate—and Nandani admitted it while we were discussing certain problems in order to settle this matter—that on the floor of the House, from the Government side there was no economic argument; to whatever plea was made from this side, only the political *danda* was shown. It created a certain amount of bitterness, not only in our minds but in the minds of the employees in the government service. That factor also cannot be ignored. But with all this, as I said, it is a great tragedy. It should not have happened. It has retarded the Indian trade union movement considerably. It has strengthened reaction not only in the country but in the Congress. You must remember all this. These are the worst consequences.

But all these consequences taken together, at this hour when we are trying to understand a particular situation that developed and certain results that followed, is it not the duty of the Government to apply its mind to this, instead of dealing with it in a symptomatic manner, and find out what is the root cause of the disease?

Some hon. friends have already referred to an article in the *Eastern Economist*. The *Eastern Economist* is not a friend of labour. The writer there has done it with a motive. He

wants to point out that the Government, in order to give some protection to the employee in the private sector, are trying to do justice, and in Bombay at least at the present moment industrial labour gets about Rs. 130. But he has pointed out—and that aspect is very important—that since 1947 to 1960, on an average the employees are getting Rs. 3½ per month less. Our wages are pegged at 1947, and if we calculate—leave aside the years 1954 and 1955 as being comparatively a better period—what do we find? The Government has failed to neutralise and give protection to his real wage, the corroding of his ordinary life has not been stopped, and every lower class employee of Government has lost, by way of neutralisation, not less than Rs. 600 in the thirteen years.

What has happened to this country? Let us examine it economically. Because, we are seeing on the one side that national income has gone up by 41 per cent or so, and on the other side there is not the slightest reflection of this in the wages or earnings of the poor employees who are serving the Government. What has happened? The other day there was a small Seminar and I happened to listen to it. There were the pure theorist I mean the economists, living in the ivory tower, and one of them suggested, "Oh, there is a sort of price phobia and there is a psychological resistance to this price problem." The main issue is that there is an uneven impact of the price rise all over the country. As Prof. Shenoy has pointed out—I quoted his article two years back—since this inflation period has started, every year more than Rs. 300 to 400 crores of rupees are mopped up by a small coterie of people in this country. What have we done to prevent this concentration of wealth? Have we done anything? Are we to suppose that during the period of reconstruction and development and planning all the burden is to be borne by the employees and the common people, that

they are to be the beasts of burden, and that they are to be the pack horses of reconstruction and advance and progress, and that they should not even raise their voice that whatever advance you are making, adding to the national income, they must get some reflection of it in their daily earnings?

And when I quote index number, I am conscious—Nandaji knows it—that the present computation of index number is very faulty. The Prime Minister said just now that there should be more amenities. In the present calculation of index number, such things as education, such things as health never creep in. And these are the problems. Do you suppose they have not to spend on the education of their children? They have got to spend on it.

I would therefore appeal to the Government, it is not an hour of triumph, and they should consider that after twelve years of their rule a situation has developed in this country when government servants, the most loyal of the lot, whatever their number, came out with a challenge. Therefore this is a matter for examination, a fundamental examination of the objectives of our labour policy.

14 hrs.

Before coming to that, I would like to mention one or two small matters.

Mr. Speaker: I have allowed the hon. Member sufficient time. He must conclude. There are so many other hon. Members.

Shri Khadilkar: I will finish in five minutes. There are two matters. One is this. In the post strike period, all power is given to the Heads of department. Yesterday, an instance was quoted by my hon. friend Shri Asoka Mehta. I have an instance of a P & T worker who has been suspended for activity that he is supposed to have indulged in about four weeks before the Ordinance was promulgated. See, in their enthusiasm, how the

officers give retrospective effect to the blessed Ordinance. That also should be studied by the Government. There is another case. One officer felt that he must punish some people. He has picked out a Harijan couple. Both of them are serving in the Telephone Exchange department at one place. The wife has been transferred from the feminine section to a district place where she will not even get accommodation. Is this the way? I would appeal to the Government not only to be generous. They should adopt a little more magnanimous attitude so far as dealing with the employees are concerned. I would expect this from the Government. In an emergency they promulgated an Ordinance. All right. It was perhaps necessary as I said in the earlier part of my speech. Now, let them declare that there won't be any punishment, and no body would be punished by his wife and children being thrown on the streets, seeking employment round about with the stamp of ex-employee of the Government, in the hour of their victory. That picture we should not see.

One word, with your permission, and I have finished. So far as the long term policy is concerned, I was very much pained, because, in this country we have not yet realised the value of human capital or social capital as we call it. We are prepared to pay the price for material resources. But, we are not prepared to pay an adequate price and look after the husbanding of human resources. If we want to do that, if we want to succeed in our plan, the objective of our labour policy during the Plan period must be naturally to establish some sort of a relationship of a durable nature where there will never occur such a conflict and there will be what we call industrial peace or industrial truce. Therefore, I appeal to the Government to forget what happened during the strike period. Let them call the leaders of the Unions, sit round a table and tell them, you will not simply bear the burden, you will be active

[Shri Khadilkar]

partners in this bold adventure of building our country, you will share it equally with us, let us evolve some machinery by which we shall at least for some years to come, in the industrial sphere and in the sphere of Government, establish a relationship in which there will be truce, and peace, so that our efforts will succeed. We are, today, in the midst of the Plan. As the Prime Minister said, an outline of the Third Plan is just before the House. We were planning to reach the 'take off' period. But, this 'take off' period is ever vanishing. I would appeal to the Government, it is not a question of how you develop a particular economic mechanism. But, the main question is how we are going to achieve the objective of our labour policy, consistent with the ideal or objective of socialism and how we are going to prevent the maldistribution of wealth, putting an uneven burden on the poorer section of the society in this country, as in no other country. Leave aside what is happening in the so-called affluent societies. In this country, we are making a plea of poverty. At the same time, I would like to point out to Shri Nanda and the Finance Minister, who also comes from Ahmedabad, what Mrs. Bose, an English lady who has married an Indian has said. She has given a vivid picture in the *Times of India* of Bombay, of how cloth prices have gone up. They have gone up because the mill-owners changed their technicians as they change cars every third month and the most incompetent people who are supposed to succeed the proprietors have some in charge of the industry. Unless the Government is prepared to change the character of our capitalism which is speculating, which is merchantile in character, which is exploitive, into a sort of modern capitalism which the Prime Minister said, we find in the West, disciplined, I do not think they can today take credit. It was perhaps incumbent on them to give protection to the community. In future, if they

do not draw proper lessons, they will be faced not with only a small number of people giving a challenge, not the immature leaders. With the past experience and accumulated bitterness that they have experienced in the things which are contrary to the objective of the Government, all the people will combine and then it would not be easy for you to meet their challenge. Therefore, be a little more careful. Apply your mind as to how to remove the deep-seated symptom. Do not deal with it in a superficial way, in a symptomatic way. That would not last long. That would not help us, nor help the country.

Dr. Melkote (Raichur): Mr. Speaker, we have been listening to a series of speeches made here since yesterday morning.

14.08 hrs.

[PANDIT TEAKUR DAS BHARGAVA in the Chair]

The speeches have been intelligent and have had their emotional content. But, I feel that the crux of the problem has not been placed squarely before this House. Before proceeding further, let me at the very outset say that the country generally and every section of its population wishes to congratulate the Government for the wise way in which they have taken action and for the efficient way that they have done it. At the same time, I have got to say that we, who are working in the labour field, feel a great amount of concern with the way that the strike took place and with the way things have developed in the country now.

We have heard the speech of Shri Asoka Mehta. He is not a person who can be considered as being disloyal to the country. He is not a person who can not be said to have a sufficient amount of intelligence. Equally so, we heard that emotional speech of Shri Nath Pai. A very moving speech it was. But, in spite of it, I should squarely place before the House that

Ordinance and Strike

the speeches that they made were most unconvincing to me. I have got to say why it is like that. It is not by merely saying that the worker is suffering, the worker demands for justice. If you go back to the history and look into the speeches that we in that side have made in the past 3 or 4 years, even last year on the occasion of the Pay Commission debate.....

Shri Braj Raj Singh (Ferozabad):
Good speeches.

Dr. Melkote: It is not merely speeches; I will show. We have been saying that since the cost of living has been going up, it should be neutralised equally in the pay scales. In today's context, we have said with the cost of living going up and with the national income that has gone up, the workers in the Government sphere should also be partners in the increase in the national income. Whilst, therefore, the cause of the workers is just and legitimate—whether Government are paying it or not is a different question altogether—to me, it appears that such a very good cause has been lost today, and it has damaged the labour union movement as it has never done in any other country of the world. And why is that so? This is a problem which has got to be understood very clearly. An upheaval of this type may have taken place in other country of the world but the damage that this strike has done to the labour movement here has not occurred in any other part of the world. And why is that so? The reason is apparently clear, over a small word that Shri Nath Pai uttered, namely 'miscalculation'. Let us understand what this miscalculation means.

Here is a labour leader with sufficient intelligence, who, whenever he gives a notice of strike and goes on implementing it, has immediately to consider how he has got to do it. He cannot put the workers into difficulties. He has got to prepare himself sufficiently; there should be a sufficient amount of public sympathy and re-

sponse to their call. They should feel sympathy for the strike that he is advocating. There should equally be a question of unanimity, and he should influence the minds of other co-workers in the field that his cause is just, and their sympathy should be evoked.

Here is a strike wherein it was said that in the railways, for instance, 80 per cent or 90 per cent of the workers belonged to the INTUC; and yet Mr. Guruswami and other federation men come up and want to negotiate with Government on equal terms. On one side, they say that there should be only one union recognised, and then, on the other side, they put pressure to see that Mr. Guruswami's union is recognised, and they begin to talk with Government; 10 per cent people trying to negotiate over the head of 90 per cent of the people.

This has occurred not only the railways but also in Defence. We have been pained at what has happened. The Indian National Defence Workers Federation which we formed only last year was formed because of the tactics that these people were playing; we knew that this strike was developing in their minds, not only a few months ago, but it was developing in their minds for the past two or three years. Knowing that these people were leading the workers astray, and, the Government servants, astray, we started this union only during last April and if today, in spite of all that they have said, they have failed in their strike, it has only proved our contention that they were going to lead the workers astray and our contention has been justified.

On the railways' side, 90 per cent of the workers did not want a strike. Why? Is it that they do not want this increment in dearness allowance? No labour leader will forward and say that 'I am going to ask only this much and nothing more', when it is justified. Can the leader justify their very existence before the workers if they say like this? Will workers

[Dr. Melkote]

support us at any time if we do that? If 90 per cent. of the people had joined the INTUC and did not join the others, does it not show to them that the method that they have adopted is wrong? Have they considered this aspect of the question?

Therefore, on the one side, they have not taken the sympathy of the people; on the other side, they have not taken the sympathy of their own co-workers in the field, who have also been speaking here and saying that this is a thing which is justified and it should be done.

What was the miscalculation? This miscalculation was only this, namely that they felt that when they demanded very much more, they would be able to bring over all the INTUC workers on their very side, and, therefore, they begged them on to strike. I am really very happy to say that the INTUC has been leading the workers, whether it be in the industrial sector, whether it be in the private or public sector or in the Government sector, properly. We are part of the nation. We are justified in demanding certain things. But, equally, we have got a responsibility. And whenever we make a demand, we see that it is a reasonable demand and nothing more. And whilst doing so, we have got to exhaust every method of getting it implemented by peaceful constitutional methods. It is only when all the avenues and labour laws are exhausted and nothing else is there that we are justified in calling for a strike. Here was a Pay Commission, whose recommendations have been debated upon here, and which have to be implemented, and during the debate on the Pay Commission Recommendations, the question that was discussed at the tripartite Labour Conference 1959, where we had agreed to Rs. 125 was never discussed here; the INTUC at Ootacamund had demanded Rs. 150 for a worker. But that was not in the

field here today. So, they had tried to confuse the minds of the workers by saying 'We shall get you the Rs. 125'. On the INTUC side also, I say that there have been Ministers and others who have been presidents of the union, who, on the eve of the strike, have disowned the union and have resigned. Similarly, there have been infiltrations into the ranks. 20 per cent. of the people have been infiltrating with communist minds into the Government services. And I have been saying this since 1952. It is this 20 per cent. that has made the P.S.P. people as their leader; the secretary belongs to them. And they tell them, look here, all these people are behind you. And when the strike was failing, it is said by the people, that it was the communists who went out of the strike, in order to beat the P.S.P. to the floor. And why? They did so because the P.S.P. beat them in Kerala. And, therefore, now they must finish them up. This is the role that the communists have played in this country. They have not merely defeated themselves, but they have defeated the P.S.P. so that the rank and file may go over to their side. But what is the result? The result has been this. The Government servants that went on strike expected that when they demanded something, and went on strike, the whole of the rank and file would be behind them. But the people have not supported them. 80 per cent. of the staff had not joined the strike. It was not merely a question of the Ordinance. Supposing all the workers had demanded this, including the INTUC, how could the Government have faced this? But we did not join. And why did we not join? We felt that this was unconstitutional; we had not exhausted all the means at our disposal, to achieve our objective. That was why we did not join this, not that we did not want any increase in the wages.

And when they begged them on to strike, the P.S.P. could not go behind,

Ordinance and Strike

because the secretaries belonged to them; it was those people that dominated the whole thing in the joining council of action; and in the meanwhile, the figureheads of the P.S.P. went on begging them to a strike, and went on speaking emotionally. This is the situation that has occurred in the country, a most damaging situation. And when has this occurred? Possibly, Government may be aware of it, or may not be aware of it; I am not sure. When the country was facing trouble, and there was invasion of our territory in Assam, by China the Communists created trouble in Punjab over the land reforms issue; when there was trouble in Longju in Assam, there was trouble in the Punjab; and again, and when the Chinese were invading near Srinagar on Kashmir side, there was trouble in Bengal, and now when the Chinese are facing the Tibetan upheaval, there is trouble in the country, so that our country may not go and re-occupy the territory that belongs to us. This is the tactics that these people have been adopting.

Acharya Kripalani (Sitamarhi): When did the Chinese invade India?

Dr. Melkote: When they occupied some part of our territory. That is what I mean. I am sorry. I would correct myself.

Acharya Kripalani: But your Prime Minister does not say that China has invaded India.

Dr. Melkote: They have occupied part of our territory. My hon. friend and I know it.

This is the situation, and this is the game that the Communists play. And in spite of whatever they have done, they have misled, and they have miscalculated. And Shri Nath Pai and these people come up at this juncture and speak emotionally and say that they are not anti-national. Certainly, they are not anti-national. But if they had succeeded, they would not have been the leaders, but it would

have been the Communists who would have been the leader; that would have been not merely politically bad, but it would have been one of the greatest national tragedies that would have occurred.

Acharya Kripalani: That would have served the Congress all right.

Dr. Melkote: It has served my hon. friend all right; it has served him perfectly all right.

This was the situation that the country had to face. That was why 90 per cent. of the workers, knowing the situation, had not backed what might be considered a legitimate demand. And this is what has happened in the country, and this is one of the greatest tragedies.

Shri Khandubhai Desai, Shri Vasavada and other leaders of the INTUC warned us right in time, during the last two or three years that this situation was developing, and, therefore, we became careful. I congratulate them, and I congratulate the INTUC people who have helped Government in every possible manner. It is not merely the INTUC workers who helped Government at the time of the strike but there were also other sections of the population that helped Government; if the INTUC had joined and helped the workers at the time of the strike, in spite of the severity of the Ordinance, the Government's arms would have been broken; it was not merely the INTUC workers who helped, but there were also other sections of the population like the Bharat Sewak Samaj and others who had helped Government, and the strike was broken. Now, at this juncture, people come up and say that nothing should be done to those who had struck work.

Acharya Kripalani: Hang them.

Dr. Melkote: I understand that nothing should be done, and we should go about with magnanimity.

Acharya Kripalani: Hang your own officers.

Dr. Melkote: But in respect of whom? In respect of those people who are trying to play politics with the country, and who are damaging the national interests? Are we to keep quiet with them?

I personally feel that those people who have taken this wrong cue and have misled the people, the leaders should be severely punished. With regard to the rest, be magnanimous and be very liberal.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: He should be made a Magistrate.

Dr. Melkote: Thanks very much. I will gladly accept it. In my Government, I will accept any post.

This is the history of the movement. If this failure is there, it only shows the bankruptcy of the P.S.P. in assessing the situation. They were misled and I only hope that they will take a lesson from this and correct themselves.

Ataharajkumar Vijaya Anand (Visakhapatnam): I rise to oppose Shri Naushir Bharucha's motion and support the government measures taken before the strike, during the strike and after the strike. I am grateful to you for giving me this opportunity of speaking today. I am not unfamiliar with this Chamber because I had the honour of being your colleague in the Central Assembly.

After the Prime Minister's speech, no matter who speak, it is something like feat champagne. It is a wonderful speech of his today. Much steam has been let off by the Opposition the whole of yesterday and probably a good deal remains to be let off towards this evening. It is said by the Opposition and by certain people that the hon. Prime Minister is vindictive. That is not so. He is the very milk of human kindness. If

anything, he is generous to a fault. He appealed to everyone over the air, through the Press and in his public speeches not to have this strike. But he had to accept the challenge when it was before him. Manfully, he stood up to it; and there was Pandit Pant, his lieutenant, the Vice-Captain, and they both had to accept the challenge, with the result that Skipper Nehru, as I would like to call him, placed his field so beautifully, and with his immaculate length of bowling and magnificent wicket keeping of Pandit Pant, each striker was caught or stumped with the result that the score was after five days, all out for a duck. When Captain Nehru's turn came to send his side in to bat, he sent the veteran Dr. Subbarayan, the oldest member of the M. C. C. and along with him, Jagjivan Ram to open the innings. At the end of five days, let me tell you, they came up against terrific body-line bowling, beaters, bouncers and everything that the book of cricket can have or has. They never ducked, they never flinched, they never edged and they never gave a catch. At the end of five days, they were both five, apiece not out, and the score board read: 10 for no loss, Nehru's victory. That is what happened at the end of the strike.

Our freedom has been won only 13 years ago, and I just cannot understand people indulging in this strike despite the passionate appeal made by the Prime Minister and other leaders of this country, not taking into account that we have Pakistan, a thorn in our bed, and across the frontiers we have the bhai-bhai—to whom we now say 'bye-bye'—with her teeth into us. Apart from this, there was the international situation so full of possibilities, on the brink of a volcano. Any time, any moment, to erupt. Forgetting all this, they started a campaign of violence—I call it violence. Despite the fact that everyone was against it, most of the elders had advised them not to do so—they went on with it, and it was a real disservice to this country.

Apart from this, I would very much like to see very strong legislation enacted so that future strikes, future goondas, as I would call them, are not allowed to do what they have done during the strike. Our Prime Minister is far too generous....

Shri S. M. Banerjee (Kanpur): What is this? He is saying 'goondas'.

Maharajkumar Vijaya Anand: Not for you.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: That may be the expression of Rajas. But it is extremely bad.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. Member has raised an objection. But he should not cast aspersions against the speaker.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: Is it not unparliamentary?

Mr. Chairman: What is the objection?

Shri Prabhat Kar (Hooghly): He is saying about them 'goondas'.

Mr. Chairman: That is his view, that those who indulge in strike in this way and bring misery to the people, will not be good people and they were future goondas. What is wrong with it?

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: So anybody can use any language to describe anything. (*Interruptions*).

Mr. Chairman: I have given my ruling. Hon. Members should not go on criticising the Chair also.

Maharajkumar Vijaya Anand: It was only meant for the people who committed violence, to none else. It was not at all meant for the Members of the House; it was meant for the people who indulged in such hooglianism.

As I said, our freedom has been won only 13 years ago and instead of

our getting together and behaving like a team, we were divided amongst ourselves, with the result that this strike caused immense loss. Apart from this, India suffered in world prestige. I do hope that in future all such strikes will be given up and no attempt will be made to encourage such strikes. I appeal to the Opposition to play the game, as our Prime Minister has always played, with a straight bat.

श्री ब्रज लाल सिंह : सभापति महोदय, आज जब इस हड़ताल पर चर्चा हो रही है और क्राइमिंस जोकि जारी किया गया था, उसके सम्बन्ध में विचार हो रहा है, तो मुझे आज से १८ वर्ष पहले सन् १९४२ का याद आती है। सन् १९४२ में सारे राष्ट्र ने विदेशी सत्ता के खिलाफ "देश में निकल जाओ" का नारा बुलन्द किया था और सारा राष्ट्र विदेशी सत्ता के खिलाफ एक जुट हो कर लड़ने के लिए तैयार था तो भी सत्ता के मद में उस ब्रिटिश सत्ता ने तीन दिन के अन्दर अन्दर सारे आन्दोलन को पददलित कर दिया था और चौथे दिन कहीं कोई भी मुक्त के हिस्से में ऐसा आदमी देखने में नहीं मिलता था जो साह और से यह कह सकता कि अब हमें ब्रिटिश सत्ता को यहां से हटाना है....

कुछ माननीय सदस्य : नहीं, नहीं।

श्री ब्रज लाल सिंह : जो नहीं, नहीं कहते हैं हो सकता है कि वे उस वक्त इस चीज से अनभिज्ञ रहे हों, उस काल में न रहे हों। लेकिन यह इतिहास की बात है कि जब भी सत्ता के मद में किसी भी पापुलर आन्दोलन को दबाने के लिए हथियारों का प्रयोग किया जाता है तो ऐसे पापुलर आन्दोलन को दबाना किसी नान-वायलेंट, अहिंसापूर्ण आन्दोलन को दबाना कोई मुश्किल नहीं होता।

यही बात इस हड़ताल के बारे में कही जा सकती है। यह हड़ताल पांच दिन के

[श्री ब्रजराज सिंह]

अन्दर अन्दर खत्म हो गई। अगर इसको बहुत कम कर्मचारियों का रिसपांस मिला इसको अगर, तो इसमें कोई आश्चर्य का बात नहीं दिखाई देता। लेकिन मुझे आश्चर्य का बात लगती है जो यह कि जो हमारे वर्तमान प्रधान मंत्री हैं जिन का कि राष्ट्र का प्री-वास तौर से पुवकों का हृदय देवता कह जाता था वह रेडियो पर ब्राडकास्ट करते हैं और उस ब्राडकास्ट में न सिर्फ मुल्क की अन्दरूनी हालत का विवरण होता है बल्कि मुल्क पर जो अंतरा है और जिस से मैं इन्कार भी नहीं करता हूँ उसका भी इशारा होता है, उसके बावजूद भी अगर १२ प्रतिशत या १५ प्रतिशत या २० प्रतिशत सरकारी कर्मचारी हड़ताल के लिए तैयार हो जाते हैं तो फिर यह जरूर एक ऐसी बाँझ हो जाती है जिस पर सरकार को गम्भीरता के साथ विचार करना चाहिये। क्योंकि ऐसी स्थिति पैदा हो गई है, इस पर हम को विचार करना होगा। यह कह देना कि यह एक गैर-जिम्मेदाराना कार्य था, बहुत आसान है। मैं उसमें नहीं जाना चाहता हूँ। यह अपनी अपनी राय की बात है। मैं मानता हूँ कि कुछ लोग यह राय भी रख सकते हैं कि इस वक्त हड़ताल का आश्रय लेना एक गैर-जिम्मेदाराना कार्य था। लेकिन प्रश्न तो यह है कि आप के रहते हुए क्यों आपके ही कर्मचारी हड़ताल के लिए तैयार हो जाते हैं। आप इस सम्भावना पर विचार करें कि जिन कर्मचारियों ने हड़ताल की, उनकी आमदनियां निश्चित रूप से उन से ऊंची हैं जो कि करोड़ों में हैं, जो किसान हैं, जो कि खेतीहर मजदूर हैं, दूसरे गरीब लोग हैं और जो संगठित नहीं हैं। इससे हमें एक सबक लेना चाहिये। हमें देखना चाहिये कि जो लोग संगठित नहीं हैं और जो करोड़ों की तादाद में हैं, यदि वे संगठित हो जायें तो फिर आपकी सत्ता कहा रहेगी ?

प्रधान मंत्री महोदय ने कहा कि इस तरह की आम हड़ताल एक सिविल रिबेलियन

है। इस में मैं उनके साथ सी फीसटी सहमत हूँ। इसमें कोई शक नहीं और न ही इससे कोई इन्कार कर सकता है कि इस तरह का हड़ताल सिविल रिबेलियन होगी। लेकिन देखना यह है कि सिविल रिबेलियन करने की आपके कर्मचारियों का क्यों हिम्मत हुई? आखिर कौन सी ऐसी परिस्थितियाँ पैदा हुई हैं जिन में प्रेरित हो कर हड़ताल करने के लिए विवश हुए हैं? आप कहते हैं कि ४२ प्रतिशत हजारों राष्ट्रीय आय में वृद्धि हुई है, २० प्रतिशत प्रति व्यक्ति आय में वृद्धि हुई है लेकिन उसके बावजूद भी हम देखते हैं कि जो कर्मचारियों का तनख्वाह है वह सन् १९४७ के आधार पर नहीं रहीं है। उस तनख्वाह को आज की परिस्थितियों में १९५७ की हालत में लाने के लिए जब बार बार आपसे कहा जाता है तो उस पर विचार करने के लिए आप तैयार नहीं होते हैं। ऐसा करने के लिए आप क्यों तैयार नहीं होते हैं, क्यों आप ऐसी स्थिति आने देते हैं जिस में कि हड़ताल का बीज आए? अगर हड़ताल होने की नीबत आई तो साफ ज़ाहिर है कि आप के शासन में एक ऐसा ब्यूरोक्रेटिक सैट अप आ गया है, इस तरह का नोकरशाही प्रवृत्ति पैदा हो गई है कि वह किसी तरह की भली बात को मानने के लिए तैयार नहीं है, सुनने के लिए तैयार नहीं है और जब तैयार नहीं है तब फिर मैं समझता हूँ कि एक बहुत बड़ा खतरा मुल्क में आ सकता है। यह मानते हुए भी कि इस तरह की आम हड़ताल एक सिविल रिबेलियन हो सकती है मैं यह मानने से इन्कार करता हूँ कि उससे डेमोक्रेसी को कोई खतरा पैदा हो सकता है, वह प्रजातंत्र को खत्म कर सकती है। वह ऐसा नहीं कर सकती है। इस तरह से प्रजातंत्र को खत्म करने का सवाल ही नहीं उठता। जहाँ तक प्रजातंत्र के खाल्मे का सवाल है हमें देखना पड़ेगा कि मुल्क की जनता प्रजातंत्र चाहती है या नहीं चाहती है। मुझे यह कहते हुए गर्व का अनुभव होता है कि हिन्दुस्तान

का जनता प्रजातंत्र में विश्वास करती है और चाहे इस तरह की हड़ताल हो या कोई और चीज हो, हिन्दुस्तान से प्रजातंत्र की जड़ों को नहीं उखाड़ा जा सकता। इसलिए इस तरह का हड़ताल से हमें कोई खतरा नहीं है। मैं तो समझता हूँ कि इन तरह की हड़ताल का हमें स्वागत करना चाहिये। इन तरह की हड़ताल से सरकार तो खत्म हो सकती है, वर्तमान सरकार के खत्म का तो इससे मौका मिल सकता है लेकिन आज के प्रधान मंत्री को या उनके मंत्रिमंडल को इससे क्यों मोह होना चाहिये कि जिन कुर्सियों पर वह बैठे हैं, उन कुर्सियों पर वह हमेशा हमेशा के लिए बैठे रहें। मोह तो उन्हें इस बात से होना चाहिये कि इस नीति पर वह चल रहे हैं वह सच्ची हो, सही हो, बुद्धिमत्तापूर्ण है। जिस नीति का वह अनुसरण कर रहे हैं उसने पिछले १३ साल में हिन्दुस्तान के जीवन को क्या दिखाया है, क्या वह नीति सही साबित हुई है, सच्ची साबित हुई है, क्या उससे असन्तोष नहीं बढ़ा है। यह बात दूसरी है कि वह असन्तोष संगठित नहीं है, वह अभी प्रदर्शन नहीं पा रहा है, उस असन्तोष को अभी मौका नहीं मिल रहा है कि अच्छी तरह से संगठित हो कर वह आज की सरकार के खिलाफ उठ खड़ा हो। लेकिन यह एक चेतावनी है जो कि सरकार को लेनी चाहिये। चेतावनी इस रूप में नहीं कि स्ट्राइक हमेशा के लिए बंद कर दी जाए, स्ट्राइक करना हमेशा के लिए बंद कानूनी करार दे दिया जाए और कह दिया जाए कि आगे वह नहीं हो सकेगी इससे काम चलने वाला नहीं है। जितनी थोड़ी सी भी शक्ति मुझ में है उससे मैं अपना विरोध प्रकट करना चाहूँगा अगर सरकार की तरफ से कोई भी इस तरह का कानून बनता है जिस से यह कोशिश की जाती है कि हड़ताल को गैर कानूनी करार दे दिया जाए। इस पर गम्भीरतापूर्वक विचार करने

की जरूरत है। मैं समझता हूँ कि उनका भी इसमें कोई हित नहीं होगा।

मैं इस बात से सहमत हूँ कि बराबर इस तरह की हड़ताल नहीं होनी चाहिये, लेकिन मैं पूछना चाहता हूँ कि इसके लिए जिम्मेदार कौन है। इसके लिए कर्मचारी जिम्मेदार नहीं है, इसके लिए जिम्मेदार वे लोग नहीं हैं जिन को कि हमारे प्रधानमंत्री अनुत्तरदायित्वपूर्ण कहते हैं, इरिस्पॉसिबल कहते हैं। आखिर ऐसे इरिस्पॉसिबल लोगों को कैसे मौका मिला नेतृत्व करने का, इस पर विचार करने की जरूरत है। आज कहा जाता है कि आई०एन०टी०यू०सी० की इतनी मैनबरशिप है कि तीन सेंट्रल ट्रेड यूनियन आर्गनाइजेशंस केन्द्रीय वर्कर्स के संगठन जो हैं, उनकी मैनबरशिप को अगर जोड़ा जाए तो वह उसके बराबर नहीं बैठती है। यदि यह बात सही है तो मैं पूछना चाहता हूँ कि आई०एन०टी०यू०सी० क्यों इसको रोक नहीं पाती, कैसे ऐसी स्थिति पैदा होती है। मैं साथ ही यह भी पूछना चाहता हूँ कि आपकी कार्रवाइयाँ, अप के कानून आपकी गतिविधियाँ मूल्क में जो जीवनोपयोगी वस्तुयें हैं, उनकी कीमतों के स्तरों को क्या रोक सकी हैं? कल ही हमारे वाणिज्य तथा उद्योग मंत्री, श्री लाल बहादुर शास्त्री जी ने मंजूर किया कि ४० प्रतिशत कपड़े की कीमतें बढ़ी हैं। अन्न की कीमतें बढ़ती रहती हैं, दूसरी जीवनोपयोगी चीजों की कीमतें बढ़ती हैं और जब वे बढ़ती हैं, उन पर आप चूक नहीं लगा सकते हैं, रोक नहीं लगा सकते हैं तो फिर उन लोगों से कहें जोकि भूखे हैं कि तुम ज्यादा मांग न करो और उनकी मांगों को तब तक सुनने के लिए तैयार न हों जब तक वे हड़ताल पर उतरकर न हो जाए, ठीक नहीं है। मुझे तो खास तौर पर यही लगता है कि आज की सरकार सिर्फ हिंसा से डरने वाली सरकार हो गई है, जब तक हिंसा नहीं होगी तब तक किसी बात को सुनने के लिए वह तैयार नहीं हो सकती

[श्री बजराम सिंह]

है। हमें मालूम है कि तीन चार पांच साल पहले से मूल्क के बहुत से लोग, जिम्मेदार लोग यह महसूस करते आ रहे हैं कि नांगालैंड जिस को प्रधान मंत्री ने अब देने का निश्चय किया है उसका मसला पांच साल पहले तय हो जाना चाहिये था। लेकिन उस वक्त ऐसा नहीं किया गया। उसके बाद हिंसा हुई और जिस हिंसा पर प्रधान मंत्री कंट्रोल नहीं कर सके तो आज जा कर नांगालैंड को मंजूर करते हैं। जब तक हिंसा नहीं होगी तब तक किसी बात को भी वह मानने के लिए तैयार नहीं हैं। चाहे कोई आन्दोलन कितना ही शान्तिमय हो, जनता अपना प्रतिरोध प्रकट करती रहे, विरोध प्रकट करती रहे लेकिन प्रधान मंत्री तथा उनकी सरकार यह स्वीकार करने से इन्कार करती रहती है कि किसी के भी कोई ग्रीवेंसिस हो सकते हैं, कोई दिक्कतें हो सकती हैं। जब वह चीख हिंसक रूप धारण करती है तब कहीं बात सुनने के लिए वह तैयार होते हैं।

मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि हम मरते दम तक हिंसा को हिन्दुस्तान में प्रश्रय नहीं देंगे, हिंसा नहीं करना चाहेंगे। लेकिन प्रश्न यह है कि हिंसा इस हड़ताल में भी अगर शुरू हुई तो कहां से शुरू हुई। सात व्यक्तियों की जानें चली गई हैं और मैं उनके प्रति अपनी श्रद्धांजलि अर्पित करता हूँ। लेकिन देखना यह है कि किस तरह से उनकी जानें गई। सात व्यक्तियों का सवाल नहीं है, यह नीति का सवाल है। सन् १९४७ से लेकर आज तक हिन्दुस्तान में जितनी बार सरकार की तरफ से गोलीबारी हुई है उतनी बार डेढ़ सौ साल के अंग्रेजी शासनकाल में नहीं हुई थी। यह हिन्दुस्तान के लिए बड़ी दुर्भाग्यपूर्ण बात है। यह एक ऐसी बात है जिस पर कि आज के शासकों को बहुत ही गम्भीरतापूर्वक विचार करना चाहिये क्योंकि इस तरह की चीजों का होना अच्छा नहीं है।

मैं निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि जो हड़ताल हुई उस हड़ताल में १९,००० आदमी गिरफ्तार हुए, यह छोटी बात नहीं थी। जब आप कहते हैं कि दस बारह या बीस प्रतिशत लोगों ने इसमें भाग लिया, तो इसको मैं मानता हूँ। लेकिन जितने भी आपके कर्मचारी हैं बीस लाख या बाईस लाख उन सब की साहानुभूति उन्हें प्राप्त थी, इससे इन्कार नहीं किया जा सकता है। यह दूसरी बात है कि मशीनगन के डर से जेल के डर से, आर्डिनंस के डर से वे अपनी साहानुभूति का प्रदर्शन न कर सकें हों या न दिखाना चाहते हों। लेकिन आपको गम्भीरतापूर्वक विचार करना होगा इस सारे मामले पर। न सिर्फ सरकारी कर्मचारियों के लिए बल्कि दूसरे कर्मचारियों के लिए भी, किसान वर्ग के लिए भी, जनता के दूसरे मध्यम वर्ग के लिए भी आपको अपनी नीतियों में परिवर्तन करना होगा। आज यहां पर आप पंचवर्षीय योजनाओं में हजारों करोड़ों रुपये जनता की गाड़ी कमाई के खर्च कर रहे हैं, वहां पर आपको यह भी देखना होगा कि उन पंचवर्षीय योजनाओं का जो लाभ है वह थोड़े से लोगों के हाथ में ही न रह जाए। मुझे याद है कि मैंने इसी सदन में पिछले साल यह चार्ज लगाया था गवर्नमेंट पर और खास तौर से फूड मिनिस्टरों पर कि शूगर के मामले में पांच करोड़ रुपया ब्लैक मार्केट में कमाया गया है, उसकी जांच पड़ताल की जाए।

मैं अब भी जानने को हूँ कि क्या सरकार की तरफ से इस की कोई जांच की जा रही है। अभी पिछले चार पांच महीनों में कपड़े के जो मिलमालिक हैं उन्होंने, मैं समझता हूँ, करोड़ों रुपये कमाये होंगे। क्या उस की जांच पड़ताल के लिये सरकार की तरफ से कोई कमेटी बिठाने का विचार है? लेकिन यहां प्रश्न तो यह है कि जो लोग सरकार की खुशामद कर सकते हैं, मीठी बानी बोल सकते हैं, जो उन के साथ

दावतों में शामिल हो सकते हैं, जो उन के ठौर तरीकों में विश्वास कर सकते हैं, उन के साथ कोई कार्रवाई करने का प्रश्न आज नहीं रह गया है। मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि यह राष्ट्र के लिये घातक सिद्ध होगा। प्रश्न यह नहीं है कि अब आज कौन हारा और कौन जीता। हार जीत तो होती ही रहती है। आज कर्मचारी हार गये हैं। यह भी मान लिया जाये कि आप कानून बना सकते हैं कि कभी भी कोई हड़ताल नहीं होगी। मैं यह भी मान सकता हूँ कि हो सकता है कि उन में कभी हड़ताल न हो, लेकिन आम जनता के दूसरे वर्गों को आप अपना असन्तोष व्यक्त करने नहीं रोक सकेंगे। दस या पंद्रह साल बाद आप की नीतियों के कारण अगर जनता में अहिंसात्मक तरीके से भी इस तरह का प्रतिरोध पैदा हो गया तो आप का वहाँ बैठना मुश्किल हो जायेगा। मैं आपके उन बैचों पर बैठने का कोई विरोधी नहीं हूँ, कोई यह डक़्क़ा नहीं है कि जा जा कर वहीं बैठा जाये, मैं विरोध इस बात पर कर रहा हूँ कि आप जिन नीतियों पर चल रहे हैं उन नीतियों पर चलते जनता का भला नहीं हो सकता। मुल्क में आज भी गरीब और गरीब हो रहे हैं और अमीर और अमीर हो रहे हैं। आप कहते हैं कि आप समाजवाद बनाने जा रहे हैं। इस तरह से कैसा समाजवाद बनेगा? आप कहते हैं कि केन्द्रीय सरकारी कर्मचारियों की तनस्वाह में ५ या १० ६० भी बढ़ाये नहीं जा सकते, लेकिन जब हम कहते हैं कि अख्द्री बात है जो ४,००० ६० माहवारी पाने वाले लोग हैं उन की तनस्वाह २,००० ६० पर लाओ, २५०० ६० पर लाओ, ३००० ६० पर लाओ, तो आप कहते हैं कि यह समाजवाद के माने नहीं हैं। समाजवाद के माने यह हैं कि ऊर के लोगों को नीचे मत लाओ, नीचे के लोगों को ही ऊपर ले जाओ। अगर आप ऊपर वालों को नीचे नहीं करेंगे तो कोई ऐसा कैलकुलेशन लगाया

जाये। कोई ऐसी गणित लगाई जाये जिस से लोगों का फायदा हो सके। जिस तरह की परिस्थिति आज है उससे तो आप एक हजार साल में भी नीचे के लोगों को ऊपर नहीं ले जा सकते।

इस लिये मेरा आप से निवेदन है कि इस हड़ताल के बाद जो प्रतिक्रियायें आप के बीच में हो रही हैं, जो तरीके आप अपनाना चाहते हैं सरकारी कर्मचारियों में हड़ताल को हमेशा के लिये रोकने के लिये, कृपा कर के जनता के भले के लिये ऐसे कानून लाने की कोशिश मत कीजिये। आप इस तरह की परिस्थिति पैदा न कीजिये। कि आप के कर्मचारियों को हड़ताल करने का अधिकार न हो जब उस की जरूरत हो। आप उस दिक्कत को बातचीत के जरिये दूर कीजिये, यह मैं नहीं कहता कि हमेशा हड़ताल होनी ही चाहिये, लेकिन मैं इस बात को मानता हूँ, गांधी जी के उसूलों के मुताबिक भी इस को माना जाना चाहिये कि जिस को तकलीफ हो उस को अपनी तकलीफ को अहिंसात्मक तरीके से रखने का अधिकार दिया जाना चाहिये। मैं यह नहीं कहूंगा कि कोई वायोलेंट तरीका इस्तेमाल किया जाना चाहिये। कर्मचारियों का यह मौलिक अधिकार है, फंडामेंटल राइट है कि अगर दूसरे तरीके खत्म हो जाते हैं तो वे हड़ताल के जरिये अपनी मांगों को बनवायें। यह कर्मचारी कहीं भी हों, सरकारी कर्मचारी हों या औद्योगिक कर्मचारी हों, हर एक कर्मचारी को अधिकार होना चाहिये इसका। आप अभी भी यह न सोचें कि सरकारी कर्मचारियों की हड़ताल को गैर कानूनी करार दे कर आप उन्हें सन्तुष्ट कर सकेंगे या जनता के दूसरे वर्ग जो हैं उन को आप कंविस कर सकेंगे कि इस तरह की बात प्रजातंत्रात्मक तरीकों के अनुसार है। इसलिये मेरा निवेदन होगा कि हड़ताल में जो भी परिस्थिति रही, उस में भले ही

[श्री: जगराज सिंह]

आप जीते और कर्मचारी हारे, लेकिन आप उससे ऐसा कोई नतीजा निकालने की कोशिश मत कीजिये जिस से आगे के लिये दुर्भावनायें पैदा हों, आगे के लिये इस तरह की परिस्थिति पैदा हो जिस से कि हिन्दुस्तान में लेबर मूवमेंट दूसरी गति ले ले, इस तरह की बात पैदा हो जिस से लोगों का प्रजातंत्रात्मक उसूलों से विश्वास हट जाये और इस तरह की परिस्थिति पैदा होते ही न केवल कर्मचारी लोगों की हानि होगी, बल्कि प्रजातंत्रात्मक ढांचा जो है, हमारी डिमाण्डेटिक फैब्रिक जो है, उस ढांचे में विश्वास के खत्म होने की बात हो जायेगी। मैं आशा करूंगा कि सरकार अपनी जीत के मद में इस तरह का कानून बनाने की कोशिश नहीं करेगी, इस तरह की बात नहीं सोचेंगी जिस में अगर किसी आदमी ने कोई भी काम किया है, हड़ताल में हिस्सा लिया है, उस के विरुद्ध बदले की भावना से काम लिया जाये।

मैं एक दो निवेदन कर के खत्म करता हूँ। अभी मेरे पास रेलवे के एक कर्मचारी आये। उन्होंने कहा, मैं आई० एन० टी० यू० सी० के सम्बन्ध रखता हूँ, हड़ताल से मेरा कोई सम्बन्ध नहीं है। मैंने नोटिस भी नहीं दिया, लेकिन बिना किसी हड़ताल में हिस्सा लेने का जिक्र किये दिये कह दिया गया है कि तुम को डिस्चार्ज किया गया है। इस तरह के न जाने कितने मामले होंगे। तो डिपार्टमेंटल हेड्स को जो अधिकार दिये जा रहे हैं वे अधिकार खतरनाक हैं क्योंकि उन से वे पुरानी रंजिशें निकाल सकते हैं या दूसरे तरीके की बात कर सकते हैं जिस से लोगों का नुकसान हो सकता है। मैं निवेदन करूंगा कि हड़ताल को खत्म करने के बाद अब आप कोई इस तरह की बात न कीजिये जो कि बदले की भावना को प्रकट करने वाली हो। आप कहीं पर कोई कानून

बनाने की कोशिश मत कीजिये जिस में हड़ताल को गैरकानूनी करने की बात सोची जा सके।

Shri Indrajit Gupta (Calcutta—South West): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am afraid, after listening to the hon. Prime Minister's very angry and eloquent oration, I fail to be convinced particularly regarding his invitation to appear before him in sack cloth and ashes. I am afraid I must decline that invitation politely but firmly, because I find that in all the speeches made in this House both yesterday and today on behalf of Government the central issue which has been raised through this strike and which has been referred to here repeatedly by a number of hon. Members is being evaded. No clear-cut answer is being given to that question; and that question is this. Are the Central Government employees, who, everybody here admits, are not in the run or ordinary employees because they occupy a particularly strategic and vital position and who do not number just a few thousands but 22 lakhs, which means that, if you take into consideration their dependants and families, they may come anywhere between one to one and a half crores of people, which is quite a substantial section of the population of our country, are these people to have any sort of guarantee or assurance that their existing real wages are going to be protected? No answer is being given to this point as far as I have been able to follow the arguments of the speakers on behalf of Government. I would like a reply to it because unless we get a reply to this we cannot be convinced by other arguments.

The Prime Minister referred in his broadcast before the strike, and referred to it also in his speech, to the consideration of border defence. He chose to score some, what I think is somewhat rather unworthy, debating points at the expense of the Opposi-

tion. On that point I am provoked to make a remark.

Unfortunately, his reference in this connection, linking it with the strike, to the question of border defence would have sounded a little more convincing if we had seen the Government take some vigorous action to defend the rear of those brave soldiers of ours who are not standing only on the western borders but also on the north-eastern borders of the country. Are there not our jawans there and what kind of rear did the Government create for them when for 18 long days arson, looting and plunder was going on in Assam? Was that the way to strengthen the defence in a border State? We would be a little more convinced if some of these things were correlated and put before the House because everything with which the Prime Minister disagrees or which he does not approve of is, of course, out-moded, according to him. Even he knows—and he admits that—that in today's circumstances and the conditions of the modern world—I am not talking about the countries equipped with nuclear weapons but countries like ours—defence does not mean the front alone but means the front and the rear. Defence has no meaning without a strong rear, without contented civil workers manning our railway lines, our postal, telegraph and telephone services, our coal mines and our steel plants. Could you treat the workers there to starvation and to hunger and expect your defence to be strengthened? That is why these arguments have not cut any ice, from the day that broadcast was made. I know some of the Government Members may indulge in some self-satisfaction by quoting statistics and say that an overwhelming majority of the employees did not participate in this strike.

Sir, I am not going into statistical arguments. We agree to differ on that because in that part of the country from which I come some statistics

were put out during the strike. You have to go and ask all those hundreds and thousands of people who listened over the radio every day that all the trains were running normally from Howrah and Sealdah and took their luggage and went to the station and saw a different sight and came back cursing the Government. You have to ask those people who could not put a trunk telephone call through and who could not get their letters posted or delivered.

Shri C. D. Pande (Naini Tal): Thanks to you.

Shri Indrajit Gupta: Yes, thanks to you. So, I am not going into statistical arguments.

But the fact remains—even if 4 or 5 lakhs of employees out of 22 lakhs went on strike in conditions where they were threatened with this kind of Ordinance, where they were threatened with immediate dismissal from work and where their own livelihood and the future of their families was at stake, is it a light matter to be taken lightly? Four or five lakhs of workers risked their everything and went on strike. Therefore, there is one point which I must refer to here; and that is this question has become sufficiently clear, I think, for all honest people to admit that what the employees were out for was some sort of release, release from this perpetual nightmare which has been haunting them for the last so many years, this nightmare of rising prices and falling real wages.

I am not prepared like the Prime Minister to forget all that background. He says, forget all that; let us just come down to what happened on the 11th July. I say, 'No.' We have to take into consideration that past and, therefore, this nightmare from which they were seeking some sort of release—what is going to happen to that in future. Those who, according to the Prime Minister, tried to ride the tiger may have fallen off the back of the

[Shri Indrajit Gupta]

tiger; but what about the tiger? Where is the tiger to go? Do you want it to turn into a man-eater as somebody in this House tried to make out in another connection—man-eating tiger? The tiger is there; the rider may have fallen off. Let us discuss what the tiger asked for. (*Interruption*). It is an unhappy simile. But the Prime Minister has used it.

Therefore, in this connection I do not find myself in harmony with the sentiments expressed in this House that the strike has been defeated. Has it been defeated? Look at things a little more deeply. Yes; it has been defeated, in the immediate sense; it has been defeated in the sense that the immediate demand which had come to the forefront of getting an immediate increase in dearness allowance—that the employees were not able to get. So, they have been beaten. I say, ultimately, if you look at it a little deeper, the same experience which these employees have suffered repeatedly at the hands of this Government from 1946-47 and onwards, namely, that unless you do something, unless you shout, unless you put pressure, unless you give a threat of strike and unless you go on strike or some sort of struggle nothing ever comes out, this basic lesson has not been contradicted. It has been confirmed once again. The Prime Minister was good enough to admit that one good thing that has come out of the strike was that it has given us a jolt. The Government and other people who were not so keenly aware of these problems are now compelled to think about them. It is good; it is a gain of the strike. But not only that. On the eve of the strike, when the Joint Council of Action, I believe, was prepared to call off the strike and withdraw the strike notice on the basis of the formula which they had put forward, namely, 7 point increase in the cost of living index instead of 10 points above the 115 which was the proposal of the Government. If they were agreeable to compensate at least 50 per cent. of the rise and if an ave-

rage of 7 points is reached at the end of 12 months, the balance can be referred to arbitration. Was it such an unreasonable proposal? Was that a proposal put forward by people who are absolutely insistent and bent on going on strike, who were so irresponsible as the Prime Minister says. They were not prepared to think of any way by which they could avert the situation. But at that time, through the agency of the Labour Minister it was made clear that even if they accepted the Government's proposal of the average rise of 10 points over 12 months, the Government may or may not review the situation, let alone give an increase. Whether it would be reviewed or not was itself to be left to the discretion of the Government. But at least as a by-product of this defeated strike here, yesterday, in this House, the Home Minister as I understood him to say has made a commitment before the nation that if the index goes up by an average of 10 points over 12 months Government will review the position. 'May' is substituted by 'will'.... (*Interruptions*.)

The Minister of Finance (Shri Morarji Desai): There is nothing new about it.

An Hon. Member: He did not say so.

Shri Indrajit Gupta: I am very sorry for it. But I understood him to say that it would be reviewed and it might be compensated up to 50 per cent.

Shri Morarji Desai: That was said before also.

Shri Indrajit Gupta: That was not said before. I have looked through all the correspondence and the papers and it is quite clearly put there that they may review the situation.

There are these new scales which have been announced and new increments and adjustments in pay and so on. They were lying there for months

and years together but now they have come out. What is the grace in this announcement? If it had come before the strike, there would have been some grace in it and they could have taken some credit for it. Is it a by-product of the strike. These are all good things. You may say that you were considering the matter. But the point is that nothing would have come out and it would have taken another six months or a year. We know this Government very well. There are some concessions in them.

Acharya Kripalani: They may take them back!

Shri Indrajit Gupta: They have been given. Not only that. There is our brave soldier of the Indian Army. After all he had some desire too, I think, that his family, poverty-stricken family back in his home village—its condition should be improved a bit. He got from the Prime Minister of course very generous measure of praise which he deserves but that generous measure of verbal praise was not enough to feed his family nor were his own rations. Anyway, we are glad that if only after the strike—you may say there is no connection but I say there is connection—from Rs. 55.50 or Rs. 52.50 his emoluments are raised to Rs. 66. It seems there is some catalytic agent working somewhere. What is it? Why are these things coming now one after another within the space of 3-4 days where they used to take months together? The public of this country will draw its own conclusion.

Not only in the case of the Central Government employees has this happened. I read today that the Government of U.P.—the biggest State in our country—which, I believe, was offered a subsidy by the Central Government if it was thinking of revising the emoluments of its State Government employees but which at one time refused to do that—that Government of U.P. on the 27th of last month has at last announced—after the strike—a raise of Rs. 5.50 for the State Government employees. Our Governor of Madras—he

is not friendly to the Opposition or the strike—Shri Bishnuram Medhi in his Address to the Joint Session of the two Houses of the Madras Legislature says:

“One disquieting feature in the present economy of the country is the persistent upward trend in prices. This is indeed causing considerable hardship to the people, particularly in the fixed low-income groups.”

What does he say? I say this because the Prime Minister waxed eloquent about the Plan and the future.

“Unless this tendency is arrested the anticipated resources for the Third Plan may not ever be forthcoming because the incentive and ability to save are diminished under inflationary conditions.”

Lower down in that speech he goes on to mention the recent increase which the State Pay Commission has granted in Madras also, to the employees there.

An Hon. Member: It is not because of the strike.

Shri Indrajit Gupta: Everything has happened because of the strike. As I said, evidently, some by-products have come. Therefore, we are not prepared to accept that the strike has produced no results at all.

Certain proposals have been made here for the future. I do not want to take time over them. When these proposals come before this House, we shall have enough to say. But I want to say this much. If you want to ban the strikes, you will have to ban certain other things also. Otherwise the unilateral ban would not work. The tiger is roaming about, though riderless at the moment; the tiger has to be satisfied. You have got so many Acts, bans and Ordinances. But not one of them worked. I do not want to repeat what my hon. friends have said about the prices, blackmarketing, profiteering and speculation. If you can ban them, you can also ban the strike.

[Shri Indrajit Gupta]

Otherwise, a hundred bans will not prevent people going on strike of their conditions become intolerable.

The question of outsiders was raised yesterday—the question of excluding outsiders from trade unions. As far as we from the AITUC are concerned—my friends from the INTUC sounded a bit apprehensive yesterday—we may say that at the last Indian Labour Conference we made it clear that we are prepared for the exclusion of outsiders from all trade unions—not only from those of the Government employees. But your definition of outsiders must not include ex-employees. That is the thin end of the wedge. I know that anybody who is an employee and who is a leading member of his union can be sacked today and victimised tomorrow. He becomes an ex-employee and an outsider and can no longer have a place in the union. We are not prepared to accept that position. Apart from that we are not afraid of it. Some INTUC gentlemen may be apprehensive of losing their jobs but we are not afraid.

I have no time to go into the withdrawal of recognition and other things. But before concluding I must say a few words about the post-strike repression and victimisation of the employees. I am not going to quote cases because it is no use giving a few individual cases. I want an answer from the Government on one central point. Much has been said about leniency—lenient attitude towards the majority of the employees and stern measures against just a few who were guilty of violence or sabotage. The Home Minister said yesterday—if I heard him right—that he had got information about 135 cases of sabotage and some 200 cases of violence, intimidation, etc. If that is so, why is action taken against thousands of employees throughout the country? A veil is being thrown over realities. What is happening? We have been given assurances about leniency.

15 hrs.

But what is going on for the last three weeks in this country since the strike was called off? Why do they run into hundreds and thousands, people who are suspended, discharged, dismissed and so on? The point is, for mere participation in strikes, even if it is an illegal strike, the Supreme Court has laid down in decision after decision, in the case of the Punjab National Bank, in the case of Burn and Company, in the case of some other cases—I can give you references—that for mere participation in a strike, even if it is an illegal strike, an employee cannot be dismissed from his job. I want to say, if the Prime Minister feels that any modification of a high-power Pay Commission's recommendation may lead to a situation where any decent man, he said, will think twice before serving on that Pay Commission again, is it not unwittingly casting a reflection on the Judges of the Supreme Court, the highest judiciary of the country, whose decisions are now being flouted by every petty bureaucrat and officer who considers himself to be a little dictator in governmental offices? What is your reply to this question? Are you going to punish people for the crime of mere participation in the strike? That is what is happening.

My final word is, are you prepared to give any kind of machinery or provision for providing safeguard to workers and employees against possible misuse of these powers by the officers? Will you consider any form of appellate body or appellate authority, or are you going to leave it completely in the hands of the officers to do what they please and there is nobody else to question or check up.

Finally, there is one question which has not been referred to by anyone.

Mr. Chairman: Order, order. Only 15 minutes are allowed. I rang the bell thrice after 15 minutes. He must conclude now.

Shri Tangamani (Madurai): This is his maiden speech.

Mr. Chairman: I am only requesting him to conclude. If he has concluded, then I will call another hon. Member.

Shri Nath Pai: One minute is lost in the negotiation.

Mr. Chairman: He has taken one minute thrice. I will certainly give him one more minute if he so desires.

Shri Indrajit Gupta: Sir, I have concluded.

Shri Naushir Bharucha (East Khadesh): Sir, may I know when the hon. Minister will be called on to reply?

Mr. Chairman: At 3.15 P.M.

Shri Naushir Bharucha: It is already 3.00.

Mr. Chairman: Shri Nanda is going to speak at 3.15.

Shri Naushir Bharucha: When will the Home Minister be called?

Mr. Chairman: So far it has not been decided.

Some Hon. Members: To-morrow.

The Minister of Parliamentary Affairs (Shri Satya Narayan Sinha): He will be called at 4.30 P.M. today.

Shri Naushir Bharucha: In that case, Sir, when shall I have the time to reply, at 4.15?

Mr. Chairman: That will depend upon the time available.

Shri Goray (Poona): If it is possible Sir, taking into consideration the seriousness of the discussion, I would suggest that you may ask the Home Minister to reply tomorrow.

An Hon. Member: At 12.00.

Mr. Chairman: As a matter of fact, this debate was fixed for two days. If

the House feels that the time should be extended, I personally have no objection. The Speaker will be coming just now and he will decide the question.

Shri Nath Pai: We agree.

Shri Satya Narayan Sinha: Sir, he is very anxious to finish it today.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: In that case, Sir, why don't you let Shri Indrajit Gupta finish his speech. If you are going to extend the time he may be allowed to finish his speech. This is his maiden speech.

Mr. Chairman: I understand that there are some hon. Members who want to see that the time is extended and there are others who want to see that the time is not extended. The Minister of Parliamentary Affairs has just now said that the Speaker wishes to see that this debate is concluded today. Only two days have been allotted for this debate.

Shri Jaipal Singh (Ranchi West-Reserved-Sch. Tribes): Sir, now that we are staggering the time available at our disposal, I want to know whether Shri Bharucha would be given his right to reply. I heard from the hon. Minister for Parliamentary Affairs, who is again sitting in the wrong place, that the hon. Home Minister will be called to reply at 4.30. Am I correct Sir?

Mr. Chairman: The hon. Minister for Parliamentary Affairs said that the Home Minister will reply at 4.30. What more does he want to know?

Shri Jaipal Singh: Indirectly, Sir, you have indicated that the desire of the House is not that the time may be extended. That is to be seen by a voice vote. But still, I maintain that a maiden speech deserves special consideration.

Mr. Chairman: The time fixed for this debate was two days. If the whole House agrees to extend the time I have no objection.

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Chairman: Some hon. Members want to see that the time is not extended. The Speaker will come now and he will then decide the question. Shrimati Sucheta Kripalani.

Shrimati Sucheta Kripalani (New Delhi): Mr. Chairman, Sir, much has been spoken, and at the fag end of the discussion I do not want to take much time of the House. But I have been thinking about this strike situation. Unfortunately, I was away from India when the strike took place. Our country since its freedom has faced many difficult situations. Particularly, this year has been a difficult year for us. But I feel this was one of the gravest situations we faced. If the Central Government employees had all gone on strike it would not have been merely a crisis for the Government, it would have been a crisis for the whole nation.

I am happy that this strike failed. This strike failed, I am told, due to various reasons. One was the lack of public response and also the firm handling by the Government. Government is accused for firmly handling the strike. But I think they advisedly did so, because if a situation of chaos had been created here we would not have known how to get out of it. Therefore, at such a juncture it was necessary that the strike should not be allowed to be successful.

Also, I am happy that the leaders of the strike unconditionally withdrew it after five days. For these reasons, we got out a very difficult situation. It would have served nobody's interest if the strike had continued and a situation of chaos had come about. I do not wish to get into any recrimination nor do I wish to make all sorts of charges, we have heard enough about it yesterday and also today, but I would say that this strike was untimely and very ill-advised. I say untimely because of the difficulties at our borders. This whole year has been a year of great anxiety. I know that the PSP has been greatly exer-

cised by this. Therefore, it came as a surprise to me that the PSP should have played such a prominent part during the strike.

The whole psychology in the country was opposed to a strike. That is why we found such public response against the strike. It is unfortunate that when the trade union leaders—I have also done a little of trade union work—gave a call for a strike the public should not respond. If you want to succeed, if you really want to lead the workers to their goal, then it is your duty first to assess your strength, first assess the public opinion and then go on strike. In this strike the leaders gave a tremendous call, they gave a call, to all the government servants all over the country. It was not an ordinary industrial strike. It was a call for a tremendous strike affecting the core of our being, affecting the existence of the country. But for that strike they did not think it fit to educate public opinion, to collect the sympathy of the people. We had strikes during our national movement. After all, what was our national movement? There were general strikes against the British Government. But Gandhiji took six months, a year to prepare the nation for a strike. Only when he found that the country was ready he gave the call for a strike.

Therefore, Sir, I feel that it was thoroughly ill-advised, ill-timed and they chose the most wrong psychological moment to give a call for the strike.

I am happy that in Delhi the government servants were wise enough not to indulge in this strike. In some areas they did strike. On my return to Delhi, Government employees have come again and again to me. I am associated with many labour unions and with the Government servants' associations also. The one burden of the song of the Government servants was, "get us out of these difficulties. See that nobody is victimised." Their prayer is to see that the orders of suspension and dis-

missal are withdrawn. I have received letters from the members of the families of these people. They are all poorly paid people. They are faced with dire consequences. You know how difficult it is to get employment in this country now. After all who have suffered by this ill-timed call for strike? Whenever a strike fails, who suffers most? The people concerned suffer most; the strikers suffer. First of all, they are faced with all this punishment. Secondly, owing to the action that the Government is now going to take by putting a restriction on trade union activity by de-recognising some of the trade unions, it is the trade unions' interests that would suffer. Therefore, no leader worth his salt, no leader of a trade union should indulge in a strike before preparing his people for the eventualities. There is frustration. There is demoralisation in the ranks of the Government servants as a result of this strike.

I do not think this is the time to apportion blame or to say who was responsible and who was not. Let us say that the blame was on both sides. At this time, I would appeal to the Government and to my hon. friends on the other side. What is our duty at the moment? Our duty is to see that normalcy is arrived at. Our duty is to try and see that good relations are established between the Government servants and the Government. Our duty is to see that the just grievances of the people are properly redressed, taking into consideration the entire situation obtaining in the nation.

I am happy that our Home Minister in his yesterday's speech repeatedly said this; and he expressed his sympathy and concern for the Government servants. He also made it clear that his attitude is not a vindictive one. He does not want to be retaliatory. He wants to handle the situation with as much human consideration as possible. The same sentiments were expressed by the Prime Minister today. Therefore, I would like to ap-

peal to the Government. The situation, as I have assessed, is one where the Government will have to act with a great deal of generosity and a great deal of wisdom. The Government would like to have the best of relations between themselves and the Government employees. I would, therefore, request the Government to see that all employees against whom suspension and dismissal orders have been served are allowed to rejoin. Individual cases may be studied and after scrutiny of the individual cases, if it is found that they had indulged in sabotage or in violence, certainly action should be taken against such persons. Such a general policy and such a generous attitude, I am sure, will give you good dividends.

I would also like to appeal to the Government to see that no wide use of rule 5 is made. With a wide use of rule 5, the Government can dismiss the Government servants without assigning the causes, and if such wide use of the rule is made, it will leave a trail of bitterness. I am sure the Government do not desire to have a trail of bitterness behind all this.

While speaking on this situation, I may also say this. I also came to realise that there were certain unions which in the beginning did not join the strikers. They decided against the strike. But, later on, under the force of events and under pressure, they gave notice of strike. I would appeal to the Government to treat them leniently. I most earnestly appeal to the Government to see that in no way do the Government servants go away with the feeling that they are being victimised and that the Government are being vindictive towards them.

I have an objection to one of the decisions of the Government. The discretion of taking action against the staff should not be left with the departmental heads. I have nothing to say against the departmental heads.

[Shrimati Sucheta Kripalani]

But instances have been quoted to us today and yesterday where they have acted in an ill-informed way and where sometimes they have acted in a vindictive manner. When you leave the discretion with the heads of departments, there is a chance and there is a scope of wreaking vengeance on some private scores. Somebody might have been angry at some Government servant and the head of the department might make use of this opportunity to get rid of the man concerned. Therefore, I appeal to the Government in all earnestness that for the future good of the country, for the future good relations between the Government and the Government servants, they should see that all those servants are allowed to rejoin. Let the individual cases be scrutinised and those who are found to have been at fault may be punished; action may be taken against them. But that does not mean that I do not appreciate the argument that the Government may put forward. They will say that strict discipline should be maintained. Certainly, among the Government servants there should be strict discipline. But this was an extraordinary situation and such a situation, I hope, is not going to recur again in this country. In this case, the strikers also withdrew the strike. Therefore, it is good and proper that you should adopt a very generous attitude and deal with the strikers on the grounds of humanity and clemency and see that no trail of bitterness is left behind.

Then, I would like to say a few words about the demands of the low-paid Government servants. I live in New Delhi and I represent the Government servants in New Delhi. I have had occasion, as the hon. Home Minister knows, to deal with their cases. The Home Minister and the Minister of State in the Ministry of Home Affairs, Shri Datar, have complained to me that "we get the largest number of representations about Government servants from you." I suppose you know that I know all the pro-

blems of these Government servants. I am in touch with them. I meet them every day. I know how they live and I know how these Class IV or Class III servants find it difficult to meet the growing cost of living. It is true that Government servants are better paid than the people in other sectors, but even with all that, with today's high cost of living, a poorly paid Government servant finds it very difficult to meet all his demands at the end of the month. Therefore, they demand that they be given a minimum wage which is linked to the needs; that their dearness allowance be linked to the cost of living index. I might mention that this demand is not unreasonable. It is reasonable. This principle was accepted by the Pay Commission, but the first Pay Commission thought that about the cost of living the prices would be stabilised at a particular stage; unfortunately, the prices did not stabilise, and they kept on soaring. Therefore, today, in spite of the rise that you have given, today's real wage of the worker is of the 1947 level only. This is so when our national income is supposed to have gone up. Therefore, you cannot blame them if they say, "Give us a share of the national income." You cannot blame them if they cry, "We are in distress." I understand that the Home Minister has to view the entire country as a whole. But if the Government servant is in distress, if his shoe pinches what can the Government servant do? The Minister also knows that these poor Government servants cannot pay the school fees of their children, that they cannot sometimes pay the grocers' bills, etc. Therefore, they come and ask for a rise in the wage. I do appreciate the Government's difficulty. I appreciate what Shri G. B. Pant told us yesterday: that they have to think of the entire nation; that they have to consider the salaries that prevail in the States and in the local bodies, etc. But with all that, I would appeal to the Government to try to give these people whatever relief they can, be-

Ordinance and Strike

cause, without that relief it is difficult for them to work efficiently.

The Government want these people to be contented and efficient. They do not want the staff to be grumbling all the time. They do not want them to be in the processions all the time, and they do not want them in the public to be voicing their grievances. If the Government want them to be contented and efficient, conditions must be created under which they can work properly. Here, I would like to draw the attention of the Government to one more aspect of the problem. The cost of living index does not take into consideration all the items of essential expenditure. The cost of living index is based on the needs of the working class. The Government servant must educate his children; the cost of education has risen very high during the last few years. I know the conditions in Delhi. There is no provision to mitigate this difficulty, in the calculation of the salary. Then take housing. I know that the Government servants are supposed to get houses from the Government, but there are not enough houses for them. I know that the Government servants are paying enormous house-rents for private houses. Sometimes even one-third of the salary is paid out as house rent. Therefore, I am happy that some kind of solution has now come, namely, this ten point formula. With the implementation of this formula, there would be perhaps a little rise in the salaries of Government employees. It would not completely satisfy them, though I do not decry it. It is something. But even this rise adds a burden of Rs. 45 crores to the budget. When I look at the other side of the picture, I see it is a difficult position. Therefore, I would appeal to the Government to see that they must try to help the Government servants in other ways.

The Prime Minister today talked of amenities. The Pay Commission has devoted a whole chapter to the wel-

fare of the workers. This should be given to them. Facilities should be given to them for cheap grain shops. If that cannot be done then they should be given facilities for running their own co-operatives for consumer goods. Government should give them facilities for the education of their children, cheap housing and such facilities which add to the real wages of the people, because an increase of Rs. 5 today means very little and it does not remove the discontent.

I would like to draw attention to another aspect. As I have been dealing with the Government servants, I know there are innumerable small pin-pricks which are focal points of discontent. There are troubles about promotion. The employees should know that the promotions will always come with fairness and justice. If a man is superseded in order to give advantage to somebody else, it becomes a point of discontent. Then, there are the relations between the superior staff and the inferior staff. The management of personnel is not what it should be. Every day poor Government servants come to me with all sorts of complaints. If these are removed, you take away a major factor of their discontent and you lay the foundation for better relations between the Government and the servants.

Something very serious has happened as a result of the strike. We are taking away the right to strike from the trade unions. Trade unions came into existence in order to facilitate smooth adjustment between the employer and the employees. When we take away these rights, we should create a really efficient machinery which will give an opportunity to employees to negotiate with the employers properly. So, a proper procedure should be laid down clearly and precisely. Such machinery should be quick and efficient.

In this regard, Shri Masani drew the attention of the House to the fact

[Shrimati Sucheta Kripalani]

that Government servants can be divided into three categories—essential services, civil service proper and industrial workers. As the public sector is increasing every day, more and more industrial workers will become Government employees. So, we should think very deeply before we take away this right from them.

15.23 hrs.

[MR. SPEAKER in the Chair]

The Minister of Labour and Employment and Planning (Shri Nanda):

Sir, you allow me to intervene briefly in this discussion in order that I may be able to offer a little further clarification on some important issues, mainly two issues—one is the justification for the strike and the second is the reasonableness of the measures that we propose to adopt for the future. I would like to give an objective and calm appraisal of certain things which happened at a certain stage in the progress of the dispute, a stage with which I happened to be associated. On the basis of that knowledge, on the basis also of my special knowledge of the labour movement, the needs of labour and their obligations also and of the labour administration, I would like to say something. There is nothing exciting about what I have to say, but it is going to have a bearing on the proper understanding of the situation.

In the first place, I might submit that I might be incurring the risk of causing a certain amount of displeasure, by talking of certain things, giving facts and speaking out my mind frankly. It may not be liked, it may not be palatable.....

Shri Asoka Mehta: To which side of the House?

Shri Nanda: You will find out. I am very conscious of the fact that I have had a great deal of goodwill and support for whatever I have been attempting to do. Sometimes I feel overwhelmed by it. It is no question of personal satisfaction, but I feel

the support, sympathy and goodwill are a very great asset in promoting the objectives of labour policy and in promoting the interests of the working class and the industry and also the national interest. So, I value it very highly as a very great asset.

I may also say that there are individual Members who have been very kind to me. One of them just spoke of me in terms which are almost embarrassing. But he said in respect of me among other things about my integrity and therefore, I shall exercise that obligation?

The first thing about the strike is, why did it occur? There has been a great deal of labouring of the point and a great deal of stress that they had been driven to this position of going on strike of this magnitude with all its serious consequences, because they had not been allowed any avenue for settlement and no channel for discussion. So, what would we do? "We had our grievances for which there was no way to ventilate and to get redress". If that had been the fact, as a person who has spent many more years in the labour movement in other places, I can certainly appreciate that feeling and that attitude. But at the point of time when I entered on the scene, I dealt with these demands and all that they had to say on behalf of the workers at very great length. I had prolonged discussions and they were not in a personal capacity. It was on behalf of Government. That was not just on the eve of the strike in the sense that things had gone out of hand. It was on the 30th June, 1st or 2nd July; it was about that period. For hours, in the mornings and till late evenings, individually and in groups, we discussed all these things.

I thought I had been able to create a certain impression regarding each individual demand and issue. It was discussed threadbare and all the merits of it were gone into and nothing of substance had been left which could

be the basis or reason for taking this drastic step. May be, I now understand that they might have taken a certain view of the situation into which all these things did not enter and something else entered, which may not have been relevant. Shri Nath Pai has been saying, "Don't introduce extraneous considerations". I still have a lurking suspicion in my mind that at that stage certain other considerations—extraneous considerations—entered. This is my feeling. On the face of it, on the face of their own record of demands and my offers made to them, nothing very much was left to be done.

I have heard from some hon. Members here something being said about my personal attitude as distinct from the position as a member of the Government. There is no such distinction. I was speaking on behalf of the Government. It is not a compliment to say I had more sympathy than others to the Government servants. It is not a compliment but it is a condemnation. If in any substantial matter injustice is done to the working class I will have no hesitation in condemning it and the attractions of office will not hold me here even for a moment. When I was talking to them I was talking out of conviction.

Shri Tangamani: If you feel so strongly you must resign.

Shri Nanda: Because you feel so, I also should feel that I have not been able to play my part properly, that is not correct. There may be differences in detail here and there. But in substance if I feel justice is not done to the working class I would not be here. This is the wrong way of looking at it. I argued with the hon. Members with deep conviction about the case I had been entrusted with, and not simply because certain instructions or a certain brief had been given to me. It is not so.

About the demands themselves my broad approach was very clear. Among the demands there are some which touch the heart of the recommendations of the Pay Commission. It was not possible to by-pass those recommendations. But within the framework of the Pay Commission's recommendations the maximum possible accommodation and latitude would be given. That is what I said regarding those two demands. Regarding the others I said that the utmost that was possible would be done. How much was actually offered? It was practically full satisfaction in respect of all those items of demands. When I say we were not prepared to by-pass the Pay Commission we are confronted with another question "you say you would not by-pass it because you attribute to it a certain sanctity, a certain importance which is equivalent to the award of an arbitration board or adjudication or something like that. Did you actually treat it like that yourself? That was the question." Sir, it may be that some modifications had been made. If you look into the whole gamut of the recommendations you will find that those modifications were very small which, in totality did not amount to very much. But if still that argument could be advanced my answer is that in those three days full rectification was made. I offered to them that whatever the Pay Commission has offered that was going to be observed and respected. This was the position. Therefore, if anything had been taken away from the value of the recommendations of the Pay Commission, that had been set right. Therefore, that ground does not remain. To say "you did not treat it as an award; so we did not treat it that way" is not correct. I told them that whatever departures have been made from the recommendations of the Pay Commission, we would set them right and rectify them. Therefore, that point no longer remains.

I will come to those two demands a little bit later, but there were other

[Shri Nanda]

questions. One other question, was about the principle of arbitration. Here the Pay Commission has made some very good recommendations. But the employees could ask: "What about us? We have no machinery for negotiations and settlement. When there is a dispute what do we do?" I realise the great force in that position. If we do not want the Government servants always to be agitating or giving threats of strike then there must be some kind of assurance that when they have a grievance justice will be done unto them. Therefore, I agreed with them that so far as the recommendations of the Pay Commission were concerned, and they cover almost the whole range of things which interest the Government employees—remuneration and conditions of services, etc.—any point arising out of implementation of non-implementation of these recommendations we will try to meet and discuss with each other. If we still differ then these differences will be referred for impartial settlement. Therefore, the principle of arbitration was accepted. Not only for the occasion but also I offered that later on we would establish a machinery, some kind of a joint machinery. Regarding the details I offered that within six months we will have a conference and we will decide all the issues.

Therefore, whatever we are now saying I said even then—machinery for negotiations, arbitration and so on. Well, if they thought differently, I cannot really enter into their minds. All that was possible at that stage was done. Having got all they could have, and still to launch a strike for this there was certainly not the slightest justification. Regarding the other demands I do not want to go in detail now.

But I did not rest content with that. On these two demands I entered into a close argument with them on the merits of the case. Take, for example, the need based on minimum wage. A

good deal of misconception has gathered round the need-based minimum wage. About the Indian Labour Conference recommendations in various quarters the misconception remains. It is necessary that it should be cleared. The 15th Indian Labour Conference broke new ground. Previously there used to be consideration of some legislation, properly these were really matters entirely for the Government; some of the recommendations were accepted and some were not. Here we met in a particular situation, and the unrest was increasing. The number of man days lost owing to stoppages was rising, the employers were complaining that there was indiscipline growing and cases of intimidation and violence and coercion increasing. The workers were asking for a 25 per cent increase in wages. The employers themselves were feeling that there should be some kind of norms set up, because the tribunals are not fully acquainted with all these things. That was the situation in which this subject was taken up and the Indian Labour Conference met. What were the issues before them? The issues were discipline in industry, rationalisation of industry, workers' education, participation; in fact all aspects of all labour policy were brought into the picture in that conference.

Perhaps it is not known that the need-based minimum wage was a unanimous recommendation, unanimous not only on the part of the workers' representatives—workers representatives of course agreed to it—but of the employers also. The representatives of various sections of the employers also agreed to it. Then the States concerned, the Ministers, Secretaries all agreed to it. Why did they agree? They agreed because it was a kind of a package deal. By agreeing to it they were getting in turn rationalisation, discipline in industry and so on. And discipline in industry was not a small matter.

The workers on their side agreed to it.

Shri Nath Pai: The Finance Minister said that Government is not bound by these recommendations.

Shri Nanda: We have to understand the sense in which it is said.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy (Kendrapara): Finance Minister did not agree (*Interruptions*).

Shri Nanda: I shall deal with it.

Shri Tangamani: Is it not true that all the decisions of the Indian Labour Conferences are unanimous decisions?

Shri Nanda: I have said so. Why have you to remind me about that?

Shri Nath Pai: Your colleague repudiated it.

Shri Nanda: I am coming to that.

Now, what does it say? It says, firstly, that there should be no strike or lockout without notice.

Shri Tyagi (Dehra Dun): Unanimous?

Shri Nanda: Yes, unanimous from the workers' side.

The Minister of Railways (Shri Jagjivan Ram): It says 'without notice'.

Shri Nanda: Then it says:

"No unilateral action should be taken in connection with any industrial matter;

There should be no recourse to go-slow tactics;

No deliberate damage should be caused to a plant or property;

Act of violence, intimidation, coercion or instigation should not be resorted to;

Awards and agreements should be speedily implemented;

Any action which disturbs cordial industrial relations should be avoided."

There were several other things...

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: What about the last two?

Shri Nanda: ...and that the whole machinery and procedure should be exhausted before a notice of strike is given.

Shri Tyagi: How did you persuade them to agree to this?

Shri Prabhat Kar: What procedure under the Industrial Disputes Act was followed in this case?

Shri Nanda: I shall deal with that. I shall deal with the actual facts of the case.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: How do you say that the employers have accepted it? The Railways have not accepted it. Defence has not accepted it. No public sector employer has accepted it.

Shri Nanda: We could have a full debate on that. It is only a side issue at the moment. The main issue at the moment is not something to which my friend need raise objections. When the employers accepted this, they accepted it because they knew that they were getting certain advantages and it was a deal made between the employers and the workers. Committees of the Conference were set up and they dealt with it. This thing was adopted in the open conference and it was rightly so. I do not think there was anything wrong that was done. But I may say that some misunderstandings grew later on about the content and the meaning of this recommendation. I think if that recommendation is properly understood there should be

[Shri Nanda]

no difficulty about this being accepted by anybody.

What does it say? It says:

"While accepting that minimum wage was 'need-based' and should ensure the minimum human needs of the industrial worker the following norms were accepted as a guide for all wage fixing authorities including minimum wage committees....." etc.

That is a guide. Then certain norms are given. Firstly,

"In calculating the minimum wage the standard working class family should be taken to comprise three consumption units for one earner....." etc.

Then,

"Minimum food requirements should be calculated on the basis of a net intake of calories as recommended by Dr. Akroyd...."

In regard to clothing requirements, 18 yards per annum were taken. Then,

"In respect of housing, the rent corresponding to the minimum area provided for under Government's Industrial Housing Scheme should be taken into consideration.....".

"Fuel, lighting and other miscellaneous items of expenditure should constitute 20 per cent of the total minimum wage."

I do not know how and where somehow a mistake occurred. This budget does not make an equivalent of Rs. 125. There has been a misunderstanding about the real content of this recommendation. That health bulletin of Dr. Akroyd gives three different schedules—one is a balanced diet; the other is an adequate diet and the third is an improved diet. A minimum wage cannot be based on a

balanced diet and on high ideas about how much vitamins of the best kind—so much eggs, so much milk and all that—be made available. But it was an improved diet which was necessarily to be taken and on the basis of improved diet—I have made the calculations it means Rs. 100 to Rs. 105. What wrong had been done?

Shri S. M. Banerjee: That does not amount to 56 nP per day.

Shri Nanda: I am at the moment dealing with the recommendations of the Indian Labour Conference regarding the need-based minimum wage. Now this comes to Rs. 105 at a time when actually in the textile industry a section of the workers are getting more, that is, minimum wage and dearness allowance, not to think of bonus which they get from year to year. So it was more. It was nothing so atrocious as is being made out to be.

What did the Government do? Did the Government tell the Pay Commission not to take into consideration all this? All that the recommendation says is that this should be taken into consideration by the authorities who go into the question of wages and all that the Finance Ministry's letter said was, Deal with it on its merits." We have not ratified it, because there is no ratification of recommendations of the Indian Labour Conference. They do not go through a process of ratification. Therefore all that the Finance Ministry said was, "All right, take it into consideration on its merits." That was what was intended to be done.

Shri Prabhat Kar: It was an agreement and merit had to be taken into consideration before the agreement was arrived at.

Shri Nanda: I shall explain it a little further and then possibly the position will become clear to the hon. Member. What did the Pay Commission do? Did it not consider this report? Did it not consider

Ordinance and Strike

these recommendations? The Pay Commission took them into full consideration. Pages after pages have been devoted to a consideration of this recommendation. The Pay Commission considered it.

There is another clause in this agreement, which says:

"Whenever the minimum wage fixed was below the norms recommended above, it would be incumbent on the authorities concerned to justify the circumstances which prevented them from adherence to the aforesaid norms."

The Pay Commission did the utmost justice to this recommendation by making a detailed analysis of it, by going into it in its own way and by arriving at a certain conclusion of its own according to which it gave that figure which you know.

There may be differences of opinion. They said that it was not possible to give much more. The Pay Commission therefore took into account the recommendations of the Indian Labour Conference fully. It did not meet the requirements fully. That is a very different matter because it was perfectly within its competence to consider it and, if conditions did not permit, to say, "We cannot give this much. We are giving so much only after a full enquiry and consideration of the whole matter."

The question was raised about the agreement, the Indian Labour Conference's recommendations and status. Naturally, it has necessarily and essentially an advisory status. But when the two parties, that is, the employers and the workers, sit together and the Government helps in facilitating agreements then they certainly acquire a certain character and a certain force. Of course, there has to be no rigidity about these things. It is the spirit of accommodation in which these things have to be dealt with.

Recently, I took the matter again to the Standing Labour Committee after the Pay Commission's report. I said, "Some kind of an objection has been raised. Some doubt has been cast on certain calculations and certain bases adopted in these recommendations. Let us go into it and see what are the minimum needs of the workers. It is a scientific fact. Some years ago some scientist did it. Today if anybody says that it is excessive let us go into it." The Standing Labour Committee agreed to that. They did not take a rigid view. I told them, if you bind a person to the letter of an agreement then you would not get agreements in future. If you find that something is not workable, something is wrong which has been discovered, be just and accommodate." That is what they did. We are going on all right so far as this thing is concerned.

In justice to the hon. Member and his colleagues who spoke to me and discussed this with me, I must say that they realised the force of all this and did not press the demand for a minimum wage. They said that it was a progressive realisation of this which, they were seeking. Of course, nobody could object to that. What are all these plans for and our effort at economic development except that in course of time all these things should be realised.

The other thing was about dearness allowance. Again, there are two parts of that demand. The Pay Commission took its stand on two grounds. One was that it was not proper that the emoluments of Government employees should be disturbed too frequently, and changes should occur often. Therefore, they said, there should be some stability about that. That was one thing.

Secondly, they said that there should be no automatic linking, and they gave reasons for it. These ten points over a period of twelve months is the result of this consideration. If it is to change, let it not be over

[Shri Nanda]

three or four months or such short period, let it be after a considerable period lapses. And that period may have gone against the employees now but then it can be in their favour also. If the things are in the reverse direction there will be some benefit also. Of course, hon. Members may think whether it is going to happen. Well, we have all to try to see that it does happen. But that is the principle of it.

Then in regard to automatic linking, the Pay Commission looked into this matter very closely and very carefully and it felt that automatic linking may not be feasible or possible for a Government to agree to, and to adhere to if it has agreed, because the conditions are different. There is a difference between industry and Government. In industry if the cloth prices rise, simultaneously the workers get a little more wage, it is distributed over a whole community of consumers. But here the Government's revenue from which to pay its employees come from narrow sources. It is from taxation.

Shri M. R. Masani: These also have increased, like prices!

Shri Nanda: True, but the increase in prices is for other reasons, and not due to the increase in wages, because the increase in wages would not have made any difference, more than 2 per cent or so, in the case of cloth even less than that. It has no relation at all to what has happened. The workers' wages have not contributed in any sense to that.

The Textile Wage Board has laid down that there should be no change in the wage for five years; that is, for five years the textile worker has not to raise his voice and ask for anything more; stay-put for the industry for five years. And this increase is coupled with certain conditions about rationalisation. And in place after place agreements have been

entered into about rationalisation. All that has happened there.

Here hon. Members say about the prices. Now, there is nothing which can have a greater impact or a worse impact on prices, what Government may do in a wrong way so far as its own resources are concerned, in this sense that if it is not taxation and if the resources are not adequate and if we have recourse to deficit financing, then the amount of deficit finance, which will have repercussions on the inflationary situation of prices, out of all proportion to the same amount of money which may be paid to in industry, etc. We should understand that it will be out of all proportion and we will be setting up the spiral of inflation of prices.

Shri Tyagi: And real wages will go down.

An Hon. Member: What has happened?

Shri Nanda: But did they say that if there is to be no alternative for automatic linking, there should be no consideration of the demand? After a persistent rise for a period—and they defined it in certain terms—it should be considered. And to these friends, with whom I had long discussions, I made this offer—and this is very important. I said that as soon as the conditions laid down in this formula are satisfied, immediately the Government will consider it. I also further assured them that if somehow we offered something and the employees' representatives do not find it satisfactory, the matter will not rest in the hands of Government alone; it will go for impartial settlement. Here was full-fledged arbitration. What then was left as a ground for a strike? And it was not on the 11th but on the 3rd July.

It is said, "you gave automatic linking in industry, Government imposed it". Some hon. Member, I think Shri Naushir Bharucha, said,

"you imposed it on them and you don't accept that position for yourself". We never imposed it on them anywhere. This automatic linking even in industry is not universal. This automatic linking, full neutralisation on the cost of living, is confined to a small section of industry. It is not all-pervasive at all. Even the Wage Board has only said that if the workers want to make a claim that their wages have not been neutralised, they can go to adjudication. And this is what I offered, they may have arbitration and substantiate their claim. That is what was offered. It is nothing else than what is open in private industry. It was fully that.

Why did then the strike happens? They understood the position, but they had got stuck on something. They said, "whatever happens, let us vary this formula a bit". It is not ten months or twelve months and ten points. To me it was not a question of a little variation, because when we are dealing with high issues, how could I say, "you vary it"? The moment I vary it I throw overboard my main contention that the main and the principal recommendations of the Pay Commission are not going to be tampered with. It was not a question at that time; of a little more or less. They should have understood it. It was not possible.

Then we discussed, apart from the merits of this case which I have gone over, we discussed also other aspects. Because, I am a friend of theirs, I am a humble servant of the working class. And I knew all that was going to come, somehow I saw it very clearly, and I told them, "you are loudly protesting"—it was on the 3rd July—"that it is not a political strike, that there is no political intention; I agree fully; but intentions apart, what are going to be the consequences of it?" Hon. Members are telling them now; I told them then. I said, "No Government can tolerate it; you may not want to embarrass Government or to bring it down or create a rebellion or

anything of that kind; but if it succeeds to any considerable extent it can have only those consequences; will any Government allow it to be done; it will use all its strength, all its capacity, all its resources legitimately for that purpose". I told them like that. And I said, "Then what will happen; how much suffering will be brought about; how much damage will be caused; the workers and the government employees will be alienated from the public; there will be a greater gulf between the public and the government employees and its repercussions on the government employees". I told them all this.

But there was some inexorable fate which had taken them in hand and pushed them. I am very sorry, I am unhappy about it. Shri Nath Pai said about his aspirations, his illusions and all that. And I also feel unhappy that such energy, youthful energy, such dedication and enthusiasm for the country, such socialist passion should be wasted like this. It has other uses, other purposes and more constructive purposes.

There was something about the future. I may say a word about it. What do we want to do now? We have been talking about banning of strikes, etc. The word 'banning' of strikes is really irrelevant here. We are not going to just ban strikes; we are going to make them superfluous. We are going to make it sure that there is no occasion for a strike—why do you strike? Even now we can ban strikes. There is the Industrial Disputes Act under which, when we refer a case to adjudication, a strike becomes illegal. So that, illegality is not a new concept. We do that. Shri Naushir Bharucha asked, "why did you not do it in this case?" Yes, I shall answer that. Here something like adjudication has already been done. So where was the question of fresh adjudication. How could we utilise the Industrial Disputes Act in this case? The hon. Member may take another view. I took that view that we are going to carry out the

[Shri Nanda]

Pay Commission recommendations fully, and therefore it was on that basis. The working class now is very keen, much more keen for arbitration than for adjudication. It was the essence of arbitration.

16 hrs.

I may remind some hon. Members who met me in these tripartite bodies. I put it to the Indian labour conference. I am prepared to scrap this legislation for adjudication which compels the workers to remain at work, are you agreeable? I can give a trial to free action if you want to have it, collective bargaining or anything. All of them disagreed. They wanted adjudication.

Shri Nath Pai: Did you have the consent of your colleagues?

Shri Nanda: Leave it between us now.

This was the position. What happens? The ordinary worker has no greater advantage than the government employees under the provisions of a new law like this. An ordinary worker may go on strike. We can compel him not to go on strike. He is not assured of an adjudication. What is happening in this case? Here we are providing always adjudication or something similar. There was uncertainty regarding government employees so far. I can understand the plea, that we may pass an Ordinance any time and take away the right to get justice. Here, we say, you have always your right to struggle justice all the time. They are in a better position than the other workers who sometimes may be allowed to go on strike or may not be allowed to go on strike; Here we shall lay down a certain procedure that we will adopt in all circumstances. This is what we are thinking of doing. The stress is not on banning strike; the stress is on the machinery to be provided so that disputes will be resolved by mutual understanding.

Occasionally if something remained, that would be settled by arbitration, or adjudication or by some process. This is superior to anything that we have got in our existing legislation. Don't call it as something drastic or draconian with the intentions we have got about government employees.

Shri Tyagi: Only there should not be outsiders.

Shri Nanda: I do not know what the hon. Member means by outsiders. I have been an outsider for many years in the labour movement. Therefore, I may not be in a good position to state the case dispassionately. Since the hon. Member has reminded me about outsiders. I may add that one lesson of the strike is this. Outsider or no, I do not attach importance to whether one is outsider or not. I attach importance to two things. One is, you should have whole-time workers, a person who, gives his whole time to it. It is not playing about with this union in his pocket or that union in his hand or another on his head. This is what should not be. This is doing injustice to the workers: not being able to look after their interests. You are not able to understand things properly. The second thing is politics. This part-time trade union worker and larger-time politician has his political interests always. I am not now making any invidious distinction between one section and another; I say, this irrespective of any distinction, of all sections. They should forget their politics and devote their whole time to this. They are thinking of the elections and the use they can make of their Trade Union connections. Therefore, it is not a question of outsider or not. We have to interpret this problem in these terms: how do we try to secure the working classes from these dangers. These are dangers.

I have taken a good deal of time. I have covered some of the points. The conclusion is, I again repeat, whatever may have been the situation be-

fore, when I started meeting them, there was not a semblance of an excuse left for my friends to persist in that course of a strike coming about. They should have called it off much earlier. That was not done. Therefore, I repeat, there was no justification for a strike. To the other question of Shri Naushir Bharucha, the answer comes straight from that. What we propose to do is naturally for the good of the working classes of the country and everybody.

Mr. Speaker: Shri Frank Anthony.

Shri Jaipal Singh (Ranchi West—Reserved—Sch. Tribes): Before Shri Frank Anthony begins, may I just have a clarification? Earlier I requested that the hon. Home Minister may reply tomorrow so that more Members may take part in this.

Mr. Speaker: Even if he replies tomorrow, that would give only half an hour. I will call the hon. Home Minister at 4.30. The House will rise at 5.

Shri Nath Pai: He has a right to reply.

Mr. Speaker: He will reply in two minutes.

Shri Naushir Bhaurcha: Both of us will reply tomorrow.

Some Hon. Members: It should be finished today.

Shri G. B. Pant: Whatever time hon. Members opposite are willing to give, I will be satisfied with that. I leave it to them as to the time that they would like me to take. If they want to gag me altogether, I won't speak.

Some Hon. Members: Speak tomorrow.

Shri S. M. Banerjee rose—

Mr. Speaker: I cannot allow every hon. Member.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: Personal references have been made.

Mr. Speaker: Many personal references have been made.

Shri Jaipal Singh: I have no intention of gagging my hon. friend. Since the debate has taken a very healthy and interesting turn, I thought more hon. Members may have an opportunity to speak if the hon. Home Minister replied tomorrow and after him Shri Naushir Bharucha also who has a right of reply.

Shri G. B. Pant: You, Sir, started with one day. Then you said, one more forenoon; then, two days.

Dr. Sushila Nayar (Jhansi): I wish to submit that we had our programmes outside on the 8th and 9th. We could not leave because of the debate. If it goes on tomorrow, we have to again cancel our programmes. Therefore we want it to be finished today.

Mr. Speaker: The decision is, we will complete it today.

Shri Frank Anthony (Nominated—Anglo-Indians): Mr. Speaker, I have listened carefully to the speeches made on both sides of the House, and perhaps the welter of contradictory views is what I had expected. I shall have a little more to say later on about what the hon. Labour Minister has just now said. But, let us start with this premise that trade union in the country is nothing if it is not politics conditioned. Every major trade union in this country is the creature of one political party or the other.

Some Hon. Members: The I.N.T.U.C. is not that.

Shri Frank Anthony: My friends say that the I.N.T.U.C. is not that. With great respect to the I.N.T.U.C., it has all the attributes of a union which dances to the tune of the Government.

An Hon. Member: And of the Congress party.

Shri Frank Anthony: We won't go into that. Because of that, we have inevitably had speeches.....

Shri K. N. Pandey (Hata): I object to this remark. It is an independent organisation. Naturally it has got an alliance and it believes in the policy as laid down by the Congress. But, that does not mean that we work on the instructions of the Government. What are you talking?

Shri Frank Anthony: Both my hon. friend's protestation and his physical position rather belie what he asks me to believe. As a person owing allegiance to no political party, perhaps what I have to say may partake of some objectivity.

First of all, I want to say this. The hon. Prime Minister, when he spoke this morning, wanted us to isolate this question, as if all this happened in some kind of a vacuum. I feel strongly that the Government is not blameless for the conditions which permitted frustration and resentment to come to such a head that it could become the springboard for a strike in this country. I say this in all seriousness that there has been no urgent attempt the part of the Government to hold the price line. There has been a great deal of philosophising, calling for more production, greater austerity, the Government never practising what it preaches. While they preach in season and out of season greater austerity, the only thing we see is an increasing complex of reckless extravagance on the part of the Government. And the man-in-the-street has become resigned to this position that half of Government expenditure goes down the drain, either of waste or of corruption. And what is the position so far as the Government machinery is concerned?

I have said it before that increasingly you get this unhealthy turgidity, too many Government servants chasing too few responsibilities and tasks. I agree that some degree of inflation is inevitable, because with this vast

expenditure and necessary planning, there is bound to be a certain amount of inflation. But, as my hon. friend Shri Asoka Mehta has pointed out, the kind of inflation that we are up against today is near run-away inflation. It is almost meaningless to talk in terms of Rs. 80 or Rs. 85 or Rs. 100. When we come down and assess it in terms of real wages, it means barely Rs. 15 or Rs. 20 as compared with the purchasing power in 1939.

But what I feel is this. My hon. friend the Labour Minister has tried to justify the attitude of Government towards those employed in the private sector and the attitude of Government towards their own employees. I found that to be a distinction without a difference. There is no doubt that Government have endorsed a certain minimum, a need-based minimum, or whatever you may call it. Now, it is not for Government to assume an aura of injured innocence. You were obviously a party—whether you call it a unanimous agreement or not—to an agreement that there is the need for this minimum need-based wage. Obviously, it was the minimum, otherwise, you would not have accepted it. If you think that it is the minimum, and it is based on need for the private sector, then when your own employees come to you and say 'We want the same thing which you almost insist on for the private sector, and you must give it to us', then, it is not for you as Government to assume an air of injured innocence. The worst feature of all this is.....

Shri Nanda: May I interrupt my hon. friend for a minute and inform him that even in the private sector, the employers come up and urge that they cannot pay, and the wage boards also do not give the full need-based minimum? Therefore, there is no difference.

Shri Ranga: But you come down with an Ordinance.

Shri Frank Anthony: My hon. friend who has just interrupted me has underlined the position. Govern-

ment are today suffering from some kind of a torpor; I do not know what it is, but there is some power-drunk torpor or some other torpor. They never move until somebody resorts either to threats of violence or resorts to violence.

My hon. friend himself has said that they had rejected certain recommendations of the Pay Commission. The Government may have called them, the minimal recommendation, but the point is this; today, you do things unilaterally. You had rejected certain recommendations of the Pay Commission; you had never consulted anybody. Suddenly, you come here and you say that you want to invest the Pay Commission's recommendations with some aura of sanctity, but unilaterally, because of this power-drunkenness on your part, you rejected their recommendations. When these people come to you, you say I am going to condemn them too. (*Interruptions*).

Shrimati Sucheta Kripalani: My hon. friend can derive whatever satisfaction he likes from that.

Shri Frank Anthony: I have great personal regard for my hon. friend Shri Nath Pai, and I am sorry over what has happened. Had he come to see me, I would have persuaded him not to precipitate the strike. I have had not a little to do with railway labour in my own way, and I know how the men feel, how they think, how resentful they are, how frustrated they are. I followed these negotiations carefully, and I found that ultimately they resolved themselves into two major points, a need-based minimum wage of Rs. 125 and the linking of dearness allowance with the cost of living so as to bring about complete neutralisation.

On the 2nd July, I found one of the Joint Council of Action leaders saying, no, we do not insist on Rs. 125, let it be Rs. 100. On the 3rd July, another leader of the Joint Council of Action said, we do not even insist on Rs. 100, you may make it Rs. 90.

Shri Nath Pai: No.

Shri Frank Anthony: I saw this on the 2nd July in *The Times of India*, and on the 3rd July in *The Statesman* and I can only be guided by these press reports. And I said to myself, here is Shri Nath Pai, a very able person, very enthusiastic, who apparently wanted to do something, but they are not only not clear about what they want, but they are not serious about what they want; and then, ultimately, they came down to this particular issue of the linking of dearness allowance with the cost of living index.

I was a member of the First Pay Commission. You may say that I was guilty of trying to give to the worker in this country complete neutralisation, so far as the increase in the cost of living index was concerned. But I looked at it in this way. I am not suggesting that the recommendation of the Central Pay Commission was perfect. But so far as the linking of the dearness allowance with the cost of living index is concerned, I do think that the recommendation of the Second Pay Commission is in one way an advance over that of the First Pay Commission. We had recommended the after 20 points increase, there should be complete neutralisation. As far as I can make out, if you work it out—I have seen some kind of an analysis—there is just a difference of a few naye paise. But, so far as the Second Pay Commission is concerned, they have said that after every 10 points increase.....

Shri Asoka Mehta: Those 10 points are equal to the old 35 points. I am afraid my hon. friend has made a mistake.

Shri Nath Pai: May I interrupt my hon. friend for a minute? One interruption is very essential at this stage. My hon. friend has referred to me, but I am not going to say anything by way of personal explanation. But there is the danger of an able and eminent Member of this House succes-

[Shri Nath Pai]

fully trying to mislead the House on a vital point. He is going by the 10 points of the Second Pay Commission. But these 10 points are based on the base year of 1949, and these are equal to 35.5 points of the First Pay Commission, based on the year 1939. The First Pay Commission recommended a review every six months, if there was an average increase of 20 points over a period of three months. As against this the Second Pay Commission demanded that the average must persist over a period of twelve months, and this increase must be 35.5 old points or 10 new points. I would like my hon. friend to bear this in mind. Such a thing has not happened for three years, and that was the reason why we rejected it.

Shri Frank Anthony: I have got an analysis made. I have studied it. The point that I was trying to make was this. I felt that the major grievance of the workers was against the unilateral rejection by Government of the Second Pay Commission's recommendation. When the Prime Minister categorically on the 7th July said that: Government would adhere to all the major recommendations, I felt in spite of this difference with regard to the linking of the dearness allowance with the cost of living index that there was no valid reason for the Joint Council of Action to precipitate a strike, a trial of strength. What could they possibly hope to get? As my hon. friend Shrimati Sucheta Kripalani has pointed out, those who have anything to do with trade unionism have not only a duty, but they have a grave responsibility, a trust to those whom they purport to lead. Surely, my hon. friends must have known that there was not the semblance of a hope of their succeeding in this trial of strength with Government. I say this that it was their inescapable duty to have weighed everything in the balance.

Who constitute the largest number of workers in this country? It is the railwaymen. I know as much as any

other Member of this House as to what the conditions are on railway trade unionism. Not more than half the railwaymen altogether belong to any trade union. And how are the trade unions organised on the railways? They are farcical, excepting the union which I have the privilege to lead. As my hon. friend has said, there are unions with a paper membership of 20,000 or 30,000; the office is located in the pocket of the secretary, the funds are located in the vest-pocket of some other office-bearer. That is how they are organised. Now, with your trade union movement in this country not organised properly,—it is allegedly organised, but organised really in a farcical way—you precipitated a trial of strength, knowing that on this particular issue, the difference has been narrowed down so considerably.....

Shri Feroze Gandhi (Rae Bareli): Why does my hon. friend say 'Your country'? He should say 'Our country'.

Shri Frank Anthony: I did not say 'country' at all. I said, 'trial of strength with Government'.

I am not going to say anything about my hon. friend Shri Nath Pai, because I have a great regard for him. But I am going to say categorically that the part played by the Communists was a deliberately unworthy part, and that was unfortunate. Shri Nath Pai and his PSP colleagues were caught on the horns of this dilemma. The Communists were lying close behind them. And nobody has referred to this. I expected the Communists to throw in their full weight in their appointed role as saboteurs and subverters of civil order. Their Peking masters had the impertinence to express solicitude for the Indian workers; I mean the people in Peking. But then I found the Communists not throwing in their full weight. I think there are several reasons. What are the reasons? They felt that the PSP has precipitated the strike and

it will not do for them to pull their chest-nuts out of the political fire. Another reason—and a greater reason—is the revulsion of feeling in the country against the role of the Communists. The Communists realised that if they threw in their full weight and indulged in sabotage and subversion, because of this Chinese aggression against India in which the Communists of this country have not only acquiesced but endorsed, there would be such a tremendous revulsion of feeling against the Communists in this country that they would be wiped off the political map of India. That is why we did not have the amount of subversion and violence that I expected in this strike.

But I say this. I know the extent our people are emotional and the extent they are credulous, and I am going to endorse the plea made by Shrimati Sucheta Kripalani. I do not know what the attitude of the government servants is going to be, the senior government servants. I have never had much faith in them—good people, well-meaning people, but distinguished always by a complete lack of imagination. Let us put it at the highest at that. Many of them are going to use this occasion not only for victimisation but for witch-hunting, and they are going to penalise all kinds of really innocent people who did not know what the strike was about. But I say this too, that every person who is found guilty of intimidation, of violence, of sabotage, must be punished, and punished in an exemplary way.

I know what has happened on the South-Eastern Railway. Members of my community have faced every form of intimidation, violence and sabotage. But they kept your trains running from Kharagpur to Arra. Your Territorial Army was nowhere in the picture. It came late to Kharagpur. It came late to Arra. These people with their families exposed to violence kept your trains running.

Now, I say, however credulous a government servant may be, if he allows that credulity to stampede him into committing an offence, he has to pay the full penalty, whatever misery is caused to him or his family. After that, I say this, that if there is a doubt, the benefit of the doubt must go to the government servants. My own fear is that your heads of department—yes, with all due respect to them—will use this as an occasion for getting rid of any and every person they do not like. Every person whose face is *persona non grata* with the head of the department or the Divisional superintendent or even with the officers at the lower echelons, will be got rid of. So Government have to be most careful about it in not allowing complete discretion to the officers in the matter of punishment even to the heads of department.

Now I wish to say something about my hon. friend's the Labour Minister's defence of the banning of strikes. I know that he does not like the sound of it. Nobody who has ever had anything to do with workers in this country likes the sound of it. But let us be frank. Let us face it. What do you want to do? Ban strikes? In every civilised society, it is a basic fundamental right to have collective bargaining. Is not the need for that right a thousand fold greater in India where people do not only live, on the margin but live at a sub-marginal level? How are they going to exercise this vital right, recognised as a fundamental right in the most advanced countries? Unless you accept the right of collective bargaining, what is the point of saying, 'You can form trade unions; you can form associations'? It will be farcical. What are they to do? Are they to give certificates to Government? Are they to give receptions to Ministers? What is the purpose of a trade union or association if it is not to under-write, as it is, the first and essential task of collective bargaining? How will they collectively bargain with Government? There may be a dispute; bargain first fight, if necessary. You find Government completely unresponsive. I do

[Shri Frank Anthony]

not know why today it is completely unresponsive. Silent pain evokes no response. Constitutional methods are treated with contempt. It is only the *danda*, the *lathi* and something else which moves Government to any kind of response. Government have placed a premium on strikes. Government have placed a premium on violence. The resentment comes to a head and the people say, 'Nothing will get us even our minimum legitimate rights, unless we resort to violence'. That is the tragedy. Do not blame my hon. friend, Shri Nath Pai—you may blame the Communists.

What is the position? My hon. friend knows the position as well as I do. We have taken our parliamentary democracy from Britain. What is the position in Britain? There, except for a very narrow section of government servants, all government servants have the right to strike. Railwaymen are not even regarded as government servants. Government are going to ban railwaymen too from striking.

Shri C. D. Pande: What is the position in the USA?

Shri M. R. Masani: In the USA, the railways are not run by Government.

Shri Frank Anthony: I will come to that. Somebody gives a second-hand opinion and it is repeated third-hand in this House.

Shri C. D. Pande: It is first-hand.

Shri Frank Anthony: In the USA, they have not put a pedestal, as we have done in our usual fashion. We pay lip-service to the trappings of democracy. We have given in India the fundamental right to form unions and associations. In the USA, there is no fundamental right; there is only the due-process clause. We have made it a fundamental right, and like all other fundamental rights, we are now going to make a travesty of it.

We are going to denude it of its content. As a distinguished Judge said the other day, more and more the executive has drained the vitality from the rule of law in this country. That is what has happened. I just do not understand it.

I am quite prepared to accept the position as it obtains in Britain. What is prohibited in Britain? If a person does an illegal act, certainly it is prohibited and it comes under punishment by the law. I am even prepared to accept the position under the British Trade Unions Act of 1927. There a general strike is prescribed, that is, when all the workers intend to go on strike, provided two conditions are fulfilled, or one of two conditions is fulfilled, firstly, it is intended avowedly to paralyse the Government, and secondly, it will have a disastrous impact on the community. If you say, 'Yes, we will ban it and we will copy the British Act'. I am prepared to accept it. That is why I say that in this case I support this Ordinance because there was a general strike, whether it was intended avowedly to paralyse the Government or not.

Shri Nath Pai: The strike was only of the employees, not a general strike.

Shri Frank Anthony: I would be prepared to regard it as a general strike and in those conditions, I say, 'Yes, you can ban it'. I am prepared to go as far as that. But after that, why do you want to shackle all your government servants? I ask my hon. friend, what is the effect going to be? I know that he in his heart is not happy about this; he is only justifying the brief that he is asked to plead on behalf of the Government. He cannot be happy.

Shri Nanda: I resent this insinuation.

An Hon. Member: He is happy in his position.

Shri Nanda: I cannot ask for another spell of time for repudiating all these things. But I can quote chapter and verse to show in how many countries there is such a ban on strikes by employees of Government. I will do that on some other occasion.

In any case, so far as my intentions are concerned, I believe it is in the interest of the workers that they should not be exposed to the position to which they were exposed sometime back, and an Ordinance was promulgated.

Shri Frank Anthony: What, in effect, are you going to do in this country? You are not only going to ban strikes; you are going to destroy utterly and completely the trade union movement.

Shri Nath Pai: Therefore, do not support the Ordinance.

Shri Frank Anthony: Because of the steadily expanding public sector, today Government is the largest employer of labour. With a steadily expanding public sector, inevitably Government will become more and more the largest employer of labour. You are going to ban all your employees, however provoked they are, however intolerable the conditions, from ever striking.

Shri Nanda: We never suggested that.

Shri Frank Anthony: Political motives have been imputed to my friends on this side. But what are the people saying and what will they continue to say? What is the your reason for banning? I do not know. You de-recognise them. If I were sitting on the Treasury Benches, I would have de-recognised the Communists long ago. What are the people going to say? Your motives are nothing but political. Firstly, you are going to de-recognise and ban. What will be the effect of it? You will have the workers into your Union. The

Union which works, at any rate on the Railways, regards itself as some kind of limb, if anything—I won't say marionette—of the ruling party.

What I do not understand is this. Has not the present Government got enough powers today? The Government today has arrogated to itself more powers than the British did when they had to deal with these things. Under the Penal Code, you can punish a conspiracy to commit an offence. Any two government servants who concert in order to commit an offence or to commit violence can be punished under the Penal Code. Under the Criminal Law Amendment Act of 1908 you can ban any association which is dangerous to the country. You should have done that long ago with my communist friends. (*Interruptions.*)

Shri A. K. Gopalan (Kasergod): On every occasion he repeats this. Even when it is a question of exporting monkeys he will say, ban the communists. (*Interruptions.*)

Shri Frank Anthony: You can ban any association that is dangerous to the country. You have several Ordinance making powers. You have the Preventive Detention Act by which you can put anybody whom you do not like into jail, however innocent he may be.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Member must conclude.

Shri Frank Anthony: I will finish in two minutes, Sir; there I want to make an appeal to the Home Minister. It is no doubt that our regard for the rule of law is rapidly disappearing and Government is the most guilty party. I wrote an article. The Home Minister might not have seen it. It was commenced by jurists. I talked of the erosion of the rule of law since 1950, of the emasculation by Government, not only the emasculation but the destruction by Government of our fundamental rights. And, what is left of the Fun-

[Shri Frank Anthony]

damental Rights? There is also erosion by judicial interpretation. There is nothing left in our Fundamental Rights chapter. You take that out tomorrow and no citizen will be in a worse position. The right to property has gone. Article 14 has gone by judicial interpretation. What we have left is article 19. One of the sub-articles is the right to form unions and associations. Now, you ban it. It will be a gearless standing mockery to the workers to form unions but which must say 'namaste' to Government.

I am proud of the part the members of my community played in the strike. But is this the reward that you are going to give them; is this the answer you are going to give for their loyalty? Do you mean to say that your workers are not capable of deciding how they should organise themselves and who their leader should be? If your workers are not capable of doing it, then why do you give them the right to vote? If the workers are going to be misled by their leaders they are misled also in voting people into power. Is this the reward you are going to give to the workers? You say, 'Yes, you have been loyal; you have shown courage; but you are not able to protect yourselves and Government is going to protect you. Is that the protection you are going to give? Are they going to be bound hand and foot?

An Hon. Member: Is that a warning or an appeal?

Shri Frank Anthony: I think his hands and feet are tied.

Shri Naushir Bharucha: Mr. Speaker, Sir, frankly, I am very much disappointed at the substance and tenor of the speeches made by the hon. Home Minister and Prime Minister. Frankly, I was shocked when the hon. Prime Minister laid on the floor of the House a novel dictum that every general strike is a political strike. *(Interruptions.)*

Never mind, Shri Anthony, I am answering the Prime Minister.

He said that the strike leaders were irresponsible. They were people who were riding a tiger when they even did not know how to ride a donkey. May I point out to the hon. Prime Minister that when he spoke this he completely disregarded the judgment of this hon. House because it was this hon. House which had enacted the Industrial Disputes Act of 1947? Does the Industrial Disputes Act take away the right of a general strike from the workers? May I know whether, when the framers of this Act, which means this hon. House, when they framed that Act and gave this right to the workers, they did not understand that there would be leaders among workers who may not be able to ride a donkey but who may be wanting to ride a tiger? The point is that this hon. House in its wisdom had granted the right of general strike to the workers. And, so long as the law stands as it is, it does not lie in the mouth of the Prime Minister to say that a general strike is a political strike or a general strike should not be resorted to.

Sir, in resorting to a general strike only of a limited section, namely, the Central Government employees, the leaders of the strike had done nothing except to exercise this right which the Industrial Disputes Act has given them. I was surprised at the argument which the hon. Home Minister put out: 'Does Mr. Bharucha not know the magnitude of the problem with which the country was faced? What would happen if there was a successful strike in the electricity supply undertakings? There would be no light; there would be no water supply. Does he mean to say that the Government must sit and watch this country go into chaos?' May I point out to him, Sir, that the Industrial Disputes Act does not even think of these 'essential services' at all. In the First Schedule to the Act there are 10 services enumerated including transport, banking, food-stuffs, iron and steel, etc. And these

are called only 'public utility services' and the Act gives the workers in these services a right to strike in any circumstance. May I point out to him that the only difference made is that a particular kind of 14 days' notice is necessary for, the purpose of going on strike even in the public utility services.

When the hon. Minister asks, 'Does not Mr. Bharucha understand the implications of a general strike in essential services', may I ask the hon. Home Minister, 'Did not the House understand it when it enacted this Act, the consequences of a general strike in essential services?' Why did the House give that right? Did not the House understand that without electricity supply and without water supply there would be chaos? But, still this precious right to strike was given to the workers. Therefore, what does that mean? It means that all this bogie now drawn before this House, namely, that there would be chaos, and other factors were considered by this hon. House and the hon. House said, 'Never mind all these things, the workers must have this right of general strike'. And the workers have exercised that right. Therefore, it does not lie in the mouth of the Government now to say that the country would have been paralysed and that Government would have been paralysed and there would have been civil rebellion. What does it matter if the government was paralysed so long as this Act of this House thought it fit to give right of strike to the workers? (*Interruption*).

This House might have been paralysed. There may not be any Parliament at all. This hon. House has considered all these things and then given this right. Now, it does not lie in the mouth of individual Ministers to say that the exercise of that right means a sort of political uprising. We do not agree. This is a right granted by the House under the Act and Union leaders have exercised it under the Act.

I was further surprised about the way the Prime Minister spoke about responsibility.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Member must conclude soon.

Shri Naushir Bharucha: I have hardly taken 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker: How long does he want?

Shri Naushir Bharucha: Fifteen minutes.

Mr. Speaker: He cannot have 15 minutes in reply. He can just touch the points; he cannot make a fresh speech.

Shri Naushir Bharucha: I was surprised when the hon. Prime Minister spoke. I should say it is open to the House reconsider its attitude and completely revise the Industrial Disputes Act. I am not referring to that. The hon. Home Minister has not said what the alternative is going to be when he said that strikes are going to be banned. There can be only one alternative if strikes are banned and the workers have got no other means of having their grievances redressed. They can only be reduced to the position of bonded slaves. If that is the intention of the House it can do it. But let us understand the situation. The House is supreme.

Sir, the hon. Prime Minister has said that we will find out some alternative. What is the alternative? I would like to know. Let it be understood that so far as we are concerned, whatever political affiliations we may have, we do not want strikes and it has been borne out by no less a person than Shri Nanda himself when he said that he put the question point blank to the representative of the workers whether they want to have a strike and have a trial of strength or arbitration and they said that they wanted arbitration. They wanted arbitration because they do not want a

[Shri Naushir Bharucha]

strike. They want to resolve industrial disputes by negotiation, conciliation and arbitration. That is a tribute to them. So, if you are prepared to ban a strike without any alternative remedies for the redress of the grievances to the workers, democracy is at an end so far as the Government workers are concerned. The hon. Prime Minister has placed before this House no proposal to the effect that whatever disputes are there they will be referred to arbitration automatically and the Government undertake to be bound by the award. Unless that is said, how can the strikes be banned?

Before I close, I want to speak on one point. A wrong impression has been going round the country since yesterday's debate that some concessions had been given by the Home Minister with respect to the linking of the dearness allowance to the cost of living index. In responsible papers it is stated that 50 per cent. rise in the cost would be automatically neutralised. May I read exactly what the hon. Home Minister has said:

"(Government) has also accepted the proposal for review of the position when there is a persistent rise of ten points . . ."

How very persistent? One year, two years, ten years?

An Hon. Member: 12 months.

Shri Naushir Bharucha: He goes on—

" . . . rise of ten points in the index of prices for twelve months . . ." (*Interruptions.*)

May I just point out that it is either '12 months' or 'persistent' Or is it persistent rise for 12 months at a stretch or is it that there is a persistent rise for six months and then there is no rise for a month and there is a rise for another five months . . . (*Interruptions.*) I shall read further:

" . . . 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."

A reference may be made. I should like to know from the hon. Home Minister as to what exactly he means. Shall I take it that if on the whole ten points have risen whether persistently or not in the cost of living index for a year, automatically half of the rise will be neutralised?

Shri G. B. Pant: Will you be satisfied if I say 'yes'?

Shri Naushir Bharucha: I am grateful to the hon. Home Minister for this because it is a small mercy and a small concession which the workers have got. For the rest he says that if necessary, a reference may be made to an impartial body. Shall I also take it that there will automatically be a reference for the rest and the Government will abide by the decision of that body? I hope he may say 'yes'.

Shri G. B. Pant: You should read the words I have used and if you cannot interpret them, I will help you outside the House.

Shri Naushir Bharucha: I should like a clear cut assurance. It is not that I am satisfied even then; that is a different question. But let him say that it will be referred automatically and the decision would be binding on the Government. When the First Pay Commission recommended linking of the dearness allowance to the cost of living index, having regard to the 1947 conditions the workers should have got today Rs. 45 more. What the Government would actually give now even if this is conceded, would be 25 per cent. That is not proper.

Sir, these are some of the fundamental points. As I said, let us deal with this question in a statesmanlike way. If the Government wants to ban strikes, I prefer Shri Nanda's phraseology that strikes should be made superfluous, not banned, if strikes are to be made superfluous our co-operation is with you, provided you by legislation provide the machinery where the worker would be able to refer a dispute to an impartial body or tribunal and the Government gives a promise that the decision of that tribunal will be binding on them.

Sir, this debate has been very useful. It has extracted some small mercies from the Government. That apart, I hope it has also had the effect of toning down the Government in the post-strike measures they are going to take—I hope so. There is one important thing, that so far as the future is concerned I must tell this Government that they must not light-heartedly enter upon legislation to ban strikes.

So far as my resolution regarding the Ordinance is concerned, anybody who has the interest of the workers at heart and who understands the position that the worker did nothing more than exercise the right given under the Industrial Disputes Act, such a person should vote for the resolution. I appeal to the House to accept it.

Shri G. B. Pant: Sir, I wonder if at this hour I can deal with the various questions that have been raised in the course of this debate during the last two days. I venture to think that the statements made by me yesterday stand almost, I should say, effectively unassailed, they remain as sound as they were when I made them. Certain points here and there have been picked up which do not affect the basic issues in this matter.

The question has been raised whether the recommendations of the Pay Commission were or were not accepted by Government as an award, or whether they were treated in a different manner. Well, the attitude of the

Government was like this, that so far as the two fundamental issues are concerned relating to the need-based wage and the linking of the salary or the wage with the price index, these matters were of such a basic and fundamental character that they could not be varied. If we tamper with them then the whole structure collapses and tumbles down. So we could not reopen these questions.

Well, I think it was conceded even by the leaders of the strike that so far as their demand for the minimum wage on the basis of the resolution passed at the 15th Tripartite Labour Conference was concerned it was not very sound and they virtually dropped it—not virtually, but they dropped it—and as to the other there was also an attempt to find some solution. But there was a sort of stubbornness in the matter. Shri Nanda has explained the position. I think from what he has said it must be clear that the Government have made every attempt to avert the strike and the responsibility for it does not rest on the Government at all, either directly or indirectly. It is regrettable that those who were in a position to take a decision considered it necessary to go in for the strike.

Something has been said here about the linking of the wage with the price index. A recommendation of that character was made by the first Pay Commission. It was also accepted by the Government. But it was found that it was unworkable. The Government could not enforce it and it had to be dropped. So, with that experience and also with the knowledge of the fact that in no other country have the governments accepted any principle of linking the price index with the wage structure, it was not possible for Government to accept this, against the recommendation made by the first Pay Commission. The Second Pay Commission has gone into the question thoroughly. They have considered the suggestions made by Dr. Aykroyd and also other matters which have a bearing on this, and after having given the utmost and careful thought to it, they arrived at the conclusion that this was not a

[Shri G. B. Pant]

feasible proposition. In the circumstances, I do not see how anybody could have expected the Government to repeat the mistake which they had already committed in the year 1947 or 1948 and which they had to correct later.

Then it was said that since 1947 there has been a rise of about 22 points. There were also *ad hoc* increments allowed in the meantime. Rs. 10 were given once and Rs. 5 thereafter, so that Rs. 15 had been added to the minimum wage previously, and now the Pay Commission has added something to what had been allowed previously and it is accepted that it has at least neutralised all the rise that has taken place since 1947.

It is said that there has been an improvement in the national income and other things. I have dealt with the matter at some length yesterday and I will not repeat the arguments again, but out of the national income there have to be investments. We are engaged in the planned development of our country today, which was not then the condition and which was not within the view of any person who was connected with the determination of these issues. Then there was no question of planning nor of development in the manner in which it is being attempted on a large scale. Shri M. R. Masani would like all resources to be devoted to the production of consumer goods; the method of planned development to be abandoned and that no heavy industry be encouraged or established in the in the country at least in the public sector.

Shri M. R. Masani: That is not correct.

Shri G. B. Pant: Nothing would be more harmful than the course suggested by him. So, in the circumstances, what the Government has done is the best that could possibly be done. I

have already said that the Government might grant an automatic increase of half that may be necessary to meet the hardship caused by a rise of ten per cent. during a period of 12 months. So, I think Shri Bharucha should not have any grouse in this respect now.

So far as other matters are concerned, there was no occasion for putting the country in such a dangerous position. The catastrophic step that was taken was hardly justified; it can never be justified and under those circumstances, it was something reprehensible. So, I think what the Government tried to do to avert the strike was neutralised by those who were determined to go in for the strike. Shri A. P. Jain read out some extracts from the mouthpiece of the Hind Mazdoor Sabha in which it has been definitely stated that the conditions should be such as would be impossible of acceptance by Government, so that the strike will necessarily be launched.

I was surprised to hear Shri Asoka Mehta's remarks which he made the other day when he said that only 5 lakhs had balloted for the strike and only 3 lakhs from among them had perhaps cast their ballots for it or something like that. I do not know how these ballots were cast and whether they were genuine or otherwise. But he drew the inference from that that it was not a general strike, but what was intended was that only those people who had voted for the strike should go in for the strike. That is rather a queer way of looking at this.

In fact, I have before me, the resolution passed by the Joint Council of Action on the 10th July. It was published in the papers. I do not want to read the whole of it:

"The Committee feels confident that all Central Government employees will strike work at midnight on July 11, as decided by the Joint Council of Action."

That was the expectation. So, the result of such a general strike can

Ordinance and Strike

easily be visualised even by the unimaginative people. I indicated what it would have led to yesterday and I would not repeat that. But as the Prime Minister stated in his powerful speech this morning, a general strike would be anti-social and subversive under any circumstances whatsoever.

17 hrs.

I need not refer to what an esteemed leader has said in this connection, who is respected by the Members sitting in the opposite benches as much as by me. He would not agree with the philosophy that has been propounded by some of the Members here. Shri Bharucha went still further and said that there is a right of general strike under the statute. Well, I have not come across any law like that so far. Then, Shri Frank Anthony said there is a fundamental right to strike.

Shri Frank Anthony: No, no.

Shri G. B. Pant: If you did not say so then I am glad. So, there is no fundamental right to strike. If it is admitted then what is necessary is to settle the disputes in a satisfactory manner, to see that the workers or the employers do not suffer in any way and that the difference are settled in a satisfactory and reasonable manner. when it is said that the strikes should be banned it is also coupled with other proposals that some machinery should be set up for consultation, negotiation and settlement and, where necessary, reference to arbitration. This will not apply to the industrial concerns in the private sector but it will apply to Government servants and also to railways and post offices and, perhaps, to defence installations. But that will have to be examined fully and the law or the Bill when ready will be placed before this House.

I do not see how any reasonable man can say we must quarrel over a thing and not devise any such means as would enable those who have any grievance to get justice without going

in for any suffering or any sort of trial or hardship. I do not see how it is right for anyone to suffer unnecessarily. Every person should be heard and justice should be done to him with the least delay and in a manner that may be less uncongenial. So far as the basic matters go, I do not think there can be any two opinions in this House and if some of the hon. Members differ from this, then I think they will realise that the course that has been suggested is the best in the interests of the country and in the interests of maintenance of order and good relations and such relations of mutual confidence as should exist between the Government and its employees.

In the course of this discussion there was also the question why is the Government going to de-recognize any of these unions. It was said that there would be an interference with the right of association. Nobody is going to lay down any law to the effect that there should be no unions in the industrial concerns or even in railways and post offices, but there will be a different code for the latter. These unions have to be de-recognized because they have taken a very subversive step which would have landed the entire country in an irrevocable catastrophe.

Here I would like to just refer to one or two statements made by those who had called this strike even after the strike had been called off. From a letter issued by Sri Peter Alvares I am giving the quotation below:

"The strike has been of an unprecedented character. Its dimensions are phenomenal. Its repercussions will be felt for a long time. It will have succeeded in lifting the trade union movement from a third class static administrative machinery into an active and revolutionary economic instrument.

"... Its potentialities are both revolutionary and dynamic. A new economic force has emerged in the country. All efforts should be made

[Shri G. B. Pant]

to keep up this spirit and purpose."

There is another one, an extract from a circular letter issued by Shri Mahadebeshwar, who is the Secretary of the Hind Mazdoor Sabha:

"Our strike was 100 per cent. successful. More than 15 lakh Central Government employees participated in the strike and over 20,000 of them embraced the ordeal of taking a leading part and risking not only their service but even their lives from . . ."

I think, it must be 'for'.

" . . . for the common interest of the working class. Its actual effects and gains would be realised in the coming future and this historic economic struggle of all Central Government employees will prove an important landmark in the history of our trade movement."

I see that this conclusion cannot in any way be avoided and it has to be accepted that those who are in charge of these unions still intend to persist in this method so that they may work for a general strike which we all consider to be suicidal in the interest of the workers and also of the people and the country.

There is an exaggeration here that 15 lakhs had joined the strike. Shri Gopalan also the other day said that one million had joined the strike. Of course, he has his own sources of information. I do not know whether he had been reading these news in the Chinese papers which made . . . (*Interruption*).

Shri A. K. Gopalan: Because Indian papers gave incorrect news.

Shri G. B. Pant: . . . which had taken special glee in publishing these news and had been gloating over what it was expecting to be a movement which will lead to anarchy and chaos in this country. I do not know whether he read that news. But he made another astounding statement. He said:

"The conduct of Government before the strike etc., had shocked the conscience of every honest man in this country barring perhaps nearly a million of them who struck work. It has shocked the conscience of everyone except those who are sitting on the opposite side".

That is what he had said, I think. I do not know if he has at all any idea of the reaction that the strike produced in the country. I would not, I think, be able to convince him of what has appeared in the press which has condemned it, except for certain papers belonging to certain parties, and the people in general from all platforms have not done so. But he thinks that the conscience of the country has been shocked. I am glad to hear of conscience at least in this connection. It is something elastic. But I do not know whether his conscience was shocked when many steps were taken by the Kerala Government against the strikers and the warnings that were given to the strikers there. But to talk of the conscience of the country being shocked is nothing but, if I may say so, a travesty of facts and altogether ridiculous. There was hardly any person in the country excepting those who were involved in this strike and who could not extricate themselves, who had any sympathy with this strike or the strikers or the organisers of the strike.

Sir, the position has been fully explained in many ways. I have got really long notes and there have been a large number of speeches too. But I wonder if it is necessary for me to take more time of the House. I hope that it will be realised by all sections of this House and of the community that these methods cannot but lead to disaster. I hope all will pledge themselves not to have recourse to anything by way of general strike now and that every effort will be made by all to devise such means as will

enable the country to march forward and to strengthen its defences and also its internal resources, so that we may gain strength in all fronts.

One of the observations made here was to the effect, namely, while asking for this general strike the organisers had said that Assam, Tripura and Manipur should be left out of this general strike. I do not know how it could help them. If they say that no railway in the country should function, no post office should function, no dockyard should function, nothing should be transported to these areas, what is to be done in those places? If you bind the hand and foot and you also shut up the mouth but keep one finger free, what is the result of it? Who can benefit thereby? And how can anyone gain any strength in that manner? That was perhaps supposed to be an indication of the patriotic sentiments that lay behind this move. I am sorry that those sentiments were not respected by the Chinese Press. I will not say much more about this now.

I hope, Sir, that the resolution of Shri Naushir Bharucha will be thrown out. Everybody here almost accepts, excepting those who were intimately associated with the general strike, that the general strike should not have been allowed in any way to materialise and steps should have been taken for that purpose. So this step was absolutely necessary and it was unavoidable. I hope, therefore, that my motion with the amendment (No. 6) of Shri Jaganatha Rao will be accepted by the House.

Mr. Speaker: I will put Shri Naushir Bharucha's motion first. There are no amendments to this motion.

Division No. 2]

[17.19 hrs.

AYES

Amjad Ali, Shri
Banerjee, Shri Pramathanath
Banerjee, Shri S. M.
Barua, Shri Hem
Bharucha, Shri Naushir
Braj Raj Singh, Shri
Das Gupta, Shri B.

Dige, Shri
Elias, Shri Muhammed
Gaikwad, Shri B. K.
Ghosal, Shri Aurobindo
Ghose, Shri Subiman
Gopalan, Shri A. K.
Goray, Shri

Gupta, Shri Indrajit
Halder, Shri
Jadhav, Shri Yadav Narayan
Kamble, Shri B. C.
Kar, Shri Prabhat
Khushwaqt Rai, Shri
Kodiyani, Shri

The question is:

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

The House divided.

Some Hon. Members: There are mistakes.

Shri Harish Chandra Mathur (Pali): Here is a mistake by pressing the wrong button.

Mr. Speaker: Any mistakes?

Shrimati Kesar Kumari (Rajpur—Reserved—Sch. Tribes): *rose*—

Mr. Speaker: Did she vote for the 'Ayes' or 'Noes'?

Shrimati Kesar Kumari: 'Noes'.

Shrimati Sucheta Kripalani: I wanted to vote for 'Noes'.

Shri J. R. Mehta (Jodhpur): My vote is not indicated there. I wanted to vote for 'Noes'.

Shri P. R. Patel (Mehsana): I wanted to vote for 'Notes'.

An Hon. Member: He has joined the Congress Party and that is why he is voting for 'Noes'.

Shri Hem Barua (Gauhati): I wanted to vote for 'Ayes'.

Mr. Speaker: Has he voted, and is his vote recorded?

Shri Hem Barua: It is recorded as 'Noes' but I want to vote for 'Ayes'.

Mr. Speaker: The result of the division is as follows:

*

Ayes: 38; **Noes:** 258.

*The fige was corrected as 37 *vide* Debates dated 10. 8. 60.

Mohan Swarup, Shri
Mukerjee, Shri H. N.
Mullick, Shri B. C.
Nair, Shri Vasudevan
Nath Pal, Shri
Pandey, Shri Sa rju

Panigrahi, Shri Chintamani
Parvathi Krishnan, Shrimati
Patil, Shri Nana
Patil, Shri U. L.
Prodhan, Shri B. C.
Rajendra Singh, Shri

Saksena, Shri S. L.
Tangamani, Shri
Vajpayee, Shri
Verma, Shri Ramji

NOES

Abdul Latif, Shri
Achal Singh, Seth
Achar, Shri
Agarwal, Shri Manakbbai
Ambalam, Shri Subbiah
Aney, Dr. M. S.
Anthony, Shri Frank
Arumugam, Shri R. S.
Arumugham, Shri S. R.
Asthana, Shri Lila Dha:
Ayyakannu, Shri
Badan Singh, Ch.
Bahadur Singh, Shri
Bajaj, Shri Kamalnayan
Bakliwal, Shri
Balakrishnan, Shri
Balmiki, Shri
Banerji, Shri P. B.
Bangshi Thakur, Shri
Barman, Shri
Barupal, Shri P. L.
Basappa, Shri
Basumatari, Shri
Bhagat, Shri B. R.
Bhagavati, Shri
Bhakt Darshan, Shri
Bhargava, Pandit Thakur Das
Bhatkar, Shri
Bhattacharya, Shri C. K.
Bhogji Bhai, Shri
Bidari, Shri
Birbal Singh, Shri
Birendra Bahadur Singhji, Shri
Biswas, Shri Bholanath
Brahm Prakash, Ch.
Brajeshwar Prasad, Shri
Chanda, Shri Anil K.
Chandak, Shri
Chandra Shankar, Shri
Chaturvedi, Shri
Chettiar, Shri Ramanathan
Choudhry, Shri C. L.
Chuni Lal, Shri
Daljit Singh, Shri
Damani, Shri
Damar, Shri
Das, Dr. M. M.
Das, Shri N. T.
Dasappa, Shri
Datar, Shri
Deb, Shri N. M.
Desai, Shri Morarji

Deshmukh, Shri K. G.
Dindod, Shri
Dinesh Singh, Shri
Dube, Shri Mulchand
Dubliish, Shri
Dwivedi, Shri M. L.
Bacharan, Shri V.
Ganapathy, Shri
Gandhi, Shri Feroze
Gandhi, Shri M. M.
Ganga Devi, Shrimati
Ganpati Ram, Shri
Ghosh, Shri M. K.
Ghosh, Shri N. R.
Gohokar, Dr.
Gounder, Shri Doraiswami
Gounder, Shri K. Periaswami
Govind Das, Seth
Guha, Shri A. C.
Harvani, Shri Anwar
Hansda, Shri Subodh
Hathi, Shri
Hazarika, Shri J. N.
Heda, Shri
Hem Raj, Shri
Iqbal Singh, Sardar
Jaggiwan Ram, Shri
Jain, Shri A. P.
Jangde, Shri
Jena, Shri K. C.
Jhunjhunwala, Shri
Jinachandran, Shri
Joshi, Shri A. C.
Joshi, Shrimati Subhadra
Jyotishi, Pandit J. P.
Kalika Singh, Shri
Kamble, Dr.
Kasliwal, Shri
Kedaria, Shri C. M.
Kesar Kumari, Shrimati
Keshava, Shri
Keskar, Dr.
Khadiwala, Shri
Khan, Shri Osman Ali
Khan, Shri Sadath Ali
Khan, Shri Shahnewaz
Kiledar, Shri R. S.
Koratar, Shri
Kripalani, Shrimati Sucheta
Krishna, Shri M. R.
Krishna Chandra, Shri
Krishna Rao, Shri M. V.

Krishnappa, Shri M. V.
Kureel, Shri B. N.
Lachhi Ram, Shri
Lahiri, Shri
Laskar, Shri N. C.
Laxmi Bai, Shrimati
Maftda Ahmed, Shrimati
Maiti, Shri N. B.
Majhi, Shri R. C.
Majithia, Sardar
Malaviya, Pandit Govind
Majhotra, Shri Joder J.
Malliah, Shri U. S.
Malvia, Shri K. B.
Malviya, Shri Motilal
Manse n, Shri
Mandal, Dr. Pashupati
Maniyangadan, Shri
Masuriya Din, Shri
Mathur, Shri Harish Chandra
Mathur, Shri M. D.
Mehdi, Shri S. A.
Mehta, Shri B. G.
Mehta, Shri J. R.
Mehta, Shrimati Krishna
Melkote, Dr.
Menon, Shri Krishna
Mimama, Shrimati
Mishra, Shri Bibhuti
Mishra, Shri L. N.
Mishra, Shri R. R.
Mishra, Shri S. N.
Misra, Shri B. D.
Mohammad Akbar, Shaikh
Mohideen, Shri Gulam
Mohiuddin, Shri
Morarka, Shri
More, Shri
Muniswamy, Shri N. R.
Murmu, Shri Palka
Murty, Shri M. S.
Muthukrishnan, Shri
Naidu, Shri Govindarajulu
Nair, Shri C. K.
Nair, Shri Kuttikrishnan
Nallekoya, Shri
Nanda, Shri
Nanjappa, Shri
Narasimhan, Shri
Narayanasaamy, Shri R.
Nayak, Shri Mohan
Nayar, Dr. Sushila,

Negi, Shri Nek Ram
 Nehru, Shri Jawaharlal
 Nehru, Shrimati Uma
 Onkar Lal, Shri
 Oza, Shri
 Padam Dev, Shri
 Palaniyandy, Shri
 Palchoudhuri, Shrimati Ila
 Pande, Shri C. D.
 Pandey, Shri K. N.
 Pangarkar, Shri
 Panna Lal, Shri
 Parmar, Shri Deen Bandhu
 Patel, Sushri Maniben
 Patel, Shri N. N.
 Patel, Shri P. R.
 Patel, Shri Rajeshwar
 Pattabhi Raman, Shri C. R.
 Prabhakar, Shri Naval
 Radha Mohan Singh, Shri
 Radha Raman, Shri
 Raghur Sahai, Shri
 Raghurameiah, Shri
 Raj Bahadur, Shri
 Raju, Shri D. S.
 Ram Saran, Shri
 Ram Shankar Lal, Shri
 Ram Subhag Singh, Dr.
 Ramaswamy, Shri S. V.
 Ramaswamy, Shri K. S.
 Ramaul, Shri S. N.
 Ramdhani Das, Shri
 Rane, Shri
 Rangarao, Shri
 Rao, Shri Jaganatha

Rao, Shri Thirumala
 Raut, Shri Bhola
 Ray, Shrimati Renuka
 Reddy, Shri K. C.
 Reddy, Shri Ramakrishna
 Reddy, Shri Rami
 Roy, Shri Bishwanath
 Rup, Narain, Shri
 Sadhu Ram, Shri
 Sahu, Shri Bhagabat
 Sahu, Shri Rameshwar
 Saigal, Sardar A. S.
 Samanta, Shri S. C.
 Samantsinhar, Dr.
 Sarhadi, Shri Ajit Singh
 Satiah Chandra, Shri
 Satyabhama Devi, Shrimati
 Selku, Shri
 Sen, Shri P. G.
 Shah, Shrimati Jayaben
 Shah, Shri Manabendra
 Shankaraiya, Shri
 Sharma, Shri D. C.
 Sharma, Pandit K. C.
 Sharma, Shri R. C.
 Shaastri, Shri Lal Bahadur
 Shaastri, Swami Ramanand
 Shree Narayan Das, Shri
 Siddananjappa, Shri
 Siddiah, Shri
 Singh, Shri D. N.
 Singh, Shri H. P.
 Sinha, Shri Gajendra Prasad
 Sinha, Shri K. P.
 Sinha, Shri Satya Narayan

Sinhasan Singh, Shri
 Sniatak, Shri Nardeo
 Somani, Shri
 Soren, Shri Debi
 Subbarayan, Dr. P.
 Subramanyam, Shri T.
 Sumat Prasad, Shri
 Sunder Lal, Shri
 Surya Prasad, Shri
 Tahir Shri Mohammed
 Tantis, Shri Rameshwar
 Tariq, Sh A. M.
 Tewari, Shri Dwarikanath
 Thimmaiah, Shri
 Thomas, Shri A. M.
 Tiwari, Pandit Babu Lal
 Tiwari, Shri R. S.
 Tiwari, Pandit D. N.
 Tula Ram, Shri
 Uike, Shri
 Umrao Singh, Shri
 Upadhyaya, Shri Shiva Datt
 Varma, Shri B. B.
 Varma, Shri M. L.
 Varma, Shri Ramalinga Bhatt
 Venkatasubbaiah, Shri
 Vijaya Anand, Mahalingam
 Viswanath Prasad, Shri
 Vyas, Shri R.
 Vyas, Shri Rajhela
 Wadiwa, Shri
 Woleyar, Shri

The Motion was negatived.

Mr. Speaker: Need I put any of the amendments to the vote of the House?

Shri A. K. Gopalan: My amendment may be put to vote.

Shri Naushir Bharucha: All the amendments may be put together.

Shri B. K. Gaekwad (Narsik): My amendment is very simple. I have heard the Home Minister's speech.

Mr. Speaker: What is the number of his amendment?

Shri B. K. Gaekwad: It is amendment No. 4.

Mr. Speaker: Need I put it to the vote of the House?

Shri B. K. Gaekwad: May I know the reaction of Government? I am prepared to withdraw.

Mr. Speaker: We have heard the reaction for two days now.

Shri B. K. Gaekwad: He has not replied to this amendment.

Mr. Speaker: There would not be any more reply. Does he press it or does he withdraw it?

Shri B. K. Gaekwad: If I do not hear the reaction of Government, I press it.

Mr. Speaker: If he has not heard so far, he would not hear hereafter.

I shall now put all these amendments together.

Shri Naushir Bharucha: But Shri Jaganatha Rao's amendment will have to be separated.

Mr. Speaker: I know.

Shri Tangamani: Similarly, Shri Kasliwal's amendment also has to be separated.

Mr. Speaker: I shall now put amendments Nos. 1, 2, 3, 4, 7, 8 and 9 to vote.

The amendments Nos. 1 to 4 and 7 to 9 were put and negatived.

Mr. Speaker: Now, I come to Shri Kasliwal's amendment.

Shri Kasliwal: I would like to withdraw it.

Mr. Speaker: Has the hon. Member leave of the House to withdraw his amendment?

Hon. Members: Yes.

The amendment was, by leave, withdrawn.

Mr. Speaker: I shall now put Shri Jaganatha Rao's amendment to vote.

The question is:

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 the action and the stand of the Government of India thereon." (6)

The motion was adopted.

17.24 hrs.

The Lok Sabha then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock on Wednesday, the 10th August, 1960/Sharavana 19, 1882 (Saka).