

*Delegation to 41st
(Maritime) Session of
International Labour
Conference*

[Mr. Deputy Speaker]

it is not the stage now when a speech can be made after the hon. Minister's reply.

Shri S. C. Samanta: I want to know whether the time has not come when Government should think of the scope of this convention at the present time. Only financial questions are being referred to this Convention Committee. As the Government has shown that it is a utility plus commercial concern, I want to know whether things relating to utility also could be referred to this Convention Committee and whether Government is thinking on that line. That is the clarification which I want.

Shri Jagjivan Ram: If the hon friend will refer to the report of the last Convention Committee, he will find that while determining the financial matters the Convention Committee has made recommendations which touch upon many things pertaining to the railways and not only to the railway finances.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

"That this House resolves that the period for the continuance in force of the recommendations of the Railway Convention Committee, 1954, governing the arrangements between railway finance and general finance which were approved by this House by a resolution adopted on the 16th December, 1954, be extended by one year up to the 31st March, 1961".

The motion was adopted.

15-33 hrs.

**MOTION RE REPORT OF
INDIAN DELEGATION TO 41ST
(MARITIME) SESSION OF IN-
TERNATIONAL LABOUR CON-
FERENCE.**

Shri Tangamani (Madurai). Sir, I beg to move:

"That this House takes note of the Report of the Indian Government Delegation to the 41st (Mari-

time) Session of the International Labour Conference held at Geneva in April-May, 1958, laid on the Table of the House on the 29th November, 1958."

When I gave notice of this motion I also indicated the points on which I would like to know the view of the hon. Minister. The following are the seven points which I have raised in the motion. 1. Wages, hours of work and manning; 2. Engagement of the seafarers; 3. Medical facilities to seamen; 4. Competency certificates and identity cards, 5. Safety of life in sea; 6. Shipowners' liability; and 7. Convention No. 109 and the recommendations 105 to 108.

Before I go into those matters in detail, I would like to refer to certain preliminary points about the conference itself. The International Labour Organisation has regular conferences once a year. Regarding maritime aspects, such conferences take place once in six years or sometimes once in seven years.

Shri Raghunath Singh (Varanasi): This conference was held after 12 years.

Shri Tangamani: The last conference which was the sixth of its kind took place at Seattle in 1946. The seventh in the series of the maritime conferences was held in Geneva from 29th April to 14th May, 1958. So it is easy to imagine how important this conference is. This conference was taking place at a time when our Government was taking several steps for the development of the shipping industry. A very important Act was passed in the last session, namely, the Merchant Shipping Act of 1958. That has dealt with in great detail not only the various aspects of development of the shipping industry but also the conditions of service of seamen. As I indicated earlier, this conference is tripartite in nature. There are representatives from the Government of India, from the shipping

industry and also from labour. We were fortunate in having the Director-General, Shipping, Dr. Nagendra Singh, as the leader not only of the Government delegation but the leader of the entire delegation. Two labour representatives represented the National Union of Seamen, Bombay, and the National Union of Seamen, Calcutta. Here, I cannot help remarking that of late it has become the tendency of Government to give representation for the workers' delegations only through a particular section of labour or labour which is affiliated to a particular central trade union organisation. This question was raised in the Credentials Committee. The United Seamen's Federation raised the question whether the two representatives, one coming from Bombay and the other coming from Calcutta, could represent the seamen of this country. It is true that unlike, say, the textiles or unlike iron and steel, the trade union movement amongst the seafarers is very weak. The main concentration of seafarers is in Bombay and Calcutta.

Now, there is a United Seamen's Federation and there are certain trade unions which are affiliated to the INTUC. There is not a trade federation which may speak on behalf of the seafarers. That is why rightly the question of credentials was raised. This is what the representatives of labour had to say:

"Nominations were originally made by the National Union of Seamen which were in turn supported by the INTUC".

Let it not be said that I am opposing any particular central trade union organisation, but the *modus operandi* of bringing in representatives of labour who were affiliated to the central trade union organisation like the INTUC is something which is not doing justice either to the workers or to the seafarers.

Since 1947 a tendency has grown that whenever representatives of

labour are to be taken, whether it is for the International Labour Organisation's conferences or to any of these trade federation conferences, representation is given only to the INTUC. Here, the INTUC cannot claim complete monopoly over the seafarers, whether they are in Bombay or in Calcutta. The hon. Minister in charge of shipping also knows that when the Merchant Shipping Bill was discussed before the Select Committee we received witnesses both from the national union and also from the United Seamen's Federation. So, there were two separate organisations functioning. Probably they have not developed to such an extent to have a single organisation to speak on behalf of the entire seamen. But Government only resorted to one central trade union organisation which cannot, by any standards, be representative so far as the seamen are concerned. This is only by the way, because that itself was a question which was raised before the conference actually started its proceedings. I request that at least in future when we have such conferences, representation should be given to all sections of labour. Let there be no prejudice. All that we seek is that in such conferences the best talents must be represented. The real issues facing the employees of this country—whether they are seamen or other sections of employees—should be represented. That is my preliminary observation.

Having said that, coming to the report itself, I consider it is a very good report. It deals with the statement of our D.G. Shipping on the Director-General's report and it also gives most of these recommendations and conventions. With your permission, I shall deal with one or two conventions in detail and in conclusion, I will refer particularly to the training of the seamen and their condition in this country.

The important convention is Convention No. 109. This convention was

[Shri Tangamani]

there even before the Merchant Shipping Bill was discussed here. The question did arise about the implementation of this convention in the joint committee meeting also. Convention No. 109 concerns wages, hours of work on board the ship and manning (sea) and it is the revised convention of 1958. So, most of these International Labour Organisation conventions are given the number and also the year. There was a similar convention earlier at the Seattle Conference and the revised convention is the convention of 1958.

Annexure XV deals with Convention No. 109. Part I deals with the general provisions; Part II deals with wages. Without reading verbatim what the convention says, I shall give the basic pay of the seamen. As the hon. Minister knows, as per the report of the D.G. Shipping, we have 65,000 seamen. Most of them are engaged on the ocean-going ships and most of these ships are not out ships. So, probably more than 40,000 seamen are employed in foreign companies. It is necessary that our Government which acts as the recruiting agent, guaranteeing certain conditions of service for these employees, must see that certain accepted international conventions are implemented so far as these employees are concerned.

They say, the basic pay shall not be less than £16 per mensem. But in a subsequent resolution, they say, £16 is the minimum and under conditions prevailing today it should be £25. Here are men who are on the high seas. They are engaged for 6 months, 1 year or sometimes 2 years. When they come back, until they are chartered for another ship, they may be without employment for a few months or even years sometimes. £16 is according to the British standard. Normally, even during the pre-war period, a bus conductor in England was getting £5 or £6 per week. With the prices having gone up, it may be much more now. Here

a sort of compromise is made, where you have not only Indians, Asiatics, but Europeans also. So, they say the minimum should be £16 per mensem. When they fixed this, they did take into consideration the scales of pay prevailing amongst the Asiatics and also Europeans amongst all the member-nations, of which India is one. They want to go a little further and make it £25. I would like to know whether we have accepted this convention and ratified part II of this convention. If we have not ratified it, what are the reasons standing in our way of ratifying it? If we have not ratified this, what is the scale of pay we are demanding from the foreign companies who engage our seamen? These are points for which I want definite replies.

Part III deals in great detail with hours of work. There is one whole chapter in our Merchant Shipping Act about hours of work. In the agreements that we enter into with these foreign companies, the foreign companies are somehow reluctant to introduce a clause on hours of work. If our seamen are made to work for 12 or even 15 hours a day, there is nothing which will empower the Government of India to challenge that particular company. That is the position today. Even according to Part III dealing with hours of work in this convention, I do not say it is very satisfactory.

They divide the ships into three types—coastal ships, which they call 'near trade ships'; ocean-going ships which they call 'distant trade ships' and passenger ships. For coastal ships they say, when at sea, 24 hours in any period of two consecutive days. When in the port, 8 hours or less, according to the agreement; on weekly holidays, 2 hours for attending to certain routine and sanitary duties; 112 hours in a period of two consecutive weeks. So, for coastal ships, anything exceeding 112 hours in two weeks will be considered as overtime. This would mean, on an

average, 8 hours per day, or 56 hours for 7 days or 112 hours for two weeks. This is for the home trade.

Regarding ocean-going ships, for the staff employed in the deck, engine-room and radio departments, when the ship is at sea, it is 8 hours per day. At port, it is 8 hours; on weekly holidays, 2 hours. So, it is 48 hours a week and anything over 48 hours a week will be construed as over-time and over-time wages will have to be paid. They say, the minimum over-time wage will be 1½ times the normal wage.

Article 15 deals with catering department. When the vessel is at sea and on days of sailing and arrival, it is 10 hours in a period of 14 hours. At port, when the passengers are on board, ten hours in a period of 14 hours. In other cases, on the day preceding the weekly day of rest, five hours; on the weekly day of rest, five hours for persons engaged in messing duties and two hours for ordinary routine and sanitary duties in the case of other persons; on any other day, eight hours. In the case of a vessel which is not a passenger ship, when the vessel is at sea and on days of sailing and arrival it is 9 hours in any period of 13 hours; when at port, on the day preceding the weekly day of rest, it will be 6 hours; on weekly holidays it is 5 hours and on any other days, it is 8 hours in any period of 12 hours. This comes to 112 hours in two consecutive weeks.

Normally eight hours a day has been accepted in our country as early as 1946. 48 hours a week or 8 hours a day was accepted for all factory workers.

I understand and I do appreciate that there will have to be certain difference in the case of this ocean-going crew and it will have to vary when it is on the sea, when it is in the port and then how the weekly holiday is to be fixed for them. So,

having accepted the eight-hour day, it is necessary for us to stipulate that those companies which engage our seamen should accept either this Convention or at least the 48-hour week.

As the hon. Minister knows, when the Select Committee went to the various ports we had occasion to meet the seamen in Bombay and we had occasion to meet the seamen in Calcutta also. Most of the seamen complained to us that they did not know as to what is the total number of hours they are expected to work in a week and that if they claimed any overtime that is considered as a breach of discipline and action has been taken against them. Action has been taken against some employees when they demanded from the management as to what exactly is the weekly hour and whether they are entitled to any overtime wages. This sort of situation cannot continue.

I know what the hon. Minister will say by way of a reply. He will say that these crews are the best foreign exchange earners and there is so much competition in the market, so, when we lend their services to these ocean-going vessels or to the foreign companies, there is a danger if these foreign companies engaging crews from other countries which are also training these crews. But in the name of competing with the other Asiatic countries or other countries which recruit these crews we should not allow slave labour so far as our crews are concerned. That is my submission.

So, I would like to know whether we have ratified this Convention. If we have not ratified this Convention, what is the limit beyond which we do not allow our seamen to work, whether there is on the deck or whether it is in the radio station or whether it is in the engine room? That is what I want to know. These are the two points on which if a good reply could be given by the hon. Minister I will be very grateful to him.

[Shri Tangamani]

But there are certain recommendations. These recommendations I will rapidly run through. Now, there is recommendation No. 108. That deals with the agencies for signing on or signing off of sea-farers, conditions in accordance with the standards accepted by the traditional maritime countries. There must be freedom of association. There must be proper repatriation. Then it is regarding the question of competency. So, this recommendation No. 108 deals with the normal trade union rights of these crews. What have we done about recommendation No. 108?

Recommendations No. 105 and No. 106 deal with medical facilities. That is given *in extenso*. I shall not read them because they are all given, that is, recommendations No. 105 and No. 106. They go to the extent of saying that if a specialist is to be immediately got for a crew or for any of the seamen or any of the members of the crew, radio signal must be sent and a specialist got as soon as possible from any ship which is available or from any port of call. That is the importance that they give for the safety of these seamen at sea. There is a danger of their contracting certain types of diseases also. There is another question also, that is, the question of the safety of these crews on board the ship. There may be some kind of a rioting. There was an instance. It was stated in this House as to how there was a quarrel between the two and one of them was ultimately murdered. So, when these crews are away from their homes—we have always been saying that at the work spot he must be given full protection—and when one falls ill it is the duty of the employer to see that he recoups himself as soon as possible. On these two matters also, if we have not adopted this, I would like to know what are the various facilities given to these crew and what are the conditions that we are

demanding from these shipping companies?

15-55 hrs.

[SHRI BARMAN in the Chair]

On the question of Indianisation, I do not want to say very much because it is necessary that we must have as many Indian crew as possible. Indian crew must be allowed to man our ships and we will have to send our own men. If there are certain foreign nationals and certain conditions, we will have to keep them also and not send them away. At the same time, Indianisation of the crew is a point on which I do not think we will have any difference of opinion.

Having said this about the main recommendations and the Convention, I would briefly refer to certain issues raised by the D. G., Shipping himself. What are the facilities which are given to these people whom we are going to call upon to man the ships? The first thing that is required is training. We have to produce efficient trained personnel to man our vessels. In this regard, we have got seven institutions. That is what the D. G., Shipping says. The first institution is for training of officers in *Dufferin*. *Dufferin* is one of the old battle-ships, which is anchored very near Bombay. So far, I think, since 1949, more than 1000 trainees have passed out from this institution and they are very successfully manning our merchant navy. It is really a proud record. Here, what I would suggest is, what I find is, sufficient publicity has not been given to this. Only young men from a certain sector come and avail themselves of this training. When we want to develop our merchant navy, when we want to increase our tonnage also, we require more and more men for manning our ships. So, it is not enough that we train only 75 persons at a time. Only 75 persons can be admitted in the *Dufferin* at a

time. Another Dufferin will have to be created. Unless that is done, we will not have enough men to man our ships. That is about the Dufferin.

There is the question of training our own Engineering personnel, marine engineers. There is the Marine Engineering College in Calcutta. Some of the Members of the Select Committee did visit the Marine Engineering College at Calcutta. They were complaining to us how, if the diploma that is given to them is to have universal application, they have to have another super training in the U.K. When they are able to finish the academic carrier and qualify themselves in their own colleges, that separate test is also put there. A fine set of young men are there. Highly qualified students come there and they are given the best and rigorous training. Having received this training, steps must be taken by the Government to see that they are given the same status as any other trainee from other countries.

The next one is about the Nautical and Engineering College in Bombay about which I will not say much. There are three training centres of seamen, one in Bombay, one in Calcutta...

Shri Raghunath Singh: How does this come here? This report does not deal with these things: what schools and colleges we have got in Bombay or Calcutta. That is not concerned with this report.

Shri N. E. Munkswamy (Vellore): Standard of training incidentally comes.

Shri Tangamani: Please read page 2. There is Shri Nagendra Singh's report. I would like my hon. friend to read that.

Shri Raghunath Singh: We are dealing with the Convention and the recommendations only.

Shri Tangamani: I would like my hon. friend to read the text of the
45 LSD-7

speech of Shri Nagendra Singh. In the beginning also I said that in addition to the wages and hours of work, I shall also deal with the training of seamen. I prefaced my speech that the question of training is also a point which I would like to raise.

The Minister of State in the Ministry of Transport and Communications (Shri Raj Bahadur): How is it germane to the consideration of the report? That is the question.
16 hrs.

Shri Tangamani: Actually, if the entire report is gone through, it will be found that the Director-General of the ILO has dealt with not only the shipping industry but also training, the various conventions, and the relations between the employers and employees. As far as possible, I am not going into the development of the shipping industry.

Shri Raj Bahadur: I have no objection if the hon. Member does so.

Shri Tangamani: When we are talking about the seamen in our country, the question of training of seamen is a very important thing. Without training our seamen and without getting enough seamen, how are we going to have conditions of service for these seamen?

Shri Raj Bahadur: May I make myself clear? My hon. friend Shri Raghunath Singhji has raised an important question of principle, in fact. Does the hon. Member opposite mean that any particular stray observation which has been made by any of the speakers or any member of our delegation to the ILC can form the subject-matter of discussion here? I think that cannot be the case. What is proposed to be discussed are the broad conclusions and the recommendations or the conventions. Personally speaking, I have no objection if the hon. Member refers to the training question also, but let us rather devote our attention to the subject that is under discussion before us.

Mr. Chairman: Towards the later part of his speech, the hon. Member has said that unless we have adequate and qualified seamen, we may not be able to demand the rights for our seamen, which are accorded by these international conferences. In that way, he was going to refer to this. Anyhow, it is better not to go into the details of that.

Shri Tangamani: I shall not develop that point.

Shri Raj Bahadur: I have no objection if the hon. Member deals with that point.

Shri Tanagamani: The only point that I would like to mention on the question of training of our seamen is that we have either to increase the number of trainees in these training ships in the three centres, or we must have another training centre. The Estimates Committee also has gone into this question and made some recommendations.

Mr. Chairman: It is not irrelevant. Naturally, I also thought that unless we had adequate training facilities in India and had adequately trained seamen, we may not be able to demand that the seamen of our country should get the rights that are accorded or recommended by these international conferences. In that way, it is relevant. At the same time, however, I feel that it is not strictly relevant if the hon. Member were to say that there are three or four centres now, and the number should be increased to five or six, for, that would mean going wide of the mark. So, the hon. Member should confine himself to discussing the rights that have been laid down by these conferences, how far we are giving those rights to our seamen, and how far Government have taken notice of those recommendations.

Shri Raghunath Singh: There are only seven points.

Shri Tangamani: The main points that I wanted to emphasis have been

emphasised and brought to the notice of the House already. I know also that many of these conventions have not been ratified. So, I would like to know from the hon. Minister about the hours of work, the wages, the steps we are taking for the encouragements of these seafarers and for guaranteeing that they get the proper treatment, how the competency certificates and identity cards are issued, and what facilities are now extended to them in the ports of call. For, we find that one of the important points raised at this conference was in regard to the facilities now given to them whether in Bombay or in Calcutta or in the ports of call. That was one of the points raised by our Director-General of Shipping, that the seamen from the Asian countries find difficulty at the ports of call in the different countries. So, what are the steps that the Government of India have taken in the light of the decisions arrived at this conference?

Mr. Chairman: Motion moved:

“That this House takes note of the Report of the Indian Government Delegation to the 41st (Maritime) Session of the International Labour Conference held at Geneva in April-May, 1958 laid on the Table of the House on the 29th November, 1958.”

श्री रघुनाथ सिंह : सभापति महोदय, हमारे भाई ने जो बहस यहां आरम्भ की है यह कुछ प्रीमैच्योर सी है। इस वास्ते प्रीमैच्योर सी है कि लेबर मिनिस्ट्री का सम्बन्ध इस रेकमेंडेशन से है और इस इस्ट्रमेंट के आधार पर १८ महीने के बाद तक इस हाउस के सामने कोई सजैशन या चीज उपस्थित करनी चाहिये और उस वक्त समय होगा कि उस पर कुछ डिटेल के साथ बहस हो।

हमारे भाई श्री तंगामणि ने बड़ी अच्छी भाषा का प्रयोग किया है और सीमेन् के सम्बन्ध में जो कुछ उन्होंने कहा है उसके

अब लखी को सहानुभूति होगी लेकिन इस विषय पर जब विचार करते हैं तो एक बात हमें विचार कर लेनी चाहिए कि भारतवर्ष में ८० हजार सीमेन्ट हीर ८० हजार सीमेन्ट में से केवल ५ हजार सीमेन्ट हिन्दुस्तानी जहाजों में काम करते हैं और बाकी जितने सीमेन्ट हैं वह विदेशी जहाजों में काम करते हैं। इसका अर्थ यह है कि ७५ हजार सीमेन्ट कारेन शिप्स में एम्पलायमेंट पाते हैं और केवल ५ हजार सीमेन्ट ऐसे हैं जो कि हिन्दुस्तान के जहाजों में काम करते हैं।

मैं थोड़े से आकड़े देना चाहता हूँ। बम्बई और कलकत्ता दो जगहों पर हमारे भाई गये और मैं भी उनके साथ था और हम ने उनको देखा। बम्बई में जो सीमेन्ट हिन्दुस्तानी जहाजों पर काम करते हैं उनकी संख्या है ३१६३ और कलकत्ता में उनकी संख्या है ६६५, अर्थात् हिन्दुस्तानी जहाजों पर जो हिन्दुस्तानी सीमेन्ट काम करते हैं उनकी संख्या है सिर्फ ५१८७। इसकी तुलना में जो हिन्दुस्तानी बम्बई में विदेशी जहाजों पर काम करते हैं उनकी संख्या है १८,७१५ और कलकत्ता में जो हिन्दुस्तानी विदेशी जहाजों पर लगे हुए हैं उनकी संख्या है १५,३५८ अर्थात् कुल ३४,०७२ हिन्दुस्तानी सीमेन्ट कारिन शिप्स पर काम करते हैं। इस प्रकार ८० हजार सीमेन्ट की तादाद है उसमें से केवल ३८,२५६ को अब तक काम मिल सका है। यह ठीक है कि जिनको काम नहीं मिला है उनके साथ हमारे तंगामणि साहब की सहानुभूति है। लेकिन सूली सहानुभूति से तो कोई फायदा नहीं हो सकता क्योंकि ८० हजार हिन्दुस्तानी सीमेन्ट में से केवल ३८००० हजार को काम दिला सके हैं। इसमें कोई दो मत नहीं हो सकते। इन ३८ हजार श्रावणियों में से भी ३५ हजार पर हमारा कोई अधिकार नहीं है। वह विदेशी कम्पनियों में काम करते हैं। इन विदेशी कम्पनियों में जो काम करते हैं

उन्में से ८० प्रतिशत केवल ५० के० की कम्पनियों में लगे हुए हैं। इनमें ११,००० हजार पाकिस्तानी सीमेन्ट भी शामिल हैं जो कि कलकत्ता पोर्ट में रजिस्टर और भरती होते हैं। हमको यह विचार करना है कि जो विदेशी कम्पनियाँ विदेशी फ्लेग ले कर चलती हैं उनकी रजिस्ट्री हमारे यहाँ नहीं है, उन पर हमारा कोई अधिकार नहीं है। ये कम्पनियाँ हमारे हिन्दुस्तान के करीब ५० हजार श्रावणियों को एम्पलायमेंट देती हैं। यह हमारी स्थिति है। इस अवस्था में हमारी नीति सहानुभूतिपूर्ण, सौजन्यतापूर्ण और उदारतापूर्ण होनी चाहिए। मैं एक उदाहरण देना चाहता हूँ। पिनांग और सिगापुर में जो कि साउथ ईस्ट एशिया में दो महत्वपूर्ण स्थान हैं वहाँ पर ज्यादातर सीमेन्ट हिन्दुस्तानी है शायद तमिल लोग हैं। हुआ यह कि ५० के० का एक जहाज आया और उसने सीमेन्ट मागे। वहाँ पर दो हिन्दुस्तानियों की यूनियन है। एक कम्प्युनिस्ट यूनियन है। जैसा कि हमारे भाई ने कहा, उसी तरह उस यूनियन ने कहा कि साहब हमको तो २५ पाउंड मिलना चाहिए जो कि अग्रेज सीमेन्ट को मिलता है। अगर इतना मिलेगा तब तो हम आपके जहाज पर काम करेंगे वरना नहीं करेंगे। उसका परिणाम यह हुआ कि ५० के० की जहाजी कम्पनियों ने पिनांग और सिगापुर से हिन्दुस्तानियों को रिफूट करना छोड़ दिया। आज मैं कम्प्युनिस्ट पार्टी से कहना चाहता हूँ कि वहाँ पर दस हजार हिन्दुस्तानी सीमेन्ट हैं जिनको कारिन कम्पनियाँ लेती थी, वे आज बेकार हैं, और कम्प्युनिस्ट चाहे उल्टे भी टंग जायें वे उनको काम नहीं दिला सकते। नतीजा क्या हुआ? नतीजा यह हुआ कि हिन्दुस्तानियों के हाथ में जो एक बड़ा भारी व्यापार था साउथ ईस्ट एशिया में वह उनके हाथ से निकल गया। दस हजार सीमेन्ट बेकार हो गये और अब जो जहाज सिगापुर और पिनांग से हिन्दुस्तान आते हैं हम अक्सर में पढ़ते हैं कि आज उनके द्वारा तीन हजार हिन्दुस्तान

[श्री रघुनाथ सिंह]

वापस आये, कम चार हजार वापस आये। एक उल्टी नीति के कारण ही अपना एक बड़ा भारी व्यापार लो बिबा। उस नीति को हमें हिन्दुस्तान में पुहराना नहीं है। हमको तो जो हिन्दुस्तानी कनबेशन है उसकी सिफारिश के अनुसार चलना चाहिए।

तगामणि साहब ने बहुत सी बातें कहीं। उन्होंने कहा कि नियर ट्रेड शिप्स में ५६ बंटे हैं और डिस्टेंट ट्रेड शिप्स में ४८ अवर्स सीमन को काम करना पड़ता है। वो प्रकार के शिप होते हैं नियर ट्रेड शिप और डिस्टेंट ट्रेड शिप। नियर ट्रेड शिप में ५६ बंटे हैं और डिस्टेंट ट्रेड शिप में ४८ बंटे काम होता है। लेकिन साथ ही साथ केटरिंग डिपार्टमेंट में ५६ अवर्स है। जो लोग इंजिन में काम करते हैं, बाइस्तर में काम करते हैं या डेक साफ करने का काम करते हैं उनका अधिक मेहनत का काम है। इसलिए उनके लिए ४८ बंटे हैं और जो सिर्फ खाना पीना देते हैं उनके बास्ते ५६ अवर्स का कनबेशन था। मैं तो कहूंगा कि यह कनबेशन बिल्कुल ठीक था और साइंटिफिक था। जो आदमी मैन्युअल लेबर करता है उसको ज्यादा भाराम की आवश्यकता है और जो आदमी चाय पानी और खिलाने पिलाने का काम करता है उसको अधिक मैन्युअल काम नहीं करना पड़ता। इसलिए उसके लिए ५६ अवर्स है। तो यह कनबेशन बिल्कुल ठीक है।

दूसरी बात हमें यह कहनी है कि सभापति महोदय आपके सभापतित्व में जो कानून बना है उसके सेक्टर ७ में करीब-करीब १३० धारायें हैं सीमन के बारे में। इतनी डिस्टेंस और किसी कानून में नहीं होंगी। हम लोग सीमन के बरों पर गये और उनकी स्थिति का अध्ययन किया और उसके बाद वह कानून बनाया। मैं पूछना चाहता हूँ कि

यू० के०, अमरीका, सोवियत या किसी भी देश के कानून में सीमन के बारे में इतनी धारायें रखी नहीं हैं। हम चाहते हैं कि हम अपने सीमन को काम दे सकें लेकिन हम कड़े काम दे सकते हैं। हमारे पास ज्यादा जहाज नहीं हैं। हम तो केवल चार हजार लोगों को एम्प्लायमेंट दे सकते हैं। हम अपने ८० हजार सीमन को एम्प्लायमेंट नहीं दे सकते। उनको विदेशी कम्पनियां एम्प्लायमेंट देती हैं। वे हमारे कानून के अधीन नहीं हैं। अगर हम इस पार्लियामेंट में बैठकर कोई कानून बनायें तो वह केवल हिन्दुस्तानी जहाजी कम्पनियों पर ही लागू होगा। फारिन कम्पनीयों पर वह कानून लागू नहीं होगा। इसी बास्ते इंटरनेशनल कनबेशन और कानफेंस होती हैं और वह कुछ सुझाव देती हैं और चाहती हैं कि हर देश उनको मान ले। मैं तगामणि साहब से पूछता हूँ कि यू० के० एक मरीटाइम नेशन है। क्या उसने इन कनबेशन को माना है। उसने उसकी कुछ सिफारिशों को नहीं माना है। इसका कारण यह है कि सब का अलग-अलग इंटेस्ट है। हमारा स्वार्थ यह है कि हमारे जो हिन्दुस्तानी सीमन हैं वे ज्यादा से ज्यादा तादाद में विदेशी कम्पनियों में जायें, ज्यादा से ज्यादा तादाद में उन कम्पनियों में उनको काम मिले। हमारा यह इंटेस्ट है। इसी तरह से यू० के० का सीमन सोचता है कि हिन्दुस्तानी सीमन हमारे जहाजों में क्यों काम करे, हम अंग्रेज सीमन देंगे। लेकिन हमारे सीमन को विदेशी कम्पनियां क्यों लेती हैं? क्या कारण है? कारण यह है कि हमारे सीमन सस्ते हैं। वे लोग २५ पाउंड डिमांड करते हैं और हम १६ पाउंड पर ही काम करने के लिए तैयार हैं। इसलिए हमारी भाव ज्यादा मांग है। अगर एक दुकानदार भारतीय ६ घाने गन्ध बेचता है और दूसरा दुकानदार भारतीय चार घाने गन्ध बेचता है तो हर भारतीय चार घाने गन्ध की भारतीय

Delegation to the 41st
(Maritime) Session of
International Labour
Conference

जैसे के लिए तैयार होगा। यही कारण है कि दुनिया भर में हिन्दुस्तान सीमैन की डिमांड है। क्योंकि हम सस्ते हैं। इसलिए हमें काम मिलता है। लेकिन अगर हमारा स्टैंडर्ड सोवियत, यू० के० और अमरीका के सीमैन के बराबर हो जाये तो यह स्थिति नहीं रहेगी। हम तो चाहते हैं कि हमारे सीमैन का स्टैंडर्ड यू० के० आदि के सीमैन जैसा हो। लेकिन हो भी तो। अभी तो बैसा होना मुमकिन नहीं है। इसका कारण यह है कि हमारे रिसेसिंड इतने नहीं हैं। हमारे पास इतने जहाज नहीं हैं कि हम अपने ५०,००० सीमैन को काम दे सकें। तो ऐसी स्थिति में अगर उनको कुछ थोड़ी तनख्वाह पर काम मिलता है तो क्या वह अच्छा नहीं है। क्या इसके मुकाबले उनका बेकार रहना अच्छा है। आधा पेट भोजन अच्छा है या भूखा रहना अच्छा है। मैं तंगमणि साहब से कहता हूँ कि वह इन दोनों में से कोई भी चीज पसन्द कर लें। क्या वह आधा पेट रहना चाहते हैं या भूके पेट रहना पसन्द करेंगे। जो परिस्थितियाँ आज हमारे सामने हैं उनका हमें गम्भीरतापूर्वक सामना करना चाहिए।

उन्होंने बेजिज के सम्बन्ध में सवाल उठाया। समापति महोदय, आप को याद होगा कि अभी हमारे सैन्ट्रल हाल में एक भी गुब्बार जी ने एक लैम्बर दिया था। उस की रिपोर्ट छपी है। उस रिपोर्ट के यह बाहिर होता है कि एशियाटिक सीमैन बैस्ट्रन सीमैन की तरह से एप्रिन्डेंट नहीं है, उतना वैबोरियस नहीं है। एक काबुली-अप्रमानिस्तान का पठान जितना अच्छा काम कर सकता है, जितना बोझा उठा सकता है, उतना हमारे ईस्टर्न यू० पी० का आदमी नहीं उठा सकता है। इस कारण यह है कि शक्ति ने उस को मजबूत और ताकतवर बनाया है और हम को कमजोर बनाया है। अगर हम कमजोर हैं, तो हम उतना ज्यादा काम नहीं कर सकते हैं, जितना कि बाहर

का मजबूत आदमी कर सकता है। एक काबुली दो मन उठा सकता है, लेकिन ईस्ट्रन यू० पी० का आदमी केवल एक मन का बोझ उठा सकता है। दोनों की काम करने की कैपेसिटी में बहुत बड़ा अन्तर है। इस लिए आप देखेंगे कि बैस्ट्रन सीमैन और एशियाटिक सीमैन की जो पैरिटी दिखाई गई है, वह इस प्रकार है। अगर एक सात गुब्बार जी० आर० टी० का जहाज हों, तो डैक पर दस इंजन रूम में आठ और सैलून में सात बैस्ट्रन सीमैन एम्प्लाय किए जाते हैं और अगर उसी सात गुब्बार जी० आर० टी० के जहाज पर एशियाटिक सीमैन को लेना होगा, तो डैक पर दस बैस्ट्रन सीमैन के बजाय उन्नीस एशियाटिक सीमैन लिए जायेंगे और इंजन रूम में आठ बैस्ट्रन सीमैन के स्थान पर आठ एशियाटिक सीमैन लिए जायेंगे। इस तरह से आप देखेंगे कि दुनिया में जो सिस्टम, जो प्रणाली चल रही है, वह क्यों चल रही है। अगर दस बैस्ट्रन सीमैन के स्थान पर दस इंडियन काम करने के लिए तैयार हैं, तो फिर बैस्ट्रन सीमैन को छोड़ कर अपने आदमियों को छोड़ कर हिन्दुस्तानी को क्यों रखेंगे ?

श्री दासप्या (बंगलौर) : सैलून में कितने हैं ?

श्री रघुनाथ सिंह : सैलून में बैस्ट्रन भी सात हैं और हिन्दुस्तानी भी सात हैं। सैलून का काम क्या है ? बूट पालिस करना, खाना परोसना, साफ़ करना। मैं तो उस में रहा नहीं हूँ। वह वहाँ पर रहे हैं। इस लिए वह ज्यादा एक्सप्लेन कर सकते हैं। लेकिन जहाँ तक सैलून का सम्बन्ध है, सात बैस्ट्रन हैं और सात हिन्दुस्तानी हैं। उस में कोई फ़र्क नहीं है। लेकिन जहाँ तक डैक और इंजन रूम का सम्बन्ध है, करीब करीब तुलने का फ़र्क है। इस लिए जब बैस्ट्रन और एशियाटिक सीमैन का कम्पैरिजन करते हैं, तो दोनों को एक तराजू पर एक तुला पर रख

[श्री रघुनाथ सिंह]

सोल नहीं सकते। उन में कुछ अन्तर तो है ही। एशियाटिक सीमन के लिए १६ पीड बैलन रखा गया है, जो करीब करीब १६० रुपए होता है और हिन्दुस्तान में रखा गया है ११५ रुपए से १६० रुपए तक। एक सर्वेक्षण हिन्दुस्तान की तरफ से है हमारे अधिकारी कोन इस बात की कोशिश करते हैं कि हिन्दुस्तानी सीमन को ११५ रुपए से लेकर १६० रुपए तक मासिक प्राप्त हो जाये। इसको कहते हैं एडजस्टिड ईक्वीवैलेंट बेजिज अर्थात् जहाजी कम्पनियां यह चाहती हैं कि जिस मह में उनको जितना रुपया खर्च करना है, उससे ज्यादा उनको न खर्च करना पड़े। अगर बैंक पर किसी जहाजी कम्पनी को एक हज़ार रुपया खर्च करना है, तो वह उससे ज्यादा खर्च नहीं करेगी, चाहे वह वैस्ट्रन सीमन को एम्पलाय करे और चाहे एशियाटिक सीमन को। इस को कहते हैं एडजस्टिड ईक्वीवैलेंट बेजिज। अगर मान लिया जाय कि हम इस कनवैन्शन को मान लें तो उसका फल क्या होगा? उसका फल यह होगा कि हिन्दुस्तानी कम्पनियां बेजिज ज्यादा देंगी और यू० के० को कम बेजिज देनी पड़ेंगी। सभापति महोदय, आप जानते हैं कि पनामा, हाइर्रास और लाइबेरिया के पास वर्ल्ड में सबसे ज्यादा टनेज है यू० के० को छोड़ कर। उन के पास इतना टनेज क्यों है? इसलिये कि वे ट्रैम्प शिपिंग करते हैं। आज हिन्दुस्तान में उसका काम्पीटीशन हो रहा है—सारी दुनिया में हो रहा है। और करने वाले कोन हैं। अमरीकन और यू० के० वाले। अमरीका और यू० के० के पूंजीपतियों ने जब सोचा कि इनकम टैक्स से कैसे बच सकते हैं, ज्यादा से ज्यादा रुपया कैसे पा सकते हैं और इन्टरनेशनल कनवैन्शन और इन्टरनेशनल ला हम पर लागू न हों, उनसे कैसे बच सकते हैं, तो उन्होंने पनामा, हाइर्रास और लाइबेरिया में अपने शिप्स को रजिस्टर कराना शुरू कर दिया।

आज शिपिंग पनामा में ११ मिलियन टन जहाज रजिस्टर्ड है। उन पर कोई कानून लागू नहीं है। यह तो व्यापार है। मान लें कि एक हज़ार टन का माल हिन्दुस्तान से बाहर भेजना है और उसका भाड़ा समझ लीजिए कि तो क्या है। अगर पनामा हमारे पास आकर कहे कि हम अस्वी रुपए लेंगे, तो आप चाहे कितने ही पैट्रियाटिक क्यों न हों, आप सोचेंगे कि बीस रुपए का फर्क है, हम पनामा के शिप्स में माल क्यों न भेजें, हिन्दुस्तानी शिप्स में क्यों भेजें। इस बात को अहेंडर रक्खा चाहिए कि हम वर्ल्ड मार्केट में कम्पीट करने के लिये जा रहे हैं। दुनिया के बाजार के स्टैंडर्ड को हम को मानना होगा, बाजार के काम्पीटीशन में हम को एप्टर करना होगा। हम किसी ऐसी नीति को नहीं अपना सकते, जिसको अपनाने से हमारी शिपिंग कम्पनीज को हमारी शिपिंग को घाटा हो—नुकसान हो, क्योंकि जब तक कि इकानोमिक प्रापोजीशन नहीं होगा, तब तक कोई प्लान चल नहीं सकता है। इसलिये मैं कहता हू कि इस पर बड़ी गम्भीरता के साथ विचार करना है। मैं इस बात के पक्ष में नहीं हू कि हम इस कनवैन्शन को, इस रीकमेंडेशन और सर्वेशन को जहां तक हो सके मान लें। यू० के० और अमरीका ने भी इस को पूरा नहीं माना है। हम भी उस को मानेंगे, जो हमारी परिस्थिति के अनुकूल हो, जिससे हमारी जहाजरानी की तरक्की हो, जिससे दुनिया के बाजार में हम ठहर सकें, जिससे हम कुछ चल सकें, कुछ जीवित रह सकें। जब हम इस नीति को अपनायेंगे, तो हमारे शिपिंग की तरक्की होगी, नहीं तो नहीं होगी।

एक बात मैं और कहना चाहता हूँ और वह है आइडेंटिटी कार्ड के बारे में। दुनिया की बड़ी बड़ी मैरिटाइम नेशन्स जैसे अमरीका और यू० के०, हमसे ज्यादा कार्ड हैं और उनके कम से कम एक एक करोड़ टन के

बाह्य है। लेकिन अमरीका भी बिल्कुल इस को मानने के लिये तैयार नहीं है और हिन्दुस्तान को भी बिल्कुल मानना नहीं चाहिए, मैं इस के पक्ष में हूँ। मैं श्री राज बहादुर से कहना चाहता हूँ कि आईडेंटिटी कार्ड के जिस सिस्टम को वह फ़ालो कर रहे हैं, वह ठीक है और कनवेंशन के सिस्टम की नहीं मानना चाहिए। उसका डेंजर क्या है? मैं बताता हूँ कि हमारी सरकार ने यह पालिसी बंदी अच्छी प्रस्तियार की है। हमारे यहाँ अब भी ग्यारह हजार पाकिस्तानी आई एम्प्लायड हैं। वे फ़ारेनर्ज हैं और उनके पास आईडेंटिटी कार्ड हैं, लेकिन बीसा होना चाहिए, पासपोर्ट होना चाहिये। मान लीजिये कि मलाया के दो हजार के करीब लेबरर्ज हिन्दुस्तान में कलकत्ता पोर्ट में आ जाते हैं। उनके पास आईडेंटिटी कार्ड हैं। सरकार बाउन्ड है कि वह विदेशी कम्पनियों से कहे कि वह उनको सीमैन की हैसियत से काम दे। हम हिन्दुस्तान में फ़ारेन सीमैन का एम्प्लायमेंट एक्सचेंज नहीं खोलना चाहते। हम कलकत्ता और बम्बई को फ़ारेन फ़ारेनर्ज के लिये एम्प्लायमेंट एक्सचेंज नहीं बनाना चाहते, क्योंकि अगर हम बनायेगे, तो उसका फल यह होगा कि हमारे जो प्रस्सी हजार सीमैन हैं, उनका क्या होगा? अगर हम फ़ारेनर्ज को एसाऊ करेंगे, तो बहुत से देश ऐसे हैं, जहाँ के लेबरर हमारे यहाँ से चीप हैं। अगर उनके पास आईडेंटिटी कार्ड हैं, तो वह कलकत्ता और बम्बई में आ सकते हैं। अगर उन्होंने हमारे साथ कम्पीट करना शुरू कर दिया तो हम कहाँ रहेंगे? लिहाजा पासपोर्ट होना आवश्यक है। हम जिस को पासपोर्ट, बीसा दें, वही हमारे देश में आए। वे फ़ारेनर्ज हैं और फ़ारेनर्ज की तरह ही हम उस को ट्रीट करते हैं। हम भी सीमैन की हैसियत से उसका स्वागत करते हैं। हम भी कोशिश करेंगे और ईस्पर की रूप से काम दे देंगे। इसलिए मैं भारत सरकार को बधाई देना चाहता हूँ कि उसने इमेनिटेरियन

ब्यू आफ विन्स लिया है और ११,००० जो पाकिस्तानी आई सीमैन हैं, उनको काम दिलाने की कोशिश की है। लेकिन मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि पासपोर्ट और बीसा सिस्टम को हमें जरूर लागू रखना चाहिए और इस पालिसी को हमें प्रवश्य कंटेन््यू करना चाहिए। अगर ऐसा नहीं किया गया तो आगे चल कर खतरा पैदा हो सकता है।

आप देखें तो आपको पता चलेगा कि मलाया ने एक कानून बना रखा है इसके बारे में और मैं समझता हूँ कि तगामणि साहब को उसका पता ही होगा। वहाँ पर १४ परसेंट आबादी हिन्दुस्तानियों की है, ४६ परसेंट आबादी चीनियों की है और पचास परसेंट से कुछ ज्यादा मलाया के लोग हैं। इसी तरह से सिंगापुर में ७० परसेंट आबादी चाइनीज है और जो मलाया के लोग रहने वाले हैं, उनकी आबादी १० परसेंट ही है और बाकी हिन्दुस्तानी हैं। मलाया गवर्नमेंट ने जब देखा कि उनके देशवासियों का क्या होगा अगर दूसरे लोग ही यहाँ आ गये, ४६ परसेंट चाइनीज हो गये, १३ परसेंट हिन्दुस्तानी हो गये, और इस चीज को देखते हुए उसने एक कानून बनाया कि अगर मलाया में आज कोई आना चाहता है, सिंगापुर में कोई आना चाहता है या पीनांग आना चाहता है, तो उसको यह बतलाना होगा कि उसको पांच सौ रुपये के ऊपर की नौकरी मिल गई है। मलाया में उसको तब तक जहाज के नीचे पैर नहीं रखने दिया जा सकता है जब तक कि वह इस बात की गारंटी न दे कि उसको इस तरह की नौकरी मिल गई है। मलाया हमारा पड़ोसी है। वहाँ पर १३ परसेंट आबादी हिन्दुस्तानियों की है। उन्होंने इस बास्ते यह कानून बनाया है कि यह न हो कि हिन्दुस्तान की जितनी भी अनएम्प्लायड लेबर है या चाइनीज लेबर है, वह उबर चली जाये और मलाया के लोग परेशान हो जायें और उनको नौकरी न मिले। इस बास्ते उन्होंने इस कानून को बनाया है।

[श्री रघुनाथ सिंह]

इस बास्ते में कहना चाहता हूँ कि यह जो बीसा भ्रमबा पासपोर्ट की पालिसी है, इसको हमें कंटेन्ड कराना चाहिये। अगर इसको त्याग दिया गया तो इस का नतीजा यह होगा कि चाइनीज लेबर तथा दूसरे मुल्कों की लेबर हिन्दुस्तान में धावेगी ग्राइवेंटीटी कार्बंस के साथ और कहेगी कि हम को भी नौकरी मिलनी चाहिए। इस बास्ते में कहना चाहता हूँ कि यह पासपोर्ट और बीसा सिस्टम जरूर लागू रहना चाहिये।

एक और बात का यहाँ शिक्र किया गया है और वह यह कि आई० एन० टी० यू० सी० के रिप्रेजेंटेटिक्स को लिया गया और दूसरी यूनियन के रिप्रेजेंटेटिक्स को नहीं लिया गया जब हम इस रिपोर्ट को पढ़ते हैं तो इस में कोई आबजैकशनेबल बात को नहीं पाते हैं, वहाँ पर सोवियत प्रतिनिधि मौजूद थे और दूसरे मुल्कों के प्रतिनिधि मौजूद थे, किसी ने भी कोई आबजैकशन रख नहीं किया। मैं समझता हूँ कि इस में कोई हर्ष की बात नहीं है अगर आई० एन० टी० यू० सी० को प्रतिनिधित्व मिलता है। अगर मीमेन् आई० एन० टी० यू० सी० में ज्वायन होते हैं तो इस में कोई आपत्ति की बात नहीं है। मैं समझता हूँ कि यह तो दो दलों में इन्ड है। आप चाहते हैं कि सारा देश कम्युनिस्ट हो जाये और हम चाहते हैं कि सारा देश गांधीवादी हो जाये। आई० एन० टी० यू० सी० में जो भी आना चाहेगा, हम उसका स्वागत करेंगे। अगर उसको प्रतिनिधित्व मिल गया तो यह हर्ष की बात ही है।

इन शब्दों के साथ मैं आपका धन्यवाद करता हूँ कि आपने मुझे एक बार फिर सिपिंग पर बोलने का अवसर प्रदान किया है। १८ महीने के बाद एक बिल के रूप में या एक रिक्मेंडेशन के रूप में जब यह चीज फिर इस सदन के पटल पर रखी जायेगी, उस वक्त व्योरेबार इस पर विचार किया जायेगा और

तब मैं अपने विचार विस्तारपूर्वक व्यक्त करूँगा।

श्री राज सिंह भाई बर्मा (गिवाड़) : सभापति महोदय, कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी के मानवीय सदस्य ने बहस की शुरुआत करते हुए, जैसी कि उनकी परम्परा रही है, उसके धनुसार ही इस बार फिर, अपने भाषण का शीर्षणेश . .

Mr. Chairman: I have not called any hon. Member. I want to know how many hon. Members want to speak and how much time the hon. Minister wants.

Shri Raj Bahadur: About 20 or 25 minutes.

Shri Aurobindo Ghosal (Uluberia): Mr. Chairman, so far as I have understood Mr. Raghunath Singh, he supported the action of the Government on the non-implementation of the recommendations of this 41st Session of the International Labour Conference.

श्री रघुनाथ सिंह : एक बात में कहना भूल गया हूँ। जहाँ तक इम्प्लेमेंटेशन का सवाल है, वह अभी पैदा नहीं होता है। १८ महीने के बाद या उसके अन्दर यह चीज फिर हमारे सामने धावेगी जिसमें कहा जायेगा कि हम इस कनवेंशन को इम्प्लेमेंट करना चाहते हैं।

There is no question of implementation just now.

Shri Aurobindo Ghosal: In support of argument, he has brought so many international problems and magnified some of the apprehensions. To me, it seems very simple. The recommendations of this conference are on three important points: wages, working hours and manning scale. We have to consider this from this point of view, whether, if our Government accepts these three recommendations of this conference, the condition of the seafarers will be improved. I would not go into the recommendations regarding the engagement of seafarers.

medical facilities, competency certificates identification cards, etc. I would like to confine myself to the three recommendations I have referred to.

The seafarers have got a very hazardous life. They spend months together on the high seas without any touch with society, without any enjoyment or recreation in their life. So, they are in a very peculiar condition. So, in order to ameliorate their present condition and to develop their present standard, if some minimum wage is introduced, as recommended in this convention, I think it will rather improve their condition and standard of work. As already mentioned by the previous speakers, the minimum wage is £25 in U.K. But in our country, there is no such wage fixed and taking advantage of the unemployment problem, the shipowners are in a bargaining position. There is more supply of seamen than what the companies demand and so the shipowners are bargaining on their wages.

It is also to be remembered that a huge percentage of these seafarers belong to Pakistan nationals. The Government complains that youths among Indian nationals do not come forward to accept these salaries. The main difficulty in accepting the service of a seaman is that there is no continuity of service, no security, no provident fund, no retirement benefits and nothing of the kind, so that the youth may be allured to accept this job. Naturally, the Indian youth are not available for service as seamen. So, in order to give some allurements and in order to give some status to the Indian sea-farers at least the minimum wage should be introduced in our country as recommended in that Conference.

Now, as regards the second point, that is, the working hours, 48 hours for distant trade ships and 86 hours for near trade ships have been recommended. But in our country no working hours have been fixed. Not only

that, I definitely remember that in the Select Committee when we demanded that in the agreement that is executed between the owners and the seamen at least the wages, as also the leaves that they are entitled to, and the working hours should be mentioned, whatever it might be, but these were not even allowed so that these things can be incorporated in the terms of agreement that are executed between the shipowners and the sea-farers. Therefore, taking advantage of the absence of any working hours and also of the absence of any fixed wages, the shipowners are rather exploiting the sea-farers. So, the service of seamen has not proved to be very alluring to the Indian youth.

As regards the third point of manning scale, of course that is there in the Convention also but they have not fixed any manning scale. The manning scale should be fixed according to the ship and the chart of the route. In our country about this manning scale, a complaint has come from the seamen that the manning scale is such that the work on these sea-farers is too heavy. Therefore, in the Merchant Shipping Act we should have prescribed a manning scale for sea according to the tonnage. But we did not do it. Naturally when the seamen fall sick while on voyage, the work of those seamen, who go out due to sickness or due to other reasons, is to be shared by the other workers and consequently their work load is increased. Naturally, during the consideration of the Merchant Shipping Bill, we suggested that at least the shipowners should be called upon to fill up the depleted strength of the seamen at the next port. But it was also not accepted. From that point of view also the recommendation of this Convention is quite good and should have been accepted by the Government of India.

As regards the physical strength of our seamen, as pointed out by my hon. friend, Shri Raghunath Singh

[Shri Aurobindo Ghosal]

that only because of the cheapness of Indian labour, we are being recruited. But I do not subscribe to his views because we are recruited not only for our cheap price but we are also recruited because of our efficiency. But if more training is given as pointed out by my hon. friend, Shri Tangamani, and efficient training arrangements can be made by the Government, certainly our seafarers would be better than the sea-farers of U.K. or U.S.A., as mentioned by my hon. friend, Shri Raghunath Singh. Therefore, from that aspect, I am not willing to agree to the proposition of my hon. friend, Shri Raghunath Singh.

Shri Raghunath Singh: That is one of the factors.

Shri Aurobindo Ghosal: That may be one of the factors but that is not the only factor for which our seamen are accepted.

Now, as regards the welfare of our seamen, we have said that about 130 clauses have been incorporated in our Merchant Shipping Act on the issue of various amenities to our seamen. But the main issue hinges round three items: minimum wage, working hours and manning scale and determination of work load. If these three things are granted, if these recommendations of the Conference are accepted by the Government of India, I can assure them that not only the standard of our seamen will improve, but also a sufficient number of Indian youth will come forward to accept this job, and also Indianisation will be speedily made in this sector also.

With these words, I request the recommendations of the Convention should be implemented by the hon. Minister.

श्री रामसिंह भाई बर्मा (निवाड़) :
 समापति महोदय, जैसा मैंने अभी निवेदन किया है कि भारत में कुछ इस प्रकार की परम्परा रही है कि जब कभी भी कोई युव

काम की शुरुआत की जाती है, तो सब से पहले गणपति पूजन होता है। इसी प्रकार से हमारे कम्युनिस्ट मित्रों की भी पालियामेंट में एक परम्परा रही है कि जब कभी भी पालियामेंट में लेबर का सवाल आता है तो आई० एन० टी० यू० सी० की झालोचना से ही वे अपने भाषण की शुरुआत करते हैं। मुझे इस पर कुछ कहना नहीं था, लेकिन चूंकि मेरे मित्र कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी के सदस्य नै डरते डरते और झिझकते झिझकते भास्त्रि को आई० एन० टी० यू० सी० का नाम ले ही डाला . . . :

Shri Tangamani: Let my hon. friend read the report. In the report there is reference to the I.N.T.U.C. There credentials were challenged. It is on that basis that I mentioned it. Let him refer to the report. Let him not unnecessarily cast aspersions on the Communist Party. I do not know his language. Only I want to inform him beforehand.

श्री रामसिंह भाई बर्मा : आप मेरी बात सुन लीजिये। आपकी अंग्रेजी मैंने नहीं समझी है और न मैं समझता हूँ और मेरी हिन्दी को आप नहीं समझते हैं, दोनों की ही यह कठिनाई है।

Shri Tangamani: If you are able to speak in Tamil, I will speak in Hindi.

Mr. Chairman: Order, order; the hon. Member may go on.

श्री रामसिंह भाई बर्मा : वह भाषा भी पढ़ लूंगा और कोई दिन आयेगा कि उसमें बात भी कर सकूंगा।

मैं यह निवेदन कर रहा था कि माननीय सदस्यों की धाज से नहीं बहुत पहले से ही कुछ आदत सी रही है कि जब कभी भी मैं बोलने के लिए खड़ा होता हूँ तो कुछ गड़बड़ी देवा करते हैं। मेरी यह आदत नहीं है कि जब कोई बोलता हो तो उसमें मैं बिज्ज डालूँ

Mr. Chairman: He may come to the subject now.

Delegation to 41st
(Maritime) Section of
International Labour
Conference

की राजसिंह भाई बर्ना : जो सबकेन्द है, वह इससे जुड़ा हुआ है ।

मैं यह निवेदन कर रहा हूँ कि मेरे बिरोधी मित्र ने कहा कि आई० एल० ओ० के घन्दर एक ही सत्वा के प्रतिनिधि, एक ही सेंट्रल मार्गनाइजेशन के प्रतिनिधि बम्बई और कलकत्ता से भेजे गये हैं । मैं समझता हूँ कि यह सबाल किसी विशेष व्यक्ति अथवा व्यक्तियों को भेजने का नहीं है । यह भी एक नीति और एक परम्परा हमारे शासन की जो रही है और उसी के अनुसार उसने आई० एल० ओ० के घन्दर अश्रित ट्रेड यूनियस के प्रतिनिधियों को ही भेजा है । यह नीति और परम्परा १९४७ से जब ने भारत आजाद हुआ चली आ रही है और उसके अनुसार इसका भी पता लगा लिया गया है कि किस यूनियन के सब से ज्यादा मम्बर है और किस के कम है । मैं माननीय सदस्यों को यह बताना चाहता हूँ कि १९४७ के पहले यही कम्युनिस्ट लोग बगड़ी बाध कर एक समय तक आई० एल० ओ० में बैठे करते थे, मानौली इनके हाथ में थी, सीधे आई० एल० ओ० में जाते थे और उस समय की पार्लियामेंट में भी मजदूर प्रतिनिधि के नाम से नामिनेट हो जाते थे । लेकिन जब से हमारा देश आजाद हुआ है, यहाँ पर प्रजातान्त्रिक विधान की स्थापना हुई है, तब से दोनों तीनों सेंट्रल ट्रेड यूनियस के प्रतिनिधियों में यह निर्णय हो गया है कि कौन आई० एल० ओ० के घन्दर प्रतिनिधि बन कर जा सकता है, कौ नहीं जा सकता है, गवर्नमेंट का प्रतिनिधि कौन हो सकता है, एम्पलायर का कौन हो सकता है, ट्रेड यूनियन का कौन हो सकता है और यह निर्णय १९४८ में भी किया गया था उसके अनुसार जो प्रतिनिधि आई० एल० ओ० के घन्दर गये हैं और जिन का चिक्र इस रिपोर्ट में है, वे कोई बाहर के घादमी नहीं गये हैं । मुझे बड़ी खुशी होती है इसी रिपोर्ट

को देखने से और इसको पढ़ने से कि मजदूरों के जो प्रतिनिधि भारत से गये हैं, और जिन्होंने आई० एल० ओ० में हिम्सा लिय है उन्होंने बहुत ही शानदार पार्ट भवा किया है और ऐसा नहीं कहा जा सकता है कि मजदूरों के संगठन से उनका सम्बन्ध नहीं था । बम्बई का जो प्रांतनिधि गया है, उसकी सारी फैमिली जहाजरानी में काम करती है, उसका पिता इसी काम में है और वह खुद एक मजदूर के तौर पर काम करता है । यह चीज इस रिपोर्ट को पढ़ने से अपने आप सिद्ध हो जाती है कि जो भारत का प्रतिनिधि बन कर वहाँ जा कर बैठा है उसने कितना भ्रष्टा और कितना शानदार काम किया है । भारतीयस ने श्रमिकों का बहुत भ्रष्टी तरह से प्रतिनिधित्व किया है ।

जिन लोगों को प्रतिनिधित्व नहीं मिलता है या जिनको मिलना नहीं चाहिये, ऐसा देखा गया है कि वे जनमत को बिगाड़ने की कोशिश करते हैं । यह परम्परा भी मैं समझता हूँ बहुत बुरी है और चूँकि मुझे इस तरह की बातों से दुख होता है, इसी वास्ते मैं बोलने के लिए खड़ा हुआ हूँ । हमेशा ही आई० एल० टी० यू० सी० का नाम लेना और उसकी आलोचना करना, मैं समझता हूँ ठीक नहीं है । यह तो नियम और परम्परा को तोड़ना हुआ । १९५८ में मई में नैनीताल में जो इंडियन लेबर कान्फ्रेंस हुई थी, उसके घन्दर कम्युनिस्टों के प्रतिनिधि गये थे, हम लोगों के भी गये थे, एम्पलायर्स के भी गये थे, उस वक्त यह उनमें तय हो गया था कि किस इंडस्ट्री में, तथा किस-किस अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय सम्मेलन में किस प्रकार प्रतिनिधित्व किया जायेगा । यह तय हो गया था कि जिस ट्रेड यूनियन की मम्बरशिप ज्यादा होगी वही आई० एल० ओ० के घन्दर मजदूरों का प्रतिनिधित्व करेगी, इंडस्ट्री में भी इसी आधार पर आज आई० एल० टी० यू० सी० की

adopted. I wish to make out one point which I hope, the hon. Minister will give some thought to, and that is that instead of allowing a private Member to force a discussion on this issue, it is better that they themselves come forward with a resolution for ratification by this House, whenever such conventions and resolutions have been subscribed to by Government in such important international conferences. Ordinarily, the reports of these committees and conferences are placed on the Table of the House; and we are receiving an innumerable number of such reports. We are not able to make out which is important and which is not. I therefore request that in such matters as the present one which are important, Government should of its own accord come forward and seek the ratification of Parliament rather than leaving it to the initiative of a private Member.

Shri Tangamani stated that proper training should be given to our seamen so that they may compare favourably with the seamen of other countries. He also stated that our labour is comparatively cheap, but I shall not go into that question.

There are three training schools now—at Bombay, Calcutta and Visakhapatnam, but I am told that the training given at these places is not uniform, that the training given at Calcutta is much superior to that given in Bombay and Visakhapatnam. The Bombay training school is purely intended for officers and for Dufferin-cadets between 15½ and 17½ years who are recruited. In this connection, I would suggest that this limit may be lowered to between 13 and 17 or between 13 and 15 years, and thereafter they can go in for further training.

While giving training we must see that our crew do not lag behind the crew of other countries in efficiency.

I find that people are mostly chosen not for particular jobs in a ship, but for doing jobs on the deck as also non-deck jobs. They can be called semi-skilled if not skilled, but our

crew are mostly recruited as unskilled. Hence, the training imparted to the sea-farers must be of the skilled type, so that if there is any trouble at the time of manning the ship, they may be able to deal with it. They should have astronomical, scientific and technological knowledge imparted through proper training. From this point of view the question of training becomes relevant.

The certificates issued should not necessarily be in relation to a certain type of work. The training must be multi-purpose and the certificate broad-based embracing different types of work. The training imparted has to be reoriented in this light so that our seamen may be much better than others.

The leader of our delegation I find has okayed many of the resolutions except one or two which were adopted after some modification. For example, as regards the engagement of sea-farers, I believe they have some identity cards of efficiency, but when they are recruited by ships registered in foreign countries, they must also carry with them our own local, personal and national laws and rules and regulations. If they barter away our national laws and rules and regulations, they must be brought to book. Therefore, we must see when we issue cards that certain regulations are prescribed in order not to impair our own laws. I would suggest that when we are issuing certificates, this aspect may be borne in mind.

As regards wages, hours of work on board a ship and manning, each has to be viewed with care and caution. Wages vary from place to place. Shri Tangamani said that about £16 per month is paid. It works out to a certain figure in terms of our currency at the rate of Rs. 13-8-0 to a £. It may even work out more. But when they serve in a place other than their country, always on the oceans and the seas where the vagaries of the weather are such that nobody can be sure of reaching shore, we have also to make

[Shri N. R. Munisamy]

out a case that the wage that is prescribed, £. 16 or even £. 20, has to be modified according to the exigencies or the risk that the crew take.

As regards hours of work on board, they vary from place to place and from ship to ship. As a matter of fact, if the crew serve in a particular ship, after reaching harbour, they take a larger number of days; also they do not discharge any service. Therefore the hours, 40 or 48 or even 28, as the case may be, must be changed according to the place where they have to work. The limit of 40 hours need not be rigid; it must be a flexible one.

With respect to manning, I have said already that we must give proper training. Then only our crew who are recruited at the lower rungs will be able to discharge the functions of others who are doing a better type of work.

Shri Raj Bahadur: Mr. Chairman, Sir, As observed by Shri Raghunath Singh, the discussion on this Report has come a little prematurely. It is obviously so because, as the House is aware, as soon as a Report is received, we send it to the various State Governments for their opinion. We have sent this Report to the various employing Ministries of the Government of India as also other organisations of employers and workmen. When we get their reactions and conclusions about the various recommendations and conventions, the Government of India in the Ministry of Labour, in consultation with the Ministry of Transport and Communications formulate their conclusions. According to the accepted conventions, as observed by Shri Raghunath Singh, we present in 18 months time our report or conclusions to the House. It would evidently be more appropriate for hon. Members to enlighten the Government with their opinions on the various topics and subjects which form the subject matter of this Report at that stage. Even so, it would not be inappropriate that discussions are held even at the present stage. This dis-

ussion would also be useful for us because it enables us to know the direction in which the mind of this House or of the Members who have participated in this discussion are working. To that extent, it will enable us to come to right conclusions about the various matters involved in the Report. So I at any rate would like to thank Shri Tangamani for the opportunity given to us to know how Members are thinking about it. I am also grateful to the Members who have participated in the debate because they seem to have studied the Report thoroughly. Here I would also like to join Shri Munisamy in paying my tribute or expressing my appreciation of the work that has been done by our delegation at this maritime session of the I.L.O.

We know very well that the maritime session of the I.L.O. is convened every ten years. The session was last convened at Seattle in U.S.A. in 1946. The session is always preceded by a Preparatory Commission. In this particular case, before the Geneva session, there was a Preparatory Commission which met in London. That was in 1956. Then the session was convened at Geneva in 1958.

To begin with, objection was raised by Shri Tangamani to the composition of the delegation to this last session. He referred to the very first paragraphs where some reference is made to the fact that the credentials of the workers' representatives had been challenged. I would only remind him that in such conferences whenever any challenge is thrown in regard to the representative character of a particular member or a particular delegation, normally a committee is constituted by the session itself, and it goes into the whole question. I have been informed that whenever in the past the representative character of the I.N.T.U.C. was challenged by certain organisations at such conferences, then the representatives of the challenging organisation or those who raised the objection were given a hearing; and it

was after full denunciation and full consideration of the matter that the I.L.O. also upheld that the I.N.T.U.C. is the most representative organisation of the workers of this country and the nominees of the I.N.T.U.C. on such delegations are entitled to represent the workers of this country.

When this question has been thrashed out over and over again in such sessions, it does not behove us to raise this question again. More particularly I will appeal to all the labour organisations—whatever their political persuasion—that so far as the disputes in regard to our representative character are concerned, let us settle them here. It does not look nice that at every session and at every conference of such international bodies we take up this dispute. Let us not extend these conflicts to such forums. We should better settle these disputes here and see that so far as these questions are concerned they are amicably settled.

17 hrs.

In regard to the representation in this particular delegation, my hon. friend, Shri Tangamani will not deny that the National Union of Seamen in Calcutta and Bombay do really have an overwhelming following of seamen. Even on numbers, I think, very few seamen could be found to be outside the pale of this organisation and owe allegiance to any other organisation.

It happens to be a matter of accident that the I.N.T.U.C. is of congress persuasion. But it will not look nice or it will not be advisable on our part as Government to encourage splinter groups or to try to create a division among the ranks of the workers. Our policy has been to encourage that union of workers which represents, by and large, the entire body of the workers. If we have got such a body is it for the Government to find some other association or organisation and nominate their representatives in such delegations? We can then rightly be accused of encouraging dissipated tendencies in the workers' organisa-

tions. So, I would submit in all humility that so far as the selection of workers' representatives is concerned, it was thoroughly just and fair and we cannot agree with Shri Tangamani in regard to the points he has just now urged.

I would now come to some of the observations he has made in regard to the various conventions and recommendations. He has largely dwelt upon the convention or recommendation pertaining to wages, hours of work and manning. He is very well aware that the House has already had the opportunity of discussing this question in connection with the debate on the Merchant Shipping Bill and we have already, thoroughly thrashed out that point. At that time, we came to the conclusion that so far as these three matters are concerned, in the conditions obtaining in our country, keeping in view the good and future prospects of our seamen, keeping in view also the need and the desirability of providing fullest possible employment opportunities to our seamen, we should leave these matters to the parties, namely, to the seamen's organisations on the one hand and the shipowners on the other.

Therefore, in the National Maritime Boards also we have only these two parties represented. They are bipartite boards and Government is not there. We leave all these matters to be mutually settled. Why? Because, as has been pointed out just now by facts and figures, as many as 34,000 jobs which are open to our seamen, out of a total of 38,000 jobs, are provided by foreign ships, that is, the ships of foreign nationality. Only 4,000 jobs are provided by our own national shipping. If we want to retain this great advantage, we should not do anything or take any steps which may jeopardise in any way the employment opportunities that are open today to our countrymen.

Then, with regard to wages, hours of work and manning, we shall also

[Shri Raj Bahadur]

have to take note of the fact that there are some very important maritime States which have not fallen in line with the recommendation or convention as they want to preserve some sort of independence in these matters. I think I could do no better than repeat or quote from the speech or observations made by the leader of the Indian Delegation, our Director-General of Shipping. On pages 9 and 10 of this report he says:

"As far as the Convention is concerned there is a difference of opinion, and although my Government takes a progressive attitude and I would, therefore, be entitled to vote for the Convention, I would like to have it recorded that the ratification would entirely depend upon there being an agreement between seafarers and ship-owners on all the issues that arise out of the Convention."

Now, this is an observation which is entirely in keeping or in tune with our own policy, and that policy, as I submitted just now, has been accepted by this House.

So far as the difference between the recommendation and the Convention is concerned, Members might have observed that in the Convention wages have been recommended at minimum of £ 16 or \$ 64, and 48 hours of work in the case of distant trade ships and 56 hours in the case of near trade ships has been recommended. In the recommendation wages have been recommended at a minimum of £ 25 or \$ 70 and 8 hours work per day has been recommended. I would submit that this by itself shows that there is not much of unanimity between the various opinions or an international level about these matters. Each country has got to keep in view its own conditions and the circumstances in which it has to function.

As regards manning the phraseology used in the Convention is: "sufficiently and efficiently". In the recom-

mendation they say that the manning should be sufficient. There are two limits of this sufficiency. Firstly, the manning of a ship should not be such that it leads to excessive over-time work by the workers. Secondly, it should not jeopardise in any manner the rules of safety at sea. These are the two points which have to be borne in mind. But even these two depend upon mutual agreement between shipowners and seamen's organisation. So I think at best we should leave it to them. I do not think I should expatiate more on this point. But let me state that by and large, the important objections which have been raised by *Sri Tunggaman*—I should take note of this fact—have been already very well met by the valid arguments of my hon. friend, Shri Raghunath Singh.

I would now come to a point, in this connection, which was made by Shri Raghunath Singh himself while dealing with this matter. It is a painful fact for all of us that so far as our output is concerned, the output of our seamen is concerned, the capacity to work is concerned, our seamen do not show that capacity of work which is shown by foreign seamen, or seamen belonging to other nationalities. He has pointed out that whereas for a ship of 7000 GRT we would require,—if it was to be manned by foreigners or seamen of other nationalities,—only 25 seamen, but if it were to be manned by Indians it would require as many as 44 seamen. He says that it is because a Pattan or a Kabli can carry a bigger load than our eastern U.P. man. He says it is because he is perhaps *kamjor* or weak. I do not think we should advance this argument. Basically I do not agree with this argument either. I find that Shri Raghunath Singh himself is as strong physically as anybody else from any other nationality. Why should we labour under such an inferiority complex?

Shri Bose (Dhanbad): It is not 'Indian'; it is 'Asians'.

Delegation to the 41st
(Maritime) Session of
International Labour
Conference

Shri Raj Beharar: Even if it is 'Asians', the question has got to be viewed against the background of certain solid facts. Firstly, our capacity and output of work depend upon the environment, the climate, our habits and our aptitudes. It does not, however, mean that man to man, physically or mentally, we are inferior to other people. Secondly, there is a psychological factor which has got to be taken note of, and that is, that our seamen would like that as many of them as possible may be employed. That is the main thing. Where it comes to the question of employment opportunities, where it comes to the question of bread, they would like to share it and I think that is the factor which accounts for this disparity much more than any other factor. I say so because through the ages, through the centuries, the Indian seaman has proved his mettle. He has been appreciated by all the foreign shipping companies, and that is why they run to Bombay or Calcutta to recruit him. They would not have accepted him if he were not—I would not say docile—disciplined, and if he were not sufficiently efficient, if he were not sufficiently persevering and painstaking by nature or in his habits or in the performance of his work. Had that been so, they would not have engaged one seaman. So, I would suggest that so far as this aspect is concerned, it is only symptomatic of the problem that faces our country, namely, unemployment. I would not like the slightest slur to be cast upon our seamen.

Then I would come to another point made by Shri Tangamani. He wanted me to tell him something about the various recommendations. He referred to recommendation 108 which refers to social conditions and safety of seafarers in relation to registration of ships. In regard to this particular recommendation, I would just point out what the state of affairs at present is. Let us turn to page (iv) of the appendix XVIII. Item (a) of 85 L.S.D.—8

Appendix XVIII is preceded by the following:

"The country of registration should accept the full obligations implied by registration and exercise effective jurisdiction and control for the purpose of the safety and welfare of seafarers in its seagoing merchant ships and in particular should—

here, item (a) says:

"make and adopt regulations designed to ensure that all ships on its register observe internationally accepted safety standards;"

In this respect, I would point out that our country has already ratified two conventions, firstly, the Load Line Convention of 1930 by which we have committed ourselves to observe the load line rules and secondly, the Safety of Life at Sea Convention of 1948. Both of them have been ratified and we are observing them. The Safety of Life at Sea Convention of course provides for the provision of life-belts, life-boats, etc. in a ship. Then, in item (b) it is said that proper ship-inspection should be done and some machinery should be kept for this. The whole of our Merchantile Marine Department and its surveyors are engaged on this work. Every ship that comes to our ports is inspected by the surveyors and therefore this particular condition is already being fulfilled.

Then it has been said that we should establish both in our territory and abroad the requisite Government controlled agencies to supervise the signing-on and signing-off of seafarers. This is already being done. Here, I can point out that a very efficient institution is being run under the Director-General of Shipping, namely, our seaman's Employment Offices at Bombay and Calcutta. We know how these offices are running. I can only say that they meet our requirements efficiently and thoroughly. I should like to pay a tribute to the organisation and efficiency with

[Shri Raj Bahadur]

which these institutions are being run.

The next point is about the "conditions under which seafarers are engaged, and whether they are in accordance with the standards generally accepted by the traditional maritime countries." This also, we are already doing. We have got a National Welfare Board, which appointed two sub-committees sometime back. We have also received the reports of these two sub-committees. Particularly, I would mention the report of the social security sub-committee. I can only inform the House that in the next week or so, we are going to consider this report and we shall come to some conclusions.

The next recommendation is, that freedom of association should be ensured for the seafarers serving on board ships. We recognise our unions and there is complete freedom of association, and it is also guaranteed by our constitution.

The next recommendation is, that proper arrangements for repatriation of the seafarers serving on board its ships are provided in accordance with the practice followed in traditional maritime countries. Section 181 of our Indian Merchant Shipping Act provides for this, and I can say that it is also being observed already.

Lastly, the recommendation is:

"ensure that proper and satisfactory arrangements are made for the examination of candidates for certificates of competency and for the issuing of such certificates."

This is also provided by our Indian Merchant Shipping Act. Thus in fact, all the various parts of this recommendation are already being followed and I can only say that when the proper time comes, there should be no difficulty in accepting it. I cannot, of course, anticipate the decision of the House or the Govern-

ment at this stage. It is for the House to take a final decision about it. Here I have stated the facts of the situation as they obtain at present.

Regarding recommendation No. 107, concerning the engagement of seafarers for service in vessels registered in a foreign country, as explained by Mr. Raghunath Singh, this is meant to ensure that we should not allow our seamen to be engaged on ships which carry or bear flags of convenience. It is in regard to certain countries—I need not name them—but we should ensure that our seamen should get at least a modicum of social conditions and service conditions and they should not be deprived of those conditions because they are employed in foreign ships which do not observe those conditions. I would only say, in principle, there is no difficulty in accepting it. But it is for the House at the proper stage to accept it.

About medicine chests on board ships, it is already being done. But in our rules, we exclude ships with tonnage less than 200 tons. I would only say that in case this is the opinion of the various State Governments or the bodies concerned, we may consider what to do about it further to extend its scope of application. I think the rule that is there is sufficient to meet our requirements and we need not make it more elaborate.

If I have been able to understand Mr. Raghunath Singh correctly, he is of the opinion that we may leave it as it is today. I am not quite sure about it. Reference was also made to medical advice by radio to ships at sea. This is also already there and we are observing this to the maximum extent possible for us.

So far as these recommendations are concerned and so far as Government is concerned, our mind is clear about it. Our spokesman, the leader of the delegation, has placed his viewpoint before the maritime session

13901 Motion re: VAISAKHA 8, 1951 (SAKA, Report of the Indian 13902
Delegation to the 41st
(Maritime) Section of
International Labour
Conference

very ably and cogently. All the speeches and observations which have been reproduced verbatim here will convince that the delegation has done its work very efficiently. I think I would be voicing the feelings of the House if we approve and commend the work that the delegation has done at the maritime session of the ILO.

I do not think I need say anything about identity cards, because on that there is complete agreement. We have discussed this and all these things have been noted.

Shri Tangamani: I am thankful to the hon. Minister for clarifying certain points. My purpose in raising this discussion was that the position of seamen may be made known to this House. As I said earlier, the seamen are not so well-organised as the workers in other sectors of industry. So, the question of organisation of the seamen is very important.

On the question of representation in the international bodies, my reference was only with a limited purpose. I know that in ILO the INTUC has been represented. Here it is a particular sectional conference dealing with seamen. So, if the seamen are to be represented, representatives of the two organisations, namely, the organisation under the INTUC and the organisation under the United Seamen's Federation.....

Shri Raj Bahadur: Where is the other organisation?

Shri Tangamani: ...should have been sent. That would have been better, because I know about the INTUC.....

Shri Raj Bahadur: Where is the other organisation?

Shri Tangamani: There is no question of sending INTUC or AITUC. Even this United Seamen's Federation is not affiliated to the AITUC. This is just to clarify this point. But if they were very serious to get pro-

per representation from the employees it would have been better if representatives of these two organisations were sent. That was my purpose.

On the question of wages and hours of work I am very sorry to say that the hon. Minister has left the thing as vague as it was in the beginning.

I will also join him in saying that this delegation was very ably led by Dr. Rajendra Singh, who is the DG Shipping.

Shri Raj Bahadur: Dr. Nagendra Singh.

Shri Tangamani: Dr. Nagendra Singh. His report for the first time probably in such international bodies gives to the other delegates the exact position. He has not either magnified or reduced the importance for which we are very grateful. But I would again.....

Shri D. C. Sharma (Gurdaspur): So, you would not attack Dr. Nagendra Singh.

Shri Tangamani: But I would again request the hon. Minister to take up this question of hours of work and wages seriously and take up this matter when the time comes.

Mr. Chairman: The question is:

"That this House takes note of the Report of the Indian Government Delegation to the 41st (Maritime) Session of the International Labour Conference held at Geneva in April-May, 1958, laid on the Table of the House on the 29th November, 1958."

The motion was adopted.

17-23 hrs.

The Lok Sabha then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock on Wednesday, April 29, 1959|Vaisakha 9, 1951 (Saka).