

4351 Committee on Private Members Bills & Resolutions 19 JULY 1957 **Resolution re: Appointment of 4352 Second Pay Commission**

Mr. Speaker: What is the other work?

Shri E. S. Murthy: The Party meeting is there

Mr. Speaker: The hon Members on this side of the House can go half an hour later. It does not matter. Will the hon Minister start at 6 o'clock?

The Minister of Finance (Shri T. T. Krishnamachari): I am completely in the hands of the Chair

Mr. Speaker: I would like to know how much time he would take

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: It all depends on the fire and limestones that come from the Opposition.

The Minister of Home Affairs (Pandit G. B. Pant): For the present, we may accept that arrangement

Mr. Speaker: The hon Minister will start at 6 o'clock. The discussion will go on till 6. He can take whatever time he likes. Therefore, the House will sit till 6-30. Let us see if we have to sit a few more minutes. Though a formal amendment has to be moved to the motion, I will waive that objection and put the motion with this amendment

'subject to the modification that the time allotted for the discussion of the resolution regarding appointment of a Second Pay Commission be increased by thirty minutes'

I will now put the motion as amended by this amendment

The question is

"That this House agrees with the First Report of the Committee on Private Members' Bills and Resolutions presented to the House on the 17th July, 1957, subject to the modification that the time allotted for the discussion of the resolution regarding appointment of a Second Pay Commission be increased by thirty minutes"

The motion as amended was adopted

Shri Bibhuti Mishra (Bhagaha): What about my time? (Interruptions)

Sardar Hakam Singh: The second resolution is his resolution. One minute has been taken on the earlier day for the first resolution. So, after spending this 2 hours and 15 minutes on the first resolution, fifteen minutes were left for the second resolution today. Now that it has been changed, he wants at least five minutes at the end

Mr. Speaker: Very well. He wants to have a chance to move his resolution?

Some Hon. Members: Yes

Mr. Speaker: Very well. Let us consider it then

RESOLUTION RE APPOINTMENT OF SECOND PAY COMMISSION—contd

Shri Warrior (Trichur): Mr Speaker, I had moved this Resolution in the first session of the Second Parliament. I did not have an opportunity to amplify all the salient points connected with this very important subject which had been hanging fire all the time since not only the first session of this Parliament but since a resolution moved by another hon Member 1955 in the First Parliament

15 40 hrs

[MR DEPUTY-SPEAKER in the Chair]

In the first instance, I would say that this ought not to have been so. If the Government had considered it as a matter of grace or at least as a matter of justice, this resolution for a Second Pay Commission would have been granted a long time back and this thing would not have happened. This Resolution would not have come here. There is so much discontent in the absence of such a graceful action on the part of the Government. Now things have come to such a pass that even those sections of the employees which had not been asking for a second Pay Commission are doing so. I know as a matter of fact that it is a very difficult situation for the Gov-

[Shri Warrior]

ernment as well as the organisations which are leading the employees of the State

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: This House expects its Members to rise to their full stature when they are speaking

Shri Warrior: I am only tall enough for this, I am not taller

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I am not complaining about his size or height

Shri Warrior: At any rate I am not lying down

I will now resume my thread from the Fifteenth session of the Indian Labour Conference which recently held its deliberations and adopted certain resolutions. At the Fifteenth Session of the Indian Labour Conference the fact that a fair wage and a living wage should be fixed was accepted by all concerned. Considering the situation prevailing in the country, the increase in prices, the difficulties experienced by all sections about the necessities of life, the Indian Labour Conference after much deliberation agreed to fix a fair wage and from a fair wage to a living wage. They knew pretty well from facts and figures available that the cost of living index number had risen abnormally.

Apart from that when the wages question was raised there was agreement from all sections that wage boards should be set up in all industries as far as possible. Now it has become the practice with the Government with the employers and with labour to institute wage boards in one industry after another, and although fair wages have not been fixed, it has been accepted that at least there should be a minimum wage throughout the land. It is an admitted fact that the Government are the biggest employers in the country, especially the Central Government which employs about eighteen to twenty lakhs of employees. But in spite of the fact that private employers have taken a lead to give fair wage for their own employees, with the concurrence of

the Central Government, the Central Government itself is not willing to accept that

What is the ground for demanding fixation of a fair wage? The reason is very simple and very justifiable and that is that the cost of living index has gone up above the normal figure. I cannot help saying that Government have lost a good opportunity in settling this important dispute with its employees, especially those who have already given notice of direct action, for instance, the P and T workers, the dock workers and the Civil Aviation employees.

Yesterday the Minister of Transport and Communications made a statement. We had been very anxiously awaiting a statement from Government and we had naturally and very justifiably expected that a very generous gesture would be forthcoming from that side. But I very humbly put it to you that it had been most disappointing. Government know pretty well that things will not be in their hands after a while. Things have gone to such a stage that Government itself and the spokesmen of Government have not got anything to say against such a justifiable demand. For instance in private and in certain of their party meetings, the hon. the Prime Minister himself was kind enough to refer to this matter and said that the only fear of Government in allowing the appointment of a Pay Commission is that the recommendations that would come from such a Commission is a foregone conclusion. There is no other argument to be put forward against the appointment of such a Commission. The Commission would go into the matter and after scrutinising all the facts and figures available, they would have no other go but to accept the fair and justifiable demands, the very natural demands of the workers and employees of the State. We are sorry that a golden opportunity of showing grace to their employees and taking the wind off the sails of the opposi-

tion was lost Perhaps they can mend it

Now, Sir, what is the objection to the appointment of a second Pay Commission The first Pay Commission was appointed not by this Government, not by the national government, not by an independent government—it must be remembered too well The First Pay Commission was appointed while the Britishers were here Luckily the report came after we had attained independence, after a national government had been instituted in place of an alien government I do not wish to go into the details of the report of the first Pay Commission, nor do I wish to refer to their recommendations But two basic facts, two basic considerations, were established by that Commission and they were accepted by Government What were they? The first is that the Pay Commission having gone into all relevant matters came to the conclusion that they were basing the salary of government employees on starvation level If the income goes below that in relation to the living cost index in relation to the rising prices, the employees are likely to go below starvation, that is utter starvation The second basic fact was that although the employees had a rightful claim for more emoluments more income, still national interests should be taken into consideration Industrial and other developments are there and they should not be jeopardised The development of the whole Social structure of the country is there and that should not be endangered So, naturally, in consultation with financiers, economists and all those who were in the know of things, giving full consideration to all those aspects, the Commission recommended that this starvation level is the only level which could be allowed at that time Why? Not because the employees had no claims for better wages and better conditions of service, but because the larger interests of the development of the nation were to be considered along with that, and only in relation to the interests of the nation as a whole the sectional demands of a section of the people should be met

Basing all their calculations on these two things they suggested that wages and dearness allowance should be there What was their finding? They found, and all people thought that was justifiable, that the living cost index will remain somewhere near 160 or 170, that everything will come to normalcy Every economist has been thinking like that There were economic prophets who had said that normalcy will come after the war and that in the post-war period the cost of living index will come down to somewhere near 160 or 170 Sorry, they all proved to be very false prophets and things got out of their hands, out of their calculations Not only it did not come down to 160 or 170 at present it has shot up to 420.

Shri Frank Anthony (Nominated-Anglo-Indians) 439

Shri Warrior. If it is 439 all the more better

Mr Deputy-Speaker Members should not get nervous if the hon Member chooses that figure

Shri Warrior It is the first time that I am speaking in this Parliament and I may be allowed, Sir to be a bit nervous

At that time, when the wage was fixed on the basis of a cost of living index of 160 or 170, the Commission thought and rightly so that over and above that 170 point whatever increase there is in the cost of living index must be met with dearness allowance I understand Sir, and I think I am right in that, many countries who had been actually physically involved in war who actually bore the brunt of the war who were actually affected directly by the war have all done away with the dearness allowance business Our country which was not directly affected in the sense that there was no bombing or war here after twelve years of the war is still retaining it Whereas many countries have healed the wounds of war, we are still retaining the dearness allowance business Let it not be so

[Shri Warrior]

Even there the Pay Commission thought that the employees should be paid at least four annas per point whenever there is a rise, and for every 20 points they must be given Rs 5. That was the conclusion arrived at by the Commission, so that the starvation level at least could be kept on and people would not go below that starvation level.

That was, if I remember correctly when the cost of living index was at 320. From there it has risen to 420 or 440, whatever it might be. I do not say that it is going to remain at 439 or 440, it may come down after the lean months. Even then, it is never going to be what the Commission had foretold, 160 or 170. It will not even come to 320, the figures at the time of the recommendations made by the Commission.

If it was only a question of certain trade union demands or economic demands to be granted to the employees to have a better living, we would not have come forward with this resolution, at least on my part. I would not have moved such a resolution. The other point also has to be accepted, and we accept it in full without any reservation whatever, that the larger interests of the nation should also be considered. That is, in fact, the main point. The workers and employees in the country had been tightening their belts all through these years. They were not meted out with any justice whatever on the point of emoluments or economic assistance. In the budget debate and other discussions in this House things have come to light that, where the profit has increased, production has increased, Ministers' salaries have increased, States' salaries have increased and everything else has increased, only the employees' salaries have decreased and their emoluments have not increased (*Interruptions*).

The employees are not asking for a betterment of their living conditions alone, they are asking for a better economic condition in this country in

the interests of the nation as a whole. If it is only a sectional demand we can easily negotiate with respect to that. The Government, even at the top, views the thing as though it is only a sectional demand of a few of its employees. It is not so. A wider interest is involved in it, because we know from the budget speeches made here not only from this side but also from the other side, that things are not going quite all right.

When profits have increased by 130 per cent, when production has increased by 40 per cent or more, when the national income has increased by 20 per cent or more, when even the industrial workers have got a share though not a due and justifiable share, how can the Government employees alone be left out without being meted out with justice? Why is it that they alone are not given an increase? If you want to extract the maximum work from your employees, if you want to get the maximum loyalty from your employees for the development of the country, it is necessary that a Second Pay Commission should be appointed to go into all these matters, and the recommendations of that Commission should be accepted by the Government, whatever be its implications financially.

Financially it is not a very difficult proposition, especially when we have a very brave Finance Minister. Some hon. Members from the other side suggested that crores and crores of rupees could be saved if the expenditure on some of our development projects are checked properly. It is a contractors' paradise in India. Wherever you go in the construction field, either steel factories or cement factories or hydro-electric projects, simply it is a paradise for contractors and the contractors alone—of course a share for other also, not for the employees. This has got to be checked effectively. Every employee knows where the money goes. Every employee knows where corruption is. Every employee knows where Gov-

ernment money is squandered like water. If we have respect for our employees, if we have confidence in the allegiance and loyalty of the employees, why not we depend upon them, make them satisfied and contented and take them into confidence. Every pie spent by the Central Government and the State Governments also will be saved for the development of the country, for the fulfilment of the Plan. There is so much of difficulty. The Plan is going out. It is said that the Plan must be extended, must be scrapped and what not. There is no necessity for anything like that. I submit that the Finance Minister will be on a better footing even in regard to his foreign exchange business if he had relied upon the contentment and satisfaction of his own employees, the Central Government employees.

16 hrs.

Only one more argument and I shall finish. If the Central Government gives so much of rise,—suppose it comes to a rise—it is all left to the Commission, the Commission has to decide it, we cannot come to any conclusion all of a sudden—suppose it comes to that, it is asked, what will be the state of the State employees. They also come to 20 lakhs. The State employees are in a very deplorable condition. As the biggest employer, the Central Government should be the model employer not only to the private employers, but also to the States. The States are in a very bad condition. Many of the States have produced rightly or wrongly deficit budgets. That is good in a way. Whether they have taxed to the fullest capacity or not, we do not know. We have not gone into that question. That is another subject. The Central Government is now meeting much of the deficit occurring in the States, in order to meet and satisfy certain of the demands of the employees of the States. That is a good thing. But, I submit that only when the Central Government gives a lead, the State Governments will also scrutinise their budgets and their

revenues, see where corruption is, where leakage occurs and block them so that the demands of their employees could also be met. Unless and until the Central Government give a lead and move in that direction, the State Governments are not going to be on their legs. Always, they will be depending upon the Central finances for their employees. So long as the Central Government do not want to meet the demands, real and justifiable claims of their employees, the State Governments are not going to move. Once the Central Government move in the right direction naturally and logically the State Governments have to move in that direction. Or else, the Central Government can pull them by their ears. I submit, in that respect also it is the duty of the Central Government. Especially the Finance Minister must be courageous here also if he wants to pull the whole people together and make our development schemes fulfilled in the target time. The Central Government must come forward graciously and meet the demands of their own employees. Their employees cannot be said to be disloyal especially when there is a loyalty test. They are all loyal. There are no subversives. The subversives are weeded out even before entering government service. So, I submit and appeal that the Central Government should come forward without making matters worse. It is going to be worse. Not that I am threatening. Some Ministers used to say that we are inciting. We are not inciters. But, we are incited. We are the victims of incitement from the workers. We are not inciting the workers. The injustice is patent. The figures are stubborn. They don't yield to whims and fancies. I appeal most humbly, that the demand of the employees should be conceded and implemented.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The resolution is before the House.

There are some amendments. Shri-mati Ila Palchoudhuri. Does the hon

[Mr. Deputy Speaker.]

Member intend to move the amendment?

Shrimati Ila Palchoudhuri (Nabawip): I am not moving the amendment. May I speak?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: That would be a different question. Shri Shree Narayan Das is not present.

Pandit D. N. Tiwary (Kesaria): I move:

That at the end of the Resolution, the following be added, namely:—

“with special instructions to find out the practicability of fixing the minimum pay scale at Rs. 100/- per month and the maximum at Rs. 2000/- per month only.”

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The amendment and the original motion are for discussion now.

Shri Hem Barua (Gauhati): I had an amendment, No. 13.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I have no other amendment here. Perhaps the hon. Member is referring to some cut motion.

Shri Hem Barua: I had given in the last session. I did not know that it had lapsed. I have learnt it just now. It may be because it was numbered 13.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I have got about a dozen names here of hon. Members who have sent in chits. I suppose there must be as many others who have not sent chits but who are anxious to speak.

Some Hon. Members: Many more.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: A time limit of 15 minutes is the maximum. I think the hon. Members will have to be content with less.

Shri Hem Barua: Those Members whose amendments have lapsed should also get a chance.

Shri Frank Anthony (Nominated—Anglo-Indians): Sir, I shall be very brief. I hope that the discussion on

this very important matter will be taken completely out of the vortex of party politics. I believe that this is a very crucial question which may radically affect the very basis of the Second Plan. I also believe that this near universal demand from the Central Government employees is the direct result of the inflationary pressures which have been released by the Second Plan. I am not suggesting that, because these inflationary pressures have been released, we should immediately go about seeking methods for scrapping or even for emasculating the Plan. I am one of those who believe that the country demands a Plan even if it means inflation. We must have a Plan and a Plan necessarily means a fair measure of inflation. But, I also believe that the Planning Commission did not include the probability of a Second Pay Commission in their thinking on the Plan. They will have probably to re-think seriously because the full financial commitments of the appointment of a Second Pay Commission may cause a readjustment or even serious alterations in the Plan.

In one way I am glad that this demand has been made because it comes as a salutary warning to the planners that they cannot plan in a vacuum. We cannot plan in a sort of anti-Procrustean fashion, plan in a vacuum, unrelated very largely to the financial and economic realities in the country and then put the country on a financial rack and try and make the country fit the Plan. I believe that this is a salutary warning of the need for flexibility in the Plan, for the Government retaining resilience in its thinking on it.

I feel that we have reached a position where the Government will not be able to resist completely this demand, and therefore, it is necessary for us not to make this demand in absolute terms, but to attempt to clarify our thinking on what the significance of a second pay commission would mean to the country and to the plan.

To begin with I feel that we cannot preach austerity to the country. To preach austerity to our people is, I submit with respect, meaningless political philosophy, because the overwhelming majority of our people today are not practising austerity, they are practically living at standards which are little above the starvation level.

Also I feel—my Communist friends do not agree with me perhaps—it is a way of life when you have community living, community eating, community feeding and other forms of activity done in a community fashion, but who is not living to austerity standards today? Is the average Government official, a man getting Rs. 700 to Rs. 800 wallowing in luxury? My Communist friends may think he is. I see them, they strain every anna. A man with three children has to deny education to one of his three children, and that is inevitable. Some friend has pointed out that this rise in the cost of living is a four-fold rise if we take 1939 as the base. It means that in terms of purchasing power the rupee is barely worth four annas of what it was worth in 1939.

If we come down to this position that some kind of reconstruction in the scales of pay is necessary, then what does the appointment of a second pay commission or something approximating to it mean? I feel that it is no good blustering in this House. It may probably mean different things to different persons of different political persuasions. But if the Government is forthright in this matter and even if they are prepared to concede something in the nature of a second pay commission, they are bound to admit from the very beginning that the very most that they can give is some kind of marginal relief. Government cannot pretend to neutralise the tremendous increase in the cost of living.

My friend who preceded me mentioned certain recommendations by the first pay commission. I was

a member of that pay commission and I am quite prepared to concede that many of our economic estimates and assessments were quite wrong. The Government today just would not be able to find the resources if it attempted to implement the recommendations with regard to dearness allowance which the members of the pay commission made.

What is the general cost index today? It is 439, almost 40 points above what I believe even the Planning Commission envisaged. I believe that the Planning Commission envisaged up to this point an increase which may come up to 400, but today it is 439. The Finance Minister may be able to tell us what even marginal relief will mean in terms of financial commitments to the country. My friend there talked of five rupees for every 20 points increase in the cost index. Even if in the lower wage brackets you give marginal relief and it amounts to Rs. 10 to Rs. 15 per employee in the lower wage brackets, it would mean Rs. 100 crores, Rs. 200 crores. Let us come down to realities.

Today some people feel that in our attempts to try and bridge this gap of a few hundred crores, the financial back of the country is breaking. Even if we give marginal financial relief, will the country be able to bear it? This is a question which we must ask ourselves.

I feel that same relief will have to be given. We have come to a point where we will have to give some kind of relief to our employees. If the Government accepts that position—and statements in the press seem to suggest that the Government is going to accept some kind of consideration of relief—I am pleading only or suggesting to the Government that the appointment of a pay commission and its operation in isolation will mean virtually nothing. It will have to be pegged to a policy of prices.

I say this with all respect that if Government had—it is easy to be wise after the event—a clearer policy with

[Shri Frank Anthony]

regard to food prices, we may not have been faced with this critical situation today

In making certain observations in my speech on the President's Address, I said this, that unless we peg the prices and food prices, we will be in danger of progressively increased inflation, if not runaway inflation. If a second pay commission is appointed and if prices are not pegged, by the time the pay commission makes its recommendations, its recommendations will have been outstripped by this tremendous increase in the cost of living. The recommendations will have no meaning.

Here I feel that even if the Government is prepared to consider some kind of pay commission, it will have to be related directly to a policy of pegging prices. The Government is in a position to peg foodgrain prices. To what extent it is in a position to peg consumer goods prices is a different matter, but in my speech on the food situation I had said that Government has, for one reason or another, not faced this question of pegging foodgrain prices.

I do not believe that the workers would have demanded a second pay commission if there had not been this 100 point increase in foodgrain index. In one year it has gone up by 100. Some of the workers may be misled, some of them are misled, but what they want is food and cloth and had these foodgrain prices been pegged, I do not believe we would have been faced with this demand. That is something which we cannot undo.

I had suggested that there is only one way of pegging foodgrain prices. I know there is a psychological resistance in government circles to this policy of importing and releasing foodgrains, but how else are we going to peg prices? It is for the Finance Minister to decide at what level we are going to peg 5 per cent, or 10 per cent below the present level, but how do we do it? I had suggested that we release into the market

immediately a certain amount of wheat. The position with regard to rice is somewhat more difficult unless we can induce our Burmese neighbours to repay in kind some of the loan we made to them. But with regard to wheat, if we release, let us say, Rs 150 crores worth of wheat into the market, we should be able to bring down the wheat prices. But how do we do it? We release that amount into the market for Rs 100 crores. You may say where do we find the difference? Fortunately, the Finance Minister has not to find the Rs 50 crores because we are getting extended credit, and that Rs 50 crores we may pay over a period of 30 years. But if that is released, you will peg the prices, and the crucial thing will be that if you have your second pay commission and you are able to peg your prices between now and the time they report, you will be able to minimise the financial commitments of the Government.

I also feel this that a full-fledged pay commission is not necessary. I go further and say it is not desirable. What will happen? Look at the terms of reference that have been suggested in the resolution. Any full-fledged pay commission working to those terms will take anything from two to four years to report. My friends on the right will seize on it as an excuse for belabouring the Government, and they will say you are stalling the time you are playing for time, you are not giving relief for a period of two years. I feel that perhaps it is necessary today—it is necessary—to give relief immediately. My respectful submission to the Government is this. I would prefer to see an *ad hoc* body appointed, first to deal with anomalies. I believe that most categories of workers, even those in the lower wage brackets would be satisfied if you adjusted the anomalies.

I know to what extent anomalies have supervened as a result of the attempt to implement the recommendations of the first Pay Commission. We still have them with us, and the workers are suffering hardships only

because of these anomalies. You do not need a second Pay Commission to readjust those anomalies. I can enumerate a large number of them. I shall give you one instance.

Take the station masters. What does a Pay Commission do? It does not give scales *ad hoc* in respect of each category or sub-category of workers. All that a Pay Commission does is to broadly lay down scales, gradation of scales for a particular category. For instance, in the station masters' category, we prescribed seven scales, and we left it to the Railway Administration, in the context of their work and their responsibility and so forth to fit the numerous gradations of station masters into the different pay scales. The Railway Administration chose, I do not know why, to fit 87 per cent of them into the lowest scale-slab, with the result that there has been tremendous unrest amongst those people. These are anomalies. People in the supervisory cadres have been given lower scales than people who work under them. These are all anomalies, and I feel—I am talking particularly about the railway people, that, by and large, if you adjusted those anomalies which had arisen as a result of the mal-implementation of the intention of the first Pay Commission, the people would be largely satisfied.

Then, there are marginal adjustments that are necessary, in the case of allowances and things like that. I feel that if this is done, and if an *ad hoc* body is appointed, it will bring immediate relief; it will give relief where it is needed and I would also make this request that I saw a suggestion in the newspaper today that Government are thinking in terms of a committee consisting of officials or Ministers, but I would suggest—they should associate non-officials also. Otherwise, if it consists entirely of officials, it is bound to be exposed to the charge that it is working under Government direction and that it is out of touch with the real needs of the workers.

Shri Tangamani (Madurai): I rise to support the resolution moved by my hon. friend and I shall be as brief as possible.

The first Pay Commission was appointed in 1946, and it dealt mainly with the Central Government employees. It will not be out of place if I read out the terms of reference, which were as follows.

"the pay-structure of the pay-scales, standard of remunerations etc, the extent to which the present leave terms should be altered the conditions of retirement, pensions, provident fund schemes etc, the machinery for negotiating and settling questions relating to the conditions of service etc."

That was the first time when a commission was set up which considered the question of all the Central Government employees. Before this commission was set up, there was widespread unrest throughout the country and there was the threat of a strike by nearly 800,000 employees and the commission more or less put an end to this threat of strike. An interim relief to the extent of nearly Rs 10 crores was given to the railway employees.

What I would like to point out is this. In 1946 it started with the Central Government employees. After the Pay Commission was set up, and after its report was published, many of the industrial workers raised similar disputes, and their wages and emoluments have increased since then. During these ten years, what we find is that the industrial workers have gone ahead. In the State from which I come, namely the Madras State, the textile workers have got their own wage awards, and their wages have increased by nearly 15 per cent. The same is the case in regard to the plantation workers. Almost all industrial workers are going ahead while those employees who gave a lead to the trade union movement in the country are lagging behind. That, in short, is the position.

So, it is but time that we have what might be called a Central Pay Com-

[Shri Tangamani]

mission, or a second Pay Commission, or a wage board, which will go into the question of revising the wage structure, and revising the working conditions.

I would also like to point out that when the Minimum Wages Act was passed, minimum wages were fixed for certain industries. In certain industries, the bargaining power of the workers is not very high, but even in those industries, there is a provision for revising the minimum wages. It may be argued that the minimum wages of 1950 would continue to be the same in 1955 also, but there is the stipulation that the minimum wages also will have to be revised within five years. So, all these industries get their minimum wages revised.

Way, I am told, that several countries, in the recent past, have revised the wages. The P & T and telephone employees got an *ad hoc* increment last year in U.S.A. In U.K. a special commission was set up. And I believe, in Ceylon, there has already been a revision of the wages. So, in all these countries, whenever it is found that the cost of living index is going up, there has been a revision of wages and pay scales. So, the case for revising the wages and scales is very much strong.

Further, even amongst the Central Government employees, who number nearly 2 million, certain changes have taken place. If we take, for example, the Civil Aviation Department, we shall find that the Civil Aviation Department of 1947 is not the Civil Aviation Department of today. In those days, the technical departments that were formed were few and far between. But now, there has been a tremendous expansion, and the cases of these people are going by default.

Another point which my hon. friend who preceded me has pointed out is the question of anomalies. There is a crying demand from the Central Government employees that at least the Central Pay Commission's award should be implemented in all its force, and the anomalies between the class

III and class IV employees should be rectified.

Now, take the case of the port and dock workers. They have adopted the Central Pay Commission's recommendations in 1953. But we find that the Chaudhuri Committee is still looking into them with a view to resolving those anomalies.

Similarly, anomalies are yet to be resolved in the case of the railway employees. Further, none of the Central Government employees is getting the dearness allowance which has been given by the Pay Commission. If these anomalies are now resolved, and an *ad hoc* increment is given, that will be good starting point for the second wage board or second pay commission.

Further—this is an issue which might come up later; however, I might mention it now—there are certain employees who come directly under the Central Government. Recently, there has been a wage revision in the case of the insurance employees. How do their pay scales compare with those of the other employees?

Surely, the employees under the Reserve Bank, I believe, are enjoying more or less the highest privilege—not that they are getting a living wage. There the minimum is Rs. 90 and the scale goes up to Rs. 300. Recently, when the Reserve Bank Employees' Union and the authorities negotiated, several concessions were given to them. For instance, advances for purchase of cycles, advances for construction of houses, subsidies, canteen facilities, medical facilities and so many other facilities are being extended to the Reserve Bank employees.

I know there is the stock argument that the State Government employees are being poorly paid. In the Madras State, the State Government employees get another concession; the children of those employees get free education up to the sixth form. But such facilities have not been extended to the Central Government employees.

The employees in the commercial firms are getting periodically bonus for 3 months to 6 months. A small Bank like the Indian Overseas Bank has granted them bonus for 3 months. The Central Government employees do not get any bonus. They do not get even the concessions which are extended to the State Government employees. It is always wrong to compare the wages of persons with those living under starvation level. This is like the Tamil proverb:

*"Thammim Meliyarayi nokki
thamathudamai amma perithendru
ahamagilka"*

The poor must look to the poor and be satisfied with their lot. If that is going to be the policy we are to adopt, then there is not going to be any advance.

I remember the hon. Prime Minister who was inspiring us during our younger days was always saying that the living standards must increase and that our people must come up to the level of the most advanced countries of the West. The Fifteenth Indian Labour Conference has given a quietus to this controversy. Minimum wage must be given to any man worth the name. If there is any small unit which is not able to give minimum wage, then, it has got to close down. We should not have industries paying starvation wages to their employees. If there is an industry which is not able to pay the minimum wage to its employees, then we have to close down that industry in the largest interest of the community. Now, from the minimum wages we go a step further and the concept of fair wages has to apply in regard to the employees with whom we are concerned now. This has been clearly defined in the Fair Wages Committee's report. If we are going to have the Fair wages Committee's report as the basis, then, the Central Government employees will certainly deserve better treatment.

The case for the Central Government employees is really a case for the people of this country. I know

the hon. Minister will agree with me that a start has got to be made in this direction. We make this question very simple. So far as dearness allowance is concerned, the slab of Rs. 5 for 20 points has been accepted in the first Pay Commission's report and still many of the employees are not getting this. Normally, a textile worker or a worker in the petroleum industry gets three and a half annas to a point above hundred in the cost of living index. If 440 is accepted as the cost of living index, he will be getting Rs. 75. Industrial concerns are paying Rs. 75. So, the question of fixation of fair wages and dearness allowance, or the merger of these two is an important matter on which we have to resolve now. In 1946, the revision of the pay structure started with the Central Government employees and the same will be done in 1957 also.

The Prime Minister and Minister for External Affairs (Shri Jawaharlal Nehru): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, my colleague, the Finance Minister will deal with this Resolution and this subject on behalf of Government presently more adequately. I am not dealing with this subject as a whole but I thought that perhaps it might be advantageous if I ventured to draw the attention of the House to certain aspects of this question.

The proposer of the Resolution referred to me as having said something to the effect that there should be no Pay Commission. I did say that, but there is something more that I said too; not that only. That was some months back. What I said then and would like to repeat now is that we cannot consider this question in some kind of a vacuum. All of us desire obviously, higher standards for our people, for Central Government employees as well as for others. There is no difference of opinion on that. In fact, the subject is such that, normally speaking, it should not be considered a party issue but an issue on which all sections should apply their wisdom to find out what we can do about it. Obviously, as the hon. Member Shri Frank Anthony said, there are limits beyond which one

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

cannot go, whatever our desires may be. It becomes either wishful thinking or a deliberate attempt to do something which might result in the breakdown of the economic structure. It is not a question of my arguing that it is bad and some one else arguing that it is good.

16.36 hrs.

[Mr Speaker in the Chair]

We all agree that this should be done to the greatest possible extent so that the standards of the people should rise. In fact, the whole object of the economic policy of the Government, the whole object of the Five-Year Plan etc is that. That is not confined to the Central Government employees but applies to the people as a whole.

I agree with the proposition that the Government as an employer should be a good employer—obviously. So, there is a large measure of agreement and yet there may be a great deal of lack of agreement in the approach to this question.

The honourable proposer said, I think, that this must be done, whatever may be the financial implications. This is a kind of statement which, if I may say so, not only any Member of the Government, but even any Member of the Opposition cannot lightly make or accept. We have to see in whatever we do as to what are the implications. We cannot just forget the consequences and say, 'Do it!' Therefore, one has to consider this whole question in the context of today. The context of 10 years or 11 years ago when the old Pay Commission was appointed was completely different. That Government had no wide social outlook, no desire to modernise the country or to make any big revolutionary or semi-revolutionary changes. They had to carry on, maybe doing good here and there. Now conditions are entirely different. Here is this country engaged on a vital and tremendous adventure. You may criticise that we go too far. That is a different matter. But it is a common ground that this Parliament and

our people are engaged in this great adventure of trying to lift our people from boot-straps and give them higher standards—to all of them and not for a section.

Indeed, if I may criticise this resolution, this resolution says that something should be done. It says that a Pay Commission should be appointed to bring the employees 'in conformity with the country's ideal of socialist pattern of society'. I wonder what the Hon Member has in mind about the socialist pattern, as if socialist patterns are coming about to India by raising the salaries of various sections. It has absolutely nothing to do with socialism or socialist pattern, may I remind him? Therefore, for that purpose, the resolution is completely wrong. It is just not understanding the issue. Presumably the hon Member wants a socialist pattern of society. But it cannot come about in this way. In fact, you put a bar to its coming by trying to proceed in this way. Let us, by all means, have proper salaries. Let us raise the standards of our employees in the Central Government and elsewhere. But above all, let us raise the capacity of the country to do this because otherwise you stop somewhere.

Therefore, we come back to the question of the capacity to do these things—production, productive efforts etc. Some hon members talked about salaries and wages going up in other countries. It is perfectly true. Recently I had been to a number of countries in Western Europe. There I noticed, with some surprise, how they had recovered from the effects of the war. Broken down places which had been bombed out of existence are huge flourishing towns and factories today. They are paying higher salaries and higher wages because they are producing much more than they ever did. Whether you go to Germany or even France—I do not wish to criticise it with certain curious state of its politics it is producing more.

Shrimati Renu Chakravarty (Bashirhat): We are also producing more

The Prime Minister and Minister of External Affairs (Shri Jawaharlal Nehru): Yes, certainly we are producing more and we hope to produce more. But the whole question, as has been often said and I may repeat it, is this that these countries, roughly speaking, of western Europe and the Soviet Union were industrialised, went through an economic revolution, that is to say, were industrialised largely before the political revolution came in a big way. Therefore, they were strong enough to meet the demands of the political revolution, the economic revolution having come earlier. In the Soviet Union, of course, conditions were different and they brought about the economic revolution in certain ways and suffered a great deal of hardship to achieve certain results. Now we had to face in this country a big political revolution coming preceding the economic revolution. Now we are trying to bring about the economic revolution. The whole process has been put in a different way here. Not only in India I mean but in all those countries, so called best developed countries, that is the difficulty. The political revolution produces political consciousness, demands, etc., legitimate demands, of course, without adequate means of supplying those demands, unless there is an economic revolution to do it. And, it does not matter whether it is a socialistic, capitalistic, communistic or any other way, you have to produce enough in order to satisfy the demands. If not, you cannot go head. In order to bring about that system of production, to produce much more, you have to go through the pains of labour, tremendous pains, austerity, and what not. It does not matter whether it is a communist way of approach or capitalist, one has to do that till you arrive at a stage when production rather automatically increases.

When we are going through these transition periods, we have to face

that difficulty. Always we have to pick and choose as to what we can give for increasing the standards in the immediate present. We want to give it, we must give it, I agree, but to what extent? Because, the moment you go a little further, every bit further that you go means less supply for future advancement, less supply for future investment and so and so forth. That is the difficult-choice that Governments in every country have to make. So, that is a basic question which has to be faced in the context of today and not in the context of the British Government in 1946 and what they said then, it is completely different.

Then again, if that is the basic question we have to consider it. Suppose we do consider it. There can be no objection from my part or the Government's part to any enquiry, but always provide an enquiry taking into consideration every aspect of the question. It will be a totally irrelevant and unrealistic enquiry if you ask some people, as you did in 1946, "Look at this limited subject here and give us your views". Anybody can give his views, they may be very good views for the limited subject, but totally unrealistic from the larger context of things. Therefore, whatever enquiry there is, we must keep in view this larger context. We are going through this tremendous adventure, call it Five Year Plan or whatever you like. There will be many Five Year Plans, I do not say that the Five Year Plan is sacrosanct that it cannot be changed, varied, amended or what not. That is a different matter, but today, whether it is this Plan or a varied Plan, we must go through it. Otherwise, we remain where we were. Hon. Members remind me that our production is going up. I am glad about it, but I want it to go up even faster and I want to supply the results of what you produce, maybe the surplus, for further investment. Whatever our difficulties are at the present moment, whether of internal finance or external finance, or the difficulties of a dynamic progressive economy, remem-

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

ber that these are difficulties for the country which is moving forward and not for countries of static economy. Therefore, although they are giving us headaches, in a sense they are good difficulties, difficulties of progress and not of stagnation and inaction. Also remember, we want internal finance, foreign exchange and all that; what for? Some people talk vaguely about our spending spree. What do we spend money on? On machinery, which is an investment. We have not spent it away, we have got something solid out of it. It is in this context that we have to consider this question. Otherwise, you only really get going in the sense of providing enough for an everrising standard of living for our employees and others.

Of course, other matters have been mentioned. We cannot now, as the Central Government might have done in the old days, ignore the considerable difference between Central employees and State employees, sometimes equally good. Sometimes two men work in the same place and do the same job and yet, as I think Mr. Anthony said or someone else, you cannot just lift all these people, because we have not got the strength to lift all of them. What are we to do? Then, leaving out the whole question of Central and State employees what about the hundreds of millions of others? Obviously we cannot lift all of them. The process of lifting them up is the whole process of our planning, development and everything. This process, whether it is industrialisation or community development schemes or whatever they are, is one big process. To do that, therefore, one has to see these things in a proper perspective. If you have an enquiry, it must be an enquiry keeping in view the economic condition of the country, the Five Year Plan and all that, because if that fails, then the whole structure fails and the very thing that we want to happen does not happen. That is why often when such a situation arises in a country, people have talked about what

they call wage freezes and profit freezes. I am not at the moment suggesting that, although eminent people have talked about it in India too. Broadly speaking, one has to realise that one cannot in such circumstances go on, much as one might want to go on, in this direction. One simply cannot, because apart from other things, higher wages in these circumstances may lead to more inflation and therefore, the capacity to produce more becomes less and less. In fact, you do not get the higher wages, only they remain where they were. Only the country suffers; all your planning suffers, maybe the value of your currency goes down and so on. So this complicated thing occurs. It is not a question of, let us say, a labour tribunal with a very eminent judge sitting and deciding whether this should be paid or that. The judge sees only certain things. He does not see, in that limited matter, the ultimate economic consequences which a country has to face, more especially when we are dealing with millions of people. Therefore, these are the important considerations that have to be borne in mind.

One thing, of course, I will say and there can be no doubt at all. I think Mr. Anthony said about anomalies. Obviously these have to be dealt with and should be dealt with. And, not only these. I felt personally, apart from this, the real advance should be made much more in the way of providing amenities. It is a better way, a more social way and the money that is spent upon it goes much further than otherwise. Amenities, better living conditions, better health, cheaper or free education—these are the things which immediately lessen the burden on an individual or a family and I think it is the duty of the State to provide them. It is only our incapacity at the present moment to do it that prevents us from doing it and ultimately all the kind of things that the State should do. They should be provided for from birth to

death. I am prepared to accept that maxim, but only I cannot give effect to it today.

So that it is in this context that I should like this question to be looked at. Further—I hope I am not unnecessarily censorious—I do get an impression sometimes that these demands etc. for higher wages, this, that and the other, justified as they may be from time to time, somehow, at the present moment, are more in the nature of a political approach than an economic approach to these problems. . . (Interruptions).

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: Do prices not go up? It is not political

Shri Sadhan Gupta (Calcutta—East): Even the INTUC sponsored it

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Nevertheless, why I say so is this I do not say that there is no economic reason for it I admit that I agree there are economic reasons for it, and let us consider what we can do about it. Nevertheless all this business of slowing down and constant threats and the language used is not economic language. It is a very different language. It is extraordinary.

Now, I must say that this mentality of slowing down that is taking place sometimes is a most dangerous mentality, dangerous for the country today. The one big thing that I find when I go, whether to Communist countries in Europe or Asia or to non-Communist countries, the one good thing that I find is hard work—everybody working hard. During the leisure hours, play hard, if you like. But during their working hours, they work hard.

You go to Germany. One is amazed at the work of the German. Or take the Dutchman or the man of any other country. But I am simply amazed at their recovery through sheer hard work. They went through this—having been a defeated nation; the Germans—and worked hard. It was something amazing. They do not mind 9 hours, 10 hours because they felt that they had to bring themselves up.

Shri Sadhan Gupta: The wages are also amazing there.

Shri Hem Barua: When the walls of the stomach are burning, it is cruel to ask them to work harder.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I have not quite heard that. However, it is immaterial.

But this business of slowing down is, apart from the essential harm it does, that is, less production, less of everything, psychologically and spiritually a fatal thing to do in this country, when we have to make people think—ourselves, yourselves, everybody—in terms of concentrated, co-operative hard work.

Therefore, I say it is spiritually something which eats into the vitals of our being, of our public life and community life.

Take another instance, a very positive instance. Today one of our big problems is the unloading of ships at Calcutta and Bombay harbours. Every day's delay in unloading them means demurrage. We are paying, I believe, Rs 1 lakh a day—may be more—just because we are not unloading ships in time, and Rs 1 lakh in foreign currency which we can ill afford. Why? Because there are delays. I am not blaming anybody in this matter, and I hope things will be better.

But here it is. Here is the slowing down business, deliberate slowing down, which creates tremendous difficulties for us. It weakens the country, it weakens our position to improve the lot of those very persons whose lot should be improved. I agree their lot should be improved, but we cannot improve it beyond our capacity to do so. It is obvious. Or we improve it at the cost of somebody else. At whose cost? Some of our friends may say 'Oh, stop the privy purses and the rest'. Well, I agree.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: Stop the profiteering of the stevedores and you will get a lot more for your plans.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Stop the profiteering. Certainly. I am sorry I do not know enough about them. But

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

I agree with the hon lady Member completely—stop the profiteering—Certainly stop profiteering—I repeat—but one must recognise that all this business of stopping profiteering, the privy purses etc which may be desirable in its due time, does not really affect the situation basically. It does not; it may make a slight difference, and it should be done (*Interruptions*)

Shri Hem Barua: What about the psychological effect?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru. I accept that—psychology is certainly there—but the realities are that only by hard work and production we could produce the necessary stuff for advance and for increasing standards of life. There is no other way, and every process, whether it is strike or go-slow movement or anything which stops production or delays or lessens production, is harmful to the interests of the country and to the interests of the very people who are doing it, unless they want to profit at the expense of some other section of the community.

So I do submit that this constant threat of strike and go-slow is a very unhealthy sign in India or anywhere, more especially here in India today. It is almost an attempt to hold up the community and to make the community do something which normally the community cannot afford to do or may not do or can only do at the expense of others.

That is not a right approach. It is a completely right approach for workers, employees etc to discuss in an organised way their demands and their anomalies. There is no doubt that many of them suffer and, surely, whatever our faults may be, nobody can say that we, the Government or any of us, do not want them to get rid of their anomalies or sufferings or that we do not want them to better their condition.

We do want to do as much as possible, but we must, I think, realise that the way to do it in present conditions is not by conflict—whether it is industrial conflict or whether it is

a conflict directly between government employees and the Government.

Now, hon Members have often suggested what is called nationalisation. I have no doubt that, as we have done already, important industries ought to be nationalised. We have made lists of what should be and what should not be.

But I should like this House to remember what nationalisation means today. I am not talking in terms of cost. The moment Government has to deal with an industry, politics intervene and they are incited and there are anti-government strikes.

Therefore, if a Government has always to face this kind of problem, it becomes a bar or something which comes in the way of nationalisation. If nationalisation means simply conflict, which otherwise would not occur then nationalisation loses much of its charm and benefit.

Shri Hem Barua: Is it because of anticipated strikes that Government does not proceed in that line with progressive measures?

Mr Speaker. Order, order. The hon Member should not interrupt like this.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru. I do not know what the hon Member says. But in future, Government will certainly not go in that way if strikes are going to occur. I can assure the hon Member that this will be an important consideration in future in this matter. Because our object, at present moment, is not some doctrinaire or theoretical object, it is to build up this country. There must be greater production and more equitable distribution. Greater production is the first absolute essential. We cannot move otherwise. There must be greater production for greater surplus for investment for greater progress, thereby lifting up standards all round. If that cannot be achieved one way, then some other way has to be sought.

Therefore, I submit that all these aspects should be kept in view by this House. Let us consider this matter not in any narrow party way, because large numbers of people are involved. We want to do them good. At the same time, no Government, obviously, can be held up in this way to stand up and deliver, nor can the community be held up to stand up and deliver or 'we shall strike'.

If in spite of all this, strikes occur, then any Government worth its name will face the strikes whatever happens. It is quite an impossible situation, with the kind of language that is used and the kind of threats that are issued all the time for the Government to submit to it.

But we have taken steps. In regard to the posts and telegraphs matter, my hon. colleague, the Minister of Transport and Communications, made a statement yesterday showing how far they had gone to meet the demand, showing that in other matters they are discussing. They want to go ahead.

These are complicated matters and we want to meet them, the postmen and the like are the most valuable members of the community. We want them to prosper. But they do not help in the solution of those problems by gestures of defiance all the time and words of defiance. That is not the way a community should function, more especially when we are engaged in this big adventure of building up India.

17 Mrs

Shri S. A. Dange (Bombay City—Central): Sir, the subject that is before us is quite serious, not because threats of strikes are held or counter-threats of suppressing them are given, because, threats on either side, either of carrying out strikes or suppressing strikes, do not lead us anywhere. After all, there are two parties to the whole question: one is the working class which makes the demand, and the other is the employing class—either the State or the private sector. (An Hon. Member: And a third.) They want a third party. I do not

know where the party is when these things come in. If they had been a little bit careful about defining socialism, they would have found that my statements are not incorrect. However, what is the position we are having?

It is already admitted that production is increasing, nobody denies it. It is admitted we are working hard; nobody denies that. The question is, where should the increased production go? It is admitted that part of it must go into greater investments. We do not deny that. But it is also admitted in the Plan that the disparities in income should be reduced as the Plan proceeds and production grows. This is exactly the demand for the Pay Commission. The disparities in income, even in the context of growing production, still remain. They should go.

Now, what is socialism if it is not raising real wages? I am not talking of money wages, nor would you permit me to go into discussions of how wages are reflected in prices. But let me submit that it is a wrong theory in economics to say that higher wages always lead to higher prices. This theory has been blown up even in capitalist economies, let alone socialist economies. Wages are the central point around which prices revolve. But prices are not in every sector made by wages. Otherwise you would not have such a category as is called monopoly wages. Monopoly wages run away from the wage structure and have nothing to do with wage structure. It is a well-known phenomenon in economics throughout the world that, for example, the prices of manufactured goods and prices of raw materials fluctuate differently and the prices of manufactured goods are controlled by manufacturers irrespective of the wage claims. This is already admitted. Therefore, I would not go into economic theory here, because it is a wrong theory to tell the working class or the community that price, at all times, in all its quantum, is always governed by the quantum of wages.

[Shri S. A. Dange]

The quantum of wages has nothing to do with the quantum of prices, because prices are a market phenomenon while wages are a production phenomenon. Therefore, I should not go into it, and our Prime Minister would not like to be bothered with the theory of it. But I certainly would like to contradict, if he permits, the statement that wages have nothing to do with the socialist pattern. What we are saying in the resolution is simply this that socialist pattern should not mean falling living standards at least. If you cannot satisfy the demands for some time and if you say 'Do not ask for a higher and rising standard until I complete a certain stage of production', that is a reasonable demand. I can understand it. But you should at least guarantee to me a standard which is not a falling standard of living.

But here what are we getting? Prices are rising up, while wages are pegged, salaries are pegged. Therefore, what is happening is that real wages are falling. Where annual bonus is obtainable in factories, there alone we are able to get a certain level of real wages in proportion to certain levels of productivity. But with regard to government servants there is no question of a link-up of prices and dearness allowance. Therefore, our submission is that even in a socialist pattern the question of wages is the most important, because in a socialist pattern wages is the form of income and is in fact the only income. I would therefore say that if you accept socialist pattern, please remember that falling standards at least have to be stopped.

If prices are pegged, I can understand. Stop prices from rising. But with every taxation measure, or even without taxation, prices are jumping up. What is the poor man to do? He is pegged up at Rs 30 plus dearness allowance with a rising scale up to Rs 35 after ten years. In this country let us do away with the medieval pay structure of thirty or sometimes even twenty-five rupees at the lowest rung and higher pay scales

of three, or five thousand rupees with allowances and so on and so forth. Should there not be a Pay Commission to judge not only the salaries of government servants but including the whole administrative structure, instead of simply having good words about voluntary cuts? Voluntary cuts have no meaning. If ten per cent is cut from two thousand rupees, it comes to Rs 200 no doubt. But ten per cent cut from thirty rupees would be a bad blow for the man who is getting a low wage. Therefore, voluntary cut is no good. If people were to propose a rationalisation of the whole cost structure including even the M.P.'s, then for persons getting above a thousand rupees there should be a cut of thirty or forty per cent, those getting between five hundred and thousand rupees should get something less, and those who are getting below five hundred should have no cut but they should get a rise. If such a system of arriving at wages is come to, then our Finance Minister will surely find that the saving is enough to meet at least a part of the rise that is claimed by the government servants in the lower categories.

Therefore the first point is, let us not discuss abstract economics. But abstract economics is affecting real life. There I deny the theory that wages in every place determine the quantum of prices and therefore a rise in wages will always lead to a rise in prices. Even in the history of countries with capitalist economies we have found that a very big rise in wages has led actually to a fall in prices many a time. This is recorded in economic literature, and our Finance Minister certainly knows about it. There is no such theory which is valid in capitalist economy, and certainly not in socialist economy.

With regard to the question of politics being involved in this, I can say on behalf of my party that we do not approach this question from the point of view of politics at all. Because our main question is, would

you hold the price line for us? if you give me thirty rupees and rice is selling at two rupees, please hold it at two rupees. But you cannot hold, you have admitted your inability to hold it. You cannot hold the profit line.

There was a progressive manufacturer who proposed in another conference that prices be frozen, wages be frozen and dividends be frozen. Only, after "dividends" he added the words "at current level". The banks are paying dividends at the rate of 30 per cent. Plantations are paying dividends at the rate of 40 per cent or 50 per cent. And he wants freezing of dividends at the current level, prices to be frozen at the current level and wages also to be frozen at the current level—very impartial community thinking! This is an impartial thinking which leads to an impartial starvation of the fixed-wage earner! Surely, this is not the way of thinking. I am not referring to any Minister having said that I am speaking about some manufacturer who made a plea like that.

Reference is made to the Indian Labour Conference. The Indian Labour Conference certainly had done some good thing. The first was in the speech of the Minister for Labour, that the philosophy of a wage freeze is being blown up. He said this is all wrong and "we do not understand for wage freeze"—though this was the philosophy underlying the First Five Year Plan. And of course the working class had to fight against it and secure certain higher wages, because prices were rising. And it is not for a general wage increase. They do not say, have a general wage increase irrespective of what they need of the industry and the worker is. But we say a climate of general wage increase exists, whether it is 25 or 10 or 40 should be judged in terms of the industry given. Therefore, the Labour Conference did take a certain progressive standpoint on this question and demanded fair wage, demanded a minimum wage in terms of reports which are already admitted and reports

which are not being translated into action.

I must congratulate the Labour Minister for having asked that the standards which were defined are given effect to by the various industries. But that Conference itself gave a lead in saying that a general freeze is out of date. A general wage increase may not be possible in the sense of, say, a flat 25 per cent or so. The Labour Minister himself presided over a meeting wherein the coal-miners were allowed 40 per cent wage increase. Even my organisation asked for 25 per cent increase. If the coal-miners deserved 40, I won't say, give 25. If some organisation can stand only 5 per cent I won't say, in any case, 25 per cent. I say, judge the condition of the worker in the given industry, given service, given employment, see what is the cost to him in the present structure of price and give the reasonable rise. My only submission is that a rise in wages is necessary all round in the economy, in view of the fact that production is rising continuously, in view of the fact that profits are rising continuously, in view of that that productivity per head is rising continuously, in view of the fact that prices are rising continuously. Therefore, the man must get a rise in wages. In view of all these conditions, we are making a case for increase in wages and not from motives of politics or anything.

I certainly stand for negotiation with the Minister of Communications or with the Minister of Finance or with the Prime Minister. I say, do not deny the position. We do not denounce collective bargaining. Our complaint is that collective bargaining is not done quickly. There is 'go slow' on the government side in collective bargaining. Therefore the reaction is go slow in production. For go slow in production brings down Government to reason. Therefore, there should be the abolition of 'go slow' on every side. It is not merely denouncing go slow, in everything, that will do. In transport, you can produce by law that the speed should be 20 miles. When you have a lesser number of buses, you ask the driver to increase

[Shri S. A. Dange]

the speed to 30 and even 40. He meets with an accident. He is suspended and punished. The law says 20 is the speed. Therefore, there is such a thing as legitimate 'go slow'. Within the frame work of law there is such a thing and a legitimate refusal to do overtime, is also within the framework of the law. For example, in spinning, if you suddenly raise the spindles to 8,000, 13,000 or 14,000 irrespective of the count that is on the spindle frame, in that case, I think I am entitled to go slow. I cannot stand all the strain. I therefore claim that I cannot do it. Therefore, let us now denounce go slow on the ground that it is go slow. Let us understand it as an industrial phenomenon, as a defensive mechanism of the worker when he cannot stand speed and conditions. I am not in favour of go slow just as tactics for sabotage of the Plan. We do not think of sabotaging the Plan even from inside the Congress Party, let alone our side. Even amongst them there are some people who say, why so many steel plants. We say: No, steel plants must be had. I am prepared to do whatever we can for setting up the steel plants wherever they are, not necessarily Bhilai or some other place, but everywhere, Rourkela, Durgapur or anywhere. The core of the Plan cannot be challenged. We are not the people who would produce some political excuse in order to hold up the work of production and stop the Plan from attaining its goal.

Our only request is, please look at the human side of the whole thing. You are thinking of building up a plant; production is going to be planned. I say there is the human side also along with that. There are engines of iron and steel you must have them, but there is also the human side in the scheme. That means he must get rice, house, clothing etc. You only want to determine the standards of coal for the engine. In that case, the engine may probably start running; it cannot run continuously if my human engine fails. I only request that human values be import-

ed into the whole consideration and politics be set aside. The human value should be translated very simply in terms of a Pay Commission. I do not think that everything should be admitted. But enquire with a pre-condition that the climate of higher production does require, the climate of higher prices does require higher wages. That should be the pre-condition of understanding of the work of the Commission.

The relief should not be merely in some small field, say education. But, supposing 10,000 employees have not got children to be educated, what is the use of that benefit? His rice will cost as much as before; in fact more. The educational concession is not going to give him any relief in the rice, wheat or house. Therefore, the proposal to give only small benefits is not correct. It may give you satisfaction that in any case we have carried our point and we have not given a Pay Commission. Call it a Pay Committee, call it an Ad Hoc Committee, call it a non-Ad Hoc Committee, call it an unorthodox Committee—I am not worried with the name provided it functions openly, enquires correctly and judges properly.

But I would say some interim cash relief would be necessary. Or give some rice, wheat cloth at exact prices which neutralise the rise in cost of living to a large extent. Do not give me money. I do not mind that. Of course, that would be reverting back to the medieval system of wages. But, if today under present conditions it is necessary, let us do it. In the war days when dearness allowance could not be given in money, it was given in terms of rice, wheat or cloth. Please give like that. But neutralise the rising cost of living and make them live a little better. At least stop the standard of living from falling. We are not even asking for any rise in standard of living immediately, at least stop the fall in standards. If that is not done, then what can I say. I am not here to give threats of anything of that sort. We have not got the

power to give threats because it is the trade unions that have to decide and certainly, the trade unions want to decide in way that compromise and settlement is arrived at. I can assure on behalf of our party that we want settlement, we want understanding, we want the Plan to go ahead but we won't do it on the basis of starving the government employees, whether high or low, whether drawing Rs. 1,000 or drawing Rs. 20.

When production is increasing it is my right that a part of it must come to me in the form of a higher wage, a higher real wage. Therefore, the demand for wages is not against the socialist pattern. It is not against the rising needs of productivity, it is not against the economy. Now, they are talking about inflation. We cannot go into the whole theory now. In fact, I should have proposed that some of the Ministers who are interested in it and the Opposition Members should once for all thrash it—this whole question as to what is inflation, what is wages, what determines prices etc. Let us sit down and arrive at a concrete understanding on this question

Then there is the habit of suggesting that higher wages will lead to higher prices and there will be inflation, and then again you will lose wages. Somebody says, No. Let us have some understanding, therefore, if possible by a joint discussion on this question also. I would suggest a committee to determine this question so far as this House is concerned to guide us properly on questions of economy. Because economy is not such a small thing like the days of old when you can take a packet of wheat to the neighbour chamar and buy a pair of shoes and walk away. It is not merely village economy. International standards and international prices and production and many other things now enter into the economy. Therefore, economy has become a complicated thing. Therefore, let us not be taken in by slogans. I am sure if the Finance Minister wants he can find the money without

inflation. The only trouble is whether he wants it or not. If he wants it he can find the money. He can, I am sure, find that without even having a threat of inflation. It is not that always inflation leads to higher prices. I think he knows it because if he can hold the price line whatever the amount of inflation, the prices will not rise and the cost of living will come down. Therefore, it is not an automatic relation that increase in money quantum necessarily leads to inflationary rise in prices. That he himself knows. Therefore, if on questions of economics, we are entitled to a Pay Commission and interim relief and higher wages; if it is on questions of production, we are entitled to it; if it is on questions of future Plan, even then we are entitled because the government servants, a machinery of 200 million people including the Ministers, whose wages should also be rationalised very soon and see whether they should find some savings of a quite large size—and not only Ministers, I am saying the High Court Judges and so on and so forth—do require some attention through this Pay Commission.

So, in terms of that and I would say lastly in terms of human needs of making the man work efficiently, to make him feel that whenever the prices jump up, he is looked after. Under all these terms, I would suggest and plead with the Finance Minister, 'Do accept the need for a Commission or a Committee and the need for giving interim relief. not only in terms of marriage presents or education grants or something like that but in terms of real wages'. Maybe, it may not be very high to begin with but it should be real wage. Then, I can promise that the working class in this country, whether in private factories or in Government employment, will create such efficiency rate that production will rise to still greater heights. If it is not done—I do not give threats—the working class will find itself incapable of fulfilling its task. Mere moral lecturing will not help them. Sympathy does not pro-

[Shri S. A. Dange]

duce bread. It is really hard money which is required to get bread. Therefore, I again plead for a sympathetic consideration of the problem and a sympathetic approach to the solution of the problem through collective bargaining and quick negotiation. Then only we shall be in a position to fulfil our Plan.

Shri Hem Barua: Sir, I find that everybody is agreed on the demand for a Second Pay Commission. It is not only that the Central Government employees demand it, others also demand it and we find that the climate today is somewhat intense with agitation. It is an agitation for a better standard of living, for higher wages. The recommendations of the First Pay Commission are not commensurate with the present context, they could not take the present prices into consideration. The prices are rising.

There is a demand, in these circumstances, for a Second Pay Commission to rationalise the pay structure in the country and it is more than cruel to say that this agitation is by some interested individuals or people. It is a demand of the entire working class of this country and they feel that their case is neglected. When we ask them to co-operate in the nation-building activities, it is good. No political party ever stands against it. In fact they also want such activities to progress. That is what Shri Dange said about the Second Plan. He has offered his co-operation.

When it is said that these people have political motives, I ask what political motives can we have? There is no political motive whatsoever. It is an economic problem and the political parties have tried to judge this problem from the economic point of view.

The Prime Minister spoke of his recent visit to communist and non-communist countries. He referred to the people there working hard and all that. But our people have an empty stomach. It is more than cruel to ask our people to work hard on an empty stomach and that is what we are doing

in our country. We are giving them extra burdens by taxation and at the same time we forget the conditions prevailing in the countries which the Prime Minister was privileged to visit. There, the workers get a lot of social benefits such as health insurance, family allowances and children's allowances and so on. Our people do not have these advantages but you want them to work hard because we have Plans.

I do not say that people should not work hard. But you say so without providing for amenities or looking after the living conditions. Then, it is revolting.

There is a fundamental principle in our Directive Principles enjoined in our Constitution: equal distribution of wealth. When it speaks of equal distribution of wealth, it means equal distribution of income also. What about our country? The First Pay Commission which made recommendations had fixed the maximum at Rs 2,000. What did our Government do? The highest paid civilian in our country is a man who draws Rs 4,500. At the same time, a peon in a particular State draws Rs 22-8-0, that is his princely salary. We want this gap, this Chinese Wall which the Government has erected between this maximum and minimum must be liquidated. The minimum must not be below Rs 100 a month and the maximum, not more than Rs 2,000 as recommended by that Commission. This is what we want.

Talking of socialist pattern of society and all that, these are very fair phrases to capture the imagination of the people. While talking about it, the Prime Minister said he was not concerned with the pay structure. I am sorry to hear that. I feel that equality of income or economic circumstances is one of the key stones of such a society. If we forget that, we are simply reducing this socialist pattern into a pattern only and nothing else. It becomes a slogan only and nothing else.

We have a private sector and we have a public sector. But, unless and

until the State becomes an ideal employer, the other people would not get any initiative. The State must become an ideal employer. The Pay Commission has said a very beautiful sentence about it. There are certain moral sanctions behind this demand for being an ideal employer. The Pay Commission refers to 'the application of some moral principle' from the Government which happens to be the employer. I am sorry to say that this moral principle is badly neglected.

The Hon. Mover of the Resolution said about the conditions when the First Pay Commission was constituted some ten years ago. The objective factors and conditions that were then have changed a lot. It has made the recommendations on the assumption that the prices may stabilise at a level which will be, giving the cost of living index, somewhat between 160—175, taking the pre-war index to be 100. But that is not the price index today as was stated. It is round about 439. If that is so, the basis of assumption was wrong.

Unless and until our pay structure is rationalised, and people are inspired to work hard, there could be no real hard work. In other countries also, people should be inspired to work hard. What are we seeing in this country after freedom. I would refer to social mobility. If we do not create a feeling of social mobility in the country things would not improve. The employees have been starving; they find that their children have no educational facilities; they find that they have no medical facilities and that they have to creep about in the dark. It is quite natural for human psychology to be lost in frustration. What is happening in our country today. I would say that the locusts of despair are destroying the harvest of freedom. It is the business of Government to pay attention to this aspect of the matter and from that point of view we should have a Second Pay Commission in order to revise the pay structure of the country and to rationalise it entirely.

The First Pay Commission itself

had foreseen this. That was why it had written a very significant sentence in its report. The First Pay Commission said:

"After all if time should show that the assumptions or expectations on which our recommendations are based have not been justified or realised, it would not be very difficult to arrange for a revision."

They themselves had foreseen this revision. While on the subject of the Second Pay Commission, I would make a humble suggestion. On the First Pay Commission there was the late Mr. N. M. Joshi who was the only representative of the working classes and it was Mr. Joshi who made some significant recommendations. But somehow or other those recommendations were thrown out, because they were in the interest of the employees. I would request Government to see that while constituting the Second Pay Commission they should see that there are true representatives of the working class population.

The country is surcharged like a battery. However much the Prime Minister might try to condemn strikes, it has to be remembered that strike is the last weapon in the armoury of the working classes. Unless and until they go on strike, or threaten to go on strike, the skeletons in the Government would not move. That is why I would like to emphasise that while condemning strikes and non-cooperation on the part of workers they should see the other side of the picture and should not put the blind eye on the telescope. The Prime Minister when he accused the political parties of fomenting strikes and talked of hard work did not understand the condition of the people and only put his blind eye on the telescope.

Shri Dasappa (Bangalore): Mr. Speaker, Sir, we have had a very interesting debate on this subject which vitally concerns not merely the employees of the Government, but the whole nation. Let me at once say that I do not want to question the good intentions underlying this resolution. I do not want to ascribe motives. I

[Shri Dasappa]

have. However to express my surprise that whenever the question of standard of living of the people of the country comes up for consideration, it is the factory labour and the government employees that get the utmost consideration at the hands of one of the parties in the country I do not understand why the same amount of interest is not evinced by them towards those who are worse off than these wage earners

Let me not be misunderstood for one moment As I said at the very beginning, I am all for the betterment of the standard of living of those who sweat and labour But if that principle is to be accepted it must apply to all those who are having a sub-normal standard of living whose marginal level is very poor and therefore I would like hon Members who are very critical of the actions of Government to remember this one thing and find a solution, not merely for a small section of the people of India, but for all the people in India who suffer from the same disability Then I would be able to appreciate their intentions better than I am able to do today

When Mr Dange and some other Members spoke I was hoping that they would answer certain of the points, very significant points to which the hon the Prime Minister referred For instance, he said we cannot act in a vacuum, we must be realistic When we think of effecting large scale changes in the pay structure we must have regard to our financial resources Now what is the answer of my hon friend Mr Dange "Oh, that is an easy matter, if the hon Finance Minister only makes up his mind he can do it How easily solved? Is that a very responsible statement to be made by a responsible leader of the Opposition?"

Secondly, Sir,—I am racing against time—is the question of slowing down on the part of employees in the various departments It may be Posts and Telegraphs, or dock labour What was the answer of my hon friend Mr Dange? He never denied

the fact that there was slowing down He found a justification for it by the plea that Government is slow Now, I ask, is that again a very responsible statement to make?

Then, Sir, the other important point that was made from the other side was that the appointment of the Pay Commission is linked up with the realisation of our objective of a socialist pattern of society If, for instance, as per the resolution government employees are given higher salaries, is it going to usher in the socialist pattern of society in the country? They never chose to answer this question of the Prime Minister So that the main arguments which were adduced by the hon the Prime Minister were quietly evaded and the whole discussion was centred round the question of wage structure and its relation to the prices That I think was a totally wrong approach to the whole problem

In fact, Sir, I feel that the whole case was given away by my hon friend Shri Tangamani who said that if an industrial concern could not pay fair wages to its labour, let it be closed down At the back of our friends is the idea that if Government cannot find fair wages for its employees, let the Government close down its shop (Interruptions)

I am not referring to the hon Members who interrupted I said that Shri Tangamani said that

Shri Punnoose (Ambalapuzha): Government is not an industrial concern

Shri Dasappa I am not yielding

Mr Speaker Shri Tangamani is there in flesh and blood, he will answer

Some Hon Members He is not here

Mr Speaker If he is not there, let him not answer Any hon Member who speaks ought to be here to clear up any misunderstanding, others need not take up the vakalath for him Why should he not be present here

Shri Dasappa: I have noted down here in black and white what he said: "An industry which cannot pay fair wages to its labour does not deserve to exist and it may close down, there is no harm." On an analogical reasoning we have to apply that beautiful theory to the Government Departments and it means that if the Government does not give fair wages—I am not against the idea of giving fair wages, let me not be misunderstood—to its employees let it close down, there is no harm. I think that again is not a responsible approach to a very serious question like this, which is agitating, not necessarily, the Members opposite only but the whole nation, particularly the Government which is wedded to the socialistic objective.

The Government is striving hard to realise it. The hon. Members opposite themselves profusely thanked the Finance Minister for bringing in the wealth tax and expenditure tax bills, which aim at ushering in the socialistic pattern of society. Is that not an indication of the fact that very solid and substantial efforts are being made in that direction?

I can understand the arguments of my friend Shri Frank Anthony. He made a very responsible statement. Let us also realise that Shri Frank Anthony was a member of the first Pay Commission and, therefore, he can speak with full authority. What did he say? He did not say that there must be what is known as an unrestricted universal attempt made to find fair wages to all the employees.

I do not think it is necessary for me to answer the points raised by my friends opposite. I have got my own difficulties and I would be very grateful to the hon. Finance Minister if he can answer me or help me to understand the particular problem as it appears before us.

The resolution deals only with Union Government employees; it does not deal with the State Government employees. I would like to know what the hon. friends who have

brought this motion want to do with the State Government employees. There is the Kerala Government, there is the Mysore Government and so on. I have got more intimate knowledge of the Mysore Government, and if there is time I will refer to it. What prevents the local Government from creating a fair wage structure in Kerala for the benefit of its employees? Have they done anything?

Shri Punnoose: We have made beginning.

Shri Dasappa: I am glad that my friend only said: "We have made a beginning". Not only one beginning but so many beginnings have been made here. They themselves admit it. It has been done with regard to the Reserve Bank, with regard to the Life Insurance Corporation and so on. Where they had a blank slate to write upon they have been able to do it. Once they touch this question it means a reopening of the whole structure, and a certain amount of time is required for consideration.

What I am driving at is this. If my hon. friends who have made such a big grievance of these low-paid employees really mean what they say, why is it that their Government in Kerala has not done it already? Have they at least constituted, if nothing else, a Pay Commission for the Kerala State?

Shri Narayanankutty Menon (Mukandapuram): Your party men are picketing the secretariat gates.

Shri Dasappa: I may tell my hon. friends that Mysore Government even during these difficult times has been able to upgrade so many of the posts where they deserved a certain amount of consideration.

Some Hon. Members rose—

Shri Dasappa: Why is it that my hon. friends do not have the patience to listen to me. Evidently the bubble is getting pricked.

They accuse the Union Government of not being sympathetic to these em-

[Shri Dasappa]

ployees. I ask, is there any truth in this statement? What has the Finance Minister done when there was integration of States, when there were different scales of pay of the different parts to be integrated: lower scales and higher scales. It is never possible to downgrade those who are getting higher scales. It was only possible to upgrade the lower scales. What did he do immediately? Did he consult anybody? Without consulting anybody, did he not go to the rescue of the State Governments including the Kerala Government? I ask my friends, why don't you admit it?

Shri Nagi Reddy (Anantapur) He has not come to the rescue of the Andhra Government I know that.

Shri Dasappa: I have no objection to their criticisms. After all, their job is to criticise, right or wrong. But, let them realise that the Central Government is seriously attempting to do something to solve this problem.

Some Hon. Members: What is that?

Shri Dasappa: In so far as it lay in their power, they are doing it. The scales of salaries of the State employees are admittedly low. They dare not deny it. They are lower than the scales of the Union Government employees. I ask this: If there are two people, one having one loaf of bread and the other not even having half a loaf, what is the proper thing to do? At least give this man who has not even half a loaf something. I am only comparing. As I said, please don't mistake me. I am rather afraid when my hon friends get up. My point is, by all means give any scale. I have no objection. I would welcome the Finance Minister straightaway giving whatever the employees ask. Nobody would be happier than myself. I ask, is it not correct that he has first gone to the rescue of those who are infinitely lower down in the margin of living than others? What I say is, he has been proceeding in the correct way.

With regard to the present question, as the Resolution is worded, can anybody accept it?

Some Hon. Members: Why not?

Shri Dasappa: Because, they have themselves put forward all the objections which I wanted to put forward. What is it that they have said? You appoint a Pay Commission; but, at the same time, give interim relief. Is that contained in the Resolution? I venture to submit that if ever this Resolution is accepted, all chances of getting interim relief will be neutralised.

Some Hon. Members: Why?

Shri Warrior: I am prepared to accept an amendment regarding interim award.

Shri Dasappa: Why don't you wait? The trouble is this, they want a Pay Commission to go into the pay structure of the employees. Is it right on the part of the hon Minister to anticipate their decision and interfere when they are examining the whole question and coming to a decision? There would be an element of impropriety in his anticipating the decisions of the Pay Commission. I can very well understand if the Resolution was worded in this manner, appoint a pay commission and in the interim period, pending their submission of report, give such and such relief. If the Resolution had been worded like that, certainly, that would be better.

Some Hon. Members: We are prepared to accept the amendment.

Shri Dasappa: They do not bring a Resolution in the proper manner, but they want everybody to vote for the Resolution.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: You put in an amendment; we will accept.

Shri Dasappa: I think that the Government is absolutely sympathetic so far as the objective is concerned, and would like to do their very best. I was also a Finance Minister in a State.

Mr. Speaker: The hon Member is speaking with experience.

Some Hon. Members: Now the cat is out of the bag.

Mr. Speaker: There is no cat, there is no bag. The hon Member need not put a question to them. He may merely say this is so.

Shri Dasappa: They can never furnish answers to my questions.

I wanted to give some relief to those people who were drawing less than Rs 50, a paltry increase of Rs 5, and it did tax the treasury a lot. I was at my wits' ends to find the resources for it. Because there is a sense of responsibility on this side, I am able to realise that responsibility, but since there is no responsibility on the other side, it does not matter what they say.

Shri Nagi Reddy: Responsibility for bunding a white elephant in Bangalore?

Mr. Speaker: I am afraid some hon Members are irrepresible, I allowed three hon Members from the Communist group to speak one after the other. There was absolute silence, no interruption. Now, hon Members want to deliver speeches by interruptions, is it?

Shri Nagi Reddy: As he spoke of responsibility, we had to remind him of the past.

Mr. Speaker: Let him go on.

Shri Dasappa: You have been pleased to give me a caution. I shall not put a question to them but I will put a question to the House. Take the instance of Russia. What are the scales of salaries there? How much do the highest paid get? How much do the lowest paid get? I agree with my friends that there must be some ratio between the lowest paid and the highest. I am in entire agreement with them on it, in fact, that is my case more than their case. In Russia you do not find that particular ratio maintained very religiously. It is necessary that between the lowest

and the highest there must be a ratio, and I would beg of the hon Finance Minister to think on those lines.

Then I would ask the hon Finance Minister to kindly bear in mind the scales of salaries in the States and when formulating the pay structure of the Union employees do something to see that they correspond, that there is some parity, though not exact parity between the pay structure of the poor employees in the States and that of the Union employees. Is that not a legitimate claim on my part?

As regards the resources at his command to meet this demand, he is the best judge. All I can say is so far as the objective is concerned, viz, that we must keep every person satisfied and contented to the utmost possible extent, we are all agreed. Let me hope that when similar motions come in the future, we not only think of small sections of people like one million or five millions, but of the 37 crores of people who are in such distressing conditions today. Let all of us and the Government bend our energies to introduce a ray of hope into those hovels where there is no light and only darkness. That I think is the proper goal for all of us.

I plead on behalf of the employees of the Union Government that the Finance Minister may do his best to show the utmost sympathy possible for them and do his best for them.

Mr. Speaker: Still, there are five minutes more to call the Minister. If Shri S M Banerjee will finish in five minutes, I shall call him. But does he belong to the Communist Party?

Shri S. M. Banerjee (Kanpur): I am not from the Communist Party. I am supported by the Communist Party.

Shri Nagi Reddy: He is sitting here only temporarily.

Mr. Speaker: Then, I shall call Shri Khadilkar.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: I do not belong to the Communist Party.

Mr. Speaker: To which party does he belong?

Shri S. M. Banerjee: I am an Independent.

Shri Khadilkar (Ahmednagar): I would like to say a word here, because on this important issue only one section of opinion is allowed to have its say. Do you want to exclude me so as to create the impression that a party holding a particular view on this issue should alone be allowed to have its say, and that no other section of opinion should be allowed to have its expression of opinion?

Mr. Speaker: I agree by all means I have noted down the hon Member's name.

That was why I enquired from Shri S. M. Banerjee whether he belonged to the Communist Party, in which since I had already allowed three Communist Members to speak, I might not call him.

Shrimati Tarkeshwari Sinha (Bash): But he is supported by the Communist Party.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: When we are discussing the question of the appointment of a pay commission, I would like to say that I know the anomalies in the various grades of the Government employees, because I was a Government employee myself and a permanent Government employee till 1956.

In 1945 or 1946 when the Central Pay Commission was appointed, the trade unions in the various Central Government undertakings were not organised. I think most of the unions could not represent their point well.

Even today, if we really consider the wage structure in the various industries and the Central Government undertakings, we shall find that there is a huge difference in wages. A man starts at Rs. 30, and gets an increment of As. 8 annually, and he reaches up to Rs. 35. There is only an increment of As. 8 annually in this

modern age when we say that our Government are heading towards socialism. Previously, before the implementation of the Central Pay Commission's recommendations, the annual increment was just one anna, which came to a total of Rs 1-10-0 in the end. But now it is As. 8.

I have been watching with keen interest how these orderlies who are here and how the clerks who are working in this Parliament are eager to know the reaction of the Prime Minister and the Finance Minister. They are asking us constantly, as to what will happen today, today, not only these men, but nearly 28 lakhs of people, of the Central Government employees, are eagerly watching the reaction of this House and how this resolution regarding the appointment of a second pay commission will be received by the Prime Minister and the Finance Minister.

The wage differential between unskilled, semi-skilled and skilled workers is also very low. An unskilled worker gets a start of Rs 30, and with an annual increment of As. 8 he goes up to Rs 35, a semi-skilled worker gets a scale of Rs 35-50 while a skilled worker gets a scale varying from Rs 40 to Rs 60—there are various scales—and he finishes with Rs. 130. That is the condition that is there at present.

My hon friend Shri Warrior has already pointed out that the Central Pay Commission thought that prices would stabilise at 160. But even after that, the prices did not stabilise. Then, there was the Gadgil committee presided over by Shri Gadgil, on which our former Minister of Labour, Shri Khandubhai Desai was also a member. That committee also said that the prices would not stabilise at 320. That was the case.

I do not know how the Minister will react to this resolution. Sir, there is no politics in this. It is a pure and simple demand on the part of the Central Government employees on

whose shoulders depend the dignity of this country, the efficiency of working and everything else. The Central Government employees today deserve wage increase in the larger interests of the country.

18 hrs

Then, Sir, there is another point I represent the Defence employees. I represent the Posts and Telegraphs employees. I am quite willing to hear you but we should be genuine about what we mean about the strike. Why is there this threat to strike? Our Prime Minister said 'We accept the challenge'. How you accept the challenge has got to be judged. With tear gas and lathi charge you can suppress the workers. About 6,000 men were retrenched in September, 1956. In Muradnagar there was a lathi charge. You know how things can be suppressed. But may I tell you, this is not the way of doing things when we are heading towards socialism and when we beat our own trumpets so loudly about socialism. This is not the way in which our Prime Minister should react to our demand. This is my own feeling.

Sir, our wage structure has no relation with the rising cost of living today and I feel that this demand for having a Second Pay Commission should be accepted. (*Interruptions*) I will answer all your points outside when you come to the lobby. I am watching you with keen interest. I know how to answer questions because I have been answering many people. But I say that you have no courage. You can criticise here and try to interrupt the Opposition Members but have you got the courage to go to the Postal employees and face their reaction? I know you have not the courage. You can issue a press statement and take shelter under the Prime Minister. But I can tell you that when the Central Government employees—not only the 3 lakhs of Posts and Telegraphs employees, but 2½ lakhs of Defence employees and 8 lakhs of

Railway employees—have demanded this Pay Commission, they will have this Pay Commission. I can tell you honestly, you will have to do something.

The hon. Finance Minister talks of resources. Where are the resources? When we say 'stop this privy purses' and profit by foreign monopolists he says 'No, No. We are wedded to *panchsheel*; we are wedded to non-violence. How can we possibly stop the privy purses and profits? They are also nationalists. How can we possibly do it?' You cannot stop the privy purse. You can construct big hotels like the Asoka Hotel. You are going to construct new buildings at a cost of Rs 5½ crores. There is the Income-tax evasion to the tune of Rs 150 to 200 crores. Yet, you have no resources; this is a wonderful idea. I can tell you, the resources are already there. You have only to tap the resources. You have got to tell those people just as you tell the workers boldly and frankly that you will not allow this income-tax evasion. Income-tax evasion must come to an end. I can tell you that it will not satisfy the workers if you say 'Look here; the Ministers have accepted the 10 per cent'. What does it matter?

I can tell you that the demand for the appointment of a Central Pay Commission must be accepted. Then, the wage differential question should be settled. There should be job analysis and job evaluation. There is no difference between the salary of either a skilled or an unskilled or semi-skilled worker. There should be proper job evaluation because this was not done previously. If you want to pay rates for the job, there should be proper job evaluation.

Then, I would like to refer to another point. Discrimination must come to an end. For instance, I can tell you that in the Defence establishment there are two categories of employees,

[Shri S M Banerjee]

non-industrial and industrial. In the matter of leave and holidays, the non-industrial people get 21 holidays. They can enjoy 21 days, but the industrial people who are the very backbone of this Defence industry get only 14 days.

We have been told by the Defence Minister that there is a committee appointed and this discrimination must come to an end.

I do not want to tax the House further, but I can tell you that there is necessity for a second pay commission and it should be appointed. I do not say there will be no strike threat. After all, they have suffered for two years, negotiations after negotiations were held and representations after representations were made by the various federations that this demand must be met. I must submit in all humility that the Finance Minister should not take the attitude that because they are going on strike, because they are threatening to strike, this demand should not be met. I submit that I am also a responsible office-bearer of this federation and I can assure him that there will be 100 per cent co-operation to meet this demand. If you give this, we will come to you and embrace you.

The Minister of Finance (Shri T T Krishnamachari): Mr Speaker, I felt that after the intervention by the Prime Minister, I would not have much to say. I am very grateful to my hon friend, Shri Dange, for having provided some material for me to speak on. He dealt with the economic phenomena, that is a word which he seems to be particularly partial to. I would like to say, with the background for the consideration of this resolution and all that it leads to, the House had better understand what the present economic situation is. The mover of the resolution and all those who spoke in support of it very conveniently forgot the fact, which was brought to light by my hon friend, Shri Dasappa, that Government em-

ployees in this country do not necessarily mean Central Government employees. There are also the State Government employees. If the Central Government employ somewhere about 17 million people in ordinary establishments other than those which are primarily industrial, the State Governments including local bodies and teachers employ about 35 million people. As the Prime Minister mentioned very rightly, they are all of the same class. They are educated more or less in the same way, but their emoluments are totally different. The reason for this is probably due to the fact that the Central Pay commission which was appointed by the British Government did not include within its terms of reference the survey of the scales of pay and service conditions of the State Government employees (either deliberately or felt that the Central Government was something absolutely different and the State Government employees did not come into the picture). Today the position is different.

My colleagues in the Cabinet have during the last one year applied their minds almost intensively to this problem of uplift of the position of the State Government employees. I do not think any Central Minister can go out to a State without the non-gazetted officers attempting to see him, on no occasion has the Prime Minister been left out. I do not blame them. We know their conditions. You can, if necessary, go into the question of relative salaries of the State Government and Central Government employees, even after certain variations have been made. In Hyderabad a clerk in the State Government gets Rs 79, but a clerk in Hyderabad belonging to the Central Government gets Rs 125.

In Orissa, it will be Rs 69 as against Rs 125. The salaries are more or less of that category.

Hon Members know that the Central Government had, not withstanding the fact that it is not a res-

ponsibility of the Central Government, made certain offers to States in order to help the State Government employees. We have offered to shoulder two-thirds of the burden in regard to the payment of additional dearness allowance or increase in salaries to people getting Ra. 60 for the first Rs. 6 and one-third for the next Rs. 6, knowing full well that that was not in any sense adequate. But if all State Governments had taken advantage of our offer—and this offer included teachers—the Central Government would have to find about Rs. 15 crores. Many State Governments have not yet taken advantage of that offer because they cannot find the matching grant.

An hon. Member mentioned about Hyderabad. Hyderabad took advantage of this offer only to the extent that the Central Government can give two-thirds and they can give one-third. That is a circumstance that we cannot altogether forget in any context of either appointing a Commission or instituting any kind of inquiry in regard to the Central Government servants' wages.

There are other factors—of the cost of living. Undoubtedly, the cost of living has risen. Nobody denies it. But then under the new index figures that we have, the cost of living index for April is 107 as compared to 105 in 1951, 103 in 1952, 106 in 1953, 101 in 1954 and 96 in 1955.

I am not for a moment saying that merely because the increase has only been 2 points as against 1951, there is no case for consideration. In fact, the lowest that is touched is a welcome sign and we should undoubtedly try to keep the figure at that level. I appreciate that there has been an increase.

Of course, the level of wholesale prices has been going up. It has gone up by about 10 per cent. It may come down a bit, as one hon. Member said. But that itself is not a comforting factor.

I would like to mention very briefly to the House in regard to the present situation, how inflationary it is,

before I deal with the particular economic theories—as he likes to call them—propounded by my hon. friend, Shri S. A. Dange. I do not quarrel with him or anybody else if he says that the present is not a situation of inflation. But is certainly is a situation which is pregnant with inflationary potential. Certain indicators that we have which may be imperfect—but which are the indicators on which we proceed to judge whether there is inflation or not, show that note circulation has increased over a period of a year by 67.5 crores and the demand deposits in banks have gone up by 81.2 crores.

It can be argued that this increase in money supply is small adding up the figures and saying that it is only Rs. 149 crores. It is more, and inflation cannot be attributed, to unrestricted creation of money. On the other hand, the comparatively small increase in money supply is due to a large deficit in the balance of payments which has resulted in the utilisation of foreign exchange assets, including credit that we have obtained from the International Monetary Fund amounting to Rs. 323 crores. We have mopped up from the economy Rs. 323 crores. May be that some portion of it is governmental expense, but still it represents a very considerable amount of money that we have taken up, and we cannot go on doing it for all time.

So this strength of inflationary forces is there and we cannot deny it. In view of that situation, for this year we had outlined a certain approach in the Budget. Hon. Members know, and hon. members of my Party also know, the difficulties that we had in making this House accept even the general principles of a budget, which has resulted in the taxation of Rs. 87 crores this year and of Rs. 103 or 104 crores for every year following

Hon. Members opposite, themselves, while they support certain aspects of the budget, have been going about, doing propaganda to say that taxation has increased and Government is responsible for it. And I heard, to my agreeable surprise, that in one parti-

[Shri T. T. Krishnamachari]

cular place where they were doing their propaganda—it was in a place where people of what you might call lower middle class were living—one of those people said, “Well, Sir, we do not spend more than three naye paise for a box of match sticks and we have no money to buy sugar, so what is it that you are telling us about? In my locality they have attempted to do something for my slum”. There is that consciousness among them. Even those whom they try to convert say that Government are trying to do their very best for them

We are taking measures to restrain bank credit, and fairly effective measures too. Therefore, in that context I must point out to my hon friends that suppose I do agree that these 1.7 million employees of the Central Government should here and now—leave alone the question of enquiry or a Commission—get Rs. 15 more per month; well, that would mean Rs. 30 crores a year. I cannot tax, because my friends would not permit me to tax, and even my own party people would not permit any more taxation. You talk of hazy things like foreign interests. Who is to buy the foreign interests when they are liquidated? Nobody. Or about the princes’ privy purses, which would not pay even for one day’s increased wages that you are thinking of. So I have necessarily to resort to deficit financing. And I do point out to the unfortunate people who are being led away that I shall do them far more disservice by agreeing to a demand which could not be met out of savings, out of taxation, or out of sources which are not inflationary; because, if I create thirty crores of new money, I shall be putting my hand into their pocket and taking away their hard-earned money

In the glimmerings of sense in regard to economics that appeared in my hon. friend’s speech there was something about pegging of prices, a point which was heavily underlined by my hon. friend Mr. Anthony. But

it is undoubtedly a fact that if we can possibly peg the prices, if my hon. friends are prepared to offer me co-operation in that regard, I shall certainly go and embrace them—the trouble is it should not be an Afzal Khan’s embrace or a bear’s hug!

That brings me to the other point. My hon friend Shri Dange assured the House that their objective in bringing forward a resolution of this nature—which they have not even considered at length; have hon Members read that resolution?—is that it is purely economic and not political. Well, if I can believe my hon. friend, nobody would be more happy than myself, because I do believe that if they are really for the well being of the people, on the economic plane we could come nearer. At any rate I feel I could I have nothing to do with the tycoons, I have nothing to do with those people who circulate beautiful booklets here which can be given away for the purpose of mid-day feeding in some poor home. On the economic plane, politics divested, your cards taken out and put on the table, I could co-operate with you. I do not mind if at the end of four and a half years they say, “Oh, I put sense into the mind of the Finance Minister, the Congress Finance Minister” and claim the credit for all that we have done. Yes, you are at perfect liberty to go and tell the people. But can you really put your hand on your heart and say that this is not a political move?

Some Hon. Members: Oh, yes.

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: I am very sorry I am unable to believe it. The fact really is this. Where does this move originate? The move originates with the World Federation of Trade Unions—with which the Communist Party of India has nothing to do. The World Federation of Trade Unions say that there should be an International Communist Front organisation in every country where men belonging to the public services

must be brought together. I do not think the CPI has anything to do with it (*Interruption*) I am not accusing them. The CPI has nothing to do with it

Shri S. A. Dange: Let him quote the word 'Communist' from that circular or in the original file Let him point out

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: I am not accusing him

Shri Sadhan Gupta: On a point of order, Sir We are entitled to proper quotations from documents It is not proper to mislead us on any point and misquote us

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: As a matter of fact, my hon friend could not lead, I know, but he always misleads (*Interruptions*)

Shri Sadhan Gupta: You are misleading

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari. Within the third day a confederation was formed in India

Shri Sadhan Gupta: Sir, what is your ruling on the point of order

Mr. Speaker: I do not know whether I am led or misled (*Interruption*) I understood the hon Minister to say 'I am not saying that word communist is there' He definitely said so I heard it I do not possibly think I am mistaken He said that the word 'communist' is not there

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: The CPI

Mr. Speaker: CPI he said "CPI is not there", he said If the cap fits anybody he will take it

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: A confederation was set up The confederation started its work It had a demand day on the 25th August, 1956 Countrywide pay strikes were staged Later, the Second Pay Commission Day was observed in 1956— May 16th Demonstrations were staged and so

on And, unfortunately, the Communist party having nothing to do with it, individual members of the Communist party in their individual capacity are office-bearers of these confederations, of these bodies I am sure they are just individuals, they are not acting as members of the Party (*Interruption*) Therefore, I beg to submit in all humility that my hon friend Shri Dange (*Interruption*) need not disclaim what looks to outsiders to be an obvious fact that the Communist party itself sympathises with it very actively (*Interruptions*) The Communist party in its present set-up has no other objective than to overthrow the present government and the Constitution under which it functions I leave it at that

I now come to the economic points of my hon friend I learned many facts I have been a student all my life and even when the days of my end are approaching I will continue to learn Here I have a new teacher from whom I shall learn economics Shri Dange mentioned something of prices being a market phenomenon and wages being a production phenomenon He may be right But, they are inter-related because they are not isolated There is no wall between them because if wages rise, prices will rise He says, they will not, in some country which he knows—maybe Iceland (*Interruptions*) I am not saying they have not I shall come to this main question in the end But, it is undoubtedly a fact that the only method by which I can bear the increased demand will be by an act which is per se inflation and if I accept the demand in that particular form, I shall be doing injustice to a body of people for the upliftment of which the entire Cabinet has been working for the last 12 months, namely, the States Government employees

My friend, Shri Tangamani is the historian of the party apparently He told us something about the agitation in 1942—I think he did not mention 1942, did he?

Some Hon. Members: 1946.

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: He said 1946; he did not say 1942. I thought he said 1942. In 1946, what happened to the Railways? Benefited the industrial employees? That is the trouble. Unfortunately, Shri Tangamani's economics is deficient. I suggest he learns it from Shri Dange. It has affected all the other sectors. I am perfectly sure that anything that should be done for the Central Government servants should be done in such a manner—it should be done, I have no doubt about it—that the wages should be real wages. The increase that we give should be in terms of real wages and not something that is given by one hand and taken away by the other.

The economics of Shri Dange, extremely plausible, is extremely defective. He says that productivity is rising continuously. That is the trouble. He is dealing with a particular set of individuals about whom he knows nothing but who are to him political pawns in a game where he wants to embarrass the Government. He is all the time conscious of the industrial worker and his productivity and lack of productivity because he says productivity is rising. Where is it rising? What are the facts that my hon. friend can put forward to show that productivity is rising in the Government sector. Merely because there is a confusion of ideas, he cannot erase from his mind the fact that he is a man who was all along working in the industrial field.

He was talking about productivity and go slow movement. He was talking about one side of the ring frame and how one man looks after it or does not look after it and so on. The governmental apparatus is something which Shri Dange is yet to know. Therefore, there is no question of productivity here. We are not even talking in terms of job evaluation. As a matter of fact, maybe, from that point of view we are over-staff-

ed—over-staffed not only at the class IV and class III level but also in class II and class I level too. I am prepared to admit that but there is no question of productivity here. It is a mixed metaphor, and as all mixed metaphors are, extremely wrong.

He justifies go-slow in Government servants. He says that it is a defensive phenomenon again. My God! These phenomena that appear in such a torrential way! It is—the go-slow—a defensive phenomenon. The clock watcher who gets away at 4:55 is impelled by, what you call, his defensive phenomenon. Therefore, you should not complain about it! Yes, we cannot complain about it. There is nothing that we can do about it.

That brings me to the end of whatever I have to say. The question, just as the Prime Minister mentioned before, is this. Maybe, my hon. friends opposite want to use these people as a political weapon and want to have concerted strikes in one, two, or three or four dovetails so that the machinery of the Government will get paralysed. Maybe, that is their intention. Maybe, that these people are misled and the leaders might belong to the Communist Party. But, the rank and file do not. The position is that we cannot divest altogether ourselves of our responsibilities to these people. Whether rightly or wrongly, if they feel that they have a grievance, it must be attended to. In this particular case, I am prepared to admit that the level of prices is such, the cost of living is such that it is undoubtedly a case for setting right many of the grievances.

The whole trouble about it is this. I said about it in my Budget speech and I elaborated it merely because I had this in mind. I do not want the Central Government employees to be chagrined with us. I have said that even in the matter of looking into the case of these unfortunate people, we must have a sense of priorities. As Shri Dasappa mentioned, the case

of the provincial Government servants cannot be altogether ignored I am not fighting these people if I say 'No', if I say that we have set our mind against any kind of enquiry or that I am not going to give a pie to these people, I am not fighting them. They may perhaps stage a strike, that may fizzle out and then evaporate for the time being because once a strike fizzles out my friends evaporate. If a strike succeeds partially, they compromise very quick. Nobody can get on better except with a communist negotiator.

He speaks of collective bargaining. Where does collective bargaining come in in the case of a Pay Commission? Does my hon friend think that he is going to do collective bargaining with them and that we should divorce ourselves of our authority to the Pay Commission? No, Sir, it is not a case of collective bargaining, it is not a case of hurting these poor people merely because for the time being a few people have been misled. They sent a demand to my hon colleague, the Minister of Transport and Communications. They do something else to us.

My hon friends were angry when I said that my heart bleeds for them. It is true we do know that they are in difficulties. But we also know that if we do something to them without doing something to somebody else and without safeguarding the situation with regard to prices about which I am afraid, then what will ensue will be inflation and the Plan which they want to support and which they say they are supporting—and I believe it—will certainly be in jeopardy.

Sir, Government have considered this particular matter very carefully. They have spent many days thinking about it. But a Resolution of this nature cannot be accepted. May I read, for the benefit of this House, the resolution in my own way? It reads:

"The House is of opinion that a Second Pay Commission should be appointed to go into the question of the pay structure and service conditions of the Union Government employees so as to bring them in conformity with the country's ideal of socialist pattern of society"

I do not know what has this to do with the socialist pattern of society, as the Prime Minister mentioned. It has nothing to do with it. So a resolution of this nature cannot be accepted and I should have to ask the House to reject it. But in doing so I would like to tell the House that we shall continue to discuss this matter at our level with a view to seeing what could be done. Maybe, Sir, as Mr Dange said, it does not matter two hoots to him. "All that I want is that you should yield, you say an *ad hoc* committee, you say a committee of enquiry, you say a Pay Commission, the point that I want is that you must yield. You say I have yielded to Mr Dange, for the time being I am satisfied, I will start the trouble later on."

No Sir, I am not yielding. We are seized of this particular matter and we shall, other things being equal, probably be able to set up a body, but a body which will have not merely to think of the Central Government employees and their pay scales to be brought in conformity with the socialist pattern of society which we have set and which they derive every time. They say we are not socialists. Socialism comes from them. We beg to say that we are slightly different. What we propose to do is to consider this matter. Maybe we shall constitute a body to go into this question but a body cannot go into this question in an isolated manner. There are a number of integrated problems. The problems that suggest themselves to me at the moment are not many, but they are sufficiently weighty. Any body that enquires into this mat-

[Shri T. T. Krishnamachari]

ter of pay structure, standards of remuneration and conditions of service, has to enquire into amenities, which is very important from our point of view. It may not be from the point of view of the communists at all, but amenities are extremely important things so far as we are concerned. They should keep in view the general economic situation in the country and the inflationary potential in the country, and the effect of any cash increase on the inflationary situation in the country and the needs of the Five Year Plan which I am sure they would agree are important and the standards prevailing generally in governmental administration in the States sphere. We cannot altogether ignore it. I am not saying that the States will cooperate with us in the institution of an enquiry of that nature, but any body which enquires into the matter cannot forget the repercussions of the recommendations they may make on the existing structure of the States administration. Maybe, Sir, as we go on examining the matter further new points will develop. Maybe that when we come to a conclusion we shall be able to tell the House what we are doing.

May I before concluding tell my hon friends here well he says there is no politics in it, I accept his word we as a Government accept his word.

An Hon. Member: Do not accept.

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: Somebody says, do not accept. Evidently, he is not a Member of the Communist Party. I am only speaking to the Communist Party. We accept his words. But let us not talk in terms of agitation, go slow, let him not encourage go slow, leave alone this question of various phenomena appearing and disappearing, these transient phenomena. Phenomena have absolutely no bearing here. We ask for your co-operation, because I do think there is a possibility. Assuming that you feel the same way as we do in regard to the Five Year Plan, there

is a possibility of co-operation on the economic plane. If that co-operation is forth coming, all these threats and other things must stop. But, if it does not stop, well, we must necessarily conclude that politics dominates the situation, economics is a handmaid. I have to ask the House to reject the resolution.

Shri Sadhan Gupta: Politics dominates on your side.

Shri Warrior: Sir, I will take only a few minutes to give my reply. Even though the Government has not yet realised the importance of meeting the situation which has arisen, not out of this resolution particularly but out of the circumstances all round, I would only say that if this opportunity is lost by the Government, and if the Government is only standing on its own prestige, the situation may yet worsen and it will go out of our hands. Therefore, even at this last moment I would appeal to the Government, in spite of the defects in the language of the resolution as it is framed to accept in some way or the other to set up a body to conduct an enquiry which will have the effect of a Pay Commission whereby the grievances of the employees will be redressed.

Mr. Speaker: There is only one amendment which has been moved.

Pandit D N Tiwari: Sir I would beg leave of the House to withdraw it.

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

Shri Sadhan Gupta: No.

Mr. Speaker: All right, I shall put the amendment to the vote of the House. The question is

"That at the end of the Resolution, the following may be added, namely:

"with special instructions to find out the practicability of fixing the minimum pay scale at Rs 100/- per month and the maximum at Rs 2000/- per month only."

The motion was negatived.

Mr. Speaker: I shall now put the main Resolution to the vote of the House.

The question is:

"This House is of opinion that a Second Pay Commission should be appointed to go into the question of the pay structure and

service conditions of the Union Government employees so as to bring them in conformity with the country's ideal of socialist pattern of society."

The Lok Sabha divided:

Ayes 48

Noes 173

Division No. 4]

AYES

[18.42

Banerjee, Shri Pramathanath
Banerjee, Shri S. M.
Bharucha, Shri Nawab
Bhogi, Shri
Chakravarty, Shrimati Renu
Chandramani, Shri
Dange, Shri S. A.
Dasaratha Deb, Shri
Dasgupta, Shri
Dige, Shri
Dora, Shri
Dwivedy, Shri S. N.
Ehas, Shri Muhammed
Gokwad, Shri B. K.
Ghosal, Shri
Ghose, Shri B. C.

Goray, Shri
Gupta, Shri Sadhan
Imam, Shri Mohammed
Jadhav, Shri
Kumble, Shri B. C.
Kar, Shri Prabhakar
Kodiyan, Shri
Kumaran, Shri
Kumbhar, Shri
Kunhan, Shri
Majhi, Shri R. C.
Menon, Dr. K. B.
Menon, Shri Narayanankutty
More, Shri
Mukerjee, Shri H. N.
Mullik, Shri B. C.

Nair, Shri Vasudevan
Parmar, Shri K. U.
Parulekar, Shri
Parvathi Krishnan, Shrimati
Patil, Shri Bala Saheb
Pocker Sahib, Shri
Punnoose Shri
Ramani, Shri
Rao, Shri D. V.
Rao, Shri T. B. Vittal
Reddy, Shri Nagi
Sampat, Shri
Sonule, Shri
Tanjaman, Shri
Valvi, Shri
Warrior, Shri

NOES

Abdul Lateef, Shri
Achal Singh, Seth
Achar, Shri
Achint Ram, Lala
Agrawal, Shri
Alva, Shri Joachim
Ambalam, Shri Subbiah
Anjanappa, Shri
Arumugam, Shri R. S.
Arumugam, Shri S. R.
Behadur Singh, Shri
Bakliwal, Shri
Balimiki, Shri
Banerjee, Shri S. K.
Bangshi Thakur, Shri
Basumatari, Shri
Bhagwan Din, Shri
Bhargava, Pandit Thakur Das
Bhadri, Shri
Birbal Singh, Shri
Boroach, Shri P. C.
Bose, Shri P. C.
Chanda, Shri Ajit K.
Chettiar, Shri R. Ramanathan
Chhuni Lal, Shri

Damani, Shri
Dasappa, Shri
Das, Shri N. T.
Das, Shri Ramdhani
Das, Shri Shree Narayan
Datar, Shri
Desai, Shri Morari
Dindod, Shri
Dube, Shri Mulchand
Gokwad, Shri Fatesinghrai
Gandhi, Shri Feroze
Gandhi, Shri M. M.
Ghanahyam Lal, Shri
Ghosh, Shri M. K.
Harvan, Shri Anar
Hasda, Shri Subodh
Hathi, Shri
Hazarika, Shri J. N.
Hukam Singh, Sardar
Jagjivan Ram, Shri
Jain, Shri M. C.
Jangde, Shri
Jedhe, Shri
Jyotsani, Pandit J. P.
Kale, Shrimati A.

Asiwal,
Chakri, Shri L. Badhar
edaria, Shri C. M.
shava, Shri
Khan, Shri Sadat Ali
Khedkar, Shri G. B.
Khurji, Shri
Khwasia, Shri Jamal
Krishna, Shri M. R.
Krishniah, Shri
Krishnamachari, Shri T. T.
Krishan Rao, Shri M. V.
Kureel, Shri B. N.
Lahuri, Shri
Laxmi Bai, Shrimati
Mafida Ahmed, Shrimati
Maiti, Shri N. B.
Mallik, Shri U. S.
Malavaya, Pandit Govind
Malviya, Shri K. B.
Malviya, Shri Motilal
Mandal, Shri J.
Manyanagan, Shri
Mathur, Shri H. C.
Mathur, Shri M. D.

Mehdi, Shri S A
Melkote, Dr
Mishra, Shri Bibhuti
Mishra, Shri L N
Mishra, Shri M P
Misra, Shri R D
Misra, Shri R R
Mohammed, Shri
Morarka, Shri
Musafir, Gian G S
Nadar, Shri P T
Naldurgkar, Shri
Nallakoya, Shri
Nanda, Shri
Nanjappa Shri
Narasimhan, Shri
Narasaynamy, Shri
Nathvani, Shri
Naskar, Shri P S
Nayar, Dr Sushila
Nehru, Shri Jivawarshi
Nehru, Shrimati Uma
Onkar Lal, Shri
Padalu, Shri K V
Padam Dev, Shri
Pahadia, Shri
Palaniyandi, Shri
Palchoudhuri, Shrimati Ila
Pande, Shri K N
Panna Lal, Shri
Patel, Shrimati Maniben
Patil, Shri S K

Pattabiraman, Shri
Raghunath Singh, Shri
Raj Bahadur, Shri
Rajiah, Shri
Raju, Shri D S
Ramaswami, Shri S V
Ramaswamy, Shri K S
Ramaswamy, Shri P
Rameshwar Rao, Shri
Ram Krishan, Shri
Rampure, Shri M Y
Ram Saran, Shri
Ram Subhag Singh Dr
Ranbir Singh, Ch
Rene, Shri
Ranga, Shri
Rao, Shri Rajagopala
Rao, Shri E M
Rao, Shri Hanumanth
Rao, Shri R J
Ray, Shrimati Rekha
Reddy, Shri K C
Reddy, Shri Narapa
Reddy, Shri Ram
Reddy, Shri Ramakrishna
Reddy, Shri Viswanatha
Roy, Shri Bishwanath
Rungsung Suisa, Shri
Sagral, Sardar A S
Samant Sinhar, Dr
Sanganna, Shri
Selku, Shri
Shah, Shrimati Jayaben

Shankarish, Shri
Sharma, Shri D C
Sharma, Pandit K C
Shastri, Shri Lal Bahadur
Shukla, Shri V C
Siddanamappa, Shri
Siddiah, Shri
Singh, Shri B B
Singh, Shri D N
Sinha, Shri Gajendra Prasad
Sinha, Shri K P
Smha, Shri Satya Narayan
Sinha, Shrimati Tarakeshwari
Snatak, Shri Nardeo
Sonawane Shri
Subbaroyan Dr P
Sumat Prasad, Shri
Suryanarayanamurti, Shri
Swaran Singh Sardar
Tahir, Shri Mohammed
Tewari, Shri Dwarikanath
Thirumala, Shri
Thirumal Rao, Shri
Thomas, Shri A M
Tiway, Pandit D N
Uike, Shri
Upadhyay Pandit Munishwar Dutt
Varma, Shri B B
Varma Shri M L
Varma, Shri R B
Venkatasubbaiah, Shri
Wadiwa, Shri
Wodeyar, Shri

The Resolution was negatived

BUSINESS ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Fourth Report

Sardar Hukam Singh (Bhatinda):
Sir, I beg to present the Fourth Report of the Business Advisory Committee

RESOLUTION RE DISCONTINUANCE OF THE GRANT OF SCHOLARSHIPS TO STUDENTS ON COMMUNITY BASIS

Mr. Speaker: I have said that I will give an opportunity to the other hon. Member. Shri Bibhuti Mishra.

श्री बिभूति मिश्र (बगहा) अध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं आप की आज्ञा से निम्नलिखित सकल्प पेश करना चाहता हूँ —

“इस सभा की यह गय है कि केन्द्रीय सरकार की छात्रवृत्तियाँ किनी

खत्म जात या जातियों के लागू का ही नहीं दी जानी
गि हिए अपितु वे सब जातियों के गरीब आर याग्य विद्या-
विद्या का (मन्तर्ना चाहिये और
इस उद्देश्य के लिए सरकार का, यदि आवश्यक हो तो, मन्त्रि-
मन्त्रि का उशासन करने के हेतु जायुक्त कानून पेश करना चाहिये।”

Mr. Speaker: The hon Member may continue on the next day

18 44 hrs

The Lok Sabha then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock on Monday the 22nd July, 1957