

DISCUSSION ON THE WORKING OF THE MINISTRY OF LABOUR

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Now, we will have discussion on the working of the Ministry of Labour. I permit Shri E. Balanandan to raise a discussion. Mr. Balanandan, your party's time is fourteen minutes.

SHRI E. BALANANDAN (Kerala) : Madam, I will take only a few minutes.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : So, please try to be brief because you have given the names of two speakers. Will you take seven minutes?

SHRI JIBON ROY (West Bengal) : He wants to test your indulgence.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Today my indulgence is to allow every Member to speak, to allow the Members who gave their names.

SHRI E. BALANANDAN (Kerala) : Madam, our Labour Minister is here and he has to carry some other's baby. That is the situation today. This is my comment to begin with because without touching industry, labour cannot be discussed. I would like to cover one or two basic points because my friend is going to speak later.

1.00 P.M.

Madam, the first point I want to make is this India is a big country. And the registered unemployed in India today are around 30 million. And the rural unemployed today are nearly 60 million. It is not accurate. It may be more or less. At the same time, what is the agenda today? The agenda is that the workers are taken as the enemies. It is said day in and day out that the workers are not properly working, the production is less, the productivity is less and the number of workers is more and, therefore, steps have to be taken to take out the workers. And you see your Budget for industry. Seventy per cent of the money allotted is for VRS. This is the trend of the Budget. The Ministry's job is to persuade the workers who are working in the industry to get out of employment. This is the crux of the problem. For the last three years, what is

happening in the country? We are told that without modern technology, we cannot go forward and therefore, we have to go in for high-tech. Madam, here I would like to draw the attention of the Minister to the high-technology areas. What is happening in the developed societies today? What are they facing? Germany, Japan, England, America and all the developed societies, the high-tech. societies are facing a serious problem of unemployment. I am not going into the figures. It is not necessary now. But the youngsters in Germany, England, America and in the other developed countries do not find employment. Therefore, that society is facing a serious crisis. They never faced such a crisis after the Second World War. That is the society which you are going to take as a model, and that system is going to be adopted here. What would be the result? I do not want to predict that. I only say that for the last three years, because of the policies being followed by the Government, the workers are faced with the question: "What about my employment? Will I be employed tomorrow? Will my wages be protected?" And in the public sector where more than two million workers are working, they are treated as the enemy number one by the Government. Now, what is happening there today? Every public sector worker is under a serious threat today whether he will continue in employment tomorrow or not. There is a wholesale attack against the workers. The Labour Minister has to protect their interest. How can he do it? In the industries Budget, his job is defined to spend 70 per cent of the money allotted for easing out the workers from employment. That is the task of the Labour Minister now which I don't think is a good job. As of today, a total of nine crores are unemployed. Out of 3 crores of people who are registered unemployed, a majority of them are educated workers. Where will they go? The other workers who are employed are going to be sent out. This is the scenario.

Another thing is that the industries are going to be restructured. It is said that a huge number of workers are surplus. What is the position of industrial sickness today? According to your own figures, 2,60,000 industries are sick. The private figures say that the number is four lakhs.

And workers in these industries are going to be sent out. Many industries are already closed. The new technology, which is being invited for the industry, will lead to sickness in the small-scale sector. What is going to be the job of the Labour Ministry? Is it to send the workers out of employment? That seems to be the job entrusted to the Labour Ministry today. So I request the Labour Minister to see that the workers get employment and are not thrown out of their jobs. Their employment opportunities should not be reduced. We are a country of poor people where we have to provide employment to the country's workforce so that they can live. But this is not being guaranteed. That is my main criticism against the approach of the Labour Ministry.

The Labour Ministry can only administer certain things according to the present law. The Labour Minister cannot very much interfere with the industrial policy but the policy of the Government which is being persuaded in the name of restructuring or for doing away with the public sector or for the process of privatisation acts against the working class and against the nation. The best of industries in India, which can compete in the world market safely, are sought to be destroyed. I will just give the example of BHEL where 48,000 workers are employed. This industry produces power generators and it can compete in the world market. Out of 96 quotations they got approval for 91 which shows their ability to compete. But 29 per cent of their share is going to be sold—I do not know the timeframe—within six months or one year, and this may become a private company. Siemens and other multinationals will be controlling this company and they would like to reduce the workforce. This is going to be the result. This is the process in the case of every industry which turns sick. Therefore, the Labour Minister has a task by which 70 per cent of the money in the industries Budget is sought to be spent on workers accepting the VRS and going away.

Another aspect is, every industry in the name of sickness is referred to the

BIFR. The job of the BIFR is to see that closure process is completed without delay. So, what is the main work being done by the Labour Ministry? Sick industries are referred to the BIFR and the BIFR will close down the industries without taking much time, and this is the work done by this Ministry as a labour leader, I support you; I do not oppose you because labour problems are to be handled by the Labour Ministry with adequate funds at your disposal, which is not the case here. What is to be done? Under the overall policy of the Government, your performance cannot be better because you are working under constraints. Therefore, I want you to join me in opposing this policy; otherwise the Labour Ministry cannot protect the interests of the labour class, to be precise.

We have certain laws which were enacted some years back. Take, for example, the Bonus Act. There is a limitation on eligibility for payment of bonus. You know the money value has eroded, but even if you take the maximum amount payable as bonus, you cannot compensate the workers in terms of rise in prices and erosion of money value. Therefore, there is absolutely no basis for continuing with this limitation provided under the Act. There is need to change the law. Then, with regard to registration etc., you are proposing to bring in some amendments but there is criticism made by the trade unions because you had promised to consult the trade unions before bringing in the enactments. You have not done that. I have seen it only in the papers. I have not seen the legislation. The point is that your promise to consult the trade unions has been given a go-by and I am told that you are going to bring in a law.

Then, there is another thing. Demand has been made by the employers and it is said that you are going to bring in legislation providing for the right of retrenchment. The demand is that the right of 'hire and fire' should be given to the employers alone. They want that there should not be any restriction. This has been suggested by so-called experts.

Internationally, two slogans are coined by the employers. One is 'flexibility of

labour'. What does 'flexibility of labour' mean? It means that they want to send the workers out according to their whims and fancies. Another demand is being made. Another economic phrase has come into use. This is 'growthless development'. What is this 'growthless development'? 'Growthless development' is a development where the number of workers would be reduced. Industrial production may go up, but the number of workers would be reduced. This is the process which Dr. Manmohan Singh is trying to introduce in India. This is the process which he wants to introduce in India.

Madam, if this process is implemented, the number of workers in each industry would go down. Of course, the production would go up, but it would go up, with foreign technology. Therefore, employment may increase in foreign countries, but not in India. Take, for example, the Maruti car. Maruti car is a good car. Is it not. But whose is it? The engine and other parts are manufactured in Japan. Now, in the process of making one car, 48 workers would get employment in Japan, whereas, in India, only 5 workers would get employment. Therefore, more employment in Japan and lesser employment in India. This is the kind of joint-sector institutions you want to bring in which would take over our industries. This would mean that the number of workers is going to be reduced. The number of jobs in India is going to be reduced severely. This is what would happen.

Before concluding, I would draw the attention of the hon. Minister to one important point. What has happened to the tripartite machinery—it is there for 30 or 35 industries—of which you are the Chairman? Why is it not functioning properly? Then, what about the Labour Conference? In the last three years, I do not know how many meetings have been held. The tripartite machinery is the forum where the trade unions can interact with you, the Government, and discuss the issue confronting the labour. In the present context, the main job of the Labour Ministry should be to see that this tripartite machinery is strengthened so that there could be interaction between the trade unions,

the management and the Government, and the problems could be solved.

There is just one more thing. Even though the pressure is there on you to immediately take steps to send the workers out, to close the shop, the Labour Ministry should see to it that it is resisted. You should take note of the feelings of the workers. You should remember that all the trade unions are standing as one man; whether it is the I.N.T.U.C., or the A.I.T. U.C., or any other organisation. There is no difference of opinion. All the trade unions in the country are against privatisation. On two or three occasions, they have demonstrated to you that they are against it. All the trade unions, all the workers in each sector—banks, insurance, postal services, etc.—are against your move of privatisation. Therefore, please do not take the workers for granted. It is they who constitute the majority. Today, you may be in the Government. You may be the policy-maker today and you can dictate terms. But you should not forget that the majority outside would have their say and would have their way. This should not be forgotten. Thank you.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Balanandan, you have hardly left any time for your colleague. When I say 'hardly', you have not left even one minute. You have taken all the fourteen minutes. I have the watch here. I am the time-keeper. I think the Labour Minister should give me something for this job of time-keeping. Shrimati Jayanti Natarajan.

SHRIMATI JAYANTHI NATARAJAN (Tamil Nadu): Madam Deputy Chairman, I would like to confine myself to a few observations on the status of female labour, women labour, in the country.

Madam, the fact that I have been fielded by my Party to speak first is an indication of the importance that we place upon the status, the position, of women labour in the country. The Census of 1991 had registered the number of women workers in the country at 91.4 million. In other words, 22.69 per cent of the

total female population of 400.8 million are workers.

Madam, this is the figure which was put forward by the Labour Ministry itself in its Annual Report. With great respect, I wish to say that these figures do not reflect the correct position in the sense that the Census Rules themselves are wrong. According to the Census Rules, a work done by women, or work done by anybody else, unless it is sold in the market place, is not construed as work. The hours and hours and hours of work that women put in towards maintaining the family, towards kitchen garden, towards domestic cultivation for food for the family, those hours and hours of toil are not even construed to be a productive work, according to our Census Rules. Time and again I have raised it in this House and elsewhere that the Census Rules need to be amended so that the actual work, productive work that is done by women is taken into consideration for the GNP so that the country can have the full picture of the total amount of work done by women in order to plan for their development. It is not just as a measure of pride or prestige that we want that this work should be taken into consideration. This is a very important issue because unless this work is taken into account, it is not possible to plan for their development, it is not possible for the Planning Commission to set aside funds for them and it is not possible to provide for them in many other areas. This is the reason why I say that all of us live in blissful ignorance of the true amount of work that women put in in this country and the conditions of women labour. Therefore, the most important point that I want to emphasise before saying anything else is the problem of invisibility, under-valuation and under-recording of the work done by women.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Apart from their work in kitchen garden, the work that they do at home, cooking, taking care and everything else, is without any payment. It is a free service. So, that also should be taken into consideration because they are not unemployed. They are not just sitting at home.

SHRIMATI JAYANTHI NATARAJAN : That should be taken into account in the GNP. The weakness of the data base is compounded by lack of clarity on what constitutes work. The 1981 Census showed only 14 per cent work being in the labour force. This is the perception that I want to place on the forefront of what I am trying to say. This is a perception that many women themselves share. It is also a self-perception. Because of the partial perception of the work done by women that we are not able to plan for them, we are not able to take steps to ameliorate their conditions, and we are not able to really alleviate the status of women labour in the country.

Madam, thousands and thousands and millions of poor women in India are engaged in an unbelievable multiplicity of occupations. As you were pleased to mention it just now, they carry out the tremendous task of child-rearing or maintaining the family. They have a multiplicity of roles. They carry out the role of workers outside, in factories and in fields. They carry out the duties of child-rearing. They carry out the duties of home maintenance. The kinds of work women put in, are crucial for the survival of the family. They contribute far more than men in terms of survival of the family alone, but the social perception of women is that of marginal workers, that of protected dependants and that of almost non-workers.

Madam, you may recollect the television programme in which men were stopped and asked about their work. Some women's organisations took up the television programme, the documentary. Men are in different kinds of employment. They replied, "I am a clerk." He was asked, "What is your wife doing?" He said, "She sits at home, doing nothing." Another person says, "I am an officer." He was asked, "What is your wife doing?" He replies, "She sits at home, doing nothing."

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : She is a housewife.

SHRIMATI JAYANTHI NATARAJAN : Madam, a housewife is perceived

as somebody who does not do anything. This is a wrong perception. The perception of woman as totally dependant, is wrong.

Therefore, my first plea to the hon. Labour Minister, through you, Madam, is that at least as far as the limited scope of the Labour Ministry is concerned, an attempt should be made by the Government of India to perceive in full dimension the kind of work that is done by women within a limited area, even though it is not defined under the Census Rules as they exist now.

Madam, poor women labour are not a homogenous mass. They belong to all castes, communities and tribes. In the entire spectrum from officers right down to the poorest of labour in the unorganised sector, including the agriculture sector, all these women have one thing in common. They suffer, in common, from deprivation and discrimination of the worst kind. Virtually, nowhere are they paid wages equal to men, from the highest to the lowest. The most arduous and the lowest paid work is done by women in the context of economic compulsion, discrimination and restricted opportunity.

Madam, the vast majority of Indian women are assetless. They have no assets. They have no access to either assets or resources. They have no access, in an even more tragic sense, to training, to education, to technology or to anything else that would help them improve their lot in life. Therefore, they are forced to work outside the organised economy. Most of their brothers, men, work in the organised sector of the economy. This is the reason why a majority of women labour in the country is forced to work outside the organised sector. They work in the unorganised sector. We know that most of them are in the agriculture sector. This is because they have no access whatsoever to education, to training, to resources, to technological improvement and even to space in many instances.

Until 1975 the problems of the vast majority of women labour in the country went completely unnoticed. There was a

communication gap in the country between women labour and the conditions they laboured in and the people who mattered, the decision-makers, the authorities. It was only in 1975 that the Committee on the Status of Women took into consideration that 94 per cent of women worked in agriculture. It was for the first time that the Government had made an attempt to understand that something could be done for women labour who were toiling in extremely deprived conditions, and steps were taken to improve their lot. Until 1975 the then existing labour laws simply did not provide in any manner for protection of women. From that time till today more than 13 labour laws came into being which provide for protection of women. I will come to them and deal with them in a minute.

The organised sector on the country apparently, if my figures are correct, absorbs about 18 per cent of the work force in the country. In the organised sector women account for 8 per cent of the labour in mines, 10 per cent of labour in factories and 51 per cent of labour in plantation; and 94 per cent of the total women labour are employing in agriculture.

Even according to the Ministry's own Annual Report the average daily employment of women in factories is static. I would like the Minister to explain to us why it is so. Is it because employers do not want to extend the benefits of this protected legislation to women? Has the Government taken any steps to reverse this alarming trend? In the absence of this most of the women labour in the country are left in the unorganised sector. Just now an hon. Member was making a remark and you also said, Madam, that the unorganised sector defies definition. None of the protected labour legislations can obviously be extended if it does not apply to agriculture. We all know that. In fact the Committee on Status of Women has said that it should be extended to agriculture, but it defies definition and also terms like employers and employees. There is no term like that in the agricultural sector. Therefore, there is no question of protection. Therefore, I say when you do not have definition

of employer or employee or protection or security or how she can be fired, she cannot be protected because there is absolutely no security. She is completely left to the whims and fancies of that particular landlord or the person who employs her. Therefore, the time has come when you should take note of the vast amount of unorganised women working as unorganised labour and see that this definition extends to them. Otherwise, their toil would be in vain and nobody cares what happens to them really. The unorganised sector where women toil is totally an exploited sector. I do not need to point this out. All of us are aware of it. It is characterised by low earning, low productivity, low skills and absolutely no legal safeguards or security.

SHRI M. A. BABY (Kerala) : Will you please throw some light on the possible repercussions of the new structural adjustment under the new economic liberalisation on the women and other downtrodden section in the unorganised sector?

SHRIMATI JAYANTHI NATARAJAN : It is going to have a very bad effect. Women will be the worst hit. I will come to that in a minute.

Madam, surveys have been conducted by the National Commission on Self-Employed Women. According to these surveys there are problems specific to women in wage employment, that is, in the organised sector and problems specific to women in the non-wage employment, that is, in the unorganised sector. In wage employment, approximately half of the women receive wages below the subsistence level, leave alone what is received by men, below the subsistence level even in the wage employment.

Apart from that, there is irregular payment of wages. There is also uncertain employment because in seasonal employment, they are not always employed. There is also the problem of forcing these women to sign upon the receipts for an inflated amount whereas they actually receive less amount. There are problems of wages paid in kind, in goods rather than in cash. That too is in the form of

inferior goods. More than these problems, there is the problem of the highest irregular employment in agricultural sector. It is 49 per cent. It is 46 per cent in the case of construction workers. Then, in the collection of goods, it is 42 per cent.

Madam, in the case of non-wage employment, the most common problem relates to the availability of raw material, relates to the supply of raw material which is completely irregular, relates to the marketing, and middlemen who come into the picture and prevent these self-employed women, who are trying to make something and sell it in the market, from their actual profits reaching them... (Interruptions) . . . Madam, If I have the hon. Minister's attention, I will be happy.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Mr. Ashok Mitra, I would also like you to listen because it is about women. I want you to pay attention because not much attention is paid when the issues of women workers' are raised even if they are part of the trade union set-up. Everybody talks about the problems of men. Nobody considers the special problems being faced by women even if they are in a trade union set-up. So, please listen to her because she is making a serious point. I want everybody to listen to her . . . (Interruptions) . . . The Minister also should listen to her because he has to reply to the debate. Not only that; he has to take action on it. If he doesn't listen, what is the action he is going to take?

SHRIMATI JAYANTHI NATARAJAN : Thank you, Madam.

There is also the problem of marketing, uneconomic selling price and complete harassment by the middlemen. In both wage employment and non-wage employment, all women workers have one problem. They are harassed by the community at large. They are harassed by contractors. They are harassed by their employers. For reasons of time, I do not want to go into all those details. They are harassed by their own family members.

The health care provided to them at their places of work is absolutely abysmal. They have no facilities for training. They are not provided with any facilities to organise themselves into a trade union set-up. They do not even have a voice in the trade union set-up. This is subject to correction.

They do not get any maternity benefit. They do not get any compensation. I will come to the question of maternity benefit in a moment. A number of studies have been conducted by the National Commission on Self-Employed Women and other organisations. These studies clearly show that there is almost an institutionalised discrimination against women labour particularly against the women labour belonging to the Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes. There is only a slight increase in the work force of women labour belonging to the Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes from 32 per cent to 36 per cent. This is not an indication of their growth. This is not an indication of their development. This indicates that they have not come up in their life. These poor women have to work at much younger age and stay at the work place much longer in order to eke out a barely subsistence level of existence. The intervention which the Government has undertaken has been with the best of intentions.

Successive Governments have tried to do something about it. But very often, the policy-planners in the bureaucracy and the Ministers in the Government and private enterprise work completely at cross purposes. Madam, there is the specific example of the tribal people in Bharuch. Over there, Madam, it was felt that something needed to be done to ameliorate the conditions of those tribal women who were not able to make both ends meet in the tribal area of Bharuch. Therefore, *ambar charkha* was provided to them and they were taught how to spin the wheel and they were earning Rs. 8-10 for eight hours' work. But the problem was, for those tribal women, it was completely unsuited to their life-style to sit inside one place and keep on spinning because they were used to being out in the forest, out in the field.

SHRI JAGDISH PRASAD MATHUR (Uttar Pradesh) : Madam, are we continuing in the lunch-hour? Or, do we have the lunch-break?

SHRIMATI JAYANTHI NATARAJAN : Madam, I do not mind continuing afterwards. I will take another five or six minutes.

SHRI M. A. BABY : We should go on to the discussion of maternity benefits.

SHRIMATI JAYANTHI NATARAJAN : I am going to do that.

SHRI M. A. BABY : We are discussing labour. Maternity benefits should also be discussed. Then, you may have to refer to labour pains also. The result will be a baby.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Mr. Baby, it is a nice joke about labour, labour pains and a baby being born. But the problem is that most of the (Interruptions). Please sit down. Do not interrupt me. When the Chair is saying something, you should have some courtesy. It is a serious matter. I am very serious about it. I am not taking it as a joke. All these attempts by any lady Member—I underline it—to ameliorate the situation of women are always abortive because you people make it a joke. I am sorry.

The House is adjourned for lunch for one hour.

The House then adjourned for lunch at thirty-two minutes past one of the clock.

The House reassembled after lunch at thirty-four minutes past two of the clock. The Vice-Chairman, (Shri Md. Salim), in the Chair.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI MD. SALIM) : Smt. Jayanthi Natarajan to continue.

SHRIMATI JAYANTHI NATARAJAN : Sir, before we adjourned for lunch, I was talking about the problem of how due to rapid modernisation, the

human resources, particularly in the rural areas, are being rendered obsolete. We are not able to make use of the available potential especially of our women. When I was giving an example of the tribal women of Bhoiraich, in an enthusiasm to help them, a scheme was devised by which they could use *charkha* and perhaps improve their lifestyle. But no allowance was at all made to the fact that they did not have the simple technology, they didn't have the simple education of how to repair that *charkha* if something went wrong with it and the very same scheme became useless to them. It also did not take into account the question of their physical incapacity to stay put in one place inside their house whereas their entire physical strength has been devoted to working outside in the fields or in the forests. This is an example of how even policies, which are directed towards actually helping the women labour in the country, often do not succeed because of lack of imagination of the kind of labour that these women are actually doing and the kind of problems that they face. Sir, the Constitution of India prohibits discrimination, among other grounds, on the ground of sex and also ensures that there should be equality in matters of public employment. Sir, the Directive Principles of State Policy clearly lay down that there should be equal pay for equal work and hence, the Equal Remuneration Act was passed by the Parliament which, of course, was observed more in violation than in the actual following of it. Since the passing of that Act, since Independence, till today, thirteen pieces of legislation, labour legislation have enshrined in them sections which are supposed to be for the benefit of women. These include specific working hours for women, these include special maternity benefits for women. These include the provision of employing women in certain non-hazardous industries and, most important of all, 'equal pay for equal work' and the provision of maternity benefit. But in actual practice, Sir, the tragedy is that none of these rules, none of these protective legislations has had any impact upon the vast majority of working women in India from the lowest to the highest. Sir, the kind of attitude that our public sectors—for

instance the insurance companies—have towards their woman-employees, is so shocking. It has been raised time and again in Parliament. For instance, one of the rules that the Life Insurance Corporation of India have, stipulates that whenever women apply for clerical posts over there, they have to fill in intensive personal details with regard even to their menstruation. I have raised this matter time and again in this House. So far, till today, nothing has been done to change those rules, Sir. I cannot understand why the Life Insurance Corporation of India should incorporate a provision in its application form relating to its women employees where they have to write down details not just of their last pregnancy but also the date of their last menstruation.

The only reason, I can imagine, why they should have a provision like this is, Sir, they do not want to provide maternity benefits to women. This is at the highest level, Sir. Every rule is observed more in violation than in actual practice. Take, for example, Sir, the provision of a creche. How are these women supposed to actually do their work if they have small children and their families to be looked after at their homes? This is why a legislation has been enacted to insist that if 'x' number of women, for example, are employed in a particular factory, then there should be a creche there so that their children can be well looked after. Let me give you some startling figures. For 21,337 factories in the State of Bihar, there are only 26 creches. 26 creches for 21,337 factories! In Maharashtra, for 99,995 factories there are 57 creches. Just 57 creches! This is how from the dawn of Independence till today these provisions which are supposed to be beneficial to women are being implemented in this country, Sir! According to Mrs. Vimala Ranade, who is the Secretary of the All India Co-ordination Committee of Working Women, the percentage of women that lies in employment registers has gone up from 15 per cent in 1982 to 25 per cent today. At least, 25 per cent on the live employment registers are women. This is why, Sir, a new sociological phenomenon has come up in the country—35 per

cent of the poverty-stricken households in the country are headed by women. This is a new sociological phenomenon called 'feminisation of poverty'. Even poverty has become a feminine problem.

SHRI N. E. BALARAM (Kerala) :
Where are you quoting from ?

SHRIMATI JAYANTHI NATARAJAN : From the United Nations Survey, UNDP Survey.

Till today, Sir, though there are millions and millions of women working, ninety point odd billion women in the work-force, nobody has recognised the formidable emergence of women power. Even the elementary principle of provision of separate toilets in factories and workplaces is not observed at all though for men there are separate toilets for higher-ups. For instance, the officers will use one toilet, the staff will use another toilet, but for women separate toilets will not be provided in any workplace, even in Parliament House, Sir. I am sure, you are already aware of it. Even in the Parliament House every corridor has some toilet which men can use and the female. Members of Parliament can use only one toilet. The Parliament is not the real problem. No doubt we can go there. We have to walk a little distance. This is the attitude in the highest forum of legislature in the land. I am not going to make it an issue. I am not going to say, "Please come out and provide more facilities for female Members". We can suffer. But this attitude is reflected from the Parliament right down to the smallest factory where the most basic human provisions for day-to-day needs are not given to women. How are then women expected to participate in the labour force or recognised or provided for as a tremendous work-force in this country ? This is something which boggles our imagination. The stark truth of the matter is that the hon. Minister and the Government have got many schemes. The intention is noble. The intention is good. But how many of the schemes do actually reach the women ? Sir, you take the IRDP. Certainly the target of 30% to be reach-

ed under the IRDP scheme is a noble target. It is a target which all of us try to achieve. But the truth of the matter is that in 1985-86 the target reached under the IRDP was only 9.87% of the women and a little later it reached 15% of the women. NRDP reaches only between 6% and 20% of the women. The targets are nowhere reached. I don't know where the fault lies. I don't know whether the fault lies in the delivery system or in the decentralised attitude of the people implementing them. The intention is noble but the fact remains that it simply does not reach the beneficiaries who are women and they remain in a state of complete tragedy in which they have been all these years. Now, the whole trend is towards modernisation which the hon. Members would be raising just now with specific reference to coir industry, match-box industry, beedi industry, textile industry, plantation, coal-mines and pharmaceuticals. There has been a massive displacement of female labour as a result of modernisation.

Sir, between 1974 and 1981 many many workers got displaced. Many workers lost their jobs. Out of those workers, fourteen lakh women lost their jobs because of the powerlooms. As a result, the total employment of women in textile and jute industries came down from 60% to 30%. This is the amount of displacement that had occurred.

Sir, in 1984, in all the tobacco centres of Andhra Pradesh more than 50% women lost their jobs. Take the mining industry. Usually the loaders are all women. As a result of modernisation, all these women-loaders have lost their jobs. Even the Baveja Committee, which was appointed by the Central Government had recommended, as a matter of fact, the retrenchment of loaders who happened to be women. The retrenchment of these loaders had been recommended by the Committee itself. The retrenchment is done. Modernisation is a fact of life. Modernisation is something which the country has to do to keep in step with the progress to keep in tune with the time, to keep abreast of the time. I, for one, have no quarrel with modernisation or liberalisation. My

point is this. When something is inevitable, when we think that India has to join the stream of countries which go for modernisation and liberalisation, when we are opening the doors of our country to keep up with the progress that takes place all over the world, what are we doing for these women who are greater sufferers? My plea to the hon. Minister would be to take steps. We can provide instance after instance, industry after industry, where women, who are at the very lowest rung, are retrenched, are losing their jobs and are not being rehabilitated. The Government should take steps to see that alternate job avenues are provided, these women are trained in modern technology, these women are able to retain one part of their job at least so that while we are trying to keep up with time these women do not get thrown back into poverty and drudgery. Sir, even those women, who have got work, operate under inhuman conditions for paltry amounts. You take the Equal Remuneration Act. The Minister has provided some details in the annual report.

Sir, the Minister has provided some details in the Annual Report where he says, "This is the position of implementation of the Equal Remuneration Act". I read out the details. The number of inspections conducted at the State and UT level was 2,30,740. The number of violations detected was 13,889. The number of those rectified was 9,870. The number of prosecutions was 996. The number of cases which were disposed of was 442 and the number of convictions was 410. So, out of 2,30,000 inspections, you had 410 convictions and one acquittal. So, about 14,000 violations are detected and only 9,000 are rectified. What happened to others? I would like to know this from the hon. Minister. Sir, they actually hide more than they tell us. You take the Central sphere, for instance. There is a very strange figure. I will point it out to the hon. Minister without taking the time of the House. The number of inspections itself was only 21,000. The number of violations was 22,000 and the number of those rectified was 23,000. If inspections are 21,000, I don't know how the number

of rectified has come to 23,000. I think there is something wrong with these figures. I would like the Minister to clarify these points. I would like to know how many cases have been detected and how many people have been prosecuted. I would also like to know how serious the Government is about prosecuting those employers who are recalcitrant under the Equal Remuneration Act. At this time I would like to make a serious plea to the hon. Minister. The Government has to show its seriousness. We have to make an example of erring employees. Unless you make an example of the people who are refusing to implement the Equal Remuneration Act even after so many years of Independence, they will continue to do it with total impunity. The Government has to take this with utmost seriousness and show a fist of steel in implementing the Equal Remuneration Act.

I have two more points to make. Before going on to specific recommendations about what I would like the hon. Minister to do with regard to ameliorating the lot of women labour in the country, I would like to say what my personal view is on the proposal of the Government to amend the Maternity Benefit Act restricting it to two children only. I know that the National Integration Council has also approved that move. I know that the Government has its own reasons for implementing this move. But I would like to make an earnest plea that the Government and the hon. Minister should reconsider whatever view they have taken in the light of the outcry all over the country from women's organisations and from the concerned women. Sir, this maternity benefit is something that is laid down in the Directive Principles of State Policy. This is supposed to be a provision which is beneficial to women. On the very basic issue of taking away a provision which is beneficial to women, I don't understand, why we need to amend it. Why should you restrict something for which we fought for so many years? The whole question of maternity is that women are performing a social function in the society today, because men cannot have children and women alone can have children. It is a

social functions. It is not merely a matter of pleasure. It is a social function. When there is a legislation which is beneficial to women, I fail to understand the rationale behind seeking to restrict this legislation. Secondly, I want to make it very clear that nobody is against the population control. Not one of us over here or outside or the women's organisations or anybody have any grievance against the population control. It is the most important burning issue which is before the country, by all means. I don't want to go far away.

For example, take the case of the State to which I belong. Tamil Nadu has a tremendously successful record of population control. This year we dropped below the replacement level. We dropped to zero. The reason why Tamil Nadu has succeeded in population control is the status of women in the State has improved.

It is well-known, it is axiomatic, that population can be controlled if the status of women in a society improves, if the literacy of women improves, if the age of marriage is raised, and if education and economic independence are given to women. The reason as to why the track record is so poor in certain States in the Northern parts of India is the status of women is lower there, the literacy of women is lower there, the Infant Mortality Ratio is poor and very little attention is paid to women's health. It is because of all these things that population becomes a problem. Instead of doing things in a negative way, instead of making women the target of all population controls, I would plead with the Government to do things in a productive way. This, in my submission, Sir, is something that needs serious reconsideration.

Sir, I have another point also with regard to the Maternity Benefits Act. The proposal for reconsidering it will make ridiculous certain other Acts which have been passed and which go far towards the welfare of women's health and of children. Take the case of infant's milk substitutes. Only two Sessions ago, this House passed a Bill where we said

that breast-feeding was most important to the child, that women had to be given time off from their work, that the infant milk substitutes should not be allowed to be advertised in the country. Now, if you are going to restrict all these benefits, then what do we do with this Act? You will restrict that also to two children only! Then, there is another question of amniocentesis. Women's organisations all over the country are under a terrible fear. There is already a very adverse male-female ratio in the country and the moment you restrict these benefits to two children only, all the women, who are pregnant, will come forward for this sex determination test, all the female foetuses will be aborted before they are born and the male-female ratio will become even more adverse in times to come. I know what the Government's thinking in this matter is. The hon. Minister was actually sensitive enough to call for a consultation. He had consultations with the concerned people, with women's groups all over the country. Unfortunately, I was not able to attend it. But I read from press reports that the Government was of the opinion that the percentage of women, who would be affected by that, was going to be very low because, in any case, the Maternity Benefits Act did not apply to women in the agricultural field. But 90 per cent of women are in agriculture. And it does not apply, apparently, to women either in the Government offices or in the public sector and, therefore, this particular provision will not apply to them either. In effect, it will apply to a miniscule percentage of women who are employed in factories only. Sir, my respectful submission is—this is no argument—let it apply to three sets of women only but don't restrict the benefits which have already been given. On the other hand, the Committee on the Status of Women has recommended that the Maternity Benefits Act should be extended to women in agriculture also. And, here, we are doing something which is going all the way round to cutting it down from even those people for whom it applies. The second reasoning was—I am mentioning it again from press reports: I was not present in that meeting—it would actually encourage

employers to employ women in greater numbers because they wouldn't have to shell out money for children beyond the second child and therefore, a large number of women would be employed. With great respect, I don't think that this submission is valid because women are not employed on the basis of whether they are given the maternity benefits or not; they are employed because they are the cheapest labour available. Till today, they are the cheapest labour available and they will continue to be employed for that reason and somebody who is not giving them this benefit will not give them the benefit for the first child or the second child. Finally, my submission, Sir, is very simple. I only want to say that women alone should not be made to bear the brunt of population control. By all means, population control is required. But please extend it to men. Please block their promotions. What steps are you taking against men who are having more than two children? Block their avenues of promotion. Provide disincentives for these men. Once you finish exhausting all these alternatives, you can come to women and, by all means, you can apply all these rules. One more thing is, before you restrict the maternity leave for two children only, extend whatever benefits are existing, to women in the field of agriculture. Do something in return. Extend the benefits to those women who are slogging away in the unorganised field without any hope of salvation. Take productive steps. Take some steps to ameliorate the lives of women. Then, you can, as usual, make them bear the brunt of population.

Sir, I want to conclude by quoting from the report of the Committee on the Status of Women which dealt with the question of women's employment and the women in labour.

"We therefore, recommend the adoption of a well-defined policy to fulfil the constitutional directives and Government's long-term objective of total involvement of women in national development. This policy will need to be implemented carefully to avoid wages by direct or indirect methods. Apart from specific

occupations from which women are debarred by law, employers should not be permitted to exclude women from any occupation unless the basis for their unsuitability is clearly defined."

"The Committee recommends integrated development of training and employment and the reservation of a definite quota for women for training within the industry in order to arrest retrenchment as a consequence of modernisation."

Sir, there are two other recommendations which relate to this. They are as follows :

"...for specific provisions being made for part-time employment for women by suitable amendments in the recruitment rules and service conditions, of expanding the information system so that women are aware of the kind of employment that is open to them with a specific qualification."

"...provision for re-entry for women, for special leave without pay, in all manner of occupations and steps to organise labour unions in the field of agriculture and other industries where such organisations do not exist and formation of women wings in all trade unions to look after the problems of women workers and to improve women's participation in trade union activities."

Thank you, Sir.

श्री जगदीश प्रसाद मायूर (उत्तर प्रदेश) :
श्रीमन्, मैं अपनी बात प्रारंभ करने से पहले श्रीमती जयंती नटराजन ने जो कुछ महिला श्रमिकों के संबंध में कहा, उसका पूरा समर्थन करता हूँ और इस कारण से मैं उस विषय को छोड़ूंगा नहीं।

श्रीमन्, श्रम मंत्रालय के कुछ विशेष उद्देश्य हैं। मैं उन्हें पूरा नहीं पढ़ना चाहता, लेकिन उनके प्रारंभ में कहा गया है कि —

"...to promote harmonious relationship between labour and management and to regulate wages, etc., to ensure speedy implementation of the labour laws..."

श्रीमन् जमाना बदल गया है। मेरा कहना यह है कि लेबर मिनिस्ट्री को भी अपने उद्देश्यों में कुछ और चीजें जोड़नी चाहिए क्योंकि इन दिनों दुनिया बहुत कुछ बदली है। श्रीमन् भारत में भी श्रम आंदोलन बदल रहा है और उसे बदलना भी चाहिए था क्योंकि भारत में और दुनिया में अब तक श्रम आंदोलन राजनीतिक हथियार के रूप में इस्तेमाल किया जाता था। खास तौर से जबकि अंग्रेजों का राज था उस समय और आजादी के बाद भी श्रम आंदोलन वामपंथी दलों के हाथों में था जिन्होंने कि कभी भी श्रम आंदोलन को स्वतंत्र रूप से स्वीकार नहीं किया और वह राजनीतिक हथियार के रूप में ही इस्तेमाल होता रहा है। श्रीमन् आज स्थिति बदली है और कुछ आंदोलन शुरू हुए हैं जिन्होंने कि राजनीति से ऊपर उठकर कार्य प्रारंभ किया है। दूसरा कारण इसका यह भी है कि आज दुनिया का नक्शा बदला है और रूस के विघटन के पश्चात् चायना ने खुले बाजार की नीति को अपनाया है। जैसे कि उदाहरण के लिए मैं भी इस बात का समर्थक हूँ कि "गैट" को स्वीकार नहीं किया जाना चाहिए, लेकिन चायना "गैट" की संधि अपनाना चाहता है। श्रीमन् मैंने यह उदाहरण केवल इसलिए दिया है कि जिस प्रकार से दुनिया की राजनीति में बदलाव हुआ है, उसके कारण भारत के श्रम आंदोलन में भी एक परिवर्तन होना आवश्यक है और अनिवार्य है कि श्रम आंदोलन को एक राजनीतिक हथियार के रूप में इस्तेमाल नहीं किया जाना चाहिए।

दूसरे हमारे भारत सरकार की नीति में भी बहुत बड़ा परिवर्तन आया है। अब तक समाजवाद ही एक मुख्य मुद्दा था जिसके कारण से अधिकांशतः जितने भी श्रमिक आंदोलन थे, वह एक तरह से सरकार वरसे श्रमिक थे। आज जब भारत सरकार की नीति बदली है, दरवाजे खोले हैं और लिबर-लाइजेशन हो रहा है तो इस कारण से भी परिवर्तन आया है।

3.00 P. M.

रिश्ते बदल रहे हैं, बदलने पड़ेंगे और बदलने चाहिए। इसलिए एक आवश्यकता इस बात की है कि हमारा श्रम मंत्रालय केवल एक मध्यस्थ का ही कार्य न करे क्योंकि अब तक उसका मुख्य काम एक मध्यस्थ का था कि किस प्रकार से श्रमिक के अधिकारों की रक्षा की जाए और किस प्रकार से मालिकों के हित की भी रक्षा की जाए। कल तक वास्तव में समाजवाद के कारण से मुख्यतया कारखाने, कल-कारखाने सरकार के हाथ में थे तो

यह संघर्ष सरकार और श्रम आंदोलन के बीच में था। आज स्थिति बदली है, इसलिए मैं संगमा साहब का इस ओर ध्यान चाहूंगा कि वह केवल एक मध्यस्थ के रूप में काम न करते हुए एक नीति परिवर्तन लाएं कि किस प्रकार से राजनीति से अलग, राजनैतिक हथियार के रूप में उसको न करने वाला एक श्रम आंदोलन जो स्वस्थ प्रारंभ हो चुका है, ऐसे आंदोलन को वह शक्तिशाली बनाएँ। मेरा निवेदन यह नहीं है कि किसी विशेष संगठन, किसी विशेष आंदोलन को साथ लिया जाए, लेकिन केवल एक दृष्टि का, एक निगाह का, एक एप्रोच के परिवर्तन का प्रश्न है, वह बदलना चाहिए।

दूसरे एक ओर उद्देश्य जोड़ा जाना चाहिए। आज तक हड़तालों के कारण से अथवा अन्य आंदोलनों के कारण हमारा प्रोडक्शन गिरता रहा है। हमारे उद्देश्यों में, लेबर मिनिसटर के उद्देश्य लक्ष्यों में यह भी हो कि हम किस प्रकार से अपना प्रोडक्शन बढ़ाएं। मात्र प्रोडक्शन बढ़ाने से काम नहीं चलेगा, लेबर प्रोडक्टिविटी भी देखना होगी। हमारे भारत की प्रोडक्टिविटी सबसे कम है। मैं सारी फिंगर्स तो नहीं दूंगा, लेकिन आपकी जो लेटेस्ट रिपोर्ट है उस ओर आपका ध्यान दिलाना चाहूंगा। जापान में जहां 28,640 है, इंडोनेशिया में 1,588 है और पाकिस्तान में 1,436 है, वहीं हिन्दुस्तान में केवल 865 है। तो यह श्रम प्रोडक्टिविटी यानी लेबर प्रोडक्टिविटी को किस प्रकार से बढ़ाया जाएगा, यह भी हमारे श्रम मंत्रालय के लक्ष्यों में सम्मिलित होना चाहिए।

तीसरा लक्ष्य यह होना चाहिए, जो मैंने लिबर-लाइजेशन की बात कही है, एक नए प्रकार के आंदोलन की बात कही है, उसमें यह श्रम पैदा न हो कि हम लोग, मेरी पार्टी मजदूरों के अधिकारों की रक्षा के लिये या उनके हितों की रक्षा के लिए संघर्ष करने के विरुद्ध हैं। नहीं, दोनों साथ चलना चाहिए। आज साझेदारी जैसी नीति नहीं है, साझेदारी सबकी हो, श्रम की हो, पंजी की भी हो और सरकार की भी हो, परन्तु सरकार की अब तक की जो रेखाएं हैं उनको कुछ थोड़ा सा विस्तृत करना चाहिए। उसके साथ एक सीमा भी सरकार खींचे। क्यों? क्योंकि जैसा मैंने कहा, सारी स्थिति बदल रही है।

महोदय, मुझे यह कहते हुए थोड़ा खेद हो रहा है, संगमा साहब के वक्तव्य की ओर ध्यान दिलाना चाहूंगा, जो उन्होंने कुछ दिन पहले दिया था। संगमा साहब का स्वयं का यह वक्तव्य है। वक्तव्य में आपने कहा है—

"Our focus here henceforth is going to change from policy of employment protection to policy of employment generation."

आपने बहुत ठीक कहा कि एम्प्लायमेंट जनरेशन होना चाहिए, लेकिन आपने कहा चेन्ज का, जो एम्प्लायमेंट प्रोटेक्शन है वह नहीं करेंगे। इसका मतलब है कि आप कहीं न कहीं छंटनी करने का इरादा रखते हैं। ऐसा कहा है। रिट्रेजमेंट की शायद सरकार की पालिसी है। क्यों? क्योंकि आई० एम० एफ० के लोन के कारण, वर्ल्ड बैंक के दबाव कारण से, इंटरनेशनल जो बड़े-बड़े मल्टीनेशनल आ रहे हैं उनके कारण से, मांग आ रही है, दबाव आ रहा है कि हमें छूट रहनी चाहिए, लेबर-लाज बदलिये, कि जितनी चाहे हम लेबर रखें, जितनी न चाहे न रखें। इसी प्रकार संभ्रा जी, आपने अपने वक्तव्य में यह और कहा है कि आठ दस साल के भीतर 94 मिलियन लोग बेकार हो जाएंगे। मैं आपकी फिगर को कोई चुनौती नहीं दे रहा, लेकिन केवल यह इंगित करना चाहता हूँ कि आपके स्वयं के मंत्रालय के मन-मस्तिष्क में बैठा हुआ है कि आप मजदूरों की संख्या कम करेंगे। यह किस कारण से? इस कारण से कि आपकी मिनिस्टरी और फाइनेंस मिनिस्टरी के अंदर कोई तालमेल नहीं है। है, तो कहां है तालमेल? अभी बजट आया इस साल का। उसमें ऐसी एक्साइज्ड इयूटी लगाई है, जिसके कारण सैकड़ों कारखाने बंद होने पर हैं। अब जहां यह कारखाने बंद होंगे तो इससे बेकारी फैलने वाली है। आप तो सिर्फ यह वादा दे सकते हैं कि रिट्रेजमेंट नहीं करेंगे, लेकिन मैं जानता हूँ, आप मजबूरी में आकर ऐसी बात कहते हैं। आप इसे कहां तक कैसे लागू करेंगे? अभी आपने इसी महीने 9 अप्रैल को एक समझौता किया एन० टी० सी० मिल के बारे में। मैं स्वीकार करता हूँ कि आपने समझौता किया कि कोई कारखाना बंद नहीं होगा।।.....

बी० एफ० आई० आर० को भी आप शायद कोई एन० टी० सी० मिल नहीं देंगे या दे रहे हैं तो देकर के उसको रिसैटल करेंगे। आपने ठीक किया है लेकिन आपकी नीति और फाइनेंस मंत्रालय की नीति में एक ऐसा अंतर-विरोध है कि फाइनेंस मिनिस्टर का मत था जो उनकी कारगुजारी है, वह इस बात पर मजबूर कर रही है कि आप मजदूरों की छंटनी करें। आपने जिसको कहा है गोल्डन शोक हैड, गोल्डन शोक हैड केवल एक ऊपर का डचा है, एक ढोंग है जिसके भीतर आप मजदूरों

की छंटनी करना चाहते हैं। हमारे पास रिपोर्टें हैं, आपके पास भी रिपोर्टें होंगी, सैकड़ों-हजारों ऐसे लोग हैं जिनको कि बुलाकर कहा जाता है, मिल-मालिक या कारखानेदार कहते हैं या पब्लिक सेक्टर के अधिकारी कहते हैं कि आप छोड़ दो, चले जाओ। हजार, दस हजार, बीस हजार या पचास हजार रुपया लो। आप 15 दिन की सेलेरी देने के बाद या थोड़ा सा उनको पैसा देने के बाद उनको रिट्रेबिलिटी नहीं कर सकते। मैं पूछना चाहूँगा कि बी० आई० एफ० आर० के अंदर, जिसको आप गोल्डन हैड शोक कहते हैं, आपने कितने मजदूरों को रिट्रेबिलिटी किया, कितनों की आपने पैसा देकर के छुट्टी की और उन्होंने कारखाने लगा लिए? आपको एक भी ऐसा नहीं मिलेगा। तो मैं चाहूँगा कि श्रम मंत्रालय और फाइनेंस मंत्रालय के बीच में कोई तालमेल हो, कोई तालमेल आपको पैदा करना चाहिए। अब इनमें से दो-तीन बातें निकलती हैं, मैं केवल इस समय नीति की बात कह रहा हूँ, बाकी परटिकुलर बाद में आऊँगा। आज तक तीन साझेदार रहे हैं—कारखानेदार, मजदूर, सरकार। आज जब आपने नीतियों में परिवर्तन किया है, आवश्यक है कि आप अपना पैर पीछे हटा लीजिए। जिसको मैं रेफर करूँ, बाई परटाइट एग्रीमेंट। बाई परटाइट मीन्स, आज काम करेगा। कहां पर कौन सा मामला, मजदूर यूनियन है, कहीं पर जिसको एडजुडिकेशन के लिए या किसी अदालत में ले जाए, आप छुट्टी कर दीजिए। आपने पक्का होगा, आप ही की कमेटी है—रामानुजम कमेटी है, उन्होंने कहा है कि आपकी बीच में पड़ने की आवश्यकता नहीं है, श्रम और कारखाने के बीच में होने दीजिए कि कौनसा झगड़ा है और कहां पर तय होगा। लेकिन इसमें मेरा कहना कदापि यह नहीं है कि आप अपने आपको बिल्कुल बरी कर ले और जब चाहे आप कह कि आपने खुद ही तो कहा है कि छंटनी न की जाए। जिन मामलों में आपको हस्तक्षेप करना चाहिए, वहां करना आवश्यक होगा। जैसे आपके कायदे से एन० ओ०, यानी जहां पर कि आवश्यकता है कि रिटेन करे या न करे, कारखाना बंद करे या न करे, ले आफ करे या न करे, ऐसी बातों में तो आपको सरकार के अधिकारों का संरक्षण करना आवश्यक होगा। मोटे तौर पर मैं कह सकता हूँ कि जो रामानुजम कमेटी की रिपोर्टें हैं, उस पर आपने बहस की है, आपने स्वीकार भी किया है, उसमें से मोटी-मोटी जो दो-चार बातें हैं, उनका मैं उल्लेख करता हूँ। जितनी बातें हैं उनको आप स्वीकार करिए, लागू करिए। आज कमेटी की रिपोर्ट आए कितने दिन हो गए, वर्षों होने को आए, लेकिन आपने आज

तक कोई फैसला नहीं किया, क्यों नहीं किया ? उन फैसलों को जल्दी से जल्दी लागू किया जाना चाहिए। रामानुजम कमेटी की रिपोर्ट का उल्लेख करते हुए मैं दो-तीन बातों का उल्लेख करूंगा। खुद कहा है, जैसा मैंने पहले कहा कि आप अपना गूबार निकाल लीजिए, बाई परटाइट इसका एक हल है। इंडिपेंडेंट इंडस्ट्रियल रिलेशन्स कमीशन, आप कमिटेड हैं, मैं पूछना चाहूंगा कि इंडस्ट्रियल रिलेशन्स कमीशन कब बना देंगे, आप कब तक कायम कर देंगे ? इंडस्ट्रियल डिस्प्यूट एक्ट, 1947, सैक्शन 29 और 25 (ओ), जब मैंने पहले अभी उल्लेख किया कि जब तक इंडिपेंडेंट इंडस्ट्रियल रिलेशन्स कमीशन बना नहीं, उस समय तक आपको अपने हाथ में जो अधिकार हैं, 25(एन) और 25 (ओ) हैं, अर्थात् जहां पर कारखाना बंद का सवाल है, जहां पर छंटनी का सवाल है, जहां पर ले आफ का सवाल है, जहां पर वर्ल्ड बैंक के दबाव के अंदर आने का सवाल है, उसको आप अपने हाथ में रखें, न जाने दे।

एक बात और मैं कहना चाहूंगा लेबर कोर्ट्स के बारे में। आज लेबर कोर्ट्स आपके अधीन है। संगमा जी, मैं चाहूंगा कि आप इस पर जरा ध्यान दें। आज लेबर कोर्ट्स है, हाई कोर्ट उनको एक्वाइट कर देता है, फिर वह आपके अधीन काम करते हैं, आपके अधीन करने की आवश्यकता नहीं है। क्यों ? अगर दूसरी अदालतें आजाद रह सकती हैं तो लेबर कोर्ट आजाद क्यों नहीं रहती ? आप उनको अधिकार दे दें, टर्मस वरैरह सब कुछ आपके अधीन है। इनको आपको स्वतंत्र करना अत्यंत आवश्यक है। अब दूसरा हिस्सा मैं कहूंगा लेबर पार्टिसिपेशन।

आप अगर स्वतंत्र कर रहे हैं, लिबरेलाइजेशन कर रहे हैं और मेरी मांग है कि आप सरकार के हस्तक्षेप को कम से कम करें इन झगड़ों के बीच में, तो उसके साथ रास्ता क्या है ? रास्ता है—लेबर पार्टिसिपेशन का। आप साझेदारी करिए। आज तक दो रास्ते माने जा चुके हैं। या तो सरकार कारखाने की मालिक हो या मिल मालिक हो। दूसरा रास्ता है, आज जैसा मैंने कहा—श्रम आंदोलन, तीसरे प्रकार का चत्ताना पड़ेगा जिसमें सरकार हो मगर बीच में कम हो और साझेदारी हो। ऐसे एक्सपेरिमेंट हुए हैं जिसमें कुछ कारखाने चल रहे हैं। बंगाल के मिल का आज उदाहरण है, जहां पर लेबर ने लिया है। आज जो सिक मिल है जिनकी कई लाख की संख्या हो चुकी है, ऐसे छोटे-बड़े कारखाने मिलाकर उनमें से आपने कितने

मजदूरों को इसमें सम्मिलित किया है ? अगर आप चाहेंगे तो उदाहरण पड़े हुए हैं कि जहां पर मजदूरों ने चाहा कि हम कारखाना चलायेंगे। लेकिन उन्होंने कहा कि पिछली जो लॉयबिलिटीज हैं जिनकी जिम्मेदारी उनकी नहीं है, उन लॉयबिलिटीज को आप छोड़ दीजिए, हमें नया प्रारम्भ करने दीजिए। लेकिन आप उसको स्वीकार नहीं करते, उल्टा उसको बी० आई० एफ० आर० के जिम्मेदार रखते हैं। तो मैं कहूंगा कि तीसरा रास्ता—ऑनर-शिप का आप अपनाएं। आज जिसके बहुत से तरीके हैं लेबर पार्टिसिपेशन के, यह मेरा आपको दूसरा सुझाव है। मैं अंत में आ रहा हूँ, क्योंकि मेरे जो दूसरे सार्थक बोलेंगे उनके लिए समय छोड़ना आवश्यक है।

बहुत से ऐसे कायदे-कानून हैं जो पुराने हो चुके हैं। मैं तो कहूंगा कि जितने आपके लेबर लॉ हैं, लगभग सब आउट आफ टाईम हैं, समय बीत चुका है। एक भी कानून ऐसा नहीं है जो परिवर्तन नहीं चाहता हो। क्या कारण है कि आपके पेमेंट आफ वेजेज एक्ट, मिनिमम वेजेज एक्ट, इंडस्ट्रियल डिस्प्यूट एक्ट, एम्प्लोइज प्रोविडेंट फंड एक्ट में इतनी लिमिटेशन हैं ? क्यों लगा रखी हैं ? कहीं पर लिमिटेशन 25 हजार की है, 25 सी की है, तीन हजार की है। इनकी आवश्यकता क्यों है, यह कब लगी थी ? आज से लगभग बीस साल पहले जबकि रुपए की कीमत आज से ज्यादा थी। आज इनमें परिवर्तन कीजिए। बल्कि मेरा तो कहना यह है कि आज जितनी भी लिमिटेशन है उड़ा लीजिए। जो भी आपकी वर्कमैन की व्याख्या के अंदर आता है, वर्कमैन की व्याख्या में जहां यह आपके सेलेरी के, वेजेज के लिमिटेशन हैं वहां भी और भी व्याख्या है। तो इस व्याख्या से उसे बाहर कर दीजिए और जो बाकी व्याख्या वर्कमैन की है, उस वर्कमैन की व्याख्या लगाने के बाद आप छोड़ दीजिए। अब बोनस एक्ट है। क्या जरूरी है कि आप 8.33 से बंधे हुए हैं ? आपने आज से 14-15 साल पहले 8.33 का बोनस एक्ट लगाया था। क्यों ? अब उसमें भी मैं आपका इशारा चाहूंगा। आप समझ रहे हैं, मैं समझ रहा हूँ जो मंत्री महोदय से परिचित हैं वह समझ रहे हैं। वह बात पुरानी हो चुकी है। आज मजदूर मांग कर रहा है कि 8.33 को बदलकर के 12.5 को लाइए। क्या दिक्कत है आपको लाने में ? यह परिवर्तन करना आवश्यक है।

बेलफेयर डरल वर्कर्स—बहुत दिनों तक इस विषय को आपने लटका कर रखा है। क्यों ? आज से

बहुत साल पहले एक कमेटी बनी थी, जिसकी आपके पास उसकी आउट लाईंस पड़ी हुई हैं। आप उसको क्यों नहीं लागू करते? आपको लागू करना चाहिए। ऐसे ही कंस्ट्रक्शन वर्क्स बिल है। आपके मंत्रालय ने बार-बार यह वायदा किया है कि इसको हम लाएंगे। मसौदा भी बना था, एक कमेटी भी बनी थी जिसने आपको रिकमंडेशंस की हैं। आप उस पर कुछ भी काम नहीं कर रहे हैं। तो मेरा अनुरोध यह होगा कि आप इसको जल्दी से जल्दी लगाएं। एक कांटेक्ट लेबर है, जो हमारे देश में सबसे बड़ा सौदा बनी हुई है। रेलवे से लेकर अन्य जगह जो सरकारी कारखाने हैं, उनमें भी कांटेक्ट लेबर है। मैं केवल बीड़ी मजदूरों की बात नहीं कर रहा हूँ। कांटेक्ट लेबर में क्या हानि है, उसको मुझे बताने की आवश्यकता नहीं है। उसको पूरी वेजेज नहीं मिलती, जो आपके लेबर लां हैं उसकी सुविधा नहीं मिलती। आप इसके समाप्ति के लिए कब और कैसे क्या करेंगे, मैं जानना चाहूंगा?

आप इस कांटेक्ट लेबर को कब और कैसे समाप्त करेंगे यह मैं जानना चाहता हूँ। ऐसे ही मोटे तौर से अब मैं दूसरी बात लेता हूँ। बचावत वेज बोर्ड बना। कितने लोग हैं जो बचावत वेज बोर्ड से लाभान्वित हुए? कितने पक्कारों को फायदा हुआ? फिगर्स अगर आप देखें तो किसी भी स्टेट ने इसको पूरी तरह से लागू नहीं किया। मेरे बंगाल के साथी नाराज होंगे लेकिन मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि सबसे अधिक अगर किसी ने बचावत वेज बोर्ड की रिकमंडेशंस को लागू नहीं किया तो वह है वैस्ट बंगाल। बैकट बंगाल ने सबसे ज्यादा इसका उल्लंघन किया है। मैं पूछना चाहूंगा कि वैस्ट बंगाल सरकार से लेकर केंद्र शासित प्रदेशों तक आप कब बचावत वेज बोर्ड की रिकमंडेशंस को लागू करेंगे? आपने दूसरा वेज बोर्ड बना दिया है लेकिन उसकी रिपोर्ट आने में 5-6 साल लग जाएंगे, उससे पहले नहीं होगा। तो फिर आवश्यकता इस बात की है कि जो रिकमंडेशंस बचावत बोर्ड की हैं, उनको पूरी तरह से लागू किया जाए।

जयंती नटराजन जी ने महिलाओं की बात कही। मैं उसका दूसरा पक्ष लेना चाहता हूँ। एग्रीकल्चर लेबर में अन-आर्गेनाइज्ड लेबर, आर्गेनाइज्ड लेबर की तुलना में कहीं अधिक है इसलिए आपको देखना चाहिए कि आप उनको किस प्रकार से फायदा पहुंचा सकते हैं। आपको याद होगा कि जनता पार्टी की सरकार के समय मैं एग्रीकल्चर लेबर के बारे में एक कमेटी बनी थी और उसने एक मसौदा तैयार किया था लेकिन वह अभी तक बट्टे खाते

में पड़ा हुआ है। क्यों? आप उसको निकालिए और देखिए कि आप क्या कार्यवाही कर सकते हैं।

मैं दो-तीन बातें और कहकर अपनी बात समाप्त करूंगा। मैं पेमेंट ऑफ बोनस ऐक्ट के बारे में कह रहा था। उसी को रिपीट करना चाहूंगा कि पेमेंट ऑफ बोनस ऐक्ट में परिवर्तन की कोई निश्चित तिथि मुझे बताने की कृपा करेंगे तो मैं बहुत आभारी रहूंगा। दूसरी बात मैंने रामानुजम कमेटी की कही थी। उस बारे में मैं कहना चाहूंगा कि कारखानेदार जान-बूझकर ले-ऑफ कर देते हैं और खास तौर से आपके जो पब्लिक सेक्टर के लोग हैं, वे भी इसका मिस यूज करते हैं। आज ले-ऑफ के लिए आपकी कोई नीति नहीं है। मेरे ब्याल से दो परपत्र से ले-ऑफ होता है। एक तो जान-बूझकर किया जाता है केवल मजदूर को तंग करने के लिए। अगर माल मेरे पास बचा हुआ है, बिकता नहीं है, मैं बिजली उठाकर बंद कर दूँ, बिजली के बिल का पेमेंट न करूँ तो ले-ऑफ हो जाएगा। आखिर मजदूर की क्या खता है, क्या जुर्म है कि उसको पैसा न दिया जाए? तो मेरा सुझाव यह होगा कि ऐसी स्थिति में जब कि जान-बूझकर, शराबत से ले-ऑफ किया जाए अर्थात् ऐसे कारण जो कारखानेदार के हाथ में हैं, जैसा कि मैंने अभी उदाहरण दिया कि मेरा कारखाना चल रहा है, माल पड़ा हुआ है, मैं चाहता हूँ कि ले-ऑफ कर दूँ तो मैं बिजली के बिल का पेमेंट नहीं करता और बिजली कट जाती है और कारखाना बंद हो जाता है। मजदूरों को कहा जाता है कि तुम्हारी छुट्टी, 50 परसेंट ले लो, तो ऐसी स्थिति में इस तरह का नियम आप बनाइए कि जो कारण स्विनिमित है, उनमें कारखानेदार को पूरी सैलरी मजदूरों को देनी होगी। यदि किसी अन्य कारण से ले-ऑफ होता है, जो उसके हाथ की बात नहीं है तो ऐसी स्थिति में आप 50 परसेंट दीजिए। मेरा निवेदन यह है कि ले-ऑफ की जो विधि है, उस विधि में आपको इस तरह से परिवर्तन करना चाहिए कि मजदूरों के हितों की रक्षा होती रहे।

अंत में एक और बात मैं आपके सामने रखना चाहूंगा। इंडियन लेबर कॉन्फ्रेंस आपकी है और उसकी स्टैंडिंग कमेटी भी है लेकिन उसकी आखिरी मीटिंग कब हुई थी? 8 साल पहले हुई थी। स्टैंडिंग कमेटी है लेकिन आप मीटिंग नहीं करते।

तो यह तो मेरा कहना नहीं है कि आप आज ही मीटिंग कर ले लेकिन मेरा निवेदन यह है कि आप यहां से डेलिगेशन भेज देते हैं, आइ० एल० ओ० में जाते हैं मगर हिन्दुस्तान की जो लेबर कॉन्फ्रेंस है

जिसकी स्टैंडिंग कमेटीज है उनके द्वारा कोई कार्यवाही नहीं कर सकते तो आइ० एल० ओ० में जाने और उसकी शोभा बढ़ाने का कोई अर्थ नहीं है। स्टैंडिंग कमेटी की मीटिंग भी आप करवाइए, यह मेरा निवेदन है।

अंतिम बात मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि सारी दुनिया में, सारे संसार में आज श्रम आन्दोलन की जो गति बदल रही है, जो दिशा बदल रही है उसको आज राजनीतिक हथियार के रूप में इस्तेमाल किया जाता है, उसकी आवश्यकता नहीं है। तीन मुद्दे जो मैंने उठाए थे, उन्हीं पर आप्रह्न करते हुए मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि आज राजनीति से ऊपर उठकर चलने वाले श्रम आन्दोलन की आवश्यकता है। उसके साथ ही आप पाटिज्म खत्म करें, सरकार का दखल मजदूरों के हितों का जहाँ तक सवाल है कम कीजिए और अंत में प्रोडक्टिविटी बढ़ाइए। ये दो तीन लक्ष्य लेकर आप अपनी नीति में आमूलचूल परिवर्तन करें। मैं अपने साम्यवादी मित्रों से निवेदन करता कि आज के श्रम आन्दोलन को केवल राजनीतिक हथियार के रूप में जो आप इस्तेमाल कर रहे हैं उससे उसको मुक्त होने दे और एक स्वस्थ, एक ऐसा आन्दोलन जो देश के हित में कार्य कर सके, उसे उभारने के लिए आपको अपनी नीति में, अपनी दृष्टि में आवश्यक परिवर्तन करना होगा।

धन्यवाद।

SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY (Pondicherry): Today labour is the very nerve of the Indian economy. When the new Government under the leadership of the hon. Prime Minister, Shri P. V. Narsimha Rao, took the reins of administration in the country, the new economic policy, the new industrial policy and also the new import-export policy were announced by the Government and are being implemented. Under these circumstances the importance of labour force has become all the more greater for the Indian economy. The reason is that in the Western and developed countries the labour has become costly while in India it is considered moderate. I can even say it is cheap when compared to other countries. A lot of the Western and developed countries have now started investing in our country. Therefore, the Labour Ministry has to play a vital role for the purpose of giving boost to the new economy and also the industrial development of this country. I am one who ad-

mires the Minister for his capability and also for his forthright commitment to the labour. He said several times in this House and outside that the thrust of the Government now is not protection of labour, but of creation of job opportunities in the country. That is in consonance with the new economic policy announced by the Government in 1991. When that is being brought about, the broader thrust under the labour policy should be to see that there is economic growth, that there is not only protection, but also industrial sickness is avoided in the country, that productivity of the economy also improves in the country, and, further competitive advantage is maintained in the wage policies. I would like to submit that out of a total of 35 million employees in the country, the people who are covered by the rules, regulations and Acts are not even 45 per cent.

The remaining are in the unorganised sector, the rural sector and the urban sector. Several legislations have been brought forward by the Government to give protection to the people who are employed in various fields in this country. But to our displeasure, most of the enactments have not been implemented in right earnest. The hon. Minister may say, "The Central Government is only a monitoring agency and only the State Governments have to implement it." I quite agree with the hon. Minister in this regard. But I would like to submit that as a monitoring agency since the provisions of the Act relate to labour welfare and regulation of labour, it is the duty of the Labour Ministry to take care of the laws and have them implemented in the States.

Even today we have been telling proudly that bonded labour has been abolished. But day in and day out we find either in Andhra Pradesh or Orissa or in Karnataka or in Bihar or in the Northern States or in the Southern States, a new item appearing in the newspapers that still some people are working as bonded labourers in the remote villages.

SHRI M. A. BABY: Not in Parliament?

SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY: This bonded labour system is in the Communist party only, but not in other parties.

SHRI M. A. BABY : Why do you get agitated over such an innocent question ?

SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY : Though we proudly say that the bonded labour system has been abolished in all the States, still it is continuing in some States. The Minister has been touring the length and breadth of this entire country, he has been meeting the people, he has been interacting with them and he will frankly admit that the bonded labour system has not been fully abolished today. It has been one of the 20-point programmes. In spite of monitoring by the States, they have not been able to control it because of the local conditions, the economic conditions. The people's living conditions are mainly responsible for it. In this area, the Labour Ministry should play a vital role. The people should be educated. The rural people should be given proper education regarding evils of the bonded labour system. Their economic condition has to be improved. For the purpose of improving their conditions, the only way out is economic prosperity. For bringing about economic prosperity, rural industries have to be developed. For developing rural industries, agricultural inputs should come in. When the agricultural inputs come in, the rural industries will come. For that we need funds. The senior hon. friend, Mr. Jagdish Prasad Mathur said, "You are approaching the World Bank. You are approaching the IMF. You are getting funds from them. Now you are trying to bring more foreign investment for the purpose of development." For the purpose of development and for productive purposes, getting loans is not a sin. It has been done even by the developed countries. I would go to the extent of saying that we need higher production and more productivity in this country. When we get more funds from abroad, for the purpose of our development, after some-time we will be in a position to repay the same. We can also generate more employment opportunities. Therefore, his argument that we are going to the World Bank and the IMF is a foregone theory. Even Russia and China have given up their old theory. We have seen it. Today, we are in a practical world where we have to compete with other Western countries and other developed countries.

India has got the potential to develop. It can mobilise resources from whichever source it comes. Therefore, for the purpose of development of the rural areas, there should be a definite enactment to regulate the employment of rural labour. In fact, several times we have raised this issue in this House. I am very much pained to note that nothing has been done in this regard. The hon. Minister had given a categorical assurance in this House that the Government would bring forward a legislation. Our hon. Member, Shri Gurudas Das Gupta was appointed as a Chairman of the Committee on Rural Labour. They visited various States. They have identified the areas where the people are being exploited. They have submitted a very comprehensive, a very good, report. It was appreciated even by the hon. Minister in this House. And then, the matter was left at that, with just appreciation. There was no follow-up action after that. Today, the people in rural areas, the people who are working in households, the people who are working in small, petty shops, are being exploited. Agricultural labourers and the people who are working in small industries in rural areas are being exploited. How are the people working in industries in rural areas exploited ? The industry owners there do not want to come within the purview of the Industrial Disputes Act. They employ on a regular basis people whose number is lower than the statutory prescription and escape the provisions of the Industrial Disputes Act. They employ people on contract from outside. This is what is being done by them to escape the provisions of labour laws. And the State Government has no machinery to control them. Even the monitoring agency which the hon. Minister mentions now has never been very active to see that these industries are also brought within the purview of labour laws. Agricultural labourers and other workers in rural areas are living in very poor conditions. Even today, in villages, women labourers are getting Rs. 2/- per day. And they start working at 8 a.m. and work till 5 p.m. Men are getting Rs. 7-8 per day. With the cost of living being what it is today, they have to take care of their family and the relations who come to their house and educate their children. There is a large number of drop-outs in the

schools in rural areas. This is because the parents have to forcibly employ their children because of their poor conditions. Unless and until the rural labour is regulated, the rural labour is given protection, the rural labour is given its due place, I would like to submit, the rural people will remain poorer and the urban people richer. That is going to be the situation. I feel this is a very right occasion for me to ask the hon. Minister when he is going to bring a legislation to be passed by this house so that it can be implemented in the various States. I would also like to bring this to the notice of the hon. Minister. In 1993, the Chief Ministers were called. A Labour Ministers' Conference was held and the hon. Minister had a discussion with them. Some of the Chief Ministers had apprehensions. They wanted some time to be given to them for giving consent. The various Chief Ministers and Labour Ministers will try to buy time. But I want the hon. Minister to bring the legislation which is going to give benefit to the rural people, immediately. When you are giving benefits to industrial workers, why should you not give benefits to rural workers and agricultural labourers? Why some Chief Ministers or Ministers want more time? What is the purpose behind it? I do not see any valid reason. In 1985, when I became a Member of this House, one of the hon. Members from the CPI moved a private Member's Bill. That Bill was later withdrawn on the assurance given in the House that a Bill would be brought in by the Government itself immediately. Now we are going to complete ten years since then. I want the hon. Minister to announce today in this August House when they are going to bring in legislation to give protection to the rural employees who have been exploited from day one. (*Interruption*). Sir, I do not want any running commentary. Then I will have to jump on to their party affairs.

DR. BAPU KALDATE (Maharashtra) : Baby is mischievous.

SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY : Babies are always mischievous.

Sir, the hon. Minister has visited South India and also most of North India. He knows that child labour is being exploited, whether it is the bangle industry or the

match industry or the coir industry or the carpet industry or any other field. The legislation is there for "prevention and protection of child labour". It was very guardedly worded by the hon. Minister. "Prevention and Protection". But nothing has been done. The enactment is very much there. But neither have they been given the protection nor is the child labour being prevented from working in the hazardous industries. In the match industry, a lot of child labour is working. The hon. Minister had a meeting with the employers and the parents. In order to give them benefit, he took steps to give them training. But, ultimately, what is happening? At the time when the Minister goes there, at the time when the officers go there, the employers see to it that the child labour does not come to the industry at all. After that, the regular phenomenon starts. In the match industry, more than 2 lakh children are employed. They are low-paid and they are being exploited in that industry. Because of the poverty condition, the parents send their children to this hazardous industry to eke out a living. They are working there. How much education will you give to two lakh children who are working there? We have seen this thing in the coir industry. Even in the carpet industry, we have seen this phenomenon in various States. For the purpose of regulating the child labour, provisions have been made. But what I am trying to say is that the State Governments have not taken any initiative to see that child labour is protected. I agree that the Minister is taking interest, and his Ministry is also coordinating. But, in the field, it is not being implemented. The Minister is taking interest, the Ministry is working, but the States are not implementing it. What are you going to do about it? The Minister cannot say that the State Governments are not co-operating. It should not be the reply of the hon. Minister. If it is so, it shows that your monitoring agency is not functioning properly. I will not accept that reply from the hon. Minister that it is the job of the State Governments. Let there be periodic inspections by your officers. Call a meeting of the Labour Ministers of the various States. What is happening in the States? The Labour Department in the States is practically non-working. Under the Factories Act, the

Labour Officers have to work in the field. They are not supposed to sit in their rooms and decide the things from there. It is one of the areas where the child labour should be given protection because children are the future of this country. They should be given education, they should be given training and all types of social benefits should be given to them. But they have been ignored. Therefore, though the Minister is taking keen interest in this field, things are not improving. I would like the Minister to take care of that area and see to it that the State Governments take steps to implement the Act in right earnest. As far as women labour is concerned, Shrimati Jayanthi Natarajan has raised this issue and said that they are being exploited.

SHRI M. A. BABY : In that context, I would like to request the hon. Minister, through you, Sir, that so far as Khasis are concerned, men workers are being discriminated against. The Minister is well aware of this fact in his own area. They are not getting sufficient jobs. Women are dominating there. In such circumstances, the interests of the men should be protected.

SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY : You may be belonging to that category. I am not coming to that. I know the problems of the North-East. The hon. Minister also knows it. As far as equal remuneration for equal work for women is concerned, it has been provided in the Constitution. It is fine. The Minister also brought about a legislation. It is fine. But how is it being implemented? I made a reference to the people who are working there. How are the women being exploited in the agricultural fields? How are they being exploited in various other industries? On the one hand, because of the new economic policy, the avenues have been opened. I discussed it with the hon. Minister also. Now, more women are being employed in the processing units, the export oriented units because of the nature of work that they are doing. In the marine products area, women are getting more employment. On the other hand, women who are working, are not getting suitable wages for the work they are doing. Men are getting double

of what women are getting in the processing industry.

In various other fields like corporate sector, agricultural sector, small-scale Industries in big industries also, the Equal Remuneration Act is not being implemented in right earnest. The woman-employees are working equal to that of men. Why are you not implementing it in textile mills and various other industries? Why are you not protecting the interests of women as far as their wages are concerned? They are entitled to other benefits also. The States are treating women as second-class citizens. They are being ignored in the labour field also. Therefore, the interests of women should be protected. The Equal Remuneration Act should be implemented in right earnest by the Ministry.

Now, I come to industrial relations. After the implementation of the new Economic policy, several apprehensions were raised by the various trade unions. They have been telling the employees that they will be thrown out of employment by the new Economic policy; because of the new Industrial policy public sector undertakings are going to be closed down and some of the private industries will be closed down. There were certain apprehensions raised by various hon. Members also. But one aspect they have totally forgotten. Though it is a fact that regarding some of the public sector units the decision was taken by the Government that they had to be closed down, that decision was revised. The Government is prepared to take care of them and now when the multinationals are coming, when the new industries are coming up in certain areas like power sector, consumer goods industry, the aspect of employment generation has to be considered. Regarding the employment generation in the country, the hon. Minister can very well say that it is in a stagnant position. The employment which has been provided by the employment exchanges in the country has not increased. It has remained static. Ninety four million unemployed people have remained unemployed. Not only that, when the vacancies are created, only about 1.2 per cent are accommodated. After the creation of vacancies, within one year they are accommodated but the stagnation continues.

Under the new Economic policy, employment generation will be there. Not only that, people are coming forward to take over most of the closed mills and invest in them, and in this, the Labour Ministry has also a vital role to play. What happened, Sir, is, after the closure of some mills and undertakings, the negotiations were started. A special Tripartite Committee was constituted and discussions were held. And the hon. Minister also participated in those discussions. When the negotiations were going on, the employees' protection was also considered. But all of a sudden, the Government brought a scheme of National Renewal Fund. Then the Committee had a setback and the employees thereafter started negotiating with them. But the National Renewal Fund scheme is being implemented. Sir, the hon. Finance Minister has stated in this House that the Government is allocating about Rs. 1,000 crores for this purpose. Sir, it is not for me but for the hon. Minister to say, as far as this scheme is concerned, "Yes, people are rendered unemployed and they are getting sumptuous money for the rehabilitation, and with that money they can take care of their families." But that scheme is not being implemented in right earnest. Even in this there is lack of enthusiasm among the labourers. The reason is, the trade unions which are opposed to the scheme are creating a wrong impression that by the National Renewal Fund scheme the employees will not be getting adequate benefits. Sir, I would like to submit that after the closure of certain industries, textile mills and various other mills, including the sugar mills in some areas, in Maharashtra and Gujarat, in most of the cases the people have not been getting anything for more than 12 to 13 years. With the introduction of this scheme the people who were rendered unemployed will be able to get some benefits out of it. Not only that, the family of the employee, which could not get any benefit when the mill was closed, will also get some kind of a relief. Therefore, this is a novel scheme which has to be implemented in right earnest. Not only the hon. Labour Minister but also the Industry Minister and the Minister of Textiles should co-ordinate. In fact, the Minister of Textiles and the Minister of Labour had a discus-

sion for reopening some mills. The Ministry of Industry has to co-ordinate with the Ministry of Labour to see that the scheme is implemented in right earnest. I would like to make a suggestion, which has been the demand of the employees for a long time, to the hon. Minister. The employees have been stating that they are prepared to take over the mills for the purpose of running them. The employees have been coming forward with their offers. When the employees of the sick mills are coming forward, when they are willing to take over the sick industries, they should be given first preference. I find to my utter dismay that even if they are able to run the sick industries, their demands are not being considered. I would like to request the hon. Minister that when the Industries are referred to the BIFR, if the employees are able to make them viable, if the employees are capable of running them, they should be given first preference. They should go to other people only after that. If it is considered the employees will definitely work for the industry and the industry will get revived.

Another important thing which I want the hon. Minister to consider is the appointment of employees in the board of management. It has got a very long history. The scheme that employees' representative should also be there in the board of management was brought up in 1973 by the Industry Ministry so that the problems of the labour can be well explained. Not only that, the problem in various fields of the industry can also be well explained by the employees' representative. I was in the Committee on Public Undertakings. We had submitted a report to this House in this regard. There are more than 265 public sector undertakings. Till 1986 there was only one person in the board of management of one public sector undertaking. The employees' representatives have been put in the boards of management of coal India and some other public sector undertakings in 1987. It is a major policy decision which is taken by the Government of India. It doesn't refer to any political party. It is a matter of policy decision which is taken. But none of the CMDs or the chairman was ever ready to sit by the side of the employees' representatives in the board of management

and take policy decisions. It has been recurring for several years. (Time bell rings) ... Sir, our party has got more time.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI MD. SALIM) : But we have two more speakers from your party.

SHRI M.A. BABY : The mode of selection of employees' representative should also be mentioned. It should be through a democratic process.

SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY : It should be taken care of by the employees themselves. Let us not enter into that area. The employees will choose their own representative to represent them in the board of management. There should not be any party consideration in that regard. I am stating this because, if there is one employee in the board of management, then it will change the whole system of bureaucracy in the management. He knows the problems of labour. He knows the problems of the industry. The employees' representative should definitely be very strong. I know that except in five or six public sector undertakings there are no employees' representatives in the board of management of the public sector undertakings. I would like the hon. Minister to consider this aspect and to see that the Government policy is implemented. Now, I come to industrial relations. Sir, the hon. Minister stated in a press interview that he would bring an Industrial Relations Bill before this House in order to smoothen the relationship between employers and employees and to avoid cumbersome processes in deciding various disputes. It is a noble thing. The Ramanujam Committee also made certain recommendations. The Minister has said that he would come with a Bill in this Session itself. Sir, due to industrial disputes, employees are facing a lot of hardships. When the matter is referred to a Tribunal or to a High Court, it is the employees who suffer the most. The managements are very powerful and they can fight in courts through their money-power. But the poor employees cannot do so. We are getting a lot of representations from workers. We are moving with the workers. We know how they are suffering. We know about

their family problems. So, the industrial disputes should stop. Therefore, I would request the Minister to see that the three-tier appeal system is removed. The Minister can say, "It is a Constitutional right." I agree with the hon. Minister. But as far as possible, these disputes should be settled through mutual discussions and negotiations. This is a very vital thing. Managements make it a prestige issue to fight their employees. They try to take revenge on those employees who are very active trade union workers. As the employers are very rich, they can use their money-power. But the ultimate sufferer is the employee. Sometimes these employees become militants because of it. Therefore, I would request the Minister to consider this aspect so that the interests of employees can be protected.

Sir, Provident Fund is another area which is surrounded by mystery. Sir, whenever an employee applies for Provident Fund, the Provident Fund authorities take a very long time to give this benefit. They sometimes take one to two years for one application and by that time that employee loses interest in it. Even they return the application if there is one small mistake. Thereafter, a long communication takes place. Sir, the Provident Fund offices, especially in South India, have become a burden on employees, instead of giving them any benefit. I am saying this because many people come to us and say these things. I would request the Minister that there should be a separate Provident Fund office in Pondicherry. There are many sugar mills and small scale industries. Pondicherry has been linked with Tamil Nadu. When we go there, they say that they take care of the interests of the Tamil Nadu people. The Pondicherry people are totally ignored. Therefore, we want a separate Provident Fund office. It should also be seen that the Provident Fund offices function effectively. You should also make the procedure easy so that the benefits are given on time. Then the bureaucracy is also hampering the interests of the employees.

The hon. Minister should take care of that aspect.

Sir, the most vital and important wing of the Ministry of Labour is Employment

Exchanges. Today, a certain amount of modernisation has taken place in these Exchanges situated in various States. But the figures which are shown there—and the Minister himself admits it—are not accurate. This is due to various factors. One major factor is that people who are already employed are also registered there. It is a fact. Sir, even though Employment Exchanges function under the purview of the State Governments, yet the hon. Minister should see to it that they function effectively. An Employment Exchange is supposed to show employment to people in Central Government offices, State Government offices and in various public sector organisations. But these Employment Exchanges have become mere ceremonial. The officers there have become ineffective because their work is not monitored. And no survey is also done by the States to ensure that the people who have enrolled themselves are not employed anywhere. People are not going to come and say it on their own. Therefore, Employment Exchanges have to be streamlined. They should be made more effective and should help in identifying and accommodating suitable persons for various jobs. This can be done through various State machineries. This will make these Exchanges become vibrant organisations. Since these Exchanges cater to the employment needs of the people of their respective States, the hon. Minister should pay attention to this aspect as well...

SHRI M.A. BABY : They can as well be renamed as Unemployment Exchanges.

SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY : To some extent, I agree with you.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI MD. SALIM) : Mr. Narayanasamy, two more Members from your party are yet to speak and the time left is 20 minutes. So, if you wish to continue, you will be consuming their time also.

SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY : Sir, I am not going out of the subject. I am mentioning some specific points to the hon. Minister so that he can focus his attention on them. Anyway, I am going to conclude in two minutes.

Sir, introduction of a new Economic Policy a new Industrial Policy and an Export-Import Policy, has generated more employment opportunities in the country. I augmenting the employment opportunities, in creating more employment potential and in disseminating this information to the people, the job of the Labour Ministry is very very important. As such, the Labour Ministry is finding it difficult to accommodate suitable persons in suitable jobs. On the other hand, employment opportunities are being created in a big way, be it in the power sector, or the small scale industries in urban as well as rural areas. So, I would like to know from the hon. Minister as to what strategy the Government of India, especially the Labour Ministry, is going to adopt to ensure that the people, who are jobless, are accommodated in various fields. I also find that the industries, be it the public sector or the private sector, do not recruit people belonging to the States where the industries are set up. It has become a major problem in various States. What is happening is that they bring persons from other States. This problem is being faced in my State as well.

Normally, a person who sets up an industry outside his home State does not bother to recruit people belonging to that particular State; instead, he brings his own people. This also creates, to some extent, a law and order problem. So, the Government must ensure that the local people are taken care of. There should be a provision in this regard which may go a long way in safeguarding the interests of the people of various States. It is, ultimately, their Government which gives loan to the industrialists and electricity and other facilities are also provided by that State only.

4.00 P.M.

In spite of all this, the local people are ignored. In that respect, I want the hon. Minister to give a categorical assurance that the States would be advised suitably because they are getting loans from the public sector banks, from the public sector organisations. I would like to know what they are going to do for these people.

Recognition of ITIs which are being run by State Governments is taking an enormous time. In fact, in my State, there is a place, Yanam. Our Chief Minister wrote to the Labour Ministry for recognising the ITIs. The students who studied and completed their training in these institutions are not able to appear for the examination since recognition of these institutions is not given by the Labour Ministry and the students could not appear for their examinations. In spite of the recommendation of the State Government, the file is kept pending and it has not been considered by the Labour Ministry. Therefore, in that aspect, I want the hon. Minister to clarify.

There are two institutions which have come up in my area. In Yanam, a small area having 50,000 population, there are more than 400 small industries. For the purpose of providing employment to these people in these industries, training is necessary to be given. They should be trained. For this purpose, these two institutions were established. But to give recognition to these institutions, enormous time is being taken by the Labour Ministry. I want the hon. Minister to consider this. I want to know why it is lying with the Labour Ministry in spite of the State Government's recommendation.

The New Economic policy has thrown up certain challenges. Steps are needed to be taken to face those challenges. For this, the hon. Minister should keep his Ministry fully equipped and see that employment potential is created in this country for the labour force. .

With these words, I conclude, Sir. Thank you, Mr. Vice-Chairman.

SHRI M.A. BABY: This will be done provided the World Bank does not demand the disbanding of the Labour Ministry.

SHRI PRAVAT KUMAR SAMANTARAY (Orissa): Thank you, Mr. Vice-Chairman. We have got a very good Minister presiding over the Labour Ministry, with all the sincerity and dynamism. But he is surrounded by bad colleagues who do not

allow him to carry out the objectives for which the Labour Ministry is wedded to. There is a marked erosion in implementing the objectives of the Labour Ministry during the last four years. I don't know what the reason is. You take the case of disputes relating to labour, you take the case of formulation of the policy and you take the case of settlement of wages. In every objective, this Ministry is lagging behind. This Ministry is presided over by 12 Departments. It will not be fair if I don't interpret that this Labour Ministry is a bonded Ministry of the Government of India. Instead of encouraging the Ministry to carry out its objectives, the Government of India is forcing the Labour Ministry to work as a nodal agency to protect the interest of management and to severely curtail the rights of workers and employees in this country. That is the reality of the day so far as the Labour Ministry is concerned. To supplement my interpretation, I would draw the attention of the House to the budgetary provision made for this Ministry. In 1993-94, the Budget provision for this Ministry was Rs. 562.22 crores and for this year, it is Rs. 568.10 crores. My colleague, Shri E. Balanandan, has pointed out: that out of this amount, 70% is meant for payment of retrenchment benefits. The Ministry calls it Voluntary Retirement Scheme and we call it retrenchment. The Ministry claims that it is generating employment. We say that there is no employment generation. For the last three years, the Government has proved that it is not going to generate employment in this country. They are bent upon removing them. Whatever number of employees are there either in the public sector or private sector, they want to get rid of them, they want to throw the working class people into—I do not know—the Indian Ocean or the Arabian Sea or the Bay of Bengal. They are bent upon doing that.

Sir, coming to the industrial disputes, there is a large machinery for this, headed by the Chief Labour Commissioner, assisted by Regional Labour Commissioners. But, Sir, the fact is that this machinery is not adequately equipped to carry on the inspection work. Where there is a violation of labour laws, what can these officers do? Apart from that, we have got

an Industrial Disputes Act in such a manner that when an officer goes to conciliate in a dispute, and if the management does not appear, they do not have a provision to call the management to appear and settle the dispute. Not only that. The decision-makers authorise junior officers who can neither speak with authority nor conciliate. So, for years together, the dispute goes on. Finally, they force down a failure report. And the failure report sometimes gets entangled for years without being referred for adjudication. You can just imagine the plight of the workers or the employees seeking relief under this adjudication provision through the tribunals. And after two or three years, he is forced with a compromise against the terms and conditions or a person dies in seeking the relief. This is the plight of the workers and this is the type of machinery provided for industrial disputes. And the dispute can be settled only if the supreme boss of the management is inclined to settle the dispute. That is the law. That is the law prevailing in this Labour Department, and this is the machinery we are carrying on with.

Sir, to protect the interests of the workers of this country and to avoid luxurious litigation in the public sector undertakings and the Central Government undertakings, there was a circular in 1975 by the Labour Ministry to all administrative Ministries and the public sector undertakings that there cannot be any appeal against any award of the Tribunal or against any judgment of a High Court wherein a relief has been sought for by a workman. And where an Undertaking goes for an appeal, it should seek the permission of the administrative Ministry. And it has been pointed out that no Ministry is caring about this circular. They defy it. I do not know whether the Minister is aware of it. What is the monitoring system in respect of the implementation of this circular which the Ministry has issued to protect the interests of the workmen and the employees with regard to these luxurious litigations? And how can an employee who hardly gets Rs. 1500 as take-home pay, go on fighting for years? And there is hardly any scope of getting assured of any relief. And this is the plight of the workers, and this is the

working of the labour laws which we have enacted in the last 45 years. And the net result is that the workmen suffer.

My friend, Mr. Narayanasamy, has said that the labourers and the employees constitute 5 to 6 per cent of the population in this country. And they do not care for them. It is well and good if they have the rest of the 97 per cent in their mind. But, so far as the protection given under the law is concerned, so far as the machinery created to give protection is concerned, if they cannot take care of this 3 or 4 per cent, how can these people claim that they can give protection to the 97 per cent of the people? I speak of provident fund. The management, particularly in the public sector undertakings, have defaulted in making payment of the provident fund dues to the workers and employees to the tune of crores and crores of rupees. But the punishment to be awarded for such defaults is so meagre, that they do not mind paying the penalty and getting away with this huge amount which they are using as capital. The punishment for this default hardly matters to them. I cite the example of contractors who collect crores from the workers in the name of provident fund contribution and do not pay to the workers. I have myself raised this issue but nobody listens to the workers for years together. This is how we are administering the Provident Fund Commission which is an autonomous body. I do not know how the Labour Ministry or other Ministries are going to tackle this problem.

Take the case of Payment of Bonus Act. There is a limit on payment of bonus to workers and a worker getting above Rs. 1600 is debarred from getting bonus. We know that some amount is paid in lieu of bonus and this practice has become so redundant and in spite of the demands of Central trade unions and workers, nothing has happened. Sometimes, workers are told to take the money by some other means, not through bonus. I do not find any logic in it.

I raised a question with regard to payment under the Workmen's Compensation Act, to the migrant labourers. The workers migrate from one place to the other

and they are illiterate people and do not know how to get relief under the law. I raised this question in the House and I was assured by the Minister that in case any compensation is to be paid to the worker in case of casualty or injury, he will have the opportunity to file or lodge a complaint before the Labour Commissioner or Compensation Commissioner of his own State so that on the strength of his legal documents, he will be able to defend his case better and claim compensation. But that has not been taken care of and as a result, there are thousands and thousands of such migrant workers who are yet to get any relief.

As we are all aware, in the public sector undertakings recently, the Government of India has introduced Voluntary Retirement Scheme under which many workers have voluntarily retired. But the permanent posts which have fallen vacant, are still remain unfilled. But how is the work being carried on? The fact is that in spite of the Ministry of Labour's Contract Labour (Abolition) Act, they have allowed the public sector undertakings to get the work done through contract labour for the last two years. Nobody can deny the fact that work of the permanent posts—ranging from khalasi, helper to Computer Assistants—is being carried on by contract labour on cheap payment. On the one hand you claim to compete in the world market and on the other hand get the work done by paying only Rs. 750 or Rs. 1000 to the worker and expect better work and more production. In this case, what are you going to do? What are you going to achieve? It is really a serious thing and I do not know why the Labour Ministry is not taking care of all these things. The whole world is laughing at us that we are having cheap labour. At the same time, persons are migrating from our country to other countries. Skilled personnel are going out of the country because they do not get in the country the remuneration they deserve. They go to the other countries and they give their best there. This is happening because you are not giving the proper remuneration for the skilled labourers here and you are not protecting them.

Then, the performance report of the Labour Ministry says that they are taking

care of the safety of the mines. But the Minister may recall as to how many times the rules and regulations in regard to safety have been compromised which led to a number of accidents resulting in the death of a number of coal mine workers. At whose cost? For whom are we allowing all these things? Is the Ministry there for the management or it is there for the workers? For whom have the laws been enacted? Are they not for the protection of the workers?

Now, we have the E.S.I. Scheme. Under this scheme, the insured workers get the benefit of medicare; they get medicines, etc. The hon. Minister is the Chairman of the Corporation. I am also a member of this. We have got thousands of crores as Reserve Fund. This is a social security scheme. This is a social security measure for the workers. Even though we have got the Reserve Fund, the workers do not get the medicines; they do not get proper medical care. When we have got the Reserve Fund of thousands of crores, why are the employers not being forced to take steps? Why are they not being forced to take steps to ensure that proper medical care is provided to the workers in the factories when there is money reserved for it? The workers pay the money. The I. P. workers contribute to the E.S.I. C. At the same time, they are not getting adequate and proper medicare.

There is an important thing which I want to refer to, before concluding. We are talking about the enhancement of the exemption limit of income-tax in the case of salaried employees. I am not able to understand one thing here. Why should not the Labour Ministry take steps to protect the workers and other employees in relation to payment of income-tax? In my opinion, an employee or a worker gets his remuneration in lieu of the work he does. He does not get any salary the day he retires. How could it be considered, how could it be interpreted, as an income? The salary cannot be considered as an income? In the case of the salaried people, their income is recorded and, therefore, the money, in the form of tax, is taken away. However, in the case of other individuals who make investments

and earn profits, we fail to bring most of them under the tax net. Only the salaried people are made to pay tax because their income is recorded. But what they are getting is only a compensation for the work they are rendering. It is not a benefit which they are getting. Why should it be taxed? In this regard, the Labour Minister has failed to take up with his Cabinet colleague or with the Government the question of amending the law so that the workers and other employees are taken out of the purview of the Income-tax Act.

Lastly, I would like to refer to the small-scale sector. Recently, we have opened up our entire small-scale sector to the world. Here, I would like to give a small illustration. In our small scale industry we are manufacturing buttons. About 5 lakh or 6 lakh people are working in this. Each button costs about 25 paise or 30 paise. By opening up the market, we will get the same button at a little cheaper price, say 20 paise or 25 paise. We have a craze for foreign goods. So, we will go in for that. What about the 5 lakh or 6 lakh people working in the small scale industry? The chains used in pants, manufactured in our country, cost about Rs. 4 to Rs. 6. Now, the chains imported from Singapore or Hongkong, will cost about a rupee less. What about the ten lakh people working in this industry? Nobody bothers about them. Where are we going to resettle them? Where are we going to re-engage them?

Lastly, I am quoting from the observation on child labour, made by the Parliamentary Standing Committee in their Report. I am quoting their words :

“The Committee note with distress that the Ministry of Labour are not having an authentic data regarding the child labour in the age group of 0—14 as they are awaiting the 1991 Census Report.”

Again, in para 2.22 it says :

“The Committee are concerned to note that the Ministry of Labour have not given a serious thought to study the factors responsible for the continuance of child labour system after the submission of the Gurupada

Swami Committee Report way back in the year 1977.”

This is the observation of the Parliamentary Standing Committee about child labour in the country.

Before concluding, I shall draw the attention of the Minister to the fact that unless he considers that the labour available in the country as a capital investment in the development of the country, there will be no change in the scenario for the betterment of the country or the workers.

With these words, I thank you, Sir.

श्री यशवन्त मोहम्मदमाई पटेल (गुजरात) :
उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, लेबर मिनिस्ट्री की वर्किंग को लेकर आज जो बहस चल रही है इसमें पार्टीसिपेट करने का जो मुझे मौका दिया उसके लिए मैं आपका आभारी हूँ। आप सब जानते हैं कि इस समय श्रमिकों की जो संख्या है वह करीब 31 करोड़ 50 लाख यानी हिन्दुस्तान की आबादी की जनसंख्या का 30 परसेंट श्रमिक हैं। हिन्दुस्तान का आर्थिक विकास और भाग्यविधाता श्रमिक ही हैं, यह कहूँ तो गलत नहीं होगा। जैसा हमारे स्वर्गीय प्रधान मंत्री श्री लाल बहादूर शास्त्री जी ने कहा था—‘जय जवान जय किसान’, मेरा यह कहना है कि ‘जय जवान जय किसान’ के साथ ‘जय श्रमिक’ नाम भी जुड़ना चाहिए। क्योंकि अगर हिन्दुस्तान के अर्थ-तंत्र को मजबूत करने में किसी उद्योगपति का हाथ है, अगर किसी किसान का हाथ है तो मैं समझता हूँ इस हिन्दुस्तान के श्रमिक वर्ग का भी योगदान कम नहीं है। हमारे मंत्री महोदय और श्रम मंत्रालय को इस बात के लिए मुबारकबाद देना चाहूँगा क्योंकि खासतौर से पिछले वर्षों में श्रमिक वर्ग की स्थिति को सुधारने में और सामाजिक सुरक्षा और कल्याण को लेकर जो इन्होंने प्रयास किये हैं वे सराहनीय हैं। यह इस बात का प्रमाण है, इस बात का सबूत है कि इस बजट में जो मांग लेकर आये हैं इस बार वह 25 परसेंट बढ़ा कर लेकर आये हैं पिछले साल की तुलना में। खासतौर से जो हमारा अनआर्गेनाइज्ड सेक्टर है, असंगठित क्षेत्र है, बीड़ी कामदार, बाल श्रमिक और व्यवसायिक जो प्रशिक्षण हैं इसके बारे में पिछले सालों में कुछ प्रयास किये गये हैं। लेकिन अभी भी कुछ प्रयास करने बाकी हैं। इसके लिए मैं मंत्री महोदय को और श्रम मंत्रालय को मुबारकबाद देता हूँ। साथ ही खासतौर पर हमारे श्रमिक वर्ग की जो समस्याएँ हैं उन समस्याओं के बारे में इस सदन के माध्यम से

मंत्री महोदय का ध्यान आकर्षित करना चाहता हूँ। सबसे पहली समस्या है कि खामतौर पर कपड़ा मिले बंद हैं, टेक्सटाइल मिलें बंद हैं। जैसा आप जानते हैं अहमदाबाद हिन्दुस्तान का मैनचेस्टर गिना जाता था। अहमदाबाद ने भारत के अर्थतंत्र को मजबूत करने में बहुत बड़ा, महत्वपूर्ण योगदान दिया है। लेकिन आज हालत यह है कि खासतौर से अहमदाबाद की इकोनोमी जो इस टेक्सटाइल मिलों पर आधारित थी आज उसकी स्थिति बहुत ही खराब है।

करीबन एक लाख 20 हजार फेमलीज आज इस वजह से असरग्रस्त हैं क्योंकि हमारी मिलें बंद पड़ी हुई हैं और 50 हजार फेमलिज ऐसी हैं जो बेकार और बेरोजगार हैं। यह जो हमारा श्रमिक वर्ग है, जो हमारे मिल मजदूर हैं, जो बेकार है, बेरोजगार हैं उनके लिये सिर्फ नीचे जमीन और ऊपर आसमान के सिवाय और कोई चारा नहीं है। न तो उनको अपने बच्चों के पालने के लिये कुछ है और न अपना पेट भरने के लिये दो वक्त की रोटी नसीब होती है। जब इंसान बेकार और बेरोजगार होता है तो आप अच्छी तरह से जानते हैं कि समाज में तनाव भी बढ़ता है और इंसान या श्रमिक वर्ग किसी भी हद तक जा सकता है। वह अपने परिवार के लिये, अपने परिवार की रोटी के लिये कुछ भी कर सकता है। इसलिये इससे सामाजिक तनाव बढ़ता है, कम्युनल टेंशन बढ़ता है और साथ ही साथ ला एंड आर्डर की परिस्थिति भी खराब होती है। ऐसी हालत में मैं मंत्री महोदय से अनुरोध करूँगा, हम अच्छी तरह से जानते हैं कि पिछले साल जो हमारे पब्लिक सेक्टर है उनके बहुत से इम्प्लॉईज को वॉलेंटरी रिटायरमेंट स्कीम के तहत हमने उन पर 300 करोड़ रुपया खर्चा किया। लेकिन उसका फायदा किनको हुआ, सिर्फ 25 हजार फेमलीज को हुआ। एक कामगार पर हमने एक लाख 20 हजार रुपया खर्चा किया। अहमदाबाद में आज 50 हजार फेमलीज हैं उनमें से कुछ लोग ही ऐसे हैं जिनको उनका हकशुदा पैसा मिला है। कुछ ऐसे लोग हैं जिनका हकशुदा पैसा मात्र 30 हजार या 28 हजार रुपया है। अगर उसका भुगतान किया जाय तो मैं समझता हूँ कि इससे श्रमिक वर्ग को काफी फायदा होगा। मैं मंत्री महोदय से यह अनुरोध करूँगा कि जो कपड़े की मिलें बंद पड़ी हुई हैं उनका पुनरुद्धार किया जाय, उनको रिवाइव किया जाय और साथ ही साथ जो हमारा श्रमिक वर्ग है, हमारे जो मिल मजदूर हैं, उनके हक की जो राशि है, उनका जो पैसा है उसकी अदायगी नेशनल रेन्यूअल फंड से करने

के लिए जो मामले कमीड्रेशन में हैं, उनके बारे में जल्द से जल्द निर्णय किया जाय। ऐसा करने से मैं समझता हूँ कि गरीब लोगों को फायदा होगा।

दूसरी जो समस्या है, जो बहुत ही महत्वपूर्ण समस्या है वह है रोजगार के और अवसरों को बढ़ाने की। हम जानते हैं कि हिन्दुस्तान, भारत की आबादी जिस तरह से बढ़ रही है, आने वाले दिनों में हर साल हमें एक करोड़ लोगों को रोजगार देना होगा। जो सरकारी और अर्ध-सरकारी नौकरियाँ हैं, वे बहुत सीमित हैं, मर्यादित हैं। कुछ लोग कृषि क्षेत्र में काम करते हैं। लेकिन जैसाकि आप जानते हैं कि जब बारिश नहीं होती है तो कृषि का काम नहीं होता है, खेती का काम नहीं हो पाता है और मजदूर बेरोजगार होकर घर पर बैठते हैं। तो ऐसी हालत में उनको रोजगार देने की जरूरत है। जब डाउट होता है, जब बारिश नहीं होती तो लोगों को बहुत तकलीफों का सामना करना पड़ता है। हमारी जो योजनाएँ हैं, जो स्वरोजगार और अन्य योजनाएँ हैं उनके कानून में जो प्रतिबंधित प्रावधान हैं, उनकी वजह से स्वचालकता को जन्म मिलता है और रोजगार के जो अवसर हैं वे कम होते हैं। इसलिए हमें श्रम कानून ऐसे बनाने चाहिये जो श्रमिकों के हित में हों। मैं मंत्री महोदय से निवेदन करूँगा कि इसके लिए एक उच्च स्तरीय त्रि-पक्षीय कार्यदल का गठन किया जाय जो कि सभी श्रम कानूनों की जांच करें और श्रमिकों की सुरक्षा और कल्याण के बारे में समझौता किये बिना उन रुकावटों को दूर करने का प्रयास करे जिनसे रोजगार पैदा करने में बाधा आती हो।

तीसरा जो मेरा मुद्दा है वह लघु उद्योग, अति लघु उद्योग और कुटीर उद्योगों के बारे में है। जैसा कि आप अच्छी तरह से जानते हैं हमारे जो लघु उद्योग, अति लघु उद्योग और कुटीर उद्योग हैं इनके कानूनों में जो औपचारिकताएँ हैं, इनको इनसे छुड़ाने की जरूरत है। जो ऐसे कानून हैं, जो प्रावधान ऐसे हैं जिनकी वजह से हमारे जो ग्रामीण और अर्ध-शहरी क्षेत्र हैं, वहाँ रोजी नहीं मिलती है वहाँ के लिए ऐसे प्रावधान किये जाने चाहिये जिससे वहाँ पर रोजगार के ज्यादा अवसर पैदा करने में हमें मदद मिल सके।

चौथा जो क्षेत्र है और जैसा कि नारायणस्वामी जी ने भी कहा कि जो हमारे इम्प्लॉईमेंट एक्सचेंज है, जो हमारे रोजगार कार्यालय हैं वे आज पोस्ट आफिस बनकर रह गये हैं, सैरीमोनियल आफिस बनकर रह गये हैं। वहाँ पर काफी गड़बड़ियाँ भी हैं। उनके माध्यम से जरूरतमंद लोगों को रोजगार

नहीं मिलता, स्थानिय लोगों को रोजगार नहीं मिलता, बल्कि बाढ़ में जिनका रजिस्ट्रेशन होता है ऐसे लोगों को पहले नौकरी मिल जाती है। साथ ही वहाँ पर भ्रष्टाचार को भी बढ़ावा मिला है। मैं मंत्री महोदय से यह कहना चाहूंगा, अनुरोध करना चाहूंगा कि इसकी समीक्षा होनी चाहिये और ऐसे कदम उठाये जाने चाहिये जिससे जरूरतमंद लोगों को काम मिल सके। यह कुछ महत्वपूर्ण समस्याएँ हैं, जिनकी ओर मैंने मंत्री महोदय का ध्यान आकर्षित किया है। लेकिन जो हमारा श्रमिक वर्ग है उसके कल्याण के लिये कुछ एरियाज हैं, जिनके बारे में मैं कुछ सुझाव मंत्री महोदय को देना चाहूंगा।

उपसमाध्यक्ष महोदय, सब से पहला मेरा सुझाव यह है—

There is an urgent need to consider some innovative measures to help workers to provide better education to their children. Some special fund should be established for this purpose and new innovative schemes could be designed with the active support of voluntary organisations.

My second suggestion is that social security for workers particularly in the unorganised sector should get our attention. A large number of workers who are engaged in agriculture, small-scale, tiny and self-employed sector remain outside the social security network. At the same time, it would be very harsh to expect small farmers and small entrepreneurs to bear the burden of providing the social security network to their workers. The Government should take initiative in finding resources to provide comprehensive but simple to administer social security cover for all such workers.

My third suggestion is about improvement of the ESI scheme. The Government should improve wholesale some of the existing services like the ESI scheme. Inadequate medical services under the ESI scheme do not need elaboration. ESI Corporation should urgently consider increasing their share of contribution to the State Governments for providing medical services to the ESI beneficiaries. The present contribution of Rs. 345 per year per family can hardly cover the cost of even primary medical services. In some areas, voluntary organisations, trusts, hospitals and association of industries have shown willingness to manage the medical services

through a proper arrangement between the ESI and the State Governments and the Associations. I would request that such innovative ideas should be considered without hesitation and due support should be extended to such efforts.

My last point relates to productivity and training. This is one area which has to be given due importance in the Ministry's proposals for the current year with rapid changes in technology and competitive environment. Our training institutions will have to gear themselves up to meet the new challenges. I would suggest that wherever possible, with the active support of the Association of Industries, the Government should turn our polytechnics and ITIs into self-regulated self-growing autonomous bodies. Thank you.

SIRI S. VIDUTHALAI VIRUMBI (Tamil Nadu): Mr. Vice-Chairman, thank you for having given me an opportunity to speak on the working of the Ministry of Labour. When our colleagues from the Opposition side criticised the liberalisation policy as well as globalisation policy of the Government, Mr. Narayanasamy from the Treasury Benches tried his best to rebut the charges. He said that the liberalisation policy has been accepted by the Government and they wanted to see that it was implemented because of unemployment problem prevailing in this country. He said that for this purpose, the Government needs more foreign investment. This is what he has said. We think about it in a different way. We think about it from our own angle, in a different way. We feel even without resorting to this type of liberalisation or globalisation, the Government would have been able to find resources required for starting new industries in India. How? That is the question. If this question is solved, the wrangling gap between the ruling party and the opposition can be bridged.

According to one school of thought, the black money available in India as well as the amount deposited by the NRIs and foreign banks amounts to Rs. 5,20,000 crores. Let the Government find out whether it is correct or not. I would like to know from the Government: How much they have approved for foreign investment?

What is the total amount they have received so far? If they go through that, then, they can find out. . The policy pursued by them is going to ruin the country. The labour policy should aim at economic growth with social justice. Is the policy pursued by the Government in this direction? That is what we have to see. Now, a new phrase is found in the western media and that is "jobless growth". Some two decades ago, the word "stagflation" was coined to indicate stagnation plus inflation. Like that, now we have "jobless growth". That is, growth will be there in the economy, but it will not create any job for the masses. That is jobless growth. I fear that the Government of India is walking in this direction.

Regarding tapping of resources, the Government of India, in the last two and a half year, did not try, even for a week's time, to find out how to tackle it. They did not try even for a week to tap the resources available with Indians. As and when they ascended the throne, they decided to invite foreign people. As I mentioned the other day, Mahatma Gandhi went to London to participate in the Round Table Conference to see that the British people then living in India were sent back lock, stock and barrel. But now our Prime Minister went to London to invite the same people to come and invest money here. It is an invitation to a new East India Company.

The hon. Minister is a very good advocate. But the circumstances have forced him to argue a bad case. That is the only thing. If you go through the reports of the 29th Indian Labour Conference and the 30th Indian Labour Conference, you will find that for industrial relations, they had taken a decision to enact a law. But it is kept in abeyance. We have to see Japan. It perished in the Second World War. But now it has become the second richest country in the world. Similar is the case of Germany. In the case of Japan, it is a poor country in terms of material wealth of raw material. But it is the second richest country in the world. How was it possible? They were able to harmonise their human resources properly. There, we Indians failed miserably in the last four decades.

Sir, during the month of November, 1991, the month of June, 1992 and the month of September, 1993, the workers went on a strike and expressed their anger with this Government. They had announced a Bharat Bandh. I thought the eyes of the Government would be opened by the strikes. But, no.

The labour policy should consist of job security. Job security and the health of industry are inseparable. As regards legal benefits, the *status quo ante* should be maintained. In new areas, they must achieve further. Welfare of the wards should be taken into account. In these areas, how much have we developed and how much have we maintained what we had? In respect of bonded labour, out of the people the Government has identified, for more than 10,000 people, no rehabilitation work has reached them. Even to people whom they want to help, the Government is giving only Rs. 6,250. (Time bell rings). Sir, I have just begun my speech.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI MD. SALIM): You have to conclude now.

SHRI S. VIDUTHALAI VIRUMBI : They are giving Rs. 6,250 to bonded labour. Do you think they can do anything substantial with that? It is not enough even as an advance for starting a petty shop. How do you think they can be rehabilitated with this paltry sum? You are doing something. to say to the world that you are doing something. That is all. It is not substantial.

The Labour Welfare Fund was created by collecting cess on production, consumption and export to extend the medical facilities, supply drinking water and provide education for their wards and housing to the labourers employed in some mines, beedi industry and cine production. But since 1990, no change has been effected in the rate of cess even though inflation has taken place considerably during the last three years. I feel that the Government is not sincerely devoted to alleviating the sufferings of the workers employed in these areas.

Sir, for the rural workers, one scheme called the Honorary Rural Organisers

Scheme was started to impart knowledge to rural workers about laws enacted for their welfare. But it was abolished in the Seventh Plan period without giving any reasons. It clearly shows that the Government is not willing to keep the agricultural and other rural workers well informed about their rights. Once they know about their rights, they may try to achieve them. Therefore, the people who have oppressed the rural workers, might have been approached and won over in this affair.

The pension scheme should be treated as a third benefit and it should not be in lieu of what they are already getting. It should be a separate benefit.

Since 1969, the Ministry of Labour is entitled to screen the proposals for filing appeals by the Central public sector undertakings against the awards of Labour Courts or Tribunals. By utilising this right, the Labour Ministry refused permission in fourteen cases. But the reasons attributed to such decisions were not informed to the Parliament. Had the Labour Minister submitted the reasons by way of a *suo motu* statement, then the Members would have an opportunity to find out the real reasons for the dispute.

Sir, participation of workers in the management is a fundamental concept to develop the industrial relations in a proper manner. The national seminar, the regional seminars, the conference of State Labour Ministers, and the Indian Labour Conference, all these were held during 1990. The Bill provides for the real participation of workers in the management at shop floor level, establishment level and at the Board of Management level in industrial establishment and was introduced in this august House but proper action has not been taken to pass the Bill. Why has it been kept in abeyance?

Regarding the NRF, I would like to say that the Expenditure Committee of the NRF recommended allocation of at least Rs. 50 crores for re-training. The decision was taken in the meeting held on 9-9-93. But from the Performance Report I found that only Rs. 15 crores was allocated for re-training under the account

No. head 2230, 3601 and 3602. The decision of the Expenditure Committee was flouted by the Labour Department.

Then I want to emphasise that the recognition norms for labour unions should be changed. In India, there are so many regional parties. As far as Indian labour union activities are concerned, they are inter-linked with the political parties. The members of one regional party are to be members of one or the other trade union. They have to be the members of another labour union on an all India basis. Therefore, the Government should try to change the norms to see that real representation is given to various labour unions in the Central as recognised labour union.

Regarding the abolition of bonus ceiling, I would like to say that they have put in some ceiling. This should be abolished once and for all.

The Government had agreed to set up the Second National Commission on Labour. But it has not been done. I would request the hon. Minister to do it.

Then in the Vth Pay Commission, the workers representatives should also be included. Then there is a move to propose changes in the Industrial Disputes Act for easy implementation of the Exit policy. The capitalists in this country are trying their best and lobbying with the Government to see that sections 25 (N) and 25 (O) are removed from the Act. The Committee on Industrial Sickness and Corporate Structuring wants to do this. I request the Government not to succumb to the pressure exerted by the capitalists in this country. A National Wage Policy should be formulated in order to narrow down the wide gap in the wages. In foreign countries, if ten per cent unemployment is there, it is considered a national crisis.

In foreign countries, if there is ten per cent of unemployment, they say it is a national crisis. But here the position is totally different. In the Eighth Five Year Plan (interruption)

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI MD. SALIM) : Please conclude. You cannot mention new points.

SHRI S. VIDUTHALAI VIRUMBI : I will conclude after making this point. As per the Eighth Five Year Plan, "During the past two decades employment has grown at a rate of 2.2 per cent per annum but due to the faster increase of labour force at about 2.5 per cent the backlog of unemployment has been rising. It is considered necessary and reasonable to set the goal of employment for all for achievement in a time-span of ten years. The assessment of present backlog of unemployment and the likely addition of the labour force suggests that this goal requires generation of an additional ten million employment opportunities per year on an average".

What has the Government done to achieve this? The hon. Minister may reply to it. Sir, I can tell you what the Minister has said—"It is a matter of great concern that despite possessing a vast reservoir of skilled and dedicated labour force, our productivity is amongst the lowest in the world. This situation requires prompt remedial action. All elements of the product processes should play their part fully and sincerely, and all obstacles to achieve this end should be removed". This is the opinion of the hon. Minister who addressed the General Council meeting as found in the minutes of the General Council. Ten million jobs means one crore jobs per year. What is the policy that the Government is having in this regard? What is the proposal that the Government is having to provide ten million jobs? The Government should make it clear. Apart from this, Sir, the Party to which I belong feels that eight hours of work should be reduced to six hours. That is our policy which was declared by Dr. Kalaignar the Chief Minister of Tamil Nadu. Now the burden put on the worker's shoulder by the Tamil Nadu Government is much more. Sir, I want to bring to the notice of the hon. Minister the fact that the labour policy has changed in Tamil Nadu. I want to particularly mention that instead of industry-wise, the Government of Tamil Nadu is insisting on the labour unions to settle the dispute unit-wise. It will create problems. A labour union leader cannot go to every unit, every establishment. He cannot go and talk to each and everyone, including managing

director to settle the issue. This particular deviation from the regular policy has actually been adopted by the Government of Tamil Nadu.

Next, Sir, is...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI MD. SALIM) : No new point. You have already consumed double the time allotted to you.

SHRI S. VIDUTHALAI VIRUMBI : This is the last point, Sir. The members of the Indian Chambers of Commerce came to Tamil Nadu to identify the areas where they can invest their money, where the infrastructural facilities are available. The Committee has gone to Tamil Nadu to see how much amount they can invest to develop the industries of Tamil Nadu. But unfortunately the Chief Minister of Tamil Nadu has not given audience to the Committee which came from the Indian Chambers of Commerce. It is a very futile decision. This is the situation in Tamil Nadu, Sir, the people who gave their land to set up the industry, the power plant in Neyveli and Kalpakkam, were first assured that they would be given a chance for job but they were left in the lurch. I request the hon. Minister to have correspondence with the officers concerned in Tamil Nadu and insist them that the people who lost their land, who are on the roads, should be provided some jobs in the establishment for which they have given the land.

With these words, I conclude. Thank you, Mr. Vice-Chairman.

श्री सत्य प्रकाश मालवीय (उत्तर प्रदेश) : माननीय उपसभाध्यक्ष जी, जो श्रमिक हैं, मजदूर हैं, वे इस देश के बहुत ही उपेक्षित वर्ग हैं। भारत में बहुत ही प्राकृतिक संपदाएं हैं। हमारा देश गरीब नहीं है, लेकिन देश के लोग बहुत गरीब हैं और यहां पर 55 प्रतिशत से अधिक आबादी गरीबी की रेखा के नीचे रहने के लिए मजबूर है। लेकिन जिस तरीके से इस देश में श्रमिक वर्ग को उपेक्षित दृष्टि से देखा जाता है उसी तरीके से भारत सरकार ने श्रम मंत्रालय को भी उपेक्षित कर रखा है और इसका सबसे बड़ा सबूत है कि जो श्रम मंत्री हैं उनको केबिनेट स्तर का दर्जा नहीं दिया गया। तो सबसे पहले, चूंकि यह बहुत ही महत्वपूर्ण विभाग है और डिगिटी आण्ड लेबर को भारतीय संस्कृति

महत्ता देती है, तो मैं आपके जरिये प्रधान मंत्री जी से इस बात की मांग करता हूँ कि श्रम मंत्रालय को मंत्रिमंडल स्तर का दर्जा दें।

हमारे देश में जब संविधान बना तो उसमें बहुत से प्रावधान किए गए सामाजिक सुरक्षा के लिए, सोशल सेक्योरिटी के लिए और उसमें इस बात की व्यवस्था की गई कि इस देश में बांडेड लेबर नहीं होगी, बच्चों को श्रम नहीं करना होगा, समान कार्य के लिए समान वेतन मिलेगा, जिनमें महिलाएं भी सम्मिलित हैं। उसको लेकर बहुत से कानून भी बने हैं, लेकिन उन कानूनों का अनुपालन आज तक नहीं हो रहा है और उससे न केवल श्रमिकों की हालत बिगड़ी है बल्कि उनमें असंतोष भी बहुत ज्यादा व्याप्त है। हमारे देश में जो खेतिहर मजदूर हैं, बीडी मजदूर हैं, इन लोगों का अपना कोई संगठन नहीं है। यह असंगठित क्षेत्र के लोग हैं और इसलिए इनकी जो इस देश में दुर्दशा है उसके लिए बहुत ज्यादा जिम्मेदारी सरकार की है। संगमा साहब पहले भी श्रम मंत्री थे। बच्चों के श्रम के संबंध में हमारे यहां प्रावधान हैं, लेकिन सरकार की ओर से यह कहा जाता है कि ऐसा कोई कानून नहीं है, जिससे कि बच्चों को हम रोक सकें कि वह कारखाने में जाकर काम न कर सकें। हमारे यहां दस साल के बच्चों को, 8 साल के बच्चों को, 12 साल के बच्चों को गरीबी के कारण कारखानों में जाकर काम करना पड़ता है और ऐसी जगहों पर जाकर काम करना पड़ता है, जिससे कि उनका भावी जीवन बिल्कुल नष्ट और बर्बाद हो जाता है।

उपाध्यक्ष जी, 12 साल के, 14 साल के बच्चों के लिए हमारे संविधान में प्रावधान भी है कि 14 साल तक की आयु के प्रत्येक बच्चों को निःशुल्क और अनिवार्य शिक्षा उपलब्ध कराई जाएगी। चूंकि हमारे देश में गरीबी है तो बच्चों के माता-पिता को मजबूरीवश बच्चों से काम कराना पड़ता है। मैं सरकार से अनुरोध करना चाहूंगा, चूंकि वह विभागीय श्रम मंत्रालय के अंतर्गत आता है कि कोई इस प्रकार की व्यवस्था आप करें कि जिससे कम से कम जो मासूम बच्चे हैं उनको संरक्षित क्षेत्रों में काम न करना पड़े। हमारे यहां उत्तर प्रदेश के इलाहाबाद के पास बनारस और मिर्जापुर में कालीन के कारखाने हैं। छोटे-छोटे आठ-आठ, दस-दस साल के बच्चे वहां जाकर काम करते हैं। मुझे यहां तक ब्याल पड़ता है संगमा जी, पहले वहां हो आए हैं, इसी तरीके से सिवाकाशी में दियासलाई बनती है, दियासलाई की ढीली बनती है, और वहां पर छोटे-

छोटे बच्चों से काम लिया जाता है। कानून तो आपके पास है, लेकिन उस कानून को आपके विभाग की ओर से लागू नहीं किया जा रहा। मैं चाहूंगा कि यह जो बाल श्रम है, इस पर पूरा प्रतिबंध लगना चाहिए।

अब सबाल यह पैदा होता है, संगमा साहब उत्तर भी देंगे, कि चूंकि देश में गरीबी है, गरीब लोग रहते हैं, हम उसको समाप्त नहीं कर सकते। लेकिन, भारत के भविष्य को बनाने की आवश्यकता है। इसलिए जो देश के भावी भाग्य निर्माता हैं, उनको शिक्षा दी जाए। जो समय इनके पढ़ने का है, उस समय यह पढ़ाई लिखाई कैसे कर पाएंगे, यदि यह श्रम के काम में लगे रहेंगे।

महोदय, मैं आपका ध्यान आकर्षित करना चाहता हूँ कि हमारे देश में एक बहुत बड़ी समस्या है कंस्ट्रक्शन लेबरर की, जो निर्माण कार्य में लगे मजदूर हैं, जो मकान बनाते हैं, बड़े बड़े दफ्तरों की बिल्डिंग बनाते हैं, भवन बनाते हैं, उनकी। चूंकि यह असंगठित हैं तो कभी दो महिने काम किया, फिर बैठ गए और काम के समय यदि कहीं गिर गए या चोट लग गई या घायल हो गए तो इनको कोई कंपनसेशन नहीं, कोई क्षतिपूर्ति नहीं होती। यहां तक मुझे ब्याल पड़ता है, इस संबंध में कई-कई बार हमारे मंत्री जी से प्रतिनिधि मंडल भी मिल चुके हैं और शायद उनको कुछ ऐसा एसोरेन्स भी दिया गया है कि इस विषय में, कंस्ट्रक्शन वर्कर्स के लिए विधेयक लाने के लिए सरकार सक्रियता से विचार कर रही है। तो मैं जानना चाहूंगा कि इनकी स्थिति को सुधारने के लिए सरकार द्वारा क्या कदम उठाए जा रहे हैं और निकट भविष्य में क्या सरकार का इरादा कोई अधिनियम बनाने का है अथवा नहीं?

फिर, महोदय, मैं ध्यान आकर्षित करना चाहूंगा, एप्रेण्टिस एक्ट, 1961 की ओर। जैसा कि सभी लोग जानते हैं कि यह एप्रेण्टिस एक्ट, 1961 में बना था और इसलिए बना था कि जो टेक्नीकल क्षेत्र में पढ़कर लोग निकलते हैं, वह डिप्लोमा होल्डर हों या स्किल्ड वर्कर हों, उनको ट्रेनिंग दी जाए, लेकिन उनका भी शोषण होता है। आपकी यह जो एनुअल रिपोर्ट है, इसमें इस बात की चर्चा की गई है कि 1961 में एप्रेण्टिस एक्ट क्यों बनाया गया था?

The Apprentice Act, 1961 was passed with the following objectives :

“(1) To regulate the programme of training for apprentices in the industry so as to conform to the prescribed

syllabi, period of training, etc., as laid down by the Central Apprenticeship Council; and

(2) To utilise fully the facilities available for imparting practical training with a view to meeting the requirements of skilled workers in the industries."

तो जिन भावनाओं को लेकर के और जिन उद्देश्यों की पूर्ति के लिए कानून बनाया गया था, वे उद्देश्य तो बहुत अच्छे हैं, लेकिन उसके अंतर्गत हमारे एप्रेंटिस लोग जो आते हैं उनका शोषण होता है और इस संबंध में भी सरकार को और इस मंत्रालय को विशेष रूप से ध्यान देना चाहिए।

तीसरी बात, जिसकी ओर मैं ध्यान आकर्षित करना चाहता हूँ, वह है बछावत कमीशन के संबंध में। जो पत्रकार श्रमिक है, उनके संबंध में सरकार की ओर से एक बछावत कमीशन बैठाया गया था और उसने अपनी संस्तुतियाँ भी सरकार को दीं, और बहुत से समाचार पत्रों के संबंध में भी उन्होंने रिपोर्टें दीं लेकिन बछावत कमीशन की जो रिपोर्टें हैं, उसको पूरे का पूरा लागू नहीं किया गया। इसलिए मैं सरकार से अनुरोध करना चाहता हूँ और मंत्री जी से निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि जब वह अपना उत्तर दें तो इसके संबंध में सदन को अवगत कराने की कृपा करें।

तीसरे, जिस वक्त नेशनल फ्रंट की सरकार थी, तो मई, 1990 में "वर्कर्स पार्टिसिपेशन इन मैनेजमेंट" के संबंध में राज्य सभा में एक विधेयक प्रस्तुत किया गया था और वह विधेयक प्रस्तुत है, लुप्त नहीं हुआ है। मैं जानना चाहता हूँ कि आखिर सरकार की इस संबंध में क्या नीति है? संविधान में प्रावधान है इस बात का कि प्रबंध में मजदूरों की भागीदारी होनी चाहिए, तो उसके संबंध में अब सरकार की क्या नीति है? जब एक विधेयक राज्य सभा में चार-पांच साल से लम्बित पड़ा हुआ है तो उसके संबंध में कृपया आप अपनी नीति स्पष्ट करें क्योंकि इसी में मजदूरों का हित होगा।

अंतिम रूप में मैं यह निवेदन करना चाहूँगा कि जो बांडिड लेबर है, बांडिड लेबर की आखिर परिभाषा क्या है? आपका एक एक्ट है 1976 का—बांडिड लेबर सिस्टम एबोलिशन एक्ट—1976, लेकिन कई बार जब मामले न्यायालय में गए तो न्यायालय ने अपने जो निर्णय दिए हैं, उसमें न्यायालय ने स्वयं विवाद खड़ा किया है कि यह बांडिड लेबर की क्या परिभाषा है, यह कानून से स्पष्ट नहीं है और न्याया-

लय भी इसमें इस संबंध में उचित ढंग से परिभाषा नहीं कर पाया है, तो मैं आपसे निवेदन करना चाहूँगा कि अगर इस संबंध में कोई कन्स्यूजन हो या कोई दिक्कत अगर आपकी समझ में आती हो तो कृपया आप सफाई देने का कष्ट करें।

एक अंतिम बात मैं इंटरनेशनल कमीशन आन रूरल लेबर के बारे में कहना चाहता हूँ। यह कमीशन शायद 1987 में नियुक्त किया गया था और इसकी जुलाई, 1991 में सरकार के पास रिपोर्टें आ गईं और कई बार आपने उत्तर दिया है कि करीब-करीब उसकी 300 संस्तुतियाँ हैं और उन सारी संस्तुतियों का सरकार परीक्षण करा रही है। तो 1991 में जब आपके पास रिपोर्टें आ गई हैं और उनकी जो अच्छी संस्तुतियाँ हैं, जिनसे आप समझते हैं कि मजदूरों का हित होगा, भलाई होगी और श्रमिकों की परेशानी दूर होगी, तो मेरा आपसे निवेदन यह है कि जो नेशनल कमीशन आन रूरल लेबर है, इसके संबंध में आप इसको लागू कीजिए और जिन संस्तुतियों को आप समझते हैं कि ठीक नहीं है, उनको आप दरकिनारा कर दीजिए, लेकिन कम से कम यह मामला जो विचाराधीन पड़ा है, लम्बित पड़ा है, वह समाप्त तो हों।

इस अनुरोध के साथ मैं आपको धन्यवाद देता हूँ कि आपने मुझे समय दिया।

SHRI S. MADHAVAN (Tamil Nadu):
Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I would request the Government to review the working of the Emigration Act. The object of this Act is to protect the interests of workers going abroad. The hon. Minister has assured a number of times on the floor of the House that he would take some action. But the Act has become outmoded. Now, lakhs of people are going abroad. The trouble arises in foreign countries, not in India. The Minister of Labour should co-ordinate with the Minister of External Affairs. I hope the Labour Minister would visit certain countries where thousands of Indians are working. The other aspect of this Act is that—I also brought it to be notice of the Minister—this Act requires Emigration clearance for all the citizens of India, except certain categories. It is illegal. I don't think the Act empowers the Labour Department to notify such a notification at all. Section 22 of the Act says, "Only Emigrants requires clearance under this Act."

5.00 P.M.

Emigrants have been defined under the Act as those people who want to go abroad for working under labour agreement. And these people alone have to go to the Protector of Emigrants. But what is happening now? Take, for example, the case of Tamil Nadu. A lot of people of my State are living in foreign countries.

The family members of these people have to wait in long queues before the Protector of Emigrants for getting their Emigration clearance. There is also a lot of corruption and youngsters, particularly, are facing a lot of problems with this system. I think that the Minister must intervene in this matter. The Act has empowered the Protector of Emigrants to have control over all citizens of India. I even cited an instance in one of my letters to the Minister. This was about an old mother who wanted to leave for Singapore to attend to her daughter who was in the family way after a gap of about 10 years. And she had to appear before the Protector of Emigrants several times and she got into many difficulties. She could get the clearance only after my intervention. I do not know why the Minister is not able to solve this problem. The Minister wrote to me, "No, I have given clearance for 17 exempted categories". But the Minister is not able to say categorically that only those citizens seeking employment abroad will have to get this clearance; otherwise, all passports will be stamped, 'Emigration Clearance Required'. The Minister must take this aspect into account. So, the relatives of the people working abroad must not be made to go before the Protector of Emigrants for clearance. This is very important especially in the Southern States.

Then, as regards your Exit Policy, the name itself is threatening the labour force in our country. People think that you are introducing this Policy under the pressure of multinationals. Does it mean that you are going to amend the Labour Laws giving powers to employers to 'hire and fire' as and when they like? The Labour Minister also very nicely says that he will consider amending the labour laws. But

nobody knows what exactly he is going to do. The multinationals, especially, the Japanense firms, have clearly stated that unless the labour laws were amended in such a way as to give them power to throw the employees out of job and close down the factories whenever they wished, they would not think of making investments in India. The multinationals have gone with such a proposal before the Finance Ministry and I think the Finance Ministry, in turn, is putting pressure on the Labour Ministry. I fear that the Labour Minister is going to yield to that demand. Why do they want this clause to be incorporated? There is already a provision for closure of a unit. We have the Voluntary Retirement Scheme. They can obtain permission from the courts. Then why is it that the multinationals are keen on getting the laws amended? The strategy that they are adopting will only give rise to more problems for the employees.

Then, as regards BIFR, it always involves a lot of delay in the process of revival of the closed sick industries. I feel that the Labour Minister must have the final say and he must ascertain the views of the labourers before the BIFR proceeds to act. The BIFR takes a lot of times in settling the issue. It is mainly because the Board has no right to give directions to the financial institutions and the Government Departments for implementing their suggestions. Sometimes, the BIFR may require financial support for the revival of a sick unit but the financial institutions may not give them the money. So, even though this proposal may be of benefit to the labour force, yet it may not work. This lacuna has to be looked into and the Labour Minister must intervene in this matter as well.

Thank you.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI MD. SALIM): Shri Gurudas Das Gupta ...
(Interruptions)

SHRI M. A. BABY: Sir, my hon. colleague has referred to the plight of immigrant labourers. We know that many Ministers take justifiable foreign jaunts and, on a few occasions, not necessarily so.

Most of the South Indians, especially, in Saudi Arabia are facing very many difficulties, very serious difficulties. I very strongly agree with the hon. Member that the Minister should, after the Session, make a review of the matter so that the feeling of the South Indians could be assured. This is what I would like to submit, through you, to the hon. Minister.

SHRI GURUDAS DAS GUPTA (West Bengal): Sir, I am afraid that we are not discussing labour. We are discussing the anti-labour aspect of the Government's policy. After all, the country has been doling out concessions to everybody: to the trade, industry, multinationals, foreigners and Indians. At the same time, the working class of the country who are on jobs or who are without any job, are sought to be marginalised by the Government's policy. Therefore, it is this aspect of the labour policy which comes up for discussion, which has been put into the focus of the national scenario. We agree that the economy has to be reformed but the reform should not be very harsh. We agree that the industry has to be modernised. But the point is: Should the working class be called upon to bear the entire brunt of this process of change? The question that crops up very prominently is: Can the Government carry out its programme of economic reform with its completely disgruntled labour force which has a sense of growing frustration and harassment? Let me, at the very outset, put on record the nation's strong disapproval of the labour policy or the policy that is being pursued by the Government with regard to the labour in the country. At the fag end of the discussion, let me concentrate on some of the fundamentals. Will the Minister tell the country that it is possible to improve the productivity of labour and it is possible to augment the production of the country in a situation where the country is going through production recession, if we don't extend the umbrella of social security to the largest segment of the Indian labour force, may be 90% of it?

Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, years have passed, decades have gone by. Ministers have gone and new Ministers have taken their places. All they have been pronouncing in this august House is that the Govern-

ment is going to legislate on the rights and privileges of the unorganised labour force in the country which is notoriously known for underpayment of wages, which is notoriously known for the infringement upon the rights of the workers and which is notoriously known for the abnormally worsening conditions of labour. But nothing has been carried out. The National Commission for Rural Labour recommended and that recommendation was placed before the hon. Prime Minister. When he assumed his office, there was a categorical assurance that the Government would come to a conclusion within two months. Now, two years have passed. The tragedy of the situation is that profit has become fundamental in the economic decision-making of the Government and the concept of 'Welfare State' is being forgotten totally. If we look at the characteristics of the Indian labour situation, firstly there is a massive displacement of labour in all the spheres. Secondly, there is a growing sense of job insecurity and declining conditions of the labour in the country. Third, Sir, is the galloping rise in the volume of unemployment and under-employment which at the moment is in the region of 300 million in the country.

Sir, another important characteristic of the Indian situation is the rising trend of corporate crime. Sir, whether you look at jute or you look at textiles or you look at other important segments of the Indian industry, the crime being committed by the corporate sector is on the rise—delinquent transfer of ownership, benami transfer, suspension of production, transfer of capital and ultimately under the garb of sickness downright closing down of industry. And as a result, in the country today nearly 3,00,000 private sector units are closed. And you can imagine how many millions have been thrown out of job. On the other hand, there is complete anarchy in the public sector, particularly in those public sector industries which the Government has stigmatised as the so-called sick units. Till yesterday, it was the method of the private sector to close down without declaring the closure. Now look at the jute industry of West Bengal, the National Jute Manufacturing Corporation. Production has been stopped or suspended. And

there has been no formal notice whether there is a lockout or a closure or suspension of production. Look at the National Textile Corporation mills in Kanpur. The workers are not paid wages. Look at the textile mills of Maharashtra, which means the Government is following in the footsteps of the private sector to marginalise the labour force, to suspend production and to ensure carefully that the public sector is gradually dismantled in the country. May I ask the hon. Labour Minister one thing? Does he believe that the policy or principle of social justice can be initiated, even by steps, if he seeks to dismantle the public sector and he depends entirely on the private sector?

Sir, look at the atrocity committed on the Indian working class. Just within a span of one year, one lakh workers have been thrown out of job in public sector alone. Under the so-called scheme of voluntary retirement, which had been involuntary retrenchment, one lakh workers have lost jobs only in the public sector. Sir, look at the graph that depicts the rising tempo of lockouts, mandays lost due to lockouts, and the volume of lay-off. In 1990, Sir, 64,000 workers were laid off. In 1991, 71,000 workers were laid off. In 1992, more than one lakh workers had been laid off. In 1990, 13.45 million mandays were lost due to lockouts. In 1991, 14 million mandays were lost due to lockouts. In 1992, 15.13 million mandays were lost due to lockouts. Sir, this is the tragedy, this is the level of atrocity now being committed on the Indian working class, whether in the corporate sector or in the public sector. Therefore, the point is: Will the hon. Labour Minister take steps to protect the rights of the Indian working class? This is one side. On the other side, we have the double digit inflation. And as a result of the double-digit inflation, despite the optimism of our Finance Minister, the price spiral has reached 10.54 per cent rise. As a result, there is a constant erosion in the real wage of the Indian working class.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI MD. SALIM): You have to conclude now.

SHRI GURUDAS DAS GUPTA: I am concluding, Sir.

Sir, this is the country where the investment on social security is the lowest. This is the country where the growth rate of national development is low, and still lower is the job potential. Therefore, this is the situation under which we are left to discuss the conditions of the Indian labour.

Finally, Sir, may I put my points straight to the Labour Minister? May I ask him to kindly respond whether he is in a position to stop anarchy in the public sector, whether he is going to take steps to ensure that Budgetary allocations will not be suspended with regard to those public sectors whose cases are still left pending? There are innumerable examples where Dr. Manmohan Singh has been totally ingenuous. While has been generous to the foreign multinationals, he has withdrawn the life-saving finances to those public sectors which are under review with the BIFR. Incidentally, the BIFR had under its consideration 111 cases of the public sector and till date, they have recommended revival only in two cases. I would like the hon. Labour Minister to tell us if the mechanism of BIFR has been set up to give a death certificate to the public sectors before the patient has actually expired. Sir, I would like the hon. Labour Minister to tell us as to what steps he would like to take protect the jobs of the Indian working class whether in the private sector or in the public sector. I would like the hon. Labour Minister to tell us as to how he is going to prevail upon the current trend of development so that creation of additional job opportunities is augmented a little more than increase in the volume of population. Sir, I should like him to prevail upon the Indian Government to stop indiscriminate use of high-rise capital intensive labour-displacing technology in the country. India does not need indiscriminate use of high technology. What we need is appropriate technology, appropriate and consistent with the national interests. Therefore, the point is, our labour policy needs to be recast and the labour policy can only be recast if the economic policy is recast. I would like the Government and the hon. Minister of Labour to consider if the Indian situation can be altered. Indian working class needs to be

protected from the clutches of delinquency. Indian working class needs to be protected from the rising wave of displacement. Indian working class needs to be protected from the criminals who have been cheating the jute industry. I expect the hon. Minister of Labour to express his solidarity with the Government of West Bengal because it is the Government of West Bengal for the first time which has come out heavily on the provident fund defaulters and, as a result, there is an attempt on the part of big industry of the country to blackmail the Government of West Bengal. Only yesterday, there was a categorical statement that if Mr. Bajoria is not set free, then there is going to be withdrawal of capital from Calcutta. I would like to know, for whom does he stand? For whom does the Government of India stand? For whom does Comrade Jyoti Basu stand in indiscriminate arrest of all those who have been defaulting? Only yesterday in the night at 8 o'clock, I had a categorical discussion with Comrade Jyoti Basu, contrary to what *Anand Bazar* has been saying. He has categorically told me that law will have its own course in West Bengal and there is not going to be any let up. I would like to know, when West Bengal Government is sought to be (Interruptions)

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF COAL (SHRI AJIT KUMAR PANJA): There is a news in the *Anand Bazar Patrika*. . (Interruptions).

SHRI GURUDAS DAS GUPTA: He has categorically contradicted in a number of newspapers. *Anand Bazar Patrika* has scrupulously avoided contacting Comrade Jyoti Basu. A number of newspapers, including *The Statesman*, contacted him, not only myself, and there has been a categorical statement. I would like the hon. Minister of Coal to be a little soft to the State to which he belongs and to have a little solidarity with the people and the Government of West Bengal

Who are most courageously fighting against the defaulters than any other State Government in the country. Therefore, I do expect the Labour Minister to express solidarity with the West Bengal Government and tell the country categori-

cally that this attempt at blackmailing would not be tolerated. Lastly, Sir, . . .

SHRI AJIT KUMAR PANJA: Sir, since my name has been taken by the hon. Member . . .

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI MD. SALIM): You interrupted him.

SHRI AJIT KUMAR PANJA: Shri Das Gupta has taken my name. He said that since I belong to West Bengal, I should express my solidarity, Sir, three things are required. First, much has been the default in respect of provident fund in West Bengal and for how long? Secondly who are those persons? Let that list be disclosed in the House. Then, thirdly why, so long, action has not been taken? In some cases, they are pending for the last fifteen-twenty years. There was not a single action taken. I can say with responsibility in the House. Please ask the hon'ble Member to disclose the list here. No step has been taken by the West Bengal Government.

SHRI GURUDAS DAS GUPTA: The hon. Minister of Labour would kindly confirm. I am the Chairman of the Sub-Committee appointed by the Consultative Committee of the Labour Ministry to look into the problem of default. With your kind permission, let me share with this hon. House that the provident fund default in West Bengal is, of course, the highest. But the default in West Bengal had been the highest because the jute industry was defaulting. It was because the National Textile Corporation, which is under the Government, had been defaulting. It was because the National Jute Manufacturing Corporation, which is under the Commerce Ministry of the Government of India, had been defaulting. It was because a large number of engineering concerns, which are under the Ministry of Industry of the Government of India, have been defaulting. This is the reason for the provident fund default in West Bengal being the highest.

I would like to point out here that persistent efforts have been made by the Government of West Bengal, in co-operation with the Union Ministry of Labour

and the Directorate of the Provident Fund Organisation, to arrest people. Eighty-nine people were arrested. Between 1986 and 1990, 89 people were arrested. Not only people have been arrested, but people have also been sent to jail.

Sir, during the last one week, people have been arrested one after another. It is because of the long pendency of cases in the High Court that these people could not be sent to jail for a long time. It is because of lavish and very generous bailing out of people and it is because of the easy instalments that were given to the people who had defaulted that the law could not take its course.

Now, under the Ministry of Labour, a draft legislation is being prepared to plug the loopholes in the statute book so that, in future, people like Bajoria do not take refuge in the Bell View Nursing Home and are sent to jail. Steps are being taken to plug the loopholes in the statute book. Therefore, I request the Government of India, particularly, the Ministry of Labour, to stand solidly behind the West Bengal Government in the fight against these defaulters and criminals who are blackmailing the Government of West Bengal. I hope the Labour Minister would come out with a statement openly, in support of the Government of West Bengal which is taking all steps to ensure that the default is liquidated and the criminals are sent to jail.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI MD. SALIM): Shri Janardhan Yadav. (*Interruptions*).

SHRI GURUDAS DAS GUPTA: Sir, just one point. Incidentally, it is on the basis of the list that was given by the Provident Fund Organisation and the Sub-Committee of the Labour Consultative Committee that the arrests are being made in West Bengal.

श्री जनार्दन यादव (बिहार): उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, अभी माननीय सदस्य जो बोल रहे थे, प्रोविडेंट फंड के बारे में, सचमुच में खेद के साथ कहना पड़ता है कि सबसे अधिक बकाया वेस्ट बंगाल में ही है। वहां पर 32 करोड़ 87 लाख रुपया पब्लिक सेक्टर में है और 89 करोड़ 68 लाख रुपया प्राइवेट

सेक्टर में है। सबसे अधिक प्रोविडेंट फंड की वसूली पश्चिमी बंगाल में नहीं हुई। कुछ की बात यह है कि प्राइवेट सेक्टर में तो उनके मैनेजर, उनके एक्जिक्यूटिव डाइरेक्टर को जेल में बंद कर दिया है लेकिन स्टेट और सेंटर की जो पब्लिक अंडरटेकिंग्स पर जो बकाया है, उनके खिलाफ कोई कार्यवाही नहीं की जाती, यह कुछ की बात है।

उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं सर्वप्रथम मंत्री जी का ध्यान उस ओर ले जाना चाहता हूँ जहाँ से निर्माण का कार्य शुरू होता है। असंगठित मजदूर क्षेत्रों में सबसे ज्यादा संख्या ग्रामीण श्रमिकों की आती है। करीब-करीब 10 करोड़ कृषक श्रमिक हैं लेकिन कृषक मजदूर जो पैदा करता है, वहीं आज भूखा है। वह अभाव में पैदा होता है, अभाव में बढ़ता है, अभाव में जवान होता है, अभाव में बूढ़ा होता है और अभाव में ही मर जाता है अर्थात् पैदा करने वाला अन्न के अभाव में मर जाता है, वस्त्र के अभाव में मर जाता है जबकि वह अन्न और वस्त्र का उत्पादन करता है। कृषक मजदूरों के लिए अभी तक कोई भी अधिनियम नहीं बना है, जो न्यूनतम मजदूरी का नियम बना है, वह भी देश में लागू नहीं है। कृषि में काम करने वाले मजदूरों की जो मजदूरी है, 1992-93 में एक सन्धिति बनी थी, हनुमंतराव ने एक रिपोर्ट दी थी जिसमें यह बताया गया कि मद्रास के ग्रामीण क्षेत्रों में मजदूरों को चार रुपया प्रति दिन मजदूरी मिल रही है। जो निर्माण में लगे हुए मजदूर हैं, अगर वे भूखे रहे, गरीब रहे, तो देश कैसे सम्पन्न होगा? देश तभी सम्पन्न होगा जब ग्रामीण श्रमिक सम्पन्न होगा। मजदूर की हालत आज बहुत दयनीय है। अभी-अभी जो न्यूनतम मजदूरी अधिनियम लागू हुआ है वह 20 रुपये 50 पैसे है। बिहार में यह 16 रुपये 50 पैसे है। आज के युग में अगर 20 रुपये 50 पैसे मजदूरी तय हो भी जाए और मिल भी जाए तो क्या मजदूरों का पेट भरेगा? दिल्ली जैसे शहर में जिस मजदूर को 20 रुपये 50 पैसे मिलते हैं तो इतने पैसे से वह दिन भर चाय भी नहीं पी पाता है। गांव में 20 रुपये मजदूरी में वह शारीरिक श्रम करता है, इसलिए ग्रामीण श्रमिकों के उत्थान के लिए श्रम विभाग को श्रम मंत्रालय को सोचना चाहिये। अभी तक इस पर कोई विचार नहीं किया गया। साथ ही साथ असंगठित क्षेत्र में बाल श्रमिक बहुत अधिक संख्या में हैं। 1950 में जब भारत के संविधान ने भारत के बच्चों को अधिकार दिया था कि 14 वर्ष से कम उम्र के बच्चों को अनिवार्य शिक्षा मिलेगी, संविधान के साथ किस प्रकार की लगातार धोखाधड़ी हो रही है, इस बात को मैं श्रम मंत्री जी को बताना चाहता हूँ। 1948 से लगातार 11 कानून बाल श्रमिकों

को रोकने के लिए बनाए गए लेकिन बाल श्रमिकों की संख्या बढ़ती चली जा रही है। सरकारी रिपोर्ट के अनुसार यह संख्या द्वाई करोड़ है लेकिन स्वयं-सेवी संस्थाओं की रिपोर्ट के अनुसार भारत वर्ष में साढ़े पांच करोड़ बच्चे काम कर रहे हैं। बच्चों का जो काम करने का क्षेत्र है, वह गांव से शुरू होता है और शहर तक पहुंचता है। घरेलू नौकर के रूप में वह काम करता है। होटल में काम करता है। रेस्तरांत में वह काम करता है। साइकिल रिपेयर का काम करता है। खेत में काम करता है। कारण क्या है कि 46 वर्षों के बाद भी इस देश के बच्चे अपने मां-बाप के पेट में भूख की आग को बुझाने का काम अपने भविष्य को आग में झोंककर कर रहे हैं? आखिर उनका भविष्य समाप्त हो रहा है। इसलिए संविधान के अन्दर बच्चों को जो अधिकार मिला है अगर लेबर मिनिस्टर सिर्फ उसी का उपयोग करें तो बच्चों का भविष्य बन सकता है लेकिन ऐसा नहीं हो रहा है।

उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, अब मैं बीड़ी मजदूरों पर आता हूँ। बीड़ी मजदूरों की हालत तो सब से ज्यादा खराब है। यानी इस देश में दो करोड़ लोग बीड़ी बनाने का काम करते हैं लेकिन उनका शोषण हो रहा है। यानी बीड़ी बनाने वाला जो मजदूर है उसके साथ बीड़ी बनवाने वाला जो मालिक है वह बहुत बड़ा फाड़ कर रहा है। बहुत से कानून बन गये हैं लेकिन कोई भी बीड़ी मालिक अपने मकान में अपनी जमीन में कारीगरों को बुलाकर बीड़ी नहीं बनवाता है। जितनी बीड़ी बनती है उसका 10 प्रतिशत मालिक अपने कारखाने में बनवाता है और 90 प्रतिशत बीड़ी ठेके से बनवाता है। बीड़ी मजदूरों के लिए, उनके कल्याण के लिए, उनके विकास के लिए बहुत से अधिनियम बने हैं लेकिन उन अधिनियमों को लागू कौन कराएगा। यानी बीड़ी मजदूरों के कल्याण के लिए जो संस्था है उनको मकान बनाने के लिए पैसा आदि देना वह तभी देगा जब उसके पास आइडेंटिटी कार्ड रहेगा और आइडेंटिटी कार्ड बीड़ी बनवाने वाला मालिक देगा नहीं। वह देना नहीं चाहता क्योंकि अगर आइडेंटिटी कार्ड देगा तो बीड़ी मजदूर को सारी सुविधाएं मिलेगी जैसे घर बनाने की सुविधा है, टी० बी० या किसी बीमारी की सुरक्षा है। इसलिए सबसे ज्यादा गड़बड़ है कि आइडेंटिटी कार्ड बीड़ी बनवाने वाला मालिक देता ही नहीं है यानी बीड़ी मजदूरों की पहचान ही नहीं करता लेकिन बीड़ी बनवा रहा है (व्यवधान)

इसलिए बीड़ी मजदूरों के उत्थान के लिए, कल्याण के लिए एक राष्ट्रीय आयोग बनना चाहिए। देश

के सभी राज्यों में बीड़ी मजदूरों को समान मजदूरी मिलनी चाहिए, समान सुविधाएं मिलनी चाहिए। ये नहीं मिल रही है साथ ही साथ बंधुआ मजदूर हैं। बच्चे भी बंधुआ मजदूर हैं। गांव के गरीब लोग अपने बेटों को गिरवी रखते हैं अपने पेट की भूख की आग को बुझाने के लिए। लगातार अखबारों के माध्यम से सरकार स्टेटमेंट देती रही है कि देश में बंधुआ मजदूर समाप्त हो रहे हैं। एक भी बंधुआ मजदूर नहीं है। लेकिन आज देश में लाखों बंधुआ मजदूर हैं। उनकी खोज नहीं हो रही है। जिन मजदूरों की खोज हुई है 1976 के अधिनियम के तहत उनके पुनर्वास के लिए जो रपया संकलन हुआ है वह उन्हें नहीं मिल रहा है। बंधुआ मजदूर जो मुक्त हुए हैं उनके पुनर्वास की कोई व्यवस्था नहीं है। स्वतंत्र भारत में पशु की तरह लोगों को बंधक रखकर अगर लोग पेट भरते हैं तो यह शर्म की बात है, लज्जा की बात है। यह सरकारी गरीबों और पिछड़ों को सामाजिक न्याय दिलाने की बात करती है। जब से मंडल कमीशन लागू हुआ है, कांग्रेस

[उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री बी० नारायण स्वामी)
पीठासीन हुए]

भी सामाजिक न्याय की पक्षधर हो गयी है। यह जो असंगठित क्षेत्र है इसमें काम करने वाले वे ही लोग हैं जो गरीब हैं, पिछड़े हैं, हरिजन हैं, आदिवासी हैं, उनके आर्थिक उत्थान के लिए सामाजिक न्याय की घोषणा करने वाली सरकार क्या कर रही है। अभी माननीय सदस्य जगदीश प्रसाद माथुर जी कह रहे थे कि बछावत रिपोर्ट के बाद भी पत्रकारों को, पत्र में काम करने वाले कर्मचारियों को, उस रिपोर्ट की अनुशंसा के बाद भी वह वेतन नहीं मिल रहा है। पूरे देश में पत्र चलाने वाले जो प्रबंधन हैं उन्होंने 22 रिट पिटीशन सुप्रीम कोर्ट में दाखिल किये हैं।

जिसके चलते पत्रकारों को बछावत रिपोर्ट के आधार पर वेतन नहीं मिल रहा है, सुविधा नहीं मिल रही है और केन्द्र सरकार, सुप्रीम कोर्ट में 22 रिट पिटीशन दाखिल है और उसको जल्दी निष्पादन कराना नहीं चाहती, तो लेबर मिनिस्टर का ध्यान उस ओर जाना चाहिए। इसके बाद नई औद्योगिक नीति आर्थिक उदारीकरण यह 1991 के बाद चला है। नई औद्योगिक नीति के चलते जितने उद्योग बंद हुए, नई औद्योगिक नीति से ज्यादा अगर हानि हुई है तो लेबर डिपार्टमेंट को, मजदूरों को, कामगारों को, यानी 65 लाख मजदूर स्वेच्छा से रिटायर हो रहे हैं, हो गए। सैंकड़ों उद्योग बंद हो गए। अभी मैं धनबाद गया था। कुमार धुरवी ने एक उद्योग है सिलिकेट का, उसको स्टील विभाग ने लिया है। 6 महीने से वह उद्योग बंद है। 1479 मजदूर बर्हा

हैं। 6 महीने से एक पैसा नहीं मिल रहा है। 20 मजदूर मर चुके हैं क्योंकि पेमेंट नहीं हो रहा है। एक मैन उदाहरण दिया। यह नई औद्योगिक नीति का पहला तोहफा है। इस प्रकार के और कितने तोहफे होंगे? इसलिए नई औद्योगिक नीति के चलते अर्ध विकसित और विकसित जो देश हैं, वहां बेकारी बढ़ेगी, गरीबी बढ़ेगी और जिम्सों के भाव बढ़ेंगे। इसलिए अगर हम नई औद्योगिक नीति को स्वीकार किए हैं तो वह नीति उद्योग के विकास के लिए, उद्योग में लगे हुए जो कामगार हैं उनके विकास के लिए कसौटी होंगी, लेकिन नहीं हो रहा है। आर्थिक उदारीकरण क्या हो रहा है। एक तरफ आर्थिक उदारीकरण का नारा दिया जा रहा है, दूसरी तरफ इस देश में लाइसेंस परमिट कोटा, जिसको समाप्त करने की बात की गई थी वह बढ़ रहा है। यानी विदेश कंपनियों को हिन्दुस्थान में लाकर हिन्दुस्थान को कंज्यूमर बना रहे हैं। वहीं देश आर्थिक दृष्टि से सम्पन्न होगा जो देश उत्पादक होगा। हमारी आर्थिक नीति ऐसी होनी चाहिए जो देश को उत्पादक बनाए। देश को कंज्यूमर बना रहे हैं और मानवीय मनमोहन सिंह जो इसके ढोल पीट रहे हैं कि आर्थिक क्षेत्र में हमने बहुत विकास किया है। यानी जब आर्थिक विकास होगा तभी लेबर का विकास होगा, किसानों की जब तक सम्पन्नता नहीं बढ़ती खेती में लगे हुए मजदूरों की सम्पन्नता भी नहीं बढ़ेगी। इसलिए किसानों को भी सुविधा नहीं दी जा रही है। न्यूनतम मजदूरी लागू करने के बाद भी ग्रामीण क्षेत्रों में मजदूर साल में 6 महीने बैठा रहता है। वहां सीजनल काम होता है। इसलिए उद्योगपतियों को भी सुविधा देना, किसानों को भी सुविधा देना, उद्योगपति और किसान को अगर सुविधा मिलेगी तभी उद्योग में लगे हुए मजदूरों को सुविधा मिलेगी, खेती में लगे हुए मजदूरों को सुविधा मिलेगी। दोनों को सुविधा नहीं मिल रही है। जब उद्योगपति को सुविधा नहीं मिलेगी, उसको जब लाभ नहीं होगा तो प्राइवेट इंडस्ट्री बंद होगा। सरकार की इंडस्ट्री बंद हो रही है। इसलिए नीतियों में परिवर्तन करने की आवश्यकता है। हम लेबर मिनिस्टर से आग्रह करेंगे कि आप कैबिनेट में जाते हैं, कम से कम उद्योग मंत्री, लेबर मिनिस्टर और फाइनांस मिनिस्टर ये तीनों मिनिस्टर एक राय से भारत के आर्थिक विकास में योगदान दें।

फायनेंस मिनिस्टर एक बात कह रहे हैं, उद्योगपति दूसरी बात कह रहे हैं और लेबर मिनिस्टर तीसरी बात कह रहे हैं। तो जब तीनों मिनिस्टर्स में मेल नहीं होगा तो देश

का विकास कैसे होगा? यहां तो एक ही पार्टी में काम करने वाले, एक ही कैबिनेट में काम करने वाले तीनों लोगों में मेल नहीं है। लेबर मिनिस्टर क्या करेंगे? वह तो लेबर के हित की बात करेंगे? फिर बेरोजगारी बढ़ रही है। तो लेबर मिनिस्टर उसका कैसे नियोजन करेंगे? वह तो नियोजन नहीं कर सकते। अभी देश में 4 करोड़ पढ़े-लिखे नौजवान बेकार हैं। 35 करोड़ लोग गरीबी रेखा के नीचे जीवन व्यतीत कर रहे हैं। इस देश में 48 करोड़ लोग निरक्षर हैं तो इस देश में जो मंत्री हैं, सांसद हैं उनके लिए काम करने का मौका है। इस देश के गरीब लोगों को, मजदूरों को चाहे वे संगठित हों या असंगठित हों, दोनों क्षेत्र के मजदूरों को इन बने हुए अधिनियमों से वे कितना लाभ पहुंचा सकते हैं, इसके लिए अगर हम मिलकर काम करेंगे तो कुछ लाभ जरूर पहुंचा सकते हैं, लेकिन इस देश में जो हरिजन हैं, आदिवासी हैं—वह सब पिछड़े हैं। हालांकि उनके लिए देश में कोविंग सेंटर्स/ट्रेनिंग के 86 सेंटर्स बने हुए हैं। उन्हें कुशल कारीगर बनाने के लिए बजट में भी प्रावधान है, लेकिन हरिजन-आदिवासी, अनुसूचित-जाति, अनुसूचित-जनजाति के बच्चों और मजदूरों को कितना लाभ मिल रहा है आज, क्या आपने कभी यह देखा है? इसलिए हम आपसे आग्रह करेंगे कि देश में जो असंगठित लेबर है, जिनके आधार पर हम और आप खड़े हैं क्योंकि अगर वह अन्न पैदा नहीं करेंगे, कपड़ा पैदा नहीं करेंगे तो हम लोग असमर्थ युग में चले जाएंगे, लेकिन आज वे भूखे हैं, नंगे हैं। असल में तो उनकी पूजा ही भगवान की पूजा होगी क्योंकि गरीबों की पूजा भगवान की पूजा होती है, लेकिन अभी तक गरीबों की पूजा नहीं हो रही है, सफेद कपड़ेवालों की पूजा हो रही है। उनका मान-सम्मान हो रहा है। आज देश में ऑर्गनाइज्ड और इंटेलिक्चुअल लोगों को सारी सुविधाएं मिल रही हैं, लेकिन जो गरीब लोग हैं, अशिक्षित हैं, आर्थिक रूप से पिछड़े हैं, सामाजिक दृष्टि से पिछड़े हैं, असंगठित लेबर हैं—उनके लिए कोई कुछ नहीं कर रहा है। सिर्फ हमारे भाषण देने से काम नहीं होगा। उनके लिए योजना बनाने और उन्हें कार्य रूप देना होगा। अगर इतना हम लोग ईमानदारी के साथ कर पाएं तो हम संसद में होने के अपने दायित्व का निर्वाह कर सकते हैं।

इन्हीं शब्दों के साथ मैं अपनी बात समाप्त करता हूँ।

डा० बापू कालदास : उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, जबिकों की समस्याओं के बारे में काफी लोग बोल

चुके हैं और मैं खुद को इतना अक्लमंद नहीं मानता हूँ कि मैं विशेष-रूप से अपना योगदान कर सकूँ क्योंकि बहुतांश विषयों को, मुझसे पहले जो सम्माननीय सदस्य इसमें हिस्सा ले चुके हैं, उन्होंने स्पर्श कर दिया है। केवल दो-तीन बातों को मैं आग्रहपूर्वक कहना चाहता हूँ और इसके लिए मुझे ज्यादा समय नहीं चाहिए, मैं 10 मिनट में अपनी बात समाप्त कर दूंगा।

उपसभाध्यक्ष जी, पहली बात मैं स्पष्ट कर देना चाहता हूँ जोकि कहीं लोगों ने कही है क्योंकि मैं यह मानता हूँ कि श्रम नीति स्वयं-भू नहीं होती है।

श्रम नीति का आधार देश की विकास की प्रक्रिया के साथ जुड़ा होता है। किस ढंग से हम इस देश की आर्थिक स्थिति को सुधारना चाहते हैं? किस ढंग से यहाँ की उत्पादन प्रक्रिया को बढ़ाने वाले हैं? किस रास्ते से इस देश के जो भी काम करने वाले लोग हैं उनके हाथों को काम देने वाले हैं? किस दृष्टि से हम दुनिया की सारी स्पर्धात्मक प्रक्रिया में एक मजबूत देश के रूप में हिस्सा ले सकते हैं? इस पर आपकी क्या नीति निर्भर होगी?

मुझे यह कहते हुए बड़ा खेद है कि सरकार की उदारता की नीति धनवानों के लिए उदारता की रही है, लेकिन श्रमिकों के लिए अनुदार और अमानुष रही है। यह बात मैं पहले स्पष्ट कर देना चाहता हूँ। शायद कांग्रेस के लोग अब गांधी जी को भूल रहे हैं। हम उसी से पैदा हुए हैं। उस आंदोलन का कोई असर है हमारे ऊपर। मैं गांधी जी के शब्द यहाँ कोट करना चाहता हूँ। वहाँ सिर्फ उनका पुतला लगा देने से कोई मतलब नहीं है। कभी-कभी हम ढोंगी बनकर देवताओं की पूजा करते हैं और अपना ढोंग चलाते हैं। यह कहा गया है—

Hypocrisy is the keynote of modern civilisation.

ढोंग, यह आधुनिक समाज की एक सबसे बड़ी उपलब्धि है। यह तो आप मानेंगे। गांधी जी ने क्या कहा था, वह मैं कोट करता हूँ। गांधी जी ने कहा—

"I am not against the machine. I want the glory of machine. But I do not want that glory to be on the debris of the dignity of man."

यह सही बात है कि सारी मानवता का आधार मनुष्य पर होना चाहिए। हम जो भी नियोजन या प्लान कर रहे हैं, उसका केन्द्र बिन्दु इस देश में मौन

है? इसका केन्द्र बिन्दु होना चाहिए मनुष्य। यह दुख की बात है कि जिस ढंग की नीतियाँ आप देश के विकास की प्रक्रिया कहकर लोगों के सामने पेश कर रहे हैं उसमें सदैव बेइज्जती अगर किसी की होती है तो इंसान की। मैंने बार-बार कहा है कि इस देश में सभी चीजों के दाम बढ़े हैं, लेकिन सबसे घटा हुआ दाम अगर किसी का है तो वह है इंसान का। इंसान का दाम रोज घटता जा रहा है।

मैं विज्ञान के विरोध में नहीं हूँ। मैं विज्ञान का उपासक हूँ और मैं मानता हूँ कि विज्ञान की प्रक्रिया हमारे देश में ऐसी होनी चाहिए, जिससे हम उसका इस्तेमाल करें तो हमारे हाथों का कष्ट कम हो जाए, शोषण की प्रक्रिया कम हो जाए और जो उत्पादन करें वह उत्पादन ज्यादा हो, ज्यादा मुलायम हो, ज्यादा अच्छा हो। जो इन्डिस्क्रीमिनेट मोडर्नाइजेशन इस देश में चल रहा है....

This is totally indiscriminate.

विवेकशून्य है। विवेकशून्य आधुनिकीकरण का यह परिणाम हो रहा है कि लोगों के हाथों के कष्ट को कम करने के बजाय लोगों के हाथों को काटने का धंधा इस देश में आप शुरू कर चुके हैं। मैं आपको एक उदाहरण देना चाहता हूँ कि क्या हो रहा है। इसमें विवेक की बहुत आवश्यकता है कि विज्ञान का उपयोग हम इस देश में जब करना चाहते हैं तो विवेकपूर्ण रूप से करें, जिसको गुरुदास जी ने कहा—

It is not modern technology alone. Modernisation is needed. But that must be appropriate.

हमारे देश की जरूरतों के साथ उसको जाना चाहिए। इसमें हम देख रहे हैं कि हो ही नहीं रहा। हमारे महाराष्ट्र में शुरार कोआपरेटिव इंडस्ट्रीज बहुत हैं। अगर 10,000 टन का प्लांट है तो वहाँ 3,000 मजदूर काम करते हैं। अब अगर आप आधुनिकीकरण करेंगे, सोफिस्टिकेटेड करेंगे तो शायद हो सकता है कि 100 मजदूर सारा काम कर सकें। ... What is our thrust? हमारे देश में जोर किस पर है? Man, in itself is a capital.

हमारे देश में हमारी कैपिटल मनुष्य शक्ति है। मनुष्य शक्ति का, जैसा विनोबा जी ने एक बार कहा था, आदमी एक होता है और उसके हाथ दो होते हैं। इसलिए कोई आवश्यकता नहीं है कि एक आदमी भूखा मरे, जब उसके दो हाथ होते हैं। यह जो हाथ है उनको अगर काम देने की प्रक्रिया जारी नहीं रखेंगे तो संगमा जी, मुझे डर है कि आपकी मिनिस्ट्री ही कुछ दिनों बाद बंद करने की अवस्था में आ जाएगी क्योंकि जिस तरह कारखाने बंद कर रहे हैं तो लेबर मिनिस्ट्री

की कोई जरूरत ही नहीं रहेगी। इतना मोडर्नाइजेशन इतना श्रम शक्ति का सिकुड़ना विकसित देशों के लिए अच्छा नहीं है। यह बात में आपके ध्यान में अवश्य लाना चाहता हूँ।

और मैं यह चाहता हूँ क्योंकि आपको याद होगा जो आपने फिर कहा कि जब जनता दल की सरकार थी, तब एक ड्राफ्ट एप्रोच डाक्यूमेंट प्रेजेंट किया था What was the thrust of the Janata Dal Government in the Eighth Five Year Plan? The thrust was employment.

और यह भी कहा था कि उस समय कि इम्प्लायमेंट के लिए डिसेंट्रलाइजेशन। ज्यादा से ज्यादा विकेन्द्रीकरण करो कि जहाँ यह छोटे से छोटे लोग हैं देहात के, उनके लिए वहाँ का जो उत्पादन है, उसके लिए वहीं प्रक्रिया करो जहाँ कि रूरल इम्प्लायमेंट हम ज्यादा बढ़ा सकते हैं, यह आज बंद हो रहा है धीरे-धीरे। आप जानते हैं कि आज का इनडिस्ट्रिकमिनेट अरबेनाइजेशन इस देश में चल रहा है, इसका सबसे बड़ा कारण यह है कि आज देहातों में रोजगार उपलब्ध नहीं है, लोग माइग्रेट हो रहे हैं। आप बम्बई में जाइए 50 फीसदी लोग रास्ते पर रहते हैं, इतनी अमानवीय अवस्था में रहते हैं, जानवर से भी बुरी हालत में रहते हैं। वे कोई प्यार से, आनन्द से वहाँ नहीं आए हैं वे इस कारण आए हैं कि उनके हाथों के लिए आज देहातों में कोई रोजगार नहीं है और आप खुद जानते हैं कि जो श्रम आयोग बनाया था, ग्रामीण श्रमिकों के लिए आयोग, जिसका अभी जिक्र किया यादव जी ने हनुमंतराव जी का, उसमें उन्होंने आपको रिपोर्ट दे दिया, उसमें तीन बातों की तरफ, आपका ज्यादा समय नहीं लूंगा, तीन बातें आप कब करने वाले हैं यह बताइए? एक रूरल लेबर के बारे में इस देश में कोई कानून अभी तक नहीं हुआ, सालों चलते गए? जब से हम आजाद हुए तब से आज 50 साल हो जाएंगे दो-चार साल में, लेकिन क्या हुआ? अभी कमीशन आफ्टर कमीशन, मीटिंग्स आफ्टर मीटिंग कभी लेबर मिनिस्टर मिलते हैं, कभी चीफ मिनिस्टर मिलते हैं, कभी आप रहते हैं, कभी कोई रहते हैं, लेकिन कानून नहीं बन रहा है। क्यों नहीं बन रहा है? और आप वहाँ लिखते हैं, आपकी एन्यूअल रिपोर्ट में क्या लिखा है :—

"The Ministry is attaching the highest priority to this matter."

चालीस-पचास साल तक आप श्रमिकों के लिए देहाती श्रमिकों के लिए अगर कानून नहीं बना सकते तो आपकी प्रियारिटी का मतलब क्या है? तो हम चाहते हैं कि What is the priority that you are giving?

क्या आप समय बता सकते हैं हमको? कालबद्ध कीजिए, समयबद्ध कीजिए कि इस समय में इस कानून को हम यहाँ लाएंगे। यह बात में जानता हूँ कि उस पर अमल करना राज्य सरकारों का काम है लेकिन अगर यहाँ से कोई दबाव आएगा तो राज्य सरकारों के ऊपर भी उसका दबाव आएगा और हम लोग जो यहाँ बैठे हैं राज्यों से आए हुए, वे देखेंगे कि राज्य सरकारें इस कानून के जरिए जो कुछ भी सुविधाएं उपलब्ध कराना चाहती हैं, उनको अमल में लाने का काम हम करेंगे। लेकिन कहां है आपकी प्रियारिटी? हमको लगता है कि कोई प्रियारिटी ही नहीं है, नहीं तो 50 साल तक यह नहीं चलता।

एक बिल हमने इस सदन में लाया था और वह है I am talking only about the unorganised sector.

जिन बातों का जिक्र यहाँ नहीं हुआ, वह है घरेलू कर्मचारी। इस सदन में मैंने एक बिल लाया था जैसे कंस्ट्रक्शन वर्कर्स है, बीड़ी मजदूर है वैसे ही घरेलू काम करने वाले मजदूर है। इन बेचारों के लिए कोई नियम नहीं है, कोई सुविधा नहीं है। जनता दल की सरकार ने अपने समय में इस पर ध्यान दिलाया था लेकिन अनफारच्युनेटली बिल का जब जवाब देने के लिए मिनिस्टर आना चाहते थे, उसी समय हमारी सरकार गिर गई, वह तो हमारे लिए दुर्भाग्य की बात है, आपके हाथ में अगर आ गया तो मैं यह भी जानना चाहता हूँ कि जो घरेलू मजदूर होते हैं, इनके लिए आप कुछ करना चाहते हैं? अगर करना चाहते हैं तो क्या करना चाहते हैं? यह मेरा दूसरा सवाल होगा। वैसे ही कंस्ट्रक्शन वर्कर्स के बारे में कई सालों से चलता आया है, आप भी जानते हैं इस बात को, जस्टिस अय्यर साहब कुछ समय के लिए आए, जिन्होंने इन लोगों को मार्गदर्शन किया था, हम भी उसमें थोड़ा-बहुत काम करते थे, लेकिन आज तक कंस्ट्रक्शन वर्कर्स के लिए, आपके इसमें भी है कि जो आयोग है, आयोग में भी इसके बारे में सिफारिशें की हैं कि एक बिल पड़ा हुआ था 1986 वाला, उसके बारे में आपने कुछ नहीं किया है।

तो मैं तीन बातों के बारे में आपका ध्यान खींचना चाहता हूँ। पहली बात तो यह है कि आप घरेलू मजदूरों के लिए कुछ करना चाहते हैं या नहीं? नम्बर दो, जिसको आप प्रियारिटी कहते हैं, वह रूरल लेबर के बारे में आप कब यहाँ सदन में लाने वाले हैं? नम्बर तीन, जो कंस्ट्रक्शन वर्कर्स की बात सालों से चलती आई है, उस सालों से चलती बात को अमली जामा पहनाने के लिए आप कब सदन में आ रहे हैं? इन तीन बातों का आप जवाब दीजिए। बहुत-बहुत धन्यवाद।

SHRI JIBON ROY (West Bengal): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I am not making any speech. I will only make some points for the response of the hon. Minister. Firstly, this year is the 75th anniversary of the International Labour Organisation, ILO. Now, the two important conventions of the ILO are right to organise and right to collective bargaining and freedom of association. The Government of India has not yet accepted them. It is not only that they are not accepted, but many workers and employees are not allowed to organise themselves. The employees of the Life Insurance Corporation and the GIC have no right to organise. They cannot do any collective bargaining. I would like to know from the Labour Minister whether the Government will ratify these two important conventions of the ILO.

The second point which I would like to respond concerning politics in trade Union, so long as the employers are organising political parties and those political parties are used against the labour to exploit the labour, the workers have a right to organise themselves as a political force. My point is that party politics should not come in the way of unity of the trade union's and workers. After all, the new economic policies and the GATT are an expression of the economics of the international capitalists and monopoly houses. Ultimately both, the GATT and the economic policies, will reduce labour into slavery. If these policies are pursued slavery will come to India. We cannot fight it without organising workers as political force. Whatever the Government may say or whatever Shrimati Jayanthi Natarajanji may say, that as a consequence of the new policies there will be large-scale contractisation of the permanent workers, there will be large-scale exploitation of the child labour and there will be large-scale exploitation of the women. You cannot escape from it. I would like to know how you are going to protect those sections of the workers. What will be the wage of the contracted workers? Is the ruling minimum wage declared in different states will be paid in the steel industry, coalmines and NTPC etc? Or, will you consider them as separate wages in those areas? So far as women workers are

concerned, 27% of the entire women workers are or part-timer. Their strength is increasing every year. How are you going to protect the interest of these workers? No wage is paid to the part-time workers. How are you going to protect them?

As far as the ICDS programme is concerned, Jayanthi Natarajanji has not said anything, their minimum wage is Rs. 200. You are taking the position that these women are social workers. I would like to know whether you are going to increase the wages of the women working under the ICDS to Rs. 1,000 per month.

There is large scale exploitation of the Scheduled Castes and tribal workers. According to your own statistics, employment in public sector has gone down by 7% between 1991 and 1993. Employment of Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes has gone down by 14.8%. Employment of tribal workers has gone down by 24%. Therefore a new trend is emerging, their employment in permanent work will be reduced. They will join the contract workers' strength. You have to protect them. How are you going to protect them?

The third point to which I would like him to react is this. The hon. Labour Minister is very generous in making promises but is very conservative in implementing those promises. You have promised before the trade unions that no public sector factories will suffer for want of raw materials. You have promised that the past loans of those industries which are not making losses currently will be waived. But nothing has been done. You have promised that you will bring a new law on the bonus issue. You have not done anything to fulfil that promise. When you were the Minister of Coal you had signed an agreement on a pension scheme for coal workers similarly agreement is signed for steel workers also. But that scheme was not implemented. You have promised that a pension scheme will be formulated.

6.00 P.M.

Why is the employer not contributing to the pension scheme? Sir, I have got one more point to make.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY): You make your final point.

SHRI JIBON ROY: Sir, an unpaid Provident Fund of Rs. 38,000 crores is lying with the Government of India. This money is being invested in the Budget. Why can't this money be diverted for investment in the public sector so that the sick plants can be revived? These are some of the points which I have placed before you. Thank you.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY): So, the hon. Members have made their points. The Minister will make his reply tomorrow. Now,

we will take up the remaining Special Mentions.

Shri Sushilkumar Sambhajirao Shinde—not there. Shri Inder Kumar Gujral—not there. Shri N. Giri Prasad—not there. Shri Govindrao Adik—not there. Shri Suresh Pachouri—not there. None of them is present.

The House stands adjourned till 11 a.m. tomorrow.

The House then adjourned at one minute past six of the clock till eleven of the clock on Tuesday, the 26th April, 1994.