

[Mr. Deputy Chairman]

The Committee recommended that the Private Member's Resolution that may be moved on Friday, the 16th July, 1982, should conclude on that very day.

The Committee also recommended that in view of the Presidential Poll on Monday, the 12th July, 1982, there will be no sitting of the Rajya Sabha on that day.

The Committee further recommended that the House should sit up to 6 p.m. daily and beyond 6 p.m. as and when necessary for the transaction of Government Business.

#### CALLING ATTENTION TO A MATTER OF URGENT PUBLIC IMPORTANCE

**The serious situation arising out of the prolonged strike in Textile mills in Bombay, Resulting in loss of production and hardship to workers and the action taken by Government**

SHRI P. RAMAMURTI (Tamil Nadu): Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, since I am not directly connected with the strike... (Interruptions) Let them go; I want some peace. Since I am not directly connected with the strike and I do not know the mood of the workers, I am not in a position to give a correct reaction as far as those people are concerned. I am not in a position to do that. But the first thing that strikes me when I read this statement is a shifting of the position of the Government. I welcome that shifting to some extent. Time was when the Government, Ministers said repeatedly that they will consider their legitimate demands after the workers go back and that 'we appeal to them that we will consider their legitimate demands. What are those legitimate demands, it is for the Government to decide. And so, you trust us. This was the attitude taken by them. Then

it requires six months of strike, a courageous struggle when people faced starvation, to put some sense in the Government that the workers cannot be dealt with in this way.

Now, Sir, I am just revealing something. On the 20th of last month I had a talk with the Prime Minister and I think Shri Pranab Mukherjee was also present there. I had a talk with the Prime Minister on this whole question of Bombay strike. I had told her at that time that you are too much depending on the INTUC union there and that has brought you into this difficult position. After all, the Bombay Industrial Disputes Act may be anything. The laws are made for the workers and workers are not made for laws. Even at that time when the law was passed the entire force of Bombay textile workers and other workers in Bombay in 1948 protested against that law by going on a complete strike on the day on which it was placed before the Assembly. You never bother about the workers. You must have a certain union. The law was specifically made for the purpose of encouraging a certain kind of union which you wanted. The mill owners can manoeuvre. The Government can manoeuvre the way it wants. That is what you did. You have done it four times. This is not the first time. Even before, the agreements that have been entered into by that union with the management they have been broken by workers' solidarity and strike and you had to enter into an agreement with other people. This has happened before on the question of bonus. This has not happened for the first time. Here is such a union which is sought to be imposed. Here it is not the only place. The INTUC joined us in Madras when the DMK Government at that time imposed an agreement behind the back of the workers. The INTUC also joined all of us when the workers revolted. At that time what the workers did was correct. But here when your union enters into an agreement behind the back of the workers, the workers know nothing

about it, the INTUC union is not in touch with the workers, you are talking to a person who you say is the representative, who is to decide about the representation, are you to decide who are the representatives, they are the representatives of the workers, today the workers are disobeying them and saying that they are not their representatives, and therefore do not talk to them, therefore, what more do you want? How many more strikes of this type do you want? The simple method that they ask is, we ask for a ballot to decide it. If the Government and the country can be decided by means of a vote, why cannot the workers' representatives be decided by a free vote of the workers? Why all this cumbersome thing. If it had been done, many of these problems would have been solved. We are doing it in a number of public sector undertakings. The results are good. That is a different question. Now, Sir, when I had a talk with them, I had suggested that all the unions might be called. Leave alone what has happened. All the unions might be called together and a discussion might take place and after that give some interim relief, fairly substantial interim relief, and after that you can appoint a tripartite committee to go into this question. But, first of all, give the interim relief. Give interim relief not on the question of the house rent alone. It should be given with regard to wages. After all, you should understand what the workers' feeling it. Your own figures show that the textile worker's productivity has increased by 25 per cent during the last 10 years. These are figure supplied by your Ministry itself. The textile workers' productivity has increased by 25 per cent, whereas his real wages have increased hardly 2 per cent. In many cases these have not increased at all. And, in some places they have gone down. In Bombay they have gone down. When this is the position and, at the same time, when the workers know that these people are blackmarketing the cloth, the blackmarket money is being

taken away, and the mills are becoming sick, it is because you are not able to prevent the sequestering of the funds of the company by the management, the worker has to suffer. For your inability the worker has to suffer. Therefore, Sir, when this is the position, when 25 per cent increase in productivity has actually taken place, according to statistics produced by you, unless you say that your statistical department is a fraudulent department, it is an under-estimate, they have produced more; even according to your own theory of productivity you have said that you will give them more wages if they increase productivity and they have increased productivity, what are you going to do now?

What are you going to do now? Therefore, an announcement of a sizable interim relief with regard to their wages would satisfy them. Without that, I do not know whether it is going to satisfy. So, at that time I had the impression that both Mr. Pranab Mukherjee and the Prime Minister agreed with my proposal that this was the best way to solve it. I do not know with whom did he discuss it further, and he said: "Don't think I did not discuss with you or somebody." I said: "You call all the textile unions in Bombay and discuss with them." As far as I know, newspapers have not carried any news that discussions took place with all the trade unions of textile workers that exist there. Therefore, I would appeal to the Government of India even now to think of the deep implications of the ferment among the workers. We want to co-operate; we do not want to sabotage, and at the same time I would also like to tell you that when we make suggestions in the public sector, in the private sector, when we bring to the notice of the Government extreme corruption in the public sector, in the core industry and other places, what do we get? We get nothing. Rather our people get victimised. What is the use? Is there a fair enquiry? No. Anyway, I do not want to go into that. I would

[Shri P. Ramamurti]

like to suggest to him to call all the leaders of the trade union workers, and as a result of this discussion, this give and take, you come to some conclusion. You announce an immediate interim relief. The Wage Committee, we hope will go into the question but its recommendations might or might not be accepted; but I am sure these will be accepted. I would like to ask whether they are prepared to consider it. If the workers accept it, I am not going to stand in the way. It is for them to decide. But my hunch is that workers will not be able to accept it because of their difficulties.

SHRI BHAGWAT JHA AZAD : I have made the position clear in reply to other hon. Members that now what the Government has offered is the best in the circumstances. We do not stand on prestige. We have given reliefs to them and these are that some increase in the wages would be considered after the tripartite committee gives its report. And that committee will also not go on for months and years as some hon. Members said, but only after 6 months it will give its report. There are peculiar features of this industry. As the hon. Member said, its productivity has gone up by 25 per cent whereas the wages have gone up by only 2 per cent. Then there are some who contended that wages in other industries have gone up at a higher rate and they compared this industry with chemicals industry. Some Members contended that Chemicals industry can pass on its burden to others but textile industry cannot. Therefore, considering all these points and considering the set up of the industry which is now suffering very much, we have to see also that the workers' interest also is not lost by closure of the industry. Therefore, we have only given 6 months to the committee to give its report and its recommendations with regard to increase in wages. This has to be considered very carefully in its all-India perspective and that is why we

could not think anything else on this aspect. We have considered the other aspect also and we are committed; we have given a definite and concrete relief and I hope the workers will come back to work and within 6 months, we will have the recommendations of the committee on the reliefs being asked for by the workers and representatives of the workers will also be there on this committee and I hope it will be possible for the Government to take a decision.

श्री सदाशिव बगईसकर (महाराष्ट्र) :

श्रीमन्, जो निवेदन अभी श्रम मंत्री जी ने किया है उस निवेदन का मेरी समझ में जो मांगे मजदूरों की है उससे कोई ताल्लुक नहीं है, सम्बन्ध नहीं है। श्रम मंत्री जी को मैं अर्ज करूंगा कि कल के बम्बई के अखबारों में जो आया है और वहां जो शिवाजी पार्क पर टेक्सटाइल मजदूरों की एक विशाल मीटिंग हुई है जिसमें अखबार में उन्होंने लिखा है कि 50 हजार से ज्यादा मजदूर वहां उपस्थित थे। श्रीमन् यह प्रेस का रिपोर्ट है। श्रीमन्, इसमें इस हड़ताल को चलाने वाले श्री दत्ता सामंत ने जो बयान दिया है उसको हम देखें और एक तरफ रख दें और दूसरी तरफ जो आज आपने निवेदन किया है उसको दूसरी तरफ रखें तो मुझे नहीं लगता है कि मजदूरों की जो जायज मांगें हैं जिनको लेकर वहां पर इतनी लम्बी हड़ताल चली है, देश के पूरे इतिहास में इस तरह की लम्बी हड़ताल पहले कभी नहीं हुई। एक हड़ताल टेक्सटाइल मजदूरों की 1928 में बम्बई में हुई थी जो 16 अप्रैल, से 2 अक्टूबर, 1980 तक चली थी।

This was the longest strike in Bombay's textile history.

उसके बाद का यह हड़ताल है। पहले के इस रिकार्ड को भी इस हड़ताल ने तोड़ा है। अब इतनी लम्बी जो हड़ताल मजदूरों

ने चलाई है इसमें आपका यह विचार या राय हो सकती है कि यह जबरदस्ती से, टैरर से, इस तरह से स्ट्राइक चली है लेकिन मेरा अपना अनुभव है ट्रेड यूनियन में इस तरह की लम्बी हड़ताल टैरर से नहीं चलती है। यह तो मजदूरों का स्वयं का फैसला है, जो 60-70 साल से वे भोग रहे हैं उससे अगर उनको छुटकारा नहीं मिलता है तो जहन्नुम में जाए टेक्सटाइल इंडस्ट्री। हमें काम पर नहीं जाना है, हम काम पर नहीं जाएंगे। इसीलिए मजदूर अपने गांव को भागा है वहां नहीं है। मुझे लग रहा है कि जो वेतन में बढ़ावे की उनकी मांग है वो जायज मांग है। मेरा कहना यह है कि बम्बई का टेक्सटाइल मजदूर तो पेंस सेटर था, टेक्सटाइल का एग्रीमेंट सब से पहले होता था और बाकी उद्योगों में मजदूरों का बाद में होता था। लेकिन इस समय तो उल्टा हो गया है कि टेक्सटाइल इंडस्ट्रीज का मजदूर वेतन के मामले में इतना पिछड़ गया और उसका वेतन-इतना हास्यास्पद है कि आप इसको सुन कर ताज्जुब करेंगे कि टेक्सटाइल के मजदूरों को जो बेसिक वेज मिलता है वह मंगल मूर्ति आवाड के बाद 42 रुपये बेसिक वेतन और मंहगाई वेतन 400 रुपये, 500 रुपये हो गया है। दुनिया में इस तरह का फ़ाइलेंट वेतन का कोई तरीका नहीं होगा। (व्यवधान) तो ठीक है। मैं इसलिए कह रहा हूं कि जिस तरह का फ़ाइलेंट वेज स्ट्रक्चर टेक्सटाइल मजदूर होता गया है सालों से इससे वह डिस्अप्वाइंट हो गया है। उनको पूछा तक नहीं गया है। 42 रुपये वेज और 300, 350, 400 रुपये डी० ए० के रूप में मिलें तो पूरा वेतन कुल मिला कर 400, 450, 500 रुपये मिलता है। यह उसकी वेतन श्रेणी की जो मांग है इसको लेकर के दत्ता सामंत आगे बढ़ रहे हैं और जिस चीज की जो रिप्रेजेंटेटिव यूनियन जो

आपकी है उसको देखा तक नहीं है। सारी यह चीज बुनियादी है। मुझे नहीं मालूम कि आपने जो एलान किया है उसका क्या परिणाम होगा और मजदूर क्या करेगा। लेकिन अगर मैं मजदूर होता, टेक्सटाइल मजदूर होता और इतना सेक्रीफाइस करने के बाद 6 महीने तक हड़ताल करने के बाद इस तरह की आपकी तरफ से धोषणा होती तो मैं उसको रद्दी की टोकरी में फेंक देता। मैं इसको बिल्कुल कबूल नहीं करता लेकिन सवाल यह है कि यह आपका शायद साइकलोजिकल आफर है—

This is not a real offer. This is a psychological move to break the solidarity of the working class. This is my charge against this Government.

इंडस्ट्रियल रिलेशंस तो आपने चीपट कर दिये हैं, कलेक्टिव बारगेनिंग का नाम तक नहीं है। हड़ताल करे कोई, एलान करे और बात किसी और से करें यह तो आपका तरीका रहा है। क्या इस तरह की कलेक्टिव बारगेनिंग देश में आप चाहते हैं। मुझे ऐसा लग रहा है कि यह जो एलान आपने किया और अगर मजदूर इससे खुश हो जाए तो मुझे नाराज होने की जरूरत नहीं है लेकिन जो ह्यूमैन एलीमेंट इसमें है उसको भी आप सोचियेगा। आपने उसमें एक कमेटी बना दी है, नम्बर-2 आईटम जो है उसको आप देखिये। तो उसमें आपने टेक्सटाइल इण्डस्ट्री के मामले को इसके साथ जोड़ दिया है।

I am reading item (2):

"examine and report on the problems being faced by textile mill industry including the urgent need to modernise the industry."

[श्री सदाशिव वगईतकर]

अब आप मजदूरों के गले को क्यों बांध रहे हो। माडरनाइजेशन, प्रौर माडरनाइजेशन के परिणाम क्या हैं, इसको बहम टैक्सटाइल इण्डस्ट्री में टैक्सटाइल यूनियन में आज से नहीं बल्कि 20 साल से चला आ रही है। जापान में एक 20 लूम चलाने वाली मशीनरी है। एक वर्कर उसको सुपरवाइज करता है। आप माडरनाइजेशन की बात को लाते हैं। मालिकों की मांग है कि लेबर फोर्स को जब तक कम नहीं किया जाता तब तक टैक्सटाइल इण्डस्ट्री हम चला नहीं सकते। उनकी मांग लगातार है कि लेबर फोर्स को कम करने का एक ही उपाय है वह है आटोमेशन, वीविंग में आटोमेशन। जिस तरह की टैक्सटाइल इण्डस्ट्री जापान में चलती है, 20 लूम, 25 लूम को एक मजदूर चलाये उसको उसी तरह अब वे चाहते हैं, माडरनाइजेशन करना। इससे प्रेनइम्प्लायमेंट आप प्रौर बढ़ायेंगे। इसलिये अगर इस तरह की बात है तो आप उसको मजदूरों के गले क्यों बांध रहे हैं। ट्राईशरटाईट कमेटी का इश्यू यह कैसे बना है यह मेरी समझ में नहीं आता इसलिये श्रीमन्, आपने सोच समझकर इस निवेदन को किया है। मुझे ऐसा लगता है कि आपको शायद ऐसा अंदाज पता लगा होगा कि मजदूर बेचारे थक गये हैं, कितना कर्जा लेंगे, कितना उधार खायेंगे, कितने भूखे मरेंगे, छः महीने हो गये हैं कुछ मिल गया सहारा तिनके का, तो सब छोड़कर आ जायेंगे, शरण में आ जायेंगे। इस कल्पना से अगर आपने यह किया है तो यह अच्छा नहीं है। शायद यह मजदूरों को आप शरण में लाने की तरकीब समझकर करेंगे तो इसका असर दुगना खराब होगा तथा मजदूर और मजबूती से आपसे लड़ेगा, यह बिल्कुल साफ बात है।

इसलिये जरूरी यह है कि जो इरेशनल वेज स्ट्रक्चर बाम्बे टैक्सटाइल में है, और भी पूरी टैक्सटाइल इण्डस्ट्री में होगा, उसको ठीक करने का उपाय आप करें। इसकी तरफ ध्यान देने का काम जिस रिप्रेजेंटेटिव यूनियन ने आज तक नहीं किया आप उसका जवाब तलब कीजिये कि आप रिप्रेजेंटेटिव यूनियन में होकर क्या कर रहे हैं, उनकी तरफ से आप जवाब तलब करेंगे कि नहीं। आखिरकार जो रिप्रेजेंटेटिव सोल बारगेनिंग एजेंसी राष्ट्रीय मिल मजदूर संघ है, उसकी अपनी जिम्मेदारी है कि नहीं, एकाऊंटेबिलिटी है कि नहीं

To whom are they accountable?

वर्कर्स ये सारे सवाल, साल प्रति साल बढ़ते गये हैं, उनकी तरफ आपने कोई ध्यान नहीं दिया तो फिर आपकी सोल बारगेनिंग की मोरेल अथारिटी क्या है। जैसे लेनिन ने कहा था जार की आर्मी के बारे में— They have voted with their legs. वही हुआ।

सीक्रेट बिलेट की बात अभी राम मर्ति जी कह रहे थे, मेरी तो यह राय है कि दत्ता सामंत साहब के साथ जा करके बात करें। जो मुकम्मल हडताल बम्बई की 60 मिलों में हुई है, उससे यह साबित हो गया है कि सो काल्ड राष्ट्रीय मिल मजदूर संघ का वहां मोरेल इन्फ्लूएंस नहीं है, कोई अथारिटी नहीं है, उनकी तरफ कोई वर्कर जाने को तैयार नहीं है, उनके इशारे पर काम पर जाने को तैयार नहीं हो रहा है। इतना साफ हो जाने के बाद आप फिर वहां राष्ट्रीय मिल मजदूर संघ को डो रहे हैं और मजदूरों पर थोपने की सोच रहे हैं, यह मैं नहीं समझता हूं कि उचित है। यह न्याय-संगत नहीं है, इसमें कुछ तर्क नहीं है और इसमें कुछ ईमानदारी नहीं है।

श्रम मंत्री जी आपने कोशिश की इसलिए मैं आपको धन्यवाद देता हूँ। कुछ कोशिश आपने की है लेकिन खाली धन्यवाद देने से क्या होगा, अगर मजदूर कल इसको मन्जर नहीं करेगा, बम्बई का तो मैं मजदूरों के साथ खड़ा हो जाऊंगा। मुझे नहीं लगता कि उसकी जो जायज मांगें हैं उनको पूरा किया गया है। अब 30 रुपये उनको दिया गया। दत्ता साहब की डिमांड है कि अढ़ाई सौ से आगे दिया जाये। आप उनको 30 रुपया दे रहे हैं, यह किस आधार पर आप दे रहे हैं, मैं पूछता हूँ। 30 के बदले सौ क्यों नहीं हों, आखिर यह एन्क्वेटेबल एमाऊंट है। 30 के बदले आप सौ करते तो ज्यादा गुर्जाइश होती कि मजदूर उसको कबूल करते। आखिरकार 30 रुपये लेकर आज का मजदूर बम्बई में इधर से उधर ट्राम, बस या गाड़ी से जा भी नहीं सकता है। यह बम्बई की स्थिति है। इसलिये 30 के बदले आपने सौ क्यों नहीं रखा है, इसको समझा दीजिये, ताकि आपके तर्कों को सुनकर हम मजदूरों को कहे कि श्रम मंत्री का तर्क यह है इसको आप सोचें। वैसे कोई आधार नहीं है अब पता नहीं किसी से भी आपने चिट्ठी उठाई बच्चे से और 30 का आंकड़ा आया तो 30 रख दिये। किस आधार पर रखा है, इसका तो कम से कम जवाब दीजिये। इसलिये मुझे लगता है कि यह टैक्सटাইल की हड़ताल और जो आपकी नीति है, जब महाराष्ट्र के चीफ मिनिस्टर वहां आये तो उन्होंने पहले भाषण में कहा कि मेरा पहला काम होगा हड़ताल को समाप्त करना।

6 P.M.

उससे वह मुकर गये और मैं आप को साफ कहना चाहता हूँ कि टैक्स-टाइल के मजदूर बम्बई में आपकी राजनीति

के शिकार हो गये हैं। ऐसे निकम्मे लोगों को वहां आपने थोपा है जिनमें इतनी काबलियत नहीं कि अपने मैट्रो-पोलिटन टाउन में महीनों से जो हड़ताल चल रही है उस पर काबू पाने की उसमें की क्षमता नहीं। पोलिटिकल इंप्लू-एन्स नहीं है, मारल आथॉरिटी नहीं है। ऐसे लोग चीफ मिनिस्टर बन जाते हैं। बम्बई के टैक्सटাইल मजदूर शिकार हो गये गलत किस्म के चीफ मिनिस्टर के.... (व्यवधान).... खैर इसको आप कहेंगे, मेरे से कोई संबंध नहीं, लेकिन जो टोटल पिक्चर है इससे सारी चीजें हैं, इससे इन्कार नहीं कर सकते। इसलिये मेरा निवेदन है कि जो आपने किया उससे हड़ताल दूर होने की संभावना बढ़ी है, इसके बारे में मैं नहीं कह सकता। मुझे डर है कि 30 रु. जो देना है उसके बारे में कहना तो जले पर नमक जैसा होगा। हमने मांगा था ढाई सौ रुपया। छः महीने हड़ताल किया और आज आप 30 रुपया देकर विदा कर रहे हैं या इंतजार करने के लिए कह रहे हैं। इसमें हो सकता है कि मजदूर इसको न माने। मैं मंत्री महोदय से पूछना चाहता हूँ कि यह 30 रु. की बुनियाद क्या है? 30 रु. के आंकड़े आपने दिये हैं, और 30 की जगह 100 क्यों नहीं दिया, इसका कारण बताइये।

दूसरे यह कि ट्रमस् आफ रेफरेन्स में इन्डस्ट्रियल माडर्नाइजेशन, मिलों के माडर्नाइजेशन की जरूरत नहीं थी, ऐसा मैं नहीं कहूंगा लेकिन ट्रेड यूनियन के साथ इसको जो लगा रखा है वह मैं नहीं समझता कि तर्कसंगत है। तो वह क्यों रखा गया है, इसको समझा दीजिये। और तीसरा सवाल यह है कि आप ने हमको कहा है, कि हमने कुछ लोगों से बातचीत किया है। क्या ये आइ-

[श्री सदाशिव वगाईत्तकर]

डेंटिफाइबल कमोडिटी है, ये जो आपके कुछ लोग है ये कौन हैं ?

एक मानव्य मदस्थ : एक तो पीछे बैठे हुए हैं ।

श्री सदाशिव वगाईत्तकर : शिवराज पाटिल थे, हम सब जानते हैं । यह तो बातचीत चल रही थी । बातचीत किससे हुई, उसका पता जल्दी लग जाएगा । बिल्कुल ठीक है । राष्ट्रीय मजदूर संघ है तो लोकल स्टैंडबाई.... (व्यवधान) ....यह ऐसा है कि जैसे "हैमलेट" मैं बातचीत चल रही है मैं मंत्री महोदय से पूछना चाहता हूँ कि हैमलेट विदाउट द प्रिन्स आफ डेन्मार्क क्या ऐसा है ? यानी जो पैलेस्टीन वालों की स्थिति है वैसी है ? बैरुत लेबनान का है, इजराईल ने वहां घुसपैठ ली । वैसे ही हड़ताल न चलाई दत्ता सामन्त ने राष्ट्रीय मजदूर संघ का कोई ज्युरिस्टिक्शन नहीं है, कोई हकीकत नहीं है, कोई सबूत नहीं है । आप बात किस से कर रहे हैं ? न दत्ता सामन्त से कर रहे हैं न आई एन टी यू सी से कर रहे हैं... (व्यवधान)... बात किस से किये, यह तो पता लगे ? तो कम से कम हमको इतना आश्वस्त कीजिये, आपके प्रपोजल की गुंजाइश बढ़ाने के लिये, कम से कम जिन लोगों से बातचीत की है वह कौन हैं ? उनको आइडेंटिफाई करें ताकि हम लोग भी समझ सकें कि सरकार का इस सारे दर्जयान जो खर्चा रहा उस से मजदूरों को क्या लाभ होने वाला है ?

एक बात मैं आप से कहना चाहता हूँ । इसमें श्री एस० एम जोशी का भी नाम आया है । पर हमको मालूम नहीं उनसे भी बातचीत की है या नहीं

की है क्योंकि उनको कहा गया था कि आप भी कोशिश करिये । उनसे भी बात नहीं की है । तो आप ने और किस से बातचीत की ? इसको बता दीजिये ताकि हम समझ सकें कि सरकार क्लेक्टिव बार्गेनिंग, इंडस्ट्रियल रिलेशंस की मशीनरी, हड़ताल और हकीकत इन सब में किस तरह बर्ताव करती है ?

इन शब्दों के साथ मैं मंत्री महोदय के साथ इस को रिकमण्ड करने की स्थिति में नहीं हूँ । मैं मजदूरों को कह नहीं सकता आप अपने हड़ताल को वापस करो इतनी बात कह कर मैं समाप्त करना चाहता हूँ ।

श्री भगवत झा आजाद : उप सभापति महोदय, इन्होंने जो 3 प्रश्न रखे हैं, एक तो यह कि उद्योग में माडर्नाइजेशन की बात आप इससे क्यों जोड़ रहे हैं । दूसरे, 30 रु० क्यों दो ? प्रश्न यह है कि ये सिर्फ तीस-तीस पर जोर दिये जा रहे हैं और हम कह रहे हैं सारे पैकेज को आप संपूर्ण रूप में देखिये । तीस तो मेरी प्रतिबद्धता इस बात से है कि हम मजदूरों की उस मांग को जो हाउस रेंट के सम्बन्ध में है और जो उन के ट्रेवलिंग एलाउन्स के सम्बन्ध में, काम पर जाने के सम्बन्ध में है, उसके प्रति हमने अपनी प्रतिबद्धता यह कह कर दिखा दी कि एड हाक में 20 रुपये दे रहे हैं । कमेटी दो महीने के अन्दर रिपोर्ट देगी । आप बिल्कुल इस बात पर उतारू हैं कि कुछ भी सरकार करे, हम वर्कर्स को मानने के लिये नहीं कहेंगे । इस लिये आप लोगों से नहीं पूछा, जिन से पूछने की जरूरत थी उन से पूछा, जो वर्कर्स के प्रतिनिधि हैं उन से पूछा । मैं सीधी बात कर रहा हूँ—आर० एम० एस० का होल्ड नहीं है तो न सही, कानून के अन्तर्गत काफी प्रावधान है, यहां ट्रेड यूनियन

के कई फाइव स्टार्स लीडर्स बोल रहे हैं, मैंने वम्बई में वहां के वन-स्टार, टू-स्टार, और स्टार लीडर्स से बात की। आप लोगों ने भी सलाह दी थी कि वहां के लोगों से बात करो। हम आप के खिलाफ उतना नहीं बोले जितना आप हमारे खिलाफ। बराबर इनफारमली बात की फारमली बात नहीं की, कुछ मित्रों से। आप कुछ मित्र जो हैं वह तो लगता है कि इतना करने के बाद भी कोई रिएक्शन नहीं देते। कहते हैं कि अगर वह मान लेंगे तो ठीक है। आप कहिये कि मान लें। पर प्रश्न यह है कि आप की बात मानता कौन है। वहां तो एक व्यक्ति है बन्धुवर। आपने ठीक कहा काम करे कोई, बात करे कोई, जिसने हड़ताल करवाई सीधे उन से या उन के मित्रों से बात करने की जरूरत पड़ेगी। मैंने कहा कि जहां पूछने की जरूरत थी वहां मैंने पूछा। 30 रुपये को ही नहीं बल्कि पूरे पैकेज को पूर्ण रूप में देखिये। टेक्सटाइल वर्कर्स की वेजेज की वृद्धि के सम्बन्ध में जितनी बातें कही गयी हैं उस के बारे में दस नहीं पचास प्वाइन्ट हैं फार में और अग्रेस्ट में। कैसे करें कितना करें, उसके लिये कमेटी बनाई है। उस में मजदूरों के प्रतिनिधि भी रहेंगे। वह 6 महीने में रिपोर्ट देगी। यह नहीं है कि वेज बोर्ड बना दिया, बरसों चल रहा है। तीन प्वाइन्ट पर, बदली पर, उन के हाउस रेंट पर दो महीने में रिपोर्ट लेगे। 30 रुपये मेरी प्रतिबद्धता इस बात पर है कि वह रिपोर्ट दे उस को हम स्वीकार करेंगे। इसको इस रूप में देखिये। वेज के सम्बन्ध में कहते हैं कि 42 मिलता है, 400 मिलता है। यह पुरानी कथा आप बार-बार कह रहे हैं यह बात झूठ है, यह बात गलत है, यह सही नहीं है, बल्कि बात तो यह है कि आज उन की मिनिमम तनख्वाह 715 है जिस में बेसिक 300 है, 42 नहीं है।

71 में भी 288 थी, 81 में 300 है। आप श्रमिक नेता हैं, अगली बार ऐसी गलत बात मत कहियेगा। बेसिक वेज 300 है। आपने यही कहा 25 परसेंट उत्पादन वृद्धि। ढाबे साहब ने केमिकल्स से तुलना की। ये सारी बातें हैं, लेकिन इन सारी बातों को सम्पूर्ण रूप में देखना है। मैं बार-बार कह रहा हूं कि 112 मिल्स एन० टी० सी० ने एस० सिक० मिल्स ली हैं। आज एन टी सी० पर हर दिन इस बात का दवाव है कि सिक मिल है, इस को ले लो। सम्भवतः 82 करोड़ के घाटे के साथ एन० टी सी इन को चला रही है। हम सिर्फ इतना ही प्रिकाशन लेना चाहते हैं....

**श्री लाडली मोहन निगम (मध्य प्रदेश) :**  
कि आप पर बोझ न पड़ जाय।

**श्री भागवत झा आजाद :** लाडली साहब यह आप की स्टाईपिंग ठीक नहीं है, जैसे आप ने पहले कहा कि आप नहीं बोल रहे हैं, आप के पीछे से कोई बोल रहा है, मैं नहीं लिख रहा हूं, कोई और लिख रहा है। आपस के आदान-प्रदान में इतना तो रखिये कि मैं समझूं कि आप बोल रहे हैं, आप के पीछे कोई और नहीं बोल रहा है। इसी प्रकार आप मुझ को भी समझ लीजिये कि मैं बोल रहा हूं, मेरे पीछे कोई नहीं बोल रहा है। अपने मित्र या अपने साथी के इन्टेशन पर आपत्ति मत कीजिये।

आप यह कहिये कि तुम नालायक हो, नहीं कर सकते, लेकिन जब कहेंगे इन्टेशन बुरा है तो फिर हमारा मीटिंग ग्राउन्ड कहां है? कम से कम इतना खयाल रखिए।

आपने तीस रुपये की बात कही, वह मैंने आपको बताया। दूसरा आप कहते हैं कि उद्योगों की स्थिति की जांच को इसके



[श्री लाडलो मोहन निगम]

साथ क्यों जोड़ दिया । उसके लिए प्रश्न बड़ा साथ है । वह यह है कि अगर यह नहीं कर पायेंगे तो लांग रन में, दूर-दृष्टि में, जो मिलें एक के बाद एक बन्द हो रही हैं, उनकी स्थिति की जानकारी नहीं करेंगे तो उस समय मजदूरों को बहुत घाटा होगा । उदाहरणार्थ बहुत सी मिलें बम्बई में हैं, कहते हैं कि हम उनको नहीं चला पायेंगे । खैर, वह तो जब केस सामने आयेगा तब देखेंगे कि कैसे नहीं चला पायेंगे । लेकिन हम उनको अगर यह कह देगे नहीं चला पायेंगे तो एक हजार इस प्रकार की इन्स्टीज हैं जो बन्द कर देगे । इसलिए मैं चाहता हूँ कि टेक्सटाइल वर्कर्स की स्थिति को कमेटी एक वर्ष में देखे कि हम वह संभावित कदम उठा सके जिनके न उठाने से अगर कुछ मिलें सचमुच में बन्द हो जायें जो कि हो रही हैं, एन. टी. सी. का साफ उदाहरण कहता है, तो फिर इन मजदूरों को हानि होगी । मिल मालिक खा पीकर कहा जायेंगे, यह मुझे नहीं मालूम, लेकिन मैं तो श्रम मंत्री हूँ, मिलों का मंत्री नहीं हूँ । आप कुछ भी कहिये, मैं हृदय से बात करता हूँ और उसी के पक्ष में कहूंगा । इसलिए मैं उद्योग की स्थिति की जांच करवाना चाहता हूँ ताकि दूर-दृष्टि में हमारे कार्यकर्ताओं को, श्रमिक बन्धुओं को घाटा न हो ।

DR. SHANTI G. PATEL (Maharashtra): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, as all of us are aware, this has been an unprecedented strike involving 2½ lakhs of workers employed in sixty textile mills, for nearly six months, and out of these sixty mills, in six mills the strike has gone on for nearly ten months.

Sir, it is a matter of some satisfaction that the Government has opened so much money. For the last few days with certain proposals. But may I submit that the basic issues still remain unsolved? There are two issues in this particular dispute. One has been the issue relating to the service con-

ditions of the textile workers in Bombay and the second has been the question as to how you govern your industrial relations. Sir, as far as the first one is concerned, some initiative is taken. In that context, I would only like to submit that the Government or the Minister in charge of this particular portfolio has not still spelt out as to how these proposals have been evolved. He has said that he has talked to some people, he has consulted some people and things like that. But he has not said specifically that these are the persons, these are the interests, directly involved in the strike, in the dispute, and they have been taken into confidence and after that these proposals have been made. I am sure, Sir, that he is a progressive man and is considered to be a member of this progressive Government. It is a basic thing that in solving any industrial dispute the persons directly concerned have to be taken into confidence and no industrial dispute can be solved if one tries to force something from above, whether the proposal is made or the offer is made with the best of intentions. I am not doubting the intentions of the Minister. But let him understand that the basic point that no dispute can be solved unless the parties concerned are taken into confidence and they agree. So, any proposal of this kind, howsoever good or bad it may be, cannot give us the desired result. If the desired result has to be there, then these parties have to be taken into confidence. Whatever is appearing in the Press only convinces us that these are the proposals emanating from the mill owners' side.

Mr. Magan Lal, or whosoever the person leading this group of mill-owners, has been all the time saying that they are prepared to give so much money. For the last few days, some things have been appearing in the Press. That is why we are left with no alternative but to conclude that these are the proposals made only by the mill-owners, and no labour side has been

consulted in this respect. If it is otherwise, let him say that these are the persons, these are the personalities, these are the institutions which have been consulted in this particular respect.

Sir I have been living in this city for a long time and I know the way in which the textile magnets of Bombay have been exploiting the labour. This is one industry where the labour has been exploited to the maximum. In the name of the consumers, for which the cloth is being produced, they say that they cannot pass on the charge. But it is the mismanagement which is the real reason of bankruptcy in this industry—the mismanagement of the so-called owners of this particular industry. So it is this industry where you find the maximum number of sick units. Why is this situation not in other industries? Why is it in this particular industry? Sir, they allow the machinery to become junk. They are not prepared to modernise or replace it and see that things are repaired in time. They want to make money out of it and they get out of it and pass on the junk to the Government, because the Government has to be concerned regarding the fate of so many people who are employed in the textile mills. So what does the Government propose to do. In the terms of reference if there is anything, there is a proposal to find some instrument of advancing money to these persons who have taken this industry to bankruptcy. There should have been a proposal to take action against these persons who are exploiting the labour and who have led this industry to nothing.

Sir, may I refer to the second basic point, and that is the industrial relations machinery. Sir, it has been proved beyond doubt that the present B.I.R. Act is of no use in resolving industrial disputes. The hon. Minister has said that if any other union, other than the union which is recognized under the law, wants to come into the picture and wants to get recognised, it can resort to the procedure under the law. He made a reference also to

the High Court. But, Sir, may I also tell you—and he knows much better than I do—that this is the very law under which 710 other unions can be recognised. Wherever one union is recognised it is a sort of 'tampatra'. That Union may not have one follower or one soul to follow. But still this Union will be on paper as a recognised union, having the so-called legal authority to represent the workers concerned in the industry. Repeated strikes in the Bombay textile industry have shown the inherent weaknesses in this particular law, and that is why they have to be set right. You may be trying and you may be able to settle this dispute, but let me warn you that you cannot prevent strikes taking place in future, unless you change this law radically and on the principle of collective bargaining. Sir, this law does not leave any scope for collective bargaining. There is no strike, not a single strike—and let him contradict me if I am wrong—which can take place under the law, which is a legal strike. Every strike is going to be illegal. And that is why the Minister starts the statement by saying that they have nothing to do with an illegal strike. That is how they want to hoodwink or bypass the real leaders of this particular strike. Let us not be personal or allergic to the persons who are concerned. Let us not try to protect some unions, bogus unions. If this had been the objective, as the Chief Minister of Maharashtra have done in the past, he (the present one) would have held consultations with all. Let the Minister answer: Does the law prevent holding consultations with persons other than the recognized union? Well, you can hold consultations with recognized unions but at the same time, simultaneously, you can hold consultations with other parties. Had Shri Vasant-rao Naik, the Chief Minister in the past, not held consultations like that? Had Shri Sharad Pawar, Chief Minister in the past also not held consultations like this? But the present one—what shall I say? The less said the better—has not the capacity or the ability to take the initiative and solve

[Shri Shanti G. Patel]

the dispute while the whole national economy is suffering.

I would, therefore, suggest that even now it is not too late for the Minister to tell the Unions which belong to his own party to face the workers and to allow the matter to be decided by secret ballot, which is the accepted method almost all over the world of determining the representative character or to settle the matter of recognition of union in such disputes. Unless this is done, the dispute will not be resolved. It will not be lasting even if it is resolved temporarily and a settlement comes about. Some years ago, on this very issue the agitation went on and there was a strike going on for 62 days. Again, there is this unprecedented strike going on in this particular field. May I therefore suggest or make a proposal for revision of this whole Act so that the industrial relations machinery is of a proper order which can meet the challenges of the situation and which can help us in solving the disputes which arise from time to time? It is in this context that I would like to ask as to why he has chosen to bypass the person who has given a call for this strike. Or is he prepared to have talks with this person, whosoever he may be? He may be Dr. Dutta Samant or somebody else. It is not a question of personalities. Let us not be allergic to persons. Let us face the realities and carry on the talks in the interest of the workers. In the interest of the national economy, the dispute has to be resolved.

(Time bell rings) May I ask in this particular context as to why he has refrained from saying anything or making any recommendation on the vital issue of Badli workers. 30 to 40 per cent of the workers are concerned with it. What he has done is to refer it to a committee. This is a part of their 20-Point Programme. This is exploitation. These Badli workers are deprived of so many benefits which the permanent workers can get. This is a part of exploitation that this industry has been indulging in. I

had expected from this progressive Government an announcement to the effect that they abolish the Badli system and not to refer it to a committee to go into it and to find out the so-called solutions. Ah! they have been saying from housetops that they have a Twenty Point Programme. Will he accept the suggestion that I would like to make? Let him call a Round Table Conference. It is not fair for me to say anything on the proposal. It is for the parties directly concerned who have to answer this issue. We have always been there to give our cooperation in resolving this dispute. The final answer has to come from the workers concerned and their really accredited leaders. Will he consider the suggestion for calling a Round Table Conference of the direct interests and to put this proposal before them so that an acceptable solution emerges out of this prolonged dispute and the stalemate comes to an end?

**SHRI BHAGWAT JHA AZAD:** Sir, Dr. Patel has said that there are two basic issues, the service conditions and the governing of the industrial relations. They are very important, I admit. That is why we have referred these three points to the Committee and we have asked them to report back in two months. He complained that I have said nothing about Badli. Well, this Tripartite Committee consisting of labour representatives, employers and the Government will go into the question of Badli. This is point No. 1. And they will report back in two months.

**DR. SHANTI G. PATEL:** I was expecting you to say that badli system will be abolished.

**SHRI BHAGWAT JHA AZAD:** I am surprised to hear this suggestion from the hon. Member. If the badli system is abolished, the greatest harm will be to the workers and not to the mill-owners. Sir, what is badli system? In a mill there is a requisite strength of permanent workers and a certain percentage of those workers are always absent. If there are two lakh persons in the textiles, there are

50,000 badli workers. It means, always 25 per cent are absent. Then whoever takes over in his behalf, he gets the same benefit. If this is abolished, Sir, all will lose their jobs. All that will happen is that the mill will run with 50,000 short when they are not on the job because they cannot remove the permanent workers. This implication is there. That is why we are recommending that let that report...

DR. SHANTI G. PATEL: When I say abolition of badli system, it is making them permanent as it has been done under the law in the Docks. It is possible to give them all the service benefits.

SHRI BHAGWAT JHA AZAD: I understand the two things very well. The situation in the Docks when they were made permanent and the situation today in the textiles are quite different. In the textiles there are two ways—either the strength in the textiles is 2,50,000 which includes the badli also with 1,75,000 permanent workers or 2,50,000 workers are required permanently. If that is the question they can be made permanent. Or, if it is abolished then the only alternative will be that those who go on leave among the permanent, either they will not get the leave or if they go on leave, the mill will go without them. So, Sir, I am not pleading anybody's case. I am for badli to have the best facilities. That is why I said let this Committee look into the question and within two months give the report. I am one with the hon. Member that the question of badli must be looked into; a solution must be found. That is why we have recommended that within two months let this Committee give the report and we will do that. Therefore, Sir, about service conditions, house rent and other things, we have recommended to report in two months. Sir, the only important point which Dr. Patel and others said is about some increase in wage. Dr. Patel said and I quote his language, Sir. He said: "These mills are mismanaged. They have al-

lowed the machinery to go junk. They have taken the money out of the mills. They have taken the industry to bankruptcy." Sir, all these four sentences have been quoted by Dr. Patel. That is why we say that this bankruptcy, this mismanagement which is now great in long term as well as in short term, is harmful to the workers. That is why now this tripartite committee, in which workers' will be represented, will look into this question, and they can find out how the mismanagement and bankruptcy, etc. can be stopped. We have appointed the Committee to report in six months.

I fully agree with the hon. Member about the conditions and what the conditions are, I cannot say. He has the knowledge. But on such a serious thing that the industry has gone to bankruptcy and to ask that industry without looking into the matter to pay how much will not be in my position but it should be left to the Expert Committee that we are setting up. Therefore, I would say that Dr. Shanti Patel should also come and agree with us and ask his friends if he has got any influence in the textiles to come for the work and take this chance.

**THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI LADLI MOHAN NIGAM)** in the chair.

Sir, one obsession with the hon. Members is about RMMS. I have said already that I do not interfere, I do not come in the way of the workers' collective bargaining right or their choice to choose their representative as bargaining agent. And it is a State legislation. They are asking here some legislation to be passed by the Parliament. Well, their representative, the one coming from Bombay, can very well take this issue at the appropriate forum and see what can be done.

But what I am saying is that I am not bound by this that I should talk to RMMS only. Sir, there is a very detailed provision. This is wrong to say that once a union is recognised as the bargaining agent, it cannot be changed. No. Easily under the Act an application may be made

[Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad]

and the Registrar of trade unions verifies it. It is being done. Let there be no obsession about it. Workers have their right to choose any one representative. Let them choose. I will be the first one to accord a welcome and I will deal with them and I will talk to them. I do not make an issue of this thing. Therefore, Sir, on this point what Dr. Patel has said, now is the time after this package, to request the workers, as I am appealing to them, to come to work. Shortly, almost immediately, a committee will be set up and that committee in two months will give the decisions and in about six months' time about the wages, and about the industry as a whole within a year. Let all the friends put their strength, if they have any, and appeal to them. But if only the pied piper has its way, we will deal with them. We know, we are talking and we will talk. Thank you very much. I hope that they will heed this appeal that they should come back to work and look to their own interest, and the interests of the industry and the nation. I appeal to my other friends also, those who are working in trade unions to exercise their influence and pressure, if they have any and to ask them to come back to work.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN: (SHRI LADLI MOHAN NIGAM): Yes, Mr. Sukul.

SHRI P. N. SUKUL (Uttar Pradesh): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, at the very outset I would like to congratulate you for occupying this Chair of Vice-Chairman. It was my proud privilege to congratulate Mr. R. Ramakrishnan also when he occupied this Chair for the first time. I was the first speaker at that time also as I am now when you have just taken the Chair.

SHRI BHAGWAT JHA AZAD: Sir, under your chairmanship important things are being discussed.

SHRI P. N. SUKUL: Sir, I congratulate the Labour Minister and the Government for coming out at last with a solution to end this most unfortunate impasse created

by the strike of the textile workers. It is no doubt true that during the last six months when this strike has been there the textile industry has lost at least Rs. 600 crores and we have lost foreign exchange to the tune of at least Rs. 75 crores. It is a very big loss and the Government have now come out with a proposal to end the strike. It is a very welcome move and I wonder why so many of my opposition friends still say, one after the other, that the workers won't join duty in spite of these concessions and reliefs that have been announced by the Government. May be, the quantum may not be satisfactory. That is something else. But, at least the spirit should be appreciated. During all this time of six months the workers, the management and the opposition friends were talking about having a tripartite body to look into the matter very seriously and to make an in-depth study of the grievances, of the problems, which the workers are facing or which the industry is facing. Now a solution is there.

As regards the question of recognition raised by some of our opposition friends, I must tell specially my learned colleague, Dr. Shanti Patel, he was referring to the BIR Act that under this Act, as he knows, recognition is granted only industry-wise. The INTUC union or the RMMS may be in the textile industry but in other industries other unions are there. In the BEST, the union of Mr George Fernandes is there. Dr. Shanti Patel's union may be in some other industry. What is wrong if the people engaged in the textile industry, a majority of them, support the RMMS or the INTUC union? If they have faith in INTUC, what is the basic objection of Mr. Patel. I do not know.

SHRI KALYAN ROY (West Bengal): Do not contradict it.

SHRI P. N. SUKUL: You are talking of paper. What is the official membership, I should say, of the union of Dr. Datta Samant? In a court of law, if I remember correctly, Dr. Samant said: "I am not interested in recognition". Even if unrecognised unions have to go on strike, they do demand recognition: they do want it. And if Dr. Datta Samant said that he is not interested in recognition, it means that he has no official following in those unions

and he is simply exploiting them emotionally and official membership is not there. And if official membership is not there, it will be contrary to the scientific trade-unionism to have his representatives in this tripartite body or anywhere for consultations. It is just a chance that the workers fed up with other unions, the union of Dr. Shanti Patel or of Mr. George Fernandes or others, or may be even RMMS, are rallying behind Dr. Datta Samant. But this state of affairs is not going to continue for long, I must say.

As regards the reliefs proposed by the Government I also agree that the interim relief of Rs. 30 seems to be paltry in the face of this long-drawn strike and also in view of the claims put forth by the union of Dr. Datta Samant. If a worker gets Rs 715/- by way of wages per month and if you are going to give him Rs. 30, it comes to only 4.2 per cent. It means the Government at the moment proposes to give an interim relief of only 4.2 per cent to the striking textile workers of Bombay...*(Interruptions)*...yes, for, 2 months and within 2 months, the things will be looked into and final relief provided, if possible, but even for these 2 months, I would request the hon. Minister to increase this amount of Rs.30 to 50 at least so that it comes to at least 7 per cent of the total emoluments received. The interim relief should also have some sense of proportion and so I would request the hon. Minister to reconsider it and increase the quantum of this relief that he proposes to give to the striking workers from Rs. 30 to Rs. 50. Also in this connection, I would like to ask as to what the Government proposes to do in order to do away with the multiplicity of unions. It is a very important problem today. Our opposition friends very conveniently forgot about this point. It is this multiplicity of unions that is responsible today for division of labour in the country and so long as this division is there, perhaps, the workers are not going to get what is their due.

So I would like to know from the Minister as to what the Government proposes to do to do away with the multiplicity of the unions, because today any 7 persons can form a union and can claim to have representation anywhere, in bipartite or

tripartite committees or any where in any consultations.

Secondly, will the Government consider, as I said, the need for increasing the quantum of relief from Rs. 30 to Rs. 50? Will the Government ensure that but for the cases of violence and not intimidation, wherever such cases have been there, there will be no victimisation? Some references have been made here to this, I myself happened to be in jail for five years in connection with strikes. I know very well what happens when workers are on strike for such a long time. *(Interruptions)* I know. I have been in jail. I was a Government servant then. I was not a party man. I was not a political man. When I resigned my job, I joined the Congress. The other thing which I would like to know is, will the Government ensure that but for the cases of violence, there will be absolutely no victimisation of the workers for their participation in the strike? Personally, I would plead for complete no victimisation, except in cases of violence and arson, wherever there have been such incidents. Will the Government also assure this House that as a result of the proposed modernisation, there will be absolutely no unemployment? Will the hon. Minister also consider the advisability of extending the payment of this interim relief to the non-striking workers in other parts of the country as well? while the striking workers are going to get interim relief, it does not mean that all the other workers who have not gone on strike do not deserve this thing. They should also get this amount, this interim relief, and only then, the Government can say 'Well; we have done full justice to the working people in the country. Sir, with these words, I welcome the suggestion of the Government to form a tripartite body to make an indepth study of the problems of the industry and of the workers and I would appeal to the striking workers to appreciate this gesture of the Government and the sympathetic attitude of the Government towards them. I would appeal to them to resume their duties as early as possible.

SHRI BHAGWAT JHA AZAD: Sir, I am happy and I am relieved that in the voice of dissent, there is some voice of

[Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad.]

reasoning and sympathy also and the proposals have been properly understood. I welcome the suggestion of the hon. Member that there should be an indepth study by this committee of the problems before the textile industry. It is precisely for this we have constituted this tripartite body, in which the representatives of all the interests will be there and they will look into this matter. About this multiplicity of unions, though it does not directly come under this, I fully agree with him that this is one of the devils which has been responsible for destroying industrial relations in this country. There should be some check on this and some way should be found out. But for this, we will have separate discussions in the near future when I propose to call a meeting of the national tripartite committee when we will discuss about it. But unfortunately, this is one point where my friends do not agree because they have their own flags to fly. Therefore, there is this multiplicity of trade unions. On the one hand, they want that there should be industrial peace and so on. But on the other, they must have a union, small or big, wanting solutions in their own fashion with their own spectacles. Yours and mine are the same. Therefore, we have no problem on this. Then, the second point which he has mentioned was, increase in the amount, from Rs. 30 to Rs. 50. As I said, this is a commitment on the part of the Government. Kindly see the entire package as a whole and do not see it piecemeal. As I said, this committee will go into three questions, namely, badli, house rent allowance and conveyance allowance. They will go into the question as to how it can be increased and then they will get it. It is a question of two months within which it will be given. The Gujarat High Court has given a decision on this, in regard to interim relief towards house rent. It exists in one part. Now, I would not go into the details as to how much will be the quantum, what will be the basis, how we will do it and so on. We have not worked out the rationale. We have just come to a conclusion and it is a commitment on the part of the Government to pay the house

rent. The Committee will take two months for this and then it will be possible for us to do it. I fully agree that there should be no victimisation of workers who have participated in the strike. As usually happens everywhere when such strikes are there, except in cases of violence, nothing more will be done. It is known to the hon. Members also that when strikes are there—and strikes have been there in this country and there has been violence and there has been intimidation—victimisation, however much pressed by the management, has been withdrawn on the persuasion of the Government except in such cases as have been mentioned. Sir, let the recommendations of the committee come and we will see what best can be done. In the absence of the recommendations, we cannot say what will be the recommendations and how they will do it. When the recommendations come, then many of the questions can be decided. About giving the benefit to the non-striking workers also—I think the hon. Member wants the Kanpur and Ahmedabad workers also to get it—I think, let us wait for that. We have formed...

SHRI P. N. SUKUL: You want them to go on strike?

SHRI BHAGWAT JHA AZAD: No. That is why you see what I have done. I have already put a committee. They should consider first the problems of the country as a whole and secondly, of the Bombay industry. That is why I have taken the precaution that the others also may not go after the Bombay strike. So this committee must report about the industry as a whole, their workmen, the problems of the industry and modernisation. I have done that already. I hope they will not be encouraged by some of the friends to go on strike. I would say that the hon. Member has put it clearly that we go by the provisions of the law. The hon. Members today are saying that the RMMS does not represent the workers. As I said, the case went to the High Court. There are ways and provisions under the Act to verify which is the representative union and which is the bargaining agent. In Bombay the industrial relationship between the mill-owners

and the textile workers for the last 15 years has been cordial. There have been bipartite agreements in the metropolitan city. And very rightly Mr. Bagaitkar said that what was done first by the textile industry used to be followed, by the others. That has been the tradition. Unfortunately at the present moment, that atmosphere does not prevail. As a matter of fact, the 1979 agreement which is persisting today was signed when Mr. Sharad Pawar was the Chief Minister and Mr. George Fernandes was the Industry Minister. Under their patronage and under their blessing this agreement was signed. I do not mean to say anything against them. I am only making the point that in Bombay industrial relationship under the same RMMS for the last decade and a half was good, was all right. Today it is not there. As I have said, I do not at all come in the way of the right of the workers to change their bargaining agent. But let them do it according to the law. And this law does not come in the way. The Bombay Industrial Relations Act has got good provisions. It says that no worker can remain suspended for more than five days. What a wonderful provision! Do the Members want that these should all go away? So if there are only some parts which they want to change, they are welcome to do it at the proper forum. I think this will suffice.

**SHRI KALYAN ROY (West Bengal):** Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I thought the Labour Minister would join with me first to congratulate these 2½ lakh textile workers on their heroic strike against heavy odds and a combination of the INTUC, the mill-owners and their gangsters and the entire State machinery. The Government desparately tried to break the strike but they miserably failed. So at last they have to offer what Mr. Azad described as a package deal. Well, Sir, I would not give my opinion about this offer. I do not want to come in between in any settlement. If it is accepted by the workers, well and good. But I do admit that there has been a shift in the Government's arrogant stand in the last five months and today. And that arrogance has been broken by the heroic strikers. I would only ask the hon. Labour Minister to reply to certain raw facts. Is it not true

that since the Government took over the textile magnates have been given concession after concession since 1980 in order to loot the workers, the cotton growers and the consumers? Is it not a fact that last year the textile policy meant total freedom to the private mill sector, private mill sector was completely absolved formally from any obligation to produce controlled cloth and the entire load was shifted to the NTC mills? Please do not shed your tears for the NTC mills. Your policy led to losses to the NTC. Is it also not a fact that the private sector was allowed to use more and more artificial or chemical fibre to produce costly cloth? Is it also not a fact that the private mill sector was allowed to expand loomage capacity in the name of export? And the question was asked by me last year or the year before when Mr. Pranab Mukherjee was the Commerce Minister and he had to admit that in the last four years they had a boom. And when asked about dividends by the Bombay textile mills and others, you said about 10 per cent dividend was paid. If you exclude the bonus shares, then the dividend came to nearly 100 per cent. The bulk of the capital in the textiles consists of bonus shares for which the worker did not get a single penny. If you exclude bonus shares, then you will find the dividend in the textiles is as high as in the tea plantations. Secondly,—this appeared in the press on the 28th May and it was surprising to the Industrial Development Bank of India; they made a survey and brought out a report on the development of banking in India for 1980-81—when Mr. Azad constitutes a committee, if he does, if the workers agree, he will know what this Bank's report states. They stated an interesting fact which they were not aware of, that the textile industry, which was supposed to be in dire distress, received the largest share of assistance from the financial institutions among all industries. The textile industry's share in the total assistance sanctioned by the financial institutions in the year 1980-81, amounted to over Rs. 403 crores. The Bank's report states, the cumulative assistance sanctioned to the industry over the decade was a whopping Rs. 1743.5 crores—more than the State Budget for three States of Orissa or Assam or West Bengal. One sector in



[Shri Kalyan Roy]

the private area got nearly Rs. 2000 crores. And what happened to the money? That is also on record. In this House the Commerce Minister said the soft loans and other assistance for modernisation, for which Mr. Azad was weeping so well today, according to the statement by the Minister, has been, by and large, misused, mis-spent, diversified. This is the character of the millowners. Let the honourable labour Minister state: Was the demand unjustified? Was the strike unjustified in the face of the fantastic profit? Was the strike unjustified? What avenue have they got the workers—to focus their grievance, their miserable conditions? Look at the slums in Bombay. The latest BBC film showed the slums of the textile workers in Bombay and the fantastic houses and flats in the Cafe Parade and the Marine Drive. Does it not create social tension? Why have you ignored it so far? It took five months, six months, when you ultimately woke up. As has been pointed out, when he ultimately woke up, he only had to offer Rs. 30/-. Again, I do not want to say anything about it. I do not want to come in the way of settlement. But one thing I want to say, you have noticed that the INTUC President has been sitting here. He quietly left. If there is one man who is most unhappy with your any offer, it is the INTUC. The other day they were asking for police protection for the workers.

Now, Mr. Azad has made this statement on the floor of the House. What does he say there? He says that as a result of several steps taken by the Central and State Governments many workers have returned to work. Now, I want some statistics. What is the number of workers who have returned to work? You have said in this statement that the workers have returned to work. How many workers have returned to work? Secondly, what are the steps you have taken? Arresting them, intimidating them or sending the Police to the slums and chawls? That is the step you have taken.

Now, my question is more fundamental. Mr. Azad has just taken over. We have seen him before that. Of course in 1969-70 we saw him as Labour Minister. Now he has taken independent charge of the Labour Ministry. There have been strikes before. But this is the first time that a massive challenge is thrown by the entire industrial workers against the policies of the Government which have been imposed on the working class. The policy is that the Government will decide who is going to be the collective bargaining agency for the working class. The second one is that latest attempt to scuttle the collective bargaining system between the labour and the management, which we have developed and built up for the last six years. Otherwise you have either to go to a tribunal or a wage board. We crossed that stage now. In the coal industry with which I am intimately connected, there was first the Mazumdar Tribunal, then the Merchant Tribunal, then the wage board, and so on. From 1974 there have been wage negotiating committees in the steel industry and coal and in banks. The Government, after LIC, have been resorting to the old pattern and are trying to put the clock back by imposing arbitrator or tribunal or committees. That, I tell you, will not be acceptable to the working class. The real challenge before the working class is your unfortunate, blatant, partisan and naked policy to impose INTUC everywhere. You see the result of this. I have already written to Mr. Azad. I have met the Leader of the House, Mr. Pranab Mukherjee, not once, but ten times. What has happened in Bombay in the textile industry is going to be repeated in the entire coal mines. Please learn your lesson from this. If the INTUC continues its arrogant policies in coal, you will have to shut all the thermal power plants in India because there will be strike in the coal fields.

Yesterday, Mr. Azad said: Well, I called a meeting on productivity.

You people did not come. May I request Mr. Azad...

SHRI BHAGWAT JHA AZAD: Are we discussing the entire industry? You are now referring to the coal industry.

SHRI KALYAN ROY: Not the whole industry. I am only referring to a parallel situation that is developing, for you to learn the lesson. I am referring to a parallel situation so that as a citizen of the country, I can take the national interest into consideration because I am greatly disturbed at the attack on the collective bargaining system. I am only pointing to the problem of collective bargaining. The entire negotiation in the coal belt has been paralysed because of one Union, the INTUC, which has walked out of the J.B.C.C.I. Neither the labour Ministry nor the Energy Ministry has taken any step to settle the pending issues of 1979, to set up a wage committee. Why? It is because of the Union...

SHRI BHAGWAT JHA AZAD: What about your side?

SHRI KALYAN ROY: I am only warning you, Mr. Azad, so that you do not have to face another Calling-Attention Motion like this because you will have another parallel strike. You have taken five months to know that there is a strike. So, I would like to ask Mr. Azad three questions. Have you talked to the men who started the strike, who have led the strike and who are leading the strike? You say that it is not a question of prestige. Good. But the very fact that you have not started talking with them or you have not formally disclosed—you might have talked, I do not know—in the House that you have talked to them, the very fact that you are keeping something up your sleeves shows that you are making it a question of prestige and are making it a political issue. So, I

would request humbly, as you have requested us, to try to see that the matter is settled. Please try to see that the matter is settled. You are not disclosing in Parliament, "Yes, I have talked and these are the offers that we have made". This is number one.

Then, number two is about the question of criminal cases that have been registered. I would like to point out that this will be one of the hardest hurdles. The workers have been implicated in false cases and the management will take the plea that because there is a case pending against a worker, he will not be allowed to join and this will not be acceptable to us at all. I am not talking about anything else; I am not taking about the economic package. I am only talking about this particular aspect of the problem which is that the management will take the plea that because a case is pending against a worker, he will not be allowed to join. This will not be accepted by the workers. The workers will die, they will perish; but they will not accept this at all. It is their very honour and it is a question of their honour and they will not accept this. In fact, "The Times of India" has written that some of the workers' girls have been forced to become prostitutes. But the Government has not realised it. The workers' determination has made them nervous. You are shaking today; but the workers are not shaky. The workers are fighting. They will die; they will perish. But they will not accept this. So, before it is too late, Mr. Azad, be a bit more friendly towards the workers who cares for your sympathy? You should have shown your sympathy in January itself. We workers do not want your sympathy. We just want our rights, our honour, and we want to settle the issue across the table. I may be wrong sometimes and you may be wrong sometimes. It is not that you are always right and I am always wrong or that you are always wrong and I am always right. It is not like

[Shri Kalyan Roy]

that. Therefore, don't take that attitude and do not stretch the textile strike to other areas. You can avoid this national disaster which is the result of your bankrupt policy to impose one union on all areas, whether they have the strength or not.

SHRI BHAGWAT JHA AZAD: Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I have said clearly before that I have talked to all concerned about this. Beyond this I cannot say anything more. That is the reply to the first question.

With regard to the second question, I have said about violence and intimidation, as they go with other strikes and as they have been in the past, as also, in this case, the workers will not be victimised and my statement is very clear.

As regards the third point, I strongly protest against the statement that the workers' daughters have become prostitutes. This is a derogatory remark against the workers. (*Interruptions*). It is very wrong to say that the workers' daughters have become prostitutes. It is very unfair and it is a very unfair remark against the workers. (*Interruptions*). You should criticise the Press then. But you support the Press.

SHRI KALYAN ROY: You give a contradiction then.

SHRI BHAGWAT JHA AZAD: Why should I know that they have not become like that. I have not said that they have become. You should defend their honour. You support them and you work for them. So, you should defend their honour. It is a matter of shame for you to say like this. I know the sense of honour of the workers. They are great people, they are brave people and they are fighting people, and they can never allow their daughters to become prostitutes (*Interruptions*). Then, Sir, about the other points that the honourable Member

has made, about the textile industry, about coal, and other things, they will be replied to at the appropriate time in the appropriate forum.

SHRI KALYAN ROY: One point he did not reply. How many workers have gone? He has stated that the workers have gone there. How many?

SHRI BHAGWAT JHA AZAD: Many workers have come. They are in thousands. Many thousands are already there. (*Interruptions*)

PROF. (SHRIMATI) ASHIMA CHATTERJEE: It is already five minutes past seven and at the fag end of the sitting I do not like to deliver a long speech like the previous speaker. But I would like to congratulate the hon. Labour Minister for the appropriate action he has taken. What I would like to state is that when the textile workers resume their duties. I would request the hon. Labour Minister to pay their salaries for the strike period on humanitarian ground.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI LADLI MOHAN NIGAM): You have made your point. (*Interruptions*)

AN. HON. MEMBER: Let the Minister reply.

SHRI BHAGWAT JHA AZAD: She has made a suggestion. I have heard it. You know what happens in the case of illegal strikes. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI GHULAM RASOOL MATTO (Jammu and Kashmir): Sir, as a person involved in textile industry, I must say that the Minister rightly said that it is a grave national loss that has taken place in Bombay. I want to bring two or three points to the notice of the hon. Minister.

My first point is that a Press report has appeared that ten mills are being shifted from Maharashtra. Although the Maharashtra Government has said that they will not allow it, since Mr. Shivraj Patil is here, I would like to request him to kindly consider this

point of mine. He is fully empowered under the Essential Commodities Act and the Textile Control Orders to issue notices to all the 62 mills in Bombay that they cannot shift. It is not for the Maharashtra Government alone. It also lies in the jurisdiction of the Central Government.

The second point I want to make is that I know that certain meetings have taken place, but the fact remains that a decision taken unilaterally is not acceptable to the workers. I would request the hon. Minister to kindly consider that within the framework of what he has said a conference may be conveyed where all these proposals may be made. The question of representation should be left to the Government because only the Government, the workers and the employers are the parties in this. No political party should be allowed to indulge in this discussion. Only these three parties should talk over this thing. I would request the hon. Minister to consider this. On the basis of my personal experience I say that he should try to get the workers' representatives—real representatives, whosoever they are; let it be Datta Samant; if he represents some section, he should also be there; if INTUC people are there and others are there. He should try to persuade to get them agree to an arbitration, because arbitration is the only way to solve such problems. I would request the hon. Minister, within the framework of his offer, to talk seriously of arbitration so that they should accept the award. I think that would be a better step than consensus. I would also request the hon. Minister to issue the necessary orders.

SHRI BHAGWAT JHA AZAD: Sir, I appreciate the sincere intention behind this suggestion of the hon. Member. It is good to find such friends in the House who appreciate the sincere offer made by the Government, and I congratulate the hon. Member. Sir, it is true that for solving such problems, the need of the hour is not a conference of those who have already shown their teeth to bite, but it is necessary that those

who are really and genuinely interested in solving the problem should be called. I fully appreciate the suggestion. We shall do our best that in this committee the representatives of the workers, the employers and the Government strive hard to reach the conclusions which are acceptable to all concerned.

Sir, about the mills approaching for transfer, I would say that no such approach has been made to us. As and when that approach is made, the Textile Minister will look into the matter according to law with reference to different Acts. As you said, in this case there is much need for an indepth study and we require immediate results. That is why we have fixed two months for certain issues and six months for certain issues and one year for the industry as a whole. As you have rightly put it, unless there is a written agreement about that, such a thing about arbitration does not work. As regards the suggestion about mills shifting, I have already referred to it. There is a feeling that the conference would not have validity unless and untill I call it. I would say that I shall make all attempts to see that I have the representation of the real workers who are really involved in this and we shall try to deal with them.

श्री जे. के. जैन (मध्य प्रदेश) :

उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, मुझे भाषण तो करना नहीं है लेकिन मैंने निवेदन किया था कि मुझे एक दो बातें कहने का अवसर प्रदान किया जाये। इसके लिए मैं आपको धन्यवाद देता हूँ। देश की हर बहू, बेटी, बहन जैसे हमारी हैं वैसे ही वर्कर्स की है लेकिन राजनीतिक लाभ उठाने के लिए जिस प्रकार मे वर्कर्स की बहू बेटियों को लपेटा जाता है और उसको वैश्या तक बना दिया जाता है, यह बड़े दुःख की बात है और यह मैंने उड़ते हुये कानों से सुना है। मुझे इस बात का बड़ा दुःख है। हमारे माननीय सदस्य उठ कर चले गये क्योंकि सत्य

[श्री जे० के० जैन]

जो है, कड़वा होता है और वह गले से नहीं उतरता है। इसीलिए वे शायद उठ कर चले गये हैं। वर्कर्स की बहू-बेटियों के बारे में इस प्रकार के शब्दों का इस्तेमाल करना कि वे बैश्या बन गई हैं, मैं इस बात के लिए उन सदस्य महोदय की, जिन्होंने केवल राजनीतिक लाभ उठाने के लिए ऐसे बुरे शब्द का इस्तेमाल किया है, भर्त्सना करना चाहता हूँ। उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, सभी जानते हैं कि हमारे सो० पो० आई० और सी० पी० एम० के जो सदस्य हैं वे वर्कर्स का लहू पी कर ही जिन्दा रहते हैं। वर्कर्स को बहूबूदी कभी सो० पो० आई० और सी० पी० एम० के नेताओं ने नहीं की। वर्कर्स की बहूबूदी कर रहे होते तो कल ही की बात है, जब हमारे माननीय कुशल मंत्री, श्री भगवत झा आजाद जी ने कहा कि वेस्ट बंगाल के अन्दर सबसे ज्यादा लाक-आउट हुये हैं और वेस्ट बंगाल लाक-आउट्स में सारे देश में शिरोमणि है। क्यों लाक-आउट हो रहे हैं? लाक-आउट कब होते हैं? जब मिल मालिक और वहाँ के नेता आपस में मिल जाते हैं, तो लाक-आउट होते हैं। मैं इन लोगों की तरह से लांछन नहीं लगाना चाहता कि वे चन्दा लेते हैं, लेकिन कम से कम यदि आप अपने को वर्कर्स का हिमायती कहते हैं, तो आपकी सरकार वहाँ पर है, तो आपको देखना चाहिये थी आपके लिए यह गर्म की बात है। कम से कम आपकी स्टेट्स में जहाँ आपका शासन है, वहाँ पर लाक-आउट्स की संख्या इतनी नहीं होनी चाहिये बल्कि इससे साफ जाहिर होता है कि यह सिर्फ वर्कर्स के लिए मगरमच्छ के आंसू बहाने हैं और उनकी समस्याओं का समाधान करना नहीं जानते हैं। समस्याओं का समाधान तो हमारी सरकार, हमारी पार्टी करना जानती है। मिनिमम वेजेज एक्ट किमने लाया देश के

अन्दर? यह कांग्रेस सरकार थी, जिसने गरीब मजदूरों को ही नहीं, मिल मजदूरों को ही नहीं, बल्कि खेतिहर मजदूरों के लिए भी कम से कम वेजेज निश्चित किये हैं कि इतने वेजेज जरूर देने होंगे। उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, चर्चाएं करना और राजनीतिक लाभ उठाना बहुत आसान है, लेकिन समस्याओं के साथ जूझना बहुत मुश्किल है और यह मैं क्यों कह रहा हूँ क्योंकि वेस्ट बंगाल में इन लोगों की सरकार है, इसलिए मैं कह रहा हूँ कि यह समस्याओं का समाधान आज तक नहीं कर पाये है। यह समस्याओं को उलझाते जा रहे हैं। दूसरे प्रदेशों के अन्दर उन्हीं समस्याओं को बना कर के आग में घी डालने का काम करते हैं। हमारी सरकार इसको जांच कराए कि कौन ऐसे तत्व हैं जो इस प्रकार से समस्याओं का उलझाने में मदद देते हैं। कौन ऐसी ताकतें हैं जो मजदूरों के परिवारों के साथ, मजदूरों के धन के साथ खिलवाड़ करते हैं और अय्याशी करते हैं, यह नेता लोग। बड़े दुःख की बात है कि...

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री लडली मोहन निगम) : कालिंग अटेंशन पर कुछ कहो।

श्री जे० के० जैन : उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, क्योंकि चर्चा हो गई है घिजौनी, मैं इतना बोलना नहीं चाहता था, लेकिन बोलना पड़ा। मैं तो एक प्रश्न करने जा रहा था। कभी कभी ऐसी चीजें यहां कह दी जाती हैं, जिसकी वजह से व्यक्ति भावुक हो जाता है। यदि हमारे श्री कल्याण राय जी इतनी घिनीनी बात नहीं कहते, तो शायद मेरा बोलने का आज कोई मक्सद नहीं था, मूड नहीं था, सिर्फ एकाध प्रश्न रखना चाहता था।

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री लडली मोहन निगम) : प्रश्न रखिये।

श्री जे० के० जैन : उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं सिर्फ यह पूछना चाहता हूँ कि

जो मिल मजदूर है वह तो तकलीफ पा ही रहा है और मिल के अन्दर चीज क्या इस्तेमाल होती है। कपास इस्तेमाल होती है और जब मिल बन्द है और कपास नहीं खरीदी जा रही है, तो वह जो कपास का खेतिहर मजदूर है, उसको क्या दशा हो रही होगी, जरा उसकी तरफ हमें ध्यान देना होगा कि गेहूँ के साथ धुन भी पिस रहा है। उस खेतिहर मजदूर के लिए हम क्या उपाय बना रहे हैं। क्योंकि जिस जगह पर वह मजदूरी करता है उसको मजदूरी भी ठीक समय पर मिल रही है या नहीं, क्या वह भूखों तो नहीं मर रहा है यह देखने की चीज है। क्योंकि मिल कपास नहीं खरद रही है, कपास पड़ी हुई है इसलिए जो कपास पैदा करने वाला व्यक्ति है वह मजदूर को कह रहा है कि भाई मेरे पास तो पैसा नहीं है। तो इसके लिए क्या बन्दोबस्त हमारी सरकार, हमारे माननीय मंत्री जी कर रहे हैं, एक तो यह।

दूसरा उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, यह जो समस्या खड़ी होती है, एक टैक्सटाइल मिल के मालिक का रहन-सहन देखिए, रजवाड़े तो जहर खत्म हो गये, लेकिन हजारों राजे-महाराजे फिर पैदा हो गये हैं, जब वह देखते हैं मिल के मजदूर 20-20 लाख की गाड़ी में मिल के मालिक को जाने हुये और उम गरीब के पास आने बेटे को दवाई खरदने के लिए पैसा नहीं होता, तब यह समस्या खड़े होता है, उनका तकलीफ होता है। मेरा निवेदन यह है टैक्सटाइल मिल के अन्दर जो मुनाफे में कमी होती है उसकी जांच कराई जाय कि क्यों मुनाफे में कमी हो रही है। क्योंकि अनाप-शनाप खर्च मिल का मालिक बढ़ा देता है, और तीसरी बात।

आज जो मिल का मालिक है वह चेक का पेमेंट देने में इंटेरेस्टेड नहीं होता है।

चेक का जो पेमेंट होता है, मिलों के अन्दर तो वह तो मिल का गुमास्ता या एकाउन्टेंट बगैरह जो होता है, वही संभालता है, मिल का मालिक तो सिर्फ आज इंटेरेस्टेड है कि कितने ब्रीफ केसेज भर करके काले धन के उसके पास आये। जड़ को खोद रहे हैं ये। आप अपने एक्साइज विभाग को और इन्कम टैक्स डिपार्टमेंट को जरा मजबूत करिए, सख्त करिये कि ट्रक के ट्रक भर कर एक्साइज फ्री जमाल मिल से जो निकाल दिया जाता है वहां किनकी सांठपाठ है। यदि उस माल पर एक्साइज की चोरी न हो, तो मिल का मुनाफा बढ़ेगा और जब मिल का मुनाफा पड़ेगी तो वर्कर्स को बोनस ज्यादा मिलेगा और यदि वर्कर्स को बोनस ज्यादा मिलेगा तो वह कभी स्ट्राइक की बात नहीं करेगा। वर्कर को तो आपने बच्चों को पालने के लिए पैसा चाहिये, रोटी देने के लिए पैसा चाहिये जो चाहे तनख्वाह के रूप में मिल जाये या बोनस के रूप में। तो मेरा यह माननीय मंत्री जी से निवेदन है कि वे क्या अपने फाइनेंस मंत्रालय को इस बात की हिदायत देंगे कि एक्साइज की चोरी और इन्कम टैक्स की चोरी से जो काला धन बढ़ता जा रहा है उस पर रोक लगाने के लिए कुछ प्रयत्न किया जाय।

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री लाडली मोहन निगम) : माननीय मंत्री कुछ कहिए, कहना हो तो।

श्री भागवत झा आजाद : आपको जो आज्ञा हो।

प्रश्न यह है कि स्ट्राइक के कारण कपास उत्पादन करने वालों की कठिनाइयों के सम्बन्ध में कहा है। मैं आपको यह सूचना देना चाहता हूं कि बम्बई में काटन प्रोक्योरमेंट स्कीम अपनी सरकार की चल रही है। इस

श्री भागवत झा आजाद : कारण से काटन प्रोक्वोरमेंट रूलों के अन्तर्गत सरकार कपास खरोद रही है इस से इस सम्बन्ध में कठिनाई जिसका आपने उल्लेख किया, वह नहीं है।

संतदीप कार्य विभाग में राज्य मंत्री श्री कल्याण राय : उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, एक मिनट। विरोधी दल के कोई भी नेता मौजूद नहीं हैं। हमेशा भाग की जाती है कि सदन बढ़ाया जाय तो आप ठूँपा करके इसको देख लें कि एक आदमी मौजूद नहीं है।

श्री भागवत झा आजाद : आपने ठाक कहा, यह देखने को आवश्यकता है कि उनके मुनाफे कितने हैं? किस प्रकार के हैं? आने यह सही कहा कि अगर अधिक मुनाफा होगा तो अधिक तनखाह मिलेगी, अधिक बोनस मिलेगा, और अधिक तनखाह-बोनस मिलेगा तो फिर स्ट्राइक की आवश्यकता नहीं पड़ेगी। इसलिए ही हमने जो कमेटी बनाई है, उसको कहा है कि "इन-डेथ" जा कर उसकी सारी चीजों को देखें। वह जो कहते हैं, पैसे नहीं हैं, मुनाफा कम हो रहा है, कहां कठिनाई है, हम वेजेज नहीं बढ़ा सकते हैं, यह सब देखें। अभी प्रो-साइसली इसी बात को लेकर एक मेम्बर ने कहा है—ये जंक रखते हैं, वैफरप्सी रखते हैं—तो इसी बात के लिए हमने ट्राइपराटाईट कमेटी को बनाया है। बम्बई के बारे में मैंने अलग कहा

है कि 3 प्वॉइंट पर दो महीने मत दीजिए, वेतन इन्क्रीज पर छः महीने में दीजिए, लेकिन संपूर्ण देश में टैंक्सटाइल उद्योग के बारे में जो कहा जा रहा है कि मुनाफे की कमी है, ये मुनाफा छिया लेंगे, ये 25 लाख की कार पर घूमते हैं, इस देश की प्रधान मंत्री और नेता चलते हैं एम्बेसेडर पर—यह तो बात सही कहते हैं, इस देश के मिल-मालिकों को ध्यान में रखना चाहिये जी इंपोर्टेड फार का रौब दिखाते हैं, इससे वर्कर का दिल दुखता है। तो यह सुझाव आप हर फोरम पर दीजिए ताकि उनको अक्ल और ज्ञान आए और इसी रूप में कमेटी बनाई है कि उनकी वॉलेंटिंग को देखा जाये, उनकी कैपेसिटी देखी जाये कि वास्तव में कितना जंक हुआ है, अगर वर्कर्स के कारण हुआ है तो यह भी देखा जाये। इन तमाम चीजों को देखकर उनकी कैपेसिटी देखी जाये, ताकि हम देश के वर्कर्स और बम्बई के टैंक्सटाइल वर्कर्स को उनकी तनखाह आदि में आवश्यक सुधार करके सुविधायें दे सकें।

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री लाडली मोहन निगम) : सदन को कार्यवाही मंगल-वार तारीख 13 जुलाई, को 11 बजे तक के लिए स्थगित होती है।

The House then adjourned at twenty two minutes past seven of the clock till eleven of the clock on Tuesday, the 13th July, 1982.