

There is record to show that the discussion took place in November and the Minister also replied. I seek the permission of the House and your permission to withdraw what I have stated previously. I apologise for the inconvenience caused.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The House stands adjourned till 2-30 P.M.

The House then adjourned for lunch at three minutes past one of the clock.

The House reassembled after lunch at half past two of the clock. The VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN in the Chair.

**RESOLUTION SUGGESTING
STEPS TO BE TAKEN BY GOVERNMENT FOR PROVIDING
GREATER EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITIES AND BRINGING
ABOUT UNIFORMITY IN THE
WORKING OF INDUSTRIAL
UNDERTAKINGS—contd.**

SHRI D. THENGARI (Uttar Pradesh): Sir, I welcome the Resolution. I am of opinion that the introduction of 40 hours per week will be helpful in increasing productivity and production. It has been experienced that if the same quantum of work is spread over a longer period, it gets itself spread and the entire time is taken by the same work. If a shorter period is allotted for the work, then the same work is finished within a shorter period also. According to Parkinson's law whatever extra time is allotted for the same quantum of work is exhausted by that work. Therefore, the introduction of 40 hours per week will be helpful in increasing productivity and production. And again we will be able to work our plants, our machines, with greater efficiency for longer hours if seven days per week we managed to run all the plants, all the factories with this provision that every worker will have 40 hours per week.

Then, I cannot reconcile myself with the idea that the age of retirement should be 60 years. That is too much. The present limit of 58 years is quite enough. We should also give opportunity to younger elements.

So far as the ceiling of Rs. 4,000 is concerned, I am of opinion that this should not be considered in isolation. It part of the bigger problem. It would be better if we begin from the other end, that is, of determining the ratio between the minimum and the maximum expendable incomes in the land. Our proposal is that immediately the ratio between the minimum and the maximum expendable incomes in the country should be 1:20 and an effort should be made to bring it down to 1:10. With that end in view we should decide the ratio between the minimum and the maximum, and not merely the ceiling of the supervisor or the managerial staff. With this difference of opinion I support the Resolution.

SHRI G. A. APPAN (Tamil Nadu): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I have great pleasure in supporting the Resolution under discussion here in this House today. It goes without saying that there can be no hesitation or objection to state that work should be found for all people. Work is a fundamental right. Many people ask for many favours such as free hospital treatment, free education, free housing and free everything. Even rich people, including Members of Parliament, want many things free. It is unfortunate that nobody likes to pay income-tax or cess gladly. How is it possible for any government to run the administration without money? Government is a very big concern employing many people, next only to private sector industries. I honestly feel that India is very, very rich in its mineral and other resources. We have plenty of labour. But the labour productivity in our country is far below what it is in other countries. Some people ask: 'Our country is poor; our people get very low wages and how can you expect efficiency in our country?' I entirely agree. What is needed in any country or any society is honesty and sincerity to work so that through such kind of work people can earn more. That will increase productivity also. Unless productivity reaches the optimum level, how can you get more and save more? Unless you earn more and save more, how can you invest as entrepreneurs? Unless

[Shri G. A. Appan]

you invest, how can you create employment and unless additional employment is created, how can you find jobs for your unemployed people and under-employed people? This problem has got to be solved sooner or later in all seriousness. To solve the problem of under-employment, our pioneers tried to find out some solution in order to provide alternative employment to agriculturists during the slack season. It was only in this context that charkha spinning started in our country. The late Mahatma Gandhi and other stalwarts devoted their time and energy in persuading people to take to handloom industry, cottage industry, domestic industry and small-scale industry. We see that the Kisan Charkha which was plying in the country in large numbers is not being encouraged after the introduction of the Ambar Charkha. Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, it is all right that we should give more employment to more people. But when we develop labour-intensive industries and create employment opportunities, only then can we provide more jobs. But here we have the poor people. Of course, rich people, influential people, get jobs easily. In a family, where there are ten educated people, eight or nine get jobs. But, in a family where there is only one educated man or where there is only one earning member, the poor fellow does not get it, because he has no influence. Sir, the Andhra Government has proposed a scheme that at least one member in every family should be employed. I have been telling for the last three years that jobs should be rationed. When commodities are scarce, we have been following the policy of rationing. Why not this now? When there is unemployment mounting to its enormous balloonistic height, why not we ration jobs? In a number of families there are only one or two people who are earning and the others do not get jobs. Very often, as a labour leader, as a man who has been trying to work amongst the commonest and the lowest in the society, I find it is very very difficult even for bigger people to give jobs unless they have something to throw away.

Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, it is my humble prayer that this Resolution should be adopted by the Government. It is a private Member's Resolution. Why not the Government come forward to take it up? That would be a very good gesture. Whether it comes from a member of the Opposition or an Independent Member, it should be adopted. If this is supposed to be acceptable to everybody, I would request the Government to come forward, to request Member to withdraw this and give an assurance on the floor of the House that they would support this.

Now, Sir, regarding the imposition of a ceiling of Rs. 4,000, our *per capita* income per year is only Rs. 400, even less than Rs. 400, and so, why not reduce this to Rs. 2,000. Many people do not know why this money was born, why this wealth was born and I do not know why people are clamouring for money and go after money. People want to go to other jobs and want to get as much money as possible to build their fortunes. When money accumulates, other corrupt practices like drinking and this thing and that thing, extravagance—many such things come. So, I would rather go to the extent of saying that the imposition of ceiling on emoluments should be not more than Rs. 200 p.m., that is, Rs. 2,400 per year, if I am permitted to do so. I know in many families there are people who do not get even Rs 100. Take the case of small farmers in the villages. They mortgage their lands, they mortgage their jewellery, and they mortgage many things even to keep the wolf out of doors. So, Sir is it not the duty of the parliamentarians and the Government in the country and in the States to come forward to help the common man, to try to lift the man from the lower rungs, instead of trying to give many benefits and other things to people?

Regarding the 40 hours per week, Sir, people who have studied history will know how, in many countries, people were in the turmoil, working the whole day, even for 12 hours, 11 hours and 10 hours. Now we are working eight hours a day. It means 48 hours per week. In some factories it is 44 hours.

Now it is a nice thing provided the labour understands that it should work even this 40 hours honestly. I have been working in the factories, in the textile mills and in a number of other mills. Even I see people working in the gardens and fields. When I was a young boy, at least when I was 30 years of age. . .

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN) : You are still young

SHRI G. A. APPAN : I would like to be young because I work hard. My father died at the age of 102 and he was working till the last day. People who work hard will live longer; people who eat less will live long. And not others

Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, yesterday when Mrs. Gandhi said : "Produce more", some friend criticized her that she wants us to produce more. It is a sin to ask people to produce more? We should produce more, earn more and ask for more—but not to ask for bonus even when the company is running into loss for the last three or four years . . .

AN HON MEMBER : You must also speak less.

SHRI G. A. APPAN : Yes. I entirely agree

Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, in the factories I want only leaders from the ranks. I appeal to this House not to accept any labour leaders from outside and unless he works along with them. Do you mean to say that we do not have labourers who have not studied even up to the third standard? Even two or three standards will do for membership of a Legislature or Parliament. We should not accept people who do no work and are parasites. We should accept people who incite people to work. I have seen some of the factories, including the Durgapur Steel Plant. Of course, that is a menace to the whole country. Sir, I have been telling : Let the labourers put their payments like bonus into the capital of

the undertaking where they work. Let them have a sense of belonging, even if it is an amount of ten rupees. He will not strike. Let the Government and the industrial undertakings give a share to the labourers also in the undertaking and in the management. I say so even in respect of the Indian Airlines . . .

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN) : You must sit down now.

SHRI G. A. APPAN : Only one more point.

Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, of course, every now and then, only the wearer knows where the shoe pinches. Much tall talk is going on 'gharibi'. Poor people cry. But the scheduled caste and scheduled tribe people are worse than the poor people. No doubt, the poor people get benefits. Do you mean to say that all the so-called benefits go to the scheduled castes and scheduled tribes? No, except in certain places. Now take the problem of beggars' rehabilitation. I would say that every Chief Minister should follow the footpath of our Chief Minister to build up a fund for the rehabilitation of the beggars and for the rehabilitation of the scheduled castes and scheduled tribes, and to create more employment. Supposing all the beggars are employed, we can get more, produce more. That's what Mahatma Gandhi was telling; that is what our Great Anna was telling. This is what Anna's follower, Shri Karunanidhi, is doing. So, let our Prime Minister Mrs. Indira Gandhi, and our President, start such a Fund. For creating more job opportunities develop industries. How can we give jobs for more people unless we develop industries? Along with this I feel that every Chief Minister should follow the good example of our Madras Chief Minister to build up funds for the rehabilitation of beggars and for the rehabilitation of the Scheduled Castes and other underprivileged classes.

Thank you, Sir.

SHRI KRISHAN KANT (Haryana) : Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I rise to sup-

[Shri Krishan Kant]

port this Resolution of my hon. friend, Shri R. P. Khaitan. Sir, what are the basic problems before this country? If we analyse this Resolution, it must be analysed in that context. There the problems are production and employment, not merely employment but giving also the basic minimum needs to the people. A person, employed or under-employed, cannot live unless his basic minimum needs are fulfilled. And this fulfilment of the basic needs of the people is one of the items of the ten-point programme which the Congress has accepted, and I am sure our friends sitting here do remember that programme although sometimes I do feel, Mr. Vice-Chairman, that the fulfilment of this programme of the basic minimum needs by 1975 is being forgotten a bit too much, because the way we are functioning, the way we are working, I do not think we can achieve this goal of providing the basic minimum needs to the people by 1975. Now here is the Resolution which Mr. Khaitan has brought. If you try to implement it, to some extent at least you will be able to achieve this. The other day we were talking here about the right to work as a fundamental right. And our friend, the Deputy Minister, said that we have decided to make a socialist society and so that will ensure the right to work. But, on the other hand, when I asked him a question, he gave a very interesting reply on the theory of socialism and said that socialism can come only in an under-populated State. Then China would never have had socialism. He gave the example of Eastern Europe and of the Soviet Union. He said, "We cannot give full employment. So we cannot give the right to work in our Constitution." Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, what I am saying is there is confusion in thinking in Government and political circles. If we really want to build a socialist society, if we really want to transform the present socialist system, we must have to give the right to work to every citizen of India who is capable of doing work. In order to achieve that we cannot dilly-dally and we cannot put excuse after excuse for not doing so. We

must find out the ways and means of achieving that, and I think Mr. Khaitan's Resolution, to some extent, can help in achieving that, to achieve the right to work to every citizen.

Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir; the other day, when Mr. Babubhai Chinai and others were speaking on this Resolution, a seminar on this and allied subjects was taking place in Bombay participated in by a number of economists, labour leaders and others. Now, Sir, in their recommendations I am glad to see that the proposal of Mr. Khaitan that it should be five days' week instead of seven days' week finds a place. The Indian economists in that Seminar explained that if we want to give more employment opportunities, then the number of work-days may be reduced to five. So, this is a very serious matter, and in order to solve the problem of unemployment, in order to solve the problem of poverty, we have to look into it. A villager came to me about a month back. He was talking to me about the new mandate that the Congress has got. He told me: "Krishan Kantji, do not worry about eradication of poverty; poverty we will remove ourselves; give us employment." The main question is giving employment. In the common man's language what he simply told me was: Do not worry about poverty; you worry about unemployment; poverty we will remove ourselves. So, Sir, the question before us is this: If we have to give employment and the basic minimum needs to the people, then does this Resolution in any way help or not? I would like to say that this will help to some extent. But neither Mr. Khaitan nor I have got the mechanism for the whole analysis of the economic aspects—how much employment will be created, what will be the total productivity what would be added to costs etc. This is a matter which needs to be looked into by experts.

Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, that day our hon. friend, Mr. Babubhai Chinai said, as usual, that when you increase employment the cost of production will also increase by 1/6th. Like the businessman, as usual, whenever a propo-

sal comes he wants to sidetrack the whole issue. In the production of textiles or jute or vegetable oils, what is the total amount which is added towards labour? In textiles and jute probably it is 20-25 per cent and 3 per cent in vegetable oil industry and all that. So, if 1/6th is added, the total rise will be only 1/6th of that. One item which Mr. Khaitan has put forward is that when you work two or three shifts, production will increase, cost of production will become less, the number of people who will get employment will be much more, the production will be much more so that the additional amount towards wages will be absorbed against additional production. And that is the only way to solve the problem. But the difficulty is that the industrialists, other tycoons and their representatives want that this country should have an economy of shortages because it is in an economy of shortages that they gain and profit. If they have got two or three shifts, the production will be more, wages will be more and other things will be more but, then their capitalist economy will be out shattered. So, Mr. Babubhai Chinai or anybody who did not support it were only trying to delude, and sidetrack and hush-hush the issue. I would like the Minister and the Government to deal with this question and let this House know how much increase there really will be in the cost of production because that will settle the problem.

The other thing is the question of working hours. President Giri who was for long in the labour movement has welcomed what has happened in Mysore. Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, even the ILO had a number of reports on the reduction of hours of work and whatever they have recommended should be considered. But one falsity in the thinking of the National Commission on Labour is, they feel that reduction in hours of work is possible only in developed economy. That is wrong because in an under-developed country where the people are poor they need more nutrition—they certainly need more nutrition—to work.

391RS/71—6

Where they are poor, if they do less hours of work the productivity will be more. If a healthy person can do x quantity of work, a weak person is supposed to do $(x-1)$ quantity of work better. So, the productivity will be much more and they will do better work if they do work according to the physical capacity and that way enhance the productivity of the country and add to the national wealth.

Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I hope the Government is not going to accept all the recommendations of the National Commission on Labour. The National Commission on Labour has not accepted the idea of five days' work. It is a question which needs to be looked into in view of the new conditions—unemployment, under-employment and provision of basic minimum needs to the people. Here are some of the recommendations in which they themselves say that workers' hours of work should be according to the type of industry :

The National Commission says :

“Our Study Group on Heavy Chemicals has recommended that the duration of work in hazardous areas should be reduced by the employment of workers for short and conveniently broken spells and shifting workers elsewhere for the rest of the period. Since this may not be feasible always, we recommend a reduction in the total hours of work for such workers.

May I know when the hon. Deputy Minister replies, whether he will refer to this recommendation of the Labour Commission and say what the Government's reaction is? Even for the mining labour the number of hours of work is to be reduced because they work in very unhealthy conditions in underground and this is their recommendation even the National Commission makes. Another thing I want to say is this and I would like to know from the Minister whether the Government has thought of removing this anomaly and if not, why not. The

[Shri Krishan Kant]

anomaly is very clear. The Commission says :

"One anomaly, however requires to be removed. Plantation Labour Act, 1951 and the Minimum Wages Act, 1948. While the former prescribes a fifty-four hour week, the latter envisages only forty-eight hours work. The relevant provision under the former Act needs to be changed to bring it in line with that under the latter."

May I know what has been the thinking? Are they thinking of bringing in an amendment so that this anomaly is removed? May I know what the Government is trying to do in this respect?

I would like to say another thing about imposing a ceiling of Rs. 4000 per month on emoluments. I would like to remind this House of the Faizpur Resolution of the Congress where under Gandhiji's leadership we decided that the differences in wage should be 1 to 25. The times have changed and many things have changed. Productivity has changed and I brought a resolution that it should be 1 to 20. The present Budget mentions the maximum figure of 5000. But that is not clear. Here is a lacuna in the Budget because henceforward the maximum will be paid to a Director or Joint Director and the Income-tax will be paid by the company. It is the shareholder and those who get the dividend who will suffer. They know how to sidetrack the various laws and the common man who has bought the shares will suffer. The Company will suffer but the Managing Director will not suffer. There is no limit on perquisites. Unless along with this Rs. 5000 there is a limit on perquisites, the whole approach is wrong. Mr. Khaitan has said Rs. 4000. I suggest it should include all the perquisites like housing, TA, DA and everything because you say in the Resolution :

"to impose a ceiling of Rs. 4000 per month on emoluments paid to directors and employees of factories, plantations, mines and transport undertakings of the country whether

in public sector, or private sector so that disparities existing in this respect may be removed."

Disparity we want to remove but you have not mentioned perquisites. I feel the Minister should also note that the perquisites should be included in this. I think the stage has come in the development of the country when not merely talk of removal of unemployment should be there but strong steps in this direction should be taken up and till the Government is prepared to include the right to work in the Fundamental Rights. If it is not done there will be a flare-up in this country. The Naxalites will grow other groups will grow because they want to live as honourable citizen. They do not want to live like orphans and go about in lanes and by-lanes in the villages. Unless you give the right to work the country will be in conflagration. There will be violence, there will be bloodshed. So the time has come when agitations will grow and on this matter of right to work all the parties, from Right to the Left, are united. So don't take it lying down. Don't think you can stop it. If you want really to give every citizen the right to work you will have to think on revolutionary lines, not on the usual budgeting lines not on accounting lines as the bureaucrats have been thinking during the last twenty years. The whole economic thinking is old; the whole economic approach is old. Why can't we in this country provide for food, clothing and shelter at cheap rates. Even in UAR food is very cheap, so cheap that any poor man can afford to buy. Why can't our Budget, why can't our economic policy ensure that these basic needs of the people will be cheap? If you do that, other taxation measures will not impinge on the common man's mind. This of course has got to be done and this Resolution of Mr. Khaitan shows the direction in which you have to work. Therefore may I know from the Government what they are doing? If they do not tackle this problem in time, as I have warned, the dangers are ahead. They will engulf you; they will engulf all of us. The signs are there. Bangla Desh is a sign of what economic disparities and poverty can

lead to. The poor people cannot wait for long. The whole of South East Asia is bleeding. What is happening in Ceylon? Mrs. Bandaranaike can suppress them for the time being but the people who have risen for their rights can never be suppressed. They will always grow. In India we have this challenge; the challenge before you before the country is whether you can, whether Parliament can solve them by peaceful means. Otherwise the people will try to solve them by violence. This is the question before us and I hope the Deputy Minister who will reply on behalf of the Government will have something to say on this or will he give just a flat speech?

SHRI BALACHANDRA MENON (Kerala): I welcome this Resolution and I think a little can be done on the basis of some action as suggested to by this Resolution; not much and this is not going to be the solution. I would like to point out that no country can give employment to its people unless it has a bold policy of industrialisation. A backward country with petty production can only keep a large number of people unemployed or underemployed. We have been that and we will continue to be that unless we have a bold policy of industrialisation. We speak of socialism but have we done even the minimum basic task before we can ever think of socialism? My own feeling is we have failed to do it. The huge rich peasant-parasite-landlord economy continues. Twenty-five per cent of our scarce resources go to feed these parasites who are wasting the entire surplus. The money which should have been diverted for industrialisation is being eaten up by people who do not do any work. It is this semi-feudal rich-peasant economy—after all the feudalism has turned to be the rich peasant driving away the poor and middle peasant—which is creating all this trouble and without drastic changes in the agrarian sector nothing can be done in this country. And that is what Mr. Krishan Kant's party dare not do and as long as they do not do it all the surplus that can be generated will be in the agrarian sector eaten up by those people who will never allow industrialisation of the country.

Therefore I want to point out that the basic thing, the first task of India to day is to insist on what we have been telling all along that your Governments which are there in almost all the States now, bring about these land reforms so that the basis for industrialisation. That is the first task that has got to be done. Sir, I have been reading recently some books about how Japan got industrialised and I learnt something from it. The deficit financing that we have been doing was done for a large number of years in Japan. Bleeding the ordinary man and handing over the entire surplus to the bourgeoisie was what was done in Japan. Are we following that path? I would like to know it. If that is so, I can tell you that there is danger ahead. The period has changed. Japan's period of industrialisation was during the first world war and immediate before. After the second world war that kind of industrialisation cannot come about. The State sector, in Japan was handed over to the private people and that proved to be the basis to help the private sector. The private sector made use of the small industries to produce the spares and a whole monopoly was built and that monopoly is really now the most powerful force in Japan. Here even before industrialisation took place there was monopoly tied up to imperialism, which would not allow industrialisation. As the land system will not allow the surplus land to be used, the monopoly system will not allow other industries to come up. We have got all the defects of a monopoly and all the backwardness of a semi-feudal structure. In twenty years you have not done much. You have got a mandate now. Can you do something? I have my own doubts. If you have eyes you can read the writing on the wall. If we don't move what was pointed out by Mr. Krishan Kant is bound to take place. I would therefore, say that we should have a clear and new strategy regarding industrialisation I welcome the reduction to forty hours, but it should not in any way affect the wages of the workers. Otherwise it would mean wage cut which will be resisted. I am prepared to accept even the seven-day week, provided there is sufficient time for the machinery to be

[Shri Balachandra Menon]

given rest. Some industries cannot have three shifts. The age of retirement should be 58. It can be further reduced. Old men must give way. They will at least have some gratuity when they go away. In most of the organised industries there will be some provident fund or gratuity. How long can the youngman wait for a job? He passes his school examination. He passes out of an engineering college. He is eighteen and above. If you keep him unemployed for a long number of years, what will happen to this country? The best period of a man is spent in idleness. A youngman loses six or seven years waiting for a job. Production by India's ablest section is lost. To avoid that the old man has to go. He must retire, whether it be 55 or 58 years. For the time being I am prepared to accept 58, because some of our trade unionists will shout at me if I demand 55, as the age for retirement. Otherwise, I would like the age of retirement to be 55. The man when he retires gets his pension or he gets his provident fund. He should make way for his son. Should he not at least do that? Our ancestors at the age of fifty or sixty took to Vanaprasta and went away. They at least had the good sense to accept Sanyasa and go away. Why should we not at least retire from work when we are above 55. No worker should continue in service after 55. Therefore, the time has come when all those people who have put in 25 years service or who are fifty-five should get out and make way for their brothers or children.

Then, what should be our objective? The State sector is there. That by itself is not going to do much. The bureaucracy in control of state sector will sabotage the economy and the nationalised sector. This is what is happening today. You have no faith in your worker. You speak of worker's participation in management but you dare not do it. The manager himself is a paid employee. Elect committees in the State sector and hand over a good deal of power to the worker's

council and see whether our workers are committed or not. But as long as you say that his business is only to work for wages, you are only making him a militant fighter for wages. You are making him so because you say no politics in this. Yes, lack of politics has resulted in this. The politics that the industry is his, the politics that this country is his, the politics of socialism that the worker is the leader for social change you dare not tell him. The result is that you have made him a wage slave. Refusal to give the worker his place in politics has resulted in backwardness for which you are partly responsible. Some of us who try to tell the worker that he has a big role in politics is the target of your attack. You say some politicians come and create trouble in the factories. It is the politician, the social engineer, who is to tell the other worker how he will have to work and improve our country. Now you pay for our failure to take profit to the worker. Let us go and tell the worker that he has got his role in changing the economy. Hand over certain industries to him. So many factories are closed. You are going to spend Rs. 50 crores for removal of unemployment in the rural areas and another Rs. 25 crores for the technicians and others. Take over those factories and hand them over to the workers. Here is the factory and here is the worker. Why don't you take over the closed units. Now you will just dig some well here some there to provide a miserable 3 rupees for a few days a year. Is that what you are going to do? Are you going to have charkas for providing employment? No such technique is going to solve the problem. No more charkas and handlooms. If you insist on Hand Loom and Charkas you are tying up the worker to a backward economy or a backward technique that has no future. Our villages will have to be improved. That is what Gandhiji wanted. Today in the modern village the unemployed boy is restless. Take small scale modern factories in the villages. All the factories which are closed should be taken over and handed over to the workers. There should be absolutely no difficulty. Let us try that. I

believe the worker will be much better than the IAS officer whom you have put incharge of some industries because the worker is closer to the people. Of all the people in the world he is closer to life. You entrust him with the responsibility. Then he will know the economics of the industry. I would therefore request that we decide that the 400 odd factories which are closed down during the last two years be taken up by the Government and that a considerable part of Rs. 50 crores or Rs. 75 crores which you are today putting up for industrialisation or for providing employment the rural sector be diverted for this so that at least the factories which were alive are alive again now. Those workers who had work will get back the work. Those who were part of the process of production can participate again in this glorious job of increasing the nations wealth. There is nothing greater. Man reveals himself through work and he attains his greatness through purposeful work. Give him the opportunity to do that. That is what we can do. The Government can immediately come forward and say there shall be no closed factory in India. Have the courage to do it. Bring a Bill Take over the closed factories and hand them to the workers to run. Entrust at least a few of them to the workers; twenty per cent of them at least hand over to the workers. I can assure you they will manage them well. Then a new sector in our industrial set up will emerge which will have great possibilities.

With these observations I conclude my speech.

خوددھری اے۔ محمد (نہار) :

جناب وائس حمر من صاحب - انہی جو ہاؤس کے سامنے کھیتان صاحب کا پرسناؤ ہے ان اسلائمنٹ کے بارے میں - اس کو حار حصوں میں تقسیم کیا گیا ہے - پہلا حصہ وہ ہے کہ جو ابھی کام کا وہ ہے اس کام کے وہ

کو گھٹا دیا گیا جائے - دوسرا پہلو یہ ہے اس کا کہ جنے پلا نٹس ہیں جتنی فیکٹریاں ہیں اور مائز ہیں ان کے اندر 6 کے بجائے 7 دن کام ہونا چاہئے - تیسرا ہے کہ جو ورکرس کام کرتے ہں ان کے ریشٹرمینٹ کی ایج 60 ایس ہونی چاہئے - چوتھی نڑی مزے کی بات یہ ہے کہ ہمارے کھیتان صاحب نے 4 ہزار روئے ڈائریکٹرس کے لئے رکھدی لیکن ورکرس کا جو پہلو تھا کہ ان کا مینم کیا ہوگا یا ان کا مکسیم کیا ہوگا - اس کے بارے میں کھیتان صاحب کے سوسلزم نے کوئی فیصلہ نہیں کیا - وائس حمر من صاحب - میں بتاؤں، میں ٹریڈ یوس میں کام کرنا ہوں - میں جانا ہوں کہ مزدور آندول کا آج کیا پہلو ہے - اور وہ پہلو وہ ہے کہ دیس کے ہر رہنے والے کو کام ملے - اس پرستاؤ میں جو پہلو رکھے گئے ہں ان سے دیس کا ان اسلائمنٹ ختم نہیں ہو سکا - پہلے کھیتان صاحب کو یہ محسوس کرنا چاہئے کہ ان کو ٹی بلاٹسس کا تجربہ ہو سکا ہے لیکن فیکٹریز کی، مائینز کی ورکنگ کنڈیشنس کا ہں اس کا تجربہ کھیتان صاحب کو نہیں ہوگا - کہوں کہ انہیں فیکٹری میں کام کرنے کا موقعہ ہی نہ ملا ہو نا وہاں کی ورکنگ کنڈیشن دیکھنے کا بھی موقعہ نہ ملا ہو اور میں سمجھا ہوں کہ مائز کو تو ایک دم دیکھے کا موقعہ انہیں نہیں

[چودھری اے محمد]

ملا ہوگا۔ کہیں صاحب کو سمجھنا
چاہئے کہ مائٹز میں سے سٹک کام
نہیں کر سکتے۔ کمونکہ مائٹز کی دو
سٹک میں ورکنگ ہوئی ہے اور بائٹ
سٹک میں لائٹنگ کام ہوا ہے بلا شک
کے بعد سہر کو نکالا جا رہا ہے سہر
کرسنگ بلاٹ میں چھٹا جانا ہے جو
آج نے کہا کہ سن ٹائم کم ہو۔ میں
سمجھتا ہوں کہ یہ فٹامیں
غلط بات ہے۔ کیونکہ جو ورکنگ
کنڈیشنس فیکٹریز کی ہیں ان میں
آخری سٹک میں بھی دم ہوا ہے۔
ہے۔ لیکن یہ سی حکمیں اسی دوسری
میں جہاں مسٹری کو ریلیف دینے
کی بات ہوئی ہے نا مسٹری کو صاف
کرنے کی بات ہوئی ہے۔ اس سے
ان املائمنٹ کی برالمہ سالو نہیں
ہوئی۔ ان املائمنٹ کی برالمہ سالو
کرنے کے لئے آج کو راسہ نکالا ہوگا۔
اب میں سرکار سے کہوں گا کہ سن جا رہا
مہسے پہلے اس نے ہندوستان کے آدموں
کو یہ وعدہ دنا تھا کہ ہم اس ملک
کے ہر آدمی کو کام کرنے کا موقعہ
دینگے۔ اس دس سے عرصی ہٹائیں
نے۔ اب وہ آگیا ہے کہ اس وعدہ
کو پورا کریں۔ لیکن اس رستائے سے
وہ وعدے پورے نہیں ہو سکتے۔ یہ
رساؤ گول مول ہے۔ آٹھ لاکھ سے زیادہ
کام نہیں ہونا چاہئے۔ رٹائرمنٹ کی
ایچ 60 ہوئی چاہئے جا رہا رٹائرمنٹ
کو ملنا چاہئے لیکن اس میں نہ کہیں
نہیں کہا گیا ہے کہ ورکنس کی

میں وہی ہوئی چاہئے کہوں
کہ کہیں صاحب کو آدنا میں
ہے کہ املائمنٹ کی طرح سے حل
ہے۔ مائٹز کی طرح سے حل
ہے۔ مائٹز میں لکھ حصہ ان 5
ہو رہا ہے۔ ٹی لائسنس کا تجربہ ان دو
صوبوں میں لیکن معلوم ہوا ہے کہ جو
ورکنگ کمپنیز ہیں 22, 23 عمار
ورکنس میں کام کر رہے ہیں ان کے
سامنے نام کرنے کی برالمہ ہیں۔
بلا شک نا بنا طریقہ ہے اور دوسری
صوبوں کے بنا طریقے ہیں۔ کہیں
صاحب کو اس کے بارے میں گمان نہیں
ہے۔ یا ہی ہی عمارت میں ان دو
مائٹز کے بارے میں آٹھ لاکھ ہے۔ اس
رستائے سے میں سمجھتا ہوں کہ
ان املائمنٹ کی برالمہ سالو نہیں ہو
سکتی۔ اس کے لئے آج دو سو چھ ہوا
ہے ہمارے یہاں املائمنٹ کی
ٹیلو کرنے۔ ہمارے یہاں جو
نورمنٹ انڈر ٹیکنکس ہیں ان کے
اور یہ نوجو ہے۔ وائس میں
صاحب۔ میں آج سے لکھ لکھ
ہوں کہ میں سرکاری کارخانہ 5
مخالف نہیں ہوں۔ میں لکھ لکھ
اس دس میں سرکاری کارخانہ لکھ۔
لیکن مجھ کو عجیب معلوم ہوا
ہے کہ جب سرکار کسی برس
اسی ہے تو وہاں ہمسہ لکھ رہا ہے۔
اب وہی حال ہے۔ آج ہم لکھ لکھ
میں لکھ لکھ ہیں جو کہ گورنمنٹ آف
انڈیا کی مائٹز میں ایٹامک انرجی

کی مائنز ہیں ان مائنز کی کیا حالت ہے کہ نین بین جا جا رہا ہے روپیہ کا افسروں کے لئے کلب بن گیا۔ موح کرنے کے لئے، پیڈ مینٹن ٹھیلنے کے لئے، سومسگ بولس میں انسان کرنے کے لئے افسروں کے لئے کلب بن گیا لیکن اگر وہی گورنمنٹ کی جائے کوئی دوسری کنسرن ٹریکی تو پہلے بروڈکنس شروع کر دے گی۔ ہمارے یہاں یہ ہے کہ بروڈکنس کے پہلے ہم آفیسرس کا کلب بنائے ہیں اور ان کے لئے بنگلے بنائے ہیں۔ ورکرس کے مکان اگر بنائے جائیں تو وہ ٹھیک ہیں۔ میں نہ کہنا چاہتا ہوں سرکار سے کہ ہم آج چاہتے ہیں کہ ہندوستان میں کابر کا بروڈکشن بڑھے لیکن مجھے تعجب ہوتا ہے انڈین کابر کارپوریشن جو کہ پہلے انکریوں کے ہاؤس میں تھا اس میں اتنا زیادہ برفاٹ ہو رہا تھا جتنا برفاٹ بس آئسٹریز میں ہوتا ہے۔ لیکن آج کتا ہو رہا ہے وہ وہاں در اس انڈین کابر کارپوریشن کو کوئی ایک بہت بڑا انڈسٹریل کوٹھاری ہے اس نے خرید لیا ہے لیکن اس سرکار کو اس کا ہتہ بھی نہیں ہے۔ ہم نے ہمیشہ اس بارے میں کہا اور کنسلٹیشن کمیٹی میں بھی کہا کہ یہ امپورٹنٹ مائنز ہیں۔ ہم نے 1964 میں کہا تھا سرکار سے کہ ڈپر کا سپرینٹنڈنٹ جہاں کہ ہوتا ہے وہاں اس کو ڈینجرس ڈکلیئر کر کے لچھ نہیں کیا

جاتا ہے اور جہاں ہائی سپرینٹنڈنٹ ہوتا ہے وہاں بروہ اس کو نکالتے ہیں۔ اس طرح وہ بنیوٹن کرنا چاہتے ہیں۔ اس سرکار نے ایک کمیٹی بنائی جس نے انکوائری کی اور جو ہم نے کہا تھا وہی ٹھیک نکلا۔ اس وقت با جی جی اس یونین کے پریذیڈنٹ بھی اور میں اس کا جنرل سیکرٹری تھا۔ مجھے آج بھی افسوس کے ساتھ کہنا پڑتا ہے۔ کہ نیشنلائز کرنے کے لئے سرکار تیار نہیں ہے۔ آج کسی بزنس میں کو سرکار اسے دینا چاہتی ہے۔ انڈین کابر کارپوریشن کو نیشنلائز کرنے کے بعد وائس چیرمین صاحب۔ آپ ملاحظہ فرمائیں ہندوستان کابر کارپوریشن کو کروڑوں روپیہ مزدوروں کے مکان بنانے کے لئے لگانا پڑے گا کروڑوں روپیہ ہسپتال بنانے کے لئے لگانا پڑے گا۔ پلانٹ بٹھانے کے لئے لگانا پڑے گا۔ ان کو کرسنگ پلانٹ لگانا پڑے گا۔ اسمیلنگ پلانٹ بنانا پڑے گا اور اس طرح کی بہت سی چیزیں کرنی پڑیں گی لیکن آج انڈین کابر کارپوریشن کو سرکار اگر نیشنلائز کر لیتی ہے تو کروڑوں روپیہ سرکار کو بچ جاتا ہے۔ جتنا اور نکلتا ہے وہ وہیں جاتا ہے اور بنا بنایا مل جاتا ہے۔ ہم نے اس کے لئے کنسلٹیشن کمیٹی میں کہا تھا لیکن جودھری ننتی راج سنگھ صاحب جو مائنز اینڈ میٹلس کے منسٹر تھے انہوں نے کہا تھا سرکار کو اس کا ہتہ نہیں ہے کہ انڈین کابر کارپوریشن کو کس نے خرید لیا ہے۔

[چودھری اے محمد]

آج ہم کو یہ دیکھنا ہوگا کہ ان امپلائمنٹ کے لئے جب ہم کوئی پرستاولاتے ہیں تو ہمارے سامنے کوئی ایسا کنکریٹ سجنسن ہونا چاہئے کہ انڈسٹریز کو ہم کس طرح سے ڈیولپ کریں۔ ہم کس طرح سے انڈسٹریز کے اندر جو پریشر ہے اس کو کم کریں۔ وائس چیر مین صاحب۔ اب دیکھیں گے تو اب کو تعجب ہوگا کہ آج جادو گوڈا میں کیا ہو رہا ہے۔

میں بہ ہاؤس میں کہتا ہوں اور ایک دم ذمہ داری کے ساتھ کہتا ہوں کہ میں دیکھتا ہوں کہ نین تین چار چار گاڑیاں مینیجنگ ڈائریکٹرز کے ڈسپوزل پر ہیں۔ ایک گاڑی ان کی بیوی کے لئے ہے۔ ایک بیٹی کو کالج لے جانے کے لئے ہے ابک گاڑی ان کے گھومنے کے لئے ہے۔ اس طرح سے وہاں مس یوز آف مٹی ہو رہا ہے۔ میں یہ کہتی نہیں کہ گورنمنٹ انڈر ٹیکننگس نہ رہیں لیکن یہ صحیح ہے کہ وہاں مس یوز آف پاور ہو رہا ہے۔ اب آئی۔ سی۔ ایس۔ آفیسر کو وہاں ذمہ دار بنا دیتے ہیں۔ میں آپ سے کہنا چاہتا ہوں کہ کسی بھی انڈر ٹیکننگ میں اب ان کو بھیجیں لیکن اس کے لئے ان کو ٹریننگ کی ضرورت ہے اور لیبر منسٹری سے میں کہنا چاہتا ہوں کہ مینیجنگ ڈائریکٹرز بنائے جانے ہیں یا جہاں بھی ایسی گورنمنٹ انڈر ٹیکننگس میں

وہ چٹیر میں بنائے جاتے ہیں ان سب کی ٹریننگ ہونی چاہئے۔ آئی۔ سی۔ ایس۔ آفیسر تو ایڈمنسٹریٹو آرڈرز نکال دیتے ہیں کہ فلاں کو پھانسی دے دو، فلاں کو سولی پر چڑھا دو اس سے ورکرس میں ڈس کنٹینٹمنٹ پیدا ہوتا ہے آج جو آتا ہے کہتا ہے کہ ورکرس پورٹڈ کشن نہیں دیتے نہ نہیں لیتے وہ نہیں دیتے لیکن کیا کبھی آپ نے اس بات کو محسوس کیا کہ ورکرس کی پرابلمس کیا ہیں کبھی آپ نے محسوس کیا کہ مزدوروں کو کیا آپ نے کہیں پارٹنر بنایا۔ میں دعویٰ سے کہتا ہوں کہ اب ڈیکلیر کر دیں کہ فلاں انڈسٹری میں مزدور پارٹنر ہوں گے۔ اب دیکھیں گے کہ اس کے بعد اس کا پورٹڈ کشن بڑھ جائے گا۔ لیکن آپ یہ کرنے کے لئے تیار نہیں ہیں۔ آپ نے کوڈ آف ڈسپلن کا نام لے کر کہا کہ ہم ورکرس کو منیجمنٹ میں پارٹنریشن کی اجازت دے رہے ہیں لیکن وہ آج تک نہیں ہوا۔ اس لئے وائس چیر مین صاحب۔ میں کہتا ہوں کہ کھیتان صاحب نے بڑا خوب صورت یہ چار پوائنٹ کا ان امپلائمنٹ کو ختم کرنے والا پرستاول رکھا ہے اور ایک بہت اچھی بات اس میں چار ہزار روپے کی کمی ہے لیکن چار ہزار جب آپ بورڈ آف ڈائریکٹرز کو دیتے ہیں تو میں جانتا ہوں کہ اس کے علاوہ ان کے کتنے کا الاؤنس ہوتا ہے۔ ان کے چیلڈرین کا الاؤنس ہوتا

ہے اور میں کما بھاؤں کہ اب نے
صرف چار ہزار روپے ان کے لئے رکھے
لیکن وہ چار کی جگہ چھ ہزار لے
جائینگے اور اس کی کوئی حکمتنگ
نہیں رہے گی۔ اس لئے اب پہلے اس
باب کو طے کریں کہ ہم جو راسمہ
سنانا چاہتے ہیں ان اسٹائمنٹ کو سالوں
کریں کہ اس کا طریقہ کیا ہوگا اور
اس کے پہلے ہم یہ ڈسائنڈ کریں۔
ہمارے سر منسٹر سری ورما جی ڈیٹی
سیر منسٹر ہیں ان کے دھن میں یہ بات
ڈالنا چاہئے ہوں کہ جب تک اب
ورکرس کو ذمہ دار نہیں سائننگے
خواہ وہ سلیک انڈر ٹیکینگ میں سرکاری
یا غیر سرکاری کارخانے ہوں۔ جب تک
اب مزدوروں کو ساتھ نہیں لینگے
تب تک کام نہیں چلے گا۔ آج مزدور
محسوس کریں ہیں ہزاروں فیٹ نیچے
جائے ہیں اور اپنا دستانہ نکال کر جو
کچھ وہ نکالیں ہیں اس کی کھائی کون
کہا۔ ہے چند لوگ اور انکمپلائنس ہونا
ہے۔ جو آئی۔ سی۔ ایس۔ آفسر
ہیں وہ ان کو انکمپلائنس کرتے ہیں
اس لئے میں عرض کرنا ہوں کہ واقعی
اگر اب سوسلزم کی بات کرنا چاہئے ہیں
جو وعدے اب بے جنتا کے ساتھ کئے
ہیں ان کو پورا کرنا چاہئے ہیں نو
اب مزدوروں کو اس بات کا موقعہ
دیجئے کہ وہ مزدور بھی اپنے
کارخانوں میں سٹر ہولڈرس ہوں۔ میں
محسوس کرنا ہوں کہ چند سیر لیڈرز اگر
میں کارخانے میں سیر ہولڈرس ہو

جائیں تو اس سے ہمارا مطلب نہیں۔
ورکرس کے بیچ اب جتنا کرانے اور
تب ان کو حق دیجئے۔ میں ان کا کام
ٹھیک سے چلے گا۔ اس حق کو کہنے
کے بعد میں اب کا سرکار ہوں اور
میں خیال ہے کہ اب سری ایڈوں کا
خیال کریں گے۔

†[**چوہدری ۴۰ موہممد (بھار)**] جناب
واہس چیئرمن ساہب، ابھی جو ہاؤس کے
سامنے خیتان ساہب کا پرستانہ ہے انڈسٹری-
لائزیشن کے بارے میں اسکو چار حصوں میں
تقسیم کیا گیا ہے۔ پہلا حصہ یہ
ہے کہ جو ابھی کام کا وقت ہے اس کام
کے وقت کو بٹا دیا جائے۔ دوسرا پہلو
یہ ہے اسکا کہ جیتنے پلانٹیشن
ہے جیتنے فیکٹریا ہیں اور مائنس ہے انکے
اندھ 6 کے بجائے 7 دین کام ہونا چاہیے۔
تیسرا یہ کہ جو ورکس کام کرتے ہیں انکے
ریٹائرمنٹ کی ایج 60 دیس ہونی چاہیے۔
چوتھی بڑی مچہ کی بات یہ ہے کہ ہمارے
خیتان ساہب نے 4 ہزار روپے ڈائریکٹس
کے لئے رکھ دیے لیکن ورکس کا جو پہلو
ہے کہ انکا مینیمم کیا ہوگا یا انکا
میکسیمم کیا ہوگا اس کے بارے میں خیتان
ساہب کے سوشلزم نے کوئی فیملی نہیں
کیا۔ واہس چیئرمن ساہب، میں بتاؤں،
میں ڈیڈ یونین میں کام کرتا ہوں۔ میں جانتا
ہوں کہ مزدور آندولن کا آواز کیا پہلو
ہے۔ اور وہ پہلو یہ ہے کہ ہم دیش کے ہر
رہنے والے کو کام ملے۔ اس پرستانہ میں
جو پہلو رکھے گئے ہیں ان میں دیش کا انڈسٹری-
لائزیشن ختم نہیں ہو سکتا۔ پہلے خیتان
ساہب کو یہ محسوس کرنا چاہیے کہ
انکو ٹی پلانٹیشن کا تہوا ہو سکتا
ہے لیکن فیکٹریز کی، مائنس کی ورکس
کنڈیشن کیا ہے، اسکا تہوا خیتان ساہب
کو نہیں ہوگا کیونکہ انہی فیکٹریز میں کام
کرنے کا ماکا بھی نہیں ملتا ہے یا وہاں کی
ورکس کنڈیشن دیکھنے کا بھی ماکا نہیں ملتا

[चोधरी ए० मोहम्मद]

होगा और मैं समझता हूँ कि माइन्स को तो एक दम देखने का मौका उन्हें नहीं मिला होगा। खैतान साहब को समझना चाहिए कि माइन्स में तीन शिफ्ट काम नहीं कर सकती। क्योंकि माइन्स की दो शिफ्ट में वर्किंग होती है और नाइट शिफ्ट में ब्लास्टिंग का काम होता है। ब्लास्टिंग के बाद पत्थर को निकाला जाता है फिर क्रसिंग प्लांट में भेजा जाता है जो आपने कहा कि तीन टाइम काम हो। मैं समझता हूँ कि यह फडामेंटल गलत बात है क्योंकि जो वर्किंग कन्डीशन्स फैक्ट्रीज की हैं उनमें आखरी शिफ्ट में भी काम हो सकता है। लेकिन बहुत सी जगहें ऐसी होती हैं जहाँ मशीनरी को रिव्नीफ देने की बात होती है या मशीनरी को माफ करने की बात होती है। इससे अनइम्प्लाइमेंट की प्रब्लम साल्व नहीं होगी। अनइम्प्लाइमेंट की प्रब्लम साल्व करने के लिये आपको रास्ता निकालना होगा। अब मैं सरकार से कहूँगा कि तीन चार महीने पहले उसने हिन्दुस्तान के आदमियों से यह वायदा किया था कि हम डम मूल्क के हर आदमी को काम करने का मौका देंगे। इस देश में गरीबी हटायेंगे। अब वक्त आ गया है कि इस वायदे को पूरा करें। लेकिन इस प्रस्ताव में वह वायदे पूरे नहीं हो सकते। यह प्रस्ताव गोल मोल है। आठ घंटे से ज्यादा काम नहीं होना चाहिए, रिटायरमेंट की एज 60 होनी चाहिए। चार हजार डायरेक्टर को मिलना चाहिए लेकिन इस में यह कही नहीं कहा गया है कि वर्कर्स की मिनिमम वेजेंज कितनी होनी चाहिए क्योंकि खैतान साहब को आइडिया नहीं है कि इंडस्ट्री किस तरह से चलती है। माइन्स किस तरह से चलती है। टी प्लांटेशन में कुछ हिस्सा उनका जरूर है। टी प्लांटेशन का तजुर्वा उनका जरूर है लेकिन जो वर्किंग कन्डीशन्स हैं, 22-23 हजार वर्कर्स नीचे काम करते हैं उनके सामने काम करने की प्रब्लम्स हैं। ब्लास्टिंग का क्या तरीका है और हमारी चीजों के क्या

तरीके हैं खैतान साहब को इसके बारे में ज्ञान नहीं है। यार्ज जी हमारे नेता हैं उनको माइन्स के बारे में आइडिया है। इस प्रस्ताव में मैं समझता हूँ कि अनइम्प्लाइमेंट की प्रब्लम साल्व नहीं हो सकती। उसके लिये आपको सोचना होगा कि हमारे यहां इंडस्ट्री कैसे डिवेलप करें। हमारे यहां जो गवर्नमेंट अन्डरटेकिंग्स हैं उनके ऊपर बहुत बोझ है। वाइस चेयरमैन साहब, मैं आपसे इलतजा करना चाहता हूँ कि मैं सरकारी कारखाने का मुखालिफ नहीं हूँ। मैं चाहता हूँ कि इस देश में सरकारी कारखाने लगे लेकिन मुझे ताज्जुब मालूम होता है कि जब सरकार किसी बिजनेस को लेती है तो वहाँ हमेशा घाटा रहता है। अब वही हालत है। आज हम जादूगोड़ा में देखते हैं जो कि गवर्नमेंट आफ इंडिया की माइन्स हैं। अटॉमिक इनर्जी की माइन्स हैं, उन माइन्स की क्या हालत है कि तीन-तीन-चार-चार लाख रुपये का अफसरों के लिये क्लब बनेगा मॉज करने के लिये, बैडमिंटन खेलने के लिये। स्वीमिंग पूल में स्नान करने के लिये अफसरों के लिये क्लब बन गया लेकिन अगर वही गवर्नमेंट की बजाये कोई दूसरी कन्सर्न करेगी तो पहले प्रोडक्शन शुरू कर देगी। हमारे यहां यह है कि प्रोडक्शन के पहले हम आफिसर का क्लब बनाते हैं और उनके लिये बगले बनाते हैं। वर्कर्स के मकान अगर बनाये जायें तो वह ठीक है। मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ सरकार में कि हम आज चाहते हैं कि हिन्दुस्तान में कापर का प्रोडक्शन बढ़े लेकिन मुझे ताज्जुब होता है कि इंडियन कापर कारपोरेशन जो कि पहले अंग्रेजों के हाथ में था उसमें इतना ज्यादा प्राफिट हो रहा था जितना प्राफिट बहुत कम इंडस्ट्रीज में होता है लेकिन आज क्या हो रहा है कि वहाँ पर इस इंडियन कापर कारपोरेशन को कोई एक बहुत बड़ा इंडस्ट्रियलियन्ट कोठारी है उसने खरीद लिया है लेकिन इस सरकार को इसका पता भी नहीं है। हमने हमेशा उस बारे में कहा और

कन्सल्टेटिव कमेटी में भी कहा ये बहुत इम्पोर्टेंट माइन्स है । हमने 1964 में कहा था सरकार में कि कापर का परसेटेज जहाँ कम होता है वहाँ उसको डेन्जरस डिक्लेयर करके कुछ नहीं किया जाता है और जहाँ हाई परसेटेज होता है वहाँ पर वह उसको निकालते हैं । इस तरह वह बनयुटी करना चाहते हैं । इस पर सरकार ने एक कमेटी बनाई जिम्मे जम्बवायरी की ओर जो हमने कहा था वही ठीक निकला । उस वक्त याजी जी इस यूनियन के प्रेसिडेंट थे और मैं उसका जनरल सेक्रेटरी था । मुझे आज भी अफसोस के साथ कहना पड़ता है कि नेशनलाइज करने के लिये सरकार तैयार नहीं है । आज किसी बिजनेसमैन को सरकार इसे देना चाहती है । इंडियन कापर कारपोरेशन को नेशनलाइज करने के बाद वाइस चेयरमैन माहव आप मुलाहजा फरमाइये हिन्दुस्तान कापर कारपोरेशन को करोड़ों रुपया मजदूरों के मकान बनाने के लिये लगाना पड़ेगा, करोड़ों रुपया हस्पताल बनाने के लिये लगाना पड़ेगा, प्लाट बिठाने लगाना पड़ेगा । उनको क्रिसिंग प्लाट लगाना पड़ेगा । एमिमिलेटिंग प्लाट बनाना पड़ेगा और इस तरह की बहुत सी चीजें करनी पड़ेंगी लेकिन आज इंडियन कापर कारपोरेशन को सरकार अगर नेशनलाइज कर लेती है तो करोड़ों रुपया सरकार का बच जाता है जितना आग निकलता है वह वही जाता है और बना बनाया मिल जाता है । हमने उसके लिये कन्सल्टेटिव कमेटी में कहा था लेकिन चौधरी नीति राज सिंह माहव जो माइन्स एण्ड मेटल्स के मिनिस्टर थे उन्होंने कहा था कि सरकार को इसका पता नहीं है कि इंडियन कापर कारपोरेशन को किसने खरीद लिया है ।

आज हमका यह देखना होगा कि अन-इम्प्लाइमेंट के लिये जब हम कोई प्रस्ताव लाते हैं तो हमारे सामने कोई ऐसा ककरीट सजेशन होता चाहिए कि इंडस्ट्री को हम किस तरह में ट्रिबल करे । हम किस तरह

में इंडस्ट्रीज के अन्दर जो प्रेशर है उसको कम करे । वाइस चेयरमैन माहव, आप देखेंगे तो आपको ताज्जुब होगा कि आज जादूगोडा में क्या हो रहा है ।

मैं यह हाउस में कहता हूँ और एकदम जिम्मेदारी के साथ कहता हूँ कि मैं देखता हूँ कि तीन-तीन-चार-चार गाडिया मेनेजिंग डायरेक्टर्स के डिस्पोजल पर हैं । एक गाडी उनकी बीबी के लिये है, एक बेटी का कॉलेज ले जाने के लिये है एक गाडी उनके घूमने के लिये है । इस तरह से वहाँ मिसयूज आफ मनी हो रहा है । मैं यह कभी नहीं कहता कि गवर्नमेन्ट अडरटेकिंग्स न रहे लेकिन यह सही है कि वहाँ मिसयूज आफ पावर हो रहा है । आप आई० सी० एस० आफिसर को वहाँ जिम्मेदार बना देते हैं । मैं आपसे कहना चाहता हूँ कि किसी भी अडरटेकिंग में आप उनको भेजें लेकिन उसके लिये उनको ट्रेनिंग की जरूरत है और लेबर मिनिस्ट्री से मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि जितने मैनेजिंग डायरेक्टर्स बनाये जाते हैं या जहाँ भी ऐसी गवर्नमेन्ट अडरटेकिंग्स में वे चेयरमैन बनाये जाते हैं उन सबकी ट्रेनिंग होनी चाहिए । आई० सी० एस० आफिसर को एडमिनिस्ट्रेटिव आर्ट्स निकाल देते हैं कि फला को फासी दे दो, फला को सूली पर चढ़ा दो, उससे वर्कर्स में डिम कंटेन्मेंट पैदा होता है । आज जो आता है कहता है कि वर्कर्स प्रोडक्शन नहीं देने, यह नहीं देने, वह नहीं देते लेकिन क्या कभी आपने उस बात को महसूस किया कि वर्कर्स की प्राब्लम्स क्या हैं कभी आपने महसूस किया कि मजदूरों को क्या आपने कहीं पार्टनर बनाया । मैं दावे में कहता हूँ कि आप डिक्लेयर कर दें कि फला इंडस्ट्री में मजदूर पार्टनर होंगे । आप देखेंगे कि इसके बाद इस का प्रोडक्शन बढ़ जायेगा लेकिन आप यह करने के लिये तैयार नहीं हैं । आपने कोड आफ डिसिप्लिन का नाम ले कर कहा कि हम वर्कर्स को मेनेजमेन्ट में पार्टिसिपेशन की इजाजत दे रहे हैं लेकिन वह आज तक नहीं हुआ । इस लिये वाइस

[चोधरी ए० मोहम्मद]

चेयरमेन साहब, मैं कहता हू कि खैतान साहब ने बड़ा खूब सूरत यह चार प्वाइंट का अनइम्प्लाइमेन्ट को खत्म करने वाला प्रस्ताव रखा है और एक बहुत अच्छी बात उसमें चार हजार रुपये की कही है। लेकिन चार हजार जब आप बोर्ड आफ डायरेक्टर्स को देते हैं तो मैं जानता हू कि उसके अलावा उनके कुत्ते का एलाऊंस होता है। उनके चिल्ड्रन का एलाऊंस होता है और मैं क्या बताऊँ कि आप ने सिर्फ चार हजार रुपये उनके लिये रखे लेकिन वे चार की जगह 6 हजार ले जायेंगे और उसकी कोई चैकिंग नहीं रहेगी। इसलिये आप पहले इस बात को तय करें कि हम जो रास्ता बनाना चाहते हैं अनइम्प्लाइमेन्ट को सल्व करने का उसका तरीका क्या होगा और उसके पहले हम यह डिसाइड करें हमारे लेबर मिनिस्टर श्री वर्मा जी डिप्टी लेबर मिनिस्टर हैं, मैं उनके जहन में यह बात डालना चाहता हू कि जब तक आप वर्कर्स को जिम्मेदार नहीं बनायेंगे खाह वह पब्लिक अडरटेकिंग हो सरकारी या गैर सरकारी कारखाने हो। जब तक आप मजदूरों को साथ नहीं लेंगे तब तक काम नहीं चलेगा। आज मजदूर मेहनत करते हैं हजारों फीट नीचे जाते हैं और अपना पसीना निकाल कर जो कुछ वे निकालते हैं उसकी कमाई कौन खाता है चन्द लोग और एक्सप्लाइडेशन होता है उल्टा। जो आई० सी० एस० आफिसर्स हैं वे उनको एक्सप्लाइड करते हैं इसलिये मैं अर्ज करता हू कि वाकई अगर आप सोशलिज्म की बात करना चाहते हैं जो वायदे आप ने जनता के साथ किये हैं उनको पूरा करना चाहते हैं तो आप मजदूरों को इस बात का मौका दीजिये कि वे मजदूर भी अपने कारखानों में शेयर होल्डर्स हों। मैं महसूस करता हू कि चन्द लेबर लीडर अगर किसी कारखाने में शेयर होल्डर्स हो जायें तो इसमें हमारा मतलब नहीं, वर्कर्स के बीच आप चुनाव कराइयें और तब उनको हक

दीजिये। तभी उन का काम ठीक से चलेगा इस चीज को कहने के बाद मैं आप का शुक्र-गुजार हू और मेरा ख्याल है कि आप मेरी बातों का ख्याल करेंगे।

SHRI CHITTA BASU (West Bengal). Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, the object of the Resolution of my friend, Mr. Khaitan, if I understand it correctly, is merely to touch the fringe of the problem of unemployment which has already assumed a menacing dimension. Having regard to the four-point recommendation of the Resolution, I am inclined to support it with certain modifications. Mr. Vice-Chairman, you would agree with me that the unemployment problem of our country is so vast and it is assuming such a menacing character with every passing day that a mere resolution of this nature cannot meet the challenge thrown up by it. It is from the economic point of view, from the point of view of the reorganisation of the society on a new model, that the problem of unemployment can be solved or rather the challenge can be taken up. I shall not take the time of the House in discussing the economic policies which are required to bring about total employment for our people or for guaranteeing work in each hand within the brief compass of the Resolution today. But the Resolution suffers from certain weaknesses which I want to bring to the notice of the House. Mr. Khaitan wants that there should be 40 hours per week. In this connection Mr. Khaitan should understand and know that there is a regular reduction of the working forces in the organised industry of our country. You will agree with me that in India there are several organised industries of which cotton, textiles and mines are the principal. I have got figures to suggest that in 1956 when the total labour complement in the cotton industry was 8,20,000 you will be astonished to learn that in November 1970, it has come down to 7,53,000. How does it happen when we are in a modern era? We want to industrialise our country. We are committed to providing work to all. And yet in the cotton industry which is one

of the most organised and ancient industry of our country there has been a systematic reduction of the labour complement. If we take the position of the mines we will find that in 1965 while the total labour complement in the mines was 4,65,000, it has now been reduced to 3,70,000. In the jute industry where there were more than 3 lakh jute workers working on both sides of the Ganges, if my memory does not fail me, I say the labour complement in jute factories in West Bengal has been reduced to 2,75,000 or 2,50,000. Now, Mr. Khaitan wants that there should be 40 hours of work per week. But at the same time we find that there is a constant reduction of the labour complement in the organised sectors of our industry. What is the answer that the Government has to offer? What are the programmes of the Government which, instead of reducing the labour complement, can really increase the labour complement at least in the organised industry? The Government does not want to say anything. The reason is I have seen that there has been a constant rationalisation, automation and closure. Some year back the capitalists and monopolists of our country in order to amass huge profits, took resort to the programme of rationalisation, automation and how, of course, closure. When the question of rationalisation came before the textile workers and the jute workers it was opposed by the organised trade unions. Then they were being told that rationalisation was necessary to improve the quality of work, to modernise the industry and also to step up production. There has been unbridled rationalisation and automation. Although the assurance was given that rationalisation would be without tears, I find that with rationalisation tears have come. Unless this Government understands the basic problem of unemployment, they cannot solve the problem of rationalisation and automation. As a matter of fact, as a private Member of this House, sometime ago I introduced a Bill called the Automation (Regulation) Bill 1970. I have got figures to suggest that unless automation and rationalisation are restrict-

ed, there will be constant reduction of labour complements in the organised industry in the name of modernisation. May I make a plea to the Government that they should, even at this late stage, undertake a study with regard to the impact of rationalisation and automation on the employment front and I am sure that the mover of this Resolution will accept an amendment of this nature that rationalisation and automation should be restricted and for that some kind of machinery both at the national plane, State plane and plant plane should be immediately brought into existence so that there may not be unchecked and unbridled rationalisation and automation.

Then there is the question of closure. You will be glad to know that West Bengal Government has, by an ordinance, made it incumbent on the employer to give sixty days notice before a closure of any factory is declared. This kind of legislation, I feel, is necessary at the national plane. This House had the opportunity to hear that in many cases it is mismanagement, it is fraudulent practices, it is speculative activities of the big businessmen and monopoly houses which are responsible for the closures of many industrial units. Therefore, I would suggest to the Government that there should be a legislative measure by which the employers can be forced to give notice of their intention to close their factories sufficiently in advance. Also there should be a tripartite machinery for the determination of the justifiability of the closure or otherwise.

I am sorry to mention that according to newspaper reports, the Government of India has not yet given their consent to such an ordinance which has been promulgated by the Government of West Bengal in the matter of closure of factories.

Many of my friends mentioned about unemployment. As they have pointed out, unless there is a radical overhauling of the economy, this unemployment problem cannot be solved and this is not the opportune moment to discuss how the entire economy can be reorganised.

[Shri Chitta Basu]

The Resolution seeks to impose a ceiling on the emoluments of Directors at Rs. 4,000 per month. Sir, may I ask Mr. Khaitan one thing? I think he belongs to the ruling Congress which is now very much eloquent in giving expression to socialism, socialist management, growth for social justice, etc. What is the social justice here? What is the social commitment here? What is the social commitment here when you, as a Congress member, allow Rs. 4,000 p.m. as salary for a director or an officer while an ordinary agricultural worker is not guaranteed even Rs. 2 a day? Sir, even the latest scheme, about which the Government is so much eloquent, the rural unemployment scheme, provides only a maximum of Rs. 3 per day. It is the Government's scheme! The Government's rural unemployment scheme provides a maximum of Rs. 3 per day!

SHRI R. P. KHAITAN : What is it that you are talking about?

SHRI CHITTA BASU : About your Rs. 50-crore rural unemployment scheme. Your 50 crore rural unemployment scheme provides for giving only Rs. 3 a day for the worker. Do you know the scheme, Sir? The scheme is that one thousand people in each district will get employment. Sir, I have calculated it and I can say that at least in our part of the country, that is, West Bengal, only one young man can get work, only three villages can get one young man employed under this scheme. I can give you the figures. Unemployment is so big that for three villages there is only one job and the income is Rs. 3 a day and the work is for ten months in a year! This is the scheme which has been prepared by the so-called socialist government with social commitment, with growth with social justice and this is on the one hand and on the other, a Congress member comes and says that Rs. 4,000 should be there as the maximum ceiling for a director or any other officer in the government. Sir, this is a sheer joke. Therefore, Sir, the time has come when it is not only necessary to impose a ceiling on the

higher-salaried group, but also for providing statutorily the national minimum wage for the working population. Since it relates to plantation, his eyes are always glued to the bigmen and he has not the time to think of all the woes and plights of the poor working people of our country for whom he has not a word to say that there would be statutorily fixed minimum national wage. Therefore, Sir his Resolution should include a demand for statutorily fixing the national minimum wage.

Sir, the question of retirement he has brought in. Sir, may I ask him and through him and through you the Government whether the Government is in a position to legislate banning employment of the retired ICS officers in the private sector industries or any other units? You are speaking of the retirement of an ordinary employee at the age of 50 or 60, but you cannot prevent the ICS officers from being employed by the Birlas or employed in any monopolist houses thereby utilising their past experience and connections in the Government for the interests of those industrial houses. Is the Government prepared to come out with a legislative proposal to ban the employment of the ICS officers after their retirement? I think Mr. Khaitan should understand the implications of it.

SHRI U. K. LAKSHMANA GOWDA (Mysore) : By banning the few ICS officers, how much unemployment problem are you going to solve?

SHRI CHITTA BASU : That is not the question. Why should they be provided with jobs? Sir, it is not the question of providing employment to the ICS officers. But it is a question of plugging the loopholes, stopping mis-utilising their past experience, mis-utilising the government machinery and their connections, for the interests of the industrial houses. It is not a question of relieving unemployment or providing employment. But because they, after retirement, go to the Birlas and the Tatas and join their industrial units at fat salaries, they exploit the workers there. They exploit their contact with the Government and they are provided

with enough opportunity there to fleece the people and also get certain concessions from the Government because these ICS officers who maintain contact with the Governments are employed there. They are used to blackmail the Government. They make use of their contact with the Government in the interests of their industrial house. Therefore, it is to be banned. The purpose is not to provide employment to these persons.

Sir, I can give you some examples how these public sector undertakings are being also utilized by these retired ICS officers. Sir, today there was a question in the morning about some lathi-charge in the HEC in April last. The Minister, Shri Mohan Kumaramangalam, made a written statement that the workers 'gheraoed' the management and therefore there was some lathi-charge, etc. etc. But, Sir, he conveniently forgot to mention the reason why there was a 'gherao'. Sir, there was an agreement with the HEC Board of Management in the year 1969 about an automatic payment of dearness allowance in accordance with the cost of living index...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN) : Please conclude.

SHRI CHITTA BASU: Sir, the Board of the Management did not agree to pay, did not agree to honour the agreement; on the other hand, they indulged in certain provocative actions. Therefore, there was this 'gherao', and something followed.

Sir, my point is that the public sector management should be an ideal employer and should look to their own interest, as also the interest of the employees, and thereby create a climate necessary for good relations between the employer and the employee...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN) : Please conclude now.

SHRI CHITTA BASU : Only two or three minutes more! Sir, I can give you some instances about the public sector industries. In the public sector in-

dustries, the Government appears to be very averse to give a fair deal to the workers, but are very much liberal with regard to the officers. Take, for instance, the question of HEC. Sir, in the recent months Mr. Jagota, the retired Director General of Supplies & Disposal was employed there. HEC has become a heaven for the retired officials. A retired Press Information Bureau man has been recently appointed Public Relations Officer in the scale of Rs. 1,600—Rs. 2,000, the highest offer given to the PRO in that concern. Sir, another thing I may mention. Mr. Ram Rattan Ram, a former Congress MLC, who was defeated in the last biennial election, has been appointed as the liaison officer of the HEC. Sir, he has been rejected by the people. Or he was rejected by the Legislative Assembly Members there. But he is not the only liaison officer there in the HEC to draw a fat salary because there were four or five other liaison officers there.

Then, Sir, a post of Technical Director was newly created only to accommodate Dr. B. Bhattacharya of the Calcutta Ordnance Factory. Brigadier Upadhyaya has been recently appointed as the Chief of the Township in the scale of Rs. 1,800—2,250, much higher than all the previous incumbents.

Therefore, Sir, this is the attitude of the Government that they are not at all interested in giving a fair deal to the workers while they are very much liberal in their attitude towards the retired I.C.S. or I.P.S. officers, towards persons of the fat-salary groups. And now Mr. Khaitan comes to their aid, although a professed and committed socialist, to guarantee them Rs. 4,000 per month as per his Resolution under discussion. I think Mr. Khaitan, in the course of his reply, will make his case clearer and become a much more committed socialist by accepting some of the amendments that might have been suggested by some of us from this side. At the same time I would say that the Government should understand that, unless they reorient their entire policies, unless they create a climate for workers' participation in the management, unless they create the conditions for the involvement of workers in the

[Shri Chitta Basu]

production itself, the situation is not going to be improved but it is going to be deteriorated, and the explosive situation thus created will consume not only the workers; this will also consume them. So, they should remain very alert at least in future.

SHRI U. K. LAKSHMANA GOWDA : I thank you very much, Mr. Vice-Chairman, for having given me the time even though at the tail end of the debate on this Resolution. Mr. Subramania Menon is very anxious that I should conclude early so that his Resolution might come up for discussion, and I am going to oblige him.

I am glad that Mr. Khaitan, who is himself well versed with many of the establishments and industries, etc. which are mentioned in his Resolution, like plantations, industries, etc. has brought in this Resolution and has given an opportunity for Members in this House to express their views by participating in this discussion.

Sir, I would straightway come to the first part of the Resolution which purports to restrict the working hours to forty hours a week. It is a very laudable proposition and it is a very desirable one and even the I.L.O. has already recommended that. But I would like to mention here that there are practical difficulties, in implementing this part of the resolution, and also the feasibility of such a move at the present stage of development of our economy in this country should be considered. Sir, the very fact that you cut down the hours of work from 48 to 40 a week will immediately put an additional wage burden on all the industries, plantations, etc., to the extent of 16 per cent. My friend, Mr. Krishan Kant, has tried to argue that this will be offset by the incentive which they get to work three shifts, that this total wage raise will be offset by that the increased production. But in practice, Sir, I can tell you that it is not going to work to that extent. It might offset to a certain extent but certainly it is not going to offset the entire burden of the additional 16 per cent wage total increase. I would like to mention

here its impact particularly on the export-oriented industries and plantation products. It is all right for an indigenous product which is used mainly for home consumption. If you allow the rise in total wage it is immediately reflected in the cost of production. Whether the wage-rise is in the workers' section or the staff or the Directors or anybody, it will immediately reflect the cost of production. As is well known, in the indigenous industry catering to the indigenous requirements in the protected market, what happens is that when the cost of production will rise and the consumer will be obliged to pay higher price. I will quote cement. When the cost of production rose, what happened, the S.T.C. which was distributing the cement, they put up the increased price by one rupee a bag or so, and the consumer was obliged to pay, because otherwise they could not get cement anywhere and to that extent the industry was saved, although the consumer had to pay higher. In that case, the industry was able to carry through. But what about the export-oriented industries which produce exportable commodities? They have to compete in the world market and if the cost of production is so high, would it be possible to compete in the world market? There is a standing example of what has happened in the case of sugar. In order to see that our exports were maintained and the stocks did not pile up, here we were obliged to subsidize the sugar and sell it in the world market where the price was nearly half of our domestic price. What has happened in the case of rubber? The same difficulty was there. There was a Tariff Commission's recommendation that it should be Rs. 525 for 100 kgs. and now the complaint is that the manufacturers are not lifting and there is a certain proposal that they would have to think in terms of exporting it. But what will you get if you export rubber? In the world market it will about Rs. 280 for 100 kgs. and then what will happen is that you will have to subsidize the product. So, at least in particular reference to this 40-hour week, however desirable it may be, still it will not be a practicable economic proposition.

because at this stage, in order to see that our export earnings are increased, our main burden is to see how economically we can produce the exportable commodities and sell them in the competitive export market, build up our export and help earn foreign exchange in this country. To this extent, Sir this, I am afraid, will not be possible at this juncture. I know this is a desirable thing and I myself have participated in the debates in the I.L.O. on the five day week and I.L.O. has accepted but many of the developing countries have not been able to implement this suggestion.

Another point that I would like to mention here, is that we should not take into consideration only the net increase in the wage rates. Now, take for example the tea plantations, where apart from the wage, you are obliged to provide other amenities including housing etc., which work out to nearly 25 to 30 per cent.

SHRI BALACHANDRA MENON : These are cringe benefits.

SHRI U. K. LAKSHMANA GOWDA : You may call it fringe benefit or cringe benefit. Whatever it may be, but I am not unhappy about it. I think he is a trade unionist and he likes to call it 'cringe benefits'. All right, I am not unhappy about it. But they amount to 25 to 30 per cent, which I am sure my dear trade unionist will certainly agree. So, when you increase the complement of a labourer in a unit by reducing the working hours from 48 to 40 hours, there will be not only the net increase, but also there will be increase in the amenities to be provided. You will have to provide them with more amenities and how you are going to do that. Is it not going to be additional burden on many of these planters who are finding it difficult to market their produce in the foreign market. Take the example of coffee. Last year there was a shortage of crop, so the price was high. This year the crop has been good, the Chairman of the Coffee Board said that the prices have come down very sharply. Unless you sell the extra crop in the export market for whatever price we can get, you cannot

hold the stocks for more than a year and the coffee will deteriorate and we will face difficulty next year. So if we see that our cost of production is high, we will never be able to maintain this sector of the industry which is a matter which should be taken serious note of. From that point of view, I feel this reduction of the hours of work from 48 to 40 is going to be a difficult job and it may not be practicable now. Again whether you have sufficient machinery and equipment in other fields in order to work for three shifts is a matter which has to be looked into. We can say everybody should work but whether it is possible, whether you have the equipment is a matter to be seen before we come out with resolutions like that.

Again Mr. Chitta Basu mentioned about the textile industry and in the form of rationalisation and modernisation there has been reduction in the complement of labour. I would not fully agree with it. It has happened but can we say without modernisation we can compete in the export market particularly for our textiles and everyday we see statements here that the textile industry is in doldrums and one of the causes is the textile mill-owners have not taken to modernisation. So in modernisation of any industry in the world we have to accept a certain amount of rationalisation. We cannot get over that fact but how best we do it with the minimum of difficulties for labour and with the minimum number of people being thrown out is a matter which has to be gone through carefully and with caution, I agree, but certainly in a modern set-up, whether it is in industry or plantation, without rationalisation and modernisation it is not possible to compete with the products of the other parts of the world. So my point is, however laudable and desirable this thing is, this 40 hours a week, it is not a practicable suggestion which can be implemented straightaway now. The whole purport of this resolution is to solve unemployment in this country and I do not think this is such a far-reaching measure as to solve this colossal task of the removal of unemployment or reduce it in this country.

[Shri U. K. Lakshmana Gowda]

Certain references were made to rural employment, I would dilate on it because Mr. Khaitan has confined himself mainly to urban employment in factories and others except a little reference to plantation which is a specialised field on which I have spoken. Regarding rural unemployment it is a colossal problem. Every day even during the Budget discussion we hear everyone saying that the rural sector should be taxed. It has been left free. I do agree the sections which are capable of paying tax in the rural sector should be taxed. There should not be any discrimination. It is forgotten that there are Agricultural Income-tax in many States. Yesterday some reference was made to Maharashtra where the tax applies only after Rs. 3,600. It was a revelation to me but take Mysore, Kerala and Madras where the Agricultural Tax is from Rs. 3,600 for an individual and Rs. 7,200 for a HUF. It is much less than the relief provided by the Central Income-tax which is from Rs. 5,000. There again the commercial crops plantation and others, come under that Income-tax and they are certainly being taxed. If you take the taxation in Mysore, for the first one lakh it works out at 38% and after that at 60%. And in Kerala it goes up to 65 per cent and for foreign-owned companies it goes to 75 per cent; in Madras it is up to 45 per cent. Certainly this is not only comparable but higher than in the corporate sector. Apart from that, that covers a little affluent circle of people within the rural area. What about the others? Now we have the land ceiling; I certainly support the view that there should be a land ceiling but my point is it should be on economic unit. If you give a man one acre of land or two acres and say that that is the arbitrary ceiling fixed for political reasons or whatever it is and ask the whole family to work on that you may have the psychological satisfaction of having solved the unemployment problem to an extent because you have given so many people land but what you are creating is underemployment. That is not the way to solve this problem of unemploy-

ment. My point is, agriculture should be such that when a family produces an agricultural product it is not merely for its own consumption—that might be the Gandhian concept or the Ram Rajya of the old days where you say every village should be self-contained and what they produce they eat and finish up—but agriculture should be such as to produce some surplus to be made available to the non-agricultural community. How can that be done unless it is an economic unit? What we should aim at is to siphon off the vast underemployed and unemployed sections in the rural areas to the urban areas for the new industries which should be started in the country. Unless you industrialise the country and with these haphazard measures you cannot tackle the problem of unemployment. There has to be a wholesale radical revision of the policies and more industries should come to cover the backward and the rural areas and the surplus population from the villages which is either unemployed or underemployed must be siphoned off to the industries and the percentage of people who are living on agriculture should be reduced. That is the only way by which you can tackle the rural unemployment problem. This 40-hour week will not help to solve this problem. With more than 70 per cent living in the rural areas the problem of unemployment that you have in the rural areas is much more colossal than it is in the industrial areas. So even though I am not opposed to this introduction of 40-hour week I say at present it is not a workable proposition and it is not possible and it does not make any headway. If this is tried to be pushed through, as Mr. Chitta Basu has said, after the rationalisation and modernisation you will find the complement of labour employed in the industries going down.

I come to the next point, that is, retirement age. I am opposed to 60 years being the retirement age because if you want to provide employment for more people in every sphere it should be less than that. Actually in many of the labour negotiations, particularly in plantations, it has been agreed that

the retirement age should be 55 and with reference to the ordinary workers it should be 60. But there is a case for bringing it down to 55 and not for raising it to 60 years. I would certainly agree that there should be some exemption provided in the case of technical personnel, specialists and others, where it might be necessary for you to keep them in employment up to the age of 60 or even more than that but as a general rule I do not think it should be 60; it should be less.

Next point is about the ceiling of Rs. 4,000 per month on emoluments. I want to know how it is going to be implemented even granting that we accept this. Under the taxation proposals if you pay more you have to pay income-tax on that and that is the only way by which you can handle that. This ceiling cannot be implemented now particularly when the prices are soaring and when the Government has not been able to hold the price line. How it is possible to do this sort of thing and have a ceiling of Rs. 4,000 I cannot understand. It works out to Rs. 48,000. On a salary of Rs. 4,000 I think income-tax even at the previous rate comes to Rs. 1,300. That leaves Rs. 2,700. He has to pay 10 to 12 per cent as house rent allowance. It is deducted at source. That takes away another Rs. 400. What is left then? He gets about Rs. 2,300. You want to have a manager or somebody in that particular position who will get Rs. 3,300 or so. Then, he has to maintain himself, his family and give education to his children. With the present high cost of living it becomes very difficult for him to carry on. That is what I am saying. I am all for having a ratio as was suggested. Whether it be one to ten or one to twenty, it does not matter. That must be worked out on rational basis. Before that you must be in a position to hold the price-line. You must be in a position to see that commodities are available at a cheap rate for the consumption of people, whether he is labourer, a director or any other member of staff. That is the main thing. We see that in every succeeding Budget there is deficit financing and

as a result the cost of living is going up. The prices of commodities are rising. How are you going to put a ceiling on this? This, again, is an unworkable suggestion. However desirable, I do not think it will be possible to do it. There was a talk of fixing a national minimum wage. That is a very good suggestion. If we can actually manage to do it, it will be very good. That gives a chance for having a ratio between the lowest paid worker and the highest paid worker. In the present state of things I do not think that Mr. Khaitan's Resolution is one which can be implemented in practice, however much he and his Government would like to do it. The problem of unemployment has to be tackled at the national level in a much bigger way and for that a more radical programme is required. It cannot be solved by a Resolution like this. Thank you.

[MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN in the Chair].

SHRI ARJUN ARORA (Uttar Pradesh) : Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, I support the Resolution because the object of it is to provide more industrial employment and to increase the much-needed industrial production. We in this country are toying with many ideas of employment like Rs. 50 crores for crash programmes and Rs. 25 crores for programmes which will not crash. We know the working of the CPWD. We know the working of the State PWDS. We also know that the ratio between the real labour cost and the administrative cost is increasing. I have got my own doubts about these Rs. 50-crore schemes and Rs. 25-crore schemes. The real problem today is that there is too much pressure of population on land in the country. There are only two alternatives which can reduce that pressure and provide employment, stable employment. Firstly, putting up of new industries and secondly finding avenues of bigger employment for people in the established industries. Thirdly, we should have an ambitious but well-regulated road-building programme. I particularly mention the road building programme because, firstly, it is a much neglected programme. Only yesterday the Minis-

[Shri Arjun Arora]

ter of State of Planning admitted in this House that of the money allotted for road building Rs. 352 crores remained unspent, though it is the most labour-intensive programme and our countryside is not yet connected by roads with the mandis and markets.

The more important avenue of employment is the industry. Setting up of new industries takes time. Then capital investment is also necessary. We should find avenues of greater employment in the existing industries. Mr. Khaitan has suggested a 40-hour week. As you know, Sir, in the Soviet Union, in the United States, in the socialist countries and even in some capitalist countries 5-day week has become the rule, 5 days of 8 hours each. That has become the rule. In this country we should now adopt a 40-hour week. That will give the workers an opportunity to work for five days and have two days of rest and holiday. Most of our workers, particularly in the North, come from rural areas round about industrial centres. They can easily avail of these two days to visit their people at home. Sir, any survey will reveal that most of our industrial workers, though married, live in cities without their wives and children. Firstly, there is the housing difficulty. Secondly, there is the lack of resources. So, they keep their families away. If we have a 5-day week and 2 days as holidays, workers can easily cycle to distances of 20 or 30 miles or they can avail of the road transport etc. and go home. But certain precautions will have to be taken. The first precaution is that the labour complement should not be reduced. Secondly, the main purpose of this resolution should be met, that is, employment must increase. A 5-day week should not mean a holiday for the whole plant for the other two days. Machinery also requires some rest but not two days' rest in a week. If we resort to a 40-hour week, we should see that the employment potential increases by 1/6 because just now we have a 6-day week. If we take to 5-day week, employment potential must increase by 1/6th. Then the resolution says that the factories should work on all the

seven days. As you know, Sir, under the Factories Act the seventh day has to be a holiday. The Factories Act provides that one day out of nine days may be a closed day, but the number of closed days in a year will be 52, each week should have a holiday. At present there is six-day working and if we take to seven-day working, one-sixth employment potential should increase for working on the seventh day. So, 40 hours a week coupled with seven and five-day working in a week in a factory should lead to the employment of one-third of the existing labour force. This is a Resolution. If the Government accepts this Resolution and acts upon it, the Factories Act and other regulations will have to be amended and when they are amended and when 40 hours a week and seven-day working are enforced, the pre-condition should be the extra employment of one-third of the labour force.

Then, Sir, there is the question of wages. I remember the days when there was no regulation of working hours. They used to work from dawn to dusk. And there is the famous story that industrial workers' children knew only their mothers, they did not see the faces of their fathers because the father left for duty before the children woke up in the morning and came, after working for thirteen or fourteen hours, at night when the children were asleep. They used to describe their father as the person, as the visitor, who came on Sundays. There is the famous story that one day there was a complete breakdown in the plant and so the father came back early. The children were awake, playing. They rushed to their mother and said, the man who comes on Sundays has come today. From that, we have come to a stage during the last sixty years when we have eight hours working a day, 48 hours a week, for our industrial workers. But whenever the working hours have been reduced, the existence of the previous wage level has been guaranteed. Provision will have to be made for that also. Both time-rated workers and piece-rated workers will have to be guaranteed that the five-day week will not mean any loss of wages. This will

have to be done by legislation in the present context of industrial relations in the country.

While I support much of this Resolution, I feel that a provision will have to be made that though there will be a seven-day week, Sunday afternoons will be free of work. There will be no afternoon shift on Sundays because workers of various shifts should have an opportunity to meet together and discuss their common problems. We in Kanpur have always insisted that the trade union meetings must be held at a time when all the workers are free. Of course, in Kanpur there is generally no work on Sundays. But when on certain occasions Sundays working was permitted, Dr. Sampurnanand, our late lamented Chief Minister, laid down in an award that Sunday afternoon shift will not be allowed on any condition and that afternoon will always be reserved for giving the workers an opportunity to attend trade union meetings. Then, Sir, this Resolution says something about the age of retirement. The words are important :

"to provide that all persons engaged in working in or managing factories, plantations, mines and transport undertakings of the country retire at the age of 60 years;"

Sir, all the industrial workers are like बड़ा बैल (old bull). Nobody retains them beyond 60. But as far as the managerial personnel is concerned, the continuance beyond 60 seems to be the rule in the private sector. Even in the public sector people who retire from the I.C.S., the I.A.S. and similar services at the age of 58 or 60, or whatever it is, are employed irrespective of age. So I support this 60 years limit for employment because I know it will not affect the workers. Most industrial awards have laid down the age of retirement for workers as 58 or, occasionally, 60. But there is no law relating to managerial personnel. Those whom the employers want to favour, those who are related to them, those who know their secrets and are in a position to blackmail them, are generally retained till death. Fixing of retire-

ment age of 60 will not affect workers; it will affect the managerial personnel both in the public and the private sectors.

Sir, the Resolution calls for imposing of a ceiling of Rs. 4,000 per month on emoluments paid to directors etc. I heard somebody saying that the Finance Minister has already in the Budget Proposals laid down some limit. That is a misconception. What the Finance Minister has laid down is that for purposes of income tax only, salaries of Rs. 5,000+Rs. 1,000 as perquisites, that is Rs. 6,000 will be taken to be the expense. They will go in the expense account and income tax will not be levied on that expense. But the Finance Minister does not stop the companies and the private sector employers or anybody to pay more at the expense of the shareholders. I personally feel that is a bad point of the Budget which is being paraded as socialistic but which will hit the shareholder.

Mr. Khaitan has done well by advocating a ceiling. I hope those who have supported this Resolution today will move an amendment to the Finance Bill when it comes here or the Finance Minister himself, having a very enlightened colleague in Mr. Ganesh, will take some step in this direction. Ceiling on salaries must be fixed. We talk so much of austerity and curb on conspicuous consumption. We talk so much of many things. As a matter of fact, we talk so much of socialism that socialism has become the most prostituted word in India to-day. If we want to remove some disparities, a ceiling of Rs. 4,000 must be fixed. It appears Mr. Khaitan has fixed the ceiling of Rs. 4,000 to win the support of the bureaucracy which has a big say, sometimes even a bigger say than the Ministers and, of course, always a bigger say than the Members of Parliament. The highest paid bureaucrats, the Secretaries, are paid Rs. 4,000. If the Finance Secretary, for example, is paid Rs. 4,000 per month, why should the Financial Adviser of various companies get more? The Industries Secretary, who is supposed to

[Shri Arjun Arora]

regulate all the industrial development in the country, cannot draw more than Rs. 4,000 per month. But most industrial units have people drawing much more than Rs 4,000. And that is how the power of the managerial personnel to corrupt the bureaucracy comes into play. This ceiling of Rs. 4,000 is a very laudable idea. This Resolution may or may not be accepted. But when the Finance Bill comes, I hope this Rs. 5,000 plus Rs. 1,000 tax exemption will be converted into a ceiling of Rs. 4,000 without any perquisites. Thank you.

THE DEPUTY MINISTER IN THE MINISTRY OF LABOUR AND REHABILITATION (SHRI BALGOVIND VERMA): Sir, I have heard the speeches of hon. Members in this debate with rapt attention, and I have noted the suggestions that they have made which I am sure will be made use of at the right time. I will confine myself now to the Resolution of Mr. Khaitan. Mr. Khaitan has brought out four things in his Resolution. The first is reduction of working hours in all factories, plantations, mines and transport undertakings. Secondly, he wants that all factories, plantations, mines and transport undertakings of the country should work on all the seven days every week and operate three shifts as far as practicable. The third thing that he wants is that all those who are engaged in working in or managing of factories, plantations, mines and transport undertakings of the country should have their age of retirement raised to 60 years. Finally, he wants a ceiling of Rs. 4,000 per month in so far as the emoluments of directors and other employees of factories, plantations, mines and transport undertakings are concerned. In regard to all these things, he wants the Government to take immediate steps by enacting legislation or otherwise. So far as the first two things are concerned, I do not think there is any restriction. The only thing that is there is that the working hours of factory workers and their weekly rest are governed by the Factories Act, 1948. The working hours and weekly rest of those working in plantations are gov-

erned by the Plantation Labour Act, 1951. And in mines it is governed by Mines Act, 1952 and there is the Motor Transport Workers Act, 1961. There is no bar. If they so like, the factories can work all the three shifts. They can continue to employ labour all the seven days. There is no legal bar standing in their way. So far as the reduction of working hours is concerned, this question was examined by the National Labour Commission. And in their report they have said that the requirements of the current economy do not permit immediate reduction in working hours, as conditions improve working hours could be brought down to 40 hours a week but at two stages: in the first they should be brought down to 45 hours. The Government is in full agreement with the recommendations of the Commission and it thinks that when the appropriate time comes, this reduction in working hours will be considered. Working hours cannot be reduced all of a sudden. They can be reduced progressively as advised by the National Labour Commission. This reduction of working hours, as has been suggested, cannot be taken up off hand. Much has to be gone through. Everything has to be looked into and proper arrangements have to be made before this thing is taken up. Not only the National Labour Commission but the ILO has shown concern about it. They said that due regard should be paid to the level of economic development attained and to the extent to which the country is in a position to bring about reduction in the hours of working without reducing production and productivity. In attaining economic growth and the development of industries we should be in complete possession of internal trade, without creating inflationary pressures which reduce the income...." The ILO has also warned us that we should not take it all of a sudden; it should be taken after a careful consideration. Mere reduction of hours of work with a view to employing a large number of persons without any corresponding increase in production and productivity will only increase the cost of production and add to inflationary tendencies. The time is not ripe still in our country to think in terms of

reducing the hours of work. As I said before, there is no bar on the factories working all the seven days and reducing the number of hours of work, if they so like. But one thing be borne in mind that there are still factories, everybody knows it, which are not in a position to work to their full capacity. Reasons may be many. Raw-materials may not be available or power may not be available and other reasons may also be there. But the fact cannot be denied that there are many factories which have not so far been able to work to the fullest capacity.

So far as plantation industry is concerned, it is more or less an agricultural industry and I do not think night shift will be desirable. If at all it has to be worked out, it will have to be left to individual establishments. Under such circumstances, I do not think legislative compulsion is feasible.

It has been spelt out here that the age for retirement should be raised to 60 years. I think it is on the high side. Even in Government service 58 years has been considered to be the proper age for retirement. Shri Arjun Arora referred to extensions beyond 60 for certain privileged persons. In public undertakings it is not done under any circumstances. We cannot speak of private undertakings where we cannot bring about any compulsion. So far as public undertakings are concerned, I think the age of 58 for superannuation is strictly adhered to. While talking about providing greater employment opportunities, the suggestion to raise the retirement age to 60 years would run counter to the existing practice in Government service and the public undertakings.

श्री शीतभद्र याजी (बिहार) : हम
नौग नो 90, 100 और 115 तक जाते
हैं ।

SHRI BALGOVIND VERMA : So far as labour is concerned, the age of retirement in respect of industrial undertakings is not regulated by any statute. This is usually fixed by the establishment concerned. Any industrial dispute arising out of this is settled

by means of bi-partite or tripartite settlements or through arbitration or adjudication. This again is not a matter on which legislative compulsion can be brought about.

Now, the last point is regarding the payment of emoluments to the extent of Rs. 4,000 to certain categories of persons. Sir, so far as this matter is concerned, I think it is beyond the purview of the Labour Ministry. The Ministry of Finance and the Ministry of Company Affairs have been consulted in the matter and we have been told that the highest-paid top officers like the executives of bigger undertakings like the Hindustan Steel Limited, State Trading Corporation, etc. are only getting Rs. 4,000 which is the maximum of the pay scales envisaged for the top posts in public enterprises. This was fixed in 1965 and holds good even now. And, so far as the fixation of pay is concerned, it is regulated by the Companies Act, 1956. The remuneration payable to the directors, whole-time directors, part-time directors and managers of public limited companies is regulated under this Act. This is so far as the public sector undertakings are concerned. But in affluent companies, earning huge profits, that is, in private undertakings, the remuneration on the basis of a percentage of the net profits as prescribed in the Act would amount, no doubt, to a huge sum. Therefore, keeping in view the socio-economic objectives as enshrined in the Directive Principles of State Policy and with a view to narrowing down the disparities in the existing levels of income, the Department of Economic Affairs has, since 1959, been imposing administrative ceiling even within the statutory limits prescribed under the Act. There is one thing more, Sir. Very recently a writ petition was filed in the Delhi High Court and the Delhi High Court has given its judgment. It has said that the Act itself prescribes certain statutory limits and it is not proper or competent on the part of the Government to impose any further ceilings on the managerial or directorial remuneration. The Government as such is presently considering the question further of the fixation of remuneration.

[Shri Balgovind Verma]

nerations as arising out of the judgment of the Delhi High Court. Then Sir, .

SHRI KRISHAN KANT : Sir, the hon. Minister has been repeating what we already know. The question is .

MR DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : You should know that this is not the time to put questions, . . .

(Interruptions)

SHRI KRISHAN KANT : Sir, the Company Law and the laws relating to dividends and shares, etc. are already there. The question is what they are doing now. In the Budget Speech itself Mr Chavavain said . . .

(Interruptions)

MR DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : It does not matter. If, because of the imposition of a ceiling on the salaries, the shareholders are affected they may sell the shares. Why do you put the question now? Let him continue.

SHRI KRISHAN KANT : Sir, it is the question of ceiling. He is repeating what we already know. We know the High Court case. We know everything. There is nothing new.

MR DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Mr Krishan Kant, why don't you put the question to Mr. Chavan while replying to the debate on the budget? He has only five minutes to finish his reply.

SHRI KRISHAN KANT : He should see the question of ceiling in terms of the present position of the Government and let us know what the position is with regard to the points raised. This is what I mean.

MR DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : There are only five minutes left for the Minister to reply and we will adjourn at 5-00.

SHRI BALGOVIND VERMA : In practical working, sometimes the fixation of the salary may not be very desirable, because sometimes it becomes very imperative to attract the best talents to manage the affairs of commercial undertakings, both in the public and private sectors. It may some-

times militate against the fixation of a ceiling on emoluments. But efforts are being made. As my friend has stated, Rs. 5,000 is supposed to be the maximum which can be given to any person in any undertaking. So far as the minimum is concerned, in every undertaking people do not want that they should take the minimum.

So, Sir, taking into consideration all the facts, any additional productive employment cannot be created merely by reducing hours of work, or by legislation in respect of matters proposed in the Resolution. Employment opportunities can be created only by increase in production and productivity which would reduce the cost of production and create adequate surpluses for investment in fresh avenues of employment. Measures for increasing employment opportunities in the country are the major preoccupation of the Government now. The Government, through the Five Year Plans, has been steadily trying to do so. The Fourth Five Year Plan has spelt out many schemes such as special attention to small and sub-marginal farmers, agricultural labourers through systematic rural works programmes .

SHRI ARJUN ARORA : Sir, on a point of order. I request you to continue a little longer. But please direct the Deputy Minister to speak on the Resolution. He is speaking on Plans and other things. . .

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : He is replying to the points made by Members like you.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA : He has got a very limited time at his disposal. . .

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : . . . which you are devouring.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA : He should tell the House whether the Government accepts the Resolution, or if it does not accept, why not? He is speaking about agriculture, green revolution and family planning, which have become very fashionable.

SHRI BALGOVIND VERMA : If I may be allowed to point out because

a Minister cannot speak, his mouth is shut—anybody can heckle him in any way he likes.

I was speaking on the points of the Resolution. The main purpose of this Resolution is to create employment. The Government is alive to its duties. The Government is doing its best to create opportunities for employment and is bringing so many schemes in the Fourth Five Year Plan. You will find that in all the Ministries, everywhere whatever works are being executed, these are employment oriented, and that is what I was telling. But the hon. Member did not relish it. I do not want to burden him with my speech. I would only say that the Government is alive to its duty.

Government wants to solve this unemployment problem...

SHRI ARJUN ARORA : Do you accept this Resolution ?

SHRI BALGOVIND VERMA : We will accept. But the time has not come. Let the time come, because unless the resources are created, we do not think it is advisable to do so.

So, Sir, in view of these facts, I would request the hon. Member, the mover of the Resolution, to withdraw it, and co-operate with the Government in fulfilling the tasks that lie ahead.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : It is 5 o'clock. We have to adjourn now.

श्री शीलभद्रयाजी : खैतान जी अपने रजोल्यूशन को वापस ले लेते हैं। इतने से हो जायगा। पांच तो बज रहे हैं।

श्री आर० पी० खैतान : नहीं, मैं अपने रजोल्यूशन पर बहस का जवाब दूंगा।

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : I can give you one minute if you want to withdraw your Resolution but I cannot allow you to reply to the debate now because it will take a long time and we cannot sit any longer today. But, as I said, if you want to withdraw your Resolution, I can allow you one minute.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA : You have not already extended the time and now after 5 you cannot extend the time.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : All right. There is a Message from the Lok Sabha, Secretary.

MESSAGE FROM THE LOK SABHA THE MANIPUR APPROPRIATION (No. 2) BILL, 1971

SECRETARY : Sir, I have to report to the House the following Message received from the Lok Sabha signed by the Secretary of the Lok Sabha :

"In accordance with the provisions of Rule 96 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in Lok Sabha, I am directed to enclose herewith the Manipur Appropriation (No. 2) Bill, 1971, as passed by Lok Sabha at its sitting held on the 11th June, 1971.

The Speaker has certified that this Bill is a Money Bill."

Sir, I lay the Bill on the Table.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : The House stands adjourned till 11 A.M. on Monday.

The House then adjourned at two minutes past five of the clock till eleven of the clock on Monday, the 14th June, 1971.