

little on the voting on the Privy Purse Bill, the D. M. K. Member would have come in and the Privy Purse Bill would have been passed in this House. So there is something in what he says.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : All right. The Secretary will in future wait for about half a minute after warning the Members.

REFERENCE TO THE ELEVENTH REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE WELFARE OF SCHEDULED CASTES AND SCHEDULED TRIBES

श्री नेकीराम (हरियाणा) : उपसभापति जी, मैं आपकी इजाज़त से अनुसूचित जातियों तथा अनुसूचित जनजातियों के कल्याण...

श्री उपसभापति : उसका सवाल यहां कहाँ उठ रहा है ?

श्री नेकीराम : मैं एक मिनट लूंगा, आप सूनिए। यह अनुसूचित जातियों तथा अनुसूचित जनजातियों के कल्याण सम्बन्धी समिति की 11 वीं रिपोर्ट है। उसके पेज 30 पर देखिए शेड्यूल्ड कास्ट का खना गायब है, कुछ नहीं दिखाया गया है। तो मैं आपके जरिए हाउस से अनुरोध करूंगा कि या रिपोर्ट ठीक करके टेबल पर रखी जाय।

श्री कल्याण चन्द (उत्तर प्रदेश) : मान्यवर, यह इनकम्पलीट रिपोर्ट है।

श्री नेकीराम : इसमें जनजाति दिखाई गई है जहां उसकी आबादी भी नहीं है।

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : It was some time back, I think, not today.

श्री नेकीराम : आइन्दा के लिए मैं आपके जरिए हाउस से अनुरोध करूंगा कि जो मेम्बर समिति में होते हैं उनको एक दिन पहले रिपोर्ट भेज दी जाय जिससे वे देख लें कि वह गलत है या सही है नहीं तो बाद में हमारे मध्ये मड़ी जायेगी कि गलत बना दी। सारे आंकड़े गलत हैं।

श्री जगदीश प्रसाद माथुर (राजस्थान) : चौधरी साहब, रखने से पहले आप पढ़ लेते।

श्री नेकीराम : मैंने तो नहीं रखी।

श्री जगदीश प्रसाद माथुर : इस कमेटी के आप मेम्बर हैं।

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Mr. Neki Ram, please sit down. He has raised a point that the Report that has been placed on the Table of the House, is not a correct report which was adopted by the Committee on Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes. I do not know what is the factual position. Whether the correct Report has been placed on the House or not. It is very difficult for me to say in absence of the verification of the facts and the allegation made by Mr. Neki Ram.

SHRI M. V. BHADRAM (Andhra Pradesh) : He is a Member of the Committee.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Let the hon'ble Member show me the Report as it was adopted by the Committee as also the one placed on the Table of the House, and only after verifying both I can say whether any mistake has been made or not.

THE PAYMENT OF BONUS (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1966 (Motion for Reference to a Select Committee)

SHRI CHITTA BASU (West Bengal) : Sir, I move :

"That the Bill further to amend the Payment of Bonus Act, 1965, be referred to a Select committee of the Rajya Sabha consisting of the following members with instructions to report by the first day of the next Session :

1. Shri Banka Behary Das.
2. Shri M. K. Mohta.
3. Shri Sitaram Singh.
4. Shri A. D. Mani.
5. Shri T. K. Srinivasan.
6. Dr. Salig Ram.
7. Shri B. S. Savnekar
8. Shri Nand Kishore Bhatt
9. Shri Sultan Singh.

[Shri Chitta Basu.]

10. Shri Mahitosh Purakayastha
11. Shri M. P. Shukla
12. Shri J. S. Tilak.
13. Shri Monoranjan Roy.
14. Shri Mohamad Usman.
15. Chaudhary A. Mohammad.
16. Shri Babubhai M. Chinai.
17. Shri T. V. Anandan.
18. Shri D. Sanjivayya and
19. Shri Chitta Basu."

Sir, the purpose of the Bill and other things have been already been explained and the House has discussed it on earlier occasions. So, on this occasion I do not want to dwell on them. I would urge upon the House to accept this motion without much discussion.

The question was proposed.

SHRI G. A. APPAN (Tamil Nadu) : Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, I am very happy that a Bill like this has come here. Who can deny the concept of bonus to the worker ? Now, according to the Oxford Dictionary, "bonus" has been defined as "something to the good, into the bargain; especially extra dividend to shareholders of company distribution of profits to insurance-policy-holders gratuity to workmen beyond their wages."

Now, my first contention is that the question of bonus can come only if there is any gain or profit. It is really very unfortunate that in our country—I do not know whether it is prevalent in other countries also—bonus is being advocated to be given to workers of any company or undertaking which is making loss. If it works in profit, all the factors of production, land, labour, capital and entrepreneurship, are entitled to a proportional share according to the contribution made by each of these factors of production. You know, the land owners get their rent. The house owners and the factory owners are also entitled to their rent. The labour is entitled to its wages. The capital is entitled to its interest. But when there is no outturn from the land, labour or capital, when an undertaking is already working at a loss, how can anybody give bonus, unless the capital is eroded or eaten away ? Of course, the Government has passed an Act that a minimum of four per cent should be

given to all entitled workers whether there is profit or loss. I do not agree here personally. There have been some cases in the recent past when some undertakings have given 8 per cent, 10 per cent, 20 per cent and so on.

[THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN) in the Chair]

I have seen also cases being reported in the press that some industrial labourers have been advocating that bonus should be paid even when the undertaking was working at a loss. Even if an undertaking is working at a loss, bonus can be paid to the labourers provided there is more capital, over and above the capital first invested. Suppose the capital of a company is Rs. 1 lakh and by periodic reserves the capital has been built up over a period of time. Then you can certainly pay a dividend or bonus from the surplus of this capital. But I do not know how any body can expect a company to pay bonus when the company is already working at a loss eating away the capital itself. Anyway, granting that bonus is to be paid to the workers, most of us, rightly or wrongly, feel that workers should have participation they should have a sense of participation, a sense of involvement, a sense of responsibility in the affairs of the company. The workers and the officers who work in the company do get their wages and salaries. Over and above this they want bonus. Some people ask for bonus even if the company is working at a loss. All right, granting that, my only appeal to both the Government and to the labour leaders is to educate the labour to realise their own responsibilities, to create consciousness in the workers to save. In our parts there are certain business communities where if a person earns one rupee, he will definitely save an anna or two even if he may have to starve. So this habit of saving should be inculcated in the workers. Supposing a worker does not save anything and suddenly he dies. That means his family is left in the lurch. So you should try to create in the workers that awareness of the need to save. The worker should also try to invest a portion of his money in insurance. Most of the workers say we should spend away whatever we earn. There is a proverb in Tamil which says anybody who spends more than his income, will always be in trouble; so also anybody who spends what all he earns will also be in trouble. So, the capitalists, the entrepreneurs and the

Government should join together and say we are prepared to give you bonus, but you plough it back into the capital of the company. You must make the worker a participant in the undertaking. Every labourer should pay, say, Rs. 5 or Rs. 10 or whatever is possible. There should be labour involvement. By law it should be made compulsory. A law should be enacted that every labourer, be it in office, be it in an industry, be it in business, should plough all his bonus and extra wage into the capital of that undertaking. I have been telling always that very often prices are rising even when there is income to come in. In anticipation of financial income prices begin to rise. Even before the Budget is presented, prices start shooting up. But when the income

is not saved, what happens is that 4 P.M. the expenditure eats the income even before it is earned. One person gets a bonus in a family. The price increase on all commodities is such that he has to pay three or four times what he gets in the form of the bonus. That puts him in dire debt because in anticipation of income prices rise and expenditure goes up. Supposing he ploughs this into the capital for the company or the undertaking where he is involved, there will be less money in circulation and to that extent the price rise may not be there. According to the rise and fall of money in circulation the prices rise or fall. If there is more money in circulation, it will inflate the prices and less money in circulation will bring down the prices. Workers should be made conscious of the price structure. I have been speaking to some of the labour leaders and except one or two of them, others agreed with me that wages or bonus or salaries should be linked up with productivity. Yesterday we saw some others and they began laughing. I said 'No'. Here we have seen people getting wages for nothing because they waste their time. Take other countries such as Japan or Germany. They have civic consciousness. They are honest in their duty. Once I met the United States Ambassador in Madras. He was to go on leave at 4 o'clock. I fixed up my appointment with him for 3.30. His name was Shepherd. He is a great man in America. I asked him : "Mr. Shepherd, you have to catch the plane. Still you have not left". You know what he told me ? He said, "Mr. Appan, I am paid upto 4 o'clock. At 4 o'clock I will go and the car is waiting for me". Everybody should rise upto this level of civic consciousness. Shri

Mohan Kumaramangalam was a trade union leader in the University of Madras sometime back. I went to the university and the university people were packing their luggage even by 3.30. I told them it was not 5 o'clock yet. They told me : "So and so is our leader and he will bombard us like anything". I told them that he was not paying them, but they were being paid out of the money of the common people...

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

SHRI G. A. APPAN : Sir, let us take an example. I am a labour leader. I am only a social worker. Supposing I am a labourer leader and some ten people are involved in a strike. I won't get the beating and I won't starve. It is the poor fellows who will suffer. Therefore, I request the government to pass a law that no outsider should be a labour leader unless he is lowest of the workers. We have seen some people in the legislature and Parliament who cannot even speak in their mother tongue. But are they not Members of Parliament ? Do you mean to say our labourers are worse than some of us ? They are not. Labourers have a right in everything but let us educate them honestly, let us educate them to be conscious about their responsibilities towards their families towards their industries, towards their employers and towards their country.

SHRI M. M. DHARIA (Maharashtra) : Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, the motion to refer this Bill to a Select Committee has given us a good opportunity to express ourselves, particularly in the context of the situation where there are demands from all sections of the employees and working classes to have equitable bonus. I do concede that bonus is not a reward; it is a part of the emoluments. Having regard to the cost of living index and also having regard to the profits derived by factories, it is necessary to correlate bonus, in some form or other, to every type of job. But, Sir, is it not a fact to be taken into consideration that in this country of ours, because of the *ad hoc* decisions that we are taking, we have not been able to solve the problem ? On the contrary we are creating a situation, making the problem more and more complicated. If we look at that by taking into account the existing clause for a bonus of 4% or Rs. 40, whichever is higher, the bonus should be equivalent

[Shri M. M. Dharia.]

to 1/12th of the emoluments of the employee. Therefore, This Bill is here to increase the wage packet by one month's salary during the whole of a year.

I am not opposed to any increase in the salary of those who are in a position to claim it for themselves as a matter of principle, but how can we forget today that the relationship between the production and the salary or emoluments shall have to be fixed? While I make this claim, perhaps somebody might tell me that it is no use having any high talks. But may I quote something of which this House would like to know?

I am the President of the Hindustan Antibiotics Employees' Union; the undertaking is in the public sector. Dr. Triguna Sen who happens to be the Minister in charge of the Petroleum and Chemicals Ministry was kind enough to come to Pimpri and stay there for three days. He discussed the matters with the employees and members of the management and today this House will be happy to know that an agreement has been reached between the management and the employees where, for three years the bonus is not to relate to profits but bonus is actually to relate to the actual production in the factory. I can say on behalf of the employees that during these three years the employees in this factory shall be having a bonus of not less than 18 to 20 per cent because we are determined to see that in this public sector undertaking the production goes up by at least 18 to 20 per cent every year whereas production in our country is hardly 7 to 8 per cent and in some cases retarded.

In this public sector undertaking where I am the President of the Union, I have myself signed the agreement. There was a hue and cry from some trade union leaders in that area. They had asked me how, when I signed the agreement, I could relate bonus with production and not with profits. I told them that in this country if we wanted to prosper bonus should be related to production and there was no other alternative but to see that the workers became more and more production conscious and is was that incentive which should be given to the employees.

It is the incentive for more production and that is why I have signed this agreement—with a list of accusations—but,

of course, in the interest of the country I have done it and I am proud of those two thousand employees. Dr. Triguna Sen was there and it is for him to comment. If I am to quote again only one sentence of his, he said, "I am really happy that in this country of ours there are public sector undertakings, there are workers and there are employee, who are so much patriotic and they certainly make there public sector undertakings a success." I need not add further, Sir, But, while I am saying this, I do not want to...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN) : They deserve our compliments.

SHRI M. M. DHARIA : Yes, Sir, But I do not want to teach any philosophy and I do not believe in it. Now, Sir, we have made one more proposal to the Ministry and that proposal is that for the coming fifteen years we should have neither one lock-out nor a strike in the Hindustan Antibiotics Ltd. What is our proposal? The proposal is very clear and that is that there should be a mechanism for resolving disputes.

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

SHRI M. M. DHARIA : Yes, Sir, and if we fail to come to an agreement let there be a Board of Arbitrators. Let us leave it to the arbitrators and let the decision or the award of the Board of Arbitrators be binding on both the parties. Sir, here I have considered one point. It may be possible that the Government feel that the award given by the Board of Arbitrators is not in the interest of the industry or the country because it is a bit harm. It is likely to be so. I have conceded that it may be the right of the Parliament to amend that award, not of the Government. Sir, the Government cannot be the management and also the judge. So, here I have made that proposal to Dr. Triguna Sen and his Ministry. Our Union has made that proposal. You accept the scheme. We authorise this Parliament. Because of parliamentary democracy, it is the representatives of the people who should have that right and if they give their consent, we are prepared to sign that agreement that there shall not be any lock-out or strike in the Hindustan Antibiotics Limited for fifteen years to come.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN) : It will be a very good precedent.

SHRI M. M. DHARIA : Yes, Sir, Whenever I look at the falling production in this country. I have felt that if we want to face the present challenge in this country, if we want to face the challenge of unemployment and poverty in this country, this is the only way. I do understand that those who work should get their minimum needs to be satisfied out of their emoluments. There is no doubt about it. But why should we forget that this concept of strikes in the country has been hampering the progress of the country ? And, from that point of view, when I look at this Bill, I feel that we are just trying to protect all rights without taking any care of the responsibilities. I feel it is high time in this country to take care of or make people know, make everybody know of the responsibilities also. Since independence, what has happened? We have made so many labour laws. I know the deficiencies in the labour laws. On the contrary, I am one of the critics in this House who has said pointblank that the present Industrial Disputes Act of 1947 and the Industrial Relations Act as it is there in my state of Maharashtra, the Bombay Industrial Relations Act, though they are good enactments, have failed to do justice. Sir, if I am to quote again the Hindustan Antibiotics Ltd., prior to Dr. Sen's taking over charge, the Industrial Tribunal, while giving the award said that the industry-cum-region basis should be taken into consideration while deciding the wages. Unfortunately, the award was given by the Industrial Tribunal, but the management did not agree with that award and they came up to the Supreme Court. My Union had to spend one lakh and thirty thousand rupees in fighting that case. Of course, it is a powerful Union and I could do that. But how many Unions can afford this one lakh and thirty thousand rupees for fighting a case? We fought up to the Supreme Court and we won. Why should the workers have their faith in this industrial tribunal where they have to spend in thousands? It is practically impossible, Sir. It is exorbitant.

Sir, I would like to appeal to the whole House today that let us take into consideration the present labour laws, the present mechanism and let us make it very clear to the Government and to ourselves that the present mechanism of resol-

ving disputes in this country has been failing, and it is this failure which is the cause of industrial unrest and industrial instability in this country. If this country wants that there should be industrial peace, if this country wants that there should be industrial progress, if this country wants that there should be more industrial production, there is no other alternative but to see that all disputes, either existing or apprehended, could be resolved on the basis of some principles.

It is an important issue, and the House will bear me out...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN) : This measure is going to the Select Committee.

SHRI M. M. DHARIA : This is going to the Select Committee. I would like them to go through this evidence, all this evidence, because I feel...

SHRI A. P. SHARMA (Bihar) : No Sir, this is more than evidence.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN) : There are many speakers. The proposition is that this should be finished today. We are adjourning at five.

SHRI M. M. DHARIA : There is no harm. Sir, we shall have to create a good mechanism. How many fields are there under the private sector, public sector, the Government and their employees. And, Sir, when I mention production, this production is not only limited to industrial production actually in factories. For me, the definition of 'production' is a bit vast. I feel that if a clerk in an office, instead of every day writing 40 letters, he writes 50 letters a day, this is increase in production. When I say 'productivity', productivity is not necessarily related to manufacture of some goods, but more efficiency and more results are also known as productivity in the new sense of the term. And if we want that efficiency to prevail then naturally in all these sectors, whether it is the Government sector or whether it is a public undertaking or whether it is a private undertaking, we have to introduce some system agreeable to all in this House, in the other House and also to State Legislatures.

Perhaps some may say how it affects the trade unions' functioning in this country

[Shri M. M. Dharia.]

Again, Sir, the sad history of this country of ours is that it is the political parties which came into being earlier and the trade union movement came afterwards. And naturally every political party wanted to have some effective weapon in its hand for its own propaganda, and they started their labour movement. That's why the labour movement in the country is more political, being a movement to serve the interests of the employers. It did not happen in England. In England these trade unions came into being afterwards. And if this history is to be reversed, it is high time in this country to have for every industry only one union.

SHRI BALACHANDRA MENON (Kerala) : This is not a small thing. We can discuss this later.

SHRI M. M. DHARIA : My friend will bear me out, Sir. The point is that there should be only one union in one industry. I am saying this because, instead of guaranteeing bonus this way, let us create conditions in the country whereby we can pay more to the employee than what we can pay now... (Interruptions). Please excuse my being so blunt. I am also working in trade unions. I am related with so many unions. I know this. Unfortunately, in this country it so happens that political leaders have been exploiting this whole trade union movement more for political purpose than for serving the interests of the employees.

SHRI B. T. KEMPARAJ (Mysore) : You are also in it.

SHRI M. M. DHARIA : Because I am in it, as I stated in the beginning, it is in the Union where I am the President that I have related bonus with production and not with profit. I have shown that.

SHRI M. V. BHADRAM (Andhra Pradesh) : See these things to your union and see what they say.

SHRI M. M. DHARIA : Unfortunately Mr. Bhadram was not present but I said in the beginning that I have done it and thereafter I am saying it. That is done in the public sector—in the Hindustan Antibiotic Factory at Pimpri. It is related with production and not with profit. For 2 years the employees will be getting between 18 and 20 % because we have shown increase in

production. That is my moral strength if not physical strength. So my submission is that we have so many unions, there are rivalries and naturally because of the rivalries between the unions, the relationship in-between the management and the employees cannot be properly maintained and the management takes undue advantage of the various rivalries and one union is made to fight against another and instead of serving the interests of the employees, they go on fighting with each other. It is high time we should have one union in one industry and it is for the Government and for the Political parties and in the interests of the country that the trade unions will come forward and say : "Let the trade unions where there is one union in one industry related to the Central trade union, that should be the union which will be the representative union". It will be possible to create a new relationship in-between the management and the unions. When such relationship is created, then it is possible to have a good mechanism to resolve all the disputes. When we discussed the IAC pilots' strike or non-cooperation to-day, let us not forget that our public sector undertakings have also failed in creating that mechanism. What is the mechanism and what is the dialogue with the pilots. I asked and the reply was 'It is only the management'. They said : "We are taking firm action but that does not mean our doors are closed". I do not want that. When I said that there should be proper mechanism I mean it. No proper mechanism is possible unless and until the workers get a feeling of belonging in that undertaking. So long as they are not in the management itself, so long as they are not in the Board of Directors, so long as they are not in the various Committees, how is it possible to create that sense of understanding and that sort of sense of belonging ? From this point of view my appeal to the Minister of Labour, who is here and who has also on many occasions preached about this theory of workers' participation in the management is this. Should he not come forward and see that at least in the public sector undertaking a step is taken by the Government so that the workers become the representative of the management, they become a part of the management ? When I say that there should be participation of workers in the management, it is not only one or two representatives in the Board of Directors. Let me make it clear. When I say workers' participation in management, that

participation should be from top to bottom—at the time of recruitment, at the time of promotion, at the time of disciplinary action and even for maintaining efficiency and production. There should be various Committees where the worker's representatives and the representatives of the management should sit together. It is their factory. Let there be that feeling. Have we created that feeling? Do the pilots in the IAC feel that the IAC is their undertaking? Here the failure is again of the Government in not creating that sense of belonging in the minds of the employees. If we create that feeling then, naturally they shall look at the whole aspect from a different point of view. The workers shall be having their unions. The workers shall be having their representatives in the various forms of the factory or of the undertaking or of the establishment, and whenever questions come up, they are equally answerable. If the matter of wages or bonus comes before the board of directors, and if the workers' representatives are there, they will have to think in both ways. They will have to safeguard the interests of the employees and at the same time they will have to take care to see that the industry runs at a profit that it runs effectively.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN) : We have made a beginning in the nationalised banks.

SHRI M. M. DHARIA : Yes, Sir. I appreciate that scheme.

SHRI D. THENGARI (Uttar Pradesh) : It is time. The Minister is to reply at 4.45.

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF LABOUR, EMPLOYMENT AND REHABILITATION (SHRI BHAGWAT JHA AZAD) : It depends upon you. It is for you Members.

SHRI CHITTA BASU : Our idea is that we want to finish this Motion today, at 5 or before.

SHRI BHAGWAT JHA AZAD : Not necessary. It can be continued on the next day.

SHRI M. V. BHADRAM : I think Mr. Dharia is not interested in this. If interested, Mr. Dharia, then you close your speech and sit down.

SHRI M. M. DHARIA : I am certainly interested and so I am making these observations. Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, here the point is : is it not high time for us to realise what we are doing? Only to pass a Bill or send it to a Select Committee saying that one-twelfth of the total emoluments paid to an employee during the accounting year should be paid to him as bonus, is it enough to say that we should do it? Should we not express ourselves as to what are our feelings? Today every pie in this country is material, and when we spend that pie, let us take care that it goes for some good in the country, that it necessarily goes in achieving the social objectives set for the country.

SHRI M. V. BHADRAM : You will have better opportunity to say all this and more when the Bill comes back again.

SHRI M. M. DHARIA : No, Mr. Vice-Chairman; the difficulty lies in the implementation of a law also. Mr. Bhadram says that the Bill will come back here again. Mr. Bhadram, on the Medical Bill we both were on the Committee on that Bill and we insisted very hard for some changes. But it was not possible. So, naturally, it is better that, whatever we have to say, we say it earlier and not afterwards.

SHRI M. V. BHADRAM : Your Government representatives will be there.

SHRI M. M. DHARIA : No, no. Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I can assure this House that it is out of some experience of mine. It was when I was a college student in 1946 that I, for the first time, joined the Postal Union in Poona, and for twenty-five years I have served in this field, and let me tell you my experience. I know that perhaps I may get some brickbats also for saying this, but it is high time for us to say what is wrong and what is right. I have no doubt in my mind whatsoever that my friends are interested in the workers getting more and more emoluments. But at the same time let us not forget the production in this country. I want this country to go ahead. I want this country to

[Shri M. M. Dharia.]

achieve more and more knowledge in science and technology. I want this country to compete with any modern country in the world. And if it is to be done, it is with that sense of participation, with that sense of having better production, that we can do it, not otherwise. If we simply go on saying that additional wages should be paid, it is not enough. Along with additional wages let us formulate the whole policy first, let us formulate what is our policy, let us see whether the wages are related to the production in the factories.

SHRI BALACHANDRA MENON. We will have it up to 5.30.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN) : He is finishing.

SHRI M. M. DHARIA : In five minutes, Sir.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN) : I think it is not fair, to take five more minutes.

SHRI M. V. BHADRAM : I submit to you, Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir; let us take a decision now that we will sit till the Bill is passed, whether it is 5.30, 5.45, or whatever it may be.

SHRI U. K. LAKSHMANA GOWDA (Mysore) : The Bill is after all for reference to a Select Committee.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN) : Let us finish at 5. On Fridays we finish at 5.

SHRI M. M. DHARIA : Mr. Vice-Chairman, this House should kindly excuse me. I was under the impression that whenever we discuss private Members' Bills there is no restriction of time. I do not want to offend anybody. If it is the desire of the House that there should be restriction of time I am not opposing it but I was under the impression that there is no restriction of time and that is why I went into details. Otherwise I would not have got up. That was my impression. If the House is of opinion that others have to speak, I have no objection; within five minutes I will sit down. I will not take even five minutes. So my submission to this House is this. Let this Bill go to the Select Committee; I am not opposed to it but let us all express our views which the Select Committee

should consider. I am very clear about this; I feel that the whole policy shall have to be considered. This is not merely a question of bonus; I think the whole aspect shall have to be taken into consideration but who is going to take it into consideration if we do not express ourselves? Because we are worried over securing votes we are not prepared to say...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN) : Mr. Dharia, this is a limited Bill.

SHRI M. M. DHARIA : No, no. It covers many issues because we are giving a blank cheque for a month's salary by way of bonus even if a factory is in loss. We are really giving additional emoluments to the workmen to the tune of one-twelfth of their total emoluments for the year. Therefore, I felt that when we are giving this blank cheque we should take into consideration all aspects, particularly when this country needs a high rate of industrial production. That is my whole submission and from that point of view I felt that the functioning of the trade unions, their relationship with the management, the way in which they have been behaving, all these should be considered. There are Central Acts and State Acts regarding labour and everywhere there are lacunae and drawbacks. If they are not taken into consideration we shall not be in a position to do justice to the cause that we all want to serve. That is why I have gone into details. I feel that this Bill should go before the Select Committee and should be considered there. But I have no doubt in my mind that after giving a guarantee of minimum wages, a further addition of wages must necessarily be related to production and not only to profits. And this should be considered by all. I am thankful to the House for giving me this Patient hearing.

چودھری اے - محمد (بہار) :
وائس چیئرمین صاحب - بونس کے
سلسلہ میں ابھی دھاریا جی نے بہت
سی باتیں کہی ہیں -

†[چوہدری اے مہمدم (بہار) : واہس
چیرمین ساہب، بونس کے سلسلے میں ابھی
اریا جی نے بہت سی باتیں کہی ہیں]۔

[] Hindi translation.

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री अकबर अली खान) : चौधरी साहब, आप सेलेक्ट कमेटी में हैं। हमारे यहाँ का ट्रेडिशन यह है कि जो सेलेक्ट कमेटी में होते हैं नहीं बोलते हैं। मैं समझता हूँ कि आप अपने दूसरे भाइयों को सुनिये ताकि आप सेलेक्ट कमेटी में उन चीजों को वहाँ ला सकें। तो अगर आप इजाजत दें तो वह लोग बोलें जो कि सेलेक्ट कमेटी में नहीं हैं।

چودھری اے - محمد : ٹھیک ہے۔

† [चौधरी ए० मोहम्मद : ठीक है।]

श्रीमती विद्यावती चतुर्वेदी (मध्य प्रदेश) : आप कमेटी के मेम्बर हो कर भी बोल रहे थे।

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN) : Mr. Lakshmana Gowda.

SHRI B. T. KEMPARAJ (Mysore) : Sir, I may be given that chance now. Instead of him, I may be given the chance.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN) : Your name is not here. Now I cannot do that.

SHRI U. K. LAKSHMANA GOWDA (Mysore) : Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, to begin with I would like to congratulate my friend, Mr. Mohan Dharia, and also express my gratitude to him for expressing his refreshing views on the subject of bonus. That is relating Bonus to productivity. Coming as it does from a trade union leader of repute I think, Sir, that is a matter which should be given the utmost consideration by all the people concerned including my trade union friends sitting here representing various political parties. Sir, this matter of bonus has been one which has created such a lot of industrial unrest in this country for years together. It is only in 1965 after the matter was referred to the Bonus Commission certain recommendations emerged which deserve a fair trial for at least another half a dozen years. I am not going to be long and I am certainly going to be brief. My hon. friend, Mr. Chitta Basu, need not be worried and my hon. trade union friends also need not be worried. The Bill relates mainly to three sections, viz., sections 10, 15 and 20. Others are consequential amendments or amend-

ments not of much importance. The principal amendment relates to section 10 which, under the existing Bonus Act, provides for 4 per cent or Rs. 40 whichever is higher, as a minimum bonus, irrespective of the fact whether an establishment makes a profit or loss. My friend Mr. Chitta Basu, in his amendment proposes to make it 8 per cent or Rs. 80 whichever is higher. I am opposed to this amendment because as we find today many of the establishments, which are undergoing a loss or are making a marginal profit, are not in a position to maintain themselves and plough back their reserves and profits to the development of the establishment. As such any addition to this minimum bonus, when the establishment has made a loss, is going to be a very big burden and it will definitely not help in the industrial growth in the country. As we know, hundreds of new industries are coming up and this will definitely come in the way of their progress and development.

Then I will deal with section 15. It relates to a maximum bonus of 20 per cent and the provision of set on and set off. After having increased the minimum bonus to eight per cent, Mr. Chitta Basu wants the ceiling to be removed. I certainly feel that this is unfair. I can understand it if you say, remove the minimum bonus and also the ceiling. What will happen in that situation is that an establishment which makes a loss will not pay any bonus and an establishment which makes a profit may pay more than 20 per cent bonus. It might be 30 per cent. I will be certainly happy if it is 30 per cent, because that, to a certain extent, as my friend, Mr. Mohan Dharia, has said relates to...

SHRI CHITTA BASU (West Bengal) : Does the Act preclude payment of a bonus which is more than 20 per cent?

SHRI U. K. LAKSHMANA GOWDA : Certainly. I am sure he has read the Act and is well versed with it. Any profit which is more than 20 per cent, according to the present Act, is ceiled at 20 per cent and carried over to the next year. Next year when there is a lower profit, that is added on to it and thus they maintain a certain even level of bonus payment to the workers.

SHRI K. P. SUBRAMANIA MENON (Kerala) : After the Bonus Act came into being, no company has been making any profit.

SHRI U. K. LAKSHMANA GOWDA :

This is a very good arrangement which has been arrived at by the Bonus Commission and this should be given a trial at least for a period of another six or ten years. You have passed an Act about five years ago and immediately you want to come forward with an amendment and that only to make the loss-making establishments and the marginal establishments pay much higher than what they can afford. If there is a floor, i.e., a minimum bonus, there should be a ceiling. If you remove the ceiling you remove the floor as well.

Then I come to section 20. In this section it is proposed to apply the Act to the public sector industries. As I have already spoken on an earlier occasion, I certainly support it. There has been a sense of discrimination and heart-burning among the large number of people employed in the public sector undertakings. In order to make the payment of bonus applicable to all the different sections of the workers in this country irrespective of whether they are employed in the public sector or private sector, I would support this provision that this Bonus Act should be made applicable to the public sector as well. In applying it to the public sector it becomes all the more important that we should not raise the minimum bonus because, as we have seen, most of the public sector industries either are ending up with a loss or are just making a marginal profit and also most of them are working below-installed capacity. In such circumstances is it fair on our part to put an additional burden on the public sector undertakings which are still in a developing stage and which are beset with many difficulties, and which are struggling themselves to attain their full installed capacity in production? In these circumstances I ask is it really fair to put this burden of 8 per cent on them? So, Sir, I would say by all means you apply it to the public sector undertakings but do not meddle with the minimum bonus. I would qualify it here: let us wait for some more years until the industries have reached a proper stage of development. When they can afford sufficient resources let us by all means extend or revise or find any other method of paying bonus. It is much better and rational, as suggested by Mr. Dharia, to link it to production.

In such circumstances I cannot understand why this should now go to the Select Committee at all. In any case it has been decided to send it to the Select Committee. I have no objection, let it go to the Select Committee. I am not against it, but I would urge here that these matters which I have raised should be considered by the Select Committee.

In this connection I would also like to mention here that when this Bill was sent out for eliciting public opinion, almost every State Government has made reference particularly to the minimum bonus and the point about how their own public sector undertakings and also the private industries which are newly started in those States are finding it difficult to develop and how this will certainly come in the way and interfere in the further progress and development of the industries in the States. In these circumstances I would say that it is not fair that the minimum bonus should be proposed to be increased by 100 per cent, that is from 4 per cent to 8 per cent. Let some time be given for it. Let alternative methods be explored. If we can find a formula by which we can link bonus to production, it will be very healthy and rational. Bonus has been one of the factors, as I have already said, which has created a lot of difficulty for industrial understanding, and it has been the cause of many industrial disputes. I would rather have a proper revision of wages than go on grouping with difficult bonus problem and getting ended up with industrial unrest all over the country.

SHRI BALACHANDRA MENON (Kerala) : Mr. Vice-Chairman, under rule 245 of the Rules of Procedure, I request you to extend the debate. The rule says :

“Whenever the debate on any motion in connection with a Bill or on any other motion becomes unduly protracted, the Chairman may, after taking the sense of the Council, fix the hour at which the debate shall conclude”.

I request that it should be done. We are anxious that it should go to the Select Committee and so we request you that the time may be extended up to six.

SHRI BALKRISHNA GUPTA (Bihar) : It is a controversial Bill. It should be debated in the proper way.

SHRI MAHABIR DASS (Bihar) : I oppose this move. क्योंकि आज शुक्रवार है और हमेशा सदा पांच बजे बन्द हो जाता है। हम लोगों ने पहले 15 मिनट पांच बजे के बाद का प्रोग्राम बना लिया है और इस तरह से 15 मिनट पहले इस तरह का प्रपोजल रखना जिससे कि हमारे सारे प्रोग्राम खूब हो जायें उचित नहीं हैं। अगर यह प्रपोजल लाना था तो एक घंटा पहले लाना था ताकि हम लोग अपने प्रोग्राम को निश्चित कर सकते हैं। इसलिए मेरा निवेदन है कि 5 बजे से अधिक समय देने का कोई प्रस्ताव मंजूर न किया जाय।

SHRI D. THENGARI (Uttar Pradesh) : To begin with, I take strong exception to the principle enunciated by my progressive friend, Mr. Dharia, that the quantum of bonus should be linked with productivity because we all know that labour productivity is not the only responsible factor for total productivity. There are many other factors including the attitude of the management. We have very often seen that managements are responsible for reducing production because of the law of demand and supply. If production goes on unhampered there will be additional supply which will reduce the prices and therefore the profit margin. I personally know of instances where employers have even bribed or tried to bribe some of the trade unionists to bring about strikes so that production could be hampered and consequently the prices can go up and the profit of margin also can go up. When all such examples are there, it would be wrong to link the quantum of bonus with productivity.

SHRI P. C. MITRA (Bihar) : Do you mean to say that the establishment which have bribed them, they also should pay more bonus?

SHRI D. THENGARI : For want of time, I am not entering into a debate.

SHRI M. V. BHADRAM : You can go on.

SHRI D. THENGARI : Therefore, to link the quantum of bonus with productivity is highly unfair.

Secondly, the whole discussion has arisen, the whole controversy has arisen, because the definition of bonus has not been incorporated in the Act itself. Bonus is not, as many of our friends would have us believe, merely profit sharing. In the first place, so long as there is a gap between the living wage and the actual wage, bonus is only a deferred wage or a supplementary wage, and as such it deserves to be given all priority. Only after the actual wage attains the level of the living wage, the profit-sharing character of bonus commences. And therefore, to say that since there are no profits, no bonus should be given, is irrelevant. If the living wage is being given to the workers, then profit can be the basis for computation of the quantum of bonus. So long as we have not reached the level of living wage, it is only a wage, deferred or supplementary. And as such, the workers should not be denied their right to wage.

Even about the public sector undertakings, there has been a public debate going on about how to balance properly its autonomy and its answerability to Parliament. We know that in the name of nationalisation there is an excessively heavy dose of bureaucratisation in the public sector undertakings. Even in countries like Great Britain, a Thinkers' Group of the socialist MPs of the Labour Party has come to the conclusion that because of bureaucratisation it has not been possible for them to make the public sector undertakings completely answerable to Parliament. Therefore, I should like to suggest that even in regard to the public sector undertakings rethinking is necessary. Bureaucratisation must be removed. And for this purpose, I would like to suggest that a regular cadre of Public Administrators should be created. These Public Administrators should be given statutory recognition. The public undertakings should be placed under their charge. And by way of experiment, it would be worth-while to entrust at least two or three of the public undertakings to the Workers' Councils, that is councils of the workers within the industry. And all the financial and technical aid which is generally made available to public undertakings if they are under the bureaucrats' charge should be made available to the workers also. And I am

[Shri D. Thengari.]

very confident that our workers are patriotic and responsible enough to manage the public undertakings as efficient at least as the bureaucrats are.

Then so far as the private industry is concerned—and as a matter of fact this can be generalised and extended to the public undertakings also—it is necessary that the quantum of bonus should be increased because of the rising cost of living. Four per cent was the prescribed minimum. But we know how in the private sector employers have turned this minimum into maximum so that even those who used to give 16, 17 or 20 per cent. are now giving only 4 per cent. and saying that their statutory obligation is over. So the minimum is converted into maximum. In order to eliminate all controversies regarding bonus it is necessary that our workers should be given the right to go behind, inspect and scrutinise the balance sheets and profit and loss accounts of their own concerns and, secondly, they should have a right to participate in the process of decision making on deployment of capital of their own industry and, thirdly, it should be recognised as a principle that as money is the capital of any industry, labour also is the capital though of a different type. As such the labour of every worker should be evaluated in terms of shares. Every worker should be elevated to the status of a shareholder and, as shareholders, our workers should have a right to send their representative even to the Board of Directors. If such an arrangement materialises there will be no controversy regarding bonus in our country. So long as that is not done, it is necessary that the Bill by Mr. Chitta Basu should be passed. It should be sent to the Select Committee and the right to bonus of the workers, irrespective of the number of employees in any particular undertaking, or its public or private character, irrespective of all these considerations, every worker who is earning a living wage must have a right to the deferred or supplementary wage, that is, bonus. This should be incorporated in the Act itself.

With these suggestions I support the move for sending the Bill to the Select Committee.

SHRI GULAM NABI UNTOO (Jammu and Kashmir) : Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir,

I thank Mr. Chitta Basu for whose efforts I am here to speak on this Bill. I think that the Bill to amend the Bonus Act will also apply to the State of Jammu and Kashmir. While the Labour Minister present here, Mr. Azad, was piloting the scheme of labour laws the other day, I mentioned at that moment also that so far they were only paper laws so far as the State of Jammu and Kashmir is concerned. I wish they applied to the State of Jammu and Kashmir also. Similarly, as this motion is being discussed, even if the Act is amended by virtue of the motion being accepted, I do not feel at all enthusiastic that it will be of any use or benefit to us because basically in my State there is no industry, small or big, private or public.

Sir, this Bill is a very serious move that Mr. Chitta Basu has made. But I do not think this is sufficient. As far as public sector industry is concerned, I feel there is no involvement of labour. From the labour movement as such which is going on in this country at present one can well say that it does not feel involvement in the ownership of the industrial development. The reasons behind it are various. A comprehensive bill should be brought for the purpose adopting all the measures so that the labour actually feels involved, participated, one with the production and one with the factory.

I understand, Sir, that the entire system of the law in the country, particularly labour schemes has to be not only revised but seriously amended so that the system of the working of labour is such that a labourer feels that what he produces is his own and for the production of goods he stands answerable. That is missing. Till we attain that, we cannot be successful in this matter. Sir, the basic thing in the matter of bonus is that the living wage and the existing wage must come closer. These will always be varying. It is difficult to say when the time will come when the living wage and the existing wage will be one and the same. As far as the economic conditions of the country at present are concerned, it is not easy to give the labourers what is termed as living wage. The existing wages are not also sufficient they are barely sufficient to enable him to involve himself in the labour movement. Therefore, while discussing this bonus Bill, one feels that the minimum bonus should be increased from four per-

cent to some other level. It should be open to the Select Committee to fix the percentage as it seems proper. But one should have to consider the three important pillars, i. e. capital, labour and production, they should be simultaneously kept in mind. It should not be only the welfare of labour that should be exercising our mind. We should be equally occupied with capital and production. They are interrelated. If harmony is not created among these three units, it is not possible to achieve the very purpose of this movement. If we ignore capital and lay stress on labour, we will possibly be ignoring the most important factor, that is, production. We cannot also ignore another important thing, that is, the quality of the goods produced. Whether it is in the private sector or in the public sector, the Government is hopelessly ignorant of it. We have allowed many private sector undertakings to produce goods. But we never examine the quality of those goods. The result is that the moment the market goes into their grip, the quality of the goods deteriorates. But there is nobody to look after it and pull them up so that the required quality of goods is maintained. Therefore, while discussing the bonus Bill, we have to keep in mind that we should evolve a method whereby we can fully make the labour involved in the entire production and capital. For that, we have to make a serious revision in all our laws. And the basic revision we have to make is that there should be no right to property for anybody. Property, whether industrial or agricultural, must belong to all. One should not be able to say "This is my industry, this is Tata's industry, this is Birla's industry" and so on. The labourer should not have the feeling that it is not his own. At present the difficulty is that the worker in Tatas or Birlas or any other concern, never feels that the company or the undertaking belongs to him. Therefore, we should evolve a system where the labourers always feel that the factory is theirs and that any harm done to the factory is equal to harm done to their own house. Only then the labourer stands up to the occasion and protects the factory. That system has to be evolved where there is a sense of collective ownership developed in the labour movement in the entire country. (Time-bell) . . .

(Interruptions)

SHRI M. V. BHADRAM : Mr. Vice-Chairman, how long are we sitting?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN) : As I felt, the consensus of the House was...

SHRI M. V. BHADRAM : But I suggested some time ago that we should sit till complete the speakers and pass the motion before the House.

SHRI P. C. MITRA : No, the House should adjourn now.

SHRI M. V. BHADRAM : In that case the House should have adjourned by now. It is already 5 o'clock.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN) : I am in the hands of the House. That is why I rang the bell.

SHRI M. V. BHADRAM : If you allow the House to sit beyond 5, then we will be committing contempt of the House.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN) : I want to know whether on this non-official day the House wants to continue beyond 5 ...

SOME HON. MEMBERS : No, no.

SOME HON. MEMBERS : Yes, yes.

SHRI MONORANJAN ROY (West Bengal) : The House should remember that the Official Benches were agreeable to a Bill brought by an Opposition Member; discussion has been continuing; there was an agreed panel of Members to the Select Committee. But the House is not being allowed to continue this discussion beyond 5 o'clock. If this is so, we shall remember this and when the Treasury Benches are in difficulty, we shall also react in the same way.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN) : Mr. Monoranjan Roy, you will appreciate that on non-official days on Fridays, we have been adjourning at 5. On other days...

SHRI M. V. BHADRAM : Sir, there are occasions when we sat beyond 5 even on non-official days.

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE DEPARTMENT OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS (SHRI OM MEHTA) : No, not beyond 5 o'clock.

SHRI P. C. MITRA : When the Business Advisory Committee has decided it...

SHRI M. V. BHADRAM : The Business Advisory Committee has nothing to do with this. The House did sit beyond 5 on non-official days also. There are occasions. Please go through the records and you will find it. If the Treasury Benches do not accommodate us and pass this motion today, they cannot expect the Opposition to accommodate them in their turn. When the Treasury Benches have agreed in principle to refer the Bill to a Select Committee, why should they not pass this motion right now?

SHRI MAHABIR DASS : Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, . . .

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN) : Yes, what do you want to say?

श्री महाबीर दास (बिहार) : वाइस-चैयरमैन साहब, हमारे माननीय सदस्य कह रहे हैं कि यह बिल पास करना है, यह बिल पास करना है। लेकिन बिल तो पास करना नहीं है, उनका प्रस्ताव है कि यह सेलेक्ट कमेटी में जाय और यह विषय अगर आज डिसकशन में अधूरा रह गया तो फिर आयेंगा। ऐसी कोई बात नहीं हो गई है कि कल शायद कोई भूकम्प होने वाला है और इसको सम्हालना जरूरी है या कल कोई बहुत बड़ा खतरा देश पर है और उसको सम्हालना जरूरी है। यह खत्म होता नहीं है, यह फिर आयगा, इस पर विचार होगा, फिर हम लोग इस पर डिसकशन करेंगे।

आप अपोजीशन की बात कर रहे हैं लेकिन जो रिकगनाइज्ड अपोजीशन लीडर हैं वह खुद भी प्रेजेंट नहीं हैं। यहां अपोजीशन की बात भी नहीं है। अपोजीशन के जो एक लीडर हैं वह भी प्रेजेंट नहीं हैं।

इसलिये पांच बज गये हैं और पांच बजे हाउस एडजर्न होना चाहिये। पांच बजे के पहले कोई इस बारे में मोशन भी पास नहीं हुआ है, इसलिये हाउस ओटोमैटिकली आज अभी एडजर्न हो जाना चाहिये।

SHRI M. V. BHADRAM : Shri Mahabir Dass is forgetting one thing. This is the third non-official day we are sitting. If the discussion on this motion to refer the Bill to the Select Committee is not finished, then I do not know how many days we will require.

श्री कल्याण चन्द (उत्तर प्रदेश) : नान-ऑफिशियल डे में 5 बजे तक सदन बैठता है। 5 बजे सदन को उठ जाना चाहिए।

SHRI M. V. BHADRAM : We prepared to adjourn now, if the Treasury Benches do not come to the opposition for accommodation on some other day.

श्री महाबीर दास : अर्जुन अरोड़ा जी के भी बिल को हमने वैसे ही नकारात्मक जवाब देकर अस्वीकारा करा दिया है। ट्रेजरी बेंच के मेम्बर के साथ भी तो हम वहीं व्यवहार कर चुके हैं।

SHRI M. V. BHADRAM : You are betraying your own comrades.

SHRI MAHABIR DASS : We are doing justice, not betraying anybody.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN) : Shri Chitta Basu and Shri Bhadram should see that the House is very sympathetic to this Bill.

SHRI M. V. BHADRAM : In that case, let us pass this motion without any further discussion.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN) : Please sit down. What I say is that it is not lapsing. If it is a question of lapsing, I can understand your argument.

SHRI M. V. BHADRAM : You put the motion to the vote of the House.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN) : As I could see, the majority of the House is keen about this. Because they have some other engagement...

SHRI M. V. BHADRAM : Let me make a submission. If the majority are sympathetic with this motion, let us put an end to any discussion and put the motion straightway to the vote and pass it.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN) : But there are persons to speak on this.

श्री महाबीर दास : वाइस चैयरमैन साहब, हमने भी अपना नाम दे रखा है। मुझको भी इस विषय में बोलना है। लेबर यूनियन्स का मैं प्रेसिडेंट हूँ। कोई यह बात नहीं है कि इसी के पास होने से चित्त बासु सारे लेबर यूनियन्स के मालिक हो जाएँ। केवल उन्हीं से संबंधित बातें नहीं हैं। हमें भी लेबर मिनिस्ट्री को सुझाव देने है कि उनको क्या क्या करना चाहिए।

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN) : He is also a labour leader.

SHRI M. V. BHADRAM : He is only a private labour leader and is not interested in bonus. Some of the members on the Treasury Benches are not interested in passing the motion today.

SHRI MONORANJAN ROY : I would like to remind my friends on the Treasury Benches of one thing. Even if you sabotage this Bill today, people will not sit down. The workmen have shown what their mood is in Bombay, Gujarat and other places. The textile workers, in spite of agreement by their INTUC union, went on strike. This will go on even if you kill this Bill. I warn them not to sabotage this measure in an indirect manner. Why don't you come and say: "We do not accept this Bill". Let them say so. Let them say : "No bonus should be paid to the workers; no wages should be paid to the workers. Workers have to produce and produce".

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN) : Shri Untoo was speaking. Should I allow him to continue or should we adjourn now?

SHRI M. V. BHADRAM : Only on one condition that we finish this motion and pass it.

SHRIMATI PURABI MUKHOPADHYAY (West Bengal) : It is the privilege of the private members to move non-official Bills on Fridays. We should not curtail that privilege and encroach upon that right of private members to have a full fledged discussion on non-official Bills. Sir, I entirely agree with the Members of the Opposition that on Fridays we should not show any hurry

to go back for other engagements. Let there be a rule that on Fridays we will sit up to the scheduled time, even on the day of the non-official business. For today, I do not know. If it was announced earlier that the House would close at 5 o'clock, we may close today. But let it be a condition that henceforth the private Members' day will not be curtailed or the hours will not be encroached upon, because we want their co-operation also to run the House and when they co-operate with us in running the House we should reciprocate and we should also show our courtesy and the non-official days which are meant for the Private Members should not in any way be curtailed. Thank you, Sir.

THE VICE CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN) : But what about today ?

SHRIMATI PURABI MUKHOPADHYAY : I said for today it is all right.

SHRI AWADHESHWAR PRASAD SINHA (Bihar) : Sir, why don't you decide one way or the other ? We are fed up with the speeches. Please give your ruling.

SHRI M. V. BHADRAM : I entirely agree with the Madam. The time loss is to be compensated. Today we sat up to 1-30; we adjourned at 1-30 and so, half an hour was lost and now these interruptions, etc. mean ten more minutes. So, let us sit, to compensate that half an hour, till 5-45 and complete the Bill.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN) : The whole thing is that if it would have been the position that within half-an-hour we are going to finish the Bill, I might say that. But...

SOME HON. MEMBERS : No.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN) : They are in no mood. There are many speakers. So, in these circumstances, I decide that we adjourn till Monday, the 14th December, 1970.

SOME HON. MEMBERS : Yes, Sir.

The House then adjourned at twelve minutes past five of the clock till eleven of the clock on Monday, the 14th December, 1970.