

और तीन साधु सत—जिन्होंने आज से यह निश्चय किया कि देश में उस आन्दोलन को फिर से शुरू किया जायेगा जिससे देश के अन्दर पूर्ण रूप से शांति हो गयी बन्द कर दी जाय उसी आन्दोलन के सिलसिले में आज यहां पर गिरफ्तार कर लिये गये हैं।

सदन के सम्मानित सदस्यों को इस बात का पता है कि पहले भी जब यह आन्दोलन हुआ था तो उसके बाद न्यायाधीश सरकार के नेतृत्व में एक कमेटी नियुक्त की गई थी। उस कमेटी की आवश्यकता इस बात पर पड़ी कि हिन्दुस्तान के न्यायालयों में हिन्दुस्तान के संविधान की भाषा का विश्लेषण करते समय सम्पूर्ण गो बंश की हत्या के संबंध में कुछ आपत्ति उठाई गई थी, इसलिए यह कमेटी बिठलाई गई थी कि कांस्टीट्यूशन की भाषा या डाइ-रेक्टिव प्रिंसिपल्स में किस प्रकार से परिवर्तन किया जाय जिससे देश की इस भावना की रक्षा की जा सके। सरकार कमेटी द्वारा इसके स्कोप के संबंध में विवाद होने के कारण गो रक्षा अभियान समिति के प्रतिनिधियों ने इस समिति से अपने आपको अलग कर दिया। इस बात को हुए काफी अरसा बीत गया लेकिन सरकार की तरफ से इस हिचक का समाधान करने के लिए...

श्री उपसभापति : आप तो अरेस्ट की बात कह रहे थे।

श्री सुन्दर सिंह भंडारी : मैं उसके कारण बतला रहा हूँ। इस हिचक का समाधान करने के लिए कोई रास्ता नहीं निकाला गया। जिस वजह से वह आन्दोलन बन्द किया गया था वह फिर शुरू हुआ है। मैं आपके माध्यम से सरकार से कहना चाहता हूँ कि इस सवाल पर जिस पर देश की भावनाएँ एक सीमा तक जा सकती हैं, उस पर शीघ्रताशीघ्र ऐसी व्यवस्था करनी चाहिये जिससे इस आन्दोलन को आगे चलाने की आवश्यकता न पड़े।

श्री जगदीश प्रसाद माथुर (राजस्थान)  
इसका क्या हुआ।

श्री उपसभापति : वे देखेंगे।

# THE PAYMENT OF BONUS (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1966

(to amend sections 10, 12, 13 and 32 and to omit sections 11, 15 and the Fourth Schedule and substitution of new section for section 20)—  
contd.

SHRI M. M. DHARIA (Maharashtra): Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, I would like to support the Bill moved by my hon. friend Mr. Chitta Basu. It is a very simple Bill wherein Mr. Chitta Basu has proposed that instead of the present provision which provides for a minimum bonus at four per cent of the salary or wage or Rs. 40 whichever is higher out of the total emoluments for the year one-twelfth should be paid to the employees as bonus for the year. It should be, of course, the minimum bonus. It must be admitted that the Payment of Bonus Act, 1965 was enacted on the recommendations of the Bonus Commission and it should be given a fair trial. However, during the past few years we have witnessed and it is clear beyond doubt that while efforts were being made to give it a fair trial, because of the unfair practices adopted by the industrialists and due to the undue advantage being taken by the factory-owners, the employees\* had not been able to gain anything, except the minimum bonus. They manage by keeping even false or double accounts to show their income and profit at the minimum and according to the present provisions the employee hardly gets Rs. 40. If we take into consideration the present difference between the actual wage and the cost of living—leave aside a living wage—and if the gap has to be narrowed, bonus should be paid to him, not as a matter of grace. It is not any gracious act. It is part of his payment and it is in this background that I would like to support this Bill. However, I wish my friend Mr. Chitta Basu, instead of bringing this sort of small amendment to the Payment of Bonus Act, had taken some more endeavours and more efforts to bring a special code, a new code, in this country so far as our labour affairs are concerned. It is high time for the Government to consolidate the present labour law; and to have a uniform labour code for the whole country.

Mr. Deputy Chairman, if we examine the various laws, what do we find today? Workmen's Compensation Act, an old

[Shri M. M. Dharia]

Act, is there where the compensation prescribed in those old days yet continues. Thereby the employees who are hurt or injured or who lose their lives hardly get adequate compensation under the Workmen's Compensation Act. Let us take the Industrial Disputes Act. The Industrial Disputes Act with all the good desires of the Government has not been able to give a sense of satisfaction and to resolve any disputes between the employers and the employees. If these disputes between the employees and the employers are to be amicably resolved, a new dispute settlement machinery, which can settle the disputes before matters get precipitated, that sort of machinery has become absolutely essential for the time being in this country, because this country cannot afford to have any sort of lockouts or strikes. We shall have to add to our production will all possible speed, and if that is to be done, we shall have to take care that there are no strikes or lockouts and, if there are any disputes whatsoever between the employees and the employers, an effective machinery functions. Unfortunately today there is a lot of delay. The matters go to courts of law, they take years and years, and in some cases the unions have to spend not in thousands but in lakhs. I happen to be President of union in the Hindustan Anti-biotics at Pimpri, and for one matter we had to spend Rs. 1,40,000. It is all right, the union was powerful and they can afford to do it.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN (Andhra Pradesh) : Legal expense?

SHRI M. M. DHARIA : Yes, legal expense. Rs. 1,40,000. I am speaking of my own union where I am the President.

AN HON. MEMBER: Yours is a rich union.

SHRI M. M. DHARIA : Mr. Deputy Chairman, richness comes out of generosity of the employees. It is their strength, it is their generosity, it is their spirit to fight against the reactionary forces that they can create such sort of funds and in this country which is treated to be a poor country. If it can mobilise its own resources from that point of view with that spirit, this country is also a rich country.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: The Chairman or the President has also some say in the matter.

SHRI SUNDAR SINGH BHANDARI (Rajasthan) : He must have contributed something.

SHRI M. M. DHARIA: I was referring to the Industrial Disputes Act. Today there is that simplicity discharger. The employers can discharge any number of employees without giving any reasons whatsoever, and those employees cannot go to any court of law for justice. It is known as simplicity discharger. I am here to demand that this right given to the employers should be immediately taken away. It has done tremendous injustice to the employees all over the country in all possible industries.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN : Temporary labour?

SHRI M. M. DHARIA: No. Permanent labour. It is used even against permanent labour to victimise the leaders of the union. All possible tactics are being played by the employers.

SHRI U. K. LAKSHMANA GOWDA (Mysore) : Just one point. Mr. Dharia said that the employers can discharge any permanent worker. I do not know what he is referring to. But as far as I know unless you go through the investigation and you frame charges against him and then take action- it is not possible. Immediately it will have to go for conciliation. I do not know which particular matter he is referring to.

SHRI M. M. DHARIA: Mr. Deputy Chairman, I need not go into all the provisions, but may I say to my friend that if it is a case of individual discharge, there is nothing like conciliation? The conciliation officers do not treat that matter- Besides in some matters under the new amended Act the employees can go to the court of law, but there again it is restricted under the simplicity discharger provision- I was opposing that provision.

Coming to the unions and recognition^ it was in the year 1957 that the Tripartite Labour Conference had agreed that there should be only one union in one industry, to say I know from the Government what they have been doing to have one union in one industry? Unfortunately the history of trade union movement in this country is not a healthy history. In England it was the unions which were

formed in the beginning and then the political parties came up. But here in this country the political parties organise their own central trade unions by way of political instruments to have strength from the workers to their political parties, and naturally the working classes stand divided because of this sad history of our trade union movement. Therefore, when we have accepted socialist objectives as our aim, it is high time that there should be only one union in one industry, and I would like to request the hon. Labour Minister, who is aware of all these problems to make all possible endeavours so that there is only one union in one industry. The present system of exploiting the trade unions for political purposes has done the greatest possible harm to the working classes, and therefore, we shall have to resolve, "No, we shall not tolerate that sort of exploitation of the working classes" Here the hon. Labour Minister can play an effective role. It is high time for all the central bodies, it may be INTUC, it may be AITUC

SHRI MAHDEVIR TYAGI (Uttar Pradesh) : The Minister is a politician.

SHRI M. M. DHARIA: It is true that the hon. Minister is a politician. Mr. Tyagi is also a politician. But there are politicians whose integrity cannot be challenged. I am glad that is the only ray of hope. Otherwise there are also politicians whose integrity can be challenged any moment.

SHRI SUNIL VAR SINGH BHANDARI: You have 100 president of a union.

SHRI M. M. DHARIA: Thank you for the compliment. Mr. Deputy Chairman, my submission to the INTUC, to the AITUC, to the Hind Mazdoor Sabha, to the Hind Mazdoor Panchayat, to those who believe in democracy, who believe in socialism, who are having a progressive approach, is why should they not take into consideration the changed context in the country? If they properly take into consideration the changed context in the country, they should try to come closer, and if possible there should be an endeavour to merge these central organisations which are national, which are progressive and which believe in democratic principles and which are out to have the establishment of a socialist state

in our country. It is now a challenge to the hon. Labour Minister who is also having a progressive approach towards these matters. What is going to be done? Are we going to continue in the same way? I am really sorry that since our Bombay resolution at least so far as the working classes are concerned, I have not seen any effort on the part of my own Government to see that the working classes are not only mobilised but their strength is channelised for a new reconstruction of the country, that their energies are utilised for the creation of a new society and a new order, and it is in this direction that a great role could be played by the hon. Labour Minister.

What about other Acts? What do we, find? So far as the Factories Act is concerned ...

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: This is the Bonus Act.

SHRI M. M. DHARIA: I am submitting that this Payment of Bonus Act is absolutely meaningless. What this country needs today is a uniform labour code. I am absolutely consistent in my speech. Without that it will not be possible for this country to satisfy the legitimate demands of the employees and to solve the matters which are agitating the trade unionists and also the politicians in this country.

In case you refer to the Factories Act this House will be surprised to know that there are factories, Government-owned where the simple provisions of the Factories Act are not made applicable. Even drinking water, which is an obligation under that Act, is not made available to the employees. I can quote one instance under the Industrial Disputes Act. In Poona, we are having our ammunition factory which employs fifteen thousand people. And I would like to bring to the notice of the hon. Labour Minister that during the last 15 years, a Works Committee under the Industrial Disputes Act could not be constituted because of some differences, and the matter has gone to a court of law. There is no Works Committee. We are at one end saying that there shall be more and more participation of the employees in the management and this Works Committee which is also a part in that process could not be constituted for the last 13 years, and the Government •

[Shri M. M. Dharia]

is just helpless. When there are these lacunae in that Act, is it not necessary that we should modify it?

It is in this background that I would like to appeal to the Government that it should have an integrated labour code, a progressive labour code, for the whole country, where the labourers should feel, yes, they belong to this country, the factory belongs to them, the country belongs to them; at the same time, production in the country should not be hampered—Those guarantees to the employers or the industrialists shall also have to be given. At the same time the employers shall have to be told also that there cannot be any lockouts in this country, that this country cannot afford to have them. This is the constructive approach and if this is to be implemented, without a good, uniform labour code, it is not possible. Therefore, I make a demand today for such a progressive Central labour code from the Government, and I hope that the hon. Labour Minister would look into it.

I am thankful to Mr. Ghitta Basu for bringing forward this and at the same time giving me an opportunity to express my views on the present labour conditions in the country. If proper remedies are not provided immediately, I feel that there will also be the victims of Naxalite activities. It is not only a law and order problem but also a socio-economic problem. And it is in that context that I look at this Bill, and I shall welcome a Central unified labour code from the hon. Labour Minister.

SHRI THILLAI VILLALAN (Tamil Nadu) : Mr. Deputy Chairman, I rise to support the Payment of Bonus (Amendment) Bill moved by my hon. friend, Mr. Chitta Basu. While doing so, I wish to make certain observations regarding the provisions of the amending Bill.

I entirely agree with the suggestion made by my hon. friend, Mr. Dharia, when he says that a unified and all-comprehensive labour code is necessary. But here I want to confine myself only to the Payment of Bonus (Amendment) Bill which seeks to amend the parent Act regarding the quantum of bonus.

Before considering the amending provision, the whole concept of wage is to be considered by the Members of this

House. When we consider the concept of wage, we can see that it has been changed from time to time, from country to country. Even in capitalist countries like the U. S. A. the concept has now been changed. Once they said that employees would give production according to the wages given. Now they have changed the concept itself and they say, give more wages; you can get more production. In our country also, the concept should be changed. By way of giving wages we are producing the wealth of this country. When we take up the question of bonus, we can see that the actual wages and the living wages are different. When the actual wage is lower than the living wage, if there is a difference between the two wages then the bonus given to the employee takes the character of a supplementary or additional wage because he cannot live within the actual wage given to him, he has to get a supplementary wage in the form of a bonus. When the actual wage and the living wage are one and the same, then the bonus given to the labourer will take another character, that is profit-sharing in the industry in which he is employed.

In the parent Act, we can see two sections, section 10 and section II. The minimum bonus has been fixed by section 10 and the maximum bonus by section II. By this amending Bill, an attempt is made to change the quantum of prescribed in the parent Act. The parent Act fixes 4 per cent as the minimum; by virtue of the amending provision the employee will get one month's salary as his bonus. By the second amendment to section II the amending Bill seeks to abolish the provision for fixing the maximum bonus.

Then, this amending Bill wants this provision to be applied to all the public sector undertakings. My submission would be that the bonus now claimed by the amending provision is very reasonable. It should be accepted. Unless and until at least a month's salary is given to an employee, he cannot meet his reasonable expenses of his family in a year. So my first submission would be that the quantum now claimed is very reasonable and it should be accepted.

So far as the maximum is concerned there are provisions fixing the maximum percentage as 60, 40 and other percentages in the parent Act itself. So there is

no necessity for fixing the maximum bonus by section i in the parent Act. So, it should be deleted.

My third sub-n ission would be that the public sector uil e takings must set an example to the >ther industries in the private sector- the Government should set an example. Therefore, these provisions should be aj plicable to all the industries in the public sector undertakings also.

3 P. M.

Therefore, Si my lion, friend, Mr. China Basu, h is brought this amending Bill at a prope time and in a proper manner. So I su port this Bill.

SHRI ARJU: .AR.ORA (Uttar Pradesh) : Mr. >.puty Chairman, Sir, I rise to support the Bill and I urge upon the Labour Mil ister with all the emphasis at my comm nd that he should accept this Bill, and tl us do away with some of the patent misi ikes in the Payment of Bonus Act, 1966;

Sir, this Bill hould have been brought by the Govemi tent itself long ago. As, you know, this . ct for the first time fixed a minimum rat. of bonus. Unfortunately, the fixing of a ainimum has a very dangerous implicat on. The minimum becomes the ma> imum. The Government fixed the minin urn at four per cent. The experience of tl : last five years is that in most industrie of the country this four per cent has b< oine the maximum. Industries on the r own did not pay anything more tha l four per cent. Sir, the Payment of Bon is Act provides that where there are profit , and where the workers feel that a bon ts of more than four per cent is justified, the formula of the Labour Appellate Tri »unal as approved by the Supreme Cour will apply. This means that wherever and whenever there are profits in indu try and a bonus of more than four per o nt is justified, the workers have to go in i >r a lengthy adjudication. And this lengthy adjudication was one thing which th introduction of a law relating to bonus sought to do away with. So, if we have o avoid lengthy adjudication with the ( rraging of the proceedings before the indut :rial tribunals, High Courts and the Suprei ie Court, a reasonable minimum must t : fixed, and four per cent is not a reasor ible minimum. As far as the maximum is concerned, the law lays town a limit o 20 per cent. Sir, a bonus

of more than the legal li<sup>mi</sup>, of four cent is justified only on the g<sup>round</sup>S<sup>p</sup>\*f extraordinary profits by the fed \*\* %/f an industry makes extraordinary TofiJ why should there be a limit of £ J?l cent bonus? Let the workers share f<sup>he</sup> gams of productivity. Let the workers share the gams of prosperity of theindus try. Let the workers share the fruits of their own endeavour, their own labour, without which no industry ca<sup>n</sup> make tiro-fits. Why should there be a limit of 20 per cent as the maximum bonus ?

Sir, in this country to-day it has become very fashionable to deliver sermons to workers to produce more, to work harder,' to increase their productivity ancj thus help the economy of the countrv. But if we really want the workers to produce more, if we really want the workers to work harder and if we really want the workers to increase their productivity, there should be some method of affording the workers a reasonable share in the gains of their own labour.

SHRI MAHAVIR TYAGI : Or incentive.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA: Well, bonus is also an incentive. Profit bonus is an incentive. The word "incentive" is go<sup>od</sup> the word "bonus" is better. But profit bonus is also an incentive. So why should there be a limitation? As Mr. China Basu has very correctly pointed out in the Statement of Objects and Reasons of the Bill, a much higher bonus than 20<sup>per</sup> cent was the rule in many industries. For example, the oil distribution companies Burmah-Shell, Caltex and ESSO, used' to give five montlis' wages as bonus. In the electric supply undertakings of U.P., there were instances when five months' wages were given as bonus because the profits of the industry justified it. Now even if there are profits, workers cannot get more than 20 per cent. So the maximum limit is unreasonable, uncalled for and a disincentive for hard Work. But, as I was submitting earlier, the fact is that the minimum has become the maximum. The employers in the country are short-sighted and they give only the legal minimum and ask the workers to do their worst to get more- The result is that workers have to go in for adjudication and adjudication means that workers who have , no access to the account books of the company have to prove in a court of law

[Shri Arjun Arora]

that the profits of the industry are much higher than what the industry declares or admits. So in many cases because of lack of resources, because of lack of expertise in trade unions, the workers are not able to get their reasonable share in profits.

Sir there was a time when in this country bonus was considered by the employers, and even by some orthodox type of judges, as an ex-gratia payment. Those days are gone. Today bonus is recognised as a right. Even before the enactment of the Payment of Bonus Act, 1965, by virtue of a number of awards confirmed by the High Courts and the Supreme Court the workers' claim to bonus as a right was legally established in this country. That was a big gain. Of course, then there was no law and there was no minimum bonus. But, Sir, during the 30 years that preceded the enactment of this legislation, there were hardly any instances when as a result of adjudication, as a result of strikes, as a result of workers organised struggle, the workers won only four per cent bonus. Either they did not win bonus or they won a sufficient bonus. So, this minimum limit of bonus has curtailed the rate of bonus, most as the maximum limit of bonus has curtailed the limit of maximum bonus. Both need to be revised as is being sought to be done under this Bill.

Then, Sir, there is the basic question of the public sector. The public sector is intended to be a model employer and if the public sector is supposed to be a model employer, it should be a model in the payment of emoluments to the workers. Sir the Law Courts have held that bonus is an effort to bridge the gap between the existing level of wages and the fair wages. Nowhere in the country are the workers being paid the fair wages.

In 1948, the Government of India set up a Committee on Fair Wages. That Committee did not consist of revolutionaries. That Committee consisted of employers, some representatives of organised labour and some economists and experts. The fair wages as defined in 1948 are now where available to the workers in the country to-day. So, there is a big gap between the well-defined fair wage and the existing level of wages. Bonus is an attempt to fill that gap. Why should that

I attempt be not made in the Public Sector which is claimed to be trying to become a model employer? The whole concept of bonus, the concept of profit-sharing bonus, must be applicable to Public Sector, even to industrial undertakings where they are run departmentally.

Sir, Mr. Tyagi mentioned the word 'incentive'. Bonus is the real incentive because bonus depends on the profitability of an undertaking. The workers in the country to-day do realise that profits are not grown on trees. Monsoon does not bring profits. Profits are born on account of hard and disciplined work of the workers. Only if the workers have a guarantee of a fair share of the profits as bonus, they will work harder and bonus will act as an incentive.

Just now what is the position? 4% is the legal minimum which is paid to the workers. Even in the case of profits in industry, the rise depends upon the Courts, upon the ability of the Trade Union leaders, upon the ability of their vakils, pleaders. Unless the Trade Union is able to have access to the documents, unless the Trade Union is able to argue with the case properly, in spite of hard work the workers do not get any bonus more than the minimum bonus. That must be done away with.

With these words, Sir, I support the Bill of Mr. Chitta Basu and I hope the Government will accept it. ~Thank you

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA (West Bengal) : Mr. Deputy Chairman, I rise to support this Bill. I am very grateful to the Hon. Mr. Chitta Basu for having brought it before the House. But I am not sure what is going to be the fate of the Bill. I think I am sure, but still I put it like this because there is a trend, the thinking of the Labour Department and of the Government that it is enough.

Now-a-days they speak nicely to the workers; sometimes even address the demonstrations. But when it comes to the meeting of their demands, whether in bonus or dearness allowance or in wages, the Government gives them a complete blank cheque. That is what is happening in the country.

Let us see with regard to the appointment of the Pay Commission. They have appointed the Pay Commission, but at

the same time, they have not provided for an interim relief on the basis of the need based minimum wage which is the common demand, in fact the national demand of the working people of our country. Generally the Government does not encourage, much less help the cause of wage rise in the country. Only when the workers, employees and others launch mass struggles and mass agitation, Government is forced to partially concede some of their demands and in the same way the employers in the private sector are also compelled to concede partially the demands of the working people.

It goes to the credit of our workers and employees in the country that not only they have resisted heroically the offensive attitude of the monopolists and others and those in authority, but in some cases they have forced the employers to concede a wage rise, sometimes not quite unsubstantial. Only recently the workers of Engineering, Jute Industries in West Bengal, for example, forced the authorities and the employers to give a wage rise. Last year, actually, the Jamshedpur workers 40,000 of them—engineering workers—conducted a heroic strike and succeeded in wresting from the employers a wage rise between Rs 30 and Rs. 40. That is how they have gained. But at every step they have to fight. At every step they have to conduct militant mass struggle, sometimes general strikes and so on!

You will remember, the Bonus Commission was appointed several years ago in the background of national working class action for increase in their wages and for claiming bonus not as an ex-gratia payment but something due to the workers as a matter of right and in this background and all those struggles the Bonus Commission was appointed. It went into this question, [the Commission included representatives of the working class and the trade union movement just as it had the representatives of the employers apart from the Government. It was a tripartite arrangement and the decision was given, award was given or conclusions were given and except that Mr. Dandekar, representing the employers, who dissented, all others agreed. But for him the decision would have been unanimous. But when it came to Parliament, at that time my friend Shri Mishra, was on the other side and I believe he was a Minister also. I

Government what the Government  
Shri Abdul Ghani Dhar was asked when  
you woke him up. They  
Those are the AS'ES'SSL  
old ones and not the new ones. They  
on that side. You will remember  
Government rejected the suggestion  
on his question of the bonus. The  
Majority decision, in fact the decision of the  
the Committee or the Committee.

rejected in preference to SKKSJ" only one Member of the Committee suggested. My friends there, all of them voted for Mr. Dandekar, that is to say for modification of the proposals of Bonus Commission in the light of the suggestion of Mr. Dandekar. At that time was not a Member of Parliament. He as a representative of his business and he did not make any bone about it. His suggestion was accepted. The Committee of the Bonus Commission of Mr. Dandekar's formula, and we wanted that the majority formula should be accepted. But the Government did not do so. That only shows the anti-labour mentality of the Congress Government of that time. If they were at all fair, they would have accepted the majority recommendation of the Bonus Commission instead of accepting the suggestion of Mr. Dandekar. But, Mr. Dandekar was not really the man who influenced the Government at that time. Mr Dandekar was a proxy, a decoy of the employing class put on the Bonus Commission.

It was the Birlas, the Tatas, Naval Tata and the like who brought pressure to bear upon the Government, and the Government meekly submitted to the pressure of the capitalist class, specially the monopolist class, and accepted the recommendation or the dissenting proposal of Mr Dandekar. And that is how the Bonus Act got modified in the light of Mr. Dandekar's thinking, which, in fact, was the directive of the big capitalist people. That is how it happened. This is the attitude of the Government in many matters even now. Now Mr. Sanjivayya has come, and I would advise him that the first thing for him in the Labour Ministry today is to disengage himself from the ideas and ways of his predecessors, who had been running the Department basically on anti-labour lines on many matters. Now you will see as to what he says on this Bill.

[Sfari Bupesh Gupta]'

Why should there be a restriction on the maximum? The maximum can be given on a firm's profits, if the firm is in a position to give. The workers should be entitled to get more than 20 per cent. Why should there be a ceiling on them? Whenever a demand from the worker comes, you put a ceiling so that he cannot take more. Even when the employers are in a position to give more, you put a statutory ban on getting more than 20 per cent, and at the bottom of the gain, you fix the minimum in such a manner that the gets the lowest. This is the position.

What happens to the privy purses? You will see that on the 18th of this month, the Bill is going to be introduced in the other House for the abolition of privy purses and special privileges. According to my opinion, the Bill is going to provide heavy compensation for the Princes. It is a heavy compensation. They must be given the maximum possible accommodation! Even when you take away something to which they are not entitled, you must provide them with money in the shape of compensation. When it comes to the workers and employees, when you appoint the Pay Commission, you do not provide or interim relief for the Government employees. And when it comes to bonus, you find that the workers are not in a position to get even the minimum that is due to them- I think this is a preposterous approach to the labour problem.

Incentive to workers is not something about which the Government is particularly concerned. The industrial production can be stepped up by providing what they call the incentive to the employers by way of export subsidies, tax relief, rebate and various other forms of compensation. In the Union Budget presented by Prime Minister Indira Gandhi, there was no increase in the corporation tax at all in the name of incentive. And speaking at a meeting, Smt. Indira Gandhi told the audience that the employers, the capitalist class had received her Budget very well. Of course, they would receive well because after the bank nationalisation they were afraid that there would be more taxes on companies and higher rates of tax on co'-po>'At'on. When they found that nothing of the kind had come about, naturally, they were happy. And the Stock Exchanges in our country welcomed the Budget proposals of the Prime Minister

with 6 to 7 per cent rise in equities. That is how it was done. Here again, we see the same picture in many matters. Therefore, I say that the Government's policy must be clear. Incentive to the workers is much more important. Increased production is something which leads to the immediate improvement in the living conditions of our working people. The workers cannot live on homilies and big lectures from the hon. Ministers. They want clothing. They want housing-They want bread. They want medical facilities and certain other amenities of life. Unless the wages arise, specially When the prices are rising, how are the workers going to make both ends meet? On the one hand, the Government pursues an economic policy which is infla-tionery. To day the prices rose by 6J per cent, compared to the prices in March last year. After the Budget, there has been an upward swing of prices. If such is the position and every Plan indicates 30 to 40 per cent rise in prices in five years, it stands to reason that the workers should be given better wages, living wages and more wages so that they can at least keep themselves abreast of the spiral in in the prices. But that is not done. So, I say that from the point of view of (he incentive and from the point of view of social justice, it is of the utmost importance that the proposals made in this Bill are accepted by the Government. But what to speak of this Government? Do you know what is happening?

Some Central Government employees are being prosecuted in Kerala in connection with the one-day token strike of 1968. Now, the Kerala Government decided to withdraw the cases. The Central Government passed instructions to the authorities there in Kerala to contest the withdrawal petition of the Kerala Government. The Kerala Government was not allowed to withdraw the cases against the employees in connection with the strike because the Central Government wanted them to be prosecuted. Some of the employees are even now under prosecution. I understand that something is happening in certain other States as well. The Central Government has removed the suspension orders on so many as a result of the pressure of the working people and the public opinion. But they are not withdrawing the cases against these employees who had been prosecuted. That shows the men-tatity of the Central Government. And I would ask the Labour Minister to take personal interest in this matter and see that the cases arising out of the Central



Government employees' token strike are withdrawn, whether in Kerala or any part of the country I mentioned this only to emphasise the attitude of the Government in regard to labour and Wage Board matters.

The suggestions that have been made now are well known and I need not repeat them. But they should be accepted. Mr. Sanjivayya should himself sponsor a Bill. Nowadays, since you expect us to support or not; of your kind; and without our support you cannot pass them, you should also similarly support some of our Bills. There should be *quid pro quo* in such matters. The traffic should be both ways. We would not, of course, support any of your bad Bills and I would not expect any of our bad Bills to be supported by you. But this is not a bad Bill. This is a Bill in conformity with you (i.e. separations, in conformity with what everybody wants in this country irrespective of party affiliations. This is a Bill which has been supported by the INTUC which has been your pocket organisation in this country in many ways. So, there should not be any difficulty in accepting this Bill.

Mr. Deputy Chairman, here I must point out in contrast the attitude of the Government towards its employers. Everytime they give concessions to them. Everytime they meet their demands. Everybody knows that the entire policy of decontrol has been revised with a view to helping the employers to make more profits. They are always offered incentives to earn extra profits and sometimes the profit is so extortionate in a way and so abnormal and unjust that no sensible Government should support it. At least the Government should denounce it. But that is not being done. As you know most of the workers work under big employers. If you take into account the 75 families named in the Monopolies Inquiry Commission's report, they account not only for Rs. 2,226 crores of industrial wealth and more on, but they also account for a very large number of workers in the country, and many of those workers are well organised into trade unions and so on.

Is it not the duty of the Government that when those 75 families' accumulations of wealth are rising larger and larger year after year, when the Tatas and the Birlas have increased their assets even after the Monopolies Inquiry Commission's findings from Rs 700 odd crores to Rs. 1,300 odd

crores, to enforce and see that a part of it at least is shared in an equitable manner with the workers? It is not a generosity to be shown to the workers by the employers. Every single paise of profit which the capitalist class pockets comes from the sweat and toil of the working class and it is being expropriated by the exploiting capitalist class. Therefore, it is not something which the capitalist class is giving away from its own funds. Really speaking, it is only a question of preventing the capitalist class from pocketing such a huge quantum of surplus value by exploiting the labour; it is only a question of forcing the capitalist class to part with a small portion— or a little portion— of that profit to the workers. The question of generosity does not arise at all. We cannot talk about social justice and economic equilibrium unless we see that this is done. We talk about the removal or reduction of disparities in income. At the same time, the more we talk about the reduction of disparities in income, the more we find that the disparities are widening. The disparities are in fact widening more and more every year. . .

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Mr. Bhupesh Gupta, we should try to remove the disparity in the time taken by honourable Members also.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : What is the disparity there? So now you have spoken in line with the Congress Government in this thing. They talk about philosophy. . .

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Other honourable Members also should get some time.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : So I will finish now. I am very glad you have said it. Similarly, I would ask other Members also to be a little considerate to the workers. I follow you in this matter.

Now, the disparity in incomes is widening. Why? Why is it widening? It is widening because maldistribution of wealth is taking place. The national output or the national wealth is being more and more unevenly distributed between two components, between the creators of wealth and those who enjoy the fruits of labour of others, that is to say, between the employees and the employers, the workers and their employers. Those who create the wealth, the people whose labour creates the wealth, they're denied

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta]

a larger share in the total national output the percentage of their share is declining whereas the share of those who live on the sweat of the labour, who exploit the labour, is increasing. Therefore we come to a situation where even in the background of industrial economy, we see such yawning disparities in income. I say you should stop this thing before you talk about the removal or reduction of disparities in income. Fourteen years ago, when the Second Plan was announced this was named as one of the four principal objectives of our planning—the reduction of the disparities in income. But in practice what has happened is exactly opposite. The income disparities have grown. The rich have become richer and the poor poorer. Social imbalances have grown in the country beyond the worst apprehensions of many people sixteen years ago. We want to put a stop to it. Hence I would appeal to the honourable Minister, Mr. Sanjivayya, to accept our suggestions.

One more word. This Bonus Act should be extended to the public sector also. At the moment it does not apply to the public sector to the departmental undertaking of the Government. Why should it be so? They are also working people. Simply because you own the steel-mill or own the transport system, you say the Bonus Act should not apply there. This is very very unfair . . .

SHRI BALKRISHNA GUPTA (Bihar) : But are there any profits in the public sector to give bonus.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : This is a matter which we can discuss, but there are profits in some. But the rule is this that the Act does not apply to them at the moment. First of all, make it applicable to them. And then you see whether you can get any bonus or not. Yes, the public sector is also contributing to the Central Revenues from various sources. So why should it not apply? If there are workers there they should also get bonus. Why should it not apply there? The public sector is being treated again to the disadvantage of the working people. You have got the Suratgarh farm. It is a complete failure and it is in a mess. And have put some military man there, some Major or Lt. Colonel. God knows from where all those military men come. You have put some Maharaja from somewhere as its chairman. The fellow has not attended a single meeting of the Suratgarh

farm. Therefore, this is the position. They put such people who have nothing to do with the working class, who do not understand the problems of the undertaking who are anti-labour. I should like Mr. Raghunatha Reddy to tell the House as to how many of these ICS, IAS, and other officials of that type and how many sons and daughters and other relatives of the big business people, have been placed in the various public sector undertakings of the country. The public sector undertakings have become a shelter, a sort of refuge, for all the discarded ICS, IAS and other officials of that type, for the henchmen of the capitalist and the monopolist classes. . .

SHRI BALKRISHNA GUPTA : For discarded politicians too.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : Yes, for discarded politicians too. Some of them are the defeated Congress politicians. They have found their places in the public sector undertakings. That is the reason why they had a quarrel with the Swatantra Party. The Swatantra Party does not get enough there. Why only the Swatantra Party? The Syndicate also. That is one of the reasons why the Syndicate has gone away. They wanted more of such people to be placed in the public sector. Perhaps they wanted the Indian industrial public sector to be headed by a super manager of the Dodsia Company, Mr. Kantilal Desai. Anyway, that is a different matter and let us not go into that. But only ask Mr. Rajnarain, your friend, not to support them. I agree with you there. So, this is the position. I should say that this Bill should put a stop to that. It should be extended to the public sector undertakings also. You are losing money there in any case by putting such rotten people, such anti-working class people. I ask the House to demand to the Government to produce a list of all the management personnel in the public sector. And you will see what a horrid picture it makes. You will find people unsuited to be placed in such positions have been placed in large numbers. When you have such people manning the public sector, you lose on both counts --- you lose on account of revenue, you do not earn money, they run at a loss and human values also and in the name of social justice also you lose because they take an anti-working class, anti employee line and produce the example of which we have in many places including in my State at Durgapur. Thank you.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA : With your permission, Sir. I wish to move an amendment.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : To some clause?

SHRI ARJUN ARORA : To the motion. My amendment

"That the Bill be circulated for the purpose of eliciting public opinion on the Bill by the end of October 1970."

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Do you want to move it at this late stage?

SHRI ARJUN ARORA : I am moving at this late stage. I could have moved it earlier but I wanted to know the feeling of the House on the Bill. The Bill has won widespread support in the House

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : I support it fully.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA : Therefore it is only proper that the opinion of those who matter in the country may also be elicited. As you know, in labour matters, the Government has a procedure and a machinery for consultation. It is called the tripartite machinery. Almost everything that the Government does about labour is done in consultation. So the trade unions in the country are interested in this Bill. Their opinion must be available to the House and also the opinions of the employers, which are bad, which also be made available and let the issue be discussed and considered in the country before this House adopts it or does not adopt it. So I move this amendment. I am sorry for moving it at a late stage but as I submit to the sense of the House had to be ascertained. The fact that the Bill has won widespread support encourages me to move this amendment.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : I would like to know what Mr. Sanjivayya has to say. I would appeal to him to give his reaction. We will record our speeches. Let him say what he wants to say.

THE MINISTER OF LABOUR AND REHABILITATION (SHRI D. SANJIVAYYA) : I welcome the suggestion.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : Very good. Let it be circulated.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Is it the general feeling of the House that there should be no objection for Mr. Arora to move an amendment even though it is a bit late?

HON. MEMBERS : Yes.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : In view of the widespread support from all parts of the House----- I should say it is unanimous support—I think there should be no objection in allowing Mr. Arora to move the amendment. Therefore I allow him to move the amendment at this stage.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA : Sir, I move the amendment.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : I support it. Mr. Basu should say that he is accepting it.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA : That he will do when he replies.

*The question was proposed.*

SHRI U. K. LAKSHMANA GOWDA : I rise to offer my comments on this Bill. At the outset I would say that certain provisions in Mr. Basu's Bill I support and the others I do not. To start with, as he has explained while moving the Bill on the 20th of March, the history of the Bonus Act coming into force was this. For many many years there was agitation by the workers for a bonus and this used to be a sort of a dispute in almost every industry in the country and this particularly took a very grave turn during the last war and bonus became more or less a sort of a deferred wage at that time. The introduction of the Bonus Act and the passing of it has tried to resolve to a considerable extent the industrial disputes in the various parts of the country which were arising out of the disputes on unit-wise bonus. This Act has been in force for a short duration and I agree with Mr. Dharwadkar that this could be tried for a few more years after applying it "to certain other sectors to which it is not applied."

On the Bill itself I have to offer my comments. Mr. Basu has proposed the deletion of sections 10 and 11 which related to the minimum and maximum bonus. As it is well known, after the recommendations of the Bonus Commission and even after a Dissenting Note was given by one member—that Dissenting Note never covered the minimum and maximum bonus, it mainly related to the available surplus and particularly with reference to the allowable interest on the working capital and the reserves so far as the minimum and maximum bonuses were concerned. 4% minimum was fixed •

[Shri U. K. Lakshmana Gowda]

and 20% was put as the ceiling. If it is the idea that the maximum should be removed there is not justification for us to say that the minimum should remain.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA : It should be increased.

SHRI U. K. LAKSHMANA GOWDA :  
If bonus is to be paid mainly according to the profits, then.

SHRI CHITTA BASU (West Bengal) :  
That is a wrong conception.

SHRI U. K. LAKSHMANA GOWDA: If that is the attitude, then it should be a bonus which is directly related to the profits and there is no question of keeping a minimum bonus at all. The people who make higher profits, let them pay more than 20% but about those making losses, are we justified in saying that they must pay the minimum bonus? So, why the Bonus Commission recommended this and even the trade union representatives on that accepted the concept of minimum and maximum was, if in a year a particular industry did not make a profit, even then it paid 4%. No doubt I do agree they paid the minimum but the year in which they made more than 20% they paid only up to 20% and kept the balance as a set-on so that if they made a loss next year they could use it. "This should be allowed to continue in the case of the continuation of those undertakings. Since it says 4 % or Rs. 40 whichever is higher and when the wages increase, naturally the quantum should be more than Rs. 40. I do agree that in certain sections of the industry the workers' wages may be so low that the minimum does not come to Rs. 40 and so Rs. 40 is fixed but with the current level of wages, I do not think there will be any industry which pay less than Rs. 40.

[THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR AU KHAN) in the chair]

My own personal view is, apart from bonus there should be a rational fixation of wages. Can we do away with these disputes about bonus of the wages are properly fixed: that is the angle which we should take, and not just continuing this sort of bonus due to which we have industrial disputes every where. I do agree that the wages are low. that they are

not proper wages. We may consider bonus as deferred wage but what do we see? When the wages increased progressively and you reach a certain stage, do you mean to say that the same percentage of bonus should continue? Actually this bonus came into existence during the time of the war. When the wages were very low and when profits were high the Workers were given a share and I am very happy that that system come about.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA : During the first war.

SHRI U. K. LAKSHMANA GOWDA :  
Yes, during the first war it came up.

Mr. Chitta Basu referred to section 20, that is the exemption which relates to public sector undertakings. As Mr. Arjun Arora has very pertinently said. Government being a model employer, should see that bonus is paid by the public sector undertaking\* as well. If you give an excuse that since they are not making a profit they cannot pay bonus the same excuse will hold good in the case of the private sector where they have not made any profit but who have been asked to pay a bonus of 4 per cent. So I would support this proposal where it is said that it should cover the public sector undertaking; as well.

I would like to refer to section 34(3) in the existing Act which relates to agreements being arrived at between the employers and the workers in a particular establishment. The Act provides that such any agreement or understanding is possible bilaterally provided it is under a formula. Section 34(3) reads :

"Nothing contained in this Act shall be construed to preclude employees employed in any establishment or class of establishment from entering into agreement with their employer for granting them an amount of bonus under a formula which is different from that under this Act."

That means if any agreement has to be arrived at it has got to be in the form of a formula. I would like to suggest a change here because in certain industries, particularly the plantation industries with which I have had something to do we have always had bilateral settlement even after the Bonus Act came into existence. In such industries like plantation industries the payment of bonus unitwise has often led to industrial disputes. Being

backward labour, when workers of one unit see that workers in another unit which might be more prosperous are getting more bonus, it has always resulted in heartburning and there have been unending series of troubles because of that. This is a point very well understood in the south in the plantation industries where they have been having bilateral negotiations and a settlement about bonus payment even after the Bonus Act came into existence. Such bilateral settlements have been there in Mysore, Madras and I think in Kerala also. So this provision that such an agreement should be under a formula should be deleted because if it is another formula different from that in the Bonus Act it becomes difficult to do that for one year, it has to be a formula which will over a period of years. If the workers and employers of a certain unit or of a certain industry as such as in the case of plantation industry where the association representing the employers and the trade union representing the employees sit together and come to a settlement about the bonus why should the Act come in the way? In such case it has always been seen that the settlement was never less than the minimum bonus which has been provided in the Act. This is a matter which I would like Mr. Chittabasu to give consideration to and since this Bill is being sent for eliciting public opinion, hope this matter will also be taken up by the different sections who are adopting this method of settlement on an industry-wise basis rather than on a unitwise basis.

Again in section 32 of the Principal Act Mr. Chittabasu has suggested a deletion. I think that refers to the public sector people. I certainly agree that this should be omitted and I support him in that.

SHRI CHITTABASU : That is consequential.

SHRI U. K. LAKSHMANA GOWDA:  
Yes, it is consequential.

Now, certain references were made by my friend Mr. Mohan Dharia and Mr. Arjun Arora as well about the general labour laws situation in the country. I certainly agree that a comprehensive labour law covering the different industries is welcome because there are so many different legislations that it has become very difficult from the angle of the

6—30 R.S./70

trade unions and also of the employers to implement them properly and the implementation is also delayed.

Sir, reference was made to the idea of one union for one industry. I strongly support this. This has been discussed in the Indian Labour Conference and also in the Working Group of the National Commission on Labour. While on this I would like to say that the representative union should be elected by a secret ballot of the entire membership of an establishment. If that is not done and if the principle of one union for one industry is not accepted we are not going to solve either the problem of bonus or the inter-union rivalries which are resulting in such a lot of industrial unrest these days causing loss of production and unending series of troubles in the labour field and also extending to the political field. So it is a very good idea and I fully support that.

So far as codification of different law and having a comprehensive legislation is concerned I would like to mention here that so far as plantations are concerned we have a Plantations Labour Act which covers almost every aspect of labour legislation in the plantations. Still it is covered under the Minimum Wages Act, the Workmen's Compensation Act, the Payment of Wages Act and so many other Acts. In this respect I would strongly urge that if you have a single legislation like the Plantation Labour Act to cover all types of industries it will certainly do away with a lot of unnecessary trouble in dealing with these labour matters.

Sir, now on the motion of Mr. Arjun Arora it has been decided and the House has approved that the Bill will be sent out for eliciting public opinion.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA : Not yet approved.

SHRI U. K. LAKSHMANA GOWDA:  
Anyway, he has moved the motion for that. I would also like to extend my support to that motion so that this Bill, which is a very important Bill covering different fields of industry in the country, is circulated and public opinion elicited on it, and I hope it will receive wide consideration from the public.

Thank you.

4 P.M.

श्री शीलमद्र याजी (बिहार) : माननीय वाइस चेयरमैन महोदय, मैं कामरेड चित्त बासु का जो विधेयक है उसकी तारीफ करते हुए साथी अर्जुन अरोड़ा जी ने जो तरमीम रखी है कि इसको पब्लिक ओपीनियन जानने के लिए, जनता की राय जानने के लिए भेजा जाय, उसकी तारीफ करता हूँ। चूँकि यह मत-संग्रह के लिए जा रहा है, इसलिए इसके जितने क्लोजेज हैं उन पर अभी विवाद करने की आवश्यकता नहीं है, लेकिन एक बात के लिए मैं कामरेड चित्त बासु को धन्यवाद देता हूँ कि उन्होंने हमारी सरकार का, हमारी पार्टी का, जिसका समाजवाद लक्ष्य है, ध्यान आकर्षित किया है कि जब हम जो प्राइवेट सेक्टर हैं, उस में बोनस देते हैं और जो हम समाजवाद की बात करते हैं और स्थापित करना चाहते हैं तो उससे श्रमजीवी लोग जो हैं, मेहनत करने वाले जो लोग हैं, उन को उससे महकूम रखते हैं तो यह कोई अच्छी बात नहीं है और खास कर इस सरकार के लिए। इसलिए इस सदन में और बाहर भी बराबर मैं इस चीज की तरफ सरकार का ध्यान आकर्षित करता रहता हूँ। सरकार को कम से कम जितने प्राइवेट सेक्टर वाले हैं जैसे टाटा, बिरला और साहू जैन हैं, उन के सामने एक आदर्श उपस्थित करना चाहिए खास कर के रेलवे में क्योंकि वह एक बहुत बड़ी इंडस्ट्री है। तो पब्लिक सेक्टर में चाहे वह रेलवे हो या कोई और, जब हम प्लानिंग के आधार पर समाजवाद लाना चाहते हैं और अब तो सिर्फ पब्लिक सेक्टर ही सब जगह है और उसी के जरिये से हम हिन्दुस्तान में उन्नति करना चाहते हैं और इंडस्ट्री को लगाना चाहते हैं, तो सरकार के लिए, जो समाजवाद की स्थापना के लिए कृतसंकल्प है, यह लाजमी हो जाता है कि वह और भी जो श्रमजीवी लोग पब्लिक सेक्टर में हैं उन को भी बोनस दे।

हम लोग भी ट्रेड यूनियन मूवमेंट में 30-40 वर्ष से काम करते हैं और हम लड़ कर, झगड़ कर, जो प्राइवेट सेक्टर के लोग हैं उन से ज्यादा से ज्यादा बोनस लेते थे, लेकिन हमारी

सरकार ने अब हमारे हाथ बांध दिये हैं कि कम से कम 4 परसेन्ट और ज्यादा से ज्यादा 20 परसेन्ट बोनस हो। इससे हम मुश्किल में घिर गये। इसलिए जो कामरेड चित्त बासु का एमेंडमेंट है वह बहुत मौजू है, लेकिन क्योंकि अब वह मत-संग्रह के लिए जा रहा है और तमाम जो हिन्दुस्तान में यूनियनों हैं, सेन्ट्रल आर्गनाइजेशन्स हैं और भी दूसरी संस्थाएं हैं उन तमाम की राय ली जाएगी, तो वह राय तो ली जाएगी लेकिन सरकार को पहले से ही यह संकल्प कर लेना चाहिए कि हम जो प्राइवेट सेक्टर के लोग हैं उन के सामने एक आदर्श, एक नमूना पेश करें कि हम किस तरह से समाजवादी राज्य स्थापित करने जा रहे हैं, हम किस तरह से वर्किंग क्लास को बोनस देंगे, हम किस तरह से नीड-वेल्थ सेलरी देंगे। अगर हम ऐसा करेंगे तो उन के लिए यह एक नमूना होगा। हमारी सरकार कहती है कि हमारे पास पैसा नहीं है और बहुत से लोग तो यह कहते हैं और स्वतन्त्र पार्टी यह कहती है कि पब्लिक सेक्टर घाटे में जा रहा है। लेकिन मैं कहता हूँ कि घाटे में नहीं जा सकता है यदि आप वर्किंग क्लास को इंसेंटिव दे। जब आप ऐसा करेंगे तो वे समझेगे कि हमारी इंडस्ट्री है, मुल्क की इंडस्ट्री है और तब वे ज्यादा से ज्यादा मेहनत करेंगे और ज्यादा से ज्यादा आप को फायदा होगा। इसलिए मेरा कहना, यह है कि इंसेंटिव के रूप में पब्लिक सेक्टर में ज्यादा से ज्यादा बोनस देने की आवश्यकता है। इसलिए सरकार को अभी से इन तरफ ध्यान देना चाहिए। ठीक है, कि हमारे श्रम मंत्री जी जो हैं उन्होंने इस को कबूल कर लिया है और यह जो मत-संग्रह के लिए भेजा जा रहा है, उस का उन्होंने कोई विरोध नहीं किया है लेकिन साथ ही साथ उन से हमारी दरखवास्त है कि जो लेबर मंत्रालय है, वह कम से कम अपने दिमाग को साफ कर लें कि हम क्या करने जा रहे हैं। हम प्राइवेट सेक्टर से ज्यादा देने जा रहे हैं या कम देने जा रहे हैं और कंसा नमूना उन के सामने पेश करने जा रहे हैं जिससे अभी भी जो प्राइवेट सेक्टर में हैं, उनसे हम ज्यादा से ज्यादा ले सके।

एक और कठिनाई पैसा की कही जाती है । मैं बराबर इस सदन में भी कहता रहा हूँ और बाहर भी कहता रहा हूँ कि पैसे की कमी हिन्दुस्तान में नहीं है और एक सौ परिवारों के हाथों में हिन्दुस्तान की सारी दौलत है । इसलिए सरकार जिस रफ्तार से चल रही है वह ठीक नहीं है और खास कर बम्बई के अधिवेशन के बाद मैं ने समझा था कि कुछ रफ्तार तेज होनेवाली है, लेकिन मुझे मायुसी होती है कि वह तेज नहीं हो रही है । हम बराबर अपनी सरकार का मजाक करते हैं कि वह कछुवे की गति से चलती है, टोरंटायज की स्पीड से चलती है, लेकिन अब तो कछुवे की गति में भी कमी आई है और हमारी शिकायत है कि कछुवे की गति में तीव्रता नहीं आ रही है । इससे समाजवाद नहीं आएगा । मेरा कहना यह है कि आप के पास जितने पैसे हैं उनसे आप नीड-वेस्ट सेलरी दे सकते हैं । इन्डियन लेबर कमिशन आप ने बनाया और उसकी सिफारिशों के मुताबिक और दूसरी जो हमारी स्टैंडिंग लेबर कमेटी है, वे जब इस के बारे में अपनी सिफारिश करती हैं तो आप बराबर यही कहते हैं कि हमारे पास पसा नहीं है । पैसा हम रूस से लेते हैं, कनाडा से लेते हैं, अमेरिका से लेते हैं, लेकिन हमारे पास जो पैसा है और हमारे घर में जो पैसा है, उस को आप लेते नहीं हैं । इसलिए मैं चाहूँगा कि लेबर मिनिस्टर साहब अपनी कैबिनेट में यह चीज रखें कि जितने कल-कारखाने हैं, जितने उद्योग हैं, जितने टी प्लान्टेशन हैं, जितने बाकी बक्स बंद हो चुके हैं, जितने विदेशी बैंक्स हैं और जितना फॉरन इन्वेस्टमेंट है, हिम्मत कर के 1971 की 24 जनवरी से पहले सब का राष्ट्रीयकरण कर दे, सबका समाजीकरण कर दे । इससे बहुत बारी दौलत हमारे पास हो जाएगी और उसके बाद आप जितना बोनस देना चाहें दें । आप एक नमूना पेश कीजिए । जब ऐसा होगा तो जितने प्राइवेट सेक्टरवाले हैं वे मजबूर हो कर कहेंगे कि सब चीजों का जल्दी से जल्दी समाजीकरण कीजिए । इस तरह से बहुत काफी पसा आप के पास हो जाएगा

और जब आप के पास पसा होगा तो आप को विदेशों से कर्जा नहीं लेना पड़ेगा और हमारे जो मुलाजिम हैं, हमारे जो कर्मचारी हैं, उन को हम नीड-वेस्ट सेलरी दे सकते हैं । वे खुश होंगे जब उनको बोनस भी दिया जाएगा और जसा कि श्री चित्त बसु ने कहा कि इसको बढ़ा कर 12 परसेन्ट करना चाहिए, मेरा कहना है कि उससे भी आगे बढ़ने की आवश्यकता है । हमारे यहां पैसा है, पर लगन नहीं है, उत्साह नहीं है, संकल्प नहीं है हमारी सरकार का और यदि हमारी सरकार इसी रफ्तार से चली तो यह जो जमीन के बारे में आप गुनते हैं कि नक्सल-पंथी हो गये हैं, मैं एक चैतावनी देता हूँ सरकार को कि जनता बैठने वाली नहीं है । जनता ने आप को 1952 में अकसीरियत दिया, 1957 में दिया, 1962 में दिया पर 1967 से आप की पिटाई शुरू हो गई और अब और भी पिटाई शुरू होगी । आप एक के दो हो गये, सिंडीकेट और इंडीकेट और आपकी और पिटाई होगी । इसलिए इस रफ्तार को तेज करने की आवश्यकता है । इन सभी चीजों के लिए मैं बराबर कहता हूँ और डिमान्ड करता हूँ और मैं चाहता हूँ कि इस हाउस से, इस सदन से भी डिमान्ड होनी चाहिए । यह जो विधेयक है उसकी पूर्ति कैसे होगी, बोनस कैसे देंगे पब्लिक सेक्टर में और पैसा कहाँ से आएगा, यह सब प्रश्न हैं । मेरा कहना है कि पैसा आप के पास है । जरा रफ्तार को आप तेज करो । रफ्तार तेज करने का मतलब है कि जो आप के कल-कारखाने हैं, जो आप की बेसिक इंडस्ट्रीज हैं, जल्दी से जल्दी 1970 के अन्त तक ही सब को लेकर सब का राष्ट्रीयकरण करो, समाजीकरण करो और ऐसा संविधान बनाओं, कान्स्टीट्यूशन में ऐसा मौलिक परिवर्तन करो कि यह जो कम्पेन्सेशन का क्लाज है, यह उस में आ जाए ।

हमारे जज साहब, हिदायतुल्ला साहब ने फरमाया कि क्रिटीसिज्म करना कोई तोहीन नहीं है । ठीक है, जब जज नहीं देखेंगे कि दीवाल पर क्या लिखा हुआ है, राजनीतिज्ञ नहीं देखेंगे, सियासतदां नहीं देखेंगे तो इस

[श्री शीलभद्र याजी]

मुल्क का क्या होगा ? क्या यह सुप्रीम कोर्ट रहेगा, क्या हाई कोर्ट रहेगा और क्या हम रहेंगे ? नहीं रहेंगे। इसलिए यह जरूरी है कि जज लोगोंको वालों की खाल निकालने का जो मौका मिलता है, वह नहीं मिले क्योंकि हमारे संविधान में ऐसी चीज है गड़बड़ है यद्यपि कम्पेंसेशन के क्लाज में नहीं है, लेकिन यह चीज हो जाती है। इसलिए इस कान्स्टीट्यूशन में, इस दस्तूर में मूल परिवर्तन करने की आवश्यकता है प्रोपर्टी क्लाज के बारे में।

I

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHR  
AKBAR ALI KHAN) : We are dealing with  
bonus.

श्री शीलभद्र याजी : पैसा नहीं आएगा तो बोनस कैसे मिलेगा। इसलिए हम तरीका बता रहे हैं सरकार को कि वह अपना दिमाग साफ कर ले और कान्स्टीट्यूशन एमेंड करने में कुछ स्वतन्त्र पार्टी और जन संघ चिलपू मचाएंगे (व्यवधान) और ये रिएक्शनरी बनने, प्रक्रियागामी बनने नहीं देंगे क्योंकि ये गाय के नाम पर, जानवरों के नाम पर कुछ न कुछ करते रहेंगे (व्यवधान)। इसलिए मैं सरकार को राय देता हूँ और माननीय सदस्य को भी—वे नौजवान आदमी हैं, वे रीएक्शनरी कैसे हो गये, मुझे आश्चर्य हुआ—कि वह ऐसे कदम उठाए जिससे वह मजबूत हो। एक दल हो और एक ट्रेड यूनियन हो। वाइस चेयरमन साहब, आप को याद होगा कि पहले हम लोगों ने एक आल इंडिया ट्रेड यूनियन कांग्रेस बनाई थी। सुभाष चन्द्र बोस के नेतृत्व में आल इंडिया ट्रेड यूनियन नाम की यूनियन थी, हमारे सी० आर० दास और पंडित नेहरू के वक्त भी एक ट्रेड यूनियन थी। अब पांच पांच हो गई हैं। पहले चार थी और पांचवी जन संघ बन गई। पांच हो गई, तीन कनोजिये और 13 चूल्हे। ब्राह्मण जो थे, चार जगह उन का खाना बनता और नारा क्या लगा रहे हैं, यह कम्यूनिस्ट पार्टी के लोग कि “दुनिया के मजदूरों, एक हो जाओ” और “अपने यहां पांच हो जाओ”। यह

गलत नारा है। जब दुनिया के मजदूरों के लिए कहते हैं कि एक हो जाओ तो फिर यह राइट सी० पी० आई० और लेफ्ट सी० पी० आई० में जगड़ा क्यों ?

श्री जगदीश प्रसाद साधुर : (Rajasthan) : कांग्रेस में भी दो रहे हैं। आप एक हो जाओ।

श्री शीलभद्र याजी : आप भी बना रहे हैं। इसलिए मेरा कहना यह है कि सरकार मजबूर करे, चाहे मत—संग्रह से हो, चाहे प्लेबीसाइट से हो, चाहे डंडे से हो, और कोशिश ऐसी होनी चाहिए कि एक ही यूनियन बने। जब आप चाहते हैं कि समाजवाद आए तो समाजवाद की 10 दूकानें क्यों खोलें। सरकार मजबूर करे कि एक ही ट्रेड यूनियन हो। जिसके साथ बहुमत है उसकी यूनियन होनी चाहिये, वकिंग क्लास की जो यूनियन है वह इस आधार पर नहीं बनेगी तो फिर कैसे बनेगी। अलग अलग बनायेंगे तो फिर मैं कहता हूँ कि कोई यूनियन नहीं होगी। मैं तो सब समाजवादियों को भी कहता हूँ कि तुम क्यों अलग अलग दुकान खोल रहे हो, कांग्रेस पार्टी और सोशलिस्ट पार्टी सब को कहता हूँ कि सब इसमें आ जायें। जिस तरह से कि आजादी की लड़ाई में सब पार्टियों ने कांग्रेस के अन्दर मिल कर लड़ाई लड़ी थी उसी तरह से इसमें भी होना चाहिये। इसलिये मैं कहता हूँ कि अपनी दुकानदारी को खत्म कीजिये और सब को सलाह देता हूँ कि यह छोटी छोटी दुकान करने से काम नहीं चलेगा। हिन्दुस्तान में सब सोशलिस्ट पार्टियाँ एक हो कर कांग्रेस के अन्दर काम करें और यदि इस तरह से काम करेंगी तभी हिन्दुस्तान का कल्याण है, समाज का कल्याण है और जो विरोध करने वाले हैं उनका भी कल्याण है। नहीं तो आप जो यह सब कहते हैं कि नक्सलपंथी जो तत्व है वह सिर उठा रहा है उनका सामना नहीं कर सकते हैं। इसलिये जरूरी है कि सब मिलकर काम करें।

मैं फिर से कामरेड चित्त बसु को शाबासी देता हूँ कि वह इस तरह का विधेयक लाये और कहना चाहता हूँ कि अर्जुन अरोड़ा की तरफ़ी



को भी मान लेना चाहिये क्योंकि यह एक ऐसी बात है जिसमें कि सारे पब्लिक सेक्टर भी आते हैं, उनको भी इसमें लाना है, तो कितना बोनस हो, किस तरह से हो यह सब देखना है, इसलिये यह मतसंग्रह के लिये जाना चाहिये ।

इन शब्दों के साथ मैं फिर से इस विधेयक की तारीफ करता हूँ और साथ ही अर्जुन अरोड़ा जी ने जो तर्कमय पेश की है उसकी भी तारीफ करता हूँ । जय हिन्द ।

SHRI K. P. UBRAMANIA MENON (Kerala) : M. Vice-Chairman, 'his is a measure which I have no hesitation in supporting. <\s ou know, the overwhelming majority c 'this House has supported this measure a cl I am sure it will be accepted by t] Government when the time comes afte- the circulation for public opinion, etc. T rere is a feeling among certain circles hat the bonus given to workers is a gi ituitious relief, that it is somehing given as a sort of token of goodwill of the i lanagement. This is not so. In our country where we do not have a scientific system of wage structure, where neither a fair v age nor a living wage nor even a minim im wage is guaranteed, the bonus be somes a question of deferred wages. / his position has been accepted generall f by some of the courts, because even \ hen minimum wages arc fixed, which by fa'- are the lowest, it takes such a lot of tii ie for implementation thai it requires th< workers to wage innumerable strugg'c before they can get even the mini nam wage. Therefore, in such a situatio i whatever bonus is given becomes a part of what may be called the deferred wage, t is the right of the worker to get it and it ; necessary that we should definitely guai n'ee to the worker part of the wages w icii he has been denied by the employer.

When the B nus Act was passed sometime back, it became an occasion for innumerable l ligations in the courts, and as is natur l with our cout ts which are only too anxio is to uphold the sanctity of private pip (rty and the inviolability of monopoly j ,-olits, in such a situation the courts ha e been giving judgments which have ii many cases gone against the ineresls <>l he workers and have helped the capitalists i.o avoid or evade even the existing law. It is therefore necessary

that some of the lacunae in the existing laws should be removed before the measure can become effective.

Then, Sir, it is true that this system of minimum and maximum in fixing bonus is not a very sciertific tning- It is not very rational, but then we have to put up with many irrational things in this country, and even though it may not be rational, it meets some of the urgent needs of the workers. I do not agree with Mr. Gowda who said that this minimum should not be fixed if the maximum is removed, because unless someting is fixed, the workers are not going to get anything in many cases because, as you know, Sir, in our country generally when capitalism is developing it is natural that some establishments will not be able to stand in competition with some better equipped and managed and efficiently run establishments. Therefore, they may run into losses. But this is inherent in capitalist development. Establishments factories and industries which cannot give a minimum living wage to the workes do not deserve to exist at all. This is a fundamental tiling which we should understand. It is not possible for workers to sacrifice in order that inefficient units should go on working and help the owners of such establishments to earn a profit. That cannot be allowed.

Another' important factor to be understood is that in our country the productivity of labour has been going up whereas the wage level has been going down. A recent study of wages, labour pro-ductivity and cost of production which appeared in the Economic and Political Weekly says that a compariosn of trends in labour productivity and real wages for the seven industries taken together shows that the increase in labour productivity between 1951 and 1961 was 66 per cent which exceeded by a sizeable margin the increase in real wages, that is, 28 per cent. This is the position. Those who call for increase in productivity without increase in wages are forgetting the facts of life. The workers in our country have been producing more, have been producing better and have been giving their share to the wellbcing of the nation, but they have not benefited from that. The only people who have benefited from the sweat of the workers have been the big capitalists and monopolists. Again, Sir, an examination of Hie trend in aggregate wages and cost in the industries covered by the CMISI shows

[Shri K. P. Subramania Menon]

that not only the wages form a small proportion of the total cost but also that the wage/cost ratio in most industries actually declined over the years. This is the position. Actually whenever any increase in wages is demanded the spectre of increasing cost is brandished before us. What is the fact? The fact is that wages as such constitute only a small proportion of the real cost of manufacture and this proportion of wages has been going down. Actually on the other hand when it is a question of profit, they take only the dividend distributed. As a matter of fact if we are to consider the profits, the surpluses created by the workers in a manufacturing process are to be taken into account; then not merely the declared dividend but all the profits which come in the nature of rent, interest and profits of all grades have to be taken into account. Because the worker, when he produces a thing out of his labour, creates all these values . . .

SHRI ARJUN ARORA : Gross profits.

SHRI K. P. SUBRAMANIA MENON : ....which will be distributed among the different sections of the capitalists and which are kept away from taxation, etc., whereas in the question of interest, in the question of rent, etc. the ordinary capitalist will say that he has not got anything out of it. But as a matter of fact the capitalist class as a whole takes away, a greater proportion of the values created by the labourers than what is known or shown in the dividends distributed. This is one of the essential characteristics of capitalist development that it has covered up a lot of its exploitation through some of these tricks.

After all, Sir, you or I do not get an interest, the interest of the money kept in the banks, etc. and it goes mainly to the capitalists or the big landlords. It does not come to any of the ordinary workers or peasants or even a government employees. Therefore, the capitalist class as whole takes an undue advantage of the system of division of surpluses and while enjoying the benefits of these things, does not give credit for what they are enjoying. Thus, they deprive the workers of a big share of their labour. Therefore, considering all these factors, it is necessary that today our working people should get a better deal and the Bonus Act as it stands today is completely inefficient as

far as this purpose is concerned. I therefore support this Bill and I am sure that the Government will see its way to support it too.

SHRI V. B. RAJU (Andhra Pradesh) : Sir, I support this Bill. I do not think it is necessary now to go into the controversy whether bonus is a deferred wage or an *ex-gratia* payment. It is a deferred wage and the bonus visualised under the Act or in the amending Bill is not a profit-sharing bonus, it is not an attendance bonus, and it is not a production bonus. In fact, it is to improve the pay packet. Whether it is the dearness allowance or gratuity or bonus in this manner, it is all to see that the worker or the employee gets a near-living wage and is in a position to make savings to come to his actual assistance in his old age.

Now, Sir, as it has been correctly placed before this House, the cry that the increased wages are contributing to losses sustained by the industry is actually misleading. In fact, cheap labour is a liability to Indian industry. That must be recognised. And here also the distinction between a manual worker or a physical worker and an intellectual worker is all illusory. The word 'employee' will be better. Sir, it is correctly said that if one day the whole nation becomes a nation of employees, there would not be an employer; all would be workers. Millions of employees are there who are outside the purview of the Act, working in small establishments and in offices and in governmental industrial undertakings and transport undertakings. Let there be no distinction between employee and employee. It is a very bad effort on the part of the Government or anybody to say that the public or State-managed undertakings should be exclusively treated or should have the necessary exemptions. These exemptions are a menace to many things. Even in land reforms, you must have noted that in Andhra Pradesh, particularly in Hyderabad where we were the pioneers in bringing in the necessary reforms in 1953 after Andhra and Telengana came together, we had this pattern of exemptions. Now, through the application of these exemptions many malpractices had crept in.

Today I am very happy to see that the presiding deity is from Andhra Pradesh, the Labour Minister is from Andhra Pradesh and I coming from Andhra Pradesh I am actually pleading for the cause of the

working class Bad supporting this Bill. And the present Labour Minister is not new to this department.

SHRI CHITTA BASU : As a matter of fact, he has fathered the Bonus Bill.

THE VICE CHAIRMAN (SHRI

AKBAR ALT KHAN) : Nor are you new to this field, Mr. Raju.

SHRI V. B. RAJU : He is the friend of the working people. I should not try to reveal his identity too much. I was a Labour Minister in 1950. And Shri Jagjivan Ram

SHRI CHITTA BASU : It is a great pleasure to have his support.

SHRI V. B. RAJU : The present President was Labour Minister in Madras, he was Labour Minister at the Centre. And I was the Labour Minister of my State. I had the privilege and opportunity and luck to be in touch with these two great Labour Ministers. And I am sure the present Labour Minister will rise to the same height and even higher. That is my hope and I do not think that my hope will be belied.

Coming to the subject-matter, I have been pleading that a well-paid employee is an asset to the industry. He develops a sense of participation and identity and in this country, let us give a new direction that an industry which cannot pay a wage which really provides a living at a particular level has no place to exist. Unless we accept this in a very effective manner—I mean to say in a very sincere way—we cannot see any advancement of industry.

Sir, sometime I hear (his tall talk of incentives to industrialists. I do not know who an industrialist is. What is the definition of a politician? A politician is not registered. A writer is not registered. Who is a writer I do not know.

SHRI CHITTA BASU : Anybody who writes.

SHRI V. B. RAJU : And similarly, I do not know who is an industrialist. Is he a shareholder? Or is he the managing director? Or is he the general manager? Or who is he? No, Sir, what we should talk about is relative to industry. There must be a change in the expression and terminology which we use. It must carry some meaning. Industries are sustained by the employees. And one change that is brought about by the ruling party to which you belong and I belonged previously.

SHRI G. R. PATIL (Maharashtra) : You will belong to it tomorrow.

SHRI V. B. RAJU : You do not know what happens tomorrow.

SHRI CHITTA BASU : It depends upon which way the wind blows.

SHRI V. B. RAJU : As is said, We do not know which way the wind is blowing. The Labour Minister, in fact, is the proper person to let us know in what direction the wind is blowing and this can be only explained by actions, by such measures, and not by exhortations and by slogans.

This Bill really, in the fitness of things is in accordance with the tune that has been set for a socio-economic change. This has been very much delayed.

I am only sorry about one point. Because I am a new comer to the House, I should not be too critical. It must be misunderstood. But this House, in fact, should evince more interest in matters relating to social and economic problems than to politics. That will be helping the nation. And the other House, to which the Government is responsible, will be much busy in discussing matters of politics, etc. But we have got a relatively cooler atmosphere and matured minds here, and we are addressed as elders. It is a good thing that such an important matter should have received the attention of many of the Members of this House and particularly the leadership of the various political parties. But doing a good thing is not a big job. As human beings we should do good. But more important is to make the people believe and impress upon them that good things are being done and that they are being done for them; we should educate them and enable them to know that the things are being done for them. The worker in this country, the employee in this country, particularly in the factory, needs to be educated much. Sir, it was that great man, Lenin, whose birth centenary we celebrated on the 22nd of last month, who really gave direction to certain important philosophical observations. Firstly he said that the worker must be educated politically. By politics he did not mean the narrow power politics; he meant the affairs relating to human relations. The second thing he propounded very effectively was the grand alliance between the proletariat and the peasantry, which could not be built very effectively and purposefully in this country. The third thing was—I do not want to say much about it at the moment

[Shri V. B. Raju]

I may be misunderstood—the theory of self-determination. These three important philosophical conclusions did and do influence the human mind. Gandhiji also coined the word "Daridmarayan" and it carried a lot of meaning. If Gandhiji had not mentioned "Daridmarayan" and Harijan, I do not think this country would have passed through such a peaceful evolution to progress. If I may say so, among the countries which became independent after the Second World War, this is the one country which has enjoyed and is enjoying the maximum political stability and orderly progress. It is not because of us Sir, the 30 years' education that Gandhiji in the course of his struggle gave us has left a tremendous impact on our minds and we have been behaving correctly. Therefore, Sir, the emerging generation needs to be educated. This education cannot be given through colleges and high schools. It cannot be given through instruction. Only through struggles will the workers know much more. But these struggles must be purposeful and peaceful and competent leadership must be there to guide them. Anyhow these are all abstract things. But what I was trying to point out was that this Bill being sent for public opinion should really provide an opportunity for the working class, for the employees, to ponder now thoroughly over this and understand the implications of it and advise us correctly. It is not a question of polarisation. As I was submitting, anybody who talks in terms of polarisation is only indulging in slogans; he does not understand what is meant by polarisation. Where are the two conflicting interests here? One is actually a declining interest and the other is a growing interest. One is receding and the other is emerging. It is not as if there are two equal, capable antagonistic forces standing face to face and trying to decide who is stronger and who is weaker. In fact, as the new water pushes the old water into the ocean, similarly the new ideas that are coming are bound to push out the old and outmoded ideas. Therefore, there is no question of polarisation.

Now, I would honestly, sincerely and humbly suggest to my friends, "let us not present the case as though it relates to a controversy between the employer and the employee". This carries no meaning. I do not want to repeat myself, but who is an employer?—I would like to ask. With the elimination of the managing agency system and with the appointment of full-

time directors and with the distribution of shareholding also, what happens is that ultimately the community becomes the employer. Therefore, only the capacity and the need, these two things, should be considered and to-day, more than capacity, the need. Now this nation for 22 years had very patiently waited for a better living. We could not provide that. In fact, when I see the slum areas of urban towns, I feel that the villages, which were, constructed 2,000 years ago, seem to be much better. At least the people have free air to breathe, though they may not have bellyful of food and sufficient clothing. (*Time bell rings.*) Sir, if I have taken more time . . .

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN) : There are other speakers.

SHRI V. B. RAJU : How many minutes more have I got ?

SHRI D. SANJIVAYYA : Give him some more time.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN) : I will give you, Mr. Raju, five minutes more.

SHRI V. B. RAJU : Friends may misunderstand that you have shown me partiality.

So, Sir, this is an effort, this is a continuity in our effort, to raise the actual wage. It is really a mission in our life to see that the wage of the worker, of the employee, is raised to that level which will enable us to be at par with the rest of the world. In the Bombay Congress session, which I had the privilege to attend, while moving an amendment to the socialist policy resolution, I put this question: Sir . . .

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN) : We are dealing with a limited issue, Mr. Raju.

SHRI V. B. RAJU : Sir, this is not merely an increase of a few rupees in our salary. It is not so simple as that. There is the economic policy behind it.

SHRI CHITTA BASU : Social approach to the problem.

SHRI V. B. RAJU : It is not a question of forty rupees or fifty rupees or fifty-five rupees. There is nothing sacrosanct about it. But the point is, it reveals, it demonstrates, the attitude and the state of mind of the Government and of the nation to-day. I just put this question: Can this nation

commit to itself that no employee in this country would get less than Rs. 150 per month? I did not ask for much. In many industries the minimum wage is Rs. 200. I also asked: Are we bold enough to say that no family would have more than Rs. 30,000 per annum? Is not Rs. 30,000 sufficient for a family to have a decent living in this country? I asked: Is it possible for the ruling party to say so? If this party, which is committed to socialism, cannot commit itself to incomes and wages, I do not know to what it can commit. Bank nationalisation is good. Abolition of privy purses is very good. But immediately after the abolition of privy purses or by bank nationalisation, the pay packet of the worker is not going to improve. If anybody thinks that way, then he is mistaken. There must be very positive and interesting approaches. The Labour Minister is an important Minister. Nowadays, in the States or at the Centre, the Minister for Trade or the Minister in charge of regulatory authority has not much influence or command. The Minister for Agriculture, the Minister for Labour, the Minister for Industry, these are the prime ministers now. Through their action, their pronouncements, their behaviour and their policies, the policies of the Government should reveal themselves. Now this is an important Bill. That is why I have taken more time.

THE VICE CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN) : Thank you.

SHRI V. B. R. VJU : One point, Sir.

Sir, today, the important question shall not be left to the collective bargaining affair. If you want to enable workers to get something by collective bargaining, through strikes, you are wasting the energy of the nation. There should not be scope or need for a strike in a welfare State. To claim that ours is a socialist State is a misnomer. We are not even on the track. Let not the Labour Minister commit this mistake that the workers have sufficient strength to bargain and secure their rights. Sir, the State is to assist the worker by the backing of the State.

Now, I would like to recall to my mind and also advise, if I am capable of, that I used to tell my friends in the Labour Department if they would inform me that a strike had taken place. If any Conciliation Office or the Labour Welfare Officer told me that a strike had taken place, he would not continue to be in

his place. Why? A strike does not take place as a quarrel between a husband and a wife overnight unless there has been growing discontent. Unless the Labour officer and Labour Department are in constant touch, they cannot know what is the actual disease. If a Labour Officer gave the news of a strike as a Reporter gives to a newspaper, the Labour Officer according to me has not done his duty.

A Welfare Officer is not a post office working between the General Manager and the employees. It is not such. He is not merely a mediator, go-between.

Some people used to say you must hold a balance correctly between the labour and the management. I do not know from where they copied this word. There is no holding the balance.

I am reminded of tenants on temple land. The tenants of temple land were denied the rights and I fought against God. Does not a tenant on temple land occupy the same position as the tenant of the landlord? So, Sir, we are like the tenants on land—and whether in a co-operative society or in a Government office or an industrial factory, in the Railways, transport or anywhere, one is an employee. So, they must be treated equally. I think the Labour Minister will be doing a good thing by removing this distinction.

SHRI KOTA PUNNAIAH (Andhra Pradesh) : Mr. Chairman, I would like to congratulate my friend Mr. Chitta Basu for bringing this very important measure and I congratulate Mr. Arjun Arora also for bringing an amendment to circulate the Bill, to elicit the public opinion. Lastly, I have to congratulate the Minister for Labour Mr. Sanjivayya, who had readily agreed to the amendment moved by Mr. Arora to circulate the Bill, to elicit the public opinion because it is an important Bill so far as the workers of the factories are concerned. Just now, my friend, Mr. V. B. Raju . . .

THE VICE CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN): You finish paying compliments.

SHRI-KOTA PUNNAIAH : I have completed. Mr. Raju has enunciated a new philosophy. Though I agree with the philosophy, but the scope of this Bill is limited. What I understand from this Bill is, it is to increase from 4% bonus to 12% bonus and to give the arrears of profits. That means if the worker works for 12 months, he must at least get one

[Shri Kota Punnaiah]

month's salary extra. This is because where the earning of the worker in this country is low, the low wage earner should not be deprived of his legitimate right.

Whether it is a Bonus Bill or Provident Fund or Deamess Allowance or Gratuity, whatever it is, if the worker is able to earn sufficiently, then there is no need for any legislation regarding bonus or any other thing. This Bill is to provide the worker to get something in addition to his daily wages. In addition to his regular salary he must get at least 12% bonus in a year. That means, if he works for 12 months continuously, he must get one month's bonus to supplement his income so that he can meet his both ends well.

We know the pitiable condition of the workers in this country. We have many times discussed this problem. We are committing new philosophies. We have taken up public sector. Everyday we are talking something about socialism. In practice no effective implementation is there. The condition of workers has not improved. The problem has remained as it was, although 20 years have lapsed since independence. So, my request to the hon. Minister for Labour is he should take interest in ameliorating the condition of the workers in this country.

In public sector projects also, I do not understand the logic, the workers cannot get this bonus. Bonus is paid only on the profits earned in a year. If the firms give, then what is the difficulty in this case?

SHRI M. H. SAMUEL (Andhra Pradesh) : I am informed that the firm has to pay bonus whether it has earned the profit or not.

SHRI KOTA PUNNAIAH : I agree with Mr. Samuel so far as bonus paid to the workers \* is concerned. The firms pay the bonus whether they earn the profit or not, but they are limiting it from 4% to 20%— minimum 4% and maximum 20%. Via media has been suggested by Shri Ghitta Basu. I do not like putting any ceiling like 4% or 20%. It depends on the earnings of the profits of the workers. The workers benefit by their hard work. Unless the worker feels secure no industry is going to profit and you are not going to bring socialism in this country. My request is to take up radical measures to see that the condition of the workers is improved immediately. Otherwise, there

would not be any peace. There would not be any production. There would not be any prosperity. There would not be any progress in this country. Thank you very much.

श्री बासुकृष्ण गुप्त : उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय हिन्दुस्तान में आदमी बहुत ज्यादा है और चीज महंगी है और जो मजदूर लोग हैं उन की अवस्था बड़ी ही खराब हो रही है। उन के लिए श्री चित्त बासु जो बोनस बिल लाये हैं मैं उस का समर्थन करता हूँ और चाहता हूँ कि बड़ी बड़ी इंडस्ट्रीज में जिन में कम प्रॉफिट हो उन में कम बोनस मिले और जिन में ज्यादा प्रॉफिट हो उन में ज्यादा बोनस मिले इस प्रकार का कोई नया कानून बनना चाहिए क्योंकि कई इंडस्ट्रीज अपने कैपिटल से दूना और तिगना कमा लेती हैं और वर्कर्स को बोनस देने की बात को लेकर उन के यहां रोजाना ही झगड़े शुरू होते हैं, हड़ताल होती है, मारपीट होती है और धराब होते हैं। मैं ने कलकत्ते में जो दृश्य पिछले दो सालों में देखे हैं उन सब को मिटाने के लिए बोनस ऐक्ट में सुधार होना चाहिए। मैं थोड़े दिन पहले लंदन गया था तो वहां एक पंजाबी भाई ने मुझे अपनी बेज स्लीप दिखायी। वहां पर वह 43 पौंड प्रति हफ्ता लेता था। यहां पर अभी तक लोगों को 43 पौंड प्रति सप्ताह के हिसाब से वेतन नहीं मिलता। इंग्लंड में हफ्ते के हिसाब से बेजेज दिये जाते हैं तो यहां पर माहवारी के हिसाब से दिये जाते हैं और बड़ी ही बुरी अवस्था यहां के लेबर की है। इसलिए जब हम यह बात करते हैं कि अमरीकन लेबर 3 मिनट में जो काम करता है वही काम हमारा लेबर 1 घंटे में करता है तो उस समय हम यह नहीं देखते कि अमरीकन लेबर को कम से कम तीन, चार हजार रुपया महीना भी मिलता है। हम को भी अपने लेबर की अवस्था सुधारने के लिए, उन की उत्पादन शक्ति बढ़ाने के लिए इस बोनस ऐक्ट का समर्थन करना चाहिए और बोनस की दरों को बढ़ाना चाहिए क्योंकि जब तक यह बोनस की दरें नहीं बढ़ेंगी तब तक यहां के मजदूर वर्ग में अशान्ति बढ़ती रहेगी और औद्योगिक उत्पादन में बाधा उत्पन्न होती

رہے گی۔ میں یہ کہنا چاہتا ہوں کہ ہندوستان میں آج آدمی سب سے سستا ہے اور آدمیوں میں بھی سب سے سستا مزدور ہے۔ اگر بھی ہمارا مینجمنٹ اتنا خراب ہے کہ ہم کسی سے بھی کمپٹی نہیں کر سکتے اور اس کے باعث ہمارا برآمدات کا کاروبار خراب ہو رہا ہے۔ یہ مینجمنٹ کی بُرائی ہے، لیبر کی بُرائی نہیں ہے۔ ہمارا مینجمنٹ بہت مہنگا ہو گیا ہے۔ اس مینجمنٹ کی دیکھنی چاہیے اور لیبر کے وینس کی دے کو اہمیت دینا چاہیے اور یہ دے کو جب تک نہیں دے گا ہمارا اقتصادی ترقی بھی نہیں ہوگی اور اسی طرح سے پیداوار بھی نہیں ہوگی۔ دوسرے ممالک میں ہندوستان کے مزدوروں کے مقابلے میں مزدوروں کی مزدوری آٹھ، دس گنی، بیس، تیس گنی ہے اور وہاں کا پیداوار بھی اسی حساب سے زیادہ ہوتا ہے اور چیزوں کی قیمت بھی کم آتی ہے۔ یہاں چیزوں کی قیمت بہت زیادہ آتی ہے اور وینس سب سے کم ہے۔ ہمارے یہاں چیزوں کی قیمت دوسرے ممالکوں سے بھی زیادہ ہے۔ یہ سب دیکھ کر میں تو دنگ رہ جاتا ہوں۔ چاہے پبلک سیکٹر کا مینجمنٹ ہو یا پبلک سیکٹر کا مینجمنٹ ہو، وہ سب اتنا افسوسناک ہو گیا ہے اور اتنا بے ہنگام ہو گیا ہے کہ لیبر کے وینس تو بڑھتے نہیں، لیکن چیزوں کی قیمت بھی نہیں گرتی۔ اس لیے جب تک لیبر کو اچھی طرح سے وینس نہیں ملے گی اور ان کی کونڈیشنز امریکن، برٹش اور جرمن لیبر کی طرح کی نہیں ہو جائیں گی تب تک ہمارے یہاں بھی ترقی نہیں ہوگی۔ آج تو ہمارے مزدور کی حالت سب سے زیادہ خراب ہے اور اس کو سنبھالنے کے لیے وینس کی دے کو اہمیت دینی چاہیے۔ مجھے اچھا لگا کہ میں نے کہا ہے کہ میں زیادہ سے زیادہ اس لیے اس مینجمنٹ کا شیلنگ لے کر نکلتا ہوں کہ اس سے زیادہ ہم وینس نہیں دے سکتے اور ایک جگہ نہیں بہت جگہ اس طرح کے مسئلے سامنے آ رہے ہیں۔ میں لیبر مینسٹر صاحب سے کہوں گا، ابھی پانچویں جی نے بہت سی باتیں کہیں۔ کچھ سوشلزم کی باتیں بھی کہیں حالانکہ یہ وینس ایکٹ کی بات تھی۔ آج ۲۲ سال میں مزدور مزدور کے کئی ٹکڑے ہو گئے ہیں یہ میں مانتا ہوں لیکن صحیح معنوں میں آج تک کوئی بھی

کہا ہے میں اس کا سہارا کرنا چاہتا ہوں۔ یہ بڑا اہم مسئلہ ہے وینس کا۔ آج وینس کو لے کر سارے مزدور مزدور میں ایک تہلکہ مچا ہوا ہے۔ وینس ایکٹ کے پہلے۔ بہت سی انڈسٹریز میں ان کی ٹریڈ یونینس سے میرا تعلق رہا ہے۔ میں نے دیکھا کہ کہیں ہم لوگر ۲۲ یا ۲۳ ہفتے تک وینس لے لیتے تھے اور وینس ایکٹ آنے کے بعد ہمارے سامنے مسئلہ ہو گئی ہے۔ کیوں کہ ہم ہمیشہ یہ دیکھتے ہیں کہ جتنی بھی انڈسٹریز ہیں ان میں جہاں پر انڈسٹریلیسٹ کا اپنا مفاد ہوتا ہے وہاں پر وہ قانون کو ماننے کے لئے تیار ہو جاتے ہیں اور جہاں ان کا نقصان ہوتا ہے وہاں وہ کہتے ہیں کہ ہم اس کو نہیں مانیں گے۔ مثال کے لئے ہمارے لیبر پارلیمنٹ نے ویج بورڈ تیار کیا۔ ویج بورڈ کو بہت سی انڈسٹریز ابھی تک ماننے کے لئے تیار نہیں ہیں، ابھی تک اس کو مان نہیں رہی ہیں اور جو انڈسٹریز وہاں کی لوکل یونینس کے دباؤ سے زیادہ وینس کے مزدور مزدور کے دے سے جہاں زیادہ وینس دیتی تھیں اب وہ انڈسٹریز اس وینس ایکٹ کا شیلنگ لے کر نکلتی ہو گئی ہیں کہ اس سے زیادہ ہم وینس نہیں دے سکتے اور ایک جگہ نہیں بہت جگہ اس طرح کے مسئلے سامنے آ رہے ہیں۔ میں لیبر مینسٹر صاحب سے کہوں گا، ابھی پانچویں جی نے بہت سی باتیں کہیں۔ کچھ سوشلزم کی باتیں بھی کہیں حالانکہ یہ وینس ایکٹ کی بات تھی۔ آج ۲۲ سال میں مزدور مزدور کے کئی ٹکڑے ہو گئے ہیں یہ میں مانتا ہوں لیکن صحیح معنوں میں آج تک کوئی بھی

چودھری اے۔ - مسٹر (بہار) :  
وائس چیرمن صاحب، مانگئے چیتا  
باسو نے جو پمپٹ آف وینس  
امپلیمینٹ بل پر اپنا پوسٹاؤ پیش

[چوندری اے - منسٹر]

لیبر منسٹر ایسا نہیں ہوا جس نے صدیق طور پر مزدور آندولن کو جاننے کی کوشش کی ہو - مزدوروں کا مسئلہ کہاں پر ہے اور بونس ان کا کونسا پہلو ہے اس کو کبھی سمجھنے کی کوشش نہیں کی - بونس ہمارا رائے ہے کہ مہربانی نہیں ہے - اگر کوئی یہ کہتا ہے کہ بونس ہم ایکس گریڈ پیمینٹ کر رہے ہیں، بخشش دے رہے ہیں تو یہ غلط ہے کیونکہ بونس جو ہم کماتے ہیں، جو ہم سال بھر میں محصول کرتے ہیں - کمپنی اپنے پرافٹ کو ڈکلیئر کرتی ہے - شیئر ہولڈرس کو ڈویڈنڈ دیتی ہے اور اس کے بعد ایک طرح کی بلیک میلنگ کرتی ہے - جو بیلنس شیٹ کمپنی بذاتی ہے اس میں بلیک میلنگ کرتی ہے - وہ کہتے ہیں کہ ہم نے شیئر ہولڈرس کو اتنا دے دیا، ہم نے کارخانے کو بڑھانے کے لئے اتنے فنڈ رکھ دیے - ہم نے بینک کریسی جب آئے گی تو اس کے لئے اتنا رکھ دیا اور اس کے بعد وہ ڈویڈنڈ ڈکلیئر کرتے ہیں اور سب سے آخر بونس کی بات آتی ہے اور وہ کہتے ہیں کہ ہم نے اتنا پرسنٹ بونس دیا - تو میں آپ سے یہ کہنا چاہتا ہوں کہ آج کوئی کلیئر پیکچر لیبر ڈیپارٹمنٹ نے ہمارے سامنے نہیں رکھی - ویج بورڈ کا کیا حال ہے - ویج بورڈ کی سفارش ہوتی ہے - لیبر ڈیپارٹمنٹ یہ کہے - لیبر منسٹر یہ کہیں کہ سب لوگوں نے اتفاق رائے سے اس ویج بورڈ کو ایگری کیا ہے - ایک آدمی نے نہیں ایگری کیا اس لئے اس کو نہیں ماننا چاہیئے تو میں سمجھتا ہوں کہ آپ اس طرح کی بات لیکر اس ملک میں سووم نہیں لا

سکتے - آپ کو دیکھنا ہوگا ۱۹۳۸ میں بہار میں سوگرہ ڈاکٹر راجندر پرشاد جی کی ادھیکشتا میں ایک کمیٹی بنی تھی، بہار لیبر انکوائری کمیٹی اس کی رپورٹ لیبر ڈیپارٹمنٹ کو پہنچی چاہیئے - انہوں نے مزدوروں کے یونینس فکس کئے تھے کہ مزدوروں کے ۳ یونینس ہونے چاہئیں اور ۳ یونینس کو لیکر اس کی لیونگ ویج کو ڈیسائنڈ کرنا چاہیئے - آپ جب تک لیونگ ویج ڈیسائنڈ نہیں کرتے تب تک آپ مزدوروں کا فائدہ نہیں کر سکتے ان کے بچے پڑھ سکیں، وہ دونوں وقت کھانا کھا سکیں، ان کے بچوں کی پڑھائی اور دوا کا انتظام ہو سکے تب تک یہ نہیں ہو سکے گا - جب تک آپ لیونگ ویج ڈیسائنڈ نہیں کرتے - کوئی بھی ودھیک بونس ایکٹ کے متعلق آئے یا کوئی بھی سوال آئے میں سمجھتا ہوں کہ اس لیونگ ویج کے سوال پر سرکار کو اس سے پہلے وچار کرنا چاہئے - میں ارجن اروڑہ جی نے جو پوسٹا رکھا ہے اس کا بھی سمجھنا کرنا ہوں اور میں لیبر منسٹر صاحب سے کہنا چاہتا ہوں کہ پہلے آپ لیونگ ویج کا فیصلہ کریں اور بہار لیبر انکوائری کمیٹی ۱۹۳۸ ع کی جو ڈکومینٹ ہے، جو بابو راجندر پرشاد جی کی ادھیکشتا میں بیٹھی تھی، اس کو ڈیپارٹمنٹ کو پہنچا چاہئے اور لیبر منسٹری کو اس سے کچھ سبق سیکھنا چاہئے -

اس میں بہت سی چیزیں ہیں، قریب سارا والیوم ہے اور ان چیزوں کو پڑھنا چاہئے - آج میں آپ سے کہنا چاہتا ہوں کہ جو قانون آپ یہاں پر بناتے ہیں ان کا کیا ہو رہا



ہے - آپ کا جو انجینئرنگ ویج بورڈ ہے اس کو بہت سی انڈسٹریز نہیں مان رہی ہیں اور سب سے مزے کی بات یہ ہے کہ جو آپ کے گورنمنٹ کے سیکٹرز میں وہ بھی ان انڈسٹریز سے سامان خریدتے ہیں جو انجینئرنگ ویج بورڈ کو نہیں مانتیں - آپ سوچئے گورنمنٹ کا یہ بھی ایک پارت ہے اور گورنمنٹ کا یہ بھی ایک پارت ہے - گورنمنٹ کی جو سٹیل ملستری ہے وہ ان اور ان انڈسٹریز سے لیتی ہے جو کہ انجینئرنگ ویج بورڈ کو نہیں مانتیں - یہ آپ کا کوآرڈینیٹیشن ہے - یہ آپ کا سوشلزم ہے -

ایک بات میں اور کہنا چاہتا ہوں کہ یہ جو آپ کا نقصان ہوتا ہے یہ اس لئے ہوتا ہے کہ آپ یہ دیکھیں کہ آپ کی جڈگوزا میں جو آٹومیک انرجی کمیشن کی مائنس ہیں وہاں کیا ہو رہا ہے - وہاں کے جنرل منیجر کی لڑکی کے پڑھنے کے لئے کارڈیزور ہے اور وہ جڈگوزا سے ٹائٹانگر اس میں پڑھنے جاتی ہے - اس طرح کی چیزیں آپ کے یہاں ہو رہی ہیں - یہ میں لیبر منسٹر صاحب سے اپنا چاہتا ہوں - مجھے بہت سی ضروری باتیں کہنی تھیں لیکن میں آپ سے یہ کہنا چاہتا ہوں کہ جو بھی آپ فیصلہ کریں - اگر آپ کوئی قانون بنائیں اس کے بننے کے بعد اگر صحیح طور پر اس کی امپلیمینٹیشن نہیں کر سکتے تو میرا خیال ہے کہ قانون بنانے کی کوئی ضرورت نہیں ہے - مزدوروں سے ملائی لیکر آپ چاہتے ہیں یہ اچھا نہیں ہے - شکریہ -

†[**چौधरी ए० मोहम्मद (बिहार)** : वाइस चेयरमेन साहब, अभी माननीय चित्ता बासु ने जो पेमेन्ट आफ बोनस एमेंडमेंट मिल कर अपना प्रस्ताव पेश किया है मैं उसका समर्थन करना चाहता हूँ। यह बड़ा अहम मसला है बोनस का आज बोनस को ले कर सारे मजदूर आन्दोलन में एक तहलका मचा हुआ है। बोनस ऐक्ट के पहले—बहुत सी इण्डस्ट्रीज में उनकी ट्रेड यूनियन्स से मेरा ताल्लूक रहा है। मैंने देखा कि कहीं हम लड़ कर 22 या 23 हफ्ते तक का बोनस ले लेते थे और बोनस ऐक्ट आने के बाद हमारे सामने समस्या हो गई है। क्योंकि हम हमेशा यह देखते हैं कि जितनी भी इण्डस्ट्रीज हैं उनमें जहां पर इन्डस्ट्रियलिस्ट का अपना मुफाद होता है वहां पर वह क़ानून को मानने के लिये तैयार हो जाते हैं और जहां उनका नुकसान होता है वहां वह कह देते हैं कि हम उसको नहीं मानेंगे। मिसाल के लिये हमारे लेबर डिपार्टमेंट ने वेज बोर्ड तैयार किया। वेज बोर्ड को बहुत सी इण्डस्ट्रीज अभी तक मानने के लिए तैयार नहीं हैं अभी तक उसको मान नहीं रहीं हैं और जो इण्डस्ट्रीज वहां की लोकल यूनियन्स के दबाव से वहां के मजदूर आन्दोलन के डर से जहां ज्यादा बोनस देती थीं अब वह इण्डस्ट्रीज उस बोनस ऐक्ट का ज़ेल्डर ले कर खड़ी हो गई हैं कि उससे ज्यादा हम बोनस नहीं दे सकते और एक जगह नहीं बहुत जगह इस तरह के मसले सामने आ रहे हैं। मैं लेबर मिनिस्टर साहब को कहूंगा। अभी याजी जी ने बहुत सी बातें कहीं—कुछ सोशलिज्म की बात भी कही हालांकि यह बोनस ऐक्ट की बात थी। आज 22 साल में मजदूर आन्दोलन के कई टुकड़े हो गये हैं यह मैं मानता हूँ लेकिन सही मायनों में आज तक कोई भी लेबर मिनिस्टर ऐसा नहीं हुआ जिसने सही तौर पर मजदूर आन्दोलन को जानने की कोशिश की हो। मजदूरों का मसला कहां पर है और बोनस उनका कौन सा पहलू है उसको कभी समझने की कोशिश नहीं की। बोनस हमारा राइट है मेहरबानी

†[ ] Hindi transliteration.

[ चौधरी ए० मोहम्मद ]

नहीं है। अगर कोई यह कहता है कि बोनस हम एक्सपेंशिया पेमेन्ट कर रहे हैं बख्शीश दे रहे हैं तो यह गलत है। क्योंकि बोनस जो हम कमाते हैं जो हम साल भर में मेहनत करते हैं। कम्पनी अपने प्राफिट को डिक्लेयर करती है। शेयर होल्डर्स को डिवीडेंड देती है और उसके बाद एक तरह की ब्लैक मेलिंग करती है। जो वैंलंस शीट कम्पनी बनाती है उसमें ब्लैक मेलिंग करती है वे कहते हैं कि हमने शेयर होल्डर्स को इतना दे दिया हमने कारखाने को बढ़ाने के लिये इतने फण्ड रख दिये। हमने बैंकरोसी जब आएगी तो उसके लिये इतना रख दिया और उसके बाद वे डिवीडेंड डिक्लेयर करते हैं और सबसे आखिर बोनस की बात आती है और वे कहते हैं कि हम ने इतना परसेंट बोनस दिया। तो मैं आपसे यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि आज कोई क्लीयर पिक्चर लेबर डिपार्टमेंट ने हमारे सामने नहीं रखी। वेज बोर्ड का क्या हाल है। वेज बोर्ड की सिफारिश होती है। लेबर डिपार्टमेंट यह कहे, लेबर मिनिस्टर यह कहे कि सब लोगों ने इत्तफाक़ राय से इस वेज बोर्ड को एग्री किया है। एक आदमी ने नहीं एग्री किया इसलिये उसको नहीं मानना चाहिए तो मैं समझता हूँ कि आप इस तरह की बात ले कर इस मुल्क में सोशलज्म नहीं ला सकते। आप को देखना होगा 1938 में बिहार में स्वर्गीय डाक्टर राजेन्द्र प्रसाद जी की अध्यक्षता में एक कमेटी बनी थी बिहार लेबर इन्क्वायरी कमेटी, उसकी रिपोर्ट लेबर डिपार्टमेंट को पढ़नी चाहिए। उन्होंने मजदूरों की यूनिट्स फिक्स किये थे कि मजदूरों के 3 यूनिट्स होने चाहिए और 3 यूनिट्स को ले कर उसकी लिविंग वेजिज को डिसाइड करना चाहिए। आप जबतक लीविंग वेजिज डिसाइड नहीं करते तबतक आप मजदूरों का फायदा नहीं कर सकते। उनके बच्चे पढ़ सके, वे दोनों वक्त खाना खा सके उनके बच्चों का पढ़ाई और दवा का इन्तज़ाम हो सके तब तक यह नहीं हो सकेगा। जबतक आप लीविंग वेजिज डिसाइड नहीं करते कोई भी विधेयक

बोनस ऐक्ट के मुतालिक आये या कोई भी सवाल आए मैं समझता हूँ कि इस लिविंग वेज के सवाल पर सरकार को उसके पहले विचार करना चाहिए। मैं अर्जुन अरोड़ा जी ने जो प्रस्ताव किया है उसका भी समर्थन करता हूँ और मैं लेबर मिनिस्टर साहब से कहना चाहता हूँ कि पहले आप लिविंग वेज का फैसला करें और बिहार लेबर इन्क्वायरी कमेटी 1938 जो डाक्यूमेंट है जो बाबू राजेन्द्र प्रसाद जी की अध्यक्षता में बँठी थी, उसको डिपार्टमेंट को पढ़ना चाहिए और लेबर मिनिस्ट्री को उससे कुछ सबक सीखना चाहिए।

इसमें बहुत सी चीजें हैं करीब सारा वाल्यूम हैं और उन चीजों को पढ़ना चाहिए। आज मैं आप से कहना चाहता हूँ कि जो कानून आप यहां पर बनाते हैं उनका क्या हो रहा है। आप का जो इंजीनियरिंग वेज बोर्ड है उसको बहुत सी इंडस्ट्रीज नहीं मान रही हैं और सब से मझे की बात यह है कि जो आप के गवर्नमेंट के सेक्टर हैं वे भी इन इंडस्ट्रीज से सामान खरीदते हैं जो इंजीनियरिंग वेज बोर्ड को नहीं मानते। आप सोचिए गवर्नमेंट का यह भी एक पार्ट है और गवर्नमेंट का वह भी एक पार्ट है। गवर्नमेंट की जो स्टील मिनिस्ट्री है वह आइरन ओर उन इंडस्ट्रीज से लेती है जो कि इंजीनियरिंग वेज बोर्ड को नहीं मानती यह आप का को-आर्डिनेशन है। यह आप का सोशलज्म है।

एक बात मैं और कहना चाहता हूँ कि यह जो आप का नुकसान होता है यह इसलिये होता है कि आप यह देखें कि आप की जड़गोडा में जो आटोमिक अनर्जी कमीशन की माइन्स हैं वहां क्या हो रहा है। वहां के जंतरल मेनेजर की लड़की के पढ़ने के लिय कार रिजर्व्ड है और वह जड़गोडा से टाटा नगर इसमें पढ़ने जाती है। इस तरह की चीजें आप के यहां हो रही हैं। यह मैं लेबर मिनिस्टर साहब से कहना चाहता हूँ। मुझे बहुत सी जरूरी बातें कहनी थीं लेकिन मैं आप से यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि जो भी आप फैसला करें, अगर आप कोई

कानून बनाये उसके बनने के बाद अगर सही तौर पर उसकी इम्प्लीमेंटेशन नहीं कर सकते तो मेरा ख्याल है कि कानून बनाने की कोई जरूरत नहीं है। मजदूरों से मलाई ले कर आप चाट जायें यह अच्छा नहीं है। शुक्रिया।]

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AK-BAR ALI KHAN) : Now it is 5 O'clock and according to the programme there is a half-an-hour discussion to be raised by Mr. M. K. Mohtar.

SHRI CHITTA BASU : Sir, before you go to the next item I have something to say. I think by this time we have understood the mood of the House. Every section of the House has accepted the principle governing this Bill and the Minister in the course of his intervention has also expressed his mind to accept the amendment moved by Mr. Arjun Arora. And unless this Bill is disposed of today, I think there is no chance of this Bill being taken up in the current session. It will be held over for the next session which will be in August. The motion is only for eliciting public opinion and if it is not disposed of today, it may be delayed and may go on till October or so. It will create more complications. So I request that the amendment may be put to vote.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AK-BAR ALI KHAN) : I would like to know the reactions of the Labour Minister.

SHRI D. SANUJIVAYYA : Many points have been raised and they have got to be replied. They cannot go unanswered. So many things have been said.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AK-BAR ALI KHAN) : So then it will have to go to the next session. I think since the Labour Minister rightly wants to answer certain points which have been raised...

SHRI CHITTA BASU : What about 22nd?

SHRI OM MISHRA (Jammu and Kashmir) : I do not know whether it will be an official day or a non-official day. I do not think it will be a non-official day.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AK-BAR ALI KHAN) : Mr. Chitta Basu we are very happy and we appreciate your endeavour and you see the consensus of the House is more or less that the Bill

should be sent for public opinion and I am sure that if there is some arrangement we will take it up on 22nd, but I cannot promise. It all depends upon the Parliamentary Minister and the programme of this House and the other official work. So I cannot promise. I would ask the concerned officers to consider this matter. If it is feasible, then, they can give some time on 22nd. But today we have to take up the half-an-hour discussion as programmed.

#### HALF-AN-HOUR DISCUSSION ON POINTS ARISING OUT OF THE ANSWER TO STARRED QUESTION NO. 97 GIVEN IN THE RAJYA SABHA ON THE 30TH APRIL, 1970, REGARDING RADIO MOSCOW'S CRITICISM OF INDIAN LEADERS

SHRI M. K. MOHTA (Rajasthan) : Mr. Vice-Chairman, I am thankful for the opportunity given to me for raising this half-an-hour discussion on a matter of very grave importance. For quite sometime, actually since just before the general elections, the radio stations in Soviet Russia—Radio Moscow as well as its camouflaged wing, Radio Peace and Progress—have been indulging in many objectionable attacks on certain political parties in the country which really amount to interference in the domestic affairs of India. This matter has been raised on a couple of occasions previously in this House as well as in the honourable Lok Sabha and the only answer that the Government had in respect of the activities of Radio Peace and Progress was that according to the Soviets this was an autonomous body. Nobody can be so naive as to swallow this fairy tale given out by the Soviets. There is nothing private in the Soviet Union. The whole world knows that. Everything is controlled there...

SHRI ARJUN ARORA (Uttar Pradesh) : No, no. There are many things private there. They have some private property also. Only here you do not allow the poor to have a private life.

SHRI M. K. MOHTA : Even the life of the people in the Soviet Union are not private there. We know what the conditions are in the Soviet Union and we need not be agitated about that. Therefore, this fairy tale must be dismissed out of our mind. We believe in the freedom of expression and the freedom of the press. If in any country there is a free press and