

SHRI KRISHAN KANT (Haryana):
Sir, is it all relevant?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Rajnarain, we have heard you. Now, let the debate begin. Mr. Muniswamy will move the motion.

SHRI B. K. GAIKWAD (Maharashtra) :
Sir, before we start I want to rise on a point of order.

MR. CHAIRMAN: There are too many points of order; they are all points of disorder.

SHRI B. K. GAIKWAD: Unless we rise on a point of order you don't allow us to speak. I want to draw the attention of the House and also remind the House that in the last session it was decided that the motion regarding the Committee on the welfare of Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes would be taken up for consideration on the first -lay of this session. It was to be moved on that day itself but unfortunately there was some misunderstanding and the House was adjourned *sine die*. Now in this session the first day is gone, the second day is also going. I want to know when that Government motion is going to be taken up. That is a Government motion and . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: It is there on the agenda. Immediately this is over it will come.

THE LEADER OF THE HOUSE (SHRI JAISUKHLAL HATHI): It was there on the first day's agenda but yesterday the House decided that this should be taken up today.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes, it is there and it will come. There is no question of evading.

MOTION RE THE SITUATION ARISING OUT OF THE TOKEN STRIKE BY CENTRAL GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES ON 19TH SEPTEMBER 1968.

SHRI N. R. MUNISWAMY (Madras): Mr. Chairman, Sir, I beg to move—

"That the situation arising out of the token strike by Central Govern-

ment employees on September 19, 1968, and the action taken by Government in relation thereto be taken into consideration."

Sir, it really pains me to make any observation about this unusual situation that has arisen as a result of the strike.

[THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA) in the Chair.]

If in the course of my observations I make any remarks which might wound the susceptibilities of Members there or if I transgress in any way the limitations I hope they would excuse me because the situation arising out of this strike is not a happy one to be narrated in any form or in any shape. Mr. Vice-Chairman, Government employees numbering about 26 lakhs, if I am right, and there are three main services, Defence, Post and Telegraph and the Railways besides a host of others which I am not going to mention. Sir, the strike was brewing for a very long time and this was only to be a token strike just for a day though it might have been extended for some time or even made into an indefinite one. The trouble that has been caused as a result of this is so enormous that anybody would shed tears. The population of India is about 500 million of which about 2 to 3 million people are the servants of the entire community. About 498 million people were virtually kept at bay as a result of this strike by these two million odd people who comprise the Government employees and who went on strike. Basically it was said that it would be a very peaceful strike for about 24 hours from 6.00 A.M. to 6.00 A.M. the next day. But unfortunately it has led to various ramifications. Committing one error after another this strike resulted in loss of life and damage to property. If only we have got the patience to think we will find that the leaders or the sponsors of this strike mostly happen to be outsiders. Here I should be very charitable to the workers and I would say that excepting for a few of them I should say they are all loyal to the Government and to the service to which they have

been allotted. Mr. Vice-Chairman, I think whenever one joins Government service—I speak subject to correction—he has to sign a declaration that he will abide by the rules and service regulations and in the service regulations there is a specific provision that they would not strike. Strike is one of the weapons available to the Unions and this weapon should not be misused. It has to be used only in a legitimate way, certainly not in the way in which they have done it. The J.C.A. has been having a sort of divided opinion on the issue of strike. A few were trying to push up the strike while a few others were opposed to the strike. I myself had a talk with one of these leaders and I gave an inkling that there was likely to be an ordinance prohibiting the strike and that leader . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA (West Bengal): How did you know that there would be an ordinance.

SHRI N. R. MUNISWAMY: Please don't disturb me for Heaven's sake because I have not been doing such a thing. I am not going to give the name just as some Ministers sometimes get caught. You are a lawyer; I am also a lawyer. We know these things. So don't disturb me. Just listen. Otherwise I may miss my point.

Now that gentleman told me that in case the ordinance was issued the strike would become illegal. Then I asked him what would be his course of action then and he said that he had to think what would be the next alternative. He said that if there was going to be an ordinance though he did not think that there would be an ordinance, the strike would be illegal. Anyway, that has happened and we know what a strike is. We have seen even here that we are not able to perform our job. I have not been able to move this motion for the last 25 minutes because all sorts of questions were raised like extension of time from one day to two days etc. and even many issues which are not germane to the motion were raised. And this motion was stalled. So this is one

of the ways of strike. The Hon. Members who fight for their rights here unfortunately seem to forget that even the main thing for which they are working here is not allowed to be done. But I would leave this point here because I would be missing my point if I indulged in other aspects of the strike. As I said before, even the leaders, the sponsors of the strike were not unanimous and even among them one was intimidating the other. Intimidation is one of the process involved and the result is, victimisation also comes in since under the rules the Government can take action. Intimidation is one of the processes in which the strikers indulge. And strikes are of various kinds, stay in strike, pen down strike, sit in strike, lying down strike and so on.

SHRI A. D. MANI (Madhya Pradesh) : On a point of order.

SHRI N. R. MUNISWAMY: There can be no point of order. Your point of order can be deferred- For Heaven's sake don't do this sort of thing. As I said, various types of strikes are there. I am not questioning it. They can have any number of types of strikes.

SHRI A. D. MANI: Sir, I am on a point of order.

SHRI N. R. MUNISWAMY: I am not yielding. Unless the Chair directs me I won't yield.

SHRI A. D. MANI: Sir, you must call me. I am on a point of order.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA): Yes.

SHRI A. D. MANI: Sir, this is a very important debate. I have got great respect for Mr. Ramaswamy but there should be a person of Ministerial rank here.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Why?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Mr. Vice-Chairman, this is the attitude of the Government. We are discussing a Cabinet decision. This was a Cabinet decision as you will remember. The whole thing was decided by the Cabinet. Not a single member of the Cabi-

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta]

net is present and yet we are discussing this. My friend need not be upset. You at least should make your Cabinet members hear you. They should take you seriously. You are the Mover of this motion. Now, this is their attitude. I should like to have your view. What is the idea? I know they are very affable persons.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA): The House will stand adjourned till 2 P.M. and I do hope that a Cabinet Minister will be here when the House reassembles.

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

The House reassembled after lunch at two of the clock, THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN in the CHAIR.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Muniswamy. Before you begin, let me inform the House that the House will sit till 6 P.M. today.

SHRI N. R. MUNISWAMY. When is the reply?

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: We shall carry on the debate and then we shall see.

SHRI N. R. MUNISWAMY: Madam Deputy Chairman, this morning I was making out the point that the 26 lakhs or 30 lakhs of people who are serving under the Government of India have kept the rest of the population, say 498 million people, at bay. Being service organisations they should not keep a large number of people at bay and hold them to ransom. That is the point which I raised initially. I am not going to justify or otherwise go into the merits of the strike. I may be permitted on this point, however, to ask whether there is any justification for this and thereafter we shall see whether the methods adopted by the organisers or sponsors of the strike and the action taken by the Government on the Government employees are justified. There is the JCM or the Joint Consultative Machinery. They have provided therein for certain issues to be referred to arbitration. But

they wanted some of their demands to be complied with forthwith. The first is the need-based minimum wage. The second is the merger of dearness allowance with pay and the third is the revision of the formula governing the grant of DA. The second and the third might be clubbed together. The Government was reluctant only with regard to the first one, i.e., the need-based minimum wage. There is this justification that not only these 26 lakh, people are to be taken care of, not only they are to be well paid—and according to their services they must be paid—but there are other people, as I told you, 498 million people who are in other avocations of life. It has got serious repercussions on the social and economic aspects. If we only comply with the demands of these 26 lakhs of people, it will have serious repercussions on the other parts of the society. Unless we take into consideration these things, it will have reactions on the private industry and a host of other installations where people are employed. That is the reason why the Government was reluctant to accept the first item and they did not agree to refer it to arbitration. So far as the merger of DA with pay is concerned, they agreed to consider it. In the JCM I find, subject to correction, that there are a few points which cannot be referred to arbitration. So far as the class or the grade of a service is concerned, they will certainly consider that aspect. As regards the need-based wage, they were not agreeable and on that score the organisers or the sponsors of the strike should not have taken recourse to the extreme-step of keeping the entire population at bay. The affected service is Post and Telegraph. About 30 to 35 per cent of the people stopped work and it may be that about 9 to 10 per cent might have gone on strike when we take the totality of the strike. So far as the Posts and Telegraph is concerned, it is the worst-affected. We can rather tolerate a strike. We know that they are on strike, but their after-reaction, their go-slow is much worse. You. neither kill the man, nor allow him to live. You are only squeezing him. He does not die and he does not live.

Similarly, this sort of go-slow is really worse than a strike. I can only express my regret at the way in which the sponsors or the people behind it are encouraging this go-slow. The go-slow policy, according to me, is one of the worst methods of strike. They can as well go on strike, because then we, know that they are on strike. We can make some other alternative arrangement. The go-slow is the worst type which one can ever imagine. On the 19th I had myself seen how the people suffered as a result of it. It was said to be a token strike, but was it a token one? It was not. It was a real strike. The reactions that are taking place subsequent to the strike are much worse and we cannot imagine how this country could be run. Today the Congress may rule and tomorrow the other parties might rule the country. If you only pamper the permanent services and teach them these methods and when you take over the reigns of the country, they strike, I do not know how you will stand it. You create confusion and commotion and you are still merry. You are now sowing the wind and you will soon reap the whirlwind. That would be the result. I would say that the sponsors are mostly outsiders— subject to correction. I am of opinion that these unions should not be manned or guided by these strangers. Only the man who wears the shoes Knows where it pinches. The employees as such—I have met many of them—are all very loyal. They know they will have to starve and they cannot run their families. In a strike the real sufferers are the employees, not the sponsors or the representatives of the unions. They are merry. They create commotion and confusion and the man who actually suffers is the employee. The people who go on strike think that they will get something out of it. As a matter of fact, they get nothing, except starvation at home and a lot of trouble otherwise. That is the trouble. The Government should think of a way in which the strangers can be eliminated altogether. The outsiders must be eliminated. I have no objection to one of the employees being the prime cause of all these things, because if they

do something wrong they know how to adjust themselves. Being strangers, being outsiders, they do not consider these aspects because they do not actually suffer. They are only the brains behind it. They are the ring leaders behind the drama. The man who performs knows where the trouble lies. Therefore, I would say that the Government should seriously consider whether the outsiders should be allowed in all these things.

Another thing is that in all the establishments and offices they run their whole office in the premises themselves. These are organisations which are recognised by the Government and we should not stand in the way of their doing any work. I agree, but let them run their show outside the premises. Let them have their office outside the office premises. Having their office in the premises is in itself tinted with some kind of disloyalty or disservice or some sort of mental reservations in the discharge of their duty. They go round and round in the corridor and permeate their ideas and ideologies, and the men who are actually at work are at bay as to what to do, whether to do or not to do. It may be a small thing, but small thing only causes irritation. Even a small pin will be the cause for entire dislocation. The Government must not allow the union office to run in the premises where its office is being run.

The other thing which I mention is this. I have made out a case that there was no justification for it. The only justification is to cause commotion, to sow the wind and reap the whirlwind out of it. Really the loyal workers are put to trouble. I had been to one or two places on the day of the strike. Even women were asked not to go to office. Cowdung water was thrown at them. I was also held up. They did not do any harm to me except to cause obstruction. Such things are of no use, this kind of intimidation. They say, do not victimise. I agree nobody should be victimised, but if they intimidate a person, as a result of intimidation he succumbs to that way of life. The actual sufferer is not

[Shri N. R. Muniswamy]

that man. Who suffers? There is a provision in law that he can be punished. He has not done it of his own accord. If there is something which is against his conscience and if he resists it, it may be called Satyagraha. But this is a case where he does it not because it is against his conscience, but this is something against the conscience of the leaders. So he carries out the wishes of the leaders. This man obeys that. Here if a man is doing his work, if something is wrong, is against his own conscience, he can certainly stop doing the work; then it may be called Satyagraha or civil disobedience. But in this case it is neither Satyagraha nor civil disobedience. It is a case where they are disobeying the law wantonly and purposely with a view to causing harassment not only to them but to the entire people. There is some difference of opinion between the J.C.M. and the Government. They want something from the Government, and the Government refuses. Who are the actual sufferers? Only the people, not the Government or the persons who are egging them on to strike. I will give an illustration. It is like a husband and wife fighting. The husband cannot control the wife. The wife is a termagant. If he cannot control her, what he does is he goes and beats the children. What could the children do? He wants to show his anger against the wife, and he goes on beating the children and the children go on crying. If there is a difference of opinion between the employees and the Government, we are 498 million and we are at mercy of these people. We want their service. Between them we are punished. Nothing is done for us. All the letters which had been posted had not been delivered. They do not discharge their duties. The reason is, 'go slow' has come into play. Therefore, I would say that Government should consider hereafter whether mechanical aid has to be resorted to. I know if computerised machines are introduced, there is trouble. If we have mechanical aid, then there is trouble from these people. They say, we do not

want mechanical aid. At least we can depend upon the machines which will certainly do the job. If these people strike work, actually we suffer. For example, I tell you if the telephones had not been automatic, we would have suffered a lot. Thank God there were automatic telephones, without manual operation. Therefore, I would say the Government should consider very seriously, without jeopardising the existing set-up, to introduce mechanical aid in all possible ways. Wherever mechanical aid could be resorted to, computerisation has to be introduced, because they have given notice that they will go on strike. This sort of bamboozling the Government and harassing the Government will not do. When they come and hold the helm of affairs, I think they will suffer from the same difficulties as they have taught the people how to disobey. So I want these leaders, specially the leaders who have got in their heart the welfare of the people and the country that they should think that whatever they do, it must be only channelised against the Government and the people who run the Government and not the people who are depending on the service of these people. I would only request that the leaders should think twice before doing it. There is no use, there is no purpose in doing it.

Another thing which I wish to suggest to the Government is this. Hereafter just as we file our nomination and we take oath that we will abide by the Constitution, likewise when we recruit new men, these people have to be asked to execute a bond or an agreement whereby they will not resort to strike. There is already a provision that they are not to go beyond the Service Rules. In spite of that they do that. Now they have derecognised many of the unions. The only method adopted by the leaders is they route it through the M.Ps. The M.Ps. take their case and forward it to the Minister or the concerned Department. What they wanted to avoid is now being done through a different route. Whatever remedy we may suggest, there is a way out of it, and that

is the reason why I say that the Government should be very strong, and the steps taken by the Government are all right. One thing I wish to say to the Government. Today is the birthday of our Prime Minister, and we are now slowly coming to the birth centenary of Mahatma Gandhi also. Even for the birth centenary death sentences have been commuted. *(Interruption)* I would only wish that deserving cases have to be reconsidered and many of the persons who have succumbed as a result of intimidation and pressure by those people may be condoned. People who have actually taken part in it may be punished. Regarding leaders. I would only suggest that political leaders should not be hereafter involved in this organisation. Representatives of employees alone I am having in mind, not the leaders who are not employees. There should be no political tinge for all their actions and misdeeds. The only thing is, this is the birthday of the Prime Minister, and I wish that she would give second thought to giving punishment to all these people, and those whose actions are irremediable and who cannot be condoned by any stretch of imagination, they may be punished. Even that punishment may be lenient. If it is very strict, I should say that we will appear to be vindictive because they have done a wrong thing.

The last sentence I wish to say to all leaders of parties, including leaders from my side, is from this day they should withdraw from that organisation. You may guide them, you may give them the philosophy from a distance. I have given a resolution saying that strikes should be banned, but strikes may not be banned, they may not agree. These leaders who *are* very kind in their heart simply enact a drama in the House. They talk all sorts of irrelevant things. Relevancy is the first casualty in the House. On anything and everything one can rise and talk. We have been here in Parliament for 15 or 20 years and it is a novel experience to me. I only want to request that honourably they must withdraw from being leaders

of these organisations and unions. They can guide them from a distance, never circumventing their own activities with indirect methods.

Lastly, I request the Government to see that steps already taken may be minimised to some extent without losing the game. I only want that the Government should be a noble Government doing something good and at the same time being firm also. We should not give up principles. We can modify principles to some extent but we can never give up principles. Tomorrow when you hand over this Government to some other party, they must see that we have stabilised the permanent services on a firm ground, and these people have to serve not only us but other parties in case they come—which I do not think they will— even if they come they must be thankful to us that we have stabilised them.

SHRI A. D. MANI: Madam, I move:

1. "That at the end of the Motion, the following be added, namely:-

'and having considered the same, this House disapproves the association of outsiders, not connected with the Central Government service, with the Unions of the Central Government employees'."

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Madam, I move:

2. "That at the end of the Motion, the following be added, namely :—

'and having considered the same, this House fully supports the demands of the Government employees and condemns the action of the Government in regard to the token strike'."

SHRI RAJNARAIN (Uttar Pradesh): Madam, I move:

3. "That at the end of the Motion, the following be added, namely :—

'and having considered the same this House is of opinion that the Government have acted in a spirit of revenge and has thus caused harm to the nation as well

[Shri Rajnarain]

as to the interest of the employees'."

The questions were proposed.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Besides the names that are on the printed list on today's agenda, there are many other names given to me. I propose to go party-wise if there is no objection. Now, Mr. Gupta.

THE LEADER OF THE HOUSE (SHRI JAISUKHLAL HATHI): Party-wise?

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN. I do not think that is possible in this debate. We shall try to do the best.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Before I start, let me pay my homage to the memory of the martyrs to the cause of the working people, those men and women who lost their lives at the hands of the police at Pathankot, at Indraprastha Bhawan, Gauhati and other places. Also my thoughts go to those who have suffered in many ways, even if they had not lost their lives. It must be added that the Government employees have added a glorious chapter to the annals of the struggle of India's working people. Whatever columny may be spread against them, howsoever, the Government may try to victimise them, what will be remembered by the current, living generations and the generations yet unborn is the unity of the Government employees and the entire working people and the great cause for which they so valiantly fought.

Madam Deputy Chairman, there is no denying the fact today that the demand for a need-based minimum wage has become a truly national demand. We have to solve this problem today, or tomorrow, when there is no possibility of shirking the issue posed by life itself, sanctified by the sacrifice and suffering of so many Government employees and working people, the sooner we find a solution to the demand for a need based minimum the better for all of us concerned. I do not think we can at all ignore this

thing if we are sincere in our protestations about social justice, about removing economic disparities, about what we have stated in our Constitution itself in the Directive Principles. Article 39 of the Directive Principles says that the State shall, in particular direct its policy towards securing that the citizens, men and women equally, have the right to an adequate means of livelihood. This provision in the Constitution which gives an assurance of adequate means of livelihood has been translated in concrete terms by the demand of the Government employees for a need-based minimum wage.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN (Andhra Pradesh): Mr. Bhupesh Gupta, in the present economic conditions, do you honestly think that we can give a need-based wage?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: My friend will not understand anything. I will come to that, I will meet all your arguments.

Therefore you will agree that a need-based minimum wage is certainly not more than a living, adequate wage. The adequate wage you have promised in your Constitution, if anything, is certainly more than the need-based minimum wage which the Government employees and other working people are asking for in the country. We shall come to that aspect of the matter. Therefore, I say that it was become today a truly national demand. It is not a demand by one section of the Government employees, it is a demand of the entire working people. In fact, it is a national demand. The struggle has put this demand in a truly national focus. This you must understand. This itself is a great achievement of the Government employees' strike. Also the struggle has cemented their unity and cemented the ties of the Government employees with the other sections of the working people, which is no small gain, and the struggle has brought about very many unions in common endeavour and common action which, from the point of view of working class and democratic movements, is

undoubtedly a notable and memorable achievement.

Madam Deputy Chairman, before I pass on to the deeper aspects of the subject, we are naturally worried today about the aftermath of the strike. There are even now 12,000 Government employees who have been dismissed, suspended or whose services have been otherwise terminated. You know that when the Cabinet took a decision to withdraw the notices of termination of service—it was a good decision in so far as it went—44,000 Government employees, temporary employees, were not dismissed, it is good that they had not been sent out. But no person who has been sent out, suspended or dismissed or otherwise whose services have been terminated has been taken back as yet since that Cabinet decision, and 12,000 of them still remain. This is an aspect which calls for our understanding and attention. Out of the 12,000 whose services have been terminated or suspended, 3,000 are temporary employees. Out of these 3,000 about half the number have been arrested and against whom cases are pending in courts. According to rules, those who are arrested and detained and against whom cases are pending are normally deemed to have been suspended. But in the present case we cannot understand why they are being treated as having lost their jobs and why it is treated as if their services have been terminated.

Of the 9,000 permanent employees who are suspended, about 8,000 have been arrested and cases are pending. There are no charges of violence or sabotage against them. Out of the 8,000, about 6,000 are from Delhi, Punjab, Haryana and Rajasthan. Hon. Members should know that very few arrests took place in Madras and Andhra, practically no arrest took place. In Bihar and Bengal also very few arrests took place. Cases are being withdrawn and suspension orders are being cancelled in Bengal and Bihar. I hope nobody will suggest that the Government is showing this liberal attitude, figuratively speaking, because of the mid-term elections there. We

cannot have a mid-term election in Delhi, Rajasthan and other places in order that they should show such a relaxation in their attitude.

In Delhi, mass arrests were made in five post offices alone, numbering about 1,600 people. In Delhi, they are trying to run the services without these staff. The consequent inefficiency in services, the public are made to believe, is due to the regular staff, etc. Here we are the sufferers, not merely those who have been sent out, but we are the sufferers. I would like to ask the hon. Members to consider this problem dispassionately and in a manner of understanding. Recognitions of ten all-India unions have been withdrawn, apart from many other unions of a local nature. Now, you will find that when the recognitions of these unions had been withdrawn. Some mushroom unions or unions had been recognised. In the Posts and Telegraphs they are supposed to have some union here which has been recognised, nobody knows where their offices are, who are their representatives, whether they exist in Delhi at all. Still these unions, yet to be born perhaps or have been born only in the wake of the strike or on paper, have been recognised by the Government.

Now, this is surely not the way of having a clean slate. This is surely not the way of closing the chapter. This is surely not the way of restoring normalcy. This is surely not the way of displaying that you are sympathetic. This is surely not the way of recapturing the goodwill that should obtain between the higher echelons in the administration and the common run of Government employees. This is a constant provocation. This itself is an act which dis-organises our services, creates a very bad example and really makes the situation more complicated. I hope the Government would now start discussion with the leaders of Government employees and through bipartite talks these problems of victimisation will be solved to the satisfaction of the Government employees. The problem of victimisation will be solved to the satisfaction of the Govern-

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta] ment employees and the public. It is within the reach of the Government. Everybody knows that the Government is powerful. Everybody knows that those who have been thrown out of employment are starving with their families, that they are in the midst of great suffering and hardship. When the cause of the Government employees is just why should you stand on prestige? Why you should flex the muscle all the time over a matter like this I cannot understand. I still appeal to all concerned in the Government to talk to the leaders of the Government employees and try to solve this problem and close this chapter.

Madam Deputy Chairman, let me now come to the more fundamental aspect of the matter. First of all, I should like to say one or two things about the genesis of this particular strike. This is a little important because a lot of misrepresentation has taken place. Firstly, it was a token strike. It was meant to be a token strike. In fact it was a token strike. Mr. Chavan and others thought that it was a dress rehearsal for some bigger struggle. May I know which Intelligence Officer with any common-sense submitted a report of this kind to make a token strike an industrial dispute which would take the shape of a revolution. It is the utterest nonsense that a man with any common-sense can ever utter. It was nothing but a token strike. The strike was in consonance with the provisions of the Constitution. The strike was in line with the principles and norms of trade union movement. The strike was perfectly legal and was intended to be peaceful, and, in fact, it was peaceful. The violence was on the other side, the Congress Government. The strike was made illegal by striking at the fundamental rights of our Constitution, by striking at the trade union movement by the heinous, shameless Ordinance which Mr. Chavan promulgated behind the back of Parliament. The strike was perfectly lawful and constitutional. Madam Deputy Chairman, may I ask now after two months of the strike, assuming that the strike

had taken place without the police interference, without the Ordinance, the heavens would not have come down. The situation would not have been worse than what it is today. A one-day token strike would not have altered anything. The one-day strike would have passed off peacefully and everything would have been normal the next day. For the abnormality, for the dislocation of the services, for the difficulties of the public, it is this Congress Government which is primarily responsible, which is wholly responsible. That is what I would like to submit to the House.

Madam Deputy Chairman, strike took place in Japan. It took place in France when nine million Government employees and workers went on strike. There was not a single case of police firing or lathi charge not to speak of ordinance. Yet Mr. De Gaulle's regime is regarded as a regime of personal dictatorship. Here we are supposed to have a flowering democracy, beautified democracy, beautified in all manner. What has happened to that beautified democracy? A peaceful strike was suppressed with violence which a monopolist class is capable of indulging in. It is a shame. The other day there was a strike in Japan but we never heard of such a thing there. Therefore, Madam, you must read into the behaviour of the Government something more than mere brandishing of the police lathi and danda. It indicates a clear policy of violence, of interference in, of suppression of trade union rights to intimidate the Government employees and the working class. Here instead of improving the situation they tried to worsen it by attacking the working people the moment they came forward to advance their very legitimate demand and to seek redressal.

I was reading some London and American papers where they have acclaimed the Government for the manner in which the strong man, Mr. Chavan, handled the strike. Even a talk of it in the city of London and New York in this manner is a shame and you should take it really as a con-

demnation of the manner in which the administration here is functioning. Madam Deputy Chairman, I should like here to come to one or two other aspects of the demands. Come to the need-based minimum. Did it come in all of a sudden? It was not a demand which was put up suddenly by some people who wanted to take political advantage of the situation. After independence the Government itself was groping to find some norms of wages and so on. Thanks to the working people's struggle, some norms were arrived at from time to time through struggle and tripartite and bipartite discussions. Now these norms took the shape of a need-based minimum. Remember that it was arrived at by a tripartite agreement in 1957-53. It was a tripartite agreement. That agreement included the Central Government, the State Governments and the employers and the workers' representatives. All came to the conclusion that we must work towards the need-based minimum wage. Everybody welcomed it and, what is more, the Government supported it. Now only when the Second Pay Commission was appointed that Mr. Morarji Desai was asked by the Commission to give his opinion on the question of the need-based minimum. Mr. Morarji Desai wrote a letter to the Pay Commission saying that he did not accept this convention. He did not accept the commitment of the Government. So whatever somebody might say it is Mr. Morarji Desai, the Finance Minister of the time and the Government of the time who violated the tripartite agreement arrived at on the question of a need-based minimum wage. It is not the workers and the Government employees who violated anything. Still the workers and the Government employees have stood by the principle which had been arrived at through mutual consultations and discussions and by agreement. It was a unilateral violation of that agreement by the Government. Such a behaviour is regarded by the I.L.O. as most objectionable, not only anti-labour but offensive. I do not know how the Members here would view this matter.

Madam Deputy Chairman, what is the position? If you take the 1949 index figure as 100 you will find that on the basis of the data the need-based minimum wage would be between Rupees 100 and Rupees 125 depending on diet. Now the prices have gone up and the price index has risen from 100 to 200. On that basis the need-based minimum should be clearly between Rs. 200 and Rs. 250. That is the position. They were going in that direction. What happened? Mr. Morarji Desai stopped it believing in the policy of wage freeze of which he is very fond. You will remember, Madam, that at that time the idea of real wage came. Then the idea has since been given a go-by because neutralisation has not been given hundred per cent. Today when the prices have gone up we find that the major sections of the working people and the Government employees are getting only 60 per cent, of the neutralisation. The real wages of the major sections of the Government employees come to about 60 per cent, of what they were getting ten years ago. This is the position. That is accepted. I am talking not from any trade union brief but from the reports of the Government, the Labour Ministry and the Finance Ministry. Therefore, the real wages are falling behind while the prices are rising. Neutralisation and the rise in the cost of living are not keeping abreast with the rise in prices. Such is the situation. In such a situation obviously the Government employees demanded a fair deal. What did they ask for? They demanded a need-based minimum apart from other demands into which I am not going.

Madam Deputy Chairman, the Government took a stubborn attitude. Now after the 1960 strike the Joint Consultative Machinery was set up. It was on the pattern of the so-called Whitley Council. Here was a clear commitment by the Government that the Whitley Council machinery will be worked and that all disputes which could not be settled by the Joint Consultative Machinery would be referred to arbitration. But on account of the cussed attitude of the Government a

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta]

solution could not be found with regard to many matters including, above all, the demand for a need-based minimum wage. It was open to the Government to refer it to arbitration under the terms of agreement, under the very principle which guided this institution, the Joint Consultative Machinery. But here in this House and in the other House the Government declared "No, it is not arbitrable; we shall not send it to arbitration". Many arguments had been put forward in this connection. First of all, the argument is "We are not in a position to refer it to arbitration the question of payment of need-based wage" because according to Mr. Morarji Desai's logic "it would be referring the Budget to arbitration". What a wonderful logic ? I have never known such height of absurdity displayed as logic from the treasury benches. May I know from the hon. Members and from the Finance Minister of the country, when you referred the question of the wages and allowances of the Government employees to the First Pay Commission or to the Second Pay Commission, were you referring the Budget to the arbitration of the Pay Commission ? Were you asking the Pay Commission to write the Budget for you simply because certain demands of the working people had been referred to a machinery created by the Government, namely, the Pay Commission ? Nobody then said it. Yet the recommendations of the Pay Commission had some impact on the Budget and the Budget had to adjust partially to the recommendations of the Pay Commission. So this is an absurd logic. If reference of the question of wages to the Pay Commission was not reference of the Budget to the arbitration of the Pay Commission, how then could the question of reference to arbitration of the demands for need-based wage be regarded as putting the Budget in the hands of an arbitrator, I cannot understand. It is perverse logic, it is the logic of people who have gone bankrupt, whose ideas are bankrupt as in certain matters of financial, economic

and political policies. Madam Deputy Chairman, on the contrary, in a progressive society, if we at all intend to be progressive, the Budget is an instrument of national policy. It is the task of the Budget to adjust to the requirements of socio-economic development. It is the task of the Finance Minister to take into account the demands of various aspects of social life and economic development, of the various classes who create wealth, and then adjust the Budget accordingly. The Budget implies a social policy, a social approach. Instead of taking that approach, they took an entirely different approach and then tried to mislead the public as if the Central Government employees were trying to send the Budget of the Government of India to an arbitrator. It is false logic. People would laugh at this logic. This kind of fantastic, nonsensical argument can only pass where ignorance is bliss or a calculated art on the part of some people. Madam Deputy Chairman, I will leave it at that.

Then there is the question of capacity to pay. My friend, Shri Akbar Ali Khan, got up and said "Where is the capacity to pay?" But I never saw him get up on the question of capacity to pay on the part of the Government when the Government suddenly, to meet a situation, increased our Defence Budget from Rs. 500 crores to well over Rs. 1,000 crores.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN : That is for the security of the country.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : Almost overnight we increased our capacity, maybe justifiably. But the question of capacity was not raised then. I think here also in the case of the Government employees there is justification, and the element of capacity should not be brought in in the manner in which it has been done.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN : Even if you are in the treasury bench, I am convinced honestly that you cannot give a need-based wage to all sections.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : You always believe what the Government

says. Now here the increase in the Budget was Rs. 500 crores. Where was the money found? Nobody questioned the capacity of the Government then. Madam Deputy Chairman, did you see our Defence Minister, our Deputy Defence Minister, our Parliamentary Secretaries or some other people going on hunger strike in order to impress upon Mr. Morarji Desai that an additional sum of Rs. 500 crores should be found for our National Defence Budget? This you never saw. No hunger strike was needed, no economic discussion was needed; the matter was settled almost out of court straightway. Now when the question of Government employees comes, the argument about capacity to pay is put forward. Madam Deputy Chairman, when Mr. and Mrs. Dharma Teja—and I must say that Mrs. Dharma Teja was a charming lady, a fascinating lady, a captivating woman—came for money and asked for Rs. 20 crores, no question of capacity to pay was raised. The money was given straightway. Madam Deputy Chairman, the other day Mr. Morarji Desai declared in Goa that he would give financial assistance to the States if they would carry out Prohibition, and that he was ready to finance them to the extent of 50 per cent of the loss that they would incur, which comes, according to the calculation of Mr. Dandekar, in whom my friend has got any amount of faith, to Rs. 130 crores. Mr. Morarji Desai is ready to finance Prohibition, which means bootlegging, to the extent of Rs. 130 crores. But when the Government employees, suffering, toiling and starving, stretch out their hand for a little succour and relief, Mr. Morarji Desai tells Mr. Chavan "Put them in prison; shoot them down. You can lathi-charge them, victimise them, hang them. That is the law." Well, I can give many more examples of departmental expenditure. See the Budget. Year after year overhead charges and departmental and non-developmental expenditures are going up. Wherefrom do you get money for this, I should like to know. Madam Deputy Chairman, the mere act of devaluation which reduced the value of the rupee in terms of the

dollar and the sterling, raised our outstanding foreign debt from Rs. 2,700 crores to Rs. 4,100 crores; *i.e.* by Rs. 1,400 crores as if by a stroke of pen. I do not say that the money is being spent in one single year, but every year we are, on account of devaluation, paying Rs. 200 crores or so more than we used to pay before devaluation. Where is the money coming from? Why was the question of capacity not considered then? At that time, the question of capacity did not arise. But here it arises. Therefore, it is a wrong approach . . .

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Please wind up.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : So it is a wrong approach. It is an altogether insupportable, unjustified, unworthy approach on the part of the Government. Madam Deputy Chairman, the Central Government employees did not demand "Give us all the money today". All that they said was "Refer our demands to arbitration. Let the arbitrator decide and then we can discuss it". It was not a question of working out and paying cash the moment the Government employees appeared with their demands. Nothing of the kind. Yet when Mr. Asoka Mehta, Mr. Subramaniam and others demanded devaluation, it was done without reference to the Parliament. Immediately we lost. But when the Government employees came to have the matter considered, they were attacked.

My final point in this connection is this, the way the strike has been dealt with by Mr. Chavan and his Government is a shame; it has brought shame on our democracy, if we at all claim to be a democracy. Madam Deputy Chairman, they were negotiating. Leaders of the Government employees were negotiating. Mr. Chavan negotiated with them with an ordinance in his pocket. He knew that he would suppress the strike. It was a camouflage on his part, it was a manoeuvre on his part when he made a show of negotiation while preparing his machine of repression for an all-out war, an all-out attack against the Government

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta] employees. That is how it has been done. Madam Deputy Chairman, while the Parliament was in session, when we discussed such things, why didn't the Central Government come before the Parliament with a proposal for a Bill like the one they passed by way of an Ordinance? They did not do so because they knew that it would not be easy possible for them to pass such a Bill in Parliament. That is why they did not give an inkling of it to Parliament. When the Parliament was in recess, like persons who attack people's houses at dead of night, kill people and raid homes in the dark hours of the night, Mr. Chavan came out with his Ordinance and made a legal strike illegal, swept away trade union lights, swept away fundamental rights and let loose his minions, the police, all over the country. Madam Deputy Chairman, I need not go into this thing. The tale of repression would shock any one.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Please wind up.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : I am finishing. I would now like to refer to one or two cases before I sit down. I cannot give you the whole story of that repression. Thousands of people, tens of thousands of people had been arrested. In Kalka—here is an application with me signed by 430 people—the police went and entered their homes and assaulted women, children and others. Here in Adra and other places also they behaved in this manner. This is the account I can give. Here is a petition which 450 people have signed.

Madam Deputy Chairman, I need not tell the story of the Indraprastha Bhavan. It is well known. I would like to know as to why there is no judicial public enquiry into all the cases of police firing and excesses, because in a judicial public enquiry everything will be brought to light. In that Mr. Chavan will come in for criticism ; the Secretaries will come in for criticism; high officials will come in for criticism. You say, in the Indraprastha Bhavan incident an officer was

responsible and he has been suspended. How is it that responsibility does not attach to Mr. Chavan himself ? Why is he taking cover under the showy suspension of some official instead of coming and telling us who is the guilty. It is a sad commentary on parliamentary democracy when Ministers take cover under actions against officers. Well, in the Mundhra case action was taken against Mr. H. M. Patel and some people did not believe that Mr. Krishnamachari was guilty. But here I would like to know: what about Mr. Chavan ?

Finally, Madam Deputy Chairman, I should like to say, the entire behaviour of the Government has been revengeful, has been vindictive. There is no doubt about it. Mr. Chavan has sought to prove himself a strong man. He was applauded in London and Washington, I know. I have read the "Times". I have read the "Washington Post" and other papers which come here. He degraded our parliamentary democracy. Our working people are unsafe today when they have to face such a violence on the part of the authorities.

Madam Deputy Chairman, before I sit down I strike a note of warning. Well, it is quite clear, the Government is out to smash the trade union rights, to attack the trade union movement, to attack the working people, because the monopolist bosses who maintain the people in authority and power want this happen. They are there for the ruling party. They told the Government, "You Government, you are the biggest employer in the country and you have set an example of suppression of collective bargaining, suppression of trade union rights". Therefore, I take the entire action of the Government as a sign of a mounting, growing offensive against the working people. They have landed the country in a crisis today. Now, they want to get out of this situation by attacking their own employees in this manner.

Finally, Madam Deputy Chairman, I demand the cancellation of all victimisation orders of dismissal or suspension or whatever they may be. I demand the restoration of recognition

to all unions which have been recognised. I demand the withdrawal of all cases and warrants pending against the Government employees. Only thus you can close the dismal chapter and begin a new one. I hear that the talk is going to take place today between the leaders of the various opposition parties or the various parties in the Parliament and the Prime Minister this afternoon. There I hope, this chapter of victimisation must be ended. Every single Government employee who had been thrown out of employment, whatever the pretext, must get his job and every union must be recognised. Thank you.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Now Mr. Krishan Kant. May I request the Members who are participating in this debate to keep some kind of a restraint on time ?

SHRI KRISHAN KANT (Haryana): Madam Deputy Chairman, my heart goes out to those Government employees who are moving on the streets of Delhi, in the corridors of the Government of India, who have been dismissed or who have been suspended. They come to me daily and they tell me a harrowing tale as to what happened to them. I feel sorry to hear their stories. I was astonished when they told me that "we have been completely misguided". They told me, their hopes were raised to the sky and they thought they would get something. I am sorry, a good cause, a cause which was initiated by the Government of India in the Labour Conference headed by Shri Gulzarilal Nanda, a Congress Minister, saying that the aim of our welfare State would be to give a need-based minimum wage to the people in the country, a good cause for which we all struggle, for which we all are working—whether in the Congress or outside—that cause has been spoiled in the wrong hands. These workers tell me that the Left Communists have misguided them. They tell me that the leaders of the movement went away, some people signed early in the morning and came out. Some were on duty for work. Those workers who were genuine workers were arrested and they are now loitering on the ! 6—38 R.S./68

streets. The leaders of this movement, who created this fire, are still away. They have not been caught. So, what has happened is, the innocent, genuine, well-meaning people, the Central Government employees for whom we feel so much, have been misled. They are suffering and the leaders are scot-free—I am sorry, a good man like Mr. Bhupesh Gupta or a sober man like Mr. S. M. Joshi and all those people, if you talk to them, you will find them very balanced and good people. But then, some friends of theirs and including Mr. Banka Behary Das—I am sorry for him, he is a very sober and genuine man—have been carried away by the high slogans of getting something and attracting the people by false hopes and false slogans. Madam Deputy Chairman, it appears to be a race, who gives bigger hopes, who raises bigger slogans. That is the game that they are playing, a game with the interests of the poor people. The struggle for the betterment of society, the struggle to create a welfare State, a socialist State, is being clouded. I am sorry for that. In the morning we were discussing about the dearness allowance. A struggle has been going on all over the country that the State Governments' employees must have the same dearness allowance as the Central Government's employees and we feel their demand is just. In the welfare State that we want to create there must be an equality of emoluments, whether of the State Governments' employees or of the Central Government's employees. That struggle is going on. The State Governments are accusing the Central Government that it does not give us money. That struggle has not been fulfilled, a new struggle has been started now—for the need-based minimum wage. It means, it will create more disparities between the Central Government employees and the State Government employees so that a struggle, a collision comes up and it creates more unrest. I know that the Government of India did not fall a prey to this kind of game. We heard the slogans, "we want that dearness allowance should be given to them. We want a living wage for all the State Governments'

[Shri Krishan Kant.] employees". Now it is the need-based minimum wage. What does it mean ? It means only slogan-mongering. Though I do not know the facts of the situation. Mr. Chitta Basu will say, when the State Governments are not able to give the dearness allowance, the Central Government should give it . . . (Interruption) In that egalitarian society which you want to create it is necessary that the Central Government employees and the State Government employees must have equal wages. That is the first stage. There is no need for creating more and more disparities. This is one thing. 3 P.M.

Then you know that there has been a struggle going on among the political parties what to do and what not to do. My personal assessment is that our friends like Mr. Bhupesh Gupta, Mr. S. M. Joshi and others in the SSP and CPI have been hustled into this situation by the Left Communists. Our friends in the Jan Sangh knew that the struggle was not going to succeed and it was a very wrong movement but they thought 'Let us fish in troubled waters'. So they spoke with two voices. Mr. Madhok said "Do not go on strike" and others said "We are with you". They thought that they had no base yet in the labour movement; so they wanted to have that base there. I do not want to name anybody but a Jan Sangh leader in Delhi, because he wanted to show that he was a well-wisher of the Central Government employees and he was with them, went there with a garland and sat in the police van. When the police asked him to get out of the police van, he said "I am under" arrest". The police said "We have not arrested you" but he said "I am under arrest". So with a garland he was sitting in the police van.

SHRI D. THENGARI (Uttar Pradesh) : I should be very happy if Mr. Chavan corroborates the facts now narrated by Mr. Krishan Kant. He should have at least corroborated from Mr. Chavan.

(Interruption!)

SHRI KRISHAN KANT: I am not naming anybody. The main thing is that everybody is eager to take advantage of a particular situation so that he should become popular with labour. Nobody cares whether labour is led to a deluge or elsewhere. They are saying "Nadan kee dostee jee kaa janjal". They neither can get out of this situation nor wish to remain entangled. What has happened now ? The Left Communist and other Parties are in a quandary what to do. What happened in the Lok Sabha that day? They created such a situation that the Prime Minister was not allowed to speak. This was done deliberately so that they could show their faces to the Central Government employees that they were not misleading them. In such an august House like Parliament can you justify such a situation in which even the Prime Minister is not allowed to speak? Is this the way how democracy functions? Can any true democrat behave in that way? It is only those people who do not have faith in the parliamentary democracy, they alone can behave in that fashion using the parliamentary democracy as a tool to justify their objective. I think the members of the CPI, SSP and PSP are ashamed of their behaviour because I know that friends like Mr. Bhupesh Gupta or Mr. Rajnarain or Mr. Joshi or Mr. Banka Behary Das have full faith in parliamentary democracy. Of course, we are all for right causes. Mr. Dange gave the example of the pharmaceutical industry and said that the need-based minimum wage can be given. That is true. Wherever an industry makes profits and the Wage Board gives its report, we are for it. I think when the question of implementation of the Wage Board Award for the newspaper industry came up, I was there, Mr. Dharia was there and everybody else was there, because the report showed that they were making profits. So when profits are being made, the labourers and workers must get a share of those profits and if that share is not given, then we can struggle for them and die for them. But what is the position today ? If we had been an affluent State, we would certainly have worked

for them. But you know, Madam Deputy Chairman, that the country has passed during the last two or three years through drought conditions. You also know that our agricultural production went down from 89 million tons in 1964-65 to 75 million tons in 1966-67. There was recession in the industrial field. We in this House wanted all help to be given to unemployed engineers; unemployment has increased in this country because of recession. The backlog of unemployment at the end of the Third Plan is 9.8 million people. Madam, 40 thousand workers in the engineering industry are unemployed; 30 thousand people are unemployed in the textile industry; 40 thousand people, engineers, educated people, are unemployed. (*Interruptions*) Madam, why is he getting impatient? That shows that the Left Communists have lost the ground and they can only gain it by interrupting us and not allowing us to speak. They want to tell the Central Government servants that they are their well-wishers. They are like those people about whom the Central Government Servants are saying "Oh God, save us from such saviours." We in this House during the last year discussed many times the question of unemployment among educated people. Government came forward with certain proposals to remove unemployment but we were not satisfied with them. We know that not enough has been done in that direction and unemployment is increasing. So is this the time to ask for a need-based minimum wage? When our production increases and when our national income increases, we shall certainly be with them in their demand for a need-based minimum wage. We do not lack in patriotism or love or affection for the Central Government servants; after all they are our breath-rens and we know their difficulties. The main thing is that the rate of savings and investment has been reduced and even after two or three years our economy has not yet sufficiently improved. But here we find that the slogan of a need-based minimum wage is being raised. I can say that the whole thing is that it is politically motivated; there

is no doubt about it. When the hon. Home Minister said that the National Labour Commission was looking into it, Mr. Dange said that it was not looking into it.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : Mr. Dange was a member of the National Labour Commission and he knows things better.

SHRI KRISHAN KANT : Kindly hear me. Supposing for argument's sake what Mr. Dange was saying was correct but when the Home Minister said that the National Labour Commission would look into it and he committed himself to that—it may be rightly or wrongly—and when he also said that the Report was expected by March 1969 and after that we could discuss this question ...

SHRI A. G. KULKARNI (Maharashtra) : Till that time the elections will be over.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Madam Deputy Chairman, on a point of order. Can we misrepresent a Member of the other House or a Party leader in the Lok Sabha who is not present here? Mr. Dange precisely exposed the duplicity on the part of the Home Minister when he wanted to mislead the country by saying that the National Labour Commission was looking into it. Mr. Dange is supposed to know it better because he was a member of the National Labour Commission. I was explaining that even if Mr. Dange was correct and the Home Minister was wrong—I am saying for argument—when the Home Minister and the Chairman exchanged letters and the Home Minister said that the National La'. Commission would consider the question of minimum wage even if it was wrong, they would have been forced to do so. The Home Minister said that the report was expected in March 1969 and after that the whole situation could be considered. The Home Minister must have been correct because the recession in the industries and unemployment among engineers" etc. are there now and by the next Budget Session he might be able to help but the difficulty was, they were not prepared to wait for six months. I only want to drive at the conclusion that it was not the interest of the Central Government

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta.] employees that motivated them but it was a political motivation that led them to do it.

श्री शीलमद्र याजी (बिहार) : उन को ये मसाला दे रहे हैं ।

SHRI KRISHAN KANT: Mr. Gupta said that they wanted just arbitration and they were not wanting money immediately but the question is, the Home Minister himself said: 'They themselves do not want money. Wait for March 1969 and then everything can be discussed. The Chairman of the Labour Commission said that he is going to give the report by that time about that and then let us study it.' They did not want to wait for that. They said: 'Now or never'. The main thing was the mid-term elections that are coming. They want to tell the employees: 'We are your saviours and nobody else'. The Home Minister, in the last meeting, went to the extent of saying: 'Let us discuss whether the need-based minimum is arbitrable or not.' They said: 'No, we will strike' and they walked out.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Are you ready to ask the Government to produce Mr. Chavan's letter to the Chairman or place the correspondence on the Table of the House? Mr. Dange demanded it in the other House because he knows the text. Again and again you are indulging in deliberate falsehood in order to mislead.

SHRI KRISHAN KANT: The main thing is, they wanted to give a bad name to the Central Government. You know how the Central Government behaved. We know how friends of Shri Rajnarain and Shri Thengari behave in Madhya Pradesh. They accuse the Central Government, for issuing the Ordinance. What did the M. P. Government do? The Deputy Chief Minister of the Jan Sangh is still there. They are defying. What happened in U.P.? Near the Secretariat shooting went on. I have no sympathy for those police officials who shot people in the Indraprastha Estate and I think normally I would have certainly supported

the demand for a judicial enquiry but the Home Minister and the Government of India took immediate action. They gave relief immediately to the victims. An enquiry was held. If a judicial enquiry takes place, it will take two months and no action will be taken but the main question is, they want the judicial enquiry to continue for another six months so that it goes on simmering. So it is not for the Central Government employees but for the sake of their political motive that they are demanding this so that by that time the mid-term elections might be over. So in the present situation, I would appeal to my friends here: let us sit down together and evolve certain things which will be good for the Government servants...

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Stop victimisation.

SHRI KRISHAN KANT: ... and not harm the interest of the Government servants. This will harm the cause which is dear to everybody. Mr. Gupta yesterday and to-day said: 'Let the Prime Minister make a statement. We do not want to hear the Home Minister as he has given provocation'. We are all giving provocation but we know we have freedom to speak in this House but they do not want to give the same right to the Prime Minister or to the Home Minister. In that House they said: 'We will not hear the Prime Minister'. In this House he says: 'We will not hear the Home Minister'. Is this the way to function in a parliamentary democracy? I hope in the name of freedom of speech, they do not kill the very institution and the very principles for which we all stand.

SHRI D. THENGARI: Madam, I need not repeat all the facts that are already publicly known. One thing is obvious that the greatest responsibility for the token strike of September 19th rests with the Government of India. Had the Government any intention of avoiding the strike possibility, it was within their reach but it seems the Government was determined to provoke the workers. That is why they did not abide by whatever has been laid down in the scheme of Joint Con-

sultative Machinery. The scheme in unmistakable terms provides for arbitration in case of disagreement on certain questions including salaries and allowances. There was no reason why the Government should not have agreed to arbitrate but this particular fact and again the fact that on behalf of the Government there have been attempts to terrorise and provoke simultaneously the Government employees even in subsequent periods goes to prove that more than the employees, the Government has been responsible for the strike on 19th September. Now the propaganda by the Government regarding the demands has outdone even Dr. Goebbels. The Government had agreed in principle in the 15th ILC about the need-based minimum wage. We do not understand why there should be no coordination between the Labour Ministry and the Finance Ministry. It has been said that the Government employees constitute a fixed income group—that is correct—that crores of people in the rural areas are starving—that is also true—that this is not true—the Government employees are aspiring to thrive at the cost of the starving millions, as if the Government employees are out to snatch the morsel of foodgrains from the mouths of the starving millions in the rural areas. That is not so. If our agricultural labourers and the petty kisans are on starvation level, the Government employees are not to be blamed for their miserable plight. It is the wrong economic policies and planning of the Government that are responsible for this. Again while mentioning one extreme of starvation, the Government has conveniently ignored or forgotten that there is the other extreme also. Thousands of crores of black money through tax evasion—of anything between Rs. 200 to Rs. 300 crores every year—concentration of wealth in the private sector—at least the lion's share of wealth—in 75 industrial houses—all these facts are conveniently ignored by the Government and only the starving millions are referred to. This is unfair.

We want to suggest—we have already said—that the national income policy,

the national price policy and the national production policy of the country during the Fourth Five-Year Plan period should be determined at least now. Now we are on the threshold of the Fourth Five-Year Plan and this is the appropriate time when all these three national policies regarding once, production and income should be determined, and for this purpose we had suggested that the Government should convene a round table conference of all the economic interests—I am not mentioning political parties—a round table conference of all the economic interests so that, through the conference, on the basis of some sort of consensus, all the three national policies can be evolved. I am very confident, Madam, that if such a round table conference is convened, the representatives of the Central Government employees, or for that matter of all the workers in general, would be able to prove that a need-based minimum wage is possible even under the present circumstances. But that apart, what was highlighted in the Government propaganda was the fact that the workers demanded a need-based minimum wage. But they conveniently forgot to highlight the fact that what they actually wanted was arbitration on the point. Therefore, some sort of a misunderstanding about the demand of the workers was created.

Recently we were amused to read in the newspapers that our Finance Minister, Shri Morarji Desai, had declared that the Centre was prepared to give Rs. 100 crores to the States for the implementation of the policy of prohibition. If a hundred crores could be given for prohibition, why the same amount could not be diverted for the benefit of Government employees is something ununderstandable.

Now the point has been raised by our friend that the National Labour Commission is going into this question. As a matter of fact, it is controversial whether this point was already specifically referred to the National Labour Commission; I will not go into the controversy but, apart from that, it is but logical to say that the National Labour Commission would have been

[Shri D. Thengari] greatly helped if this important problem would have been referred to arbitration so that the proceedings of arbitration and the arbitration award would have greatly helped the National Labour Commission in arriving at right conclusions on this most important point.

Secondly, Madam, it was said—rather an impression was created—that these employees were out for an all out revolution—as if they wanted to go on an indefinite strike and as if the Government had come down heavily upon these alleged revolutionaries and curbed the revolution. Now this is all false. It is a well known principle that strike is an outlet for discontent so that a revolution should become superfluous. Those who want revolution do not resort to strikes, and those who resort to the legitimate and constitutional weapon of strikes are not out for a revolution. Still, there was a calculated effort on the part of the Government to create this misunderstanding, and also to create the impression that the Home Ministry had behaved in a very strong manner and proved themselves strong administrators. Madam, in this connection I cannot but be reminded of a story, which everyone of us has read, about one Don Quixote. He attacked a windmill thinking that it was a demon, and when the windmill was stopped by his attack, he paraded himself as a brave man and said that he had killed a demon. Actually there was no demon but only a windmill, and there was no killing. In the same way here there was no revolution and there were no revolutionaries, but yet an impression was created that a revolution had been suppressed. To say so is very unfair to the Government employees.

Now so far as the present plight of the employees is concerned, I am sorry to say that the various Departments of the Government of India were not uniformly implementing the decision about termination of the services of temporary employees on the 18th of October. First of all we find, Madam, that there is no uniformity even in the

, policy of victimisation; there are no uniform criteria for victimisation of the employees in different States. For example, out of about 7,600 total arrests, nearly 6,000 were confined to five States; they are Delhi, Punjab, Haryana, Rajasthan and Madhya Pradesh, though in other States also the degree of the success of the strike was no less than in those States. This indicates that more than any policy the petty prejudices of local officials had a free hand in victimising the employees and there was no uniform policy. Now we And, for example, how uniformity is lacking even in victimisation in the Audit and Accounts Departments where some 416 are suspended though only 80 out of them were actually arrested and their services since terminated, but the others have been suspended even when they had not been arrested.

Now regarding the suspended employees, different policies are followed in different offices. For example, at Ranchi the suspended employees are required to mark their attendance in office every day, whereas in the office of the A.G.C.R. in Delhi the suspended employees are not even allowed to enter the office. Thus there is no uniformity of policy even in the matter of victimisation.

In the Railways 3,616 are suspended and 935 are dismissed. But suspension apart, many of the railway employees were arrested on the 18th of September, that is, on the previous day, while they were alighting from buses or returning from office and proceeding homeward. In the first place the arrests, such mass arrests were unjustified and, secondly, curiously enough, without a chargesheet being given, those who were arrested on the 18th of September have been accused of staying away from work on the 19th of September. This pattern of accusation has been followed in similar cases in the case of employees of other Ministries also. In the Railways, the policy of withdrawing termination notices against temporary employees has not been implemented in a large number of cases, and wherever it is

implemented, it is done on the basis of discrimination—the whims and fancies of local bureaucrats. There have been cases of deliberate, calculated moves and manoeuvres by local bureaucrats to victimise employees out of vindictiveness. To cite an example—I will not repeat—to cite a single example—a telegraphist—we do not know whether at the instance of official instigation or not—reported to the police on 23rd September that he was assaulted by nine persons on the 20th of September. He did not report it to the officer in-charge, nor was it reported to the police for three days. Now after three days he is reporting, and merely on that report these nine persons were arrested and then suspended from service. Out of the nine, four were temporary and they were discharged from service. And one of them, Mr. S. R. Gupta, a telegraphist, he died in hospital out of shock. The point to be noted is that the complaint was made three days after the alleged assault though it was alleged to have happened within the office premises. The officer in-charge was not informed, nor was there any investigation by the officer in-charge. Thus the arrests and suspensions were made without any investigation. Such examples of vindictiveness can be multiplied, but I have cited a single example.

One of the more important problems, Madam, is about the termination of temporary employees; most of the temporary employees were not at all arrested and yet discharged without giving them any opportunity to explain their cases. At the most they could have been suspended, show cause notices served on them, and further action based upon the replies received from them. In the absence of show cause notices the termination is obviously arbitrary. So all temporary employees, whose services are thus terminated, should be immediately reinstated. This is the demand of justice.

Now, even in the case of such of the temporary employees, who happened to be arrested, the injustice done is equally obvious. Their cases are pending before law courts. Still they

are terminated. Now, suppose some of them are acquitted subsequently, what will be the position of those terminated employees? Clearly, their termination should be withdrawn. At the most, suspension orders should be served.

The Ministry of Works and Housing, Madam, has withdrawn many termination orders and served orders of suspension on such employees. I think the same procedure should have been followed by other Ministries also. The postal services in Delhi are not yet normal. The Government is claiming that they are normal but the claim is false to the knowledge of the Government. New recruits are pressed into service but naturally they cannot dispose of the work that efficiently.

In response to the Government's decision on October 18 to cancel the termination notices served on temporary employees the National Federation of Posts and Telegraphs employees withdrew its work-to-rule programme—this was a gesture of good-will—and extended its cooperation to the Government in running the services efficiently. But the Communications Ministry has not implemented the decision of reinstating the terminated temporary employees. Thus the offer of cooperation has been cold-shouldered. Along with the temporary employees the plight of extra-departmental staff is also miserable. At least a thousand extra-departmental staff have been victimised. Their wages are only from Rs. 40 to Rs. 60. Madam, I would urge that the extra-departmental staff should be treated as a special case and all of them reinstated immediately.

Madam, there have been cases of unwarranted firing and lathi charges. At Pathankot without any provocation on the part of the workers or the citizens there was firing in the course of which six persons died and 33 were injured, mostly with bullets, and the wonderful part of it was that as in Serai Rohilla in Delhi, there in Pathankot also the police entered even into the family quarters. Even women were assaulted—all this without any provocation—and an officer junior to

[Shri D. Thengari] the one who ordered the firing was appointed as Enquiry Officer. Similar cases have occurred in Bikaner, Gauhati etc. There were lathi charges in Ferozepore, Jodhpur, Serai Rohilla and there was also the case of a person who was run over and killed at Jagdhari. Now in all these cases we demand that there should be judicial enquiry and that adequate compensation should be paid to the persons aggrieved and the concerned officers punished. In the particular case of Pathankot we demanded that the Report of the Executive Magistrate who conducted the enquiry should be laid on the Table of the House.

Madam, we wish that there should be perfect coordination between the Government and its employees and it is the responsibility of the Government, because Government is stronger, to take the initiative in creating an atmosphere of congeniality, an atmosphere of cordiality. Out of vindictiveness only vindictiveness would grow. Now some time also has elapsed and we are in a more calm atmosphere. Therefore I urge upon the Government to withdraw all gestures of vindictiveness and withdraw all victimisation. I will not enumerate and say that the terminated employees should be reinstated, that suspension orders should be withdrawn and so on. It is not necessary to say all that; the entire victimisation should be withdrawn and a proper atmosphere for the functioning of the Joint Consultation Machinery should be created. That is the only way to ensure the smooth functioning of the Government administrative apparatus in the country. I hope the Home Ministry will prefer to be wiser rather than vindictive.

Thank you.

SHRI R. T. PARTHASARATHY (Madras) : Madam Deputy Chairman, today I had the privilege of listening to a speech from the doyen of our House, Mr. Bhupesh Gupta but after listening to his speech I would only say that it was a political harangue and in substance there was no economic

justification. While I would agree with Mr. Bhupesh Gupta in conveying my sympathies to the families of those who died and to those who were injured as a result of the strike and the consequent action the Government took on 19th September I would say that the Government employees were totally ill-advised in their move. On the other hand I would go to the length of congratulating the Government of India on the bold stand that they took in quelling the strike. The nation's thankfulness goes to the Prime Minister and to our firm Home Minister who acted not only with wisdom but with a sense of responsibility in keeping with the high office that they are holding.

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

Sir, the firm step that they took came as a timely move to concretise stability and order in our administrative machinery. No democratic Government can function effectively—nay, can function at all—if it is going to permit and tolerate indiscipline among its own employees who are there to run the administration of the whole country. Mr. Bhupesh Gupta referred to the strike as not a serious one but only as a token strike. Whether it is a full-fledged strike or whether it is a token one I would like to say that no sensible Government anywhere in the world will allow itself to be paralysed by its own constituents. Discipline and discharge of duties with devotion and loyalty to the State should be demanded of every Government employee. To maintain this cardinal factor the Government of India on September 19 took the right decision and followed it up with the right step by promulgating the ordinance to meet the situation squarely and firmly for which it deserves the palm of the entire nation because it was a nation-saving measure as I see it.

One factor appears to me to be very important here. I would blame the Government for conducting the negotiations with those who called themselves representatives of the Government employees but who had no footing in Government service. The Government was

wrong in recognising these self-styled leaders or trade unionists who carried on their own political philosophy into the Government services, a dangerous experiment by itself. It is time, Sir, that the Government Drought forward a legislation which would offer recognition only to real Government employees as their spokesmen and exclude outsiders however important they might be in the political life of the country from the ambit of the Government employees' unions. Such a step, Sir, would not only reflect the opinion of the Government employees truly and effectively and in all its purposefulness but would prevent the Government employees from becoming a pawn and a plaything in the hands of the so-called trade union leaders. I hope the Government, and particularly the strong Home Minister, will give a positive response to this humble suggestion of mine. I again appreciate the magnanimity with which the Home Minister and the Prime Minister acted in withdrawing the notices of termination of service of the temporary employees. This was a gesture tempered by reason but to ask the same principle to be extended to all those who participated in the strike, to all those who instigated others to do it, who incited others to do it, as demanded by Mr. Bhupesh Gupta, would mean breaking the law and also asking for lawlessness and indiscipline in Government services to be perpetuated. Sir, the law should be allowed to take its course. Sympathy cannot be extended to those who deliberately instigated and incited others to bring upon the Government a paralytic force. I appeal to the Government, and particularly to the Home Minister who is here today, to act firmly and to stick to its decisions.

Mr. Bhupesh Gupta made a vociferous demand to give all the Government employees the need-based minimum wage. Much has been said in this country now and in the past few years too about this need-based minimum wage, a term that has the appearance of reasonableness "but has no end in itself for the words 'needs' and 'necessity' have no barriers of boundaries in

human conduct. The first Pay Commission made a reference to the term 'need-based minimum wage' but in a different context altogether and they drew the analogy that the need-based minimum wage should be worked out in conformity with the principle of per capita national income not only in the industrial sector but with particular reference to the agricultural sector also. But today political thinkers do give a different turn to this aspect and use the term torn off the context. In a developing country like India in regard to the application of a need-based minimum wage, as things exist today in this country, in the economic position in which we are placed, it is economically not feasible, it is materially unrealistic and it is patently unworkable. How can this be given particularly to the Government employees who form only a small proportion . . . SHRI A. P. CHATTERJEE (West Bengal) : Is it Mr. McNamara speaking?

SHRI R. T. PARTHASARATHY: ... in relation to the entire country's agricultural and industrial working population? With the present finances it is absolutely impossible to give it, however much we may like to give it to them. It would be impossible in the present financial structure to give them a need-based minimum wage. I would only request you and through you, Sir, the Members of this House to wait till the Indian Labour Conference decides this issue. We have made a reference to that Conference. Let us await the outcome of it. They will weigh the pros and cons of this particular problem which is the burning problem of the day. Let us find out what they have to say, debate it in this House and then take a decision whether it would be possible, with our present finances, to extend it to every section of the public or not. I would only say that unless we are going to apply it to the whole country, it would be wrong to apply it only to the Government employees, who ultimately enjoy much more benefits than the other sections of the public. If anybody thinks that he is going to get it through the instrument of strike or violence, I can only

[Shri R. T. Parthasarathy] say that the Government will give him the deserved answer, in whatever form it be.

The recent strike by the Government employees is a strange move by those who believe in sabotage and violence and it was a prior test to find out what proportion of the Government employees were behind these anti-national forces and anti-national groups who instigated the Government employees to strike. These groups have planned their future course of action to try and bring down the Government by paralysing its activities. I warn the Government that they should be vigilant and ever more vigilant and see that there is no infiltration of these anti-national forces into the Services, as they are out to destroy the very democratic structure of our country. In my view the Government should emulate the example of other great democratic countries like Canada, Australia, Japan, Switzerland, the United States and France by which a statutory provision should be made to restrict strikes by Government employees or the classes of civil servants, as the case may be. This is followed in some of the States like Haryana and Uttar Pradesh. I would very much like legislation to be brought forward by the Government of India for the whole country, so that not only the Government will see that its employees behave properly, but also the relationship between the Government and its employees will be smoothened out.

Mr. Bhupesh Gupta referred to the Indraprastha Bhavan incident. All that I would say very respectfully is that I am ashamed of the use of brute force which deserves condemnation in the most emphatic term. The Opposition has made no case for a judicial enquiry and I agree with the Home Minister who has very often stated that the enquiry committee that has been set up will do a good job and it will serve the purpose.

In the end, I would only say that the solution to all these evils is in the

hands of the Government. I appeal to the Government to legalise the ban on strikes and extend the law to the private and public sectors, so that our country's economy will be safeguarded. I appeal to the Government to reorient its labour laws, to give a fair and honourable deal to labour and at the same time tell the labour that they should realise their duties first before they ask for the enforcement of their rights. They should run on parallel lines and it should not be a one-way traffic. The Government, by these methods, will follow a progressive course towards the establishment of a better economy and a good social order. The strike of September 19 should be an eye-opener not only to the Government, but also to every right-thinking man. The Government should act with wisdom and firmness, save our democratic set-up and ensure the progress of India. Thank you.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : No wonder Tamil Nad slipped out of their hands. Now, you have understood why they lost Tamil Nad.

श्री राजनारायण : श्रीमन् यह जो 19 सितंबर को केन्द्रीय राज-कर्मचारियों की हड़ताल हुई उससे कई प्रश्न पैदा होते हैं। मुझे अफ-सोस है कि इस समय यहां न तो श्रम मंत्री हैं और न तो यहां घर मंत्री हैं।

श्री महेश्वर नाथ कौल (नाम-निर्देशित) : बैठ जाइये जब तक कि आयें।

श्री ओम मेहता (जम्मू और काश्मीर) : डिप्टी मिनिस्टर हैं यहां।

श्री राजनारायण : ठीक है। श्रीमन् पहला प्रश्न तो यह है कि अध्यादेश कब आना चाहिये। सब लोग इस सदन में सदा पार्लियामेंटरी डीसेंसी और पार्लियामेंटरी डिकोरम की बात करते हैं मगर पार्लियामेंटरी डीसेंसी या डिकोरम से अध्यादेश का भी कोई सम्बन्ध है। जब यह सरकार पार्लियामेंट की परवाह नहीं करेगी तो पार्लियामेंट की शोभा और पार्लियामेंट की सुरीति कायम रहेगी? पहला प्रश्न। मैं इस

निश्चित मत का हूँ कि यदि सरकार पालियामेंट के सम्मान की सुरक्षा करना चाहती है तो अध्यादेश कब और कैसे निकले इस पर अच्छी तरह से विचार करे। पालियामेंट चल रही थी, केन्द्रीय कर्मचारियों के बारे में चर्चा चल रही थी, उनकी मांगों पर बातचीत हो रही थी, यह कोई आकस्मिक घटना नहीं हुई, जिसके लिए कि यकायक अध्यादेश निकालने की आवश्यकता पड़ जाय मगर यह सरकार पालियामेंट की अवहेलना कर के पूर्णतः स्वच्छन्द तरीके से मनमाने तरीके से जब चाहे तब अध्यादेश को निकाल दिया करती है। जिस ढंग से और जब यह अध्यादेश निकला, यह खुद ब खुद अपने में पालियामेंट का अपमान है, पालियामेंट का कंटेम्प्ट है। तो जो सरकार और जो पार्टी पालियामेंट की सुरीली और शोभा का नाम लेती है उसे शर्म आनी चाहिये कि जिस ढंग से केन्द्रीय राज-कर्मचारियों की हड़ताल को कुचलने के लिये, दबाने के लिये अध्यादेश निकाला गया। पहली बात।

दूसरी बात वह है कि हमारे दो मित्र यहाँ से चले गये, एक श्री कृष्ण कान्त और एक श्री पारथसारथी। ये असल में अंग्रेजी बोलते हैं, कंसा मुंह बनाते हैं, हाथ चलाते हैं वह तो आपने देखा ही, लेकिन इनको पता नहीं है कि डेमोक्रेसी और डेमोगागी में फर्क क्या है, उन्होंने यहाँ जनतंत्र को प्रवंचतंत्र बना दिया। जनतंत्र और प्रवंचतंत्र में बड़ा फर्क है, डेमोक्रेसी और डेमोगागी में बड़ा फर्क है। दोनों की स्पीच को सुनने के बाद हमने देखा और समझा कि वे अच्छे डेमोगाग हैं।

अब जरा कुछ मूल तथ्यों पर आना चाहिये। एक रपट हमारे पास है। पहले उसी का एक अंश मैं पढ़ दूँ। वह रपट है यहाँ के डिप्टी कमिश्नर श्री टंडन की। टंडन की रपट का एक वाक्य पढ़ंगा।

"What happened inside the building was shameful and shocking. It appears to me that the manner in which the police force entered the

Y building, much worse would have hadDened."

यह जो श्री टंडन की रपट है पता नहीं इसकी कापी मुझे कैसे मिल गई। इसे मैं पढ़ रहा हूँ। यहाँ का डिप्टी कमिश्नर खुद यह कहता है . . .

श्री महेश्वर नाथ कौल : इससे ज्यादा जुडीशल इन्क्वायरी क्या कहेंगी ?

श्री राजनारायण : यह रपट हमारे पास है। कई कापी है।

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI A.KBAR ALI KHAN) : I think he was appointed by the Home Minister to snquire. Is he the same man?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I would like it to be laid on the Table of the House.

श्री राजनारायण : देखिये 19-9-1968 को एक सुपरिन्टेन्डेंट आफ पुलिस, इन चार्ज सेन्ट्रल ज़ोन युनियन टैरीटरी आफ देहली, उसके ऊपर चार्जशीट उन्होंने लगाई और यह रपट है—

A. Report on the incidents in the Indraprastha Bhavan on 19 9-1968.

"As desired by I. G I have pie-pared a report on the happenings in and around Indraprastha Bhavan (commonly known as Y building) Indraprastha Estate, New Delhi, on 19-9-68."

आई० जी० की इच्छानुसार मैंने 19-9-1968 को इन्द्रप्रस्थ की घटना की रपट तैयार किया है।

श्रीमन् मैंने इस रपट के इस अंश को अपनी पेन्सिल से निशान लगा दिया है और जो इस रपट का मूल है उसको हमने थोड़े में पढ़ दिया। फिर सुन लीजिए, उसमें लिखा है कि जिस ढंग से पुलिस फोर्स इन्द्रप्रस्थ बिल्डिंग में घुसी उसमें तो और भी बड़ा गजब हो सकता था, बहुत बड़ा भयंकर कांड हो सकता था और वह कहते हैं जो घटनाएं घटी वह शेमफुल और शाकिंग हैं।

[श्री राजनारायण]

सबसे बड़ी चीज क्या है जो डिमान्ड करे, मांग करे, घर मंत्री के इस्तीफे की। मैं श्री यशवंत-राव चव्हाण से बहुत ही अदब के साथ कहूंगा, अगर जनतंत्र में डेमोक्रेसी में उनकी तनिक भी आस्था है तो अपने डिप्टी कमिश्नर की रपट के इस वाक्य को पढ़ कर उनको खुद बखुद इस्तीफा देना चाहिये।

अब एक प्रश्न यह है कि यह हमारे पास जाइंट कंसल्टेटीव मशीनरी की पूरी किताब है। इसके दो सेक्शन को पढ़ा जाय, एक 16 एक 21 :

"Compulsory arbitration shall be limited to pay and leave allowances, weekly hours of work and leave of a class or grade of employees."

यानी तीनों चीजों पर, जिसमें पे एन्ड अलाउन्सेज भी है। अब मेरी समझ में नहीं आता उस व्यक्ति या उस सरकार की अक्ल कहां है? क्या नरक कुंड के गंदे कीड़े ने इस सरकार की अक्ल को छान कर छलनी बना दिया, जिसके दिमाग में कुछ चीज ठहरती नहीं? साफ तो कह दिया है : कंपलसरी आर्बिट्रेशन पे एन्ड अलाउन्सेज के बारे में, और वीकली, साप्ताहिक, काम के घंटों के बारे में और कर्मचारियों के वर्ग अथवा श्रेणी की छुट्टी के बारे में होगा। जो यहां डेमोक्रेसी की बात और पार्लियामेन्ट के आनर की बात कहते हैं उनको शर्म नहीं आती, अपने मुख से उन शब्दों को निकालते हुए। कहां यह मुल्क जा रहा है, क्या हो रहा है, मैं बहुत परेशान हूँ। सेक्शन 21 कहता है :

"Subject to the overriding authority of Parliament, recommendations of the board of arbitration will be binding on both sides."

श्री के० के० शाह को आप हिदायत करें कि वह बात न करें। पार्लियामेन्टरी डीसेन्सी यही है कि यहां बैठकर गप लड़ाएँ। तो 21 सेक्शन कहता है कि जो आर्बिट्रेशन का फैसला होगा वह

फैसला अगर जरूरी हो तो पार्लियामेन्ट में रखा जाय, यानी पार्लियामेन्ट ही उसको ओवरराइड कर सकती है। तो अगर कंपलसरी आर्बिट्रेशन का फैसला इस सरकार की निगाह में गलत होता तो सरकार आसानी से अपील में आ सकती थी। पार्लियामेन्ट में सरकार का बहुमत था, सरकार पार्लियामेन्ट का बडिक्ट लेकर उसके बारे में फैसला कर सकती थी। इतना विशाल बहुमत पार्लियामेन्ट में रहते हुए भी मुझे आश्चर्य है कि कोई भी जनतंत्रीय सरकार यह कंपलसरी आर्बिट्रेशन की बात को कैसे इन्कार कर सकती है क्योंकि आखिरकार जो भी आर्बिट्रेशन बनता उस आर्बिट्रेशन को यदि सरकार अपनी दृष्टि से ठीक नहीं समझती तो उसको यहां पर पार्लियामेन्ट में रखने की गुंजाइश है; सेक्शन 21 के मुताबिक वह ओवरराइडिंग अथारिटी है पार्लियामेन्ट की। फिर भी यहां पर जितने लोग बोले वह यह कह रहे हैं कि नेताओं ने गड़बड़ किया, हम लोगों को भड़का दिया ए० पी० चटर्जी के दल ने भड़का दिया। यह क्या बेवकूफी की बात है। "नानसेन्स टाकिंग हेयर"। मैं हैरान हूँ कि आखिर यह बेवकूफी की बात करने की यही जगह है। अरे यहां अच्छी बात करो, ठीक बात करो जिसका अक्ल से ताल्लुक हो। यानी, सवाल कहां और जवाब कहां जिससे कोई ताल्लुक नहीं। इसमें सदन का समय अनावश्यक खर्च होता है। हमारा माया चक्कर खाने लगा श्री कृष्णकांत को सुनते सुनते। कहां उसकी जवानी व्यर्थ बर्बाद हो रही है। कुछ पदों लिखो, ठीक बात करो, जो समझ में आने वाली हो। बंदर की बोली में मुँह बिटका कर कभी ए० पी० चटर्जी को कहो उसने फंसाया, कभी भूपेश गुप्त को, कभी एस० एम० जोशी को, कभी बांका बिहारी दास को उन्होंने फंसाया। तो हम आगे के लिये कहते हैं यह दो क्लॉज हैं 16 और 21। सदन के सम्मानित सदस्य ईमानदारी से इसको पढ़ लें और पढ़ने के बाद यहां आएँ बरना उनको अनावश्यक ढंग से इधर उधर का विवाद करने के लिये यहां नहीं आना चाहिये।

दूसरी बात यह है श्रीमन्, कि 12 सितम्बर को श्री एस० एम० जोशी और दूसरे नेतागण श्री यशवंतराव चव्हाण से मिले, जो आखरी दिन था बात को तोड़ने के लिये। श्री गजेन्द्रगडकर को लोगों ने कहा गवर्मेन्ट को मान लेना चाहिए और जो गजेन्द्रगडकर का फैसला होगा वह हम भी मानने के लिये तैयार हैं मगर श्री गजेन्द्रगडकर को पंच मानने के लिये सरकार तैयार नहीं हुई। क्यों नहीं सरकार तैयार हुई इसका कोई जवाब उनकी तरफ से आना चाहिये। हाँ उसका एक जवाब है। . . .

श्री महेश्वर नाथ कौल : नहीं नहीं। उनका इन्टरप्रिटेशन आपके इन्टरप्रिटेशन से डिफरेंट है। वह कहते हैं नीड बेस्ड वेज आक्टिवेल नहीं है, अन्डर द रूल्स।

श्री राजनारायण : श्रीमन्, कौल साहब ठीक कहते हैं।

श्री महेश्वर नाथ कौल : नहीं, गवर्मेन्ट ने कहा है।

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN) : I am sure you will kppn tn timp_

श्री राजनारायण : नहीं मेरा वक्त नहीं जायेगा आपके कहने से। भूपेश गुप्त ने 45 मिनट लिये मैं भी 45 मिनट लूंगा इसलिये बीच में हमको टोकिये नहीं वरना जो बाहर हुआ है वह भीतर भी होगा, हम साफ बता देते हैं, इस टोकाई से हम हटने वाले नहीं हैं। सारी बातें कहूंगा, जल्दी कहूंगा।

साफ बात यह है कि नीड बेस्ड वेज यह अंग्रेजी में न बोलें ताकि जनता समझे। आवश्यकता पर आधारित मजदूरी एक ऐसा शब्द है जो कि न भी कहा जाय तो भी हर भहंगाई भत्ते की बढ़ोतरी में और हर तनखाह में शामिल है। यह वाक्य कहा जाय या न कहा जाय, जो भी हमको भहंगाई भत्ता मिलता है, एक पुराना सिद्धान्त माना गया है कि जीवन निर्वाह योग्य कम से कम मजदूरी। असल में कौल साहब कभी लेबर में रहे नहीं बेचारे।

श्री महेश्वर नाथ कौल : मेरे ऊपर न आएँ। मैंने तो साधारण तौर पर कहा।

श्री राजनारायण : आप सुनिये, ठीक से समझिये। मेरा कहना यह है कि जीवन निर्वाह योग्य कम से कम मजदूरी क्या है।

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN) : You address me."

श्री राजनारायण : आप समझ लीजिए मैं आप ही को एड्रेस कर रहा हूँ। जीवन का निर्वाह, जिंदगी की गुजर बसर कैसे होती है। जीवन की गुजर बसर करना ही हमारी मौलिक आवश्यकता है, हमारी बुनियादी जरूरत है। क्या हमको पेट भरने को भोजन मिले, रहने को मकान मिले, पहनने को कपड़ा मिले, तालीम का इंतजाम हो और मर्ज की दवा दी जाय, यह सब हमारी बुनियादी जरूरतें हैं। तो बुनियादी जरूरतों पर आधारित मजदूरी, यह सिद्धांत कोई कहे न कहे, यह सन्निहित है, यह उसमें इन्क्लूडेड है। अब फिर अगर सरकार यह कहती है कि कंपल्सरी आक्टिवेशन शैल बी लिमिटेड टू, तो वह उसको आक्टिवेशन के सामने भेज देती और वहां पर उसके बारे में आक्टिवेशन हो जाता। वहां पर सरकार को जो कुछ कहना होता कहती। आखिर, जो हमारा 21वाँ क्लोज है, वह हमको यह हक देता है कि अगर सरकार के मन के मुवाफिक फैसला नहीं होगा तो सरकार पार्लियामेंट में आयेगी।

4 P.M.

THE MINISTER OF INFORMATION AND BROADCASTING (SHRI K. K. SHAH) : I want to ask a question. Is the need-based wage of Mr. Bhupesh Gupta the same of that of Rajnarainji?

श्री राजनारायण : देखिये, हमारे मित्र श्री के० के० शाह को समझाने में हर चीज का एवरेज निकालना पड़ता है। हर चीज की औसत निकाली जा सकती है और उसका औसत निकालकर काम चल सकता है। आज यह हमारा दुर्दिन है कि ऐसे आदमियों के हाथों में देश का शासन है। क्या किया जाय। आज इस

[श्री राजनारायण]

सरकार के पास कोई औचित्य नहीं है, कोई तर्क नहीं है और यही कारण है कि वह दूसरों पर दोषारोपण करती है। अब हमारा तर्क है कि हम श्री यशवंतराव चव्हाण से इस्तीफा क्यों मांग रहे हैं। श्री यशवंतराव चव्हाण ने अपने बयानों से और अपनी पुलिस के जरिये सरकारी कर्मचारियों को उकसाया और उसी का नतीजा हुआ कि इन्द्रप्रस्थ भवन में इतनी बड़ी घटना हो गई। श्री यशवंतराव चव्हाण ने डंका पीटना शुरू कर दिया था कि सरकार का तख्ता उलटने के लिए चढ़ाई हो रही है। अगर सरकार का तख्ता उलटने के लिए चढ़ाई होगी तो सरकार पुलिस और अफसरान के जरिये डंडा और गोली से जवाब देगी। तो श्रीमन्, मैं चाहता हूँ कि दुनिया का कोई भी जनतंत्र बतला दिया जाय जहां पर इस ढंग से जनता को गोली चलाकर शिकार बनाया गया हो पुलिस के जरिये। आखिर जनता की जिन्दगी सरकार दो ढंग से ले रही है। एक तो 302 में फांसी देकर और दूसरा पुलिस के जरिये गोली चलाकर। आज श्री के० के० शाह को समझना पड़ेगा कि स्थिति क्या हो गई है।

सरकार के दो हाथ हैं। एक हाथ तो कलम, दवात और कागज है और दूसरा हाथ बंदूक और लाठी है। तो सरकार अपना एक हाथ जो कागज और कलम का है, उसको वह दूसरे हाथ से तोड़ रही है। आज सरकार का बंदूक और लाठी वाला हाथ सरकार के कलम, कागज और दवात वाले हाथ को छोड़ रही है। इससे जनतंत्र बिल्कुल सिकुड़ रहा है। मैं श्री के० के० शाह को बतलाना चाहता हूँ कि क्या वे भूल गये हैं, अयूब खां ने जो किताब लिखी थी। उस किताब में श्री अयूब खां ने लिखा था कि हमको दोस्त चाहिये, मालिक नहीं। पाकिस्तान में फौजी शासन आने के पहले जो हालत पैदा हो गई थी, उससे खराब हालत आज भारतवर्ष में हो रही है। आपने खूब मजे से पढ़ा होगा कि अयूब इस्कंदर मिर्जा को गिरफ्तार करना चाहते थे, मगर हालात ने उनको

मजबूर किया और इसी बजह से उन्होंने अपने हाथ में ताकत ले ली। आज हमारे मुल्क में ऐसी हालत पैदा हो गई है जिससे जनतंत्र को दफनाया जा रहा है और फौजी शासन की ओर उसको उकसाया जा रहा है।

क्या हमारे श्री के० के० शाह को बनारस की घटना के बारे में मालूम है? बनारस में आसाम राइफल्स के 300 जवानों ने अपने हथियारों को लेकर वहां के पी० ए० सी० के ऊपर चढ़ाई कर दी और बैरिकों के अन्दर उन लोगों को पीटा। पी० ए० सी० के 6 जवानों को उन्होंने बैरिकों में बन्द कर दिया। इस घटना के सम्बन्ध में जब काफी हल्ला मचा तब दिल्ली का सिंहासन डोला और लखनऊ डोला। इतनी बात होने पर वहां के डिस्ट्रिक्ट मजिस्ट्रेट और पुलिस कप्तान को हुक्म हुआ कि तुम जा कर बैरिकों में उन लोगों की गवाही ले सकते हो। वहां के एस० एस० पी० ने हमसे कहा कि श्री राजनारायण जी अब कैसे चलेगा क्योंकि हम वहां पर बाई चान्स पहुंच गये थे। हम ने कहा कि अब तुम रियलाइज करते हो कि तुम से भी कोई बड़ी ताकत है। जब तुम हमको पीटते हो, बन्द करते हो, मारते हो, तब तुम समझते हो कि हम से कोई बड़ा ताकतवर नहीं है, मगर आज सेना के जवानों ने तुमको सबक सिखला दिया है। अगर किसी का दिमाग खराब हो जाए, तुम से ज्यादा ताकत रखता हो तो तुम को उसी तरह से पीट सकता है जिस तरह से तुम हमको पीटते हो।

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री अकबर अली खान) : तुम को पीटते हैं।

श्री राजनारायण : श्रीमन्, जो लोग यहां पर चैं चैं करते हैं और जनतंत्र की व्याख्या करते हैं उनसे मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि अंग्रेजी राज के बाद हमको यहां पर 36 बार जेल हुआ जिसमें हमें 19 महीने की सजा हुई, 10 महीने की सजा हुई, 6 महीने की सजा हुई, 3 महीने की सजा हुई, 15 दिन की सजा हुई, 7 दिन की सजा हुई और एक दिन की सजा भी इसमें

शामिल है। जब हमारी दाढ़ी नीची गई तो तब से हमने अपनी दाढ़ी छोटी कर ली। पहले हमारी दाढ़ी बड़ी थी। न मालूम कितने कुर्ते हमारे खींचने में फट गये हैं और कितनी दूर तक हमको घसीटा गया। एक कुर्ता तो हमारा सचिवालय में रखा होगा, उसको भी आप देख लें। मगर हमने किसी पर डण्डा नहीं उठाया, हमने किसी पर कंकरी नहीं उठाई। हमें कोई भी माई का लाल या खुफिया बतला दे कि हमने कभी कोई कंकरी उठाई हो। सन 1948 में डा० लोहिया जी की विशेष अनुकंपा से हमने प्रतिज्ञा की थी कि हम हाथियार नहीं उठावेंगे। मगर हम मानेंगे भी नहीं और मारेंगे भी नहीं। हम जो उचित समझेंगे, जो जायज समझेंगे उसको मानेंगे, उससे हटेंगे नहीं। हम मानेंगे भी नहीं और मारेंगे भी नहीं, यह स्थिति हमारी है। खुदा करे यह स्थिति कायम रहे। वह स्थिति न हो जाय जिसका सकेत कर रही है हमारे श्री के० के० शाह जी की सरकार।

श्रीमन्, अब मैं यहां आ रहा हूं और यह पूरी रपट पठानकोट के बारे में हमारे पास विद्यमान है। पठानकोट की रपट जो हमारे देश के राजनीतिज्ञों ने दी है, उसके बारे में कहना चाहता हूं। उसमें कहा गया है कि वहां पर दरवाजों पर गोली के निशान हैं, दीवारों पर गोली के निशान हैं, छप्परो पर गोली के निशान हैं। वहां पर पुलिस ने लोगों के घरों में घुस घुस कर गोली चलाई और घर घर में घुस कर डण्ड चलाये। मैं यह जानना चाहता हूं कि दुनिया में कोई ऐसा जनतंत्र है जहां पर इस तरह की बर्बरता हुई हो, जहां पर इस तरह की निरंकुशता हुई हो और इस तरह का जंगलीपन हुआ हो। सरकार ने अपनी शक्ति के द्वारा वहां पर जनता के ऊपर कई तरह का अत्याचार किया। इस तरह का कोई उदाहरण हमें कोई माई का लाल दे सकता है? अभी विद्यनाम के सवाल को लेकर लंदन में क्या नहीं हुआ। क्या वहां गोली चली? फ्रांस में क्या नहीं हुआ?

मगर हमको यहां यह सिखलाया जाता है कि जनतंत्र में गोली चलाया जाना अनिवार्य है।

1946 में गोविंद वल्लभ पंत की सरकार ने कानपुर में मजदूरों के ऊपर गोली चलाई थी, जिसकी वजह से गांधी जी का हृदय द्रवित हो गया था। उन्होंने कहा था कि अगर इतनी शक्ति के बिना शासन नहीं चल सकता है तो मैं सत्याग्रहियों को सलाह दूंगा कि वे सरकार में न जायें। बात क्या है, यह देखा जाय। 24 आदमियों में से 5 गोली से मारे गए और 19 आदमी घायल अस्पताल में हैं। इसमें महिलाओं को भी गोली लगी। यह एक लम्बी चीड़ी रपट है जिसको पढ़ने में मैं अपना समय नहीं नष्ट करना चाहता हूं। मैंने तो सिर्फ इशारा कर दिया है कि पठानकोट में इस तरह की घटना घटी है।

मैं आपके द्वारा यह भी बतलाना चाहता हूं कि न्यू गोहाटी में क्या हुआ। मइयाबी में क्या हुआ। दो माई के लाल वहीं पर मर गये। आप देखेंगे कि ब्रीकानेर में क्या हुआ। इस तरह से हर जगह पर इस सरकार ने बर्बरता से काम लिया जैसे कि हमारे देश के इन्सान कबूतर हैं, बंदर हैं और हिरन हैं। जिस तरह से इन जानवरों के पीछे शिकारी बंदूक लेकर दौड़ता है, उसी तरह से आज श्री यशवंतराव चव्हाण साहब की पुलिस जनता को कबूतर, बंदर और हिरन समझकर उनका शिकार कर रही है। क्या आप समझते हो कि यह कोई जनतंत्र है और क्या यह कोई इंसानियत है? आप क्या देखते नहीं कि यहां पर हालत आज हमको कहां से कहां ले जा रही है? आज सरकार का जंगलीपन, उसकी बर्बरता और उसकी पुलिस की कार्यवाही कहां तक बढ़ गई है। आपने सुना होगा कि बकेबर गांव में क्या हुआ। एक हरिजन महिला, जिसका बयान हमने जेल में जाकर लिया था, उसने हमसे रोते हुए कहा कि हमको लखना टाऊन एरिया के राज-बहादुर सिंह चैयरमैन के घर पुलिस ने बंद कर दिया। हमको तंगा कर दिया। उसके बेटे को शराब पिलाकर तंगा कर दिया। माता का हाथ पकड़ कर बेटे से कहा कि बलात्कार कर। मैं

[श्री राजनारायण]

यह पूछना चाहता हूँ कि क्या यह जनतंत्र है, क्या यह संसद है ? क्या इस संसद को वह अग्नि प्रज्वलित करने की क्षमता है जिसमें यह सरकार जलकर धार हो जाय। आप कहते हैं कि यह हरिजन नारी है। यह गांधी की नारी है। नारी प्रधान मंत्री के शासन काल में अपने बेटे के जरिए नारी पर जबरदस्ती बलात्कार कराया जाय, शर्म नहीं आती इस सरकार को इस बात पर। राष्ट्रपति शासन है वहाँ। क्या हो रहा है ? इस तरह की बर्बरता और इस तरह की घटनाओं को देख देख कर ही आज यह हालत हो रही है। कल हमारे यहाँ मुजफ्फरनगर के लोग आये। वहाँ एक टाउन एरिया है, नाम लूंगा तो लोग रंज हो जायेंगे। वहाँ के सबर्ण लोग जबरदस्ती मेहतरों पर चढ़ कर कहे कि तुम को दीपावली के दिन सफाई करनी ही होगी। कैसे डंडे पड़े हैं, किस ढंग से उन के सिर फटे हैं, उस की उन्होंने पुलिस में नाम ले ले कर रपट की है, लेकिन एस० पी० कहता है कि कोई कार्यवाही नहीं होगी क्योंकि वे सबर्ण हैं। हम पतन के गर्त में चले गये हैं। हमारा जीवन नारकीय हो गया है। मानवीय जीवन के मूल्य हमारे इस चव्हाण के राज में द्रुतगति से नीचे गिरते चले जा रहे हैं। इसलिए मैं बहुत ही अदब के साथ आप से कहूँगा कि श्री यशवंतराव जी चव्हाण, यदि आप में तनिक भी नैतिकता हो और यदि आप में जनतंत्रीय प्रथा और प्रणाली के प्रति आस्था हो, यदि आप मानवीय मूल्यों के प्रेमी हो तो आप को इस्तीफा देना चाहिये और इस्तीफा देकर कहना चाहिये कि हाँ, हमारी पुलिस ने जिस ढंग से काम किया उस की जिम्मेदारी लेने में तनिक भी हिचक नहीं है। पुलिस डाइरेक्ट, सीधे सीधे उनके कंट्रोल में है। आज उनका आदेश चलता है। उनका आई० जी० है, उन का डी० आई० जी० है, उन का कलेक्टर है, इसलिये क्या वह मारने के लिये, गोली चलाने के लिए, बर्बरता पैदा करने के लिये है ?

एक निवेदन मैं आप से और करना चाहता हूँ। यह सरकार, यह मोरारजी देसाई, यह यशवंत राव चव्हाण कहते हैं कि कच्छ आर्बिट्रेशन का फैसला हम कैसे नहीं मानेंगे। आर्बिट्रेंटर हमने नियुक्त किया है। इसी सरकार ने यह ज्वायंट कंसल्टेटिव मशीनरी बनायी है। इस ज्वायंट कंसल्टेटिव मशीनरी के पन्ने पन्ने को यशवंतराव चव्हाण ने फाड़ा है। शर्म आनी चाहिये आज ट्रेजरी वेंचेज के लोगों को कि यहाँ पर आकर केवल मोटी मोटी बात करते हैं और हंसते हैं। मजदूरों पर गोली चले, वह मारे जाय और यह हंसे, हंस कर गुलछरें उड़ायें।

श्रीमन्, अभी मैं गाय था भागलपुर। भागलपुर से लौट कर मैं आया हूँ। मेरे पास वहाँ की पूरी रपट है। जिन के नोटिस वापस कर दिये गये हैं अगर वह भी काम पर जाते हैं तो भी वे काम पर नहीं लिये जाते। मैं पूछना चाहता हूँ कि यूनियन की मान्यता क्यों छीनी गई ? मैं आज भी कहना चाहता हूँ कि जिन यूनियनों की मान्यता छीनी गई है, सरकार को फौरन उसे वापस करना चाहिए और जितने लोग मरे ह चाह वह पठानकोट में मरे हों या गीहाटी में या बिकानेर में, उन सबके परिवारों को उचित मुआवजा दिया जाना चाहिये। गीहाटी में भी अभी तक उनको कोई मुआवजा नहीं मिला है। और इसी के साथ साथ चाहे किसी का सर्पेंशन हुआ हो, निलंबन हुआ हो या किसी पर नोटिस जारी हो या मुकदमा चला रहा हो या मुकदमें का फैसला हो चुका हो, उनकी जो हैसियत 19 तारीख के पहले थी, 18 तारीख को जो उनकी हैसियत थी उन को उस हैसियत में अपनी अपनी जगहों पर रखना चाहिये। अगर यह सरकार यह नहीं करती है तो मैं समझूँगा कि इस सरकार को जनतंत्र के प्रति कोई आस्था नहीं है, इस सरकार ने जनतंत्रीय प्रथा को दबा कर रखा है। यह आज अपने घमंड में है। सोचती है कि केन्द्र में हमारा बहुमत है इस समय। पिछले चुनावों में यह देश का हतभाग्य था कि जनता ने केन्द्र में कांग्रेस पार्टी के हाथ में बहुमत दिया और उसके आधार पर ही बाद में

जिन जिन राज्यों में गैर कांग्रेसी सरकारें थीं वहाँ वहाँ राष्ट्रपति का शासन लागू किया गया। राष्ट्रपति शासन ने 6 महीनों में छः छः साल और 12, 12 साल के शासन को मात कर दिया बर्बरता में, गोली चलाने में, लाठी चलाने में और हरिजनों को गैर इन्सान समझने में। श्रीमती इंदिरा गांधी ने रुपये का अवमूल्यन किया, रुपये के अवमूल्यन के बाद अब कांग्रेस का हर मंत्री हमारे परिचित शब्दों का अवमूल्यन कर रहा है। शब्द की कीमत गिर रही है, नीति का अवमूल्यन हो रहा है। किसी शब्द की सही परिभाषा आज सरकार द्वारा नहीं की जा रही है। चाहे जो हो, चोरी हो, डकैती हो, कत्ल हो, अगर इन सब को कर के भी इंदिरा गांधी के हाथ में प्रधान मंत्रीत्व रहता है, कांग्रेस की सरकार रहती है तो आज यहाँ पर इन कामों को करने में किसी को तनिक भी हिचक नहीं है। इस लिए मैं अपने मित्र मोहन धारिया की सद्बुद्धि को उकसाना चाहता हूँ। आखिर वह सोई क्यों है। क्यों सोयी है! ऐसा नहीं होना चाहिए कि जब यशवंत राव चव्हाण की बात आय तो मोहन धारिया साहब यह समझे कि चूंकि हम भी महाराष्ट्र से आते हैं इस लिये येन केन प्रकारेण हम को यशवन्तराव चव्हाण जी का समर्थन करना चाहिए। यह बात उनको जनतंत्र से दूर ले जायेगी, यह भावना देश को बर्बाद करेगी। आज हमारे देश में जो स्थिति पैदा हो गयी है . . .

एम० एम० धारिया (महाराष्ट्र): सभापति जी, यह तो राजनारायण जी को सभसना चाहिये कि ईशयूज पर मेरी राय बिल्कुल स्पष्ट रहती है चाहे कोई भी बैठा हुआ हो। लेकिन मैं यह भी कहना चाहता हूँ कि जिस वक्त राजनारायणजी या उन की पार्टी गलती करती है तो भी मेरे मुँह से मेरी राय साफ निकलती है।

श्री राजनारायण : यह जनतंत्रीय प्रथा है। मैं बोल रहा था वे बोल गये बीच में मैंने सुन लिया। वह समय मेरे समय में नहीं जायगा। मैं संसदीय प्रथा जानता हूँ। जब तक मैं ना

बैठूँ तब तक समय हमारा है। वह बोल गये मगर मैंने हल्ला नहीं किया।

तो मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि हमारी आज स्थिति क्या है। इन स्थिति को हम जरा ठीक से देखें, अगर आप इसे ठीक से नहीं देखेंगे, नहीं परखेंगे तो इसका नतीजा देश के लिये बहुत बुरा होगा, अनर्थकारी होगा। इस लिये बहुत ही अदब के साथ, अनुनय विनय के साथ कहना चाहूँगा एक बात अपने मित्र भूपेश गुप्त से और एक बात अपने से कहना चाहता हूँ और वह यह कि हम ने भारत बंद का नारा दिया है, मगर हम ने तैयारी क्या की, क्या तैयारी हमने की?

18 तारीख को मैं बनारस पहुँचता हूँ। रेलवे के लोगों ने मुझ को टेलीफोन किया कि हमारा प्रदर्शन निकल रहा है, आप आ जाइये। मैं फोरन चला गया। उन का प्रदर्शन ले कर स्टेशन गया, वहाँ 15, 20 मिनट का भाषण कर दिया। सोचा था कि पीटा जाऊँगा लेकिन घर वापस आ गया। मैंने बताया कि घर बैठा हूँ चाहें तो गिरफ्तार कर ले जायें। भारत बंद की परिभाषा आखीर है क्या। भारत बंद माने क्या। खाली रेलें बंद हो जाय या डाक बंद हो जाय यह नहीं है भारत बंद का मतलब। मैं यशवन्तराव चव्हाण को कहना चाहता हूँ कि भारत बंद होगा और जब भारत बंद होगा तो रेलें भी नहीं चलेंगी, डाक भी नहीं चलेगी, सरकारी कार्यालय भी नहीं चलेंगे, स्कूल भी नहीं चलेंगे कालेज भी नहीं चलेंगे, दूकानें भी नहीं चलेंगी कचहरी भी नहीं चलेगी तब भारत बंद होगा और वह स्थिति हमारे यशवन्तराव चव्हाण जी पदा न करे। खुदा के लिये मैं अपील करता हूँ उन से कि वह अपनी सद्बुद्धि को काम में लायें। उस तरहसे काम में लाये जैसे राष्ट्रीय स्वतंत्रता संग्राम लड़ने के समय काम में लाये थे। आज हम को शर्म आती है उन की बात सुनते हुए। हम को खुदा ने वह ताकत क्यों नहीं दी कि जिस के बल पर हम को वह बात न सुननी पड़ती। जब हम कहते हैं कि प्रधान मंत्री के पद पर 30 हजार रुपया रोज खर्च होता है, उसे घटाओ, हर केन्द्रीय मंत्री पर रोजाना 2000 रुपया खर्च हो रहा है

[श्री राजनारायण]

उस को घटाओ, तो हमारी बात सुनी नहीं जाती। जब हम कहते हैं कि जितने छोटे कर्मचारी हैं उन का भत्ता बढ़ाओ तो हमारी बात सुनी नहीं जाती। सरकार ने आज तीन गड़बड़ खोले हैं : सरकारी कर (टैक्स) गड़बड़ा, पूँजीपति मुनाफा गड़बा और उच्चाधिकारियों की तनख्वाह, सहुलियत, भत्ता, चारबाजारी और भ्रष्टाचार गड़बा। जब हम कहते हैं कि इन गड़बड़ों को पाटो तो के०के० शाह कहते हैं कि इन को नहीं पाटेंगे इन को हम चालू रखेंगे। और जब हम कहते हैं कि जो छोटे कर्मचारी हैं उन को भत्ता अधिक दो तो कहते हैं कि पैसा नहीं है। पैसा कहाँ से आयगा। सीधी बात आज सुबह हम ने कही थी कि क्यों नहीं आप एक नियम बनाते कि जो हमारे उच्चाधिकारी हैं वे भी अन्य कर्मचारियों के समान हैं। जैसे गांव का राम, श्याम और नाजिर अली है वैसे ही वह भी है। अगर वे 1 पायें तो यह सुरेश चन्द्र और दलबहादुर खाँ लोग 5.5 लें, लेकिन एक और पांच से ज्यादा का फर्क छोटे कर्मचारी और बड़े से बड़े कर्मचारी में नहीं रहना चाहिये। अगर पैसा नहीं है तो नियंत्रित करो अगर तुम्हारा आई० जी०, डी० आई० जी० या तुम्हारा सेक्रेटरी मजा लगा तो छोटा कर्मचारी भी चाहेगा कि उस कि तनख्वाह बढ़े और अगर यह आदर्श प्रस्तुत करेंगे अपनी तनख्वाह घटा कर तो छोटे कर्मचारियों को भी कहा जा सकता है कि देखो, हम 5000 रुपया लते थे अब आगय हैं 1500 पर, इस लिये अब तुम भी आगे न बढ़ो। जितना लेते हो उतना रखो। अगर ऐसी चीज हो तो कोई आदर्श बन सकता है। मगर गोली चला कर, लाठी चला कर, बर्बरता कर के इंसान की जिन्दगी को खत्म कर के चलने वाली सरकार अब आगे नहीं चलेगी। यशवन्तराव चव्हाण का इस्तेफा हो। जनतंत्र का तकाजा है, ईमान की मांग है, सत्य की मांग है, न्याय की मांग है कि यशवन्तराव चव्हाण इस्तीफा दें तभी जनतंत्र की प्रतिष्ठा हो सकती है।

SHRI S. R. VASAVADA (Gujarat): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, in order to enable this House to understand the significance and implications of the incidents that took place on the 19th of September, I crave indulgence to place some of the facts before the House. Facts are also sometimes improperly put and it will be worthwhile for the House to take note of the facts. There are about 2½ million workers in the employment of the Government. Out of this, nearly 12 to 13 lakhs of workers are Railway employees and about 3 to 4 lakhs of workers are engaged in the Posts and Telegraphs Department. The Railway workers and the Posts and Telegraphs workers are called industrial workers; that is to say, the Industrial Disputes Act applies to them. This is a very relevant fact because I am going to refer later on to the National Labour Commission which has also been referred to by some of the hon. Members before me. Our Government with a view to giving justice to these workers allowed them—of course, the Constitution has also conferred that right on the workers—freedom of association. Freedom of association is one of the fundamental rights and the Government has tolerated, and not only tolerated but encouraged the formation of trade unions among its employees. And when you form a trade union, the legitimate right of strike also goes with it. It is true, as one of the speakers just now said, that there are countries, and that too very civilised countries, where their civil servants are not allowed to form organisations, or where at any rate strike is banned. But in our country, the Government with a view to giving justice to its employees has created a machinery which is called the Joint Consultative Machinery. The idea behind the machinery and the spirit of the machinery is that the workers' representatives may discuss their problems with their employers and representatives of the Government. That is to say, negotiations can take place and if the dispute is not settled by negotiations, that particular dispute is referred to arbitration. This is the present position. Now a section of the workers raised some demands. The

main demand in the Joint Consultative Machinery, the negotiating body which has been created by the Government, was a need-based wage. Many things have been said about need-based wage and I will explain what this need-based wage is a few minutes later. The other demand was about the merger of dearness allowance with basic pay. So far as the merger of dearness allowance with basic pay is concerned, it is not a very major demand because it only relates to terminal benefits and does not involve very heavy financial burden. The Government said "We are willing to negotiate". The only question that was to be decided was what proportion of the dearness allowance was to be merged. They said "If we do not settle this, then the matter will go to arbitration". But so far as the need-based wage is concerned, the Government had a view. The Chairman of the Joint Consultative Machinery said that according to him, it was not an arbitrable subject. But at the same time, he told the workers' repre-negotiate with them. As soon as the portant that a very high-powered committee should take a decision and he advised them—it is in the minutes of the Joint Consultative Machinery—to meet the Sub-Committee of the Cabinet which was appointed by the Cabinet to negotiate with them. As soon as the representatives heard this advice, this suggestion, they left the meeting. As soon as they left the meeting, they went to their place and immediately decided that a token strike should be declared on the 19th of September. Mr. Vice-Chairman, I have spent nearly 41 yearf in the trade union movement and I have never seen an action like th: where some of the representatives af the workers, without consulting anybody, call immediately a token strike and that also a token strike by employees who even if they go on strike for one day will disrupt the economy of the country. A token strike is called. The Chairman of the Joint Consultative Machinery, who is also the Cabinet Secretary, writes letters to them saying "Let there be no misunderstanding. Please see the Sub-Committee". They refuse to see the Sub-

Committee and call for a token strike. I would admire the patience and perseverance of the Home Minister. He did not want these difficulties and the dangers of a strike which ultimately was going to harm the workers. He did not want them to suffer. He went on persuading them, went on appealing to them—"Please come and meet us". I have never seen an employer asking his employees to come and meet him in this manner. The Home Minister went on doing it. In the meantime, what did the Joint Action Committee do? It is a very strange thing that when such an important strike was to be called, no preparations were made, no propaganda was made and no ballot also was taken anywhere. The only propaganda that was made, Sir, was issuing of bulletins. I have before me a journal—the journal of the Posts and Telegraphs Union. It is August issue appearing in September and the only propaganda that was made was "Take full charge of Government property and valuables on the 19th". This is the mandate—"Take full charge of Government property and valuables. Arise, organise and mobilise". This is the advice given to the workers. Now, what is the Government to do? Is the Government to sit with folded hands and allow the leaders who wanted this strike to capture the Government property and loot the valuables of the Government? I do not think the Government, which is responsible to the Parliament and which is responsible to the community, can allow a handful of people to loot and rob and capture Government property. I am of the opinion, Sir, that the issuing of Ordinance was perfectly justified. There was no other go for the Government. And the Ordinance was issued. We are aware that no strike can succeed if it is not backed by public opinion. The honourable Members of this House, who know what the public opinion is, would have judged by that time that when the token strike was declared, when the ordinance was issued, nobody in this country; no responsible person in this country, even raised a finger against the Government and told the Government, that "you are doing

[Shri S. R. Vasavada] something wrong". There are a large number of people including the press, who said that the Government was perfectly justified in issuing the ordinance. A statement was made by "one of the respectable leaders that "No Government can allow or submit itself to the whim or to the demand of a handful of employees". There is no democracy, there is no Parliament functioning, if the 2J millions of these employees just decide and say, "If this is not done, we shall do this and that"; the Government machinery is paralysed. I do not think, Sir, the Government can afford it. It was not the employees but the unions; not even the unions but a few leaders of employees' unions who asked the employees to force the Government to a demand which is very unreasonable. I have some experience of such token strikes. The strike that has taken place is not a token strike. One of the leaders of the strike met me and I asked him, "What are you doing? Can you really get the need-based wage? Why don't you go and negotiate?" He said, "Why negotiate? We will go on a token strike". I asked him, "Do you know the meaning of a token strike?" He replied, "What is there in a day's token strike? It is only a child's play. Why is the Government so nervous?" I do not know whether this is the view which a responsible person—he was not a trade unionist—can take of a strike. Well, later what happened is known to everybody. Large sections of workers voted against the strike. The public was also resisting the strike. Out of 26 lakhs of workers hardly one and a half lakh of them went on strike, but that was also under violence. Incidents of violence have been quoted here. What happened at Pathankot? There was violence. There was violence at Gauhati. The workers, who did not believe in strike, when they wanted to go to work, were prevented and forcibly prevented; and it was their right—it is a right of every citizen in the country—to demand protection from the police and from the Government if violence is used against them. On one occasion, Sir, when a

policeman went to give protection to the workers, the policeman was manhandled. More than that, according to my report, the policeman was taken to the engine and he was on the point of being burnt alive. Then more policemen came and that policeman was saved. This is the way in which such strikes are conducted.

Sir, I now would like to say a few words about this need-based minimum wage. Much has been made about it, about the demand on which the workers were asked to go on strike. Luckily a large number of workers did not listen to it. They realised the consequences. Even at that time it was pointed by some responsible unions that this was not the right type of demand.

SHRI A. P. CHATTERJEE: You mean by "the responsible unions" the INTUC?

SHRI S. R. VASAVADA : I will just explain that at the end of my speech. I will explain what is a responsible union. This is my first speech in the House . . .

(Interruptions)

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

SHRI A. P. CHATTERJEE: I am just wanting a fact. I just wanted to know who were those responsible persons or unions.

SHRI S. R. VASAVADA: I have already answered that. I will come to that in another few minutes. I may again refer to this matter at that time.

Sir, the concept of a need-based wage was defined at the Fifteenth Labour Conference 11 years back. I happened to be a party to that resolution. A need-based wage has been denned as "so much of cloth, so much of food" and so on. But nobody told those people who wanted to go on strike and to this House also that "this very resolution says that this is a concept achievable after some time or at any rate it is an objective", because the resolution itself contains a clause, a provision that "this need-based wage cannot be

given if the national economy at present cannot permit". The capacity of the industry, the capacity of the employer, the capacity of the pay-master, has got to be taken into consideration. And who judges this capacity? I cannot say that you have the capacity. What is the use of saying that the Deputy Prime Minister or the Finance Minister says that he is prepared to spend 130 crores on prohibition? Look at the argument. If he has spent 130 crores on prohibition, why not 130 crores on need-based wage? Sir, let this House know the meaning of spending 130 crores on prohibition. If 130 crores are spent on prohibition, the workers in the country will save 1300 crores. Those people who are spending on drinking, will be saving that amount. Their efficiency will go high and they will be the real citizens of the country. That apart—that is not the subject here—Sir, this clause should not be forgotten. The demand has been referred to the Wage Boards. The demand has been referred to the Pay Commissions. Nobody has said that this is the time to get the need-based wage. Some of my friends have served on certain Wage Boards. Some honourable Members of this House were there. They also said, this is not the time for a need-based wage.

Then, Sir, certain allegations are made against the National Labour Commission. My friend, Mr. Dange's name was also referred to. I have not to go and refer to Mr. Dange. So far as the National Labour Commission is concerned, I happen to be myself a member of the National Labour Commission. I have got some knowledge, some authority, about the subject which was discussed here. Sir, this need-based wage has been referred to the National Labour Commission. There were two questions which were posed to all the parties in the country, whether this is the time or whether any modification is required. The questions were addressed to the Government also, the largest employer in the country. A letter was sent to the Government asking, "Please state your views on this". Why the Government? Be-

0—38 R.S./68

cause, as I said earlier, the railway workers and the Posts and Telegraphs workers are covered by the National Labour Commission's report. Some hon. friends very rightly said, "Where was the hurry? The National Labour Commission was going to submit its report by March 1969". I do not want to guess or conjecture as to what was the reason behind it. I shall confine myself only to the facts. I only feel that some of my trade union friends, who call themselves well-wishers of the workers, really do not understand the meaning of a need-based wage. They do not really understand how to negotiate. Negotiation is an art. The question of a need-based wage has to be studied. The norms have to be studied.

This morning, Sir, I was hearing something about dearness allowance, "Why not 100 per cent neutralisation?" Well, on this 100 per cent neutralisation it is not for the Deputy Prime Minister to say "yes" or "no". There is a principle and that principle has been enunciated by the Gajendra-gadkar Commission and the Government has fully accepted that principle. But, Sir, what is the position today? Violence broke out. We should wait for the report of the National Labour Commission. But even before the strike call could materialise, some unions, I would again repeat, some unions—because I am now coming to the definition of the "responsible unions" . . .

SHRI A. P. CHATTERJEE: I want to know who are the responsible unions.

SHRI S. R. VASAVADA : Some responsible persons pointed out to the workers that this question cannot be settled merely by demand. A demand, according to Mahatma Gandhi, cannot be a vague demand. It must be a precise demand. Nobody has defined what is a need-based wage .. (*Interruptions*) What is the minimum that a worker gets? The minimum wage a worker gets today is about Rs. 155 or Rs. 156. In Bombay the need-based wage will go up to Rs. 200, In Delhi it will be Rs. 225 and in Calcutta it may still go up, one cannot say. If one were to

[Shri S. R. Vasavada]

study the various principles of the need-based wage, it is extremely difficult to say what will be the minimum need-based wage. If the increased burden involved in it had to be calculated, I am sure no responsible trade unionist in the country would have ever asked for a need-based wage. The real demand should have been the appointment of the third Pay Commission. The Government employees in all countries are always governed by Pay Commissions. I do not see why a third Pay Commission should not be appointed immediately.

SHRI A. P. CHATTERJEE : The National Labour Commission has already given its award that there is nothing like a need-based wage.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN) : He knows his responsibility.

(Interruptions)

SHRI S. R. VASAVADA : I am speaking as a member of this House. The National Labour Commission has not given the report. *(Interruptions)* I do not know why I am not given indulgence, this being my first speech.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN) : This is his maiden speech in the House. He is a very old labour leader. Please give him a patient hearing.

SHRI S. R. VASAVADA : I would now suggest to the Government and to the employees what is the best way out. When employees form a trade union, we cannot deny that right. Of course disputes are bound to arise. The best way is to have a negotiated settlement but it is also possible that a settlement cannot be negotiated. Mahatma Gandhi has suggested that if we want to behave like civilised people in the country, the only way is to refer the matter to arbitration. If the trade unions understand this principle, they will understand their responsibility. The role of a trade union in this country and in all the countries is not only to serve the interests of the workers. Let us

remember that the community has allowed these trade unions to come into existence not just to rob the community and destroy the interests of the country. Trade unions can be tolerated by the community as long as their approach is constructive. While serving the interests of the workers they have also to see that the interests of the community at large are served. If the trade unions do not serve their nation or their community, I am afraid they will earn a bad name and if public opinion goes against trade unions, the whole movement will be wiped out of this country. That is why I am saying that a responsible trade unionist will never be arrogant or insolent. A hundred times he will go to the employers for negotiations. Mahatma Gandhi used to go to the Viceroy hundreds of times with folded hands but when the Viceroy refused it point-blank, he started the civil disobedience movement. This is what we have to learn from our history of independence.

Finally I would request this House to advise the trade unions to be responsible trade unions, to accept arbitration, to organise workers with a view to helping the country. I would also appeal to the Government that this is the only way to ensure peace in this country. After all do we not want a welfare State? Do we not want socialism? There cannot be socialism if we are going to destroy national interests and destroy our economy. If the Government wants peace in this country, if you want prosperity in this country, if you want to improve the living standard of the people, then a constructive approach is essential. Therefore the Government who is the largest employer in this country will have to decide that all disputes are to be settled by arbitration. My friend, Shri Rajnarain, very correctly said that there is no harm in settling the disputes by arbitration. Of course, the sovereign authority in this country is Parliament. In the Industrial Disputes Act there is a clause that if the arbitrator's award is not acceptable to Government, the Parliament can modify it; modifications are allowed. So this is the present posi-

tion. Therefore let the employers in this country, including the Government, realise that unless arbitration is accepted, there can be no peace in this country. Thank you.

DR. B. N. ANTANI (Gujarat): Mr. Vice-Chairman, I am deeply distressed at the situation that has arisen in the country from 19th September. I believe it is the culmination of the vacillating policy pursued by the present administration of the Government of India. So far as the demands of the employees are concerned, they are just and fair; they were the creation of the economic policy pursued by the present Government of India. If the prices are rising every day, if I have to maintain my family, I need sufficient food and clothing. If I am not given an adequate wage, the result is that I shall do what I am led to do. This gave a handle to the leaders of the parties whose only objective is to achieve the breakdown of the Government's machinery. The Home Minister who was seized of the whole situation, lion that he is, lion that he looks, behaved ultimately as a fox. What do we notice today? Ultimately why has not the Government come to the conclusion that it is either sending it to arbitration or it is deciding it itself in a just and fair manner? The result is that they have given a handle to my friend, Mr. Bhupesh Gupta, and to Mr. Rajnarain not only to say what they do here but they must be prepared to see that situation in practice one day. Are they ready to face such a situation? Therefore as a responsible Member of this House I still appeal to the Government to think seriously of the situation that has culminated out of the vacillating policy of the Government which is not worthy of being called a Government, because it is not governing at all. They are hunting with the hound and are running with the hare. This is a very serious situation, Mr. Vice-Chairman, that has arisen in the country. No responsible citizen of India who thinks of the collective good of the country can sit idle and can face this situation with equi-

animity. Therefore I warn that the time is not still lost to consider the consequences and the results of the present situation. I heard the Deputy Prime Minister this morning answering a question in a very bold way—bold that he is—that this Government is not going to be brushed aside by anybody. With due respect to him, I ask: 'What have you done except succumbing to Pressurisation during the last 20 years? You are becoming victim of Pressurisation always'. Bold words to speak and not to practice will not make them a good Government. I therefore request the Government very earnestly to govern and be firm. After all the employees of the Central Government are a part of the machinery. Are we going to have our country working in an effective manner or are we going to be paralysed in all directions? I can never be a party to any movement which is aimed at paralysing the machinery of the Government as it is I therefore appeal to the Home Minister to be the lion that he is, to be the lion that I know him to be and not, for God's sake, to behave as a fox. That is the crux of the present situation. I have full sympathy with the employees of the Central Government. I believe that they must get and the Government must be made to pay, what is due to them. I do not know how you call it—need-based minimum etc.—but whatever is due to them must be given to them. I am very sorry that after having created the situation, after playing as a handle in the hands of those who wanted this mischief, your machinery did not behave in the way in which it should have done and the result was the Indraprastha incidents. The result was Bikaner and the result was what happened everywhere, which my friend Shri Rajnarain boldly quoted. I feel that the incidents of Indraprastha and elsewhere were a shame on any civilized Government. No less a person than an eminent judge and a jurist, Shri Tricumdas, has given a report. Your own authorities—the police or whoever it was—have given the report. Is that not a sufficient material before you to come out

[Dr. B. N. Antani] boldly and say 'We shall hold a judicial enquiry and we shall see that the culprits are punished'. You have not got the courage to do it and so we have this position. It is very well to say on the part of the Home Minister: 'I am not going to oblige the Opposition by resigning'. Do not do it and face the consequences. Why are you playing with this distinguished House with this futile verbosity? Be a serious administrator and face the consequences of what you have done. I therefore appeal through you to the Government even at this moment to seriously consider the situation and to abandon this vacillating policy. Do not be vacillating in the name of what can we do?'¹

Whenever you want to appease you

say: cfzrr ^ STfaTOT^r I < / have been an administrator myself, small that I am. If I took a decision, I used to stick to it and face the consequences. Have they the courage to do it? In their anxiety to cling to power and appease their satellites who are around them, they are following wrong policies and the result is the present situation. I therefore very earnestly plead for serious consideration even now. DA, CA, GA etc. you call them—I do not know about these. For God's sake give me a lump sum. That is my earnest prayer to the Government and face a judicial enquiry. I am glad that the Government, on occasions even in this whole affair, has behaved as a Government but they melted—I do not know how—with the result that it was neither water nor milk nor anything. I therefore want it to be firm and show to us what they are and we shall cooperate with them wherever possible. I am not one who will threaten the Government with 'India bundh or Bharat Bundh'. It is very

easy to say. किसका भारत है। जब भारत बंध होगा तो मेरा और आपका क्या होगा ? यह लोग बैठने नहीं देंगे। We therefore earnestly appeal to them to be serious and not

'आप कहते हैं यह लोकशाही है। यह लोकशाही है क्या? We are: लोकशाही। अरे लोकशाही कोई खिलोना नहीं है तुम्हारे हाथ में।

in their complacent manner allow these elements to develop; otherwise they will have to face the consequences.

श्री राजनारायण : हम अन्तानी साहब से जानना चाहते हैं . . .

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN) : You think over if

श्री राजनारायण : श्री पुरुषोत्तमदास व्रीकम-दास ने अपनी रपट में लिख दिया है कि प्राइमा फेसी केस है, जुडिशियल इन्क्वायरी हो। मैं उनसे जानना चाहता हूँ उन्होंने हमको सलाह दिया और गवर्नमेंट को सलाह दिया गवर्नमेंट जुडिशियल इन्क्वायरी क्यों नहीं कराना चाहती है ?

SHRI A. D. MANI: On a point of order. I wanted to put questions, you did not allow me.

DR. B. N. ANTANI: Let this be placed before a judicial enquiry and the whole thing will come out.

श्री राजनारायण : आप हमारा साथ दोगे या नहीं। देखिये जुडिशियल इन्क्वायरी में जुडिशियल ऐक्शन है और चव्हाण के रेजिगनेशन में पोलिटिकल ऐक्शन है। दोनों होना चाहिये।

SHRI T. V. ANANDAN (Madras) : Mr. Vice-Chairman, the subject on which I am now participating is one about which Mr. Vasavada, the President of the Federation, has expressed his views. The crux of the problem is this. As far as I know—and I had been a partisan also in that Committee—I intend blaming the leaders of the Opposition for the main reason that the JCM while being introduced in this country, the Opposition leaders, especially wedded to the philosophy of a foreign country, were not at all interested to work the JCM but the pressure was so great that they had to yield and give a trial to the JCM. The demand not only here but also in all the developed countries is that there should be no strike. Strikes should be the last weapon. Prior to that there should be conciliation, arbitration and negotiation. Here is the

Vice President of India who had the privilege to organise the trade union movement in this country. He also laid the policy for the trade unions to follow. He said: "There should be no compulsory arbitration but there should be voluntary arbitration." That compares with the United Kingdom because he served in the past in the UK and he knows how the UK the greatest country in the world, have set up a parliamentary system of Government, that is followed by the entire humanity in the world. So he stressed on that but here in this country we, who have adopted the democratic system of Government for the last 20 years, have come to know that we have given too much of democracy to all the political parties which are functioning here. Here is a political party which swears much by what happened fifty-one years ago in a country where there was a workers' revolution, and which has a stable Government today. But remember, my dear friends, it is not so possible here in this country of democracy based on Gandhian philosophy, not possible here to copy what happened successfully in another country—it will be a failure here. In those countries there was prevailing a monarchical form of Government, where oppression was very great. But here is a country which follows the Gandhian philosophy, and here is a democracy which treats alike even the communists, both Right and Left, and added to them are of course the P.S.P. and the Jana Sangh and everybody else who have joined hands with them and have united for this purpose, namely to provoke and to instigate honest and loyal workers in this country to go on strike, paralyse the Government and capture the Government. It cannot happen here; it is asking for the moon. It is not possible for the working class here to whip up a revolution and capture seats of power. We have now seen how many United Front Governments are there and how they are not prepared to yield to the demands of their State Government employees. Such was the case in U.P. and such is the case still in Kerala,

to name a few.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No, no.

SHRI T. V. ANANDAN: The demand by the Government employees in Kerala State was suppressed by the State Government. The Kerala Chief Minister has himself said that a need-based minimum wage is not a practicable solution today.

(Interruptions)

SHRI A. P. CHATTERJEE: Probably the hon. Member is mistaken. The United Front Government gave to its own employees much more than the Congress Government ever gave there by way of dearness allowance.

SHRI T. V. ANANDAN: Now, Mr. Vice-Chairman, the question of a need-based minimum wage was placed before the Joint Consultative Machinery, but the Chairman of the Council said that it was a question which could not be solved so easily and therefore "let us not discuss this subject".

(Interruptions)

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN): No interruptions please.

SHRI T. V. ANANDAN: Now when the Chairman of the JCM said that it was not possible, the staff side said, "No, the arbitration clause is there and it should be referred to arbitration". Then he said, "Very good, but whether the question is arbitrable or not is a matter to be discussed with the Ministers concerned. There was the understanding between the staff side and the Labour Minister just before introducing the JCM that, if, there was a difference of opinion on interpretation, it should be referred to three Ministers, namely the Labour Minister, the Home Minister and the Minister of the Department concerned. Therefore this course in the matter of interpretation of the arbitration clause was there.

SHRI CHITTA BASU (West Beng.-!): No, you are wrong here.

SHRI T. V. ANANDAN: You can go into the printed book on the subject. The scheme of the JCM clearly states that there are three items for arbitrariness. One is the pay and allowances of a Class or a Grade, not the entire gamut of workers. It is 'Class' or 'Grade'.

(Interruptions)

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN) : No interruptions please.

SHRI T. V. ANANDAN: If really the leaders of the working class in this country are interested in the upliftment of the workers, they should have gone to the three Ministers and discussed there about the interpretation. The Government did not say it was not an arbitrable question. It could be arbitrable, but a discussion must be held to find out whether the question was arbitrable or not. But they did not take to that course. Their intention was to paralyse the country by declaring a strike. But the Central Government employees are not the people who could easily be led away by propaganda and instigation by some labour leaders. The intention of the leaders of the opposition involved in this episode was that they wanted to accuse the Central Government because people had already gathered the impression that the United Front Governments had suppressed the trade union movement launched by their own employees putting forward their demands for better remuneration and when, to contest the mid-term elections in the States where they held power previously, they went to the people to secure their votes, they would be criticised by them and they would not cast their votes in favour of them. Therefore, apprehending such a situation, they the opposition, wanted to place the Central Government also in the same place. They therefore said, "All right, let us try and bring the criticism of the voters to be equally directed against the party in power in the Central Government".

Their intention was not really to help the Central Government employees but only to make the people of the country blame the Central Government by their launching a strike by the Central Government employees. But the Government acted well in time. They issued an Ordinance to avert the contemplated strike engineered by some labour leaders in opposition to the Government. And when Parliament was not in session, well, they issued the Ordinance. Now, should not the Ordinance be respected and obeyed? We are a law-abiding people and have been law-abiding during British days of rule of this country also. So, when our own Government issued the Ordinance, we should have obeyed it. But then there were the leaders who said, "Do not care for this piece of paper. What is this Ordinance but a piece of paper? We are here. We will see. If you are not taken back into service, we will see that Parliament does not function". They had exhibited it the day before yesterday in the Lok Sabha. They wanted to try it forgetting that the majority of the people are behind the Government of the day at the Centre. Such were the so-called leaders who gave such false hopes.

Finally, Mr. Vice-Chairman, I beg to differ from some of the statements by many friends there who said, "What is this inequitable manner of pleasing one section of the workers? Why should they alone be boosted"? Sir, workers including those working under Governments are the backbone of the country. Without these workers there will be no progress. There will be no Five-Year Plans. There will be no manufacture of the Gnat fighter planes to give a chase to hostile jet planes of American make or other makes. There will be no ship-building. There will be no Jabalpur tank factory or the Avadi tank factory to roll down hostile tanks. Therefore, the working class is an indispensable section of the society for the society's growth and for the country's growth. All the three Five-Year Plans involving a total outlay of about Rs. 20,000

•crores would have been futile if the working class had not helped the country and the community at large. Therefore, the working class should be boosted up. If the working class is not boosted up, then there will be no progress at all. My friends should not say, "Considering the average per capita income of the people in the country how can you boost up the earnings of a section of the workers alone? But, I ask, without caring for the contentment of the workers how can you expect them to produce more and more and create more wealth for the country at large? How can you expect them to feed the people and to cater to their other needs? Therefore, Sir, the interests of the working class in this country should be looked after very carefully and very favourably.

SHRI M. N. KAUL: And also the white collar workers.

SHRI T. V. ANANDAN: Certainly; they are also part and parcel of the working class in general. Those who are wage-earners should be looked after well. This morning our Deputy Prime Minister and Finance Minister said, "No, no, how can that be when 50 per cent of the people are below subsistence level? How can a section alone be favoured to the exclusion of the rest"? Sir, what is the working class there for? It has to feed the idle sections of the society who do not do the job they do. 12.6 per cent of the people of this country comprise the workers in this country. This 12.6 per cent is the feeders of the other sections of the people and they should be well looked after.

Before I close I must now appeal to the Government. Now everything is over. We should not keep quiet. This is a democratic form of Government. Every five years we go to the people for votes and so presently we must create confidence and hope in those Central Government employees who have been removed from service for participating in that strike of 19th of September. Those misguided or ill-advised people must be taken back in-

to service; whether they be temporary or permanent employees removed from service, they should be taken back into service. There are rules and regulations which can make the punishment awarded to them, by discharging them from service less rigorous. They should be condoned. It may be taken as a break in service, and future facilities may be denied to them for a number of years—according as their cases are viewed. Therefore, excepting those who were involved in acts of violence or those who instigated this strike on the 19th of September, all the others who were removed from service, whether they were temporary employees or permanent employees, should be taken back into service. You should thus create a peaceful atmosphere in this great country of ours, which follows Gandhian philosophy.

Thank you, Sir.

RE INDO-NEPAL TALKS HELD RECENTLY

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRI B. R. BHAGAT): Sir, I crave your indulgence and the indulgence of the House for a minute. At the invitation of His Majesty's Government of Nepal the Government of India sent a high-powered delegation led by me to hold talks with a delegation of the Government of Nepal. The talks continued from 15th November to this morning and were concluded successfully. After the talks a joint press communique has been issued and I lay a copy of the communique on the Table of the House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Read it.

SHRI A. D. MANI (Madhya Pradesh): Sir, this is a very important matter. We would like to hear it. Let it be read out. He should read it.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN): Mr. Mani, I have given him permission to lay it on the Table. We are in the midst of a very serious debate and there are many Members who wish to speak . . .