

SHRI ABD ALI: If I am not there some of my colleagues will be there who will have my backing but so far as they are concerned, they don't believe in God and therefore I cannot say, 'G-od take care of them.' Anyway I appreciate this spirit very much and I assure them that it will be reciprocated. If they go beyond the matter under discussion and tell things always charging us that we are slaves of the capitalists, that they are bringing pressure, that whatever they say we do, that we are their slaves, then I will say that if I am a slave, I will be a slave of the people of this country and not of some other country.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

"That the Bill, as amended, be passed."

The motion was adopted.

THE MINIMUM WAGES (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1961

THE DEPUTY MINISTER OF LABOUR (SHRI ABD ALI): Sir, excuse me; I do not find the papers.

DR. R. B. GOUR (Andhra Pradesh): You have lost the brief.

SHRI ABD ALI: So it has started again? His leader has given some assurance and I hope he and his followers will follow it.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA (West Bengal): Sir, I have given him no assurance that we shall not be fighting for the interests of the working people here.

SHRI ABD ALI: Certainly, I will welcome that but he should not fight for the interests of foreign masters also and those . . .

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order, order.

SHRI ABD ALI: Sir, I beg to move: "That the Bill further to amend the Minimum Wages Act, 1948, be taken into consideration."

Sir, as hon. Members are aware, the Minimum Wages Act, 1948, requires fixation of minimum rates of wages for all scheduled employments to be completed by a specified date and that date expired on 31st December 1959. The main object of the present Bill is to do away with any rigid time limit. We are also taking this opportunity to provide that minimum wages should not be fixed or revised in any scheduled employment when any dispute relating to that industry is pending before a tribunal or when an award of a tribunal is still in operation in that industry.

Sir, I move.

The question was proposed.

SHRI ROHIT M. DAVE (Gujarat) : Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, I have not been able to appreciate from the Statement of Objects and Reasons why this particular Bill has been brought forward at all. The most important and the only important clause in this Bill is clause 2 and this clause 2 consists of two parts. As far as the first part is concerned, the idea is to do away with the time limit before which the minimum wages should be fixed once it is notified that a particular industry comes within the purview of the Minimum Wages Act. Now, it has been stated in the Statement of Objects and Reasons that—

"The Minimum Wages (Central) Advisory Board at its meeting held on the 4th August, 1960 recommended that the time-limit for initial wage fixation should be done away with altogether."

Unfortunately we have not got the full minutes of that particular Board meeting and we do not know exactly why . . .

DR. R. B. GOUR : You must be in contact with the Central Trade Union organisations for this.

SHRI ROHIT M. DAVE: As a Member of Parliament I need not be. I must get the information. I have no such information as to why they

came to this particular decision but it is quite obvious that this decision was taken because of the fact that it was felt that now that the machinery had already worked for some time and minimum wage had been fixed for almost all the categories that were originally contemplated to be covered by this Act, there was no necessity for this particular provision in the Act. At the same time it has been further stated in the Statement that now the question is one of extending the coverage of the Act to more and more employments in both the Central and State spheres. If it is found desirable that the operation of this Act should be extended to more and more professions, more and more concerns and more and more industries, then certainly such coverage can be attained only through certain notifications and through certain machinery contemplated in the Act. So the issue of certain notifications will become necessary and in respect of them if no time limit is fixed before which the minimum wage should be determined, then certain difficulties are likely to arise, and these of course to my mind flow from the second amendment which is also contained in this very clause, in which it has been said—

"No minimum rates of wages in respect of employees employed in a scheduled employment shall be fixed or revised under this Act during the pendency before a Tribunal or National Tribunal under the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, of any industrial dispute relating to the rates of wages payable to such employees, or if any award has been made by the Tribunal or National Tribunal in respect of such dispute, during the period in which that award remains in operation."

Now, as far as the second part of it is concerned. I have no difficulty because as long as the award is in operation, certainly it is not desirable that the statute should make any change but even here I will submit that if the award is such that the minimum wage that is fixed under that award is considered to be below the minimum wage

which the wage-fixing authority thinks is desirable, then a change should be made and one need not wait till the entire award period is over. But I can at least understand that in principle as long as an award is in operation the Government should not do anything whereby the award, as it is, is modified. But I do not realise why where some proceedings are before the court not only at the time when this amendment is passed but at any time no minimum rates of wages could be fixed or revised. I fear that what will happen will be this. When the Government starts an enquiry regarding an industry or a certain concern and when the employers find that it is likely that this particular Act might be extended to that particular industry or that particular concern they might suddenly start some dispute with the result that . . .

SHRI KHANDUBHAI K. DESAI (Gujarat)
: But it cannot go before an industrial tribunal unless the Government refers it.

SHRI ROHIT M. DAVE; My friend Mr. Khandubhai knows it much more than I do. But whenever there is any dispute—that dispute need not necessarily be confined to the minimum wage; it is normally a charter of demands placed by the workers before the employers—and when conciliation proceedings do not succeed in bringing about conciliation then normally it is expected that this particular case will be referred to the industrial tribunal. At that time it would not be possible for the Government to say that as far as the minimum wage part of it is concerned they are thinking of extending this particular Act to that industry and they are not going to refer that part to the industrial tribunal. Only the other part of the charter of demands will be submitted to the Industrial Tribunal. That should not be done. When the matter is under contemplation, when a final decision has not been taken, I am quite sure the employers will have enough time to defeat the purpose of this particular

[Shri Rohit M. Dave.] Bill, because before this provision is extended to a particular concern or a class of concerns, certain enquiry has to be gone through. It is quite obvious that once that enquiry has started and the employer knows that conditions are such that this particular Act is likely to be extended to his concern or to his industry, he will take advantage of it and will see that a certain dispute goes before the Industrial Tribunal. Once it goes before the Industrial Tribunal and as long as it is before it, no action could be taken under this particular Act. I would, therefore, submit that as far as the question of submitting a matter before the Industrial Tribunal is concerned, there should not be any provision of the type mentioned in the Bill, whereby the operation of governmental authority in fixing a minimum wage would be barred merely because that particular matter has been submitted to the Industrial Tribunal. I am quite sure it should be very easy to find a provision whereby, as long as this particular Bill has not become an Act, if any matter has gone before an Industrial Tribunal it might be disposed of, as has been suggested in this particular Bill. As far as any further industrial dispute is concerned regarding minimum wage, it should be the minimum wage fixation authority which should have the power to determine whether a minimum wage should be fixed for a particular industry or should not be fixed for a particular industry. In that case the Industrial Tribunal should not be brought into the picture at all, because it is the responsibility of the minimum wage fixation authority to determine what should be the minimum wage and in what industries? and whether those industries should be brought within the Schedule or should not be brought within the Schedule. Therefore, after the Government has started an investigation and when the matter is under the contemplation of the minimum wage fixation authority to de-

cide whether a particular category should be brought under the Schedule or should not be brought under the Schedule, i.e., during the pendency of it, it should be either a convention or a rule that that particular matter will not be brought before the Industrial Tribunal for an award, so that as far as the discretion of the minimum wage fixation authority is concerned it remains unfettered and no devious methods are employed by the employers to circumvent this particular Bill, which on the whole is not very desirable from both these points of view. From the point of view of the period, I do not see any reason why the time-limit should be done away with. As long as the time-limit is there, the minimum wage fixation will have to be made before that time and because it is a statutory obligation, perhaps the Industrial Tribunal will not interfere with it. Once the time-limit is taken away and another provision is added, namely, even when the matter is before the Industrial Tribunal the authority of the minimum wage fixation authority should be taken away and only after that particular award is given—and that particular award will become binding for a certain time—for a pretty long time, a particular concern or group of concerns or a particular industry would be in a position to get away from the scope of this particular Act, which is not desirable. That is why I said in the beginning that I have not been able to appreciate the Statement of Objects and Reasons of the Bill and why it has been brought forward at all. Thank you.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA (Uttar Pradesh) : Mr. Deputy Chairman. I rise to support the Bill. The Bill deals with some of the practical problems of implementation of a very useful measure. Till 1948 in this country we had no legislation to deal with the minimum wage problem. All wages, particularly minimum wages, in the country were fixed by tribunals and earlier than the tribunals they were

fixed by some committees. We, in Uttar Pradesh, for example, had the good fortune of the minimum wage of textile labour in Kanpur being fixed by a Committee in 1938 over which Dr. Rajendra Prasad, now the President of India, himself presided. In Bombay they had a Committee with Mr. Jairamdas Daulatram as Chairman and that Committee fixed the minimum wages. That was the pattern of fixation of minimum wages till 1948. But then this pattern, this sort of enquiry, was not a feature of the 3ay to day life of the workers of the country. Only in case the workers were vocal, only in case the workers were organised and persistently demanded the fixation of a minimum wage the Government took the unusual step of appointing an Enquiry Committee, which took years. The recommendations did not have any statutory force behind them. The reports of those Committees were important documents which prepared public opinion and then it was—as in the case of Kanpur in 1938—for the workers and the employers to try their strength, the workers having public opinion behind them. The Act of 1948 was a step in the right direction, a step in accordance with the Convention of the I.L.O., which makes it necessary that minimum wages should be fixed. This Act was a remarkable piece of legislation, because it provided protection and help to workers, who were by the very nature of their employment, by the very nature of the industries in which they were employed, not in a position to organise themselves sufficiently strongly, were not in a position to win a minimum wage for themselves by their own organised strength, as workers in the Ahmedabad and Bombay textile industry did long ago. The Minimum Wages Act was an Act to help the poorest, the most down-trodden sections of the toiling population of our country. Many industries in this country were prospering on sweated labour and this Act made it necessary for them to pay minimum wages. These minimum wages only provided them with the barest means of subsistence and

it was very necessary that it should have been done. This legislation was, of course, necessary, because the workers in most of these industries, which are mentioned in Parts I and II of the Schedule in the parent Act, were not organised enough. The Act of 1948 has not been implemented as expeditiously and as widely as we would like. There are certain industries like the tannery industry in Uttar Pradesh where minimum wages have not been fixed in spite of the fact that the Act is 13 years old.

SHRI K. L. NARASIMHAM (Andhra Pradesh): Even now?

SHRI ARJUN ARORA: Even till today. There are other instances also from other States. In the case of agricultural labour, the progress has been much slower than it was expected though the original Act in 1958 laid it down that the minimum wages for agricultural workers should be fixed within three years. Sir, it is now thirteen years since that Act came into being—it came into force on the 15th March 1948—and we find that even after these thirteen years in the case of agricultural labour we have not done what was originally intended to be done in three years. There are undoubtedly a number of practical difficulties, but there is also a fact to be reckoned with that all the State Governments are not equally enthusiastic about fixation of minimum wages for agricultural labour. It is correct to say that it will be no use fixing minimum wages and not being able to enforce them. But that was something which was taken into consideration when the original Bill was considered. When the Minimum Wages Act of 1948 was enacted, all this was taken into consideration. It is only reasonable to expect that minimum wages for agricultural labour will be fixed as quickly as possible and that those States which have not done so will be pulled up by the Centre as best as the Centre can. The present Bill mainly deals with that situation. It is correct. Sir, as has been stated in the Statement of Objects and Reasons of

[Shri Arjun Arora.] the Bill, in the case of those industries in the Schedule, those sweated industries for which this Act was meant, quite a substantial percentage of workers has been covered, but the same cannot be said of agricultural labour. It would have been much better if the Government was in a position to say the same about agricultural labour. It is because of lack of enthusiasm on the part of some State Governments that our Labour Ministry has come to this House year after year and got the time limit extended—because the Act of 1948 laid down two years for industrial workers and three years for agricultural workers. That Act had to be amended again and again, and now the Deputy Minister has come forward with an amendment which will not make it necessary for him to come to this House again and again. I would not mind that, but he should be in a position to check up the rate of implementation of this measure in the various States. After all when a Central legislation is enacted, eligible persons in all the States of the country are meant to benefit from it, and the Labour Ministry should be in a position to see and ensure that all the States take adequate steps to implement the Act and fix minimum wages for those industries for which they have not been fixed so far and for agricultural labour.

Sir, there is in the Bill a provision relating to Government action when an industrial dispute is pending before a Tribunal. That I think is a very correct provision, and in spite of what my hon. friend, Mr. Dave, has said I feel that that amendment is very necessary, because the very fundamental concept of industrial litigation is that all conditions of employment remain frozen during the pendency of a dispute. If in an industrial dispute the question of wages is involved, if a dispute concerning minimum wages in an industry is being looked into by an Industrial Tribunal, nobody should be able to disturb that position. The Industrial Disputes Act itself makes it obligatory on the parties not to disturb

the arrangement. No conditions of employment can be altered during the pendency of an industrial dispute by an employer, and labour cannot resort to a strike to enforce any change in conditions of employment pertaining to which a dispute is pending before a Tribunal. Where it is in the power of the Government to fix a minimum wage for the workers, it is only reasonable that the hands of the Government should be equally restricted. After all we have in this country waited for the fixation of minimum wages for certain industries so long, and an industrial dispute before a Tribunal does not last for ever. Industrial disputes before a Tribunal are supposed to be short-lived. During that period if the Government does not fix any minimum wages, not much harm will be done. Even from the labour point of view sometimes we are able to get better things from the judiciary than from the executive. Of course if Government policy is involved, if public policy is involved, Government can even after the dispute has come to an end do its functions under the Minimum Wages Act and fix the minimum wages as required by that Act. There is in this Act a provision for Advisory Boards. There is a Central Advisory Board for minimum wages and then there are Advisory Committees in the States. The Act lays it down that the representation of labour and employer on these bodies should be equal. That is a very correct thing, but sometimes what one finds is that there is a State Advisory Committee which deals with a particular industry and the labour of that industry is not represented on that Committee, because the Act does not say that the labour of a particular industry should be represented on the Advisory Committee which has to fix the minimum wages for that particular industry. It is only proper that labour representation on a Committee should mean the representation of labour of that particular industry and not the labour of other industries. There is of course no basic conflict between the interests of labour of one industry and another, but those

who know the industry, those who have worked in the industry, those whose experience of that industry is something that counts are always in a better position to represent the workers of that industry than those who are generally pro-labour or whose general interest in labour is undisputed. We have found that in certain States the Advisory Committees are appointed and the labour representatives are appointed according to the Act. Their number is equal to the number of representatives of employers, but the labour representatives are not the people in whom the workers of the particular industry have confidence, they are not those who are dealing with the day-to-day problems of the industry. Of course that aspect of the matter is not part of the present Amendment Bill, but I take this opportunity to draw the attention of the hon. Deputy Minister to this aspect of the problem, and I hope that he will one day bring forward a Bill or take administrative action to deal with this aspect of the problem. It would have been much better if we had been told about the extent of the implementation of the original Act in the various States. That has not been done but I do hope that while giving the State Governments the opportunity to take their own time in the matter of fixation of minimum wages for certain industries and agricultural labour, the Government of India will continue to be the watch-dog of the interests of labour because the Minimum Wages Act and this amending Bill concern the people whose labour has been exploited too long. They concern people who, really speaking, are the most sweated part of our working population. Their interests should be watched, and as far as the State Governments are concerned, the Government of India should be in a position to watch their interests and see that all the State Governments do implement the Act with almost equal speed and that the benefits of the Act are made available to all the workers.

With these words, I support the Bill.

DR. R. B. GOUR: Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, this particular amending 14 RS—4 •

Bill deals with two things. One is that they are doing away with the time-limit for the fixation of minimum wages. Now, Sir, already the time-limit has expired; 31st December, 1959 was the time-limit for both the Schedules and in fact a situation had arisen where Minimum Wages Committees had been formed, minimum wages had been fixed or they advised the State Governments as to how to implement the proposals. In fact, in Andhra Pradesh the State Legislature had to pass an amending Bill extending the time for one year and in fact, the Central Government have come to this House on a number of occasions—I think twice—for extending the time-limit in this particular case. But now they have come here for doing away with it, while the Minimum Wages Advisory Committee which met on the 4th of August last year had taken that decision. The matter was under consideration and discussion between the various trade union organisations and the Government for a long time. Now what is the position? The fundamental idea of the Minimum Wages Act is that in the interests of the unorganised labour, in the interests of the sweated industry as we call it, we have to fix a certain minimum wage which will be statutorily applicable to that industry within a particular time. That was the idea. The time was extended because the time was fixed by us, by the Central Government and by Parliament but the authorities that were to implement it were different except in cases where the Central Government themselves were the appropriate authorities. Now the State Governments have failed in this particular aspect because the Act has to be primarily implemented by the State Governments in the various sectors. It is really tragic that report after report has come as to why the Minimum Wages Act was not being implemented in particular States. Take, for example, the great State of Rajasthan of Nath Dwaras and so on. What does Rajasthan say? Rajasthan says that it is very difficult for them to fix minimum wages or implement the Minimum Wages Act of 1948 in regard to agriculture, and *bidi* industry because

[Dr. R. B. Gour.]

both the employers and the employees are illiterate. Well, I do not know whether we find literates among agricultural labour or among the *bidi* workers in any part of the country. So the illiteracy of either the employers or the employees is being taken as a pretext and reports are published. These reports are published in the Indian Labour Gazette. In 'The Labour Gazette' they publish a summary or a synopsis. This is what Rajasthan says. There are so many other States also. For example, Bombay has said that it is impossible for them to see that the provisions of the Minimum Wages Act are fully implemented by the municipalities particularly when they have to deal with the wages of labour employed by their contractors and that they do not know whether it should or should not be made obligatory that the Minimum Wage Inspector issues a clearance certificate to the contractor before the bill is paid. Everywhere we find the same thing. And the most important thing is that even the public sector undertakings do not implement this; the local bodies do not implement this. For instance, there is the living example of U.P. I think that in Meerut there is a small Government company employing 150 people and out of these, 120 employees are members of a union. There is no other union. Under the Code of Discipline, it is obligatory on the part of the employer to recognise the union. All right, leave the Code of Discipline there because there is no discipline in U.P. and there is no Code of Discipline in the industries of U.P. But the provisions of the Minimum Wages Act are not implemented in that particular company there in relation to working hours and the period of weekly rest. Both these are statutory obligations under the Minimum Wages Act, 1948.

PANDIT S. S. N. TANKHA (Uttar Pradesh): Is it a farm or a garden?

DR. R. B. GOUR: Farm or garden comes under the Agricultural Labourers Act. That is the definition. It comes under that Act.

DR. SHRIMATI SEETA PARMANAND (Madhya Pradesh): Do horticultural operations come under the Act?

DR. R. B. GOUR: The Labour Department there says that it comes under the Act but it does not feel competent enough to deal with the management in enforcing this Act in relation to minimum wages, fixed working hours and others. What are we to do? Their Implementation and Evaluation Committee, I understand, is meeting tomorrow at Lucknow. I do not know why State undertakings should be the biggest defaulters and why the Labour Department feels so nervous in dealing with the employers in the public sector. What is this? Here in this particular company, the union leader is on a hunger-strike for the last nine days. Well, we hope that the Labour Minister of U.P. will be able to do something. I am sure that the Government of India cannot do anything in this respect. It can only advise but will that advice be taken? I am only giving you an instance of how the implementation of it is rendered difficult. Leave alone the fixation of minimum wages. There are a number of industries under these Schedules which have not yet been covered even for the purpose of fixation of wages in the various States. The time-limit was set at 31st December, 1959. The year 1960 has gone; we are now in 1961. So the trouble is that the State Governments have neither the will nor the machinery to implement this Act. Otherwise, there should be no difficulty.

DR. SHRIMATI SEETA PARMANAND: What about your own State?

DR. R. B. GOUR: I am coming to my own State of Andhra Pradesh. It is the number one State in our Constitution. So in this respect also it must be somewhere near that position.

Now, Sir, I just give you a certain example of how inspections under this

Act are taking place. I am not talking of fixation. I will again revert to that subject. In the half-year ending December, 1958, there were 3,288 inspections in Andhra Pradesh, whereas in the half-year ending June, 1959, that is the subsequent half-year, you will find that the inspections have come down to 2,488. Now, take Bombay. In the half year ending 31st December, 1958, the inspections were 5,452, and in the subsequent half-year they were 3,001. Now, what is happening? Then, there are certain States where it has improved also for example, in Madras from 4,800 to 5,800. At other places even inspections have fallen. And what is the nature of inspection? I will tell you. Sir, in U.P., out of 7,339 inspections in the half-year ending 31st December, 1958, 5,411 irregularities were detected. And how many prosecutions? Thirteen. Now, how are you going to implement it? Out of 5,411 irregularities detected, only thirteen were prosecuted. And in Andhra Pradesh, out of 3,288 in sections only 41 irregularities were detected. The employers in Andhra seem to be very conscious—no illiteracy as in Rajasthan.

SHRI M. GOVINDA REDDY
(Mysore): Very clever.

DR. R. B. GOUR: Peculiar inspections take place. The inspector goes to the employer—well, I do not know whether even a cup of coffee is there—and then comes back with whatever information he gives. Now, to this they themselves agree in the report. They say that only in one particular case. When they have to inspect the working sites in the construction industry, they say: "We have neither the time nor the conveyance to go and inspect the site of working." So what do they do? They are obliged there to go to the employer, sit in his office, get the information and come back and report. So what they have accepted in the case of the construction industry, they actually do in all other industries. There is the other aspect of it. Take the question of the weekly rest, apart from the amenities, this, that and all referred to. Suppose, the

question of weekly rest is there, what happens? Whether the weekly rest is given or not, firstly the employees are not organised very well. The employer is there and the employees are asked before the employer, and obviously the fellows would not say. So all such things go in spite of this, or for the sake of this Act.

Then, Sir, you take wages. In Andhra Pradesh, recently, they appointed a Minimum Wages Committee for the tobacco industry. The Committee, I understand, advised Rs. 2 per day; the recommendation of the earlier Committee was Rs. 1-8-0. Now, they advised Rs. 2 per day and the Labour Advisory Committee approved that recommendation, and ultimately the Government brought it down to Rs. 1.75 nP. Now Mr. Abid Ali Jaferbhai should tell me as to in whose interest this reduction has been made from Rs. 2 as recommended by the Minimum Wages Committee and approved by the Labour Advisory Committee, to Rs. 1.75 nP. Well, I do not know what happens in Andhra Pradesh. Trunk telephone calls go between the Minister and the employers. Then all sorts of things go on—Andhra Pradesh High Court Judgment is there. So anything can happen, and if that happens there, it must happen in all other States. All States are equally run by the same political party. So the question arises: Should the Government bring down even the recommendation of that Committee?

DR. SHRIMATI SEETA PARMANAND: On practical difficulties perhaps.

DR. R. B. GOUR: The Committee is a tripartite Committee and the Labour Advisory Board is a tripartite advisory board, and the Government is only one party. So why should the recommendation of the tripartite Committee and the approval thereof by the tripartite Advisory Board be watered down by a party in all these tripartite bodies?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I hope, Sir, the tripartite committee will not

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta.] call it a treachery on the part of somebody—Government.

DR. R. B. GOUR: Now, Sir, this happens.

Then there is another problem that has arisen. Now, that point about the tribunal and all that, that is accepted by our committees here in Delhi. Why? Because actually what is happening now is, within the same industry a big divergence of units is taking place, from the point of view of their capacity to pay, their financial outlay, their outturn, everything. Now, according to this Bill you can only fix a minimum wage. Now, take for example the hotel industry, and the minimum wage is fixed for the hotels. You have small hotels employing five fellows. On the other hand you have the Brindavan or the Taj Mahal hotel in Hyderabad, and all such hotels employ a hundred workers or more. Obviously, the Committee can fix only the minimum wage. But we say: "Well, we have the bargaining capacity. Let the union and the employer quarrel. Let the workers go on strike if necessary. Let them go to a tribunal or an industrial court or something and get separate minimum wages fixed according to the capacity of the particular unit in that industry." So a differentiation is taking place within the scheduled industries where there are really the sweated units and the economically very well-off units. So let us have collective bargaining in the better units. At the same time the need has arisen and the question is asked: Cannot the Minimum Wages Committee even be given the charge to classify this industry and then fix the minimum wage and differentials? Well, in many cases this differentiation has come to stay, for example, in the hotel industry it is there and in the bidi industry concentration is now taking place, amalgamation is taking place. People are purchasing the factories; in so many other things it is taking place. In fact the change is taking place in the units in the industries specified in these very Schedules. So certain steps have to be taken to protect not only

the interests of the lowest unit but also to see that the better-off units pay better wages. Obviously, Sir, I am not going into the recent Gajendra-gadkar judgment on the living wage. Let us go to the U.P. Enquiry Committee. They say there is a poverty wage, then a subsistence wage and finally a comfort wage or a living wage. The ordinary thing is a fair wage. Then comes the subsistence wage and then the poverty wage. All these things have to be taken into consideration. If the units are getting differentiated, then we shall have to find ways and means to protect not only the interests of the lowest units where the conditions are sweated conditions even today but also at the same time try to see that the better-off units pay better wages. Very rarely have tribunals come to the rescue of labour in these Scheduled Industries.

Then, Sir, about agricultural labour . . .

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You may continue tomorrow. There is a Message.

MESSAGE FROM THE LOK SABHA

THE ORISSA APPROPRIATION (VOTE ON ACCOUNT) BILL, 1961

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

"In accordance with the provisions of rule 96 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in Lok Sabha, I am directed to enclose herewith a copy of the Orissa Appropriation (Vote on Account) Bill, 1961, as passed by Lok Sabha at its sitting held on the 28th March, 1961.

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

Sir, I beg to lay the Bill on the Table.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA (West Bengal) : Sir, the House will be adjourning tomorrow or the day after. I have given notice of a motion calling attention to the joint statement issued by the General Managers of Burmah-