

RAJYA SABHA

Friday, 5th September, 1958

The House met at eleven of the clock, MR. CHAIRMAN in the Chair.

STATEMENT RE BUSINESS IN RAJYA SABHA FOR THE WEEK COMMENCING 8TH SEPTEMBER, 1958

THE MINISTER OF PARLIAMEN-
TARY AFFAIRS (SHRI SATYA NARA-
YAN SINHA): Sir, with your permis-
sion I rise to announce that Govern-
ment business in this House for the
next week will consist of:

- (1) Further consideration and passing of the Sugar Export Promotion Bill, 1958, as passed by Lok Sabha.
- (2) Consideration and return of the following Bills as passed by Lok Sabha:—
 - (i) Central Sales Tax (Second Amendment) Bill, 1958.
 - (ii) Estate Duty (Amendment) Bill, 1958.
- (3) Consideration and passing of the following Bills as passed by Lok Sabha:—
 - (i) Banaras Hindu University (Amendment) Bill, 1958.
 - (ii) Trade and Merchandise Marks Bill, 1958.
 - (iii) Industrial Disputes (Banking Companies) Decision Amendment Bill, 1958.
 - (iv) Sea Customs (Amendment) Bill, 1958.
 - (v) Manipur and Tripura (Repeal of Laws) Bill, 1958.
 - (vi) Rajghat Samadhi (Amendment) Bill, 1958.

I may also inform the House that discussion on food situation will take place on 15th and 16th September and on the Planning Commission's Memorandum on Appraisal and Prospects of the Second Five Year Plan on 24th and 25th September, 1958.

55 RSD—1.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA (West Bengal): Sir, I have my serious objection to the food debate being put off to 15th and 16th.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We will consider it in the Business Advisory Committee and try our best . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: We want the food debate on Monday. We are very clear about it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We shall consider it.

SHRI T. S. AVINASHILINGAM CHETTIAR (Madras): Can we take it that it will be circulated tomorrow morning?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mrs. Tarkeshwari Sinha.

PAPER LAID ON THE TABLE

NOTIFICATION PUBLISHING WEALTH-TAX
(EXEMPTION OF HEIRLOOM JEWELLERY
OF RULERS) RULES, 1958

THE DEPUTY MINISTER OF
FINANCE (SHRIMATI TARKESHWARI
SINHA): Sir, I beg to lay on the
Table, under sub-section (4) of sec-
tion 46 of the Wealth-tax Act, 1957,
a copy of the Ministry of Finance
(Department of Revenue) Notification
G.S.R. No. 719, dated the 18th August,
1958, publishing the Wealth-tax
(Exemption of Heirloom Jewellery of
Rulers) Rules, 1958. [Placed in Lib-
rary. See No. LT-895/58.]

RESOLUTION RE APPOINTMENT OF A COMMITTEE OF MEMBERS OF PARLIAMENT TO EXAMINE THE CAUSES OF INDUSTRIAL UNREST—continued

MR. CHAIRMAN: We now get back to further discussion of the Resolution. Mr. Bhupesh Gupta was speaking. The Mover and the Minister have thirty minutes each and other Members fifteen minutes. Mr. Bhupesh Gupta.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA (West Bengal): Mr. Chairman, Sir, I was speaking on the causes of industrial unrest in this country. And, Sir, my main contention was that for this industrial unrest in the country today the policies and practices of the Government and of the employers are mainly responsible. I would like to develop this theme a little in the few minutes that I have got at my disposal. From the employers' side we know a number of causes which the House should take into account. First of all, there is that intensive drive for profits. Sir, the whole thing in our developing economy is being viewed from the angle of making as much profit as possible. That is the approach of the industrialists, and especially of the big industrialists in the country. Naturally that will have its repercussions on the economy of the country as a whole. As you know, Sir, the profits cannot be augmented without intensifying the exploitation of the working people, without increasing what is known as the unpaid labour of the working class. And that is being done today. Now, Sir, what is most important in this connection is that even the minimum rules of industrial relations are not defined by the employers. I do not expect the capitalist society to behave otherwise than a capitalist society. But at the same time, as a result of experience and as a result of certain advance in democratic ideas, certain norms have been established even within the framework of the capitalist society in so far as these industrial relations are concerned. In our country these norms are not observed with the result that compared to the countries in the West, for instance England, in this country the industrialist section or the capitalist section behaves in a much more irresponsible manner without any restraint, and sometimes it appears that it is not living in modern times. Therefore, Sir, certain changes are called for. We should at least bring our industrial relations on par with the so-called democratic countries of the West. Well, the hon. Members are fond of quoting England. Therefore

we should go into the question as to the industrial relations obtaining in England, and what kinds of principles and tenets are followed there. We should at least bring our industrial relations on par with what is obtaining in the United Kingdom.

Sir, the most important question in this connection naturally is the question of wages. As production improves, it is important to see that some larger share of the wealth produced goes to the working class people. We do not expect full justice being done in a capitalist society. We are not so unrealistic as that. At the same time we can expect that things would be so arranged that the workers get a fair deal and better wages. When I say workers, I have also in mind the employees. In our country, Sir, millions of people do not get even the minimum living wage, and that is a constant cause of friction and irritation, and that lies at the root of the trouble, Sir, which sometimes we come across in our country. Therefore the demand for some wage-increase should be treated with sympathy. But the capitalist classes are not at all interested in that unless they are forced to accept the demand for some wage-increase. Now, Sir, we have got one example before us. I may mention the Calcutta Tramway strike. For 20 days or so the strike has been on, and the employers refuse to accede to their request for very legitimate demands. A little wage increase took place in 1957, and the minimum wage was fixed at Rs. 37.50 or so. During the last 11 years there has been no increase in the wage at all although the company is making twice as much the profit which it used to make in 1957. Now, this was one demand for wage increase and some increase in the dearness allowance. There was another demand also that out of gratuity, pension and provident fund at least two things should be provided for. It appears that at present when a skilled worker retires after 20 years of service, he gets only Rs. 1,200 out of his provident fund account. Naturally this is not enough.

Anybody would agree that in his old age this paltry sum of Rs. 1,200 is nothing. When the company is making so much profit, something more should be given to these people at the time of their retirement. Then, Sir, there are several other demands, and we find that the employers are taking a very very hostile, unreasonable and intransigent attitude, as a result of which the strike has been on. As far as the workers are concerned, they are ready to settle this question if certain minimum demands of theirs are accepted. But nothing of the kind is being done. The employers are interested in embroiling them in litigations and other things so that things are delayed. I can give very many examples of such things happening. Of course, every industry has this tale to tell, the tale of denial and the tale of unjust exploitation and all that.

Then, Sir, there is another question with regard to the security of service. We do not have any proper security of service. Victimisation, retrenchment, punishment, charge-sheets and all such things freely take place in our country. And naturally when the working people have to live under some constant threat of dismissal, victimisation and chargesheeting, you cannot expect the industrial relations in the country to develop in the direction in which we would very much like them to develop. Housing conditions and health services are neglected. Somehow or other the capitalist class is interested in exploiting the workers in total disregard of their amenities of life. Even to maintain their production capacity some minimum of things have to be given to them. Even these are not given. Then the new technique is now lay-off, closure of mills and rationalisation. Burnpur is an industrial centre. The authorities there are planning for a lay-off involving 3,000 workers. Mills are being closed any lay-off has become a common practice in many States with the result that industrial relations are becoming bitter. Rationalisation is another technique which the Government is permitting and unfortunately

the Second Five Year Plan has provided some funds for it—for rationalisation in the jute and cotton textile industries—when we know the incidence of this is growth of unemployment. The number of registered unemployed has reached the million mark. At the time of the Second Five Year Plan it was something about 3 lakhs. Today in the third year of the Plan it is a million—the registered unemployed persons. It only gives an indication as to how these things are developing in the country. In very many States the unemployment among the middle-class people—the number of educated unemployed—is growing and all the Study Group Reports indicate that this is growing. So much so, even in West Bengal, a Resolution was adopted unanimously in the Assembly expressing grave concern at this phenomenal growth of unemployment in our country. With unemployment growing on the one hand and retrenchment and rationalisation being indulged in on the other hand, you surely cannot expect that industrial relations in our country can improve.

Then about the attitude of the employers towards the trade unions and their behaviour in industrial disputes, our employers take a very hostile attitude towards the trade union organisations in the country. They first of all deny recognition. When they are forced to recognise, then they indulge in creating rival unions and dividing the workers and they follow a policy of repression and intimidation against the working classes. That is again another factor which stands in the way of the growth of healthy industrial relations. In industrial disputes the employers do not play a fair game at all. Firstly, when industrial disputes arise, they try to avoid them and they don't go in for peaceful settlement etc. and when things are referred to the industrial tribunals, they adopt certain tactics which embitter the relationship. First of all they engage in costly litigation. Secondly, they raise all kinds of objections, they prolong the matter and above all, when the awards are given, sometimes they are not even carried

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta.]
out. I would like to refer to the important award of the Coal Tribunal. There much of it remains to be implemented. The Implementation Committee has proved a failure.

Finally, I would like to say something about the Government policy. Government is responsible. They are encouraging the Tatas. We have seen how the Bihar Government behaved as if they are on the pay rolls of the Tatas. The police is placed at the disposal of Tatas all the time. Workers are being arrested, victimised and suspended. It is the Tatas who rule the situation there. Indiscriminate victimisation is taking place. Government does not raise a little finger. On the contrary it pounces upon the workers and arrests them, bullies them, intimidates them and it is a shame that this Government, in a civilized country, should have been behaving in such a partisan and hopelessly arrogant manner vis-a-vis the working classes. Government has no wage policy whatsoever. Minimum national wage has to be fixed, that is, the average wage. That has not been done. On the contrary sometimes they, in their own industries, in the State sector, behave as very arrogant and unconscionable employer, that is, they set a bad example. You have seen how they behaved in the matter of the Posts and Telegraphs strike, how they behaved in the matter of the Dock Workers' strike. In every strike the military is called to terrorise the workers.

(Time bell rings.)

I don't know how much time I have . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: You have taken nineteen minutes. Fifteen minutes is the time fixed. Dr. Seeta Parmanand.

DR. SHRIMATI SEETA PARMANAND (Madhya Pradesh): Mr. Chairman, in rising to oppose the Resolution, only as far as the part 'remedy' is concerned, I would like to say a few things about the facts as indicated by the

Resolution. Only because a Resolution is somehow connected with the demand for increased production and the words 'Second Five Year Plan' are there, it does not have a realistic bearing. We have to see whether the appointment of such a committee and the findings it will arrive at will increase production or if anything, will decrease it because of the unrest it will be causing during the time the Committee will go about its findings. Besides we have the experience that when certain demands of only one industry, in a limited way, like the coal-mines was undertaken, it took about 4 years or 3 years to give the report. What the time such a committee itself should take, it is difficult to say, and the ferment that will rise and the expectation that it will give to people, and perhaps if they are not fulfilled it will perhaps do greater harm than the conditions today. That does not mean that I just feel that everything is what it should be in industry and I am quite sure that Government also is not at all of that opinion and the proof of that is the continuous effort of Government to bring about labour legislation in order to ameliorate the conditions of the workers. The record of labour legislation during the last 10 years is a credit to any Government and I think that would beat the record of such legislation even in the Soviet Union. There are two sides of the question and Government has to see to the employers' side but I would like here to take this opportunity to put before the Government the black record of the employers who, while professing to understand or having the ability to understand the import of legislation have always tried to sabotage the efforts of Government. I would like here to mention only one thing because the time at my disposal is limited and there are so many factors to touch in a brief manner. Government had stipulated that an industry should have a labour welfare officer. I am speaking about the coalmining industry. These welfare officers of the employers are in name 'welfare officers' but in fact employed and used to kill the union activities. They are

used to split labour between unions and not only that but to make the workers feel that the unions are of no real use. Artificial problems are created by wrong dismissals or charge-sheetings of workers and then through the labour officers they are tried to be settled before the unions could even be approached. That way the employers are making the labourers feel that their problems could be easily solved by the labour welfare officers employed by them. This is a thing that is bringing about so much hardship that Government should immediately look into the question of perhaps having some sort of a supervisors from their side appointed to inspect the work of the employers' labour officers. I would certainly say that there is some unrest in industry in certain sectors but that depends so much on the unions. The unions have often been responsible for creating unrest where it need not be. I don't say that labourers are always getting in every industry the wages that they should. There are many industries which are not even covered by labour legislations. I would say they are unorganised but what about the people, as was pointed out by the speaker that day—Mr. Thomas—in agriculture? It was said that they are not getting anything and it would be difficult to organise them but it is possible to help them and for that reason I would ask our Communist friends whether they have done anything to help the agricultural labour.

SHRI V. PRASAD RAO (Andhra Pradesh): Certainly.

DR. SHRIMATI SEETA PARNAND: Why have they not come forward to take advantage of starting agricultural cooperatives when the Government has made that offer? They could apply themselves to constructive work. I would also ask them what they have done within the limits of the present legislation for labour welfare to take home the benefits under this labour welfare scheme to the workers. I would also like to ask that with the number of union members that they claim. . . .

SHRI V. PRASAD RAO: This is about industry . . .

(Interruptions)

DR. SHRIMATI SEETA PARNAND: I am asking about industrial unrest. Why is the unrest there? That is what I am trying to deal with. And I am trying to point out that it is to some extent in the hands of the union workers, the trade union workers, to make labour understand what is being done for them and to tell them the limits of what could be done. It is for the union workers also to see that production is raised. It was said by the first speaker who opened the debate on this Resolution that in certain countries—or was it said by another hon. Member the other day? I don't remember—when the production was raised, then automatically the wages also were raised. I would like to ask the Mover of the Resolution and his friends what they have done and in which industry they have asked the workers to have a target of increased production. It is very easy for some people, Sir, by agitation, to unnecessarily raise the hopes of workers, knowing full well that it is not within their power, within the present economic limitations, to give them the benefits. They can only point out to the workers and say to them, "We tried to do this, but it is the Government that comes in our way. Otherwise, had it been left to us, we would have brought *El Dorado* to you". For that reason I would like to point out that unrest in labour is not usually based on factual conditions. Very often, Sir, as was ably pointed out by a previous speaker the other day—Prof. Wadia—strikes are engineered by political motives and when labour unrest is brought about by such causes, it is not possible for workers to apply themselves to increased industrial production.

Sir, having said this much, I may add that the malady might have been diagnosed and that the Resolution states facts as they are; but the remedy sought to be applied is quite wrong and as such it is not likely to produce the results within any feasible

[Dr. Shrimati Seeta Parmanand.]

time. If anything, instead of increasing production, it will decrease production. I may point out in this connection that reference was made by Mr. Bhupesh Gupta to the methods and to the delays caused in settling industrial disputes. I would therefore, refer to suggestions made recently at a conference by the Government—and in other countries also they are trying to do the same thing—that instead of taking industrial disputes to courts, an attempt should be made to settle the dispute by arbitration. If that is resorted to, I think we will have in the near future better results. The Government will supply more machinery by appointing more tribunals and judges on the tribunals. I would like to mention here that during the last two or three years, there has been an increase in the number of tribunals and in the number of judges appointed. The attempt is also made to ask the tribunal to go to where the industry is situated. For example, I can speak for my district—Chhindwara. The tribunal was asked to go to Chhindwara instead of sitting at Calcutta so as to make it easy for the workers to come and give evidence.

I would also like to point out here to the Government that the grievance referred to by Mr. Gupta and other speakers about implementation is quite genuine and something has to be done about it. We know that decisions are arrived at and employers, in spite of the agreed decisions, do not implement them. Therefore, something has to be done by increasing either the fine or by taking some legislative measures, to see that the employers will have adequate punishment for not implementing the decisions. I will mention only the coal industry where an increase in wages was given, but it has not been given effect to by many employers for four periods and now it is over a year and the workers have not got it. Now it is almost impossible to take these cases to court and they have to be settled by arbitration. So compulsory appearance of employ-

ers will have to be provided for, because as it is, it is optional for them to come there for arbitration or not to come.

I would like to say lastly that our friends over there need not be so impatient to have this remedy. They have got ample opportunity to show what can be done for an industry in an ideal manner, in the industries which are under the management of the Kerala State. I think, rather than try an experiment here, let us wait and see what results are produced by the remedies provided there, and then we can see whether we can, upon the benefit of their experience, introduce something here.

Reference was made by Mr. Bhupesh Gupta to the unemployment figure of 3 millions. I would say that the figure is much more than 3 millions, because that is only the number registered

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: No, I did not say that. I said that the number of registered unemployed was 3 lakhs or so at the time of the Second Five Year Plan and now it is about a million, I mean the number of registered unemployed.

DR. SHRIMATI SEETA PARMANAND: Yes, even if it is one million, the actual number will be two millions. What I want to say is that whatever number is registered does not show the real condition, and the number will be much more. The reasons are there and those we have to see and take other measures. For instance, there is our increase in population. It was said that the employers are also closing industries. Who have to see what the reasons are. The Government can itself, with our various tripartite committees which are already there in existence, take up this matter and come to a mutual understanding. By adding one more committee, I do not think it would be possible to bring about the desired result or to serve the object mentioned in this Resolution.

So, finally while agreeing that there is unrest as mentioned in this Resolu-

tion, I do not at all think that any further appointment of a committee would serve the purpose sought to be served by this Resolution. On the contrary, I think, it will create greater unrest, because we know very often it is not possible to fulfil the expectations raised. We have the standing example of the States Reorganisation Commission and instead of making the workers to apply themselves more and to better production, we will be taking away their minds from greater production.

And finally, Sir, . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: How many times "finally"? I heard three times.

DR. SHRIMATI SEETA PARNAND: I would say lastly, not finally. Lastly, it depends very much on the workers and the trade union movement to change the outlook of the workers and not to exploit them but to increase production more and more and see that the wages that they are given are used by them for bettering their condition and not spent away in drinks and in gambling as is the experience in some of the industries. Let us consolidate our efforts in showing how increased wages really lead to better production and then we can make further demands, may be in another two years, and by that time the experience of Kerala will be before us.

DR. P. V. KANE (Nominated): Mr. Chairman, I am speaking here as a man who has suffered from strikes for about thirty years. I may tell the House I had to walk from Girgaum to the High Court because of the strike by workers of the tramcars. I have suffered from stone-throwing. The stones were being thrown at the police, but because I was on the road I also got stones on my head. I am not speaking as a party man, because I belong to no party, being a nominated Member. I have not been an employer, except that I had a clerk who served with me for 28 years and then I had another for 16 years. Now I have dismissed both because I do not practice, I have one servant. There-

fore, I am not an employer. Nor am I in the Government. I am in the Government as much as Mr. Gupta is, if being a Member means being in the Government. Nor fortunately, am I an employee. For over 35 to 40 years I have not been the employee of anybody except of my clients. I am speaking as a sufferer.

My point is, this is a Resolution I would like to defeat on several grounds. Most important of all, its wording is like this:

"to examine the causes of the present industrial unrest as well as the attitude and policies of the employers and Government".

If the word "employees" also had been there, I might have supported it to some extent. There should be the word "employees." This resolution, if passed, will show that there is nothing wrong with the employee at all. Everything that is wrong is with the employers and the Government. Now, everyone of us has committed mistakes; Government may have and the employers may have also committed but, Sir, what about the employees? It is suggested here that they were saints, as it were. That would be the meaning. If you want to pass this Resolution as it is, then I will have to oppose it. You will have to add not only the employees but also certain other matters. Those things should be brought in and they should examine, if at all, not only the attitude and the policy of the employees, the employers and the Government but also the impact of frequent strikes on society and on production. These words should be added if the Resolution is to be of any use at all.

In the second place, I object to the Resolution because nothing will come out of it. How long will 15 Members go on doing the job? I do not know. By that time, there will be hundreds of strikes most probably. Every day there is a strike. The other day, there was a strike by five lakhs of people in Bombay. I was there and I saw how they carried on. There was a loyal *tramwala*, a driver who

[Dr. P. V. Kane.]
was driving the tramcar just opposite
the High Court.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: The Bom-
bay strike was very peaceful.

DR. P. V. KANE: You never were
there. I was there. I saw the thing
for myself. You have not been there
in the first place. You were, if you
were there, somewhere else.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Mr. Lalji
was there.

DR. P. V. KANE: Mr. Lalji could
not be in all the places. Bombay is
ten miles long and three miles broad.
I shall quote another example. The
postmen were on strike. I live in a
wadi where there are 175 families.
The postmen were on strike for two
months and I was doing the work of
a postman along with seven others.
Every day we used to distribute the
letters. They went to the post office
but they would not be given the
letters but the postal authorities were
prepared to give them to me. So,
every day, I used to go to the post
office, take the letters and distribute
them to our people.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Was the
hon. Member conscious of the fact
that he was breaking the strike, a sort
of blackleg?

DR. P. V. KANE: Simply because
you strike work, am I to suffer? I
do not understand it. You have no
right to go on strike at random. What
right have you?

DR. R. B. GOUR (Andhra Pra-
desh): Similarly, society has no right
to exploit us and not pay us.

DR. P. V. KANE: Society is nobody.
We pay taxes but we have nothing to
do with the Government. Govern-
ment is only a small body.

(Interruption)

The hon. Mr. Gupta spoke for nine-
teen minutes and I never interrupted
him. Let him not interrupt me. My
point is that I am not against strikes
but let them be really peaceful, if at

all. They are never peaceful. I may
tell you that. I am hit by stones.
You have never been among the Bom-
bay strikers.

DR. SHRIMATI SEETA PARMA-
NAND: The Calcutta strikes are
worse.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, order.

DR. P. V. KANE: In the first place,
the Resolution is something which
cannot do anything. Fifteen people
are to go about but the point is, I do
not know whether fifteen Members
can be found who will have the time
to go on for two or three years and
approach the employees, approach the
employers and the Government, look
into the society's sufferings and all
that. The Report may take two or
three years to be got ready and, who
knows, what will happen? On that
ground also, I will oppose it. The
Resolution as worded gives a certifi-
cate to the employees which I am not
willing to give. That is my principal
point.

Another point is this. You talk
always about the employers badly.
There are some such employers but
what about the employees themselves
and what about the Government itself
which gets money from the society by
way of taxation? Unless you produce
more, how can there be more to dis-
tribute? I do not understand it.
How many are the workers? I do not
know myself but Mr. Bhupesh Gupta
might be knowing. I think they are
not more than some millions. I am
talking about the organised workers.
They may not be more than three or
four millions, if I am correct. If I
am wrong, it may be a little more,
say about five millions but, Sir, how
many are the people? We are 365
millions. If there is a railway work-
ers' strike, a strike by a utility con-
cern, what happens? We suffer.
Why should society suffer? Nobody
asked them to go into these lines
where you have the unions. We
pleaders never strike because nobody
would listen to our strike. There are
pleaders who are living from hand to
mouth.

SHRI DEOKINANDAN NARAYAN (Bombay): But the pleaders have struck in Jaipur.

DR. P. V. KANE: That is because of the High Court, not on the other ground, not because they have no money to fill their bellies. My point at present is that I do not oppose a law of this kind, but how are we going to get the minimum wage? What is the minimum wage? I do not know what exactly is meant by that. I am sure that what the workers get nowadays is nearly twenty times of what they were getting in my young days although the prices have not risen twenty times. I may tell you from my personal experience. I can tell you what the workers were getting in my twentieth year and now, after fifty years, you know what they are getting. It is nearly twenty times more but the prices have not gone up that much. My point is not that but my point is that the minimum wage is a good thing for a slogan but, how is it to be decided? That is one point and, secondly, who is to decide it? Are the workers themselves to decide as to what will be the minimum wage?

My other point is this. If there is going to be a private sector, you want that sector to work. I may tell you frankly that if I had the money to become an employer, I would close down all my mills at once, if it were possible. A man does not like to be worried every day, being threatened by somebody saying; "We are going to strike work today unless you do this and that". I do not like that at all. God has not given me the money that I should become an employer but if I had the money, at present my mind is that I should close everything, all my mills, whatever it is, and ask the people to do what they liked. Take away the private sector, I have no objection; nationalise the whole thing if you have got the powers but, as long as you want the private sector to help you, at least in many cases, do not come in the way. That is my idea, right or wrong. If you have a

private sector, then you should not put a handicap and say, "Do this or that". If you do that, the private sector becomes a semi-public sector. If you want the private sector to work honestly and for the idea of more production, you must give a great deal of freedom to that sector. That is another thing that struck me.

I do not want to exceed my time but my point is that strikers must be looked after in this sense that striking is never peaceful and, even if it is peaceful, it is against the whole society. The *bhangis* struck work the other day and some of us went to sweep the streets but they wanted to attack the people who went there, private volunteers, because they said that that was breaking the strike as if a strike is something sacrosanct. There is nothing sacrosanct about it. You strike work and we want to prevent the inconvenience caused by your act. The law must be so framed that if a strike is going to be in such a way that it is going to interfere with the work of the people themselves, interfere with the amenities which the strikers provided, then that strike will be illegal and should be put down at once. Some such thing I should like put in the law. If the strikes are peaceful, nothing will come out of it. I know it.

With these words, Mr. Chairman, I sit down.

SHRI P. A. SOLOMON (Kerala): Mr. Chairman, I think every hon. Member would like to talk about this subject. Admittedly, this is one of the most important subjects which immensely affects the economic life not only in the industrial sector but also in the agricultural sector. If there are no good industrial relations, I think our Plan will be a failure and it cannot be fulfilled. So many details have been discussed here but I would like to point out one or two main points. First of all I would like to stress that a new outlook on the subject is highly essential especially at the present jun-

[Shri P. A. Solomon.]

ture. Sir, one of the hon. Members said that the workers were striking work unreasonably. I think he was very much mistaken. Always a worker is working for the country as well as for his own living unless there is something to harm his intention to produce; otherwise he will not strike. There are so many strikes of course. At the same time, there are so many reasons behind it. We should find out what are the reasons behind the strikes. If we go into all those things, of course, I am prepared to admit that to some extent there may be some mistakes on the part of the workers. But that is not the main thing. The main thing is the attitude of the management. The attitude of the management and the attitude of the employers generally, I should say, is exploitation and the securing of more and more profits. This is the general phenomenon. And this is not a new thing; this is an old one, and about this attitude of the management and employers one of our prominent authors once wrote a book and I should like to read these lines therefrom:

"Altogether the two years were full of industrial unrest, and the conditions of labour were deteriorating. The post-war years had been boom years for industry in India and the most stupendous profits had been made. For five or six years the average dividend in the jute or cotton mills exceeded a hundred per cent and was often one hundred and fifty per cent per annum. All these huge profits went to the owners and shareholders and the workers continued before. The slight rise in wages was usually counterbalanced by a rise in prices. During these days when millions were being made feverishly, most of the workers continued to live in the most miserable of hovels, and even their womenfolk had hardly clothes to wear. The conditions in Bombay were bad enough but perhaps even worse was the lot of the

jute workers within an hour's drive of the palaces of Calcutta, some naked women, wild and unkempt, working away for the barest pittance, so that a broad river of wealth should flow ceaselessly to Glasgow and Dundee as well as to some pockets in India. In the boom years all went well for industry, though workers carried on as before and profited little. But when the boom passed and it was not so easy to make large profits, the burden, of course, fell on the workers."

Sir, this book from which I have quoted was written by Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru one or two decades back and in this his Autobiography he has written about the trade union movement. Sir, I would like to ask: Has any change, any slight change even, taken place in the minds of the employers here even so long after those remarks happened to be made? Nothing. After the first World War and after the second World War so many things have happened. So many Acts no doubt have been brought out governing industrial relations and trade relations, but without a strike and without a strong agitation not a single gain has accrued to the workers. The attitude of the employers is the main reason for the strikes. The attitude of the employers, the aim of the employers, should be changed. Otherwise, I think, there would be no industrial peace and good industrial relations cannot be achieved.

The second point I would like to point out is the unreal and self-contradictory approach of the Government. Of course, one of the hon. Members said that after independence within these ten years, there had been passed here so many Bills. That is true, and, perhaps, some of the laws that we have passed may be better than those of some other countries—I do not know exactly what are the laws in those countries, but for the sake of argument we can accept it. But may I ask how many laws on the subject of industrial relations have

been actually implemented? Nothing. I have to point out that if these Acts have to be implemented the workers will have to struggle and they will have to strike. There have been so many struggles and so many strikes for the implementation of the Minimum Wages Act and there will have to be many for the implementation of so many other Acts. That is the thing. Not only that, I would like to point out that there have been so many conferences; so many tripartite conferences have been held for establishing industrial relations. That is a good thing. There have been so many decisions? I think the Government is in the tripartite conferences, in the industrial boards, and so on. But has any earnest effort been made by the Government to implement those decisions? I think the Government is not taking effective steps, earnest steps, to implement those decisions. And I think some of the hon. Ministers are very vehemently opposing this industrial relation itself. I have a bitter experience in my State. I am one of the members of the Industrial Relations Board there. Once that Industrial Relations Board selected a sub-committee to formulate certain principles to maintain industrial relations in the State and that sub-committee submitted a report containing certain important points. After that the Labour Minister of Kerala convened a tripartite conference but unfortunately the Kerala Chief Minister had invited the Central Minister, Mr. Morarji Desai, to take part in that conference. He came and took part in it but before I come to that I want to point out something. The main points dealt with by that sub-committee related to works committee, negotiating body, gratuity, wages, bonus and code of conduct. Of course, I would not like to waste the time of the House in explaining all these things. That sub-committee consisted of representatives of employers and employees. Employees means there were representatives of the I. N. T. U. C., H. M. S., A. I. T. U. C. and U. T. U. C. and those are all the

central organisations. That sub-committee submitted a unanimous report with regard to wages:

"It has been laid down in the report of the second Five Year Plan that it is necessary to enunciate the principles to bring wages in conformity with the expectations of the working classes and for formulating a proper machinery for the application of these principles. This is a very complicated question which it may not be possible to solve immediately in respect of all industries....

The minimum earning of an unskilled adult worker shall be Re. 1 n.P. 75 for a normal day's work."

But at that conference Mr. Morarji Desai speaking on that particular point said this. It is a long speech which he delivered and I am quoting from the official version of his speech. This is what he said on this question of wages:

"About the minimum wages you are proposing a minimum wage of Re. 1.75 for an unskilled adult worker for a normal day's work. Just as I was coming here, I came to know that the minimum wage obtaining in the cashew industry is Re. 1|4|."

Then one Mr. P. G. Varghese, a cashew-nut factory owner, intervened and said it was Re. 1|14|- in the cashew industry for the male worker and Re. 1|4|- was the minimum for the woman worker. Shri Morarji Desai continued:

"In the recommendation regarding the minimum wage given here in this report, the Sub-Committee has not made any distinction between man and woman. Therefore, the minimum wage of Re. 1|4|- given now is the minimum wage obtaining in the cashew industry. It may be that this Re. 1.75 minimum wage now suggested may not have to

[Shri P. A. Solomon.]

apply to cashew industry. But when a general minimum wage of Re. 1.75 is fixed according to this recommendation of the Sub-Committee, do you mean to say, that in the cashew industry the workers there are not going to demand that minimum wage in that industry also? Therefore, the minimum wage should not be fixed in this manner." That was the first point.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All right. Fifteen minutes are over.

श्री शीलम्वर याजी (बिहार) : सभापति महोदय, अभी साथी लालजी पेडसे ने जो रेजोल्यूशन औद्योगिक अशान्ति को दूर करने लिये रखा है, यद्यपि उसकी मंशा बहुत दुरस्त है लेकिन मैं समझता हूँ कि इस तरह का प्रस्ताव पास करने से और संसद के १५ सदस्यों की एक कंटी बनाने से यह औद्योगिक अशान्ति मिटने वाली नहीं है।

अभी हमारे वक्ता महोदय ने बताया कि आज देश में अधिक अशान्ति हो रही है, हड़तालें हो रही हैं और इस के कोई भी चिन्ह नजर नहीं आ रहे हैं जिससे देश में औद्योगिक शान्ति हो सके। हमारे देश में आजादी आने के बाद ज्यादातर जो हड़तालें हो रही हैं वे आर्थिक कारण से नहीं हैं बल्कि राजनीतिक उद्देश्य के लिये हो रही हैं। जब तक हमारे देश में एक दर्जन सोशलिस्ट पार्टियां रहेगी और उनकी दर्जनों दुकानें रहेगी तब तक देश में शान्ति होने वाली नहीं है। पहले जितने भी वर्कर्स थे वे सब एक ट्रेड यूनियन के मातहत होते थे, मगर आज हम देखते हैं कि देश में चार चार दुकानें इन ट्रेड यूनियनों की खुली हुई हैं और अपनी दुकानें खुली रखने के लिये, अपनी पार्टी को कायम रखने के लिये ये लोग बड़ी-बड़ी हड़तालें कराते हैं। यही नहीं आप देखेंगे कि भाषावाद के नाम पर भी हड़तालें होगी जैसा कि चेतावनी चल रही है। संयुक्त महाराष्ट्र और महा गुजरात के लिये बड़ी भारी हड़तालें और धाम्दो-

लन होने वाले हैं। जिस समय बंगाल के कुछ क्षेत्र को बिहार में मिला दिया गया था और श्री विधान चन्द्र राय ने नारा दिया था, उस समय भी हड़ताल हुई। अभिप्राय यह है कि आजकल जितनी भी हड़तालें हो रही हैं वे आर्थिक कारणों को लेकर नहीं हो रही हैं बल्कि राजनीतिक कारणों से हो रही हैं। इन सब बातों को ध्यान में रखते हुए यह स्पष्ट है कि केवल कमेटी का निर्माण कर देने से ही समस्या का समाधान नहीं हो सकता।

मैं सरकार को और अपने विरोधी भाइयों को चाहे वे सोशलिस्ट हों या कम्युनिस्ट हों, एक राय देना चाहता हूँ। मैं यह बात अच्छी तरह से समझता हूँ कि मेरी बात न सरकार मानेगी और न ही हमारे साथी मानने वाले हैं। दुनिया में जितने भी सोशलिस्ट देश हैं या जहाँ सोशलिस्ट पार्टियां की हुकूमत है वहाँ हड़तालें नहीं होती। इसीलिये नेताजी सुभाषचन्द्र बोस ने कहा था कि जब देश आजाद हो जाय और आजाद होने के बाद देश में जो शासक पार्टी होगी यानी कांग्रेस, यदि वह समाजवाद को ग्रहण कर लेगी तब जितनी भी हड़तालें होगी, वे सब बन्द हो जायेंगी। और जब तक ये बन्द नहीं होगी तब तक हमारी पंचवर्षीय योजनाये, चाहे हम एक बनाये या दो, वे सफल नहीं हो सकती हैं। हमारे विरोधी भाइयों का यह ख्याल है कि वे इस तरह की हड़ताल कराके कांग्रेस गवर्नमेंट को किमी तरह से गिराये। इसलिये यदि सचमुच हम देश में सही मानों में औद्योगिक शान्ति चाहते हैं तो देश में जो एक दर्जन सोशलिस्ट पार्टियां हैं उनको एक करोड़ वाली कांग्रेस की महासभा सोशलिस्ट पार्टी में मिल जाना चाहिये। अगर ये लोग देश में समाजवाद चाहते हैं तो उन्हें यह कार्य करना होगा। अगर वे समझते हैं कि वे अपनी पार्टी को द्वारा यह चीज हासिल करेंगे तो यह नहीं होने वाला है।

12 Noon पहले एक ट्रेड यूनियन कांग्रेस की अब आल इंडिया

ट्रेड यूनियन कांग्रेस है, इंडियन ट्रेड यूनियन कांग्रेस है, हिन्दू मजदूर सभा है यूनाइटेड ट्रेड यूनियन कांग्रेस है और इनके अतिरिक्त और छोटी छोटी यूनियने बनती रहती है। ये जितनी सेट्रल ट्रेड यूनियन्स है सब यह कहती हैं कि एक समाजवादी राज्य की स्थापना करनी है। जब समाजवाद की स्थापना करनी है तो फिर अलग अलग दूकान खोलने की क्या आवश्यकता है। यह तो तीन कनौजिया और तेरह चूल्हे वाली कहावत हुई। तीन कनौजिया ब्राह्मण थे और उनके तेरह चूल्हे थे। उसी प्रकार ये पोलिटिकल कनौजिया ब्राह्मण अपनी अपनी जगह बैठे हुये हैं और अपने को पंडित समझ रहे हैं। इसलिए एक ट्रेड यूनियन कांग्रेस होनी चाहिए जो सबसे बड़ी हो। आज देश में इंडियन नेशनल कांग्रेस की सदस्य संख्या एक करोड़ की है, किसी पार्टी की एक लाख की है, किसी की दो लाख की है, किसी की कुछ हजार की है। इस तरह ये जो बारह बमाते हैं जैसे भारतीय कम्यूनिस्ट पार्टी और प्रजा सोशलिस्ट पार्टी इत्यादि और एक लोहिया सोशलिस्ट पार्टी है—अब नाम पर भी सोशलिस्ट पार्टी चलती है—बालशेविक पार्टी, केरल सोशलिस्ट पार्टी है, और अन्यान्य बहुत सी पार्टियां हैं, इन तमाम को एक हो जाना चाहिये। इसी तरह एक सिद्धान्त को मानने वाली जितनी ट्रेड यूनियन कांग्रेस हैं सब एक जगह बैठकर साफ़ साफ़ मोचकर यह हिसाब लगा ले कि कौन सब से बड़ी यूनियन है। अखबारों में बयान निकलते रहते हैं और आल इंडिया ट्रेड यूनियन कांग्रेस वाले कहते हैं कि हमारी यूनियन सब से बड़ी है और इंडियन ट्रेड यूनियन कांग्रेस वाले कहते हैं कि हमारी यूनियन सब से बड़ी है। इस पर विचार कर लिया जाय। इस सम्बन्ध में यह भी ध्यान रखने की आवश्यकता है कि इंडियन ट्रेड यूनियन कांग्रेस को इन्टरनेशनल दर्जा प्राप्त है और वही सब से बड़ी जमात समझी जाती है। इस लिए हिन्दुस्तान में मजदूरों का एक वर्ग संगठन होना चाहिये

और एक सोशलिस्ट पार्टी होनी चाहिये। इसके साथ-साथ जनसंघ के लोग बैठे हुये हैं, हिन्दू महा सभा के लोग बैठे हुये हैं, राजा महाराजाओं की पार्टियां बैठी हुई हैं। ये लोग भी हड़ताल कराने वाले हैं। आज चीन और रूस में यह व्यवस्था है कि वहां कोई हड़ताल नहीं करा सकता है। यदि कोई बात होती है तो वे कोर्ट में जाते हैं। उसी तरह यदि आप भी चाहते हैं कि पंच वर्षीय योजना आगे चले तो यह जितना क्लास स्ट्रगिल है इसको बन्द करना पड़ेगा, नेता जी के शब्दों में बैन करना पड़ेगा वरना मामूली मामूली बातों पर स्ट्राइक होने वाला है।

DR. A. N. BOSE (West Bengal): Where did he say this?

SHRI SHEEL BHADRA YAJEE: In *Indian Struggle*.

DR. A. N. BOSE: Where?

SHRI SHEEL BHADRA YAJEE: In *Indian Struggle*. Let him read it.

DR. A. N. BOSE: *Indian Struggle* is a big book.

SHRI SHEEL BHADRA YAJEE: No. The original one.

DR. A. N. BOSE: He never said that anywhere.

SHRI SHEEL BHADRA YAJEE: He can go and read it.

DR. A. N. BOSE: I have read it many times.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please go on.

SHRI SHEEL BHADRA YAJEE: Though he is a professor, he is ignorant; and I am positive on this.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order order.

श्री शीलभद्र याजी : मैं इसको अच्छी तरह से जानता हूं। उनके साथ काम करने का, उनके दाहिने और बायें होने का, उनकी किताब का एक एक अक्षर पढ़ने का मुझे पूरा-पूरा मौका मिला है। बदकिस्मती से हमारे साथी जो मुझे चैलेंज दे रहे हैं, वे हम से बहुत पहले जुदा हो चुके थे। मैं इस बात को दावे के साथ

[श्री शीलभद्र याजी]

श्रीर प्रमाणिकता के साथ कहता हूँ कि यह बात लिखी हुई है, और नेता जी लिखें या न लिखें लेकिन यदि हमें देश को बचाना है

Dr. A. N. BOSE: Why does he not give the reference when he speaks?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: He wants you to say—volume 1, page 382.

SHRI SHEEL BHADRA YAJEE: But it is in it and he can read it.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Please go on.

श्री शीलभद्र याजी : तो मैं पंचवर्षीय योजना के चलाने की बात कह रहा था । मेरा विचार यह है कि इस तरह पंचवर्षीय योजना नहीं चल सकती है क्योंकि मैं जानता हूँ कि मेरे जो साथी विरोधी दल में बैठे हैं उनको यह योजना बुरी लग रही है । पंचवर्षीय योजना के सम्बन्ध में वे ऊपर से ज़बानी हमदर्दी दिखलाते हैं, लेकिन जब उनकी अन्दरूनी पार्टी मीटिंग होती है तो उसमें यह कहा जाता है कि अगर पंचवर्षीय योजना सफल हो गई तो फिर कांग्रेस पार्टी हुकूमत में आ जायगी, नेहरू की हुकूमत बन जायगी । इसलिए चार पांच वर्ष में जो इन्वेक्शन होने वाला है उसके पहले बड़े-बड़े सत्याग्रह और दुराग्रह होने वाले हैं । यदि किसी गांव में सिंचाई का काम होगा तो यह कहा जायगा कि इससे गांव बह जायगा । ये सब चीज़ें होने वाली हैं । इसीलिए मैं ने कहा है कि मेरी यह बात न सरकार मानने वाली है और न हमारे वह साथी मानने वाले हैं जो अपोजीशन में बैठे हुये हैं और जो अपने को सोशलिज्म का पंडा कहते हैं । यदि आपको समाजवाद साना है तो जैसा चीन, रूस और दूसरे समाजवादी देशों में किया गया है उसी प्रकार यहां भी स्ट्रिक्स को बन्द करना पड़ेगा और तमाम समाजवादियों की एक पार्टी बनानी पड़ेगी । जब तक यह चीज़ नहीं होती है तब तक कभी भी इस देश में औद्योगिक शांति होने वाली नहीं है ।

श्री हर प्रसाद सक्सेना : (उत्तर प्रदेश) : क्या स्पीकर साहब डेमोक्रेसी के बजाय हमको टोटैलिटेरियेज्म की तरफ ले जाना चाहते हैं ?

श्री शीलभद्र याजी : मेरी निजी राय तो यही है कि बगैर डिक्टेटरशिप के समाजवाद नहीं हो सकता है । अब जिस डेमोक्रेसी को कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी ने लिया है, पता नहीं है कि उसको उसने कब और कहां से लिया है । उनका जो आखिरी जल्सा हुआ था उसमें भी यह कहा गया था कि अब समाजवाद बुलेट से नहीं होगा बल्कि बैलेट से होगा । इसलिए मैं कह रहा हूँ कि जो समाजवाद में विश्वास करने वाले नहीं हैं वे अपनी-अपनी पार्टी रखें । लेकिन जो समाजवाद में विश्वास रखते हैं वे कांग्रेस में मिल जायें । मैं यह जानना चाहता हूँ कि कांस्टिट्यूशन में यह कहा लिखा है कि हड़ताल करना मौलिक अधिकार है, सत्याग्रह या दुराग्रह करना कोई मौलिक अधिकार है । विधान या कांस्टिट्यूशन की बात कर रहा हूँ, मैं डिक्टेटरशिप की बात नहीं कर रहा हूँ ।

इस सम्बन्ध में एक बात और है । जहां इस बात की आवश्यकता है कि तमाम सोशलिस्ट पार्टियां एक हों, एक वर्ग संगठन या क्लास आर्गनाइजेशन हो, हड़ताल को बंद कर दिया जाये, वहां इस ओर भी ध्यान रखने की ज़रूरत है कि टाटा, बिरला और दूसरे पूंजीपति मानने वाले नहीं हैं । हम जो मजदूर कानून, लेबर लाज बनाते हैं उनको कार्यान्वित करने के लिये जो हमारी मशीनरी है वह इतनी देर लगाती है कि उस से मजदूरों की समस्या हल होने वाली नहीं है इसलिए सरकार इस तरह की मशीनरी तैयार करे जो मजदूर और मैनेजमेंट के झगड़ों का जल्दी से जल्दी फैसला कर दे । विशेष तौर से प्राइवेट सेक्टर में जो गवर्नमेंट की मशीनरी काम कर रही है उसमें पूरा कार्याकल्प और सुधार करने की आवश्यकता है ताकि लेबर मैनेजमेंट के जो झगड़े हों उनके फैसले में देर न लगे । यदि ऐसा किया गया तो मैं समझता

हूँ कि औद्योगिक शांति सर्वदा के लिए स्थापित होगी, समाजवाद की स्थापना होगी, और पंच-वर्षीय योजना की जो बात कही गई है, उसमें भी हमें कामयाबी होगी। यदि केवल इस कमेटी का निर्माण किया गया तो फिर वही तीन कनौजिया तरह चूल्हे की राय देंगे और इससे कोई काम होने वाला नहीं है।

इन शब्दों के साथ प्रस्तावक महोदय से और सरकार से मेरी यह गुजारिश है कि यदि सचमुच, जैसा कि माऊन्स तुग ने कहा है कि हम अपने यहां २५ वर्ष में समाजवाद की स्थापना करेंगे और नेहरू जी ने कहा है कि हम अपने यहां १५ वर्ष में समाजवाद की स्थापना करेंगे और हम नेहरू जी की बात को पूरा करना चाहते हैं, हम तीन कनौजिया तरह चूल्हे का झगड़ा रोकना चाहते हैं। और देश में औद्योगिक स्थायी शांति चाहते हैं तो जो मैंने सुझाव दिये हैं उनको मानिये।

इन शब्दों के साथ मैं इस प्रस्ताव का विरोध करता हूँ।

श्री निरंजन सिंह (मध्य प्रदेश) : सभापति महोदय, मुझसे पूर्व वक्ता महोदय ने जो अपने विचार बताये उनसे मैं तो कम से कम सहमत नहीं हूँ और मैं उनसे यह आशा भी नहीं करता था कि वे इस तरह की मनो-वृत्ति इस राज्य सभा भवन में बतायेंगे। सच बात यह है कि जो कुछ इस प्रस्ताव में रखा गया है उसका मैं पूर्णतया समर्थन करता हूँ। अभी जो रूस और चीन का उदाहरण उन्होंने दिया वह उन्होंने चाहे जिस सिद्धान्त से दिया हो मैं नहीं जानता, लेकिन मेरा खुद का कहना यह है कि आज गवर्नमेंट के द्वारा संचालित जितनी फैक्ट्रियां हैं या जिन उद्योग-धंधों में वह काम करती हैं उनमें और प्राइवेट उद्योग-धंधों में बहुत अन्तर पड़ रहा है। जहां पर प्राइवेट संस्थाओं द्वारा कोई इंडस्ट्री चल रही है वहां पर सरकार दबा करके, बीच में पड़ करके, कानून के द्वारा समझिये या किसी तरह समझिये मजदूरों को कुछ राहत दिलवा देती है।

लेकिन जहां पर गवर्नमेंट ने खुद उद्योग धंधे चलाये हैं, चाहे वह पेपर मिल हो, चाहे स्टील प्लांट हो, चाहे कोई प्लांट हो, वहां पर यदि कोई मजदूर अपने अधिकारों के लिये लड़ता है तो वह तुरन्त दबा दिया जाता है। या उसको निष्कासित कर दिया जाता है या उसके ऊपर मुकदमा चलाया जाता है। उसकी न तो ट्राइब्युनल में कोई मुनवाई होती है और न वह ट्राइब्युनल तक पहुंच पाता है।

इसलिये ऐसे मौके पर इस प्रस्ताव का लाना अत्यन्त आवश्यक है जब कि गवर्नमेंट एक तरफ तो इंडस्ट्रलाइजेशन को अपने हाथ में लेना चाहती है और उसको हाथ में ले कर दूसरी तरफ वही पालिसी भी कायम रखना चाहती है कि मजदूर सरकार के खिलाफ सिर नहीं उठा सकते हैं। यदि बीड़ी बनाने वालों की स्ट्राइक हो, यदि दूसरी चीजे हों तो उनमें गवर्नमेंट पड़ सकती है या मिल-मजदूरों के मामले में गवर्नमेंट पड़ सकती है लेकिन, अध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं आपका ध्यान आकर्षित करना चाहता हूँ कि यदि नेपा के पेपर मिल में कार्यकर्त्ताओं ने किसी तरह की कोई डिमांड की है तो उनको कुचल दिया गया है उनकी डिमांड को माना नहीं गया है। इसी तरह से भिलाई का उदाहरण है, वह सरकार के संरक्षण में है तो वहां मजदूर कोई यूनियन बनाने में सफल नहीं हो सकते हैं। उनको उसमें कठिनाई आती है। तो यदि हम सचमुच यह चाहते हैं कि मजदूरों का हित हो, उनको संरक्षण मिले और कांस्टीट्यूशन द्वारा बनी हुई जो सरकार है उसके हित भी सुरक्षित हों तो हम को ऐसी कमेटी का निर्माण करना होगा जो कि फ्राइव ईयर प्लान के लिये ही नहीं बल्कि फ्यूचर प्लान के लिये भी सम्मति दे सके।

आपने मुभाष चन्द्र जी का, नेता जी का, उदाहरण दिया। मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि यह कोई नई चीज नहीं है। सन् १९१७ में जब स्ट्राइक हुई थी और ग्रहमदाबाद में

• [श्री निरंजन सिंह]

मिलो के झगड़े चल रहे थे उस समय एक पालिमी ले डाउन की गई थी और हम समझते हैं कि अहमदाबाद की मिलों में आज से ४ साल पहले तक, या जब तक कि स्वतंत्रता नहीं मिली थी तब तक, कभी भी मिल मालिकों और मजदूरों में झगड़ा नहीं हुआ था और उनके पास प्राविडेंट फंड भी उस समय के हिसाब के अनुसार काफी था। उनके तब के कार्यों में और आज के कार्यों में फर्क है। उनसे कहा जाता था कि इसके प्रति तुम्हारा ममत्व होना चाहिये। जब तक कि काम करने वाले का उस संस्था के प्रति ममत्व नहीं होगा, प्रेम नहीं होगा, तब तक कुछ नहीं होगा। जब तक यह भाव रहेगा कि केवल हमें पैसा मिलना चाहिये और इससे हमें कोई मतलब नहीं कि उस संस्था में काम होता है या नहीं होता है, फैक्ट्री में काम होता है या नहीं होता है, जब तक कि पैसे से हमारी ममता है और काम से हमारी ममता नहीं है तब तक ये झगड़े चलेंगे। तो हमको यह देखना होगा कि जब तक कि कार्य के लिये ममत्व नहीं आता तब तक हम इस देश की प्रोग्रेस नहीं कह सकते जब तक कि लेबर और मालिक का दायरा अलग अलग रहेगा, जब तक कि कार्य करने वालों और उनसे कार्य कराने वालों का एकीकरण नहीं होगा तब तक कार्य नहीं चल सकता है। हमारे पूर्व वक्ता ने कहा कि हमको एक हो जाना चाहिये। इस संसार में कभी भी एक विचारधारा नहीं हुई है, बुद्धिमान आदमी एक सा सोच सकते हैं लेकिन कार्य करने के अलग अलग स्थल होंगे।

श्री शीलभद्र याजी : जो एक अलग विचारधारा के लोग हैं उनकी बात मैं नहीं कह रहा था मैं तो एक साथ कार्य करने की बात कह रहा था।

श्री निरंजन सिंह : हिन्दी में एक कहावत है। उसको बता देना चाहता हूँ। "तेरे घर के द्वार अनेक किस से आऊँ"।

तो मेरा कहना है कि जब तक ममत्व और एकत्व नहीं होगा तब तक इस देश में न तो कल्याणकारी समाज की स्थापना हो सकती है और न इस देश की प्रोग्रेस हो सकती है। इस नाते से यहां पर यह प्रस्ताव पास करना अत्यन्त आवश्यक है इसके द्वारा आप कार्य का समन्वय करेंगे और उसका समन्वय करने के बाद हम प्रोग्रेस कर सकेंगे।

SHRI K. L. NARASIMHAM (Andhra Pradesh): Sir, I rise to support the Resolution. This Resolution is moved at the proper time to examine the causes for the industrial unrest and to suggest measures to see that the industrial relations are improved for implementing the Five Year Plan successfully. I do not want to narrate the reasons why the industrial unrest is increasing day by day except to mention a few points. Firstly, the general feature of the industrial unrest as stated by previous speakers shows that the number of man-days lost is progressively increasing. Secondly, not only the man-days lost are increasing, but even the number of disputes and the number of workers participating in strikes have gone up. Thirdly, the disputes are widespread and taking on a provincial and all-India character. Fourthly, the workers in bigger factories are in action. Fifthly, the man-days lost are not due to strikes alone but due to lock-outs and closures, and this is because of the offensive of the employers against the workers and against some of the legislations that the Government of India is bringing forward. The workers in Government services and the middle-class employees are also in action. These are the general features of the strikes that we now find in our country.

[MR. DEPUTY-CHAIRMAN in the Chair.]

Sir, what are the reasons for these strikes? Is the worker resorting to a strike because some political party is behind him or is he resorting to this step as a fun? Neither is the case. The worker is resorting to this act as a last resort. His union tries

to effect a settlement by negotiations and by conciliation methods and by even approaching the industrial tribunal machinery and when he could not find any solution for his main grievance by these methods, he is resorting to this action. He is selling his labour power to his employer, and it is just and reasonable for that man to ask for reasonable conditions and a proper wage for the commodity he is selling. If anybody says that he should sell it to his disadvantage and do according to the dictates of the employer, I think he is taking an unreasonable stand. So, the strikes that are taking place today are mainly due to the adamant, indifferent and callous attitude of the employers and the policies that the Government is following towards the workers.

Sir, I will not dilate on this point further except going into some of the industrial sectors where the situation is very serious. Sir, you know that coal mining is an important industry. That is necessary and that is closely linked with the planned development of our country. The total number of collieries is nearly 900 employing 3 lakhs and odd workers. What are the conditions in the coal mining industry? After a great struggle of the coal miners at last a coal award came, and the employers are still trying to whittle down that award by not implementing it in full. Recently, the All-India Mine Workers Federation has raised the demand that the award which stated that the additional dearness allowance be increased by Rs. 4|14|- according to the rise in cost of living has not been implemented and should be implemented from January 1958. At last in the tripartite meeting recently held on the 3rd August at Calcutta they agreed to implement this from 1st April. There in the coal mining industry you will find that the number of accidents is increasing. I will only give figures to show how the accidents are increasing, only by repeating one of the answers given by the hon. Minister in the other House. During the period especially from 1.1.56 to 28.2.58 there were 6175

mine accidents involving 672 deaths and injuries to 5780. The owners ignore the safety rules—that is the main reason. You will find that in one of the court of enquiries in respect of the Central Bhowrah Colliery accident—the Chinakuri Enquiry Report is yet to see the light of day—the employers are held responsible for ignoring the safety regulations. You will find in the coal mining belt a feature of closure of mines. In the North Brook Colliery and the Kuardih Colliery in Raniganj Belt and also in other areas in Bihar and West Bengal the employers are adopting the tactics of closing the mines. When the Government insists on safety regulations being observed, to evade that thing and to threaten the persons responsible who are doing that kind of thing, they close the mine. They do not pay arrears of wages, they do not give them lay-off compensation, they do not give them the facilities statutorily due to them. When the union approaches the Government, the Government is indifferent and the Labour Department shows a helpless attitude, and that helpless attitude is mainly responsible for this feature. Cannot the Government nationalise all the mines? Cannot the Government see that this state of thing is put in order? Cannot the Government take up such steps? They can do it. So a committee of Parliament is necessary to go into the causes and to see that such kind of disruption is not resorted to by callous employers, especially in the coal-mining area.

Recently, I have noted another feature. Apart from coal-mines, there are the manganese, mica and iron ore mines. I come from a State where there is mica mining industry. There the conditions are deplorable. A worker who works underground gets only Re. 1|- per day, with no house, no facilities, no provident fund. No regulation is enforced. When we approached the Government the Labour Department showed a helpless attitude. Andhra Pradesh mica workers union gave a notice for strike on the 8th of this month. This Union

[Shri K. L. Narasimham.]

had to resort to strike only for getting the actual wages that the workers should get by statutory provision. Even to enforce a law, a worker is forced to resort to strike action. Even to get a minor concession, say for drinking water, in the mica industry which is an important industry, one has to resort to certain steps. When the Regional Labour Commissioner from Madras, one Mr. Singh, visited Gudur, I, as a trade union representative, requested for an interview but he refused it and his callous attitude is leading to the stoppage of work in the mining area especially in Gudur mica area. This needs an enquiry. We need a Parliamentary Members' team to go into the causes and see why this unrest is growing. In manganese mines, what is the position? In Srikakulam and Vizag districts, all mines are closed. In Orissa some manganese mines are closed. I have got a copy of the memorandum sent by the All India Trade Union Congress to the Ministry of Labour on the closure of iron ore and manganese mine in Barbil area in Orissa. What action was taken by the Government? Five thousand people are affected in the manganese and mica mines as well as the coal mines and the unrest is growing and you refuse to appoint even a committee of enquiry to go into the causes. Is it not the proper time, is it not time for us to go into this matter and suggest ways and means of stopping this? The 15th Indian Labour Conference held last year passed big resolutions on the principles to determine minimum wages, on rationalisation and other important matters. Many decisions were taken. The 16th Labour Conference at Nainital reviewed the decisions. During that one year what happened? During that period nowhere these principles which they laid down have been implemented. No tribunal ever cared. I have personal experience. When we quoted the decision of the Indian Labour Conference to a labour tribunal in Hyderabad that judge never cared to read that. The Andhra Pradesh Government say they cannot implement this principle. It

may be that you talk of socialistic principles in words but in action you do things in such a way that you yield to monopolistic concerns, you yield to feudalistic landlordism, you create conditions and make the workers resist this exploitation. That is the reason why this unrest is increasing. Apart from this the police help the employers. Police repression, in some places followed the efforts of the management to terrorise the workers joining the AITUC unions. Mr. S. N. Tiwari was arrested under 151 Cr. P. C. His house where the union office is situated was raided and when the workers protested, there was lathi-charge. We want a judicial enquiry into it. The Talcher Villiers Coal-mines, Orissa, have not paid wages for 23 weeks. A question was raised in the last session.

Now I refer to a memorandum. All these things were put before the Labour Minister. We only wanted to know what the Ministry was doing. If it is helpless, let them take such measures to see that they can implement their regulations. So, in the mining industry which is a very important one for the development of Indian economy, for the development of the industries, we should see that such things are set right and the general unrest is avoided. For that, appoint a wage board immediately to go into the wage structures of all mines including mica, manganese and other mines, and take steps to enforce the regulations properly, to introduce a system of inspection by workers' representatives, to ensure observance and implementation by Government and employees of all the regulations which have been adopted for the benefit of the workers. Lastly, it is time that we should think in terms of nationalising our coal mines. This is a key industry and we should see that this situation does not repeat.

Coming next to the national industry, which is the life-line of Indian economy, the Railways, let us examine what is happening there? The accidents are increasing. The Railway Minister comes with figures. He

says in 1957-58 the total number of accidents was 9011 out of which failures of engines and rolling stock account for 4695, that is, 52.1 per cent. Then he gives the reason as the failure of human element and gives 41.1 per cent, as the figure. What is the condition in the Railways? Let us go and see under what conditions the people are working? When the world is thinking in terms of a 42 hour week, we are thinking in terms of 60 hours and 84 hours in respect of intermittent workers. The running staff who have to work on foot plate, work for more than 14 to 16 hours without rest. You increase the workload of the workers. The condition of your rolling stock and your machinery is not proper. You cannot replace them. Your safety measures do not work properly. When these things are going on, you come and say that the human element is responsible for the accidents. For the same reason we want a committee to go into the working conditions and see that this unrest is avoided. You evolved a principle for recognition of the unions in the 16th Indian Labour Conference. That is not applied in the Indian Railways. In the Indian Railways you are favouring one union and giving them all facilities. Even the right of organising the trade union sometimes is being questioned. If one organised a trade union, he is dismissed under the National Security Rules. He is not allowed to collect subscriptions and hold meetings in railway premises. These are the reasons that make the railway workers think in terms of struggle to get their growing grievances redressed.

The dock workers' position is the next important thing. There was a strike and that was called off on the advice of the Prime Minister.

(Time bell rings.)

Sir, you kindly give me a few minutes more. Even after that, what happened at the negotiations? You had the Choudhri Commission Report. When you had to implement that you said

that you could not implement it in full. You appointed it and you don't implement its decisions.

I will say only one word about the strike that is going on in the Muchkund Hydro-electric Project which is a very important project for Andhra Pradesh and Orissa States and where nobody wants stoppage of work. I want a Parliamentary Committee to enquire into the causes of this strike, which is continuing especially from the 27th August. What are the reasons? The Orissa Tribunal gave an award and the Andhra Pradesh Government appealed in the Orissa High Court and got a stay order from the Orissa High Court. That refers to retrenchment and payment of compensation. They don't implement these regulations, they don't even observe certain formalities of the process of retrenchment. They don't give them alternative employment. When the whole country is agitating for an increase in dearness allowance the Andhra Pradesh Government sanctioned an *ad hoc* increase but does not implement it there. All that is responsible for the strike in Muchkund Hydro-electric Project. Every Andhra is proud of that project... (Time bell rings.)

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Your 15 minutes are over. Mr. Gopala Reddy will lay some papers on the Table.

SUPPLEMENTARY DEMANDS FOR GRANTS FOR EXPENDITURE OF CENTRAL GOVERNMENT (EXCLUDING RAILWAYS) IN 1958-59

THE MINISTER OF REVENUE AND CIVIL EXPENDITURE (SHRI B. GOPALA REDDI): Sir, I lay on the Table a statement showing the Supplementary Demands for Grants for Expenditure of the Central Government (excluding Railways) in the year 1958-59.