

M. L. BANSAL

WORKERS' PARTICIPATION IN MANAGEMENT

THE RATIONABLE

WITH the advent of modern industrialism coupled with the philosophy of *laissez-faire*, freedom of contract and of enterprise, the worker's position and prospects began to deteriorate. He came to be looked upon as a commercial commodity without the least recognition of the human element in him. He was offered the minimum wage and was subject to maximum use, periodical replacement and scrapping when damaged or worn out. In course of time there set in a reaction against these attitudes. Both Clayton Act of 1914 and the I.L.O. Declaration of Philadelphia, in 1944 upheld the personality and dignity of the worker. It was realised that he too was a self-respecting man and shared the universal feelings, emotions and aspirations. As at present, the worker has emerged on the production horizon as an inquisitive element. He wants to know for whom and for what he is working. This revival of 'meaningfulness' or 'purposefulness' of the workers' role entitles him to have a right to participate in the affairs of the industry and contribute to the effectiveness of the cooperative enterprise to which he belongs. The very idea that the industry belongs to him as much as to the management elevates him and provides him with a job satisfaction of a high order.

THE PRODUCTIVITY GOAL

Increased productivity is the aim of all economies, whether capitalist or socialist. Management must be prepared to willingly accept labour's claim that they contribute to the progress and prosperity of the enterprise and hence have a legitimate right to share in the decision-making of the understanding. Without the wholehearted cooperation of labour and management, the planned targets of higher production cannot be achieved.

Industrial peace is a *sine qua non* for maximum production. Industrial unrest whether in the form of strikes or lock-outs, besides causing tremendous loss in terms of work-stoppage and man-days lost creates a feeling of antagonism and distrust amongst workers and employers. Participation of workers cuts at the root of industrial strife. It tries to remove or at least minimize the diverse and conflicting interests between parties by substituting in their place cooperation, homogeneity of objects and commonness of interests. Employers must wake up to the need of the hour and by providing an opportunity of self-expression and recognition they must seek the cooperation of their workers.

The declared goal of India is the establishment of 'socialist pattern of society' which, when applied to industry, means a progressive widening of the area of operation of the state. With the subordination of private capital and the sublimation of the profit instinct the responsibility of workers increases all the more for a greatly increased tempo of production. The State now assuming the character of a welfare state should seek the maximum cooperation of labour at all levels of management in running the industry. Since workers constitute the vast masses and since the state works for the welfare of the community at large there must be a happy marriage of interests between the two emerging elements in India's production system. The state must seek the participation of workers in real management and the latter must operate to further the goals of the community *viz.* rising levels of wealth creation through higher productivity and enlarged output.

When workers do not participate in the production process as an integral part of it but remain as an appendage to the machine, their impulses are met with by the emergence of informal groups within the factory premises. These groups provide a chance for workers of various shades and status to come together and exchange their views. The workers must be accorded a social status along with other constituents of the industry. The only effective remedy for winning them over is the recognition of their right to participate in management.

Labour to act effectively as a fruitful participant in any scheme of labour-management cooperation needs to be educated and trained. He should be capable of understanding the various problems facing the industry and contributing to their solutions. Labour-management

association becomes all the more essential for the materialisation of any such scheme.

Workers' participation in management is justified even on technical grounds. He is the man who works on the machines and, therefore, comes to know everything about them. His knowledge can never be replaced by push buttons and gimmicks of automation. If there is an atmosphere of mutual trust and confidence, the workers can best suggest ways and means to improve production processes, avoid waste and utilize the available resources in the most efficient manner.

Thus the rationale of workers' participation may be established on the grounds¹ that (a) it will tend to resurrect the workers' lost feeling of economic and social status, (b) it will recompensate for the psychological loss caused in course of production process, (c) it will rehabilitate the idea that machines are for man and not man for machines, (d) it will attach a social purpose and meaning to the workers' job or role; (e) it will foster human relationship between workers and management and minimize industrial conflicts; (f) it will lead to increased productivity and productive efficiency of both the plant and the workers; (g) it will employ all technical knowledge accumulated by workers in the course of years on the one hand, and all managerial talents of the investor, on the other; and (h) it will pave the way for developing a unified loyalty amongst the workers and increase the area of understanding with the management.

ITS MEANING

Participation is one of the most misunderstood ideas that have ever emerged from the field of human relations. It has acquired different connotations in different parts of the world. It means Union-Management Cooperation in United States of America, Labour-Management Association in France, Joint Consultation in U.K. and Sweden, Co-Determination in Federal Republic of West Germany and Auto-Management in Yugoslavia. In India it is in its experimental stage. A suitable pattern based on its socio-economic developments is yet to be evolved.

Democracy as applied to industry means sharing the decision-making power by the rank and file of an industrial concern through their duly elected representatives at all appropriate levels the entire

range of managerial action. Analytically it is a process of delegation of authority and responsibility in the general arena of managerial functions. It may take the form of profit-sharing, or co-partnership, or joint consultation, or co-determination, or even representation on the board of management.

All the three constituents of an industry—labour, management and the government—interpret the term 'participation' in their own way. Management generally takes it to be joint consultation prior to decision-making; workers normally think of it as equivalent to co-decision or co-determination, while the administrators and experts practically regard it as mere association of labour with management without the final authority or responsibility in decision-making.

VARIOUS STAGES OF PARTICIPATION

Participation is possible at all levels and in all managerial activities varying in the areas and degrees involved. Miss Dorothea de Schweinitz in her research work, *Labour and Management in a Common Enterprise*, describes three stages of labour-management co-operation—information sharing, problem sharing and idea sharing. In 'Information' sharing the employer provides information to the employee on a number of topics such as quantum of demand and supply of the manufactured goods, the condition of the competitive markets, recruitment, training and promotion of workers, and changes in the operating methods before they are put into effect. In 'Problem' sharing the employer recognizes that workers can make a contribution in certain areas like quality, costs, or waste etc. and the labour is requested to give its opinion or to provide suggestion for improving the existing state of affairs. In 'Idea' sharing the labour initiates its own schemes in one of the fields of management such as production or personnel. It is a higher pedestal of labour management cooperation.

Mr. Ernest Dale of the American Management Association describes four stages of participation. They are : (i) informational cooperation where pooled facts are made available for information to the workers on some important issues; (ii) advisory cooperation where facilities for mutual consultation are provided by framing joint bodies of both workers and managers. But its jurisdiction is merely advisory

and not binding on the management; (iii) constructive co-operation, where the constructive suggestions are acted upon. Its field is wider than that of advisory cooperation; and (iv) joint determination where the policy decisions are taken jointly both by the labour and management representatives.²

V. G. Mhetras in his research work 'Labour Participation in Management' conceives of five stages which are: (i) informative participation, (ii) consultative participation, (iii) associative participation, (iv) administrative participation, and (v) decisive participation.³ In the informative type of participation information on some matters is supplied to the employees without any facility or right of its close scrutiny. This is the form of participation at the lowest ebb. In consultative type the participation is of a higher degree than the former. Here on matters like canteen, welfare and other amenities, safety and housing, production processes etc., suggestions are invited from the workers' representatives by the management. But they are merely of an advisory nature. Their acceptance or rejection is entirely on the discretion of the management. In associative participation the unanimous decisions of the joint committee or council are generally implemented by the management. It is a moral obligation of the management to accept and implement such decisions. Thus it is not purely an advisory form of participation. In administrative participation the decision has already been taken but the participation is sought in the choice of the alternative methods of its implementation. It includes the supervision and administration of various welfare schemes by the workers. This involves still higher degrees of delegation of authority and responsibility to the lower ranks of the organisation. In decisive participation all important matters regarding economic, financial, administrative and general policies are discussed and all decisions are taken jointly. Such decisions are final and are implemented as such. This is the highest form of participation where the sharing of decision making power is complete and the delegation of managerial authority is the maximum.

It would be seen from the foregoing classificatory approaches that the degree of participation would vary according to the extent of delegation of managerial authority transmitted to workers in an enterprise. The actual participation subjects may range from routine matters to delicate and risk some policy issues.

PHILOSOPHIES AND PRACTICES

The form and degree of workers' participation depends upon the socio-economic goals that a country professes to achieve. Philosophies embodying the concept of participation can conveniently be classified under the four broad heads;⁴

- (a) Syndicalist—Guild Approach;
- (b) Socialist Approach;
- (c) Gandhian Approach; and
- (d) Eclectic Approach.

This is not to deny the possibility of more than these approaches—for example, there can be a 'Co-operative Approach.'

Both Syndicalists and Guild Socialists agreed that after nationalisation the actual administration of the various industries and services would be in the hands of the organised workers through their trade unions. Syndicalists took an anarchist view of the State. According to Prof. G.D.H. Cole 'Anarchism is the father of Syndicalism but Trade Unionism is its mother.'⁵ They proposed the idea of 'Workers' control' over industry *i.e.* railways to be managed by railway workers, the post office by the postal employees and the mines by the miners. Guild Socialists pleaded for industrial control between producers and consumers and believed that a democratic state should own the means of production and the Guilds should control the work of production. Both have failed to exercise any tangible influence on the labour policies of any country. They are today only of an academic interest.

Socialist Approach views workers' participation in management as a multi-dimensional programme for socialist reconstruction embracing economic, socio-political and psychological aspects. In its early start it stands on the firm foundation of nationalisation of all means of production and exchange but in later stages it forecasts the gradual withering away of the state and emergence of 'workers' self-governing bodies in factories. These democratically elected institutions of the workers will manage the units of production and take crucial decisions and play a vital role in the industrial development of the country. Thus the sense of acquisitiveness and bossing will be replaced by a sense of collective belongingness and creative participation. The status of the worker will be raised from a mere cog in the machine to a master

of the machine. Social interest will take the place of self-aggrandisement. Even this approach remains in its infancy and the illussory promises of the gradual decentralization of the state authority and the emergence of independent self-governing democratic institutions of the workers motivated by community interest still remain unfulfilled.

Gandhian Approach is different. Gandhi imparted a humanitarian touch to the problem. He conceded to minimum centralized production and private ownership only if the capitalist raised the status of the workers to a 'co-proprietor' and propounded the theory of 'trusteeship' in industry. He believed that both labour and management should act as trustees for the community interests. In case of failure on the part of capitalists to behave in the aforesaid manner he accepted 'state ownership' but only under ideal and attractive conditions. In state owned enterprises the worker should be represented on the management through his elected nominees and he should be an equal partner in the management along with representatives of the Government. He thus conceived of 'Factory Democracy'. Gandhians ultimately believe in the gradual transformation of state functions into voluntary organisations. It is termed as an 'Idealist Approach'. It is not in practice anywhere in the world and unfortunately not even in India.

The most common approach to workers' participation in the non-socialist countries is based on eclecticism. It is introduced under external pressures and then its contents are borrowed from different practices and traditions which may be modified to suit the local conditions. But the specific pattern which is gradually evolved is bound to be influenced by the history of each country and there cannot be a rigid phasing of the programme.

EXPERIMENTS ABROAD

Workers' participation practised in different parts of the world differs widely both in form and degree.

United Kingdom: Towards the end of the First World War, the Whitley Committee recommended the establishment of national joint councils, district councils and joint works committees for each industry. This scheme did not work up to expectations because the employers were reluctant to share their managerial functions with the

workers and the employees' unions suspected them to be their rival alternatives. Since 1947, there have been many experiments in the field of labour-management cooperation. Various forms of joint negotiating and joint consultative machinery sometimes under official encouragement and often through voluntary agreements were initiated by individuals. Schemes of profit sharing, co-partnership, and even of direct sharing in management through workers' representatives on the Board of Directors were also floated but the idea of direct participation in management was rarely appreciated. In the case of nationalised industries, the government, at the outset, rejected this theory. Matters relating to wages, bonus, promotion and retrenchment of workers and other conditions of work etc., are kept out of the jurisdiction of joint consultation. These are settled through negotiation and collective bargaining. Thus the main features of labour-management cooperation in U.K. are; (i) it is joint consultation in form; (ii) it is voluntary in nature and not the outcome of a legal action; and (iii) it is only advisory in character.

Scandinavian Countries: Like U.K. the Joint Consultative Committees or Production or Works Committees are only advisory in character and are set up by the mutual agreement between labour and management. There is no legal compulsion in either of these countries. The Production Committees in Sweden are entitled to inspect the balance sheet, the profit and loss account and the directors' and auditors' reports.

France and Belgium: The setting up of Works Committees is compulsory under the Law. The New Constitution of the French Republic provides for the establishment of an Economic Council to assist the Council of Ministers on economic matters. Most nationalised industries have workers' representation on their management boards. But in private sector there is no direct participation other than a mere voluntary cooperation between labour and management.

Federal Republic of West Germany: Works councils consist of equal numbering of representatives of workers and management are created as a statutory obligation. The form of participation is termed 'co-determination or co-management.' Under the system, there is a Board of Directors at the top management and it consists of 11 members—5 elected by the shareholders and 5 nominated by the central Trade Unions and one an independent. Subordinate to the Board of

Directors is the Board of Management which has three members, one of which comes from workers. Finally, there is a Senate or a Works Council supervising the industry as a whole. The scheme has worked well by and large. The most important factor behind its success has been the absence of rival trade unions in Germany.

Yugoslavia: The scheme adopted here is known as 'Auto-Management.' Since industry is nationalised, the workers themselves constitute the management. The slogan is 'Factories for workers' and 'land for the Peasants.' According to the 'Basic Law on Management' the factories, mines, communications, transport and other industries are managed by 'workers' collectives'. These collectives elect the Workers' Councils and the Boards of Management. The Board of Management draws up the basic plans and runs the business but is responsible to the workers' council. The Director of the enterprise, appointed by the management board of the Higher Economic Association, manages the enterprise. He is an *ex-officio* member of the management board. In a recent review of the working of workers' councils in Yugoslavia by the 'Economist' it has been pointed out that an Engine Factory in 'RAKONICA' near Belgrade, once a pioneer in self-management, is now torn by bitter internal disagreement and strikes. The review goes on to say that in other parts of Yugoslavia the workers on the whole still remain alienated from the management. There is a feeling among them that they are often a second class citizen who can at any time be outvoted as well as outwitted by the educated professionals on the management. They also have some resentment against officials and clerks who earn fixed salaries.⁶

A study conducted by Roffery Park Institute in 1960 has concluded, 'The working of Joint Management Councils in Europe is on the whole a failure.'

Besides Europe, the scheme of participation has also been tried in U.S.A. and in U.S.S.R. These are two extreme cases.

United States of America: The experience is quite different. Far from asking for a share in management, the American unions want management to run the business and wish to be left alone to claim their share of the spoils through collective bargaining. The management view, on the other hand, is, 'we will attend to making profit; you will get your share through bargaining'. A dynamic and assertive management is in no hurry to part with its prerogatives and

responsibilities. The President of the C.I.D. declared: "To relieve the boss or the management of proper responsibility for making a success of the enterprise is about the last thing any group of employees—organised or unorganized—would consider workable or even desirable."⁷ Though the areas of labour participation are limited, collective bargaining agreements are very extensive in scope. American labour has secured many rights by this device such as an access to company's books, to be represented by unions in grievance procedures, to be consulted in regard to job specification, apprenticeship programmes and re-absorption of workers etc.

Soviet Russia: Nearer the scene of production, industrial establishments are run on the basis of one-man management. There is nothing corresponding to a Board of Directors. The Director alone constitutes the management. He is personally responsible for every thing in the industry. At meetings, permanent production conferences, technical economic conferences and meetings of managerial personnel together with front-rank person, called by the directors of the enterprises, the trade unions discuss questions of the operation of their sections, shops and enterprises reveal the urgent needs of production and outline ways to meet them. The breaking of construction records in the constant endeavour of every manager, technician or manual worker. "Emulation the most wide-scale and all-embracing form of worker participation in the management of production in U.S.S.R."⁸ Workers, engineers, technicians, and office employees contribute corrections and amendments to the State plans, find out and utilize reserves in production, exercise, through their trade union organisations, control over norms, rates and wages, render practical assistance to public and economic organisations. "Patriotism and the desire to build up socialism play their part in Soviet Russia as the chief motivation force."⁹

An analysis of different stages of labour-management cooperation in various countries reveals that the forms adopted widely differs. What matters is not the form but the attitudes of both labour and management towards the entire production. Labour and management are not conflicting groups but cooperation elements, both indispensable, to the ultimate objective of maximum production and human happiness. United States and Soviet Russia, though poles apart in their approaches to economic problems and the structure of labour parti-

icipation in management, have both succeeded well in achieving or even exceeding their production targets.

WORKERS' PARTICIPATION IN INDIA

In India the experiment with labour management Cooperation has mainly taken two forms:

- (i) Statutory Works Committees or Joint Committees; and
- (ii) Voluntary Joint Management Councils.

STATUTORY WORKS COMMITTEES

Section 3 (1) (2) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 provides for the setting up of works Committees consisting of representatives of management and employees in every undertaking employing 100 or more workers. The objectives were; (i) to promote measures for securing and preserving amity and good relations between employers and workmen; (ii) to comment upon matters of their common interest or concern; and (iii) endeavour to compose any material difference of opinion in respect of matters of policy.¹⁰ The First Five Year Plan looked upon it as 'the key of the system of industrial relations',¹¹ for it aims at getting rid of the division between the workers and management within the undertaking and welding them into a team. Legal requirement and the encouragement given by the Government led the setting up of these committees in a number of industrial undertakings. The number of such committees was 1,142 in 1951; 2,574 in 1959-60 (out of the 4,730 required to be set up) and 3,133 in 1965-66 (out of the 5,091 required to be set up).¹² However the experience of the working of these committees has been less encouraging. Research Studies reveal that due to a number of reasons these committees have been ineffective in the attainment of their avowed objective.

Joint Management Councils: Joint Management councils owe their origin to the following observation made in Government's Industrial Policy Resolution of 1956: 'In a socialist democracy, labour is a partner in the common task of development and should participate in it. . . . There should be joint consultation and workers and technicians should wherever possible be associated progressively in management. Enterprises in the public sector have to set an example in

this respect.¹³ This approach of Planning Commission was accepted both by Government and Parliament. In order to get first-hand information the Government decided in 1956 to send abroad a Tripartite Study Group under the chairmanship of Shri Vishnu Sahay, the Secretary in the Ministry of Labour. It submitted its report in 1957 which was discussed by the Indian Labour Conference in its 15th Session held in July, 1957. A sub-committee was appointed to consider details of the scheme of workers' participation in management. A draft agreement concerning the establishment of Joint Management Council was finally approved by this sub-committee. The present scheme of Joint Management Council is based upon this draft which was subsequently modified by the two Seminars on Labour Management Cooperation in 1958 and 1960.

The essential features of the scheme are: (1) it is a voluntary scheme not to be pushed forth by any legislation; (2) the council should consist of equal number of representatives of management and employees and all decisions to be taken unanimously; (3) the council is entitled to be consulted on certain specified matters; (4) in some others management is expected to share information with the council; and (5) in a set of functions like welfare amenities, supervision of safety means scheduling of work etc., the administrative responsibility is to be given to the councils. For well-known reasons all matters like wages, bonus, conditions of work, etc., which were the subject for collective bargaining, are excluded from the jurisdiction of the councils. Since 1960-61, the Joint Management Councils started appearing in both private and public sector: There has been a steady progress in their development as is seen from the following figures:¹⁴

Year	<i>Number of Councils</i>
1961-62	30
1962-63	53
1963-64	80
1964-65	90
1965-66	136
1968-69	150

Besides these two schemes, some employers introduced other schemes like Profit Sharing and Workers' representation on the Boards

of top management. Labour representatives were included in the Boards of Trustees in Bombay and Madras Port Trusts but in no way it has brought any noticeable change in the outlook of the port authorities in regard to labour. In the case of Sindri Chemical & Fertilizers Ltd., the Vishakapatnam Shipbuilding Yard and the Air Corporations, labour representatives have also been included on the boards of directors. But the experience is not happy. Labour unions are weak with full infiltration of outsiders and are not, therefore, competent partners in the field of collective bargaining. Workers are not equipped with technical and other general knowledge. Unions are financially very poor and labour representatives are easily purchased and made ineffective by the employers.

CRITICAL APPRAISAL

A number of Study and Research Groups have reported that the functioning of Works Committees and Joint Management Councils in the field of Workers' Participation has not been successful and the objectives with which they were started have not been achieved to a great extent. Some of these observations are as follows :¹⁵

"Works Committees have not been successful and Joint Management Councils have failed to create the necessary climate of mutual trust. Merely creating them in form will not advance the objective."

(INTUC Representative)

"They have failed to produce the impact expected mainly because the right atmosphere of labour management relationship was absent."

(Study Group—Northern Region)

"Andhra Pradesh Works Committees, according to the Government Labour Department, were a failure and they are not supported by trade unions."

(Study Group—Southern Region)

"Usefulness of Works Committees is in doubt in Madras and Joint Management Councils set up in 18 units show no sign of their utility."

"Joint Management Councils and Works Committees are not in evidence in the state of Mysore."

(Study Group—Southern Region)

The general report of these Study Groups is that legal compulsion notwithstanding only 40 to 60% of the establishments have these works committees and out of them only a few function effectively, the majority of them existing only in name. An official review of the working of Joint Management Councils in 1961 admitted that the working was not satisfactory and the workers in public sector undertakings were fast losing faith in the usefulness of this scheme. Even the National Commission on Labour has reported that 'there does not appear to be much support for the institution of Joint Management Councils in their present form. They are reported to be ineffective and their functioning unsatisfactory in many cases.'¹⁶ It thus appears that the scheme is most ineffective. The reasons for this are not far to seek. They are :—

(i) Lack of proper understanding of the concept, purposes and benefits of the scheme by management, workers and their unions; (ii) Apathy of both management and workers' unions—Management regards them as agencies to deprive them of their managerial prerogatives and authority and trade unions consider them to be their rivals; (iii) Multiplicity of unions always obstructs in the smooth working of committees or councils. There is inter-union rivalry; (iv) Mediocrity and lack of education and training among workers to understand problems of industrial relations and other problems like productivity, quality, cost, finance, etc; (v) Workers' primary interest is in wages, higher bonus, lower hours of work, better conditions of service etc. therefore lose their interest in them; (vi) Participation is limited only to an advisory role and even unanimous decisions are not implemented by employers; and (vii) Existence of mutual antagonism and a feeling of distrust and suspicion.

PRE-REQUISITES OF SUCCESS

Opinions are that at the present stage of economy India does not offer tempting conditions for the introduction of workers' participation in its right perspective. A number of pre-requisites are suggested for its success :¹⁷

(1) Standard of workers to be reasonably improved to assure a life of desirable human existence. Wide disparities of income to be minimized or removed as far as possible;

(2) The interest of the workers must be created in the productive process by sharing the gains of productivity, by securing their wages, better working conditions, reduced hours of work, increased production with no fear of unemployment and provision of safety measures.

(3) Workers should have freedom to organize, to speak and to shoulder responsibility in their respective sphere of work inside and outside the factory.

(4) There should be established first a thorough and sound system of consultation, suggestion and communication between employers and employees.

(5) Workers' participation should be introduced at all levels of management and not limited to top management only.

(6) A good climate of mutual confidence and trust to be created amongst workers.

(7) Employees, technocrats and others to be educated and trained.

(8) Trade unions have to be strong, recognized and financially stable to safeguard the interests of the workers through collective bargaining.

(9) Industry has to be organised on cooperative lines in which workers not only contribute labour but capital also.

EXTRAVAGANT EXPECTATIONS.

There has been a considerable amount of loose thinking in India about labour participation in management. The much advertised slogan of the 'Socialist Pattern of Society' has raised illusory expectations in every walk of life. "The common man is fed on mental visions of a society at some indefinite future period. As part of this heady vision of the future, the ordinary worker is led to believe that a day would come when he will participate in management. Imagination runs riot with mental possibilities and labour leaders can be excused if they begin to think that a push chair in the managing director's room is their appropriate place."¹⁸ Amidst such promises the workers are puffed up but they are highly disillusioned by subsequent plain speaking when participation is first reduced to cooperation and then to mere consultation.

So long as the concept of 'class war' between workers and employers exists, an atmosphere of antagonism, conflict and suspicion

is bound to be there. Gandhiji said, 'I do not think there need be any clash between capital and labour. Each is dependent on the other; hence they should supplement and help each other. They should be a great family living in unity and harmony, capital not only looking to the material welfare of the labourers but to their moral welfare also.'¹⁹ Class war concept should, therefore, be replaced by class collaboration.

Industrial democracy is considered to yield increases in 'output per man-hour', to resolve 'inter-group tensions' and to give 'worker-satisfaction.' For the realisation of these aims it is necessary that all partners to industrial relationship—employers, employees, technocrats—should reconstitute themselves into a big 'Industrial Family' where each constituent should be motivated with high aims of national prosperity and human happiness. Both the workers and employers are to give up the lust of their ego and rights and be conscious of the fulfilment of their duties and responsibilities towards others. National, industrial and Group priorities should be respected to maintain the ideals of an organised society. Success will ultimately depend upon the willingness and desire of all the members of the 'industrial family' to work together for the larger interests in an atmosphere of confidence and mutual trust.

REFERENCES

1. 'The Rationable of Workers' Participation in Management' by G. C. Hallen: *Economic Times* dated Oct. 14, '1968.
2. Dale Yoder, *Personnel Principles and Policies*, P. 185.
3. V. G. Mhetras, *Labour Participation in Management*, pp. 18—20.
4. Cole, G.D.H., 'Self-Government in Industry', p. 263.
5. Quoted in: V. B. Singh, "Industrial Relations in India" [Ed.]—Chapter XXVI, p. 405.
6. *Eastern Economist*—Annual Number, 1970, p. 1311. Article by J. S. K. Patel, 'Labour Participation in Management'.
7. K. N. Subramanian, 'Labour Management Relations in India', p.337.
8. *Ibid*: p. 338
9. 'Labour Problems in Indian Industry' by V. V. Giri, p.200.
10. The Industrial Disputes Act, 1947: Section 3[2].
11. *The Plan*, pp. 576-77.
12. National Commission on Labour; Chapter XXIV, p.342.
13. Second Five Year Plan, p.49.
14. *Eastern Economist*—Annual Number: 1970, p.1313, Figures for 1968-69 have been taken from: National Commission on Labour—Chapter XXIV, p. 344.

15. *Economic Times* : December 8, 1968; An article on Labour Participation by Economics.
16. National Commission on Labour: Chapter 24th; p.344.
17. *Economic Times*: November 4, 1968; An article by G. C. Hallen.
18. K. N. Subramanian, 'Labour Management Relations in India', Chapter IX, p.343.
19. Autobiography : p. 365.