

## TRADE UNIONISM IN DELHI'S BUILDING INDUSTRY

*The paper analyses trade unionism in the building industry in the Delhi area with special reference to its history, workers' knowledge of their union, and their union-participation. The authors find that unionism in the industry is of recent origin, weak, and fragmented because of the migratory nature of the workforce, the temporary nature of work, the prevalence of family and gang employment, and pressure of unemployment. They also observe that union-participation and knowledge of unions is low among workers.*

### SCOPE AND METHOD OF THE STUDY

**T**HE purpose of this paper is to analyse the nature of trade unionism in Delhi's building industry. The paper starts with a brief description of the special characteristics of the building industry and its workforce and is followed by an account of the development and present position of trade unionism. In subsequent sections the social attributes of the union members, workers' knowledge of their unions, their participation in union activities, and reasons for the workers' joining or not joining any union are analysed. The last section sums up our main findings.

**Dr. S. M. Pandey** is Research Officer at the Shri Ram Centre for Industrial Relations, New Delhi.

**Mr. C. M. Vikram** is Research Associate at the Shri Ram Centre for Industrial Relations, New Delhi.

The present paper forms part of a larger study entitled "Employment Relations in the Building Industry in Delhi Area", completed under the supervision of Dr. C. K. Johri. The authors are grateful to Miss Kamlesh Vaid for help in collecting the data and its processing for the computer and to Mr. K. N. Vaid for comments on an earlier draft of the paper.

The paper is mainly based on data collected through interviews with randomly selected 713 workers, on the basis of a questionnaire, conducted during January-March 1968. The scope of the study was restricted to organised building industry in the Delhi area, excluding private housing as well as the work-charged employees of the Central Public Works Department (C.P.W.D.), and workers engaged in the maintenance and development of lands. These were excluded because our study was focussed upon the workers employed on new building work-sites only. It may be noted that the sample covers only workers who were directly involved in building activities and, thus, leaves out clerks and "munshis" but includes "mistris" and supervisors. Further, while all the public sector building work-sites in progress at the time of survey were covered, the private non-housing work-sites were selected on the basis of random number tables.

One of the earliest findings of the research team was that the building activity in Delhi was at a very low ebb due to recession. So it is conceivable that in a more normal period, the structure of the workforce may be somewhat different and that it may also be reflected in the extent of union membership and other related matters.

For the purpose of data collection, workers were divided into three categories, *viz.*, skilled, semi-skilled, and unskilled as defined below :

**Skilled :** Masons, Carpenters, Electricians, Sanitary-fitters, Mechanics, Painters, Black-smiths, Mistris, and Supervisors.

**Semi-skilled :** Bhistis (water-sprayers), Glaziers, Bandhanis (scaffolders) and other such workers who might be working as skilled workers but were in the process of acquiring skills.

**Unskilled :** Beldars (male-mazdoor), Kulis (female-mazdoor), helpers to the skilled and semi-skilled workers, adolescents, and children.

These three categories of workers display basic differences in terms of skills possessed, remuneration, work assignment, and the contractors' perception of the relative group importance. The proportion of the skilled, semi-skilled, and unskilled workers varied from one work-site to other and from one stage of the building activity to other. We decided to interview ten per cent of the workers working on the work-sites falling in our sample and the proportion of ten per

cent in the universe was maintained within the three strata of the workers. The aggregate proportion of the skilled, semi-skilled, and unskilled workers was 28 : 12 : 60 in every 100 workers covered in our sample.

## THE INDUSTRY AND ITS WORKFORCE

According to the workforce data of the 1961 census, summarised in Table 1, the building construction industry in Delhi employs more than four per cent of the total non-agricultural workforce and employs more professional, technical, administrative, executive, and managerial workers than in the rest of India. This may be because the building industry in Delhi employs more advanced technology requiring more skilled and technical personnel for constructing massive structures on modern lines than in many other States in India. The industry contributes nearly three per cent of the national income originating from the non-agricultural sector in India.<sup>1</sup> A little more than one-fifth of the total cost is the cost of labour inputs which is much higher than in organised manufacturing industries in India.<sup>2</sup> The industry is further characterised by temporary nature of work, seasonally employed and geographically mobile gang labour, small-sized firms, local product market due to very little use of pre-fabricated structures, high rate of labour turnover on individual work-sites and absence of stable employer-employee relationships.<sup>3</sup> These special characteristics of the building industry have largely influenced the nature of its trade-unionism.

Our survey<sup>4</sup> reveals that as many as 96 per cent of the respondents came to Delhi from neighbouring States—one-half from Rajasthan, one-third from Uttar Pradesh, and the rest from the Punjab, Haryana, and other States of India. The workers migrating from Rajasthan and Uttar Pradesh were mostly unskilled or semi-skilled while those migrating from other States were skilled. The economic compulsions were found to be the most important reasons for their migration. Thus, "no work at home" and "insufficient income at home", or "indebtedness" accounted for the migration of nearly 70 per cent of the respondents while "prospects for a better job in Delhi" was the main motivation of only 12 per cent of the respondents.

Our study of the socio-economic characteristics of the workers

reveals that an overwhelming majority of them were rural in origin (90%), male (82%), married (78%), illiterate (*i.e.*, those who could neither read nor write in any language—63%), unskilled (60%), Harijans (*i.e.*, low caste Hindus—67%), and in the age-group of 18-34 years (63%). It may be noted that most women workers were doing unskilled jobs with their husbands or other relatives. Among the illiterate, the majority of the workers were of rural origin (65%) and were Harijans (69%). Surprisingly, only 67 per cent of the skilled workers were found to be literate. The proportion of literates was much lower among semi-skilled (29%) and unskilled (25%) workers. As many as 61 per cent of the workers stated that they were dissatisfied with their jobs, and 75 per cent were contemplating to shift from the building industry to other jobs. This suggests that the workforce is not committed to the industry.

As many as 53 per cent of the respondents had put in between one and ten years' service in the building industry. A characteristic feature of the building workers is that, excepting a few, they generally started their career as unskilled or semi-skilled workers and after acquiring necessary skills by putting in several years of service in the industry, became skilled workers. Therefore, skilled workers had longer years of service in the industry to their credit than either semi-skilled or unskilled workers. A higher proportion of the skilled (49%) than semi-skilled (34%) or unskilled (23%) workers in our sample had put in ten or more years' service in the industry. There is a positive relationship between the age of the workers and their duration of service in the industry. Thus, 54 per cent and 71 per cent of the workers who were in the age groups of 34-50 years or 50 or more years had put in ten or more years' service in the industry respectively as compared to only 24 per cent who were in the age group of less than 34 years.

## TRADE UNIONISM

### BRIEF HISTORY OF UNIONS

The first attempt at organising the building workers in Delhi was made in early 1948 by the local Communist workers led by Chhajju Ram, a C.P.W.D. employees' leader, and, consequently, a union by

the name "The All India Building Workers' Union" (AIBWU) was formed the same year. The office-bearers of the AIBWU were mostly Communists and their sympathisers, but for some reasons the union was not affiliated to the AITUC. It appears that there were differences of opinion between the local Communist leaders and the office-bearers of the AIBWU on the question of affiliation as well as on wider political and ideological issues. These differences ultimately led to the expulsion of Chhajju Ram, general secretary of the AIBWU, from the membership of the Communist Party of India in 1950. This started a power tussle within the AIBWU ending in favour of Chhajju Ram and his followers. Since then the AIBWU has been under their control.

The Communist workers tried to make good the loss by forming a rival union, "The Building Karmachari Union" (BKU) in late 1950 with Ganeshi Lal as its president and A. C. Nanda as general secretary. The BKU, however, failed to be an effective rival of the AIBWU and its activities were mainly confined to a few localities, particularly the Subzimandi area. In course of time the influence of the BKU declined further. Subsequently in 1958, to gain more control over the building workers, some Communists, led by Baldev Singh, an office-bearer of the BKU, formed another union in the same name but with a different registration. This union gained some influence among the workers and also won over some of the members of the AIBWU.

During the Chinese aggression in 1962, Baldev Singh was detained. In his absence, Diwan Chand, one of his associates, acted as the president of the union. When Baldev Singh was released, a sharp leadership conflict arose, and he levelled charges against the acting president of misappropriating union funds and destroying union records. Mutual recriminations continued for a while, but eventually resulted in a split. Diwan Chand and his followers resigned and formed in 1963 yet another union called the "Road and Building Karmachari Union" (RBKU). The new union set up two offices, looked after respectively by Diwan Chand and his brother Chotey Lal. In the same year, the BKU lost its registration due to its failure to submit the annual returns under the Trade Unions Act, 1926. The re-registration of the union being possibly more difficult than the registration of a new union, Baldev Singh and his supporters formed "The Building Mazdoor Union" (BMU) and got it duly registered in 1964. All the office-

bearers of the defunct union retained their respective positions in the new union.

Unfortunately, the BMU could not free itself from intra-union rivalries either and, as it turned out, with the sharpening of cleavage between the Right and the Left wings of the Communist Party of India, these became intensified. The Left Communists walked out of the BMU and formed another union, the "Building and Road Mazdoor Union" (BRMU) in 1965 with G. L. Bakshi as its president. However, within a few months of its formation, the BRMU witnessed a split and one group led by D. S. Musafir broke away from it and formed an independent union, "Building Mazdoor Ekta Union" (BMEU).

The above account reveals that it is not different from the state of trade unionism in other industries so far as the intra-union rivalries based on personality and political factors are concerned. This has been mainly responsible for the formation of small and rival trade unions, functioning on locality basis, suffering from serious organisational weaknesses, and incapable of conducting any worthwhile service activities for the building workers.

#### PRESENT POSITION OF THE UNIONS

At the end of 1967 there were six registered unions of building workers in Delhi.<sup>5</sup> The dates of their registration, their affiliation and membership are presented in Table 2. These unions are industrial unions and cover all categories of workers—skilled, semi-skilled, and unskilled. Although the building industry employs quite a large number of skilled craftsmen, no craft-union has been formed so far, one main reason being that their work places are scattered in different parts of Delhi and that these change very often. The table also shows variations between the membership figures claimed by the union leaders interviewed and those submitted to the Registrar of Trade Unions.

Out of the six unions, the AIBWU appears to be the strongest and comparatively better known among workers. This union has not experienced any split since 1950, although it has been changing its affiliations from time to time. The AIBWU played an active role in organising the successful strike of building workers in 1964 for wage increase. As a result the membership of the union recorded a sharp increase from nearly 8,000 in 1963-64 to more than 17,000 in 1964-65.

but declined to about 14,000 in 1966-67. The INTUC has been trying since 1963 to make inroads among the building workers but has not met with much success. The two unions that claimed to be "independent" are, in fact, not independent. The BRMU and BKEU are breakaway unions from the AITUC, and are influenced by the CPI (Left).

The main source of unions' income is membership subscriptions, varying from three to six rupees per annum per worker. The subscription rates are generally the same for all categories of workers, although in some unions these vary with their wage-rates. The union leaders we interviewed felt that the income was insufficient to meet even the basic needs of union organisation and administration. The collection of subscription is a serious problem, and according to the general secretary of one of the effective unions, the collection charges work out to roughly one-third of the total dues collected. If we compare the income and expenditure figures (Table 3) with the membership figures, we find that either the majority of the members did not pay their dues, or the unions did not disclose their actual incomes, or the claimed membership figures were highly exaggerated.

The membership subscriptions are generally collected through the union delegates at work-sites. The delegates collect the subscriptions sometimes directly but mostly through the jamadars. Some of the jamadars themselves work as union delegates and generally collect the dues from semi-skilled and unskilled workers through check-off. Another practice followed by the unions is to refuse their assistance to the workers till their dues are paid. The workers seek union help mostly in getting their unpaid wages from the contractors or adequate compensation for the injuries sustained during work. Many a time a union may contest workers' court cases and claim a share in it if the case is decided in their favour. In addition, special funds are sometimes raised for the purpose of organising demonstrations and strikes.

The organisational structure of the unions is very loose. The president and the general secretary control the affairs of the union, and the General Body, the General Council, and the Central Executive Committee, though provided in union constitutions, in fact exist only on paper. The offices of the unions are generally located at the residence of the president or the general secretary generally without any full-time staff. We had to make several visits

to union offices to see the president or the general secretary and most of the time neither of them was available. In such a situation, it can be imagined that the building workers must be facing lot of problems just in waiting upon the office-bearers of the union and in the follow-up of their grievances.

## SURVEY FINDINGS

### EXTENT OF UNIONISATION

The loose organisation and weak financial position of the unions accompanied by the scattered and shifting character of the workforce have imposed serious restrictions upon their activities and, hence, it is not surprising that they have not even been able to make their existence known to the majority of workers. As Table 4 reveals, 63 per cent of the respondents stated that they were not aware of the existence of any union of the building workers in Delhi. In fact, only 50 per cent skilled, 47 per cent semi-skilled, and 29 per cent unskilled workers stated that they knew about the existence of any union. The relationship between skill and knowledge about the existence of any union is found to be statistically significant. This shows that there is greater awareness of union among the skilled workers than the rest.

This lack of awareness of unions among the majority of building workers is mainly responsible for the very low level of unionisation among them. Only 18 per cent of the respondents stated that they were union members. However, if we reckon only those workers who were aware of the existence of a union, then the extent of unionisation works out to nearly 50 per cent. It is significant to note that only 7 out of 131 female workers, all of whom were unskilled, stated that they were union members. An important reason for the low level of unionisation seems to be the peculiar perception of union membership among the building workers. If the husband is member of a union the wife does not feel the need for enrolling herself as a member. Similarly, if the leader of a gang is a union member, other workers of that gang generally do not join it. Their loyalty is possibly implicit in the membership of the husband or the gang leader as the case may be. Moreover, in the event of any grievance, the wife first contacts her



husband, and other unskilled workers generally approach their jamadars. Therefore it appears that the majority of women and unskilled workers have not perceived the need for a union, far less the necessity of paying union dues regularly. Another important reason for a low degree of unionisation among unskilled and semi-skilled workers is that the supply of these categories of workers is much more than the demand, and, consequently, the problem before these workers is to secure and maintain employment in the tight employment market rather than concentrate on betterment of their conditions of work.

The distribution of union members and non-members vis-a-vis their social attributes is presented in Tables 5 to 9. We find that union membership is positively associated with skill. Thus, 24 per cent skilled as compared with 21 per cent semi-skilled and only 14 per cent unskilled workers were union members. A larger proportion of urban (21%) than rural (17%) workers were union members. The workers who were either too young, *i.e.*, less than 18 years of age (19%), or too old, *i.e.*, 50 or more years of age (14%) joined unions in lesser proportions than those who were in the age groups of 18-34 years (18%) or 34-50 years (23%). Similarly, a larger proportion of workers who had put in ten or more years of service in the industry (27%) than those who had put in less than one year or 1-10 years of service in the industry (17% and 6% respectively) were union members. Finally, a larger proportion of satisfied (19%) than not satisfied (16%) workers were union members. These findings are logical because as the workers mature in their age and gain work experience, they come in grips with realities, encounter more problems and, therefore, look towards some protective organisation such as the trade union. Finally, a higher proportion of urban than rural workers joined unions mainly because the latter were largely illiterate, unskilled, and were not exposed to the very concept of unionism. They deal with their jamadars who give them employment and pay their wages. If they have problems at work-sites they go through the jamadars who, as has been noted earlier, also collect union dues. It is quite apparent that for many workers the distinction between the union and the jamadar is completely blurred. It is evident that the double role of jamadar as sub-employer and union organiser has prevented the emergence of direct employment relationships and has accordingly stunted the growth of unions.

## PARTICIPATION IN UNION ACTIVITIES

It is hypothesised that because of the prevalence of illiteracy, predominant rural background of workers, weak and fragmented trade union movement, and ineffective channels of communication between the leaders and union members, the latter's participation in union activities would also be very low. In the absence of any study on this aspect of union membership in India, we devised some indicators of members' knowledge of the union and their participation in union activities:

## (i) Indicators of members' knowledge :

- (a) knowledge of the name of the union;
- (b) knowledge of the location of union office;
- (c) knowledge of the name of president or secretary of union.

## (ii) Indicators of members' participation :

- (a) payment of union dues;
- (b) talking about the union with friends;
- (c) attending union meetings;
- (d) voting in the last union elections;
- (e) making new members.

Table 10 showing the skill-wise distribution of members' responses regarding their knowledge of the union lends support to the above hypothesis. The table shows that six per cent and forty-three per cent members respectively knew the name of union and the location of the union office. However, a much higher proportion of them (62%) knew the name of either the president or the general secretary of the union. The reason why more members knew the names of the union office-bearers than either the name of the union or location of union office is that a union is more commonly identified as "so-and-so's" union rather than "such-and-such" union.<sup>6</sup> There are significant variations in members' responses according to their skill—the knowledge of the union being much better in the case of skilled than unskilled members. The relationships between the skill and knowledge of the union is found to be statistically significant for the second and third indicators but not for the first.

Members' participation in union activities, evaluated on the criteria mentioned above, was found to be generally low. As Table 11

shows, although 59 per cent of the members stated that they paid union dues regularly, only 11 per cent stated that they generally attended union meetings, 42 per cent rarely attended union meetings, and 47 per cent never attended any union meeting. Twenty-six per cent members stated that they voted in the last union elections. Only 8 per cent members worked for enrolling new members generally, 28 per cent did it only sometimes, while 66 per cent never worked for making new members. However, a much larger proportion of them (60%) talked about the union with their friends. Analysed according to their skill, we find that more unskilled workers (62%) paid their dues regularly than the skilled (58%) workers. This is mainly because, as stated earlier, the membership dues are deducted by the jamadars from the unskilled workers' wages at the time of wage-payment while skilled workers pay their dues voluntarily. More skilled workers than semi-skilled or unskilled workers said that they participated in union activities. However, the relationship between skill and members' participation in union activities is not statistically significant.

#### WHY WORKERS' JOIN UNIONS?

Workers are motivated to join a trade union by a variety of reasons. This section reports the reasons given by 129 workers who were also union members. Keeping in view the peculiar characteristics of the building industry, we have grouped workers' responses about the reasons for which they joined one or other union under the following five categories: (i) "wage increase", (ii) "redressal of grievances", (iii) "workers' unity and solidarity", (iv) "on some one's persuasion", and (v) "miscellaneous". As is revealed by Table 12, on the whole, 40 per cent respondents joined a union for "wage increase", 16 per cent for "redressal of grievances", 27 per cent "on some one's persuasion", while only 7 per cent for the reason of "workers' unity and solidarity", and the remaining 10 per cent for "miscellaneous" reasons.

Skill-wise analysis of members' responses reveals significant variations. Thus, while 52 per cent unskilled and 30 per cent semi-skilled members joined a union for "wage increase", the proportion of skilled members is only 2 per cent. Similarly, while 48 per cent semi-skilled and 32 per cent unskilled members joined a union "on some one's persuasion", only 13 per cent skilled members did so for this reason.

There appears to be a negative relationship between members' skill and their joining the union for "redressal of grievances" and "workers' unity and solidarity". This may be because semi-skilled and unskilled workers deal mostly with jamadars and mistris only and in the event of any dispute with the contractor, they go through jamadars and mistris rather than bother the unions. The relationship between skill and reasons for joining the union is found to be statistically significant.

An analysis of members' responses according to their literacy level (Table 13) shows that a higher proportion of literate (45%) than illiterate (37%) members joined union for "wage increase" though both the groups assigned first rank to this reason. But, while illiterate members assigned second rank to "on some one's persuasion" (37%) and third rank to "redressal of grievances" (12%), the literate members assigned second rank to "redressal of grievances" (17%), and third rank to "on some one's persuasion" (14%). We also find that a comparatively larger proportion of literate (9%) than illiterate (5%) members joined union for "workers' unity and solidarity". The relationship between members' literacy level and reasons for joining the union is found to be statistically significant. However, as pointed out in an earlier section, skill and literacy level are positively associated with each other, and, therefore, the relationship established here may not be a real one.

#### WHY DO WORKERS NOT JOIN UNIONS?

We have also inquired into the reasons for which a large majority of building workers did not join any union. Their responses, presented in Table 14, show that as many as 64 per cent did not join any union because they had no definite knowledge of the union; 11 per cent because no body asked them to join a union; an equal proportion because they did not feel any need to do so; 4 per cent because they had no confidence in union leaders; and 2% due to temporary and shifting nature of their job. Skill-wise analysis of their responses shows that a much larger proportion of unskilled (74%) and semi-skilled (53%) than skilled (42%) workers assigned first rank to "no definite knowledge of any union". On the other hand, more of skilled (27%) than semi-skilled (9%) and unskilled (5%) workers did so because of "no need to join any union". Similarly, more of skilled (1%)

than semi-skilled (6%) and unskilled (3%) workers did not join any union due to "no confidence in union leaders". The relationship between non-members' skill and reasons for not joining the union is found to be statistically significant.

It is logical to assume that the literate workers are more aware of union activities and their relative advantages and disadvantages and, therefore, if they do not join a union it is probably for reasons other than lack of knowledge of it or absence of persuasion from others. Table 15 shows a much larger proportion of illiterate (71%) than literate (51%) workers did not join the union because they had "no definite knowledge of any union". Similarly, more of illiterate (12%) than literate (10%) workers did not join any union because no body asked them to do so. On the other hand, it is of significance that a much larger proportion of literates (21%) than illiterates (5%) did not join a union because they did not feel any need to do so. Finally, more of literate (5%) than illiterate (3%) workers stated "no confidence in union leaders" as their main reason for not joining the union. The relationship between literacy and reasons for workers' not joining the union is found to be statistically significant.

The leaders of the six unions were also asked to state the main reasons for which the majority of workers do not join any union. Their responses as summarised in Table 16 show that most of them emphasised the migratory character of the workforce, illiteracy, fear of victimisation, scattered nature of work-sites, and prevalence of gang labour as factors for low degree of unionisation among the building workers.

## SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Trade unionism in Delhi's building industry, which is of relatively recent origin, is weak and fragmented. Union finances are insufficient to launch any effective organisation campaign among the building workers who are widely scattered and who keep on moving from place to place. As a result of this, as our survey findings show, less than one-fifth of the workers are union members. The extent of unionisation will probably be much less in the residential building sector. The prevalence of family and gang work, lack of workers' commitment to industry, and excess of supply of unskilled and semi-skilled workers

over their demand are also responsible for the low degree of unionisation. It appears that skilled, literate, and urban origin workers are more prone to unionisation than the unskilled, illiterate and rural origin workers. A tentative analysis also brings out positive correlations between unionisation and duration of work experience in the industry.

While members' knowledge of their unions is found to be low generally, it appears to be better among skilled than unskilled workers. The participation of members in union activities is also quite low although a majority of them do talk about the union with their friends and pay union dues regularly. As may be expected, participation in union activities is generally more among the skilled than the unskilled workers except in the matter of payment of union dues where unskilled workers were more regular than the skilled. This is mainly because while the jamadars deduct union dues from the wages of unskilled workers the skilled workers pay them voluntarily.

The workers joined unions due to a variety of reasons but a predominant majority of them did so, in descending order, for "wage increase", "on some one's persuasion" and "redressal of grievances". The workers who joined union for "wage increase" and "on some one's persuasion" were predominantly unskilled or semi-skilled, new to the industry and were not satisfied with their jobs. But, more skilled and literate workers joined unions for "redressal of grievances" and "workers' unity and solidarity".

Our study of the non-members' responses about the reasons for their not joining any union reveals that the majority of them either do not know the union or because no body asked them to join any union. About one-tenth of the respondents have not felt any need to join a union. Significantly the respondents who gave first importance to "no definite knowledge of any union" and "nobody asked me to join any union" were predominantly unskilled and illiterate and lesser experienced. While those who gave importance to "no need to join any union" or "no confidence in union leaders" were skilled and literate.

It appears that the building industry is, due to its traditional character and the nature of its workforce, still not ripe for a very high degree of unionisation. However, it may be stated that at least a fraction of building workers who stated that they did not join any

union either because they had no definite knowledge about the union (63%) or because they were not approached by any union organiser to do so (11%) could have possibly been unionised but for the weaknesses of the trade unions and their inability to approach the workers and maintain rapport with them.

One major weakness of the building unions in Delhi is that most of their leaders are local professionals who are more preoccupied with safeguarding their own self-interests which often leads to inter- as well as intra-union rivalries. Their activities are largely restricted to only a small proportion of the workers working on larger and easily accessible work-sites. They seem to lack the motivation for organising the workers employed on small and widely scattered work-sites located in remote places whose working conditions might probably be worse than their counterparts on the larger work-sites. There is, thus, a need for developing a cadre of devoted union activists, preferably from among the building workers themselves, who may devise suitable strategies and launch a vigorous and intensive organising campaign among the workers and keep track of them from time to time. The need for trade union unity, therefore, is probably much higher in the building industry than in other organised industries in general. Further, the union leaders should try to win over the confidence of the workers and deal with them directly rather than dealing with the jamadars only. Branch offices of the unions should be set up in different localities to make it convenient for the workers to approach their leaders.

## REFERENCES

1. *Employment Relations in the Building Industry in Delhi Area*, Shri Ram Centre for Industrial Relations, New Delhi, 1968 (unpublished), Chapter I.
2. An analysis of the data published in the Annual Survey of Industries (ASI) shows that the labour cost is less than fifteen per cent of the total cost. See, Raj Krishna and S.S. Mehta, "Productivity Trends in Large Scale Industries", *Economic and Political Weekly*, Volume III, No. 43, October 26, 1968, p. 1656.
3. *Employment Relations in the Building Industry in Delhi Area*, *op. cit.*
4. *Ibid.*, Chapter II.
5. Besides these six unions, the following unions were functioning among the C.P.W.D. and other employees, who were not covered in this study.

<i>Name of the union</i>	<i>Date of registration</i>	<i>Memberships at the end of 1967</i>
C.P.W.D. Workers' Union	1934	5,350
C.P.W.D. Employees' Union	1963	4,371
N.B.C.C. Workers' Union	1966	157
N.B.C.C. Karmachari Union	Not registered	Not available
All India C. P.W.D. Employees' Union	Not available	Not available
The All India Union of C.P.W.D. Workers	Not available	Not available

Source : (i) Office of the Registrar of Trade Unions, Delhi.

(ii) Offices of the respective trade unions.

6. Considering the divisiveness in the trade union movement it is perhaps natural that the union as an institution has been replaced by the union leaders. It is important to know where they live rather than the names of the unions they may be leading at the moment. As has already been stated the union offices are indistinguishable from the residence of their leaders.