

made by the Rockefeller Foundation for equipment in the first case and Plant Morphology, in the other.

Shri S. C. Samanta: May I know, Sir, whether it is a fact that for rural development purposes this sum has been granted by Rockefeller Foundation under the U.S. Technical Assistance Programme?

Dr. P. S. Deshmukh: No, Sir. So far as I know, this has nothing to do with the U.S.A. Technical Programme and these grants were received directly and not through the Ministry of Agriculture.

Shri S. C. Samanta: May I know, Sir, whether in 1952, the second quarter, any sum was granted by the Rockefeller Foundation?

Dr. P. S. Deshmukh: It does not appear to be so, Sir. I am unable to say for certain.

Shrimati A. Kale: May I know whether collecting information regarding this is such an elaborate affair that it could not be done in 10 days?

Dr. P. S. Deshmukh: No, Sir. It is very difficult because these applications are sent by various institutions. It is not possible to collect the information, when the applications are not sent through the Ministry. It is not possible to know who have applied and who have got it. It is only whenever there is some indication that we could know the source from which to get the information.

Shri B. S. Murthy: May I know, Sir, whether these grants are allotted after due consultation with the Government concerned, or at least the Central Government?

Dr. P. S. Deshmukh: These two grants, as I have already stated, were given directly, Sir, without the Ministry of Agriculture having been consulted.

Pandit Munishwar Datt Upadhyay: May I know, Sir, whether these institutes to which the grants were given were Government institutes or private institutes?

Dr. P. S. Deshmukh: As it appears from the reply I have given, Sir, both are probably private institutions.

Shri B. S. Murthy: May I know, Sir, what are the conditions governing these grants?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The information is being collected.

Dr. Rama Rao: Do Government allow private institutions to accept gifts from foreign institutions directly without Government's knowledge?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: It has been asked in general terms. I am not going to allow this.

Shri S. C. Samanta: May I know whether different agricultural institutions in States have been asked to send applications for help from abroad through the Union Government?

Dr. P. S. Deshmukh: No, Sir, so far as the Ministry of Agriculture is concerned.

RAILWAY EMPLOYEES (PAY SCALES)

*1299. **Shri Nambiar:** Will the Minister of Railways be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that a large number of complaints against fixation of new scales of pay have been received from Class II, III and IV staff of all Railways;

(b) if so, whether Government propose to place on the Table of the House a statement showing the number of such complaints received in each Railway; and

(c) whether any steps are being taken to dispose of such complaints?

The Deputy Minister of Railways and Transport (Shri Alagesan):

(a) The major portion of the implementation of the Central Pay Commission's recommendations in regard to pay scales was completed during the years 1948-49 and a large number of complaints against fixation of pay scales were received during that period. The number of complaints received thereafter is very small.

(b) It is not possible to place on the Table of the House, a statement showing the number of such complaints received as no statistics are maintained thereof.

(c) All necessary steps are being taken to dispose of such complaints.

Shri Nambiar: May I know, Sir, whether the recommendations of the Anomalies Committee have been implemented?

Shri Alagesan: I am sorry, Sir: it was called the Joint Advisory Committee and it was created to correct certain anomalies that arose in the implementation of the C.P.C. scale. They sat over it for a number of months, went through all representations made to them and decisions

were taken and Government have also implemented most of the recommendations of the Joint Advisory Committee.

Shri Nambiar: Arising out of the answer, Sir, may I know whether the small complaints now received can be looked into and whether the applicants' points may be considered?

Shri Alagesan: I have already answered that question in part (c) that these complaints are being looked into and disposed of.

Shri H. N. Shastri: Is it a fact that the two Federations of railwaymen represented to the Government to refer certain disputed issues to Tribunals? If so, what action have the Government taken in the matter?

Shri Alagesan: Sir, it has been done very recently and the matter is under consideration.

Shri B. S. Murthy: May I know, Sir, why the Government have taken so much time in order to implement the recommendations of both the Pay Commission and the subsequent Joint Advisory Committee and allowed so many representations to be made?

Shri Alagesan: Sir, they have taken no time at all. These scales were implemented as early as 1-11-47. Subsequently, complaints arose as a result of some of the anomalies felt; and they were again referred to a Joint Advisory Committee which finished its labours by 1950 and soon after decisions were taken on the recommendations of the Joint Advisory Committee. There is no time lost at all.

Shri B. S. Murthy: Is it not a fact, Sir, that the Government in trying to give a twisted interpretation of the recommendations created two or three divisions in one category of employees and because of that only representations were made?

Shri Alagesan: I am sorry, Sir, there is no justification for any such opinion.

ALL INDIA RAILWAY MEN'S FEDERATION

*1300. **Shri Nambiar:** Will the Minister of Railways be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that the All India Railway Men's Federation came in a deputation to wait upon the Railway Board during the last week of November, 1952 and that the Railway Board refused to meet them;

(b) if so, why;

(c) whether it is a fact that as per the previous understanding, the representative from each affiliated union of the Federation was allowed to be present in the periodical meetings of the A.I.R.F. with the Railway Board and if so, why that facility is denied to the affiliated union now; and

(d) whether it is a fact that the subjects of discussion in the above proposed joint meeting are referred to the Rates Tribunal and if not, why not?

The Deputy Minister of Railways and Transport (Shri Alagesan):

(a) In accordance with the permanent negotiating machinery set up on Indian Government Railways, a quarterly meeting between the A.I.R.F. and the Railway Board was fixed for 26th November, 1952. After preliminary discussions regarding the number of delegates, the meeting was actually held on 3rd December, 1952.

(b) Does not arise.

(c) There was no such understanding as referred to in this part of the question.

(d) The procedure laid down for the working of the Negotiating Machinery referred to in the reply to part (a) of the question does not provide for any such reference to the Railway Rates Tribunal.

Shri Nambiar: May I know, Sir, whether there was any break in the discussions due to the fact that the Railwaymen's Federation did not accept the quantum of representation, that is the number of representatives fixed by the Railway Board?

Shri Alagesan: Sir, there was some difference over the number of representatives of the A.I.R.F. that should attend this meeting and it was finally fixed and an agreement on the number of members was arrived at and then the meeting was held. By the time the agreement was reached the leader of the Federation informed the Ministry that many of the representatives had left Delhi.

Shri Nambiar: May I know what was the agreed number of persons?

Shri Alagesan: It was eight.

Shri Nambiar: May I know whether previously the practice was that every affiliated union was given a representative and more than eight representatives used to be sent? If so, may I know why this reduction has been introduced?