

14.53 hrs.

CALLING ATTENTION TO MATTER OF URGENT PUBLIC IMPORTANCE

STRIKE IN PUBLIC SECTOR ENGINEERING UNITS IN BANGALORE AND HYDERABAD.

SHRI GADADHAR SAHA (Sirbhumi): I call the attention of the Minister of Labour to the following matter of urgent public importance and request that he may make a statement thereon:

Serious situation due to continuing strike in public sector engineering units in Bangalore and Hyderabad and steps taken by the Government to settle the matter.

THE MINISTER OF PLANNING AND LABOUR (SHRI NARAYAN DATT TIWARI): Sir, over one lakh employees of public sector undertakings including HAL, BEL, BEML, ITI, ECIL, Bharat Dynamics Ltd., Mishra Dhatu Nigam Ltd. spread over various units have been on a strike beginning on different dates starting from 26-12-80 to 21-1-81 over their demands for the parity of pay scales and conditions of service with BHEL employees who have been granted a raise in their wages and D.A. by the management. Following the strike, the management of ECIL, Hyderabad had declared a lock-out from 8th January, 1981 because the striking workers in that undertaking had indulged in violence.

The appropriate Government in respect of these Public Sector Undertakings for the purpose of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 are the respective State Governments of Karnataka and Andhra Pradesh. The Industrial Relations Machinery of these State Governments have separately intervened in the matter and tried to avert the strike. Conciliation efforts were also made at the level of the Labour Ministers of Karnataka and Andhra Pradesh, as well as the Chief Minister of Karnataka, but no settlement could be arrived at.

The management's initial offer was that they would give an ad hoc increase of Rs. 20/- per month in wages plus an amount of Rs. 300/- lump sum to each worker provided the respective settlements in these undertakings are extended upto 30th September, 1982, to synchronise them with the expiry date of the BHEL settlement. This offer was later on extended by the Labour Minister of Karnataka to an increase in wages of Rs. 25/- per month and a lump sum amount to be paid against the arrears of Rs. 600/-. He had, however, made it clear that he was making this offer on his own responsibility and with the hope of getting it approved by the Central Government and public sector managements.

Negotiations were also held at the Central level by the Union Minister for Communications. Recently, on 7th February, 1981, I had invited the parties and also the representatives of the Central Organisations, namely, INTUC, AITUC, CITU and HMS, to find a solution to the problem. This meeting was also attended by the Labour Ministers of Karnataka, Andhra Pradesh and Union Minister for Communications.

In the meeting the demand of the workers was for an increase of Rs. 30/- in basic pay, Rs. 5/- in D.A. and an increment of Rs. 7/- at the minimum and Rs. 22/- at the maximum effective from 1-1-1977. On behalf of the management it was stated that there were already agreements which the workers had entered into with the management valid upto June, 1981 and according to these agreements nothing was due to the workers. If, however, the workers would agree to the extension of the terms of agreement for a period of another eighteen months, the management would be agreeable to an increase of Rs. 25/- per month in the basic wages with effect from 1-1-1981 and a lump sum payment of Rs. 600/- to each worker.

After protracted discussions the workers reduced their demands to an increase of Rs. 30/- in basic wages with one increment effective from 1-9-1978 and also agreed to extension of the current agreement by six months. This offer was, however, not acceptable to the management who offered, in turn, that the agreement under which the workers had raised the demands for increase in the wages might be referred to an arbitrator or a Board of Arbitration with a High Court Judge as the Chairman; in the meantime, the management would pay to the workers as advance of Rs. 700/- each recoverable in twelve instalments. The management would implement the decision of the Arbitrator or Board of Arbitration in full and the advance would not be adjusted against the amount payable under the Awards. Alternately, if the workers wanted an immediate settlement, they should accept an increase of Rs. 25/- per month with a lump sum payment of Rs. 700/- per worker, subject to the current agreement being extended for at least one year. These proposals and counter proposals being not acceptable to the parties, the talks broke down and the offers made during the negotiations at the meetings were withdrawn by both parties.

SHRI GADADHAR SAHA: Mr. Chairman, on behalf of my party and the working class as also of trade unions, express my grave concern at the failure of negotiations to settle this strike of 1,25,000 workers of public sector engineering units in Bangalore, Hyderabad, Kanpur etc. due to the very adamant attitude of this Government and its anti-labour policy. This Government refused to honour the commitment made earlier in the agreement which was signed with the Trade Unions.

"Sir, this anti-labour policy and the attitude of the Central Government is a challenge to the entire trade union movement. It is well-known

that the Labour Minister has given only a one-sided picture of the developments relating to the strike. There is no mention in his statement that the managements of the public undertakings solemnly agreed to review the agreement and the commitment made with the Trade Unions only if any Public Sector Engineering Unit agrees to pay wage higher than Bangalore based industries.

15 hrs.

However, Government accepted Rs. 500 as the minimum wage for unskilled workers in BHEL and BHEL wage agreement was already signed. The workers of the Bangalore-based industry then demanded a similar rise in their wage. But the Central Government refused to honour the agreement. Mr. Stephen, the Communication Minister made a categorical assertion that not a single additional naya paise could be paid to the workers on account of the particular clause in the agreement. The workers therefore have been on strike since December 26, 1980 after giving proper notice to their managements. The managements refused to negotiate with trade unions on the plea that Government had to give them clearance. This also shows that the Government was interfering in the autonomous conference during the wage negotiation. During the Kanpur Tripartite negotiations, the representative of the ITI was on record stating that the demands of the workers were fully justified but a decision could not be taken by them and the decision could only be taken by the Government of India. Negotiations could not result in fruitful conclusions. There was, therefore, no alternative for the workers except to go on strike. After the commencement of the strike the Government offered only Rs. 25 as *ad hoc* payment; and a lumpsum payment of Rs. 600 per worker with a condition of extension of the period of the agreement by one more year. This was, therefore, not acceptable to the workers. During

[Shri Gadadhar Saha]

negotiations the trade unions representatives were prepared to settle the strike if only Government agreed to grant them an additional pay of Rs. 42 per worker and a lumpsum payment which was negotiable. But what happened? During the talks convened by the Union Labour Minister, the Communication Minister, Mr. Stephen refused to accept this minimum rock-bottom demand. He used harsh and filthy language in the presence of the Labour Minister. Even the INTUC President could not accept his offer. This is the correct position.

Sir, the total loss of production per day due to the strike works out to be Rs. 2 crores. The total loss of production during the strike period, upto date, during these 54-day old strike, works out to be Rs. 108 crores. If the total demand of the workers would have been accepted the total cost on the part of the Government would have been about Rs. 20 to Rs. 23 crores. Now, during the discussions Government offered Rs. 25 per worker and the workers were prepared to accept Rs. 42 per worker. So, it is clear that the difference was so narrow that it was unwise on the part of Union Minister to have broken down the talks and dishonoured the agreement. Now, the strike is complete in almost all the public engineering units and the Central Trade Unions have decided to call a meeting on 22nd December, 1981 to consider the future course of action and organise a countrywide industrial action. So, I hope that Government will now understand the gravity of the situation and I suggest that another fresh attempt be made to settle the dispute on the basis of the proposal given by the Trade Unions. In this connection, I want to ask two questions. First, will the hon. Minister call another meeting of the Trade Unions in the striking units along with representatives for the settlement of the dispute?

AN HON. MEMBER: Which Minister?

SHRI GADADHAR SAHA: Labour Minister. On the basis of the various proposals offered by the Trade Unions; second, what steps are you going to take to meet the minimum demands of the workers and the Trade Unions?

SHRI NARAYAN DATT TIWARI: I compliment the hon. Member for having placed some facts before this august House. The facts were narrated by me rather differently. But perhaps he stated the facts more eloquently. But it is hard for me to agree with his contention that there is any challenge to the entire labour movement. There is no question of Government throwing out any challenge and as far as negotiation goes, the door was never closed. You will see from my statement that the door was never closed at any level and there had been continuous negotiations going on by the appropriate Government mainly at Bangalore. It is because the epicentre of the strike was at Bangalore. Then when I convened this meeting here, it was rather unfortunate that the talks broke down because the two sides could not agree. The responsibility of the Labour Department is only to convene such meetings. We cannot just force the management or the trade unions to give up their respective attitudes. But now since the hon. Member has said that the differences are very narrow, because he has just admitted that the differences are very narrow, I would also request him to exercise his influence on the Trade Unions and see to it that this very narrow gap, whatever it is, is further narrowed down. I hope that the Trade Unions would also come forward. Let there not be any open challenge. Let there be no adamant attitude about it and I hope the hon. Member will give some valuable time of his to exercise influence on the Trade Unions.

MR. CHAIRMAN: In other words, you mean to say that everyone should make efforts for the softening of the attitudes.

SHRI NARAYAN DATT TIWARI: I was just referring to the hon. Member's plea.

SHRI K. A. RAJAN (Trichur): Mr. Chairman, Sir, the statement made by the hon. Minister contains certain facts. Mostly, these relate to the period after the negotiations were conducted and the efforts that were made by both the sides. I would like to make a correction to para 4 of the statement. If I am correct, the workers are not demanding arrears, as stated, from 1st January, 1977, but they are only demanding these from 1st September, 1978.

The subject before this House by way of this calling attention is a very important one. This strike is going to have a great impact on the overall economy of the country, especially in the present situation. If I am correct, about 1.25 lakh workers are on strike from 26th December, and the strike has entered its 58th day. According to Government sources, there is a production loss worth Rs. two crores on every day of strike.

This strike is being conducted by the various trade unions irrespective of their party affiliations. From the very beginning, it has been going on in a very peaceful and disciplined way. First of all, in order to assess the justifiability of the strike, let us see what their demands are. If I am correct, the unions which are connected with this strike had entered into a long-term agreement in 1978 with those public undertakings. In that agreement, there was a particular clause. There is no dispute about that clause, if at all there is a dispute, it is only with regard to its interpretation. The agreement clearly provides for revision of the basic wages and dearness allowance in the event of any other public sector undertaking doing the same. As per that particular clause in the agreement, the unions in these public sector undertaking approached the management, as soon as an agreement was arrived at in the BHEL and requested them that the provision existing in their agreement should be honoured. But unfortunately, those who were party to the agreement could not make any commitment on those lines. So, when

all persuasions and other methods failed, naturally, the workers had to resort to strike in order to press that that particular provision in the agreement be implemented. This is the background of this case. And from the trade unions point of view, whenever the normal course of negotiations to get their grievances fails, the last ultimate weapon with them to go on strike and see that their legitimate demands are conceded. Therefore, these workers went on strike from 26th December.

As I said, this agreement was signed with these unions in 1978. Thereafter, another agreement was signed with BHEL alone in 1979 and in that 1979 agreement, some revisions in minimum wages, dearness allowance and certain other things were agreed upon. Naturally, these workers according to the 1978 agreement put forth their claim. Here, I would like to clear a misunderstanding which is being spread, I do not know whether deliberately or other wise. It is being said that the workers who are on strike in these undertakings are demanding parity with BHEL workers. If it had been the case, the workers would have demanded an increase in minimum basic of Rs. 30 per month plus Rs. 5/- increase in D.A. plus two increments from 1st January, 1981. This will be Rs. 49/- increase at the lowest level and Rs. 79/- at the highest level; as also payment of arrears from 1st January, 1977 to 31st December, 1980, no extension of the period of settlement, payment of Rs. 40/- as fitment benefit to those who did not get it during the last settlement and going over to the all-India consumer price index figures for calculating D.A. and payment of CCA as in BHEL. Before the last conference held in Delhi, the last offer made was—as it is very well stated in the Minister's statement—increase in minimum wage by Rs. 30/- per month, plus one increment. This will be Rs. 37/- at the lowest stage, and Rs. 52/- at the highest stage, payment of arrears computed as lump-sum from 1st September, 1978 to 31st December, 1980; extension of the period of agreement upto 31st December, 1981 on the issues of minimum wages, pay-

[Shri K. A. Rajan]

ment of Rs. 40/- as fitment benefit to those who did not get it, and not pressing for going over to the All India CPI figures as well as CCA.

This was the offer which was really made by the workers. So, it should be made clear that for a negotiated settlement and to have a peaceful settlement of the strike, the Unions concerned, and the Joint Committee also, were very eager, i.e. to see that some workable formula is forwarded and the issue is settled around the table. But, unfortunately, that did not happen. I would clarify this position, because after this conference, the Minister who handled this conference, viz., the Minister of Communications went to Bangalore, and next day he held a Press Conference, and there he categorically stated: "These workers were harping on such-and-such thing; they could not come down to anything; they were not in any mood to concede anything substantially." etc. He was also calling the workers traitors, and as not having patriotic feelings for the country, etc. I am not going into them, because they are not relevant. That is why I am clarifying things. From their point of view, the workers want to honour the settlement, and to see that an honourable settlement is made on their demands.

Of course, there is no dispute from the Government side also regarding a clause in the agreement, viz. that certain payments will be made. If there was at all a dispute, it was about the interpretation. After 58 days, what is going on? According to to-day's Press reports, it is seen that Police, CRP and Border Security Police are going round the colony of the workers, repressing them and pressurizing them with some sort of behaviour—i.e. intimidating them to go back to work. But with all these proclamations, notices and the advertisements in the Press by the respective companies, I can proudly say that not a single worker was prepared to return to the factory for work. This shows how 125,000 workers who sincerely believe

that they are fighting for a just cause and who had given ample opportunities to the management to come to an honourable settlement, could not find any avenue for an honourable settlement. They had no other way but to strike. They were pushed by the management. If the management had acted in time and promptly, I think these things would not have happened.

Really, it is a surprise that before the strike, the state of affairs in Hindustan Aeronautics was such that their workers were sitting idle for days together, without any work. Why did it happen? These are the facts which have come out during the strike period. I am impressing upon you that in such a matter of vital importance, a strike which is going on in major public sector undertakings, a strike which is affecting, and having an impact on the overall economy of the country and a strike which is affecting in fact 125,000 workers and which is dragging on for the last 58 days is, if I am correct, resulting in a loss of production worth more than Rs. 100 crores.

How to handle it, and how to settle it? The workers have come down from their earlier position, and they are eager to come to a negotiated settlement, but I would like to know from the Minister what is the further move which he is going to take in this matter. The Minister has stated in the statement something regarding the proposal for arbitration. Unfortunately, I am sorry to say that after the LIC Ordinance how can the workers bank on these arbitrations and other awards? They have lost all faith in these things, because you are scuttling the very essence of collective bargaining and all sorts of negotiated settlements can be scuttled at any time. So, you cannot blame that they did not agree for arbitration. In the light of what is happening in the LIC, how can they bank on awards? They should not be blamed. Normally, workers would not agree.

Now I am coming to a specific question as to how to settle this issue. The

workers' unions and the Joint Council have stated that if the doors are open, they are ready to come to the table and settle the matter, their only concern is that they want to have an honourable settlement. I would like to know from the hon. Minister what initiative he is going to take. Have you banged your doors or are you going to keep the doors open and have a negotiated settlement? The workers' unions and their Joint Council have expressed their desire to settle it.

You know the history of the trade unions and their negotiations. Sometimes in such matters we may have to conduct so many rounds of negotiations. Even on the issue of Port and Dock workers, we conducted a lot of negotiations. There came a period when it was felt that the negotiations might break down. If these negotiations go on, I think an honourable settlement could be arrived at. I think the workers are very reasonable in their demand. Normally the Government should not sit tight on this thing and simply keep mum when this country is suffering and the workers are also suffering and all sort of intimidation is going on against the workers. I would like to have a categorical answer from the Minister on this.

I am more interested in this settlement because the strike which has been going on for the last 58 days is not only regarding the workers but also regarding the working of the public sector undertakings. I would also like to know whether the Minister will start another round of discussion with them so that the issue may be settled at the earliest or the doors are closed. The workers have stated very often in the public and it has come in the Press today also that if the doors are open, they are ready to come for a round table conference, because they want to have an honourable settlement. I would again like to know whether the doors have been banged or the doors are still open in the best interest of the country and also in the best interest of the economy.

SHRI NARAYAN DATT TIWARI: I have great respect and regard for the views of the hon. member who is also our colleague in the Labour Consultative Committee. He has said, I have to correct my statement in respect of the workers' demand for increase, that it is with effect from 1st September, 1978, not from 1st January, 1977. (*Interruptions*) It means arrears but arrears regarding wages. So, I stand corrected. Of course, I did not make an over statement, although making over statement is wrong and making under statement is also wrong.

Since there were so many memoranda and letters coming in, I thought I should be on safer ground, but I stand corrected and I am thankful to him. There is a question basically regarding the interpretation of the word 'review'. The management of the various public sector undertakings says that review does not mean an automatic increase upto the level of the BHEL; it has to be negotiated. They say, that negotiations did take place and they did advance a few steps further. So, review does not mean an automatic equalisation of wage. Therefore, they say, if the trade unions think that their Interpretation is correct, they are ready for an arbitration and let the Board of Arbitration be chaired by the High Court Judge; let them give a decision as to what is the correct interpretation of the word 'review'. If the Board of Arbitration decides that the interpretation given by the trade unions is correct, we will abide by it. I may say that, in all fairness to the Minister of Communications, he did say to me and also in the meeting that we will abide by the decision of the arbitrators: We will not detract from any decision taken, we will abide by it in full, completely. Therefore, I have mentioned this fact also on page 3 of my statement that the management would implement the decision of the arbitrators or the Board of Arbitration in full; and the advance would not be adjusted against the amount payable under awards.

I will request that the hon. Member should not think that the LIC

[Shri Narayan Datt Tiwari]

Ordinance is meant to be an omnibus suggestion for all other sectors of public undertakings. So, this is not a precedent that way. Therefore, I think that this reference to the L.I.C. Ordinance would not help because it was made very clear by the Union Minister that this would not apply, and we shall abide by whatever the board of arbitrators says. This I would again say, that in the other House—other sanctum sanctorum I would not name the other House because it is not parliamentary I am told—he made it very clear in my presence. He said that he never used the word 'traitor' and he said that he had great respect and regard for trade union leaders and he quoted a few newspaper like the *Statesman* also to say that he did not say it. The incorrect publication of this word has caused much embarrassment and I hope that this clarification will clear the atmosphere a little. He has issued contradiction that he did not say this. He did not utter this word. He was very categorical in that. He produced the cutting of the *Statesman* for that.

Then, regarding this banging of the door, the door is never closed. There is no question of banging any door. The door is never closed.

DR. SUBRAMANIAM SWAMY:
(Bombay North-East): Is the mind open?

SHRI NARAYAN DATT TIWARI:
Because the minds are open, the doors are not closed. I would say this. It is open for the trade union leaders now to negotiate with the proper Government. The proper Government is there to negotiate. There is no question of banging or closing the door.

SHRI JANARDHANA POOJARY
(Mangalore): It has been alleged here that ours is an anti-labour policy and we are against the labour

class. We are going to make it clear that we are committed to the cause of labour and our commitment is total and the latest offer that has been put forward before the workers is just and reasonable. (*Interruption*)

Yes, it happens to be my State. That is why I am putting forward. -

Now, the labour class as such is prepared to accept the offer. Most of the workers are prepared to resume their duties also. But unfortunately they have been threatened with dire consequences and not only that, if I am to be frank, they have been intimidated. They have been asked not to attend duty. That is why they are not coming and resuming their duties. Now, so far as the fact is concerned, this policy of ours is not against the labour cause. But we are definitely against the labour leaders. Why? You are aware that during the regime of the Congress numerous legislations have been enacted for labour class. But unfortunately this benevolence has whetted with the appetite of these union leaders and they unfortunately misuse it. That is why, today my submission would be that we should think seriously about this matter. We have to prevent outsiders from getting into these labour unions, thereby damaging or inflicting a far-reaching effect on the labour class. If we are all thinking in the interests of the nation, if we all have the national interest in mind, let us think in the direction of removing outsiders from the industrial unions, because they are creating chaos in the unions. We should prevent or prohibit outsiders from entering the unions with a view to creating trouble.

Then we have to consider another aspect. There are some industrial units which are sick or inefficient while some others are efficient and profit-making. We cannot equate the inefficient units with the efficient and profit-making units. But we will

have to do it if we accept this plea of parity. Here I may state that Shri George Fernandes has already moved an amendment to the Motion of Thanks on the President's Address, stating that the railway employees are also going to plead for parity. If that is conceded, then there will not be any end to this.

SHRI SUNIL MAITRA (Calcutta North East): You are advocating parity in relation to wages of the LIC employees.... (Interruptions)

SHRI JANARDHANA POOJARY: The railway employees have been contemplating having direct action in order to have parity of benefits. If this is conceded, what will be the position of the economy of this country? Only a little while ago, Shri K. A. Rajan referred to the economic position of our country. All of us have been saying that the economy is going to shambles, or is reduced to shambles. At a time when we have just put our economy back on the rail, if this demand is conceded then there will be no end to this. So, my submission is that we should never concede this plea for pay parity. If we concede it, then once again we are going to inflict a heavy blow on the economy of this country.

Now what is going on in this country as a result of strikes? Because of strike by sweepers, there is water pollution. People are using stinking water for drinking purposes, and that is affecting the health of the people. The people working in essential services are instigated to go on strike. Doctors, locomen, electricity workers and even teachers are instigated to go on strike. What is the purpose? The purpose is to create havoc and chaos in the country to overthrow the present Government. It is a calculated attempt on the part of some of the opposition parties. Do not be under the impression that we are not in a position to see through the game.

SHRI RAMAVATAR SHASTRI (Patna): Even the INTUC has made this demand.

SHRI JANARDHANA POOJARY: In that case, we are going to condemn that also.... (Interruptions) Here is a calculated, a deliberate attempt to create chaos in the country.

DR. SUBRAMANIAM SWAMY: Are you advocating emergency?

SHRI JANARDHANA POOJARY: If, in the interest of the nation, emergency is required, we can declare it.

I have already brought to the notice of the House the role played by the union leaders. They do not have any concern for the plight of the poor people of this country. What about the millions of unorganised labour and the unemployed youth? Are you concerned with them? When you go to the villages you ask the agriculturists to demand more for their produce. Then you go to the urban areas and tell the people that the prices are rising and nothing is done to curb them.

Further, if the Government have to pay more wages to the employees, where is the money going to come from? Who will contribute it? It is again the poor people of this country who have to contribute it. You are not going to pay the money; it will have to be paid by the poor people, who constitute more than 80 per cent of the population. Are they in a position to pay it? Are you concerned with that aspect? That is why I am pleading with you to impose a moratorium or put a ban on strikes and lock-outs for at least three years.

So my suggestions are the following. You have to prevent outsiders from entering the labour unions. You should declare the strike as illegal and have compulsory adjudication. Then there should be some scheme for workers' participation in management.

SHRI NARAYAN DATT TIWARI: The hon. Member has put forward the economist's view of the situation in focus in this House. He has made three suggestions. One suggestion is that no outsider should be allowed to enter the unions of the public sector undertakings. Well, it is for the appropriate Government to take action in this regard.

Then he has stated that there should be no parity in wage scales because of the acute economic situation in the country. This is the view of the managements also. The managements of the public sector undertakings say that it is not possible under the present situation to have parity in wages in all public sector undertakings in an omnibus fashion.

DR. SUBRAMANIAM SWAMY: So, he is pleading the cause of the management.

SHRI NARAYAN DATT TIWARI: Of economists like you also.

Another suggestion is that strikes should be declared illegal and the dispute should be sent for adjudication. It is a matter for the appropriate Government to decide whether the strike should be declared illegal.

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES (Muzaffarpur) : The hon. Member has referred to me.

MR. CHAIRMAN: What you whispered, I happened to catch up. I will check up whether he has mentioned it. If it is found, then you will be given an opportunity to explain your position.

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES: He has stated that I have mentioned, in my amendment to the Motion of Thanks on the President's Address, that the railwaymen must be given parity in wages. This has nothing to do with the implementation of an agreement. What is in dispute here is the implementation of the agreement. Please understand me. Shri Stephen, who is a Minister of this Government, has

signed an agreement, conceding parity in wages for all public sector undertaking, particularly for HMT employees. So, you must allow me to make my submission. I cannot allow that statement to go unchallenged. He is quoting my amendment to the Motion of Thanks on the President's Address, while this refers to the implementation of an agreement.

श्रीमती कृष्णा साही : (बेगमराय) :
सभापति महोदय, मेरा प्वाइंट ग्राफ ग्रांडर है ।

सभापति महोदय : आपका प्वाइंट ग्राफ ग्रांडर चेंजरमैन खड़े हैं उसके बिनाफ है ? जरा बैठ जाइये । मेरी बात मुन लीजिये ।

आप बहुत धीरे से बोलें लेकिन मेरे कान कुछ तेज हैं और मुझे मुतने में कोई दिक्कत नहीं हुई । मैंने उस को ऐप रिकार्डर से चैक करने के लिये कहा है । जब इसको कर लिया जायेगा और जम्हरत हुई तो आपको एक्सप्लेन करने का अवसर दिया जायेगा ।

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES: You can ask the hon. Member, You can ask Shri Poojary.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It is no use. I will check it up.

SHRI JANARDHANA POOJARY: I said it. Where is the question of expunging it?

MR. CHAIRMAN: There is no question of expunging it. But if you have mentioned it, then he may be given an opportunity to explain his point.

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES: I do not want to go in for any personal explanation. I just want to make a point. (Interruptions). My submission is that

there is a difference. I want the honourable Labour Minister to firstly bring out the fact that there is a difference between my moving a motion..

(Interruptions)

SHRI NAWAL KISHORE SHARMA (Dausa) Sir, I am on a point of order.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Excuse me, there are so many points of order that I for one find myself lost. So, kindly resume your seat. I have given a ruling. Let the papers come and then I will decide. (Interruptions). Kindly listen to me. Let the papers containing what exactly he uttered come to me and then I will think how to give you an opportunity.

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES: Besides, the point is germane to the present discussion. There are two questions. One is the present strike is... (Interruptions). I cannot even stand and make my submission?

MR. CHAIRMAN: No, no. I was fair. I have given the order. Let the proceedings come before me. Then I will give you an opportunity.

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES: Should we expect the Labour Minister to come again to the House and answer?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, the Labour Minister is sitting here.

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES: Therefore, Sir, please let me make my point. I am only making a clarification. I am only to clarify this question.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You won't wait for the Chair to receive the papers to find out what exactly the hon. Member said and you are determined to speak?

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES: No, no.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Then kindly listen to me.

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES: You know, Sir, I have always listened to you, I have listened to you in the Committee meetings. I listen to you more than any one else listens.

MR. CHAIRMAN: And you have more than cooperated with me.

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES: Therefore the only point on which I want the Labour Minister to answer is, firstly, there is a difference. Secondly, what is now sought to be secured by the workers is something to which even Mr. Stephen is a signatory. Mr. Stephen as the leader of the HMT workers has signed a settlement that parity in wages must be available to the workers in the public sector undertakings. Now, Sir, I only want the hon. Labour Minister to make a point here. He said that it is open to the workers to go to the respective State authorities. He has been answering a Call Attention motion. He has presided over several meetings in order to bring about a settlement. Will he invite the leaders of the unions to Delhi and see that talks are held and a settlement is arrived at? The differences are so narrow. And so, will he use his good offices? The Finance Minister is here. Will he use his good offices to invite the leaders of the unions and bring about a settlement of this dispute? (Interruptions).

SHRI JANARDHANA POOJARY: I am on a point of order. (Interruptions).

SHRI NAWAL KISHORE SHARMA: You are allowing him to make points and he wants the Labour Minister to reply. What is your ruling? (Interruptions).

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES: Will he invite the leaders of the unions...

SHRI B. V. DESAI (Raichur): He is not in the list of members to speak on the Call Attention. Why should he be allowed to speak?

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES: Sir, you will ask the Labour Minister to make a point. (Interruptions).