

[English]

Appeal Against Judgement of Central Government's Industrial Tribunal

*36. SHRI A.K ROY: Will the Minister of LABOUR be pleased to state:

(a) whether there is a rule to take permission of his Ministry if the management of the coal companies in the public sector intend to go for appeal against the judgement of the Central Government's Industrial Tribunal;

(b) whether this rule has been followed by the Central Coalfields Limited for the Award in the case Reference No.115 of 1988 concerning the slurry workers of Giddi washery; and

(c) if not, the action taken in the matter?

THE MINISTER OF LABOUR AND WELFARE (SHRI RAM VILAS PASWAN):

(a) to (c). A public sector undertaking of the Government of India is required to consult its administrative Ministry if it desires to file an appeal against an award or judgement of a labour Court/Tribunal, High Court etc. The administrative Ministry, in turn, examines the matter in consultation with Ministry of Law and Ministry of Labour and conveys advice to the undertaking.

In the instant case, as per the legal advice given to the Central Coalfields Ltd., the award of the Tribunal suffered from several infirmities and it needed to be challenged in the High Court. The Central Coalfields Ltd. (CCL), accordingly, sought the approval of the administrative Ministry to file a writ petition in the Patna High Court. The legal advice obtained by the administrative Ministry also confirmed the aforesaid course of action. As the time was short, the said writ petition was filed by C.C.L., in anticipation of Governments' approval.

Eye Care Policy

*37. SHRI C.K. KUPPUSWAMY: Will the Minister of HEALTH AND FAMILY WELFARE be pleased to state:

(a) whether Union Government have been urged to adopt a new eye care policy at a meeting of the Sight Savers India Partners held in New Delhi recently;

(b) if so, the recommendations made at the meeting and reaction of Government thereto; and

(c) the action being proposed to be taken by Union Government particularly with reference to the imbalance between rural and urban eye care services?

THE MINISTER OF STATE OF THE MINISTRY OF HEALTH AND FAMILY WELFARE (SHRI RASHEED MASOOD):
(a) No, Sir.

(b) and (c). At their meeting on 27th and 28th June, 1990, several suggestions were made in connection with their own policy and approach on eye-care; shift of focus from eye-camps to permanent eye-care facilities, pilot projects for comprehensive eye care in some districts; high tech services with focus on Keratoplasty intra-ocular lense implant etc.; activating District Committees, setting up more child oriented services. In view of the huge requirement of cataract operations, Government have to continue a mix of eye camps and hospitals. There is provision of ophthalmic assistants in primary health centres and ophthalmic surgeons in district level hospitals. Moreover, there are nine regional institutes of ophthalmology. Govt. of India have written to the States to set up District Blindness control Societies. The various measures suggested at the aforesaid meeting on 27th and 28th June, 1990 are already there in some measure, in the Government approach to eye care and pre-

vention of blindness.

Survey on Child Labour

*38. SHRI BABANRAO DHAKNE:
SHRI VAMANRAO MAHADIK:

Will the Minister of LABOUR be pleased to state:

(a) whether Government have conducted a survey on child labour in various establishments;

(b) if so, how many children are employed in various establishments and of which age group;

(c) how many establishments have been found violating the child labour regulations; and

(d) the penalty prescribed for violation of the labour regulations?

THE MINISTER OF LABOUR AND WELFARE (SHRI RAM VILAS PASWAN):

(a) to (d). No comprehensive survey as such has been conducted on the extent of child labour establishment-wise. However, as per the 1981 Census figures, the total number of child workers in the country is indicated as 13.64 million.

2. The implementation of the Child Labour (Prohibition and Regulation) Act, 1986, lies in main, with the concerned State Governments. As per the available reports, 230 prosecutions had been launched under the Act during 1988-89.

3. Under section 14 of the Child Labour (Prohibition and Regulation) Act, 1986,-

Whoever employs any child or permits any child to work in contravention of the provisions of section 3 of the Act shall be punishable with imprisonment for a term which shall

not be less than three months but which may extend to one year or with fine which shall not be less than ten thousand rupees but which may extend to twenty thousand rupees or with both. Whoever, having been convicted of an offence under section 3, commits a like offence afterwards, he shall be punishable with imprisonment for a term which shall not be less than six months but which may extend to two years. For failure (i) to give notice under section 9; (ii) to maintain register under section 11 or for making-false entries in any such register; (iii) to display notice as required under section 3 and under section 14 read with section 12; and (iv) to comply with, or for contravening any other provisions of the Act or the rules made thereunder, the penalty prescribed is simple imprisonment which may extend to one month or with fine which may extend to ten thousand rupees or with both.

[Translation]

CAG's Report on functioning of C.G.H.S.

*39. PROF. YADUNATH PANDEY: Will the Minister of HEALTH AND FAMILY WELFARE be pleased to state:

(a) whether the Comptroller and Auditor General of India in his Report No. 1 of 1990 adversely commented upon the functioning of Central Government Health Scheme;

(b) if so, whether the report has since been examined; and

(c) if so, the details thereof and the corrective steps proposed to be taken in this regard?

THE MINISTER OF STATE OF THE MINISTRY OF HEALTH AND FAMILY WELFARE (SHRI RASHEED MASOOD):
(a) The Report of the Comptroller and Auditor