

को रेल डिब्बों की कमी का सामना करना पड़ रहा है;

(ख) क्या रेलवे द्वारा उम दिशा में बार-बार प्रयत्न किये जाने के बावजूद स्थिति में सुधार नहीं हुआ है; और

(ग) यदि उपरोक्त भाग (ख) का उत्तर स्वीकारात्मक हो तो स्थिति को सुधारने के बारे में सरकार का क्या कार्यवाही करने का विचार है ?

रेल मंत्री (श्री हनुमंतैया) : (क) से (ग). सेलखड़ी उदयपुर और जयपुर क्षेत्रों के स्टेशनों से और भीलवाड़ा में भेजी जाती हैं। इन क्षेत्रों से चलने वाले अन्य आवश्यक उच्चप्राथमिकता वाले यातायात की तरजीही आधार पर भेजने के वचन को विभते हुए, सेलखड़ी के यातायात के लिए अधिकतम संख्या में माल डिब्बे सप्लाई करने का प्रयास किया जाता है। जनवरी से मई, 1971 तक की अवधि में सेलखड़ी के 3689 डिब्बों का लदान हुआ जब कि पिछले वर्ष इसी अवधि में 3340 माल डिब्बों का लदान हुआ था।

Inclusion of rural areas inhabited by Harijans in rural Electrification scheme

2251. SHRI DEVINDER SINGH GARCHA : Will the Minister of IRRIGATION AND POWER be pleased to state :

(a) whether Central Government have asked the State Government to include village areas inhabited by Harijans in their Rural Electrification scheme;

(b) the number of villages inhabited by Harijans in Punjab which still remain to be electrified; and

(c) the time Government will take to provide electricity to all the villages in Punjab which are inhabited by Harijans ?

THE DEPUTY MINISTER IN THE MINISTRY OF IRRIGATION AND POWER (SHRI B. N. KUREEL) : (a) to (c). The emphasis in rural electrification schemes is on the energisation of pumpsets for agricultural production; village electrification is an incidental part of this programme. Priority is, therefore, given to electrification of villages with potential for energisation of irrigation pumpsets. It has been resolved by the Fifth Conference of Chairmen of State Electricity Boards held in May, 1971, the schemes for electrification of such villages should also provide street lighting in localities inhabited by Harijans. Out of a total of 11,947 villages in Punjab, 6132 have been electrified as on 31.3.1971. In these villages electrification facilities are available to all sections of the community including harijans. By the end of the Fourth Plan, 9600 villages would be electrified in the State. The time taken for the electrification of all the villages in Punjab and the provision of street lighting facilities to all Harijan localities would, *inter alia*, depend upon the resources available for rural electrification in the subsequent Plans.

12.12 hrs.

CALLING ATTENTION TO MATTER OF URGENT PUBLIC IMPORTANCE

FURTHER INCREASE IN DEARNESS ALLOWANCE OF CENTRAL GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE (Kanpur) : I call the attention of the Minister of Finance to the following matter of urgent public importance and I request that he may make a statement thereon :

"The reported 10-Point rise in Cost of Living Index justifying further increase in Dearness Allowance of Central Government employees"

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF FINANCE (SHRI K. R. GANESH). The Dearness Allowance Commission headed by Dr. P. B. Gajendragadkar had given a formula for regulating Dearness Allowance admissible to Central Government employees, according to which increase in additional Dearness Allowance were to be made with reference to every ten-point rise in the twelve-monthly average of the All India Working Class Consumer Price Index. The last increase in Dearness Allowance, according to this formula, was given with effect from 1st September, 1968, when the 12-monthly average of the Index reached 215. Under the formula, the next increase in the rates of dearness allowance would have become due on the 12-monthly average of the Cost Index reaching 225. The Gajendragadkar Commission had recommended that their recommendations should remain in force until the expiry of two years from the date of their acceptance or until the twelve-monthly average of the Index reached 245, whichever was earlier. On the expiry of that period, Government was to undertake revision of pay scales. The two year period specified by the Commission expired in September, 1969 and during this period, the 12-monthly average of the Index was less than 225.

As the Hon'ble Members are aware, the Third Pay Commission was set up in April, 1970 to enquire into and make recommendations, *inter alia*, on the principles which should govern the structure of emoluments and the conditions of service of Central Government employees. The Commission were specifically requested to make recommendations for the grant of interim relief in the event of the need for consideration of such relief arising during the course of their deliberations. The Commission submitted an Interim Report in September, 1970, recommending the grant of interim relief ranging from Rs. 15 to Rs. 45 for pay ranges upto Rs. 1,250/- with effect from 1st March, 1970. These recommendations have been accepted and implemented. The rates of interim relief recommended by the Com-

mission take into account higher levels of neutralisation of the increase in the cost of living compared to the previous bodies that had examined the question of dearness allowance for Central Government employees.

In this connection, the following observations of the Third Pay Commission in their Interim Report are worth noting :—

“We are accordingly not suggesting any automatic changes with the price level in the quantum of interim relief we are recommending for the duration of our work. If, however, the price situation remains intractable despite all the measures the Government may take, a review may be called for when the 12-monthly average of the Index reaches 228. We have not considered it advisable at this stage to depart from the existing practice of making adjustments in the dearness allowance only when the 12-monthly average of the index rises by 10 points”.

It will, therefore, be appreciated that interim relief already given to the employees covers the cost of living upto the 12-monthly average index figure of 218 and that a further review is to be made only when it reaches 228. The Pay Commission to whom the matter was specifically referred have confirmed this reading of their recommendation. In the circumstances, there is no occasion for a review of the dearness allowance until the 12-monthly average of the Cost Index reaches 228. The 12-monthly average for the period ended April, 1971 is only 225.83.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE: I am surprised that the hon. Minister has quoted a para from the interim report submitted by the commission while conveniently omitting the other part which I shall quote. He has quoted the portion which says:

“If, however, the price situation remains intractable despite all the

[Shri S. M. Banerjee]

measures the Government may take, a review may be called for when the 12-monthly average of the index reaches 228”.

In para 26 of their interim report the commission have observed :

“In view of what has been stated earlier we feel that it would be inappropriate to treat the interim relief we have recommended as though it was dearness allowance as the two concepts differ.”

The Commission was not asked to give any report on the dearness allowance. It was made abundantly clear that the interim relief which they recommended had nothing to do with dearness allowance and that when there is a ten point rise the dearness allowance should be paid. That is the recommendation. The Government entered into an agreement with the employees that the dearness allowance would be paid at the rates specified by the Gajendragadkar commission, whenever there is a rise of ten points on the 12 monthly average. Government is now delaying payment of additional dearness allowance on the plea that it has reached only 225.83. The Government is mixing up the question of interim relief with the question of dearness allowance. In para 25 of their report after discussing the various recommendations of different commissions on dearness allowance the pay commission concludes :

“In view of what has been stated earlier we think it would be inappropriate to treat the interim relief we have recommended as though it was dearness allowance as the two concepts differ.”

I have quoted this once before. It is clear that the commission has specifically stated that dearness allowance is not to be connected in any way with the interim

relief. While stating that a review of the interim relief would be called for only when the average of the index reaches 228, they also say : we have not considered it advisable at this stage to depart from the existing practice of making adjustments in the dearness allowance only when the 12-monthly average of the index rises by ten points. By no stretch of imagination have the commission suggested that there should be a departure from the old practice. What was the old practice? It was the recommendation of Gajendragadkar Commission and the Das Commission. The Commission has not come in the way of any increase in the dearness allowance. The Government found that they were unable to hold the price line and they miserably failed to hold the line and prices have risen far beyond expectation and the Gajendragadkar formula of ten points average came to 225. The Central Government employees legitimately and genuinely became entitled to a dearness allowance rise. But the Government then came with the sentence that the Commission has recommended 228. The Commission has no business to recommend it. They have clearly stated that these are two different concepts. I do not know why this matter was referred to the Commission, in stead of referring it to somebody who could be impartial in the matter.

My submission, therefore, is this. It would be seen that the interim relief is a separate element which should be considered as an advance payment, and the dearness allowance is given on the existing agreement.

MR. SPEAKER : The Hon-Member's time is up.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE : Sir, it is a very important matter.

MR. SPEAKER : I know it and that is why I allowed it.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE : Sir, it is only myself and Dr. Ranen Sen who are

taking it up now. The other two are not present. So, I request you to give me two or three minutes more.

MR. SPEAKER : You may take as much time as you like. But put in the shape of a question ; do not make it a long speech.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE : Yes, Sir. My question is simple. I would like to know from the Hon. Minister whether it is a fact that this interim relief has anything to do with dearness allowance. In the National Council of the Joint Consultative Machinery, at its meeting held on the 4th and 5th June, 1971 the Chairman of the Council, who is the Cabinet Secretary, who was presiding over the meeting held on the 4th and 5th June, 1971, after hearing the arguments of the staff, the representatives of the Central Government employees and the officials—both sides—agreed to give a ruling on the interpretation. The subject, therefore, is still under the consideration of the Government. In the JCM, when the matter was *sub-judice*, when the Cabinet Secretary has agreed to give a ruling on the interpretation whether this should be on 225 or on 228, when the decision is awaited, is it fair on the part of the Government when in both the Houses, they came out with the old argument that unless it reaches 228, nothing is going to happen. It had already reached 225. The Chairman had agreed to give a ruling at the earliest, and the same is binding on both the sides. The staff would abide by the ruling, because the Chairman of the JCM Council is the Cabinet Secretary.

So, I would request the hon. Minister to kindly tell us, in view of what I have quoted both from the interim report of the Commission and the deliberations of the JCM, whether he is going to reconsider the entire decision, sit and discuss with the employees and see that the dearness allowance on the basis of 225 is paid. I am not trying to threaten the hon.

Minister, but then the Central Government employees are very sore about it, that their legitimate due is being denied to them. I can understand the Government coming forward and saying "We have no money to pay you. Your demand is justified, but we have no money to pay." That, I can understand....

श्री विभूति मिश्र (मोतीहारी) : अध्यक्ष महोदय, कल हमारी पार्टी के एक आदर्मा पूछ रहे थे तो आपने कहा कि भाषण दे रहे हैं, आप ने उनको रूल समझाया और पढ़ कर सुनाया। आज ये बोल रहे हैं तो आप कुछ नहीं बोल रहे हैं।

श्री विक्रम चन्द महाजन (कांगड़ा) : 15 मिनट हो गये हैं।

श्री एस० एम० बनर्जी : यह पार्टी का सवाल नहीं है, इनको समझाइये।

श्री विक्रम चन्द महाजन : तो फिर सारा दिन इनको बोलने दीजिए।

MR. SPEAKER : I have already told you that you can ask a question, or a clarification. But you are extending it to a regular debate (*Interruption*)

SHRI S.M. BANERJEE : I am putting my last question. Let me finish it Sir, within a minute.

This is a grave injustice being done to the central Government employees. They have been deprived of their legitimate due ; I want to know whether the Government is going to reconsider the entire issue and sit with the Central Government employees and have an open talk with them and not set their face against it on the ground that the Pay Commission has recommended 228. The

[Shri S. M. Banerjee]

Pay Commission has not recommended 228. This is an absolutely wrong recommendation, which is not binding on the employees.

SHRI K. R. GANESH : I am conscious of the fact that this is a very major problem agitating the minds of the employees, and I would request Mr. Banerjee to bear with me. Firstly, there is some difference in the interpretation. There is no question of not giving an increase in DA when there is a ten point increase in the cost of living index. But the question is at what index this has to be given. The only difference between the staff and government is this the staff feels that should be given at 10 points above 215, but the Government's contention which has also been accepted by the Pay Commission is, it should be given at 10 points above 218, which would mean when the cost of living goes up by 10 points from 218 to 228. This is the crux of the matter. If this is not the correct position, honourable trade union members from all sides of the House, who are very powerful, have got tremendous channels to discuss this matter with the Government. But when a calling attention is admitted here, Government has to state its position.

He has referred to para 26 of the Pay Commission's interim report. A distinction is sought to be made between interim relief and DA. I would request him to read it again. It refers to the question of linking this allowance, whether you call it interim relief or DA, with pensionary and other benefits. It does not argue that the Pay Commission has come to the conclusion that interim relief is something different from DA. I have read it very carefully. I knew I have to answer Mr Banerjee's question. When the representative of the Central Government employees came to me, I got this and I also got the other connected papers and read them. I am speaking, not with authority, but with some conviction after having gone into it thoroughly.

If you take the reference that the Government made to the Pay Commission para 4 says :

"In case, in view of increase in cost of living, the need for consideration of relief of an interim character arises during the course of the deliberations of the commission, the commission may consider the demand for relief of an interim character and send a report thereon. In the event of the commission recommending any interim relief, the date from which the relief should take effect will be indicated by the commission."

So, the reference indicated that in the interim period, if the cost of living index goes up, relief of an interim character may be recommended by the commission. After the Gajendragadkar Commission report was implemented, when the two-year period had elapsed, government set up a Pay Commission. Having set up the Pay Commission, which has to go into the entire structure of the pay, emoluments, allowances, pension, gratuity and other fringe benefits to the employees; because the cost of living was going up, Government thought that pending the finalisation of the report relief of an interim character was called for; I am not using the term 'interim relief' but relief of an interim character. It may include increased allowances or other benefits and various other things. It may be that when recommendations of the Pay Commission are finalised they may recommend that a part of the dearness allowance should be included as part of pay because the whole structure of the pay and allowances of the Central Government employees has got to be gone into by the Pay Commission. Therefore, in the context of the increase in the cost of living it was felt that relief of an interim character was called for, which the Pay Commission gave and the Government accepted it. Now the Pay Commission itself has conceded that it may be that even after the relief has been given, before it finalises its recommendations,

the price position may become intractable and another relief may be called for. At what point this relief is called for is indicated by the Pay Commission. They say that whenever there is a rise by ten points relief is called for which, according to the Pay Commission, which they have confirmed, will be 228. That is the exact position which the government takes. I do not think there is any difference of opinion on that. The Pay Commission themselves have stated that till they finalise their recommendations, till they come to the conclusions on the criteria for dearness allowance, the quantum of dearness allowance, whether it should be based on the Das Commission Report or the Gajendragadkar Commission Report or it should be based on other considerations, because the employees' federations have demanded various other things like need-based minimum wage and so on which the earlier Pay Commissions had not taken into account, they said that till they finalise their recommendation they do not wish to depart from the practice of relief after ten point increase which was given by the Gajendragadkar and other Commissions.

SHRI A. P. SHARMA : (Buxar) How long is the Pay Commission going to take to give its report? How long the employees have to wait? He has not made that clear.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE : Sir, he has not answered my last question. The entire matter has been referred to the Cabinet Secretary, who is the Chairman of the JCM. He has heard both sides and he has reserved his interpretation which he will give at the earliest opportunity. What is the reaction of government to that?

DR. RANEN SEN (Barasat) : It is quite evident from the statement of the hon. Minister that he is standing on prestige. Because, in his statement he has conceded that the index figure for April 1971 was 225.83 which means nearly 226. It is also known to the Minister that in the computation of the cost of

living index a number of difficulties arise in regard to the price of materials on which the computation is made. The Minister is also aware that in Bombay the workers were deprived of crores of rupees because of the peculiar way in which the computation of the cost of living index was made. Later on, it was corrected as a result of which the workers got back crores of rupees.

In regard to the computation of the cost of living index also, it would be admitted by the Minister himself, that there may be a little mistake also. Now, we have reached 226 in April 1971, according to his statement, and it is known that after this Budget, these two points must have been covered. As stated by Shri S. M. Banerjee in his last question, which has not been answered, the Cabinet Secretary has himself admitted that there is some relevance in the arguments raised by the employees in the JCM. Therefore, simply on the question of two points in April 1971, is it advisable for the Government to pick up a quarrel with the employees, knowing fully well that in the mean time, after the Budget has been presented, at least there has been a rise of more than two points in the cost of living index? Therefore, I would request the Minister to consider this point and make a statement here on these particular two points.

SHRI K. R. GANESH : I think, I have covered most of the points that the hon. Member has raised. There is no question of standing on prestige. It is a question of difference in interpretation; I do not think the Government is going to stand on this question on prestige. There is no question about it. It is a clearcut position. The Government will be committed to an increase in dearness allowance when the 12-monthly average of the cost of living index goes to 228. The only difference between the Government and the employees is whether it should be at 225 or at 228.

SHRI A. P. SHARMA : Even this point needs arbitration.

SHRI K. R. GANESH : As to the point raised by the hon. Member about the increase as a result of the Budget, I wish to submit that till April the cost of living index has been steady at 224. Because of factors that the hon. member has mentioned and others factors that usually go into it, in the next few months probably the cost of living index may undergo a change. But the fact remains that the cost of living index, right from January, has been steady at 224.

I have stated the position of Government in relation to the demand for increase of dearness allowance. As I submitted earlier, a very senior Member is raising this point and I think he has so many other channels to discuss this problem.

SHRI A. P. SHARMA : The channel is only up to the Cabinet Secretary, not up to your Cabinet.

SHRI K. R. GANESH : When you commit the Government to reply to a calling-attention notice, this is bound to be the reply. I have stated the position.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE : Sir, I rise on a point of order. In reply to the calling-attention, the last sentence of the hon. Minister was, "If you want a reply to the calling-attention notice, the reply would be like this." This is actually an insult to the entire House.

SHRI P. K. DEO (Kalahandi) : He should withdraw it.

MR. SPEAKER : He is very much correct. It is not a point of order.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE : I have all the respect for Shri Ganesh. He is a very good friend of mine.

MR. SPEAKER : If you go on speaking without my permission, nothing will go on record.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE : The same question has been asked by two Members and the Minister does not reply to it.

MR. SPEAKER : The Minister says that in his position as a Minister, he has to take up certain positions. But during negotiations, something else may come out. So far as the position of Government is concerned, he has stated like that. Why don't you appreciate it ?

DR. RANEN SEN : The last point that I had raised and which was also raised by my hon. friend, Shri S. M. Banerjee, was not answered. Since the Cabinet Secretary is seized with the matter, will the Government relent to a better position or will they stick to that ?

MR. SPEAKER : I asked him. If he is not in a position to answer, I cannot force him.

SHRI K. R. GANESH : I will answer it. I was trying to answer it. Let me in all humility submit to you that I was trying to see that you do not commit me to this. This is the position of the Government at the highest level.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE : We will see that the JCM is not sabotaged like that. We will see that nobody attends the J.C.M. The J.C.M. cannot become a tool in the hands of the Indira Gandhi Government.

MR. SPEAKER : The papers to be laid.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU : (Diamond Harbour) : I want to draw the attention of the House to the strike of the J.K. Rayon, Kanpur.....

SHRI SPEAKER : I am not allowing.

MR. JYOTIRMOY BOSU : The U.P. Government is illegally trying to suppress

it by taking regressive measures. The Labour Minister, Mr. Khadilkar should intervene in the matter.

MR. SPEAKER : I am not allowing it.

SHRI S.M. BANERJEE : Why can't the Labour Minister intervene in the case of J.K. Rayon ?

MR. SPEAKER : The papers to be laid.

SHRI VIKRAM CHAND MAHAJAN: Yesterday, we had raised a matter relating to the dissolution of the Punjab Assembly. What about that ?

MR. SPEAKER : I said, "later on" which does not mean today.

SHRI VIKRAM CHAND MAHAJAN: At least you convey our feelings that the Governor should be recalled.

MR. SPEAKER : May I request you to sit down. You are a lawyer yourself. Yesterday, you wanted to ask something about the dissolution of the Punjab Assembly. The Prime Minister was here I will look into it. But if you want to go into the question of recalling the Governor or anything like that, that will amount to discussing the conduct of the Governor which is not permissible under the rule.

SHRI N. K. SHARMA (Dausa) : You allow us an opportunity to have a discussion.

MR. SPEAKER : You will have an opportunity.

SHRI N. K. SHARMA : This is an important issue. The time should be fixed for that.

MR. SPEAKER : Everything is important.

SHRI N. K. SHARMA : This is more important.

12.43 hrs.

PAPER LAID ON THE TABLE
NOTIFICATION RE : MARKET

LOAN FLOATED BY CENTRAL
GOVERNMENT IN 1971-72

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE
MINISTRY OF FINANCE (SHRI K. R.
GANESH) : I beg to lay on the Table a
copy of Notification No. F-5(4)-W &
M/71 published in Gazette of India
dated the 14th June, 1971 regarding Market
Loan floated by the Central Government
in 1971-72. [*Placed in Library. See No.
LT-411/71*]

ARREST OF MEMBERS

MR. SPEAKER : I have to inform the House that I have received the following message dated the 14th June, 1971 from the Sub-Divisional Magistrate, New Delhi :—

"I have the honour to inform you that the following three Members of Lok Sabha have been arrested today at about 2-15 p.m. between Raj Path Rafi Marg crossing and Vijay Chowck, New Delhi by police of P.S. Parliament Street, under Section 188 I.P.C. vide F.I.R. No. 950 dated 14.6.71 for violation of prohibitory orders promulgated by the Additional District Magistrate (South) Delhi. They are being remanded to Jail custody today and will be produced before Judicial Magistrate 1st Class, tomorrow :—

1. Sri Hukam Chand Kachwai ;