

ternational trade fairs and exhibitions inside and outside India.

(c) Does not arise.

**RAILWAY LINE FROM SILCHAR RAIL-HEAD TO JIRI**

3056. SHRI M. MEGHACHANDRA : Will the Minister of RAILWAYS be pleased to state :

(a) whether there is any proposal to construct a Railway line from Silchar Rail-head to Jiri of Jiribam Sub-division of Manipur;

(b) whether the Manipur Government and the public are desirous of the said rail connection; and

(c) if so, the decisions taken in the matter ?

**THE MINISTER OF RAILWAYS (SHRI C. M. POONACHA) :** (a). No.

(b) Yes.

(c) Due to paucity of funds, this proposal cannot be considered at present.

**SURVEY OF RAILWAY LINE FROM SUPAUL TO PRATAPGANJ (BIHAR)**

3057. SHRI GUNANAND THAKUR : Will the Minister of RAILWAYS be pleased to state :

(a) whether a survey in regard to Supaul-Pratapganj Railway line has been undertaken by the North-Eastern Railway;

(b) if so, the place upto which the survey has been carried out;

(c) whether it is a fact that it is essential to provide the Supaul-Pratapganj Railway line from the view point of the development of Bihar; and

(d) if so, the time by which the work in regard to the said Railway line would be undertaken and the reasons for the delay ?

**THE MINISTER OF RAILWAYS (SHRI C. M. POONACHA) :** (a) to (d). For the development of the area the Railway line from Supaul to Thurhbhita has already been reserved recently. Investigations for further restoration of the railway line from Thurhbhita to Bhanthiahi, a distance of about 13 Kms., are being carried out. A final decision on the restoration of the line upto Bha-

ptiahi will be taken after the survey report is received and examined by the Railway Board. Due to the present difficult ways and means position the proposal for restoration of the line upto Pratapganj is not likely to be taken up for consideration in the near future.

12 HRS.

**CALLING ATTENTION TO MATTER OF URGENT PUBLIC IMPORTANCE**

**REPORTED DISCONTENT AMONG EMPLOYEES OF ELECTRICITY UNDERTAKINGS FOLLOWING GOVERNMENT'S DECISION TO AMEND WAGE BOARD RECOMMENDATIONS**

श्री ए० ए० जोशी : (पूना) : अध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं अविश्वनीय लोक मष्टव के निम्नलिखित विषय की ओर धन, रोजगार तथा पुनर्वास मंत्री का ध्यान दिलाता हूँ और प्रार्थना करता हूँ कि वह इस बारे में एक बकवच दे :—

“मजूरी बोर्ड की अन्तरिम सिफारिशों में एकदशीय ढंग से संशोधन करने के सरकार के निश्चय के कारण देश में विजवाँ उपकरणों के कर्माचारियों में घोर असन्तोष”

**THE MINISTER OF LABOUR AND REHABILITATION (SHRI HATHI) :** The Government by its Resolution dated 20th June, 1968 accepted the recommendations of the Central Wage Board for Electricity Undertakings subject to the modifications/clarifications with regard to :

- (1) the date of applicability of the recommendations of the Wage Board;
- (2) the non-applicability of the recommendations to Government's Departmental Undertakings;
- (3) adjustments to be made against interim relief recommended by the Wage Board in cases any relief has been given to the employees after the constitution of the Wage Board, whether with or without retrospective effect, but subject to the conditions

— that it will not apply to increases in wages/pay due to grant of annual increments, promotions and transfers from one place to another.

So far as the date of applicability is concerned, after a careful consideration of this recommendation it was felt that payment of interim relief retrospectively from 1st January, 1967, as recommended by the Wage Board, might adversely affect the finances of the Electricity industry and lead to an increase in the electricity rates. It was, therefore, decided that the recommendations should have retrospective effect only from the 1st July, 1967.

Apart from this modification it was decided to clarify that the recommendations shall not apply to electricity undertakings run as Governmental Undertakings. The service conditions and pay scales of Government employees are regulated by departmental orders and any changes in their emoluments and other conditions of service are the subject matter of separate enquiries by Pay Commissions/Committees etc. I may point out that so far 14 Wage Boards have submitted their final recommendations and six others have made interim recommendations. None of these are, however, applicable to Government servants as such. It may also be clarified that the apprehension in the minds of the workers that this modification will exclude employees of State Electricity Boards is not correct. This modification applies only to those undertakings which are run by Government as Departmental undertakings.

The Board has itself recommended that interim relief in one or more instalments which the employees may have been given with effect from 28th May 1966 or any date subsequent to 28th May, 1966 but earlier than 1st September, 1967, should be adjusted in the total emoluments as recommended by the Board. It has been clarified in the Government Resolution that where any relief has been given by way of increases in dearness allowance and/or emoluments after the constitution of the Wage Board, whether with or without

retrospective effect such relief could be allowed for adjustment against the interim relief recommended by the Wage Board but that such adjustment will not apply to increases in wages/pay due to grant of annual increments, promotions and transfers from one place to another. It was brought to our notice that some State Electricity Boards had issued orders after the 28th May, 1966 i.e. the date of the constitution of the Wage Board for increases in the emoluments of their employees and that in some cases these orders had retrospective effect from a date earlier than the date of the Board's appointment.

I appreciate the viewpoint expressed in certain quarters that unanimous recommendations of the Board should be accepted by Government without any modifications. The House will, however, agree that the Government has to take into account the over all effect of the recommendations on the country's economy and has to ensure that the implementation of the recommendations does not impose an unduly heavy burden on the industry and the consumers, especially in this case. It will thus be seen that in the present case except the change of date of the application retrospectively of the Wage Board's recommendations, the other two changes are by way of clarification.

श्री एस० एम० जोशी : एलेक्ट्रिसिटी बोर्ड में काम करने वाले कर्मचारियों के लिये जो वेज बोर्ड बना उसके बनने के दो साल बाद यह अन्तरिम सिफारिशें आई हैं। अब शासन की तरफ से यह बतलाया जा रहा है कि जो एलेक्ट्रिसिटी बोर्ड शासन के ही डिपार्टमेंट समझे जाते हैं उन पर वह सिफारिशें लागू नहीं की जायेंगी। मगर शासन को यह पता है कि जब वेज बोर्ड बना था तब एलेक्ट्रिसिटी बोर्ड के कर्मचारियों को यह बतलाया जाता था जब उनकी तरफ से मांगें आती थीं तब, कि अब तुम्हारे लिये वेज बोर्ड बनाया गया है, इस लिये अभी हम तुम्हारे लिये कुछ नहीं करना चाहते हैं। जब वेज बोर्ड की सिफारिशें आ गई हैं तब उनको यह बतलाया

[श्री एस० एम० जोशी]

जा रहा है कि तुमको डिपार्टमेंट के जरिए से काम दिया गया है इस लिये यह तुम पर लागू नहीं होगी।

दूसरी बात यह कि जो स्टेट एलेक्ट्रिसिटी बोर्ड्स हैं, हालांकि वह आटोनोमस हैं, फिर भी गवर्नमेंट सर्वेंट्स के लिये जो कंडि-शन्स आफ सर्विस एण्ड कांडक्ट रूल्स हैं वह उन पर लागू किये जाते हैं, और इस बहाने से कहा जाता है कि तुम गवर्नमेंट सर्वेंट हो इस लिये तुमको वेज बोर्ड की सिफारिशों के कारण जो रियायतें मिलनी चाहियें वह नहीं मिलेंगी। इस तरह से वेज बोर्ड के जरिये से मजदूरों ने जो कुछ हासिल किया है उसमें से उनको कुछ मिलने वाला नहीं है। हमको डर है कि करीब-करीब आधे कर्मचारियों को इन सिफारिशों का फायदा नहीं होगा। मैं मंत्री महोदय से चाहूंगा कि पहले तो वह यह बतलायें कि कितने मजदूरों को इसका फायदा होगा। क्या इसके कोई फिगरस उनके पास हैं? दूसरी बात यह कि जब इंडियन लेबर कान्फ-रन्स में गवर्नमेंट की तरफ से यह आश्वासन दिया गया कि वेज बोर्ड की जो सिफारिशें यूनेनिमस होंगी उनमें कोई तबदीली नहीं की जायेगी परन्तु अब वह आश्वासन तोड़े जा रहे हैं। कारण यह बतलाया जाता है कि इन्फोमोमी का क्या होगा। जो वेज बोर्ड की तरफ से प्रेम वालों के लिए एवाइड आया था और हकूमत ने आर्डर पास किया परन्तु उमको वालायनाक रख दिया गया प्रेस वालों ने। और उसको ले कर हमारी हकूमत कहती है कि हम कुछ कर नहीं पाते हैं। जो गरीब मजदूर हैं उनके लिए यह फर्क करेगी और उन से मनवाएगी लेकिन बड़े बड़े लोगों का जब सवाल आता है तो कुछ नहीं करती है। मैं जानना चाहता हूँ कि जो वेज पॉसिबल है उसमें आपने क्या कोई तबदीली कर दी है और पहले जो हम लोगों ने मजदूरों को आश्वासन दिये उनको क्या हम तोड़ना चाहते हैं?

SHRI HATHI : The Hon. member has asked two or three questions. I very well understand the apprehension in the mind of the workers that those who are employees of State Electricity Boards but are governed by the conduct rules of the Government are not strictly government servants and the wage board recommendations should apply to them. I have already said that the wage board recommendations will apply to all the employees of the State Electricity Boards. There are only two States where there are no State Electricity Boards—Jammu and Kashmir and Nagaland and Union Territories. This modification applies only to those undertakings which are run by Government as departmental undertakings. This will not affect those employees of State Electricity Boards who merely for the sake of rules are governed by that.

Secondly, it has been said that the unanimous recommendations should be accepted. I appreciate it. Here there may be unanimity and both the workers and employers have agreed. But they also know that this will lead to increase in the rate of electricity. Both have said that the State Governments should be requested to allow the boards to adjust the rate accordingly. That means, retrospectively the rate of electricity should be raised. That is also a unanimous recommendation. It will mean the poor consumers including the farmers will be affected retrospectively. Therefore, we have to consider that aspect.

Thirdly, this industry is different from other industries. Here the rates have got to be so adjusted that they can get only a reasonable return, which is 2 per cent. more than the current bank rate, i.e. 7 per cent. This is not an industry where they can make unreasonable profit. In the case of private industry, they have to adjust their profits in such a way that it is just 2 per cent above the bank rate. In the case of others which are State Electricity Boards, the question does not arise.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE (Kanpur):  
On a previous occasion in this House  
—I would like to remind hon. members

—when the bank award was amended by Government, the great labour leader, Mr. V. V. Giri resigned on that issue. Here the hon. minister who is a party to the modification is defending it.

**SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES** (Bombay South): If you resign, you will be the next Vice-President!

**SHRI S. M. BANERJEE**: I want to know whether it is a fact that in the Indian Labour Conference and the Wages Standing Labour Committee, a solemn assurance was given by the Government that the unanimous recommendation of any wage board will not be tampered with or modified or amended. Here if this amendment is accepted, State electricity workers of Nagaland, Himachal Pradesh and Jammu and Kashmir will not get anything. Electricity workers of hydel projects under irrigation and power will not get anything. 30,000 workers of Andhra Pradesh will not get anything. In Kanpur and some other places in UP where they have got some benefit on 1st April 1965, they will hardly get Rs. 2 or Rs. 3.75 per cent of the workers in the electricity undertakings will not derive any benefit if these three amendments are accepted. I would ask him, why was this amended without making any reference to this House at all? Whenever board recommendations are given, they are laid on the Table along with the Government's resolution. This was an interim recommendation circulated to us when Parliament was not in session in June. It was modified on 20th June 1968. You were kind enough to admit this calling attention notice and this statement has come. Otherwise, the country would not have known that unilaterally and shamelessly this has been modified by the Government. I would, therefore, like to know why this has been modified, whether it is going to be restored and or whether he is going to wait for a general strike by the electricity workers and lastly, whether he will resign on this issue.

**SHRI HATHI**: There is no question of resigning on this issue; when the

deputation of the electricity workers met me—in fact Mr. Banerjee was to come along with them—on the first point, *i.e.* retrospective effect, I have been able to convince them and they were not pressing that.

**SHRI S. M. BANERJEE**: They were never convinced. They said, if the Government did not modify the recommendations and if the retrospective effect was the only thing which Government wanted, they would consider it. They should not be misquoted.

**SHRI HATHI**: I think I have been able to convince them. If Mr. Banerjee had come, I would have been able to convince him also. I have already said that although they are unanimous recommendations, the effect would be that the rates of electricity would have to be increased retrospectively. We have to take that into consideration. Secondly, he asked why did the Government change the recommendation without consulting Parliament. That is never the practice. The practice is that the Government considers the recommendations of the Wage Board and whatever decisions it takes, they are laid on the Table of the House. In this case, Government's decision has been laid on the Table.

**SHRI S. M. BANERJEE**: My question was....

**MR. SPEAKER**: It is so long. We do not know where it begins and where it ends.

**SHRI S. M. BANERJEE**: I know that supplementaries should not be more than 150 words under the rules. Sir, this is the interim recommendation, not the complete recommendation. This interim recommendation has been modified by the Government without any consultation with the employees. Why has it been modified without reference to Parliament? If he takes the view that this was not a statutory board, that is a different matter. But why were the employees not consulted about the modification? Is it a fact that the workers of Nagaland, Himachal Pra-

[Shri S. M. Banerjee]

Jammu, Jammu and Kashmir and Andhra will be completely deprived of the benefit?

**SHRI HATHI:** I have given the reason why this recommendation was modified although it was unanimous. As I said, the boards have to get the money from the consumers to pay the workers. The interests of the poor consumers also have to be looked into. Secondly, he has said that half of the workers will be deprived. I have asked them to let me know the position. It would not be half. Their main contention was that UP electricity workers would be debarred because they are governed by the government departmental rules. I have clarified that merely because they are governed by the government rules it cannot be said that it will not apply to them. In Jammu and Kashmir and Nagaland there is no electricity board at all. They are run as government departments. So, they are governed by the Pay Commission or Committee, whatever is appointed and the Government rules.

**श्री मधु लिमये (मुंगेर):** अध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं मंत्री महोदय से यह जानना चाहता हूँ कि इंडियन लेबर कांफ्रेंस के बारे में सरकार का जो रुख और नीति रही है, क्या उसमें कोई बुनियादी परिवर्तन आया है। यह सवाल मैं तीन बातों को लेकर पूछ रहा हूँ। स्वयं मंत्री महोदय ने कहा है:—

"I appreciate the viewpoint expressed in certain quarters that unanimous recommendations of the board should be accepted by government without any modification."

"सरटेन क्वार्टर" का क्या मतलब है ?

उन्होंने इंडियन लेबर कांफ्रेंस के सामने कहा कि जो वेज बोर्ड के सर्वसम्मत फ़ैसले होंगे, हम उनको पूर्णतया लागू करेंगे; उनमें कोई तबदीली नहीं करेंगे। अगर सरकार बहुमत वाले फ़ैसले में तबदीली करके उसको लागू करना चाहती है,

तो उसे वैसा करना चाहिये, लेकिन प्रैस के बारे में क्या हुआ ? गैर-पत्रकारों के वेज बोर्ड की मिफ़ारिमें बहुमत वाली थीं। मंत्री महोदय ने कहा कि हम उनमें तबदीली करके एक प्रस्ताव द्वारा उनको लागू कर रहे हैं, लेकिन उन पर भी अमल नहीं हुआ। कल मैंने कहा था कि केन्द्र सरकार के अनुसार ट्रेड यूनियन सम्बन्धी जितने भी कायदे-कानून और विधेयक आदि हैं, उन पर इंडियन लेबर कांफ्रेंस में विचार होना चाहिये और उसकी सम्मति के बिना उनको पास नहीं किया जाना चाहिये। श्री मोरारजी देसाई ने इस बात का कोई जवाब नहीं दिया था। आज मजदूर मंत्री को इसका जवाब जरूर देना चाहिये। उत्तर प्रदेश की संविद सरकार के मजदूर मंत्री, श्री प्रभु नारायण सिंह, ने एक बिल बनाया था कि यूनियनों के आपसी झगड़ों का हल निकालने के लिये बिल्ट के द्वारा मतदान किया जाये। वह बिल मंत्री महोदय के पास आया और मंत्री महोदय ने श्री प्रभु नारायण सिंह को जवाब दिया कि जब तक इंडियन लेबर कांफ्रेंस में इस पर विचार न हो, तब तक वह आगे न बढ़े। मैं यह जानना चाहता हूँ कि जब सरकार की ओर से यह कहा गया है कि वेज बोर्ड के बहुमत वाले निर्णय को तबदीली के साथ लागू किया जायेगा, सर्वसम्मत निर्णय को पूर्णतया लागू किया जायेगा और इंडियन लेबर कांफ्रेंस की सम्मति के बिना श्रम सम्बन्धी कोई कायदा-कानून नहीं बनाया जायेगा, तो फिर बैकिंग लाज (एम्प्लॉमेंट) बिल में श्रम सम्बन्धी धारा क्यों रखी गई? मंत्री महोदय इस बारे में सफ़्त जवाब दें कि क्या इंडियन लेबर कांफ्रेंस के सम्बन्ध में सरकार की नीति में कोई बुनियादी परिवर्तन आया है; अगर हाँ, तो वह उसको वृक्षस्त कर दे, फिर लड़ाई होगी और सड़कों पर फ़ंगला होगा।

**SHRI HATHI:** So far as the unanimous recommendations of the wage

boards are concerned, generally they are being accepted. But we have to take an overall view of the situation. Ultimately whether it should be accepted or not it is for the Government to decide. Generally, they are accepted. The convention is whenever a labour legislation is to be brought forward, we discuss it in the Indian Labour Conference. This was not strictly relating to labour.

श्री मधु लिमये : मंत्री महोदय इसको इंडियन लेबर कांफ्रेंस में ले जायें और कहे कि यह लेबर के सम्बन्ध में नहीं है।

MR. SPEAKER : The Banking Companies Bill is different.

श्री मधु लिमये : मैं चाहता हूँ कि मंत्री महोदय की तरफ से साफ-साफ ईमानदारी से जवाब आये। डांगे साहब बैठे हैं। वह इंडियन लेबर कांफ्रेंस में जाते हैं। मेरे प्रश्न का जवाब नहीं मिला है। मंत्री महोदय साफ-साफ जवाब दें। वह बैंकिंग लाज (एम्प्लॉयमेंट) बिल में से श्रम सम्बन्धी धारा को निकलवायें। फिर मैं उनकी बात मानूँगा।

MR. SPEAKER : That is different.

श्री शिव नारायण (बस्ती) : अध्यक्ष महोदय, मेरा व्यवस्था का प्रश्न है। माननीय सदस्य ने कहा है कि ईमानदारी से जवाब दिया जाये। क्या यहाँ पर कोई बेईमानी से जवाब देता है?

MR. SPEAKER : No, he cannot put a question. The other things he can leave to me.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA (Alipore) : I am very sorry to find my good friend, Shri Hathi, shedding crocodile tears for the consumer in order to deprive workers of their dues. May I remind him that in the case of previous wage boards, in the coal industry and iron and steel industry, when the boards made unanimous recommendations which would have necessarily led to a rise in prices of steel and coal, for which the consumers would have to

pay, this government saw to it that while the recommended wages were given to the workers, simultaneously, they allowed the price of coal and steel to be raised. But, in this case, because the electricity rates would have to be raised, he says the workers are to be deprived of the recommended wages. What kind of principle are they going to follow, I would like to know. Secondly, this wage board took two years or more, I think, to make even an interim recommendation, which is a very unusual thing. May I know from him whether or not the members of this wage board included all interests concerned, including those who are representing the owners' side or employers' side of these undertakings? And, am I to take it that though they deliberated for two years they were not able to understand that these unanimous recommendations might have an adverse effect on industry and only Shri Hathi has the wisdom to understand it subsequently? Are we to take it that the members of the wage board were ignorant and never understood anything although they included the owners of these undertakings? How is this? Thirdly and lastly, does he realise what the government has done now—because, it is not a question of "generally all unanimous recommendations are accepted"; they have always been accepted; he cannot give even a single instance where it is not so—the present action of the government would prejudice the future of all wage boards hereafter and no self-respecting person would be willing to serve on a wage board either as Chairman or member because even unanimous recommendations of such a board are tampered with by the government? Does he realise that?

SHRI D. C. SHARMA (Gurdaspur) : No.

SHRI HATHI : So far as the coal wage board is concerned, we had changed the date of implementation. So far as the coal prices are concerned, the employers wanted the price of coal to be raised but it was not raised. Only coal was de-controlled. So, there was no question of government raising the price.

**SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA :** What about the retention price of steel? Also, what about my other question?

**SHRI HATHI :** Which one?

**SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA :** The wage board including a representative of the employers.

**SHRI HATHI :** It did include representatives of employers. My reply to that point was that both agreed that this should be increased. But the employers wanted that they should be allowed to increase the rate of electricity so that they will have nothing to lose.

**SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA :** What will happen to the future of wage boards?

**SHRI HATHI :** That is for Sub-Committee to decide.

**MR. SPEAKER :** He cannot answer for the future.

**SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA :** All the conventions have been broken.

**श्री जार्ज फरनेन्डिज :** अध्यक्ष महोदय, आज इसी वेज बोर्ड के मामले को लेकर कई दिनों से पत्रकारों की हड़ताल चल रही है। जहां यह सरकार सर्वसम्मति से आए हुए फ्रंसले को इस ढंग से ठुकराती है, वहां इस सरकार के द्वारा पत्रकारों की हड़ताल के मामले को हल करना क्यों असम्भव है, इसकी ओर मैं आपका ध्यान आकर्षित करना चाहता हूँ। मंत्री महोदय ने अभी जो बयान दिया है, उसमें उन्होंने कितनी गलत-बयानियाँ की हैं, उसका मैं एक उदाहरण देता हूँ। पहले पन्ने पर वह कहते हैं :—

"The interim relief recommended from 1st January 1967 might have adversely affected the finances of the electricity industry and let to an increase in the electricity rates. It was, therefore, decided that the recommendations should have retrospective effect only from the 1st July 1967."

अगर छः महीने का इन्टरिम रिलीफ दिया जायेगा, तो इलेक्ट्रिसिटी अंडरटेकिंग्स के सारे फिनांसिज बिगड़ जायेंगे, इस किस्म का बयान हिन्दुस्तान के मजदूर मंत्री आज इस सदन में और देश के सामने कर रहे हैं। इसके द्वारा या तो वह सभी लोगों को गुमराह करने का प्रयास कर रहे हैं, या लोगों के सामने सरकार की बेवकूफी को प्रकट कर रहे हैं। मैं यह जानना चाहता हूँ कि श्री इन्द्रजीत गुप्त ने वेज बोर्ड के भविष्य को लेकर जो प्रश्न उठाया है, क्या उसको मद्दे नज़र रखते हुए मंत्री महोदय इस फ्रंसले पर पुनर्विचार करेंगे और इस सम्बन्ध में इलेक्ट्रिसिटी कर्मचारियों के प्रतिनिधियों से बातचीत करेंगे। जैसा कि श्री बनर्जी ने कहा है, पत्रकारों के वेज बोर्ड, इलेक्ट्रिसिटी कर्मचारियों के वेज बोर्ड और बैंकिंग लाज (एम्प्लॉयमेंट) बिल क्लाइम 36 ए० डी० को दृष्टि में रखते हुए जब मंत्री महोदय मजदूर नीति को अमल में लाने में बिल्कुल असमर्थ साबित हुए हैं, तो क्या वह सरकार से अपना इस्तीफा पेश करेंगे?

**SHRI HATHI :** I have replied to that.

**MR. SPEAKER :** He is not prepared to resign. You wanted his resignation. I do not think he will oblige you.

**श्री जार्ज फरनेन्डिज :** मंत्री महोदय इस बात का तो जवाब दें कि क्या वह अपनी नीति को बदलेंगे और कर्मचारियों के प्रतिनिधियों से बातचीत करेंगे।

**SHRI S. M. BANERJEE :** It is not a question; it is a suggestion for action. Let him say whether he will consider it or not.

**SHRI S. A. DANGE (Bombay Central South) :** The suggestion is that he may convene a tripartite conference on the electricity question and settle it.

**SHRI MADHU LIMAYE :** And Banking laws.

**SHRI HATHI :** What was the suggestion?

श्री आर्ज कर्मेगडीश : अध्यक्ष महोदय, प्रश्न के पहले हिस्से का तो उत्तर दें । एनेक्टिसिटी कर्मचारियों के प्रतिनिधियों को बुला कर इस सारी संभट को मिटाने के लिये आप कोई कदम उठाएंगे क्या ?

श्री हार्थी : मैंने उनको बुलाया था और वह मुझे मिलने आये थे । मैंने कहा है कि जो आप की पहली एक शर्त है कि जो गवर्नमेंट कान्ट्रक्ट रूल्स के अंडर में हैं उनको लागू नहीं होगा, वह बात गलत है । इसमें कोई शक नहीं है और मैंने कहा कि आप कहते हैं ।

that one third of the workers will not be covered, I have asked them to let me have the figures. Who are the one-third ?

SHRI S. A. DANGE : He had called a tripartite on the Coal Wage Board recommendations. Why does he not do it in this case ? (*Interruptions*).

SHRI HATHI : After we get the facts.

MR. SPEAKER : Papers to be laid on the Table.

श्री मधु सिमये : मैं एक आप से खुलासा चाहता हूँ । अध्यक्ष महोदय, आज अहमदाबाद से खबर आई है, अखबार में छपा है कि मोरारजी भाई ने इस्तीफा दिया है । मेरे प्रश्नों, प्रस्तावों का क्या हुआ ? क्या सचमुच इस्तीफा दे रहे हैं मोरारजी देसाई ?

MR. SPEAKER : Not now. It is not proper to raise it like this.

12.31 HRS.

#### PAPERS LAID ON THE TABLE

REPORT ETC. UNDER TARIFF COMMISSION ACT, 1951

THE MINISTER OF INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT AND COMPANY AFFAIRS (SHRI F. A. AHMED) : I beg to lay on the Table—

- (1) A copy each of the following papers under sub-section (2) of

section 16 of the Tariff Commission Act, 1951 :—

- (i) Report (1967) of the Tariff Commission on the Fixation of Prices of Agricultural Tractors.

- (ii) Government Resolution No. 5/44/67/AE.I. II, dated the 3rd June, 1968.

- (iii) Statement showing reasons why the documents mentioned at (i) and (ii) above could not be laid on the Table within the period prescribed in the said section. [*Placed in Library. See No. LT-1629/68*].

- (2) A copy of Notification No. S.O. 1955, published in Gazette of India dated the 3rd June, 1968 issued under clause 4 of the Tractors (Price Control) Order, 1967. [*Placed in Library. See No. LT-1629/68*].

#### NOTIFICATIONS UNDER EXPORT (QUALITY CONTROL AND INSPECTION) ACT

THE MINISTER OF COMMERCE (SHRI DINESH SINGH) : I beg to lay on the Table a copy each of the following Notifications under sub-section (3) of section 17 of the Export (Quality Control and Inspection) Act, 1963 :—

- (1) The Export of De-oiled Rice Bran (Quality Control and Inspection) Amendment Rules, 1968, published in Notification No. S.O. 2537 in Gazette of India, dated the 12th July, 1968 (Hindi and English versions).
- (2) The Export of Frog Legs (Inspection) Amendment Rules, 1968, published in Notification No. S.O. 2609 in Gazette of India, dated the 18th July, 1968 (Hindi and English versions).
- (3) The Export of P.V.C. Leather Cloth (Inspection) Amendment Rules, 1968, published in Notification No. S.O. 2619 in Gazette of India, dated the 24th July, 1968 (Hindi and English versions). [*Placed in Library. See No. LT-1630/68*].