

**अध्यक्ष महोदय :** स्वामी जी को तो जो अपील की गई उसे सुनना चाहिये था ।

“नमन्ति फलिनो वृक्षाः नमन्ति गुणिनो जनाः”

**श्री रामेश्वरानन्द :** अगर आप मुझ पर ही यह श्लोक लागू करते हैं तो मैं माने लेता हूँ, लेकिन और कोई इस उपदेश को मानने के लिये तैयार नहीं है ।

(ii) STRIKE BY DELHI MILK SCHEME EMPLOYEES—contd.

**Mr. Speaker:** We shall now take up the calling-attention notice relating to the Delhi Milk Scheme. The hon. Minister of Food and Agriculture may make his statement now.

**The Minister of Food and Agriculture (Shri C. Subramaniam):** I am sorry I was not present in the House yesterday when this matter was raised.

I would like to give a few facts to the House so that it may appreciate the situation better with regard to the Delhi Milk Scheme.

In June, after I took over this portfolio, I made a scrutiny of the state of affairs in the Delhi Milk Scheme, and I thought that it should be properly investigated by an expert committee. An expert committee under the chairmanship of Shri Kurien of Anand was appointed to go into the affairs of the Delhi Milk Scheme and make recommendations for the betterment of the Delhi Milk Scheme. The committee did make many recommendations, the two main recommendations being as follows. The first was that the Delhi Milk Scheme instead of being run as a part of the Department of Agriculture should be converted into a commercial organisation by being registered as a company, under the company law, to be owned completely by Government, and the other was with reference to the contract system for the supply of milk to the Delhi Milk Scheme, which has been causing difficulties with regard to the supply of milk to the Delhi Milk Scheme.

It is in pursuance of the first recommendation that we have been exploring the possibility of the Delhi Milk

Scheme being converted into a public limited company.

In August, when I visited the Delhi Milk Scheme, I gave expression to this point of view that there was a proposal to convert the Delhi Milk Scheme into a public limited company, when apprehensions were expressed by the workers there that by this conversion, their terms and service conditions might get affected. Then I gave an assurance to the workers there in a public meeting that as far as the present employees were concerned, Government would do everything to see that their service conditions were not adversely affected by this conversion, and I thought that the workers also were satisfied with this assurance. In addition to this, at that time, because we had also to make some changes in the management since we thought that the management was not efficient enough to conduct the affairs of the Delhi Milk Scheme, we got on loan the services of a very able officer from Gujarat, who has now been put in charge of the Delhi Milk Scheme.

Last month, there was a demonstration in front of my house by some workers of the Delhi Milk Scheme protesting against this conversion. I sent for some of the representatives of the workers who had assembled there and reiterated to them the assurance which I had already given.

Again, this month the workers wanted to see me in this connection. On the 15th, I gave an appointment to those representatives of the employees there. Again I assured them that in case the conversion was going through, the service conditions, rights and privileges of the existing employees would not, in any way, be adversely affected, and they need not have any apprehension about it. They again expressed their view that this conversion should not go through, that they should continue to work as part of the Department of Agriculture, to which I said that we had to consider this from the aspect of the interests of the community for whose benefit

the DMS was intended, and as far as the workers were concerned, they should be interested only in their rights and privileges being properly safeguarded.

Then they presented a memorandum to me. I refused to accept it for two reasons: first, because of the indecorous language which had been employed in it, and second, there were demands on the basis that this conversion should not go through. Therefore, I refused to accept it and advised them to give a memorandum indicating what were the rights and privileges which they wanted to be safeguarded in case of conversion. I asked the Chairman also, if such a memorandum was presented, to examine it and put it before me for perusal.

I thought that the representatives wards. I found that they had still not given. As a matter of fact, at that time a suggestion was made that this assurance should be given in writing. I said 'I gave the assurance not only here; I have publicly given this assurance'. I told them that a written assurance is not going to have greater sanctity than the assurance I had already given to them. I thought they were satisfied about it.

Then I retired to my room. Afterwards, I found that they had still not left, that there was some altercation going on in the corridor of my house. I came out and told them that now that they had made a representation, they should get out of the house without making a further scene.

Then at about midnight—a little after midnight—I received a phone call and I was informed that there was a strike in the Delhi Milk Scheme. I immediately contacted, Shri K. N. Pande, an hon. Member of this House, who happens to be President of the INTUC union, Delhi branch. I asked him to proceed to DMS, and if possible, find out what was their grievance, and have the matter settled so that the people may not be put to difficulty with regard to the supply of milk. The hon. Member was good enough to

proceed immediately to the DMS. From there, he phoned me up and said that they wanted a written assurance with regard to the assurance I had already given that their service terms would not in any way be affected. Then I instructed the Chairman to give that written assurance and persuade the employees to go back to work and see that the supply of milk was maintained the next morning. I am glad that with a written assurance, the employees went back to work.

But the point for the consideration of the House is whether, particularly in a matter of an essential supply, for the daily needs of the people, the employees of an organisation like this, whether there is provocation or not, whatever might be the provocation, even if there should be provocation should go on a strike and cause inconvenience to millions of inhabitants, the citizens of Delhi. I think this House should make it clear that whatever might be the grievances, there are other methods to get redress of those grievances and they should not resort to a strike, causing inconvenience to the citizens of Delhi, particularly children who have to depend on the DMS for supply of milk the next morning. Therefore, it is not only the ordinary citizen, but even children, who are affected.

I find this is the fourth time that they went on strike and something had to be done immediately for the purpose of averting a strike and getting them back to work.

This is the main picture I would like to place before the House. Even with regard to conversion, this House will have to take a view in this matter, whether in these matters, the interests of the community as a whole should predominate or we should care more for the interests of a few employees who have got employment in the institution. This will have to be kept in mind. No doubt, we shall try, as far as possible, to see that their interests are not affected. But I feel—and I hope the House will

[Shri C. Subramaniam]

agree with me—that in taking decisions the interests of the community should be kept in the forefront.

Some hon. Members: Yes, yes.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: On a point of clarification....

Shri Nath Pai: From this plethora of words, can we get regular supply of milk?

Shri S. M. Banerjee: From the statement, it appears that a written assurance was given to the employees of the organisation and they resumed work. I would like to know whether a final decision has since been taken to convert this into a limited company, and if so, whether Government are considering having one of their representatives as one of the members of the board so that the fear about their service conditions being jeopardised as a result of the change-over may be allayed.

Shri C. Subramaniam: It is still under examination.

श्री यशपाल सिंह (कैराना) : दिल्ली मिल्क सप्लाय का दूध दिल्ली की जनता को बोलियों में पूरे 96 घण्टे के बाद मिलता है और वह बदबूदार और खट्टा दूध यहां के निवासियों को सप्लाय किया जाता है तो क्या सरकार यह बतला सकती है कि अब जब यह दिल्ली मिल्क सप्लाय एक लिमिटेड कंसर्न बनने जा रही है तो क्या दिल्लीवासियों को अब ताजा दूध मिल सकेगा और वर्कर्स को स्ट्राइक पर नहीं जाना पड़ेगा ?

Shri C. Subramaniam: It will be our endeavour to see that the quality of the milk improves as much as possible, but for that the co-operation of the employees is also required. It is not as if merely by a directive from Government that the quality can be improved. Everybody will have to co-operate towards that, and it shall

be our endeavour to see that good quality milk is supplied.

Shri Nambiar (Tiruchirapalli): In view of the fact that on several previous occasions when departmental agencies had been converted into limited concerns—just like the Janpath Hotel conversion—many workers had to suffer, giving up their permanent service or continuity of service, will it be ensured that that will not be repeated in this case? Can an assurance to that effect be given?

Shri C. Subramaniam: I thought I had given that assurance to the workers; not only an oral assurance, but at the threat of a strike, I had given a written assurance also, to save the public.

Shri Umanath (Pudukkottai): In today's papers it has appeared that the union officials said that they have been assured that their present privileges will be protected. Immediately there is a contradiction from the DMS officials saying that they have been assured only that 'their present privileges will not be adversely affected'. I think the hon. Minister also repeated very carefully the expression 'will not be adversely affected'. I want to know the difference between 'protection of the present privileges' and 'present privileges not adversely affected'. Why this distinction?

Shri C. Subramaniam: If there is no distinction, the hon. Member need not press the point.

Shri Umanath: Why are you so careful about those words?

Mr. Speaker: He says there is no distinction.

Shri C. Subramaniam: I am using the words which had been used in the written assurance. It is that 'the rights and privileges of the employees of the Delhi Milk Scheme will not be adversely affected'. Therefore, I thought it would be better to adhere to the words which had been used in the assurance given.

**Shri K. N. Pande:** (Hata): May I say something?

**Mr. Speaker:** Papers to be laid on the Table.

## PAPERS LAID ON THE TABLE

### PAPERS UNDER TARIFF COMMISSION ACT

**The Deputy Minister in the Ministry of Commerce (Shri S. V. Ramaswamy):** On behalf of Shri Manubhai Shah, I beg to lay on the Table a copy each of the following papers under sub-section (2) of section 16 of the Tariff Commission Act, 1951:—

- (1) (i) Report (1964) of the Tariff Commission on the continuance of protection to the Titanium Dioxide Industry.
- (ii) Government Resolution No. 4(1)-Tar/64, dated the 14th December, 1964.
- (iii) Statement explaining the reasons why a copy each of the documents at (i) and (ii) above could not be laid on the Table within the period prescribed in the said sub-section.

[Placed in Library. See No. LT-3640/64].

- (2) (i) Report (1964) of the Tariff Commission on the continuance of protection to the Calcium Carbide Industry.
- (ii) Government Resolution No. 12(1)-Tar/64, dated the 14th December, 1964.
- (iii) Statement explaining the reasons why a copy each of the documents at (i) and (ii) above could not be laid on the Table within the period prescribed in the said sub-section.

[Placed in Library. See No. LT-3641/64].

- (3) (i) Report (1964) of the Tariff Commission on the continuance of protection to the Soda Ash Industry.

- (ii) Government Resolution No. 10(3)-Tar/64, dated the 14th December, 1964.

- (iii) Statement explaining the reasons why a copy each of the documents at (i) and (ii) above could not be laid on the Table within the period prescribed in the said sub-section.

[Placed in Library. See No. LT-3642/64].

- (4) (i) Report (1964) of the Tariff Commission on the continuance of protection to the Caustic Soda Industry.

- (ii) Government Resolution No. 10(2)-Tar/64, dated the 14th December, 1964.

- (iii) Statement explaining the reasons why a copy each of the documents at (i) and (ii) above could not be laid on the Table within the period prescribed in the said sub-section.

[Placed in Library. See No. LT-3643/64].

- (5) (i) Report (1964) of the Tariff Commission on the continuance of protection to the Aluminium Industry.

- (ii) Government Resolution No. 1(1)-Tar/64, dated the 9th December, 1964.

[Placed in Library. See No. LT-3644/].

- (6) (i) Report (1964) of the Tariff Commission on the continuance of protection to the Dye-stuff Industry.

- (ii) Government Resolution No. 14(1)-Tar/64, dated the 14th December, 1964.