

not connected with any labour organisation. We are members of this House and we have a right to draw the attention of the Government through a calling attention notice. We have not done it at the instigation of any trade union. I request you to give due consideration to our notice also.

Mr. Speaker: I have already explained that this was received 2 days ago and I had put it down for today. The other one was received yesterday evening. How can I add their names? Some other method will have to be found by them.

12.22 hrs.

CALLING ATTENTION TO MATTER OF URGENT PUBLIC IMPORTANCE

PROPOSED RETRENCHMENT OF DEFENCE WORKERS

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

“The proposed retrenchment of more than two thousand Defence workers in various Defence establishments at Delhi, Bangalore, Poona and other places from 1st June, 1967.”

The Minister of Defence (Shri Swaran Singh): Mr. Speaker, Sir, a study was carried out by Army Headquarters in 1965 to re-examine the scales of non-combatants authorised in Army establishments. The Study Group made certain recommendations in order to rationalise the scales of non-combatants, taking into account the desirability of inculcating the spirit of self-help among combatants in the Indian Army. In the light of these recommendations, decisions were taken by Government, which involved *inter alia*, the abolition

of the post of water carriers and reduction in the scale of sweepers authorised in the establishments of Army Units and formations. These decisions were incorporated in Government orders issued on the 13th August 1966.

2. Representations were received by the Ministry of Defence in October 1966 from some Members of Parliament against the retrenchment of large numbers of non-combatants (un-enrolled) in accordance with the decisions mentioned above. After considering these representations, Government decided in November 1966 that further implementation of the orders issued in August 1966 should be postponed till the 31st March 1967, and that every effort should be made to absorb the surplus employees in available vacancies in the various Defence installations in unskilled categories of posts like those of mazdoors, chowkidars, etc. It was also decided that the personnel who had already been retrenched might be recalled to duty if they had not been re-employed elsewhere and were willing to come back to their original posts. Necessary instructions in this respect were issued on the 24th December 1966.

3. As a result of further discussions between the Defence Minister and the representatives of the Indian National Defence Workers Federation on the 28th March 1967, Government decided that the implementation of their orders of August 1966 should be held in abeyance for a further period of two months with effect from the 1st April 1967.

4. The original decision was also reviewed in consultation with Army Headquarters in April-May 1967 and the conclusion reached was that the measures authorised in August 1966 were appropriate and should stand.

5. As a result of the all-out efforts made since August 1966 to re-employ as many as possible of the 5,683 surplus employees in alternative jobs,

[Shri Swaran Singh]

the number of personnel still to be adjusted had been reduced to 1,973 as on the 31st May 1967. Those individuals, who refused the offer of alternative employment, have been discharged.

श्री स० मो० बनर्जी : इस में दो, तीन बातें कही गयी हैं। पहले तो यह कहा गया कि हमारे जवानों को घात डालने की जरूरत है कि वह खुद साइड में घोर पाकी घरे इस लिए वाटर कीरिक्ट घोर स्वीपर्स को पोस्ट्स को खत्म कर दिया गया है। दूसरे यह कहा गया है कि पहली घरेल, 1967 तक इस की घरेल को बढ़ा दिया गया था और 5683 घरेलियों में से अब 1973 तक गये हैं जिनको कि मैंने 2000 खुद कहा था तो क्या यह सच है कि इन ती घरेल पीरियड को है। यह 31 मई 1967 तक बढ़ा दिया गया था और यह कहा गया था कि डिफेंस मिनिस्ट्री ने फाइनेंस मिनिस्ट्री से सिफरिष की है कि एक महीना दो महीना बढ़ा दिया जाय ताकि इन लोगों को भी दूसरी नौकरी मिल जाय, यदि यह बात सच है तो फाइनेंस मिनिस्ट्री ने घरेलिर नेंक्शन क्यों नहीं दिया जिसकी कि बजह से रिट्रीवमेंट हो रहा है और 1973 घरेलियों में से कितने घरेलियों को जाय नौकरी मिली है ? मेरी इनक्वीरिशन है कि एक भी घरेल को घरेलरनेटिव जाय नहीं मिली है।

The Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Finance (Shri Morarji Desai): Sir, consistently it has been argued by hon. Members on both sides that Government must take measures of economy. Economy can come only by removing redundant personnel from the various sections of Government. If the defence personnel is redundant in some quarters, they have got to be retrenched.

श्री नयू निम्बरे (मुंबैर) : घरेलियों को नहीं ? घरेलियों की तो संख्या बढ़ रही है।

Shri Morarji Desai: If the officers are redundant they also should be retrenched. Hon. Members cannot speak with two voices. Once I am asked to retrench people. Then they say they should be kept on without any work and salary should be paid to them. The Government cannot be turned into a pinjrapole.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: Sir, I want a reply from the Defence Minister whether they have been provided with alternative jobs or not. The hon. Finance Minister has only intervened; I want my main question to be answered by the Defence Minister.

Shri Morarji Desai: I would not have interfered if the hon. Member had not asked why the Finance Ministry refused this. That is why I intervened to answer. We cannot go on being inconvenienced like this.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Defence Minister may answer the other part of the question.

Shri Swaran Singh: Sir, I have in the statement given the total number of persons affected. 5683 is the number to whom offers were made. The number of those who actually accepted that offer is not at the moment available with me. Because all this happened rapidly and all over the country I have not got at the present moment the figures about those who actually availed of the offer.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: Sir, I rise to a point of order. This Calling Attention Notice was given with full particulars. I mentioned the number as 2000, I may correct it as 1973. The hon. Minister now wants to take shelter saying—he does not want notice—that this was done hurriedly. He does not know this thing has been going on in his Ministry for the last six months. I know because I am President of the All India Defence Employees Federation where these things

come up. Today he says that because this was done hurriedly he does not know the facts. Either the hon. Minister is utterly incompetent; or he does not know and there is no co-operation between the Secretary and the Minister. Sir, I want your ruling on this point whether he can take shelter on that ground.

Mr. Speaker: There is no question of giving any ruling on this.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: Sir, this is a very serious matter. 2000 men are losing their jobs. Let him answer that.

श्री जयु सिन्घे : अध्यक्ष महोदय, जब गेपालास्वामी प्रायंगर सुरक्षा मंत्री ये लो मजदूरों के सब के साथ लिखित करारनामा हुआ था कि जब कभी किसी मजदूर को छंटनी होगी, कोई भी कारण हो, तो उन को वैकल्पिक नौकरी मिलेगी, उसी स्तर की नौकरी मिलेगी और उसी स्केल में मिलेगी। तो मैं जानना चाहता हूँ कि क्या इस करार को ये लोग तोड़ना चाहते हैं ?

दूसरी बात मैं यह पूछना चाहता हूँ कि कि जिन लोगों को उन्होंने वैकल्पिक नौकरियाँ दी हैं और जिनकी संख्या उन्होंने कही है कि 5683 है तो उन में से कितने लोगों को उसी किस्म की उसी श्रेणी में और उसी तरह के वेतन, इन्कीमेंट के साथ नौकरियाँ मिली हैं। उसी तरह इन की जो सेवा है, अगर एक मुहकमे से दूसरे मुहकमे में जाते हैं या सुरक्षा मंत्रालय के किसी एक प्रकल्प में से दूसरे प्रकल्प में जाते हैं, तो क्या उन की सेवा बूटने या बैसे ही घट्ट रहेगी।

Shri Swaran Singh: Sir, I must confess that I am not aware of this written understanding which the hon. Member says was entered into between the representatives of workers and the late Shri Gopalaswami Ayyangar. But, in a case of this nature I cannot see how a similar

post could be offered. For instance, a large number of persons who have been retrenched are water carriers. The recommendation is that the post of water carriers as such is redundant because other things have happened and taps have been provided. Therefore, if it is demanded that if a water carrier's post is retrenched a similar post should be found for him, it is impossible to do it. In the categories, for instance, if he is in class 4 or in a particular level, the alternative employment should also be exactly of the same type. I am not aware of any such undertaking and it does not appear to be possible to give a firm understanding that any person who is rendered surplus must be given a similar job at the same salary and under the same conditions. It is not just possible. I will be quite frank with the House. Whereas every effort would be made to adjust them against other posts that may be available, it would be very difficult for any administration to give an undertaking that as soon as a person is retrenched there must be another post waiting for him exactly with the same emoluments. I am sorry, I cannot give that undertaking.

श्री जयु सिन्घे : मेरे प्रश्न का जवाब जानना चाहिये। उन्होंने दो बातों को मिला दिया। मैंने जिस करार के बारे में कहा था वह तो वैकल्पिक नौकरी के बारे में था। मैं जानना चाहता हूँ कि क्या कोई करार वैकल्पिक नौकरी के बारे में हुआ था। अगर हुआ था तो वह करार लागू हुआ या नहीं। मंत्री महोदय कहते हैं कि उन को जानकारी नहीं है। वह जानकारी ला कर दें। दूसरी बात मैंने पूछी थी कि जिन लोगों को नौकरियाँ दी गई हैं उन में से कितने लोगों को उसी किस्म का वेतन मिला है? सेवा के बारे में पूछा था कि सेवा घट्ट रहेगी कंतिनुइटी प्राप्त साबित रहेगी या नहीं। उस का भी कोई जवाब नहीं था।

Shri Swaran Singh: On the other two points which, the hon. Member

[Shri Swaran Singh]

has again repeated, to the first one I have already stated in reply to a question asked by Shri Banerjee that figures are not available with me about the number of persons offered employment for the reason that these employments have been offered all over the country and all this information cannot be collected within a short period. The other question was about the continuity of service. There is no question of continuity of service because if a person is retrenched then he has to wait for getting another employment. So, there is no continuity of service.

श्री एस० एच० जोशी (पूना) : अध्यक्ष महोदय मैं एक व्यवस्था का प्रश्न उठाना चाहता हूँ। मेरे विषय श्री मधु सिन्घे ने एक एम्प्लॉयमेंट के बारे में बड़ा विचार किया। उस वक्त मैं फीडबैक का जनरल सैफ्टरी था। उस एम्प्लॉयमेंट में इक्विवैलेंट जाब की बात है। जब पहले रिट्रिब्यूट हुआ और उस में 6,000 लोगों की छंटनी हुई तो इक्विवैलेंट जाब दिये गये और अगर उसी तरह के जाब नहीं दिये जा सके नीचे के जाब दिये गये तो उन लोगों की पे का प्रोटेक्शन किया गया। श्री मधु सिन्घे का मसाला यह है कि जिन लोगों को इक्विवैलेंट जाब दिया गया है बानी अगर कोई फिटर था और उस को फिटर बनाया गया है तो उस की तन्बाह को स्केल के बाटम से शुरू करने हैं या जितना पाता था उतना ही दिया है ?

Mr. Speaker: It is all right. There is no point of order.

श्री मधु सिन्घे : वह कह सकते हैं कि जो रोज में सारी इतना इच्छा कर के देंगे।

श्री एस० एच० जोशी : यह कैसे हो सकता है ? व्यवस्था का प्रश्न यह है कि वह एम्प्लॉयमेंट हुआ था और उस पर व्यवस्था था। 6,000 लोगों के बारे में एम्प्लॉयमेंट

हो कर उन को इक्विवैलेंट जाब दिये गये थे। क्या उन्हें यह मालूम नहीं है ?

Mr. Speaker: I understand that. He has said that he has no information.

श्री राम लेखक बाबू (बाराबंकी) : अध्यक्ष महोदय, प्रश्न का उत्तर नहीं आयेगा तो प्रश्न पूछेंगे ही हम लोग।

Shri S. M. Banerjee: Unless this problem is amicably settled within ten days there is going to be gherao of his house and he will not be able to move. We are going to arrange it. I am not threatening. This is a fact.

Shri Morarji Desai: Sir, is this not an illegal threat of gherao of the parliament? It is nothing but a threat.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: Water carriers and sweepers lose job all over the country. Why has he become Deputy Prime Minister? This is a redundant job which should be abolished.

Shri Morarji Desai: The hon. Member does not know that the Deputy Prime Minister does not draw any extra salary as Deputy Prime Minister.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: But he has got privileges.

Shri Hanumanthaya (Bangalore): Sir, I want to raise a point of order. Is it in consonance with the practice of this democratic institution to threaten the Minister instead of making out the point by way of reasoning? Does it not come under some kind of a breach of privilege if an hon. Member is threatened to take or not to take a decision? Very often it is said by some of the hon. Members themselves that they work under pressure or threats and all kinds of things and then they themselves begin to threaten the Minister to take or not to take a decision... (Interruption)

Shri Ranga: Sir, we dissociate ourselves from this suggestion and threat of Gherao, as we consider Gheraos inimical to civil liberties.

श्री स० मो० बनर्जी : ऐसा थोड़े ही है कि लोक सभा में हार गये तो राज्य सभा में जगह दे दिया अम्बसेडर बना दिया ।

Mr. Speaker: The word 'gherao' is not yet defined, but whatever it is, threats are not at all desirable in the House, whether it is gherao or something else.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: My gherao will be peaceful.

Shri Bal Raj Madhok (South Delhi): We dissociate ourselves with gherao. We do not like this word 'gherao'. He may speak for himself and for his party.... (*Interruption*).

Shri S. M. Banerjee: Shri Madhok's party does not.... (*Interruption*).

Shri Ranga: This word is most important.... (*Interruption*).

Mr. Speaker: Now, shall we go to the business? I think, threats should not be used, whatever be the nature of the threat or whatever be the word.

Shri M. R. Krishna (Peddapalli): May I know....

Mr. Speaker: I am not going to call anybody whose name is not on the list. That is the practice of the House which I have not created. Shri Indrajit Gupta.

Shri Indrajit Gupta (Alipore): Sir, I am thankful to you that you have made it clear that this gherao business has not been defined. So, when it has not been defined, the Deputy Minister should not say that it is illegal; he should not try to define it.

My question is this. On page 2 of the statement, if the Minister will just refer to his statement, there is a categorical statement made that it was de-

cidated that personnel who had already been retrenched might be recalled to duty if they had not been re-employed elsewhere and were willing to come back to their original posts and that necessary instructions in this respect were issued on the 24th December 1966. That means that on 24th December 1966 the Ministry's position was that anybody who was declared surplus or was retrenched but was willing to come back to the original post would be called back. Then, at the end it says that the latest position is that individuals who refused the offer of alternative employment had been discharged. I want to know why this offer which stood on the 24th December has apparently been* withdrawn now and why should not people who have been retrenched but are willing to come back to their original posts, be recalled.

Shri Swaran Singh: If the hon. Member had read the earlier four lines, the position would have been clear. On page 1 it is mentioned that although originally the Government decided in November that further implementation of the orders issued in August 1966 should be postponed till the 31st March, 1967 and that every effort should be made to absorb the surplus employees in available vacancies in the various Defence installations in unskilled categories of posts, if in the mean time that is after the issue of the original orders till the 24th December there were certain persons who had been retrenched and who had not been given any employment they could also come back to the original posts that they held because we had postponed the overall retrenchment for a period of a number of months ending on 31st March 1967. So, that was a concession that was available to those who had been retrenched during that period. This date of 31st March had been further extended by two months and this expired on 31st May. Now, the present position is that there is no present order of the continuance of these posts having been retrenched. Obviously, the situation as it obtained

[Shri Swaran Singh]

on 24th December is no longer obtaining now when the extended time has also expired.

Shri Indrajit Gupta: Sir, the point must be clarified . . .

Mr. Speaker: That is all. He says, he has not got some information. I cannot compel him.

Shri Indrajit Gupta: He does not say that he has not got the information. There are 1,973 people on their list as redundant. Should they not be retained in their original posts till alternative jobs are found for them?

Shri D. C. Sharma (Gurdaspur): On a point of order, Sir.

Unfortunately, the Ministry or the Government of India has stuck to those very names of different categories of workers which the Britishers gave to us, the categories called watermen, sweepers . . .

Mr. Speaker: There is no point of order.

Shri D. C. Sharma: I am coming to that. I want to ask the hon. Minister why he has stuck to that nomenclature of categories, watermen, sweepers, etc. and why he has not changed the nomenclature and told us what particular functions they are discharging and all that. Then, I think, the whole question would have been clear.

Mr. Speaker: There is no point of order.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy (Kendrapara): Sir, I think, the rule should be amended to provide Members raising the points of disorder also.

Mr. Speaker: The Rules Committee may consider it. One thing I want to make clear that all the points of order will be answered by the Speaker, not by the Minister.

Shri M. E. Krishna: I rise on a point of order. My point of order is very simple. The statement which the

Defence Minister has made is not correct that they retrench people on the basis of effecting economy. I only want to find out whether the Defence Minister or the Finance Minister, at any stage, has tried to find out whether employing these well-trained combatants to do the work of sweepers or watermen is more economical than appointing civilians . . .

Mr. Speaker: He may kindly resume his seat. There is no point of order.

Shri M. E. Krishna: This is very important. It depends on . . .

Mr. Speaker: I have heard him; I have followed him. Shri Goel.

Shri Shrichand Goel (Chandigarh): It is unfortunate that whenever this Government wants to effect some economy in the administration, it always makes a start on the class IV employees, the poor people belonging to scheduled castes and tribes, sweepers, cooks, watermen, etc. I want to know whether the retrenchment of these employees and the taking up of the same job by combatants will not affect the efficiency of the combatant ranks because I know that once in Ambala, when the Amar Project for the construction of houses for the military personnel was conducted by these people, that affected their efficiency and at the time of war, they were found wanting . . .

Mr. Speaker: What is your question?

Shri Shrichand Goel: I would like to know why are these employees who have served the Department for 20 years being retrenched without making a provision for alternative employment for them.

Shri Swaran Singh: To the first question, my reply is that this recommendation was made by the Army authorities themselves and they knew fully well the implications of their proposal. They went into it at great

length and recommended that they would like to encourage a certain element of self-help amongst the members of the Armed forces. He should welcome that rather than try to find fault with that.

The second question is about these employees having served long years and that Government should always provide alternative job for any person who is found surplus to the requirement. Government have never given that undertaking and it is very difficult to honour such an undertaking even if it is given.

Mr. Speaker: What is Mr. Buta Singh's point of order?

श्री बूटा सिंह (रोपड़) : मेरा एक व्यवस्था का प्रश्न है। हमारे संविधान में शैड्यूल्ड कास्ट और शैड्यूल्ड ट्राइब्ज के लिए नौकरियां देने की और सरकारी आसामियों में उनको काम देने की एक विशेष व्यवस्था की गई है। इस रिट्रेंचमेंट में मंत्री महोदय बहुत बड़ी संख्या में शैड्यूल्ड कास्ट और शैड्यूल्ड ट्राइब्ज के लोगों को नौकरियों से हटाने जा रहे हैं

Mr. Speaker: That is entirely a different thing. That has nothing to do with point of order. He may please sit down.

श्री बूटा सिंह : मैं आपकी व्यवस्था चाहता हूँ। संविधान की उस धारा का यहां उल्लंघन हो रहा है जिस के तहत इन लोगों को नौकरियां देने की बात कही गई है। मैं आप से प्रार्थना करता हूँ कि आप मंत्री महोदय से कहें कि उनको रिट्रेंच करने के बजाय गवर्नमेंट के किसी दूसरे डिपार्टमेंट में रख लिया जाये।

Mr. Speaker: That has nothing to do with point of order.

I would have entered in the list all your names if you were a little vigilant, and had given me the names earlier. Yesterday evening the list

came after everything was admitted. Now you want to take advantage of point of order. I would very much have liked to put all your names. I would not have lost anything by including a few names. Yesterday evening you gave something in a hurry and now you raise points of orders. What am I to do? I want the guidance of the hon. members. It becomes impossible for me.

Shri G. Viswanathan (Wandiwash): On a point of order.

Mr. Speaker: I am calling all the members in the list. I will call him also.

Dr. Melkote (Hyderabad): On the 12th of last month I raised a question in the Committee on Subordinate Legislation of Parliament with regard to retrenchment.

Mr. Speaker: He cannot raise that now.

Dr. Melkote: I am not making any statement. The Defence Department told us in the Committee that they were considering deferring this retrenchment. On account of this, I could not submit the list before; I could submit it only yesterday. I wish you give us permission to ask questions about it. The question relates not only to retrenchment, but it has a wider purview.

Mr. Speaker: He can discuss with the Minister later.

श्री कामेश्वर सिंह (खागरिया) : क्या प्रतिरक्षा मंत्री ने वित्त मंत्री से अनुरोध किया था कि 31 मई के बाद भी इन लोगों को काम पर रहने दिया जाए, यदि किया था तो वित्त मंत्री ने इस अनुरोध का क्या जवाब दिया था ?

Shri Swaran Singh: It was in consultation with Finance that on two occasions extensions were given: one till 31st March, as I have already said, and the other, for a further period of two months, i.e., till 31st May. These two extended periods were given in

[Shri Swaran Singh]

consultation with Finance, but then we came to the conclusion that whereas our efforts should be to find other jobs for them to continue, they need not be borne on our pay rolls for any longer period.

Shri S. Kundu (Balasore): Is it a fact that the study group did not recommend specific cases of retrenchment? Is it also a fact that the Navy and Air Force wings of the Defence Forces strongly objected to the retrenchment of these people? Is it a fact that Government are not going to pay anything towards retrenchment compensation which is ordinarily allowed to industrial workers under the Industrial Disputes Act? In view of the fact that these persons had worked hard during the Indo-Pakistan hostilities and also the Chinese aggression, will the hon. Minister consider the question from the human angle of mercy and see that this retrenchment is withheld because these are cases of class IV employees who rendered very valuable service to this country when the country was facing aggression from China and Pakistan?

Shri Swaran Singh: It was on the recommendation of the Army authorities that this decision was taken. The hon. Member had said that the study group had not made any specific recommendations. On the other hand, they did make specific recommendations that the posts of water-carriers should be abolished altogether. They also recommended reduction in the scale of sweepers and certain other things. So, it is precisely on the recommendation of the Army authorities that that decision has been taken.

As regards retrenchment benefits, whatever benefits are allowed under the rules will certainly be available to them. The hon. Member's third question was whether they could be continued or whether we could find alternative jobs for them. On those points, I have already clarified the Government's position.

Shri S. Kundu: Was it a fact that the Navy and Air Force wings had strongly objected to this retrenchment?

Shri Swaran Singh: That is not a fact. This does not relate to the Air Force and the Navy; this recommendation related only to the Army establishment.

Shri S. Kundu: In the study group's recommendation, the Air Force and Navy wings....

Mr. Speaker: Now, Shri G. Viswanathan.

Shri G. Viswanathan: In reply to the first question, the hon. Defence Minister had made a statement which I think is an incorrect statement, namely that without working they receive their salary. These water-carriers, cooks and sweepers work fifteen hours a day without any rest from 4 a.m. to about 7.30 p.m. Again, for the officers' mess, every group of six officers has four servants, whereas in the case of the jawans or other soldiers, they have only two servants for every hundred persons. This is pure discrimination. There is inhuman treatment meted out to them. They cannot ventilate their grievances. They are not allowed to have any union or any sort of association. Government have taken shelter under article 33 of the Constitution and section 21 of the Army Act and prohibited them from forming any union. This is complete discrimination. Either they should be allowed to have their union or under the Army Act they should be provided with all the benefits. About 10,000 families are going to be affected, and Government must give an assurance that they would not be retrenched.

Shri Swaran Singh: I have listened very carefully but most of the things that the hon. Member has said relates to suggestions or comments. I

could not catch any particular point on which he was asking for specific information.

It is true, that so long as these persons were working they were doing certain jobs. The recommendation of the study group was that this was a sphere in which the scale could be revised. That recommendation has been accepted, and as a result of that, certain persons are being retrenched. As for alternative jobs, we shall do our best. It is a human problem, and I have the greatest sympathy for these people from the human angle, and it is with this object that we shall do our best to find other jobs for them; they will be given a certain higher priority in the employment exchanges; if there are any vacancies anywhere, we shall try to fit them in those vacancies. We have already done something and this effort will continue.

12.56 hrs.
PAPERS LAID ON THE TABLE
NOTIFICATIONS UNDER CUSTOMS ACT ETC.

The Minister of State in the Ministry of Finance (Shri K. C. Pant): I beg to lay on the Table—

(1) A copy each of the following Notifications under section 159 of the Customs Act, 1962:—

- (i) G. S. R. 728 published in Gazette of India dated the 20th May, 1967.
- (ii) G. S. R. 729 published in Gazette of India dated the 20th May, 1967.
- (iii) G.S.R. 754 published in Gazette of India dated the 20th May, 1967.
- (iv) G.S.R. 778 published in Gazette of India dated the 26th May, 1967.

[Placed in Library. See No. LT-485/67]

(2) A copy each of the following Notifications under section 159 of the 301 (A) L.S.—7.

Customs Act, 1962 and section 38 of the Central Excises and Salt Act, 1944:—

- (i) The Customs and Central Excise Duties Export Drawback (General) Twenty-ninth Amendment Rules, 1967, published in Notification No. G.S.R. 730 in Gazette of India dated the 20th May, 1967.
- (ii) The Customs and Central Excise Duties Export Drawback (General) Thirtieth Amendment Rules, 1967, published in Notification No. G. S. R. 731 in Gazette of India dated the 30th May, 1967.
- (iii) G.S.R. 732 published in Gazette of India dated the 20th May, 1967, containing corrigendum to G. S. R. 1597 dated the 8th October, 1966. [Placed in Library. See No. LT-486/67]

(3) A copy of the Central Excise (Eighth Amendment) Rules, 1967, published in Notification No. G.S.R. 747 in Gazette of India dated the 18th May, 1967, under section 38 of the Central Excises and Salt Act, and Salt Act, 1944. [Placed in Library. See No. LT-486/67].

12.57 hrs.

BUSINESS ADVISORY COMMITTEE
SECOND REPORT

The Minister of Parliamentary Affairs and Communications (Dr. Ram Subhag Singh): I beg to move:

"That this House agrees with the Second Report of the Business Advisory Committee presented to the House on the 31st May, 1967."

Mr. Speaker: Motion moved:

"That this House agrees with the Second Report of the Business Advisory Committee presented to the House on the 31st May, 1967."