

**CORRECTION OF ANSWER TO  
U.S.Q. No. 2437 DATED 28-3-61**

**The Deputy Minister of Defence (Shri Raghuramaiah):** In reply to part (c) of Unstarred Question No. 2437 for 28th March 1961 by Shri Muhammed Elias|Shri S. M. Banerjee, regarding Employees of I.A.F. Station Chakeri, I had *inter alia* stated as under:—

“The appeals were incomplete in certain respects and were returned to the individuals for re-submission. The revised appeals have since been received and are under examination.”

2. The portion of the answer reproduced above needs revision. The correct version should read as follows:

“the appeals had to be examined in detail and considered exhaustively by the Air Force authorities at the Unit level; subsequently, these appeals were referred to the appellate authority at the Command level and the under examination.”

12:02 hrs.

**MOTION FOR ADJOURNMENT**

**ALLEGED PREVENTION OF REPRESENTATION  
OF GRIEVANCES BY CERTAIN P&T  
UNIONS**

**Mr. Speaker:** I have received a notice of an adjournment motion from Shri Rajinder Singh and others which reads as follows:

“Serious situation arising out of the latest instructions from the D.G.P. & T. preventing the staff and the Union from representing their grievances even informally and thus contravening the right of representation both individually and collectively especially in the absence of any machinery and delay in the introduction of the Bill governing Trade Union relations in Central Services.”

There cannot be any adjournment motion relating to the delay in the introduction of the Bill governing trade union relations in Central Services.

So far as the other thing is concerned, have any such instructions been issued preventing the staff from representing their grievances even informally thus preventing their right of representation?

**Shri Tangamani (Madurai):** May I make a submission? On the 21st of this month, the hon. Minister of Labour met at a meeting two representatives of the Unions—Shri Anjaneyalu and Shri Ramamurthy—both employees. Now, subsequently, when the employees wanted to meet in Calcutta, they were told that a certain circular had been received from the DG, P&T. The newspaper report says that the Labour Minister discussed with these two employees the question of expediting the recognition and the introduction of Whitley Councils. I would like to know whether the circular which was sent or supposed to have been sent was after the 21st, in which case there appears to be a change of policy. I would like to know from the hon. Labour Minister what his attitude to the negotiating machinery of these employees is because more than ten months have passed without any suitable machinery at any level.

**Mr. Speaker:** That is not the subject of the adjournment motion.

**Shri Tyagi (Dehra Dun):** Is it a communist trade union?

**Shri Rajendra Singh (Chapra):** No, Sir.

**Shri S. A. Dange (Bombay City—Central):** This is preventing the employees from ventilating their grievances even to the officers; it is carried on to such an extent that a circular has now been issued by the DG to the lower officers that if any news appeared even in a newspaper about the grievance, the editors should be visited by these officers and asked to divulge as to who wrote the letter and if the editor shows unwillingness then it should be brought to his attention that it is not in the interest of