

"(4) Each House of Parliament shall, by a resolution passed within seven days from the date on which the Act has been laid before it under sub-section (3), if it is in session and if not in session within seven days from its re-assembly, approve the same."

The question was put and the motion was negatived.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI MD. SALIM): I shall now put clause 3 to vote.

The question is:

"That clause 3 stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Clause 3 was added to the Bill.

Clause 1, the Enacting Formula and the Title were added to the Bill.

SHRI S. B. CHAVAN: Sir, I move:

"That the Bill be passed."

The question was put and the motion was adopted.

STATEMENT BY MINISTER

Government's decision on revision of rate of Industrial Dearness Allowance and introduction of pension Scheme for subscribers of Employees Provident Fund

THE MINISTER OF STATE OF THE MINISTRY OF LABOUR (SHRI P. A. SANGMA): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, The hon'ble Members of the House may be pleased to learn that pursuant to the recommendations of the tripartite DA Committee, the Government have decided that the rate of Industrial Dearness Allowance (IDA) payable to the employees of the Central public sector enterprises to whom IDA is applicable shall

stand enhanced from Rs. 1.65 to Rs. 2.00 per point increase linked to All-India Consumer Price Index (AICPI) 800 points with effect from 1-1-89. Arrears of IDA due for the period from 1-1-89 to 31-12-91 would be credited to the Provident Fund of the employees to the extent of 50 per cent, the balance 50 per cent being disbursed in cash. It is estimated that over 20 lakhs of employees stand to benefit on account of this measure.

The Government has further decided to permit negotiations for revision of wages in the Central public sector enterprises. New wage settlements which are to be concluded shall be valid for a period of 5 years. Guidelines to the enterprises are being issued separately by the Department of Public Enterprises which is working out the details.

Further the Government have decided to introduce with effect from 1st of April, 1993 a Pension Scheme for the Employees' Provident Fund subscribers which will have the following features:—

*The Scheme will not entail any further financial commitment to the employees or the employers.

*Pensions will be payable on monthly basis to—

—employees superannuating at 58 years of age or leaving service earlier with qualifying service of 20 years subject to a minimum of 10 years of membership; pension payable being based on average salary of the last five years of service.

—employees sustaining permanent total disablement during service.

—widowed survivor of the subscriber.

—In addition to the widowed survivor, two children/orphans.

*All the 17 million provident fund-subscribers are eligible for pension under the new scheme.

*A bill to amend the Employees Provident Funds and Miscellaneous Provisions Act, 1952, for this purpose is being introduced shortly.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI MD. SALIM): Now, clarifications. Shri Sukomal Sen.

SHRI SUKOMAL SEN (West Bengal): Sir, this statement is confusing, I should say. I understand the Government has come out with this statement because the I.N.T.U.C. of the ruling party, had announced a strike in the public sector on 19th March. Therefore, on the eve of the strike, the Government has come out with this announcement on D.A. and some other benefits for the public sector employees.

First of all, I would like to know from the hon. Minister whether there was an agreement between the Government and the I.N.T.U.C. that on the eve of the strike, the announcement would be made and, on that basis, the strike would be withdrawn.

Secondly, it is said here that 50 per cent of the D.A. from 1-8-89 to 31-12-91 would be deposited in the provident fund account. Now, most of the trade unions had demanded that the whole D.A. should be paid in cash. Only the I.N.T.U.C. had demanded that 50 per cent of it should be credited to the provident fund account. The Government has accepted the demand of the I.N.T.U.C., but the demand of the other trade unions that the whole amount should be paid in cash has not been accepted by the Government. I would like to know from the Government why they have decided that 50 per cent of the increased rate would be credited to the provident fund account.

Then, about wage negotiations. The public sector employees have announced a strike in the month of April. They are going on strike because they have been barred from negotiating their wage and other service conditions. Now the Government says that they would permit negotiations. They will issue guidelines, but the trade unions are demanding that negotiations should be free, there should be no guidelines either from the Government or the Bureau of Public Enterprises. The guidelines from the Bureau of Public Enterprises limit the nature of negotiations and it goes against the workers and the employees. For several years the workers and the employees have been fighting against the BPE guidelines, but the Government has again come out with a theory that BPE guidelines will be issued for such negotiations. I would like to know why, looking to the demand of the trade unions, these BPE guidelines are not being withdrawn. Why are they issuing BPE guidelines which have been opposed by the working class?

Surprisingly, pension has been linked with the provident fund. The demand of the trade unions is that pension should be given as a third benefit, in addition to the contributory provident fund, but they want to link pension with provident fund. It means there will not be contributory provident fund, it will be GPF only and then they will get pension. Sir, this theory has been rejected by the workers. They want that pension should be the third benefit.

In other sectors, in banks, LIC and other financial institutions also the employees are demanding that pension should be given as a third benefit and on that demand banking employees are going on strike. This is something surprising. I would like to know why the Government is behaving like that and rejecting the demand of the workers.

Then, Sir, the Minister must be knowing that already in the coal and steel industries negotiations are going on between the management and the workers about pension. There was an agreement between the two sides in the coal and steel industries. Now the Ministry is standing in the way. They are not permitting implementation of this agreement. I would like to know why the Government is standing in the way of implementation of an agreement which has been reached between the management and the workers. Why are they putting obstacles? What is the Government's objection to the implementation of this agreement? That should be clarified by the hon. Minister.

Lastly, Sir, when all the trade unions barring the INTUC had given a strike notice on the 16th June last and again in November 1991, on the eve of the strike the Government had invited all the trade unions, including the INTUC who were opposed to the strike, for negotiations. But in this case, when the INTUC gave a strike notice and the strike was to take place on the 19th of this month, the Government did not invite any other trade union except the INTUC. They held discussions with INTUC only, debarring all other trade unions from taking part in the negotiations. Why is this dual policy being adopted by the Government? You adopt one procedure in the case of the INTUC and another procedure in the case of all other trade unions. This is to pamper the INTUC. On the eve of the strike some political concessions are given so that the prestige of the INTUC is heightened. That is why this has come on the eve of the strike taking place.

Therefore, Sir, I have already objected to this and I would like the Minister to clarify these points.

SHRI SUNIL BASU RAY (West Bengal): Sir, the statement has not come as a surprise because all the

points covered in the statement were known in the trade union movement. Now it is a great injustice to the Indian working class to deny them their hard-earned wages in the form of DA and to freeze it in the banks. I would like to know whether the Minister is willing to defreeze this amount and allow the workers to have the benefit which is given to them at a very late hour. They have been denied every justice. Whereas the Government should have come out with a statement that for this delay the workers would be paid due interest on this amount, instead they are depriving them of this amount itself.

About the wage settlement, now, in the coal and steel sectors while bipartite negotiations take place, what would be the nature of the negotiations that are to take place and what would be the nature of the negotiations that could go on? From whatever talks we have had with the management in this regard, we feel that there is no guideline from the Ministry in this behalf. What guideline do they want to give now? Even here they have maintained secrecy. "Guidelines to the enterprises are being issued separately." Why not here and now? Though we oppose your guidelines basically and fundamentally, when you are proposing that certain guidelines will be issued should we not know what those guidelines are? Why don't you bring them here on the floor of this House? So, it should be rejected by the House and you should explain why it should not be rejected.

Now there is another injustice being done to the interests of the working class in India. There is the Pension Scheme also for the coal workers who have entered into an agreement about the scheme. Now, why is it being denied to them? Contributions are being deducted from their wages, but they are not being given the facility of withdrawing that amount or getting interest

on that account. So, in this way the workers are being deprived in this case also.

Now one can understand that it is in the face of the rising tempo in the Indian working class movement through strikes and demonstrations—and the strike call given by the Central Public Sector Trade Unions on 20–22 April for 72 hours and in the face of that threat—that the Government has come out with this statement to foist the discredited leadership of the INTUC on the workers. But the working class will not accept that. So, I think the Minister will please explain the basic thoughts behind this statement which is anti-working class and which will not be accepted by the working class. The working class will definitely march ahead to win their demands in full and to their satisfaction. Thank you, Sir.

SHRIMATI KĀMLA SINHA (Bihar): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I would like to seek some clarifications from the Labour Minister. While I agree with two of my colleagues who have preceded me, I would like to know from the Minister as to which will be the base year for the consumer price index for determining Rs. 2 as IDA. Because, as we know, prices are going up every day and so we have to know how the base year is fixed. According to the ILO standards it should be revised every ten years and I want to know whether the Government plans to revise it according to the ILO standards or what they have decided upon.

The next clarification that I would like to seek from the Minister is with regard to the payment of arrears of this IDA. It is said that 50 per cent would be paid in cash and the remaining 50 per cent would be credited to the provident fund accounts of the workers. We don't accept it. The working class, in general, would not accept it. It is

their money and so it should be paid to them 100 per cent in cash. The Government should take note of this.

Sir, this whole statement has been made with a partisan view. It has been made as a face-saving device for the INTUC, and I don't know how many membership the INTUC has—how much the verified membership is there and how much the claimed membership. There is a great doubt about it. But, even then, the INTUC does not represent the whole of the working class of India. So, for the benefit of the whole of the working class, the Government should take a broader view. The Government should have consulted all the Central trade unions, their representatives and then the Government should have come out with a statement.

Even the pension scheme that the Government has come out with in the Minister's statement, is from the provident fund. The pension scheme should have been a different scheme altogether. That was the demand of the workers. So, even now whether the Government will reconsider it or not, I would like to know.

श्री जगदीश प्रसाद माथुर (उत्तर प्रदेश)
श्रीमन्, वक्तव्य में बहुत सी बातें अधूरी छोड़ दी गई हैं और कुछ को छिपा लिया गया है। जहां तक आई.डी.ए. का प्रश्न है, यह तो ठीक है कि आपने 1.65 रुपए से बढ़ाकर 2 रुपए कर दिया है और यह जो विपक्षीय समिति बैठी थी, उसने रिकमेंड किया था। लेकिन इसमें दो बिंदु आपने छोड़ दिए हैं। मैं आपका विशेष ध्यान चाहूंगा। जिस कमेटी का आपने उल्लेख किया है, उसने यह भी रिकमेंड किया था यूनिजिसमली कि सन् 1992 से आगे स्लैब सिस्टम लागू किया जाए। आपने स्लैब सिस्टम की बात घुमा दी है। इसका मतलब यह है कि जो आई०डी०ए० आगे बढ़ सकता था, उसकी गंजाइश आपने नहीं रखी। यह उस कमेटी की रिकमेंडेशन है, जिसके आप बेयरमैन हैं, उसकी जो सर्वसम्मत रिकमें-

[श्री जगदीश प्रसाद माथुर]

डेशन थी, उसके बारे में आपने कुछ कहा नहीं है। उसको स्पष्ट करिए।

दूसरा, जो आपने कहा है कि 50 प्रतिशत पैसा प्रोविडेंट फंड में जमा होगा यह उचित नहीं है। यह मांग सारे मजदूरों की है चाहे वे किसी भी संगठन के हों, इंटक को भी मिलाकर, कि पूरा पैसा कंश दिया जाए लेकिन यदि सरकार समझती है कि इंडस्ट्री इतना पैसे का बोझ नहीं बरदाश्त कर सकती तो मैं यह पूछना चाहूंगा कि क्या आपने सुनिश्चित कर लिया है कि जितना पैसा कर्मचारी का आप काटेंगे, उतना हर इंडस्ट्री समय पर जमा करेगी? अगर नहीं जमा करेगी तो आपने कोई दंड विधान उसके लिए सोचा है और यह धन कितने पीरियड के अंदर जमा कर देगी?

तीसरा, जो आप कंश देंगे, आपने 1-1-89 से लेकर 1-1-91 तक जो पैसा देना तय किया है। तो जो यह 2 साल का ऐरियर आप दे रहे हैं, इस पर सरकार को सूद देना चाहिए। तो आप इंडस्ट्र देगे कि नहीं देंगे या उसका जो डैफंड पेमेंट हो गया, इसका इंडस्ट्र मिलना चाहिए। इंडस्ट्र मजदूर को आप देंगे कि नहीं देंगे।

अब जो आपने ये नैगोशियेशन के लिए कहा है कि 5 तारीख तक लागू करेंगे मगर जितने भी सैटलमेंट्स थे, वे खत्म हो चुके। आप 5 तारीख कह रहे हैं और जैसे मेरे सहयोगियों ने कहा, आपने बताया नहीं कि वार्ता के लिए गाईडलाइंस क्या हैं और क्या गाईडलाइंस तैयार करते समय जितनी ट्रेड यूनियन हैं, उनसे आपने परामर्श किया है या अब करेंगे? मेरा कहना यह है कि परामर्श किया जाना चाहिए। उनके परामर्श के बिना गाईडलाइंस आप दे दें, यह उचित नहीं होगा।

अंत में इसी के विषय में मैं यह कहना चाहता हूं कि अनुभव यह है कि यद्यपि गाईडलाइंस आप दे देते हैं लेकिन जब नैगोशियेशन करके बात तय होने लगती है उसके बाद आप सीधा कह देते हैं कि इसको स्वीकार मत करो। क्या गाईडलाइंस के भीतर चलते हुए जो आपकी

अंडरटेकिंग हैं, उनको स्वतंत्रता होगी फैसला करने की? अब तक का अनुभव यह है कि गाईडलाइंस तो आप दे देते हैं। उन्हीं गाईडलाइंस के पीछे नैगोशियेशन करके जब कुछ न कुछ समझौता होता होता है तो वे आपको रोकते हैं और आप कह देते हैं कि यह नहीं करना है, क्योंकि फाइनेशियल प्रॉब्लम है। अंत में आप मना कर देते हैं। इसके एक नहीं अनेक उदाहरण हैं। इसकी स्वतंत्रता जो पब्लिक अंडरटेकिंग हैं उनको देनी चाहिए। सीताराम जी, आप बाद में बात कर लीजिएगा।

व्यवधान संझी (श्री सीताराम केसरी) : आप ही की बात कर रहे हैं अंग्रेजी में... (व्यवधान)

श्री जगदीश प्रसाद माथुर : हिंदी बोल रहा हूं। अगर आप इसे अंग्रेजी समझते हैं... (व्यवधान)

श्री सीताराम केसरी : आपने नैगोशियेशन कहा, वही मैंने कहा कि इसका अर्थ होता है वार्ता। वही मैं बता रहा था।

श्री जगदीश प्रसाद माथुर : तो आप उनको हिंदी सिखा रहे हैं। वह हिंदी जानते हैं। मेरा निवेदन है, मेरा आग्रह है कि आप गाईडलाइंस मजदूरों के साथ बात करके तय करें और उसका फैसला करने के लिए जो अंडरटेकिंग कंसन्ड हैं, उनको स्वतंत्रता दें। शिपिंग कॉर्पोरेशन के अंदर भी आपने यही किया है। और भी बहुत से उदाहरण हैं।

अंत में जो आपने स्कीम कही है पेंशन की उसमें आपने कहा है कि—
—“The Scheme will not entail any further financial commitment to the employees or the employers.”

इसका क्या मतलब है? इसका मतलब समझ में नहीं आ रहा है। इसका मतलब यह है कि 10 परसेंट जो आप काटते और 10 परसेंट जो इंडस्ट्री देती उसको उसी स्थिति में आप रखना चाहते हैं? जहां पैसे का इन्वाल्वमेंट है उससे ज्यादा आप

देना नहीं चाहते। इस बात को मैं समझ नहीं पाया कि

"The Scheme will not entail any further financial commitment to the employees or the employers."

फिर मजदूरों ने मांगा था कि उनको थर्ड बेंनिफिट दिया जाए। आप इसको नहीं रहे हैं। अगर नहीं कर रहे हैं तो क्यों नहीं कर रहे हैं ?

श्रीमन्, इसमें एक घपला और है। अगर आपने प्राविडेंट फंड की बात कह दी है। वह आप पिछला बकाया देंगे। आपने आपने प्राविडेंट फंड खत्म करने की बात की है कि कंटीब्यूटरी प्राविडेंट फंड नहीं होगा। अगर कंटीब्यूटरी है तो आप साफ कीजिए। अगर कंटीब्यूटरी नहीं है तो यह जो पैसा आप जमा करेंगे उसका निवेशनशिप क्या होगा ? मेरा आग्रह यह है कि मजदूरों की जो मांग है कि उनको थर्ड बेंनिफिट करके यह दिया जाए। इसलिए जो मैंने स्पष्टीकरण मांगे उनको बताने की कृपा करें, खास करके स्लैब सिस्टम के बारे में।

श्री बतुरानन मिश्र (बिहार) : उप-सभाध्यक्ष महोदय, यह अच्छी बात है कि जो बहुत दिन से सवाल पेंडिंग था उस पर सरकार ने निर्णय लिया है। यह अच्छी बात है। लेकिन उन्होंने सिर्फ अपनी पार्टियों के ट्रेड यूनियनों के साथ मिलकर यह किया। तो इससे जो पैसा देते हैं वह उसे घर से नहीं देते हैं। यदि सबसे मिलकर करते तो एक तो देश भर में एक वातावरण होता, मजदूर वर्ग आपके साथ होता लेकिन आपने छिछलापन करके उसको दिया। शायद इसका मतलब है कि कोई चुनाव जल्दी हो रहा है। इसी की तैयारी में आप यह कर रहे हैं, नहीं तो इंडस्ट्री के व्यू-प्वाइंट से कोई ऐसा नहीं करेगा। कुछ क्लैरिफिकेशन की जो प्वाइंट्स हैं उनके बारे में आपसे हम कहना चाहते हैं... (व्यवधान)

[उप-सभाध्यक्ष (श्री सैयद सित्ते रजो) पीठासीन हुए]

हमने कहा कि इन विषयों पर आपने निर्णय लिया है, अच्छी बात है। अब आप सुनिए। जैसे अन्य माननीय सदस्यों ने उठाया कि यह डिपरनेस ऐलाउंस का 50 परसेंट जो आप जमा कर लेंगे वह तो इंटरेस्ट की बात कही है माथुर साहब ने। मैं यह जानना चाहूंगा, मंत्री महोदय सुनें, कि जो पैसा हमारा है उसका इंटरेस्ट भी होना चाहिए। जो फिक्स डिपोजिट है, हमारा रूपया है आपको उसी हिसाब से देना चाहिए। इसलिए जो इंटरेस्ट रेट आप 50 परसेंट का दें वह फिक्स डिपोजिट के रेट से दें।

That should be at the rate of the fixed deposits, which the workers are free to choose.

Regarding the next point that the new wage settlements which are to be concluded shall be valid for a period of five years, I would like to know if it is related to the Plan period or it is just from the date of coming into agreement.

Now I come to the point regarding guidelines. When you have decided so many things on the basis of the tripartite meetings, why did you not work out the guidelines on the basis of the tripartite agreement? That way the guidelines would have been much more applicable and every side would have cooperated with you, because they would have been party to that. So, guidelines should be prepared accordingly.

My next point is regarding the pension scheme. It would be effective from 1st April, 1993. But, as other hon. Members have stated, coal and steel industries have already deposited the amount. What will happen to those industries? What will be the effective date in their case? That should be decided. What about the money which has already been deposited?

On one point the hon. Member, Shri Mathur, has already spoken. The scheme will not entail any fur-

[श्री चतुरानन मिश्र]

ther financial commitments to the employees or to the employers. Will it mean that the total amount will be paid by the Government because the third party is the Government? Does it mean that? Or, what does it mean? This should be explained.

The next point is about the number of year of service. A minimum of ten years or so is stipulated. When you are introducing the Golden Handshake scheme and all those things, the period should be further lessened as suited to the workers. It is the Government which is introducing all these things.

Now, I come to the point about having two children. When? After the scheme, they should have two children or before the scheme they should have two children? It will be highly discriminatory.... (Interruptions).

THE MINISTER OF STATE OF THE MINISTRY OF STEEL (SHRI SANTOSH MOHAN DEV): A pertinent question.

SHRI CHATURANAN MISHRA: They will go to the Supreme Court and say, "We were born before. So we are denied." I can understand a date of effective implementation. You decide only that. The parents will decide whether they should have two children or more. That is up to them. You cannot deny it to those who are born. It will be very difficult to deny it to them.

SHRI MOTURU HANUMANTHA RAO (Andhra Pradesh): Depending upon the long service... (Interruptions).

SHRI CHATURANAN MISHRA: I am talking about the number of children.

SHRI MENTAY PADMANABHAM (Andhra Pradesh): Only two children are specified.

SHRI CHATURANAN MISHRA: What about the other children? They will go before the Supreme Court and ask, "What crime have we committed?"

Now, I am coming to the last question. Will the private sector also be forced to go on the same lines? Are public-sector workers only workers?

SHRI P. A. SANGMA: Pension?

SHRI CHATURANAN MISHRA: Everything. If it is beneficial to the undertakings in private sector, it should be introduced for them also. If they have some higher emoluments, all right, so much the better. But the private sector should also be brought under the scheme because they are also workers. At present, it is only for the public sector. You must extend it to the private sector also. Only then you can compare the performance of the public sector and that of the private sector. The hon. Minister should clarify all these things.

SHRI VITHALBHAI M. PATEL (Gujarat): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I congratulate the Government and the Labour Minister on taking this decision and meeting the demands of workers.

I want to know from the hon. Minister whether he is aware of the fact that the INTUC has given a notice to go on strike on the 19th March 1993. Has he requested the INTUC to withdraw the strike or not? If not, will he request the INTUC to withdraw the strike?

SHRI CHATURANAN MISHRA: How can he request them before this announcement? Only after this announcement, he will request them.

SHRI VITHALBHAI M. PATEL: Yes. But has any negotiation taken place? Let him tell us. What will be the total amount of burden on

the public sector enterprises? What amount will be given in cash and what will be deposited in provident fund schemes?

The next point is, will it apply to all the public-sector units, both those which are making profits and those which are losing?

Thanks.

श्री राम नरेश यादव : (उत्तर प्रदेश) :
महोदय, माननीय मंत्री जी ने जो वक्तव्य दिया है और जिस तरह से सार्वजनिक क्षेत्र उपक्रमों के कर्मचारियों के बारे में महंगाई भत्ते की दर में वृद्धि की है और जो अब तक वकाया चला आ रहा था उसके बारे में जो वक्तव्य दिया है उसके लिए वह बधाई के पात्र हैं क्योंकि बहुत दिनों से उनकी ये मांगें चली आ रही थीं। इसके साथ मैं यह भी कहना चाहता हूँ कि आपने यह भी कहा है 1-1-89 से 31-12-91 की अवधि की औद्योगिक महंगाई भत्ते की दर वकाया राशि का 50 प्रतिशत कर्मचारियों के भविष्य निधि खाते में जमा कर दी जायेगी और शेष 50 प्रतिशत का भुगतान नकद किया जायेगा। मैं जानना चाहता हूँ कि जो वकाया चल रहा है, क्या भविष्य में आप इस बात को सुनिश्चित करेंगे कि उनका इस संबंध में जो महंगाई भत्ता है वह वकाया न रहे, जैसे ही तय हो वैसे ही उनके खाते में जमा हो जाये, यह सुनिश्चित करेंगे? दूसरा सवाल मेरा यह है कि आपने वक्तव्य के अंत में कहा है कि 1952 में जो उपबन्ध था उसमें संशोधन करने के लिए भील ही एक विधेयक लाया जाएगा। क्या इसी सत्र में आप लायेंगे क्योंकि आपने कहा है कि जल्दी ही लायेंगे। इसलिए मैं जानना चाहता हूँ कि इसी सत्र में लायेंगे तो सही बात यह है कि यह बात सही है कि सभी सम्मानित सदस्यों ने कहा है कि इसमें उन लोगों का कोई दोष नहीं था जो महंगाई भत्ता वकाया रहा। इसलिए हमारा आग्रह होगा कि इस बात की भी आप व्यवस्था करें कि उनको उसका सुद भी मिले क्योंकि इसमें उनका दोष नहीं था उपक्रमों का दोष था। अगर आप उनको सुद भी देंगे तो वे इस से लाभान्वित होंगे।

इसलिए इस संबंध में भी आप सदन को अवगत करा दें।

DR. JINENDRA KUMAR JAIN (Madhya Pradesh): Mr. Vice Chairman, Sir, I would say that this direction of economic reforms is welcome. But consultations with all the representative groups of trade unions, not only the INTUC and the AITUC, but the Bhartiya Mazdoor Sangh also, should have been mandatory and in future, the Minister should keep this in mind. I have a few clarifications to seek. In the Pension Scheme for the Employees' Provident Fund subscribers, a good chunk belongs to the private sector. So this is a welcome thing that the employees working in the private sector will now be entitled for pension for which I would thank the hon. Minister. But who will be responsible to pay pension to the employees? Is it the Government or is it the employer who will be responsible for this? This question is linked to my second query as to what will be the source of the pension fund for the employees working in the private sector? Will it be the Provident Fund Trust or you are going to have a separate provision to provide pension to them?

My third query is that the provident fund, after all, is the trust fund, and recently, we have had the experience that the trust funds, under the charge of the Government, were diverted to places like stock market. I would like to know from the Minister what guarantees he is going to provide that these trust funds with the Government will not be diverted for any other purpose except for the purpose for which they are meant because these funds are meant for providing pension.

Then, in the economic liberalisation programme that you have simultaneously launched—I am referring to those countries where free economy exists—the rate of interest to

be earned by the pension fund or such a provident fund is not fixed the way you fix it. You give a very low rate of interest. Now, in a free economy like the United States, all such funds—the Provident Fund Trust or the Provident Fund or the Pension Fund—get benefited in terms of interest rates so that a higher amount can go to the people who get pension. In your modernisation plan for the Indian economy, will you like to pass on the benefits of such funds under your control to the beneficiaries or will you like the Government to be the beneficiary of such big funds which are going to swell to enormous size in the years to come? Also, I would like to know another thing from the Minister. There is a provision in the existing Provident Fund scheme to set up a private trust, which can be managed by the employees themselves. These provisions are there, but my information is that whenever the employees have decided or have made efforts to set up such private trust funds, the Government has not been very enthusiastic to support them. Though there is a provision, it has not been available to the employees. I would like to know from the hon. Minister one thing. When you talk of bringing a new Act or streamlining the procedure, are you going to include the streamlining of the procedure and facilitating the setting up of such privately managed provident trusts or those managed by the employees themselves so that the whole process is decentralised and instead of this money being kept under the control of bureaucrats, the employees themselves can manage their future pension funds?

श्री विठ्ठलभाई मोतोराम पटेल : आप तो भाषण कर रहे हैं।

डा० जितेन्द्र कुमार जैन : भाषण नहीं कर रहा हूँ। एक-एक मिनट की क्वेरी कर रहा हूँ। आपको ऐतराज नहीं होना चाहिए। आपको चिट्ठी होती है जब वी०जे०पी० का कोई मैनबर बोलता है। मैं बकिंग क्लाम के हित में बोल रहा हूँ इतने बुजुर्ग होकर

आप इस बात का ख्याल नहीं रखते कि आप जब बोलते हैं तो हम इंटरप्ट नहीं करते।

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SYED SIBTEY RAZI): You please speak and try to be a little brief. That's all.

DR. JINENDRA KUMAR JAIN: Last query, Sir, it has been the experience of many that there is a lot of hardship faced by them in obtaining these pensions, specially in the case of categories that are specifically mentioned in the statement of the Minister like widowed women, old people, disabled people etc. Now even if the Government has to provide pension, there are a lot of hardships. My first question is, who will be made responsible for paying pension to the employees? Suppose the private industries are made responsible for paying the pension, there has to be adequate provision to ensure that no hardships are faced by the weaker sections who have to depend on their pension, at the hands of unscrupulous people who can be made in charge of this responsibility of providing pension. Thank you very much.

SHRI S. MUTHU MANI (Tamil Nadu): Thank you, Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, for providing me this opportunity. As being the State General Secretary of the Anna Thozhurchanga Peravai which is affiliated to our Party, All India Anna DMK, I want to seek certain clarifications on the points that arise in the minds of the workers. I would have expected a more comprehensive statement from the hon. Minister since he is well aware of the problems of the workers. I have a few clarifications to seek regarding this statement. The statement states that 50 per cent of the arrears of IDA would be credited to the Provident Fund. This is very unfair. These workers have been waiting for over three years for their dues. Therefore, the Government should pay the full amount of arrears in cash with

interest for the lock-up period. I want to know whether the Minister will consider it. With the inflation on the rise every day, five years is too long a period for wage settlement to be in vogue. This should be reduced to three years. Further, the new wage settlement should take retrospective effect right from the time of expiry of the old settlement. This statement is silent on this point. I want to know whether the proposed scheme of pension is a third benefit as demanded by the employees in addition to the benefits they are already getting and whether same scheme may be provided to the private sector. I would like the hon. Minister to answer my specific points.

I want to say one thing more, Sir. The Government could have waited for a few days more and come out with a comprehensive statement with liberal benefits to the workers. The Minister has come out with this statement in a hurry because of the proposed INTUC strike on 19th March. This is like christening the baby before it is born.

SHRI MENTAY PADMANABHAM:

Sir, this statement appears to be the outcome of the bilateral talks between the Government and the INTUC. This is really unfortunate if it is true. I would request the hon. Minister to involve other trade unions also without showing any favour or any special consideration to any particular trade union. There appears to be one contradiction. Some of my friends have already pointed it out, viz., the scheme will not entail any further financial commitment to the employees or the employers. Does it mean that the Government is providing budgetary support to implement this scheme? If it is so, there are a number of State public sector enterprises also. If this scheme is implemented in the Central public sector undertakings, it will have a cascading effect and the wor-

kers in the State public sector undertakings will also agitate for the implementation of this enhancement. We know that the finances of the State Governments and the working of the public sector undertakings at the State level are in such a bad shape that they will not be able to provide necessary funds for implementing this scheme. Therefore, I would like to know whether budgetary support will be extended to the State Governments or the State public sector undertakings. Then, there is another contradiction. I don't know whether the Minister has to clarify it or not. It is stated that IDA payable to the employees of the Central public sector enterprises to whom IDA is applicable shall stand enhanced from Rs. 1.65 to Rs. 2.00. Are there any other Central public sector undertakings where this dearness allowance is not applicable? Does it mean that there are some other public sector undertakings where this dearness allowance is not being applied? If it is so will the Government think in terms of bringing all the public sector undertakings into this scheme? There is one more point. This statement says that the new wage settlements which are to be concluded shall be valid for a period of five years. The rate of dearness allowance, has increased. The entire idea is to link the dearness allowance to the consumer price index. Therefore, if the wage settlement is valid for a period of five years, does it mean that you are freezing the dearness allowance for the entire five-year period? Or, will it be increasing along with the increase in the consumer price index? This is another important point on which I would like to seek clarification from the hon. Minister. There are some other points also. My colleagues have raised them. There is no point in repeating them. They are all important points. The most important point is whether the Central Government is going to extend any financial support to the State Govern-

SHRI MENTAY PADMANABHAM: ments to implement this scheme for the workers working in the State Government enterprises.

SHRI SARADA MOHANTY (Orissa): I want to seek three clarifications. One is that it is stated in this statement that two children will get benefit under this scheme. I would like to know whether both the adult and the minor will get the benefit under this scheme. Suppose there are three children, one adult and two minors, I would like to know whether the benefit is given only on the adult and one minor and the other minor is left out. My second clarification is regarding the widow of the subscriber. Suppose a person gets pension and after getting pension he dies within two or three years, I would like to know whether his widow will get the benefit under the scheme. It has not been mentioned as pension-holder. It has been mentioned as subscriber. I want to know whether it will be subscriber and or pension holder. Thirdly I would like to know from the hon. Minister whether the widowed mother will get the pension or not. If a man has no children and widow will his widow mother get the pension?

These are my clarifications. Thank you.

SHRI PRAVAT KUMAR SAMANTARAY (Orissa): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir the hon. Minister must have felt by now that in spite of the statement enhancing the DA from Rs. 1.65 to Rs. 2.00, he could not enthuse the Members of this House. The reason is very simple. He has taken a very belated decision. Not only that. What did he do? According to the statement the DA due to the workers was from 1.1.1989. You have not specified about the interest which accrued on it. Apart from that what did you do? You have proposed to take away 50 per cent of this money and put it to the Provident Fund of the employees. I don't understand the logic behind the dues of the workers and the mode of pay-

ment. If you hold back the dues of the workers payable to them and make a fixed deposit in what way are they going to be the gainer?

My second clarification is this. Now the money value is receding in our country. After 10 years when he gets the Provident Fund, will he get that money at the value of 1989?

Thirdly, you have proposed to go in for a wage settlement in the Central public sector enterprises for five years. You must be aware that there are Central public sector undertakings and joint undertakings in this country who are having wage settlement for two years, three years, four years or for five years. What about the other leap years? In what way are you going to compensate the workers who are having two years' settlement? In what way are you going to compensate the workers who are going to face the losses and losses incurred out of this due to the five years' wage settlement? In what way are you going to compensate them?

Fourthly, what are the things you are proposing for bringing out the EPF subscribers under a pension scheme? I would like to ask: Is it not a fact that you are actually taking away the benefit of the workers in the name of introducing this pension scheme? Are you not aware that even in the Central Government and the State Governments pension holders are not getting pension in due time? In all these private establishments, what will be the mode of payment and who will be the regulating authority for this pension scheme? I would also like to know what will be the relation of original pension scheme with the present pension scheme. What are the details? Will this scheme be identical or a separate one? When family is mentioned to be the beneficiary of the subscriber in original scheme what is the reason that you have limited it to two children/orphans?

SHRI ASHIS SEN (West Bengal): Thank you, Mr. Vice-Chairman. The

hon. Minister has placed before the House a statement which says that certain changes have been made in the Dearness Allowance formula for industrial units in the public sector. Nineteenth of March was the day for strike which was declared by the INTUC. If I have understood correctly, it is in this background that the statement has been made. The first question that I would like to ask the hon. Minister is whether as a consequence of this statement an understanding has been reached by the Government with the INTUC and as a result of this INTUC is withdrawing its strike on 19th March. Secondly, it is a continuation of the bad feature of earlier years that the Congress Government in power would always like to have negotiations with the labour wing of that particular political party irrespective of the fact whether it represents the majority of the workers or even 50 per cent of the workers. If the Government continues to negotiate with only one section of workers or trade unions it will continue to breed a divisive outlook and consequentially exacerbate the situation in the industry. So the first question in this regard will be whether all the trade unions have been consulted before taking this decision. If this is not done then there will be a feeling of discrimination and it will give rise to more complications. Now I come to the question of Dearness Allowance. Dearness Allowance has been enhanced at the index point of 800 points with effect from 1.1.89. When the central trade unions in the public sector demanded enhancement of these rates, what was the index at that point of time? It was below 600 points. When that was the index points. When that was the index it from Rs. 1.65 to Rs. 2. The index being around 1200. It should have gone much beyond that. It should have been around Rs. 3.50 or so. To do it at this stage on the basis of 800 points means it is a belated decision and to that extent

it means depriving the workers of their legitimate dues under the formula which...linked...with...the Consumer Price Index. In the second paragraph he has mentioned that Government has decided to permit negotiations for revision of wages in the Central Public Sector enterprises. Are the financial institutions included in it? It is a straight question whether under this provision negotiations with unions in financial sectors like banks, insurance companies, IFCI, IDBI etc., which had been stalled on the plea that there was no briefing from the Government, would be initiated along with other public sector undertakings. Then again he said that guidelines are being issued separately by the Department of Public Enterprises. I would like to know whether the guidelines are being issued directly to the management of industries or some order would be given to Members of Parliament so that they know what these guidelines are. A policy statement should be made here. Otherwise, employers in the public sector would deal with it in a different manner and at the base level of industries conflicts would arise. I would like to know whether these guidelines would be placed before the House for our consideration. As I said earlier if the decision has been taken without consulting other central trade unions, I would like to know whether these guidelines would be followed by other industries also. I know, all the central trade unions in the banking sector are not allowed to sit in the negotiating forum with the result that there is continuous conflict between management and the unions and the units in the industries find themselves in a difficult situation. I would like to know whether all the organisations, including the Bank Employees Federation of India have been asked to participate in the bipartite negotiations. Now, coming to the question of pension, what does it mean? Is there

[Shri Pravat Kumar Samantray]

going to be no further financial commitment? Will provident fund continue along with pension that is coming in or will provident fund be replaced by pension? If that be so, then what is the gain that is to be made available to the workers? I know, when this proposal was given to one unit of the banking industry, that is, the Reserve Bank of India, overwhelming majority of the employees and officers had rejected it.

They said that this was not the type of pension that they were asking for. They wanted pension to be additional benefit. Gratuity is there. Provident Fund is there. And they want a pension. Whatever be the quantum, that is not the point. Pension is a social security measure that is given to the workers. But as it appears, it will be—don't mistake my using this word—hoodwinking the workers telling them, "we are providing you with pension but at the same time we are taking away all that has been accumulated in your provident fund account, the employers' contribution of that."

SHRI SUNIL BASU RAY: This is *maya*.

SHRI ASHIS SEN: *Maya*, as you call it. This is not proper because I know in the banking industry itself and insurance the contribution of the employees towards provident fund amounts to Rs. 3500 crores. Now, if Rs. 3500 crores are to be withdrawn, assuming that this formula is being applied to the banking industry, then, the employers' liability on account of provident fund will also be withdrawn to the same extent. And, the second liability of the employers, that is to pay 10 per cent of the basic pay, will also be withdrawn. So, the employers' contribution to the provident fund will not be there. What will happen to the pension fund, we do not know. So, it is a measure by which all the

responsibilities and the Provident Fund liabilities of the employees to the employees and the officers are exactly to be withdrawn by way of giving this type of a pension. The balance remaining in the provident fund account will be withdrawn and then it will be shown that some sort of a pension has been given. That is not good. And the workers will not accept it. At least, I know, in certain sectors, like the financial sector, they will not accept it. That is why they have declared a strike on the 29th of March demanding that an additional retirement benefit in the shape of pension should be given in addition to gratuity and provident fund. Whether there will be any adjustment between the provident fund and the quantum of pension by extra contribution from employers and the employees, is a question for negotiation. But even for that, the employers are not negotiating with the trade unions. There seems to be negotiation on the issue by ten lakh employees and officers. On 29th March, there is going to be a strike on this issue. There should be an immediate negotiation on this and pension should be given. About the privatisation of the banking institutions also, I do not know what is going to happen. But primarily now, I am concerned with the question of pension. They are actually showing two pictures to the workers. They create an illusion in the minds of the workers that they are going to get some benefit by way of pension. Tell the worker positively whether there is any commitment on your part to give the third retirement benefit. One more thing that I will ask the Minister is whether in any industry,—I know, in the Steel industry, Coal industry, etc., an agreement was reached and deduction is being made on account of pension as the third retirement benefit—public sector or otherwise, the third type of retirement benefit is made available. If so, which are the industries, particularly, in the public sector? The Minister must be knowing this.

So, I have to say that I am opposed to the idea of making some sort of an withdrawal of the existing provident fund and then giving a part of it as pension. If you really mean that you want to do some good to the workers, then, come in a straightforward manner saying "Yes, the Government has decided to give pension as a social security measure." The value of the rupee has gone down to such an extent that whatever amount is received by way of gratuity or provident fund is of no use. It will be a scrap of paper bringing only a very small amount. Sir, I am coming to the end. I know you are turning the bell and you are going to ring the bell.

Sir, I would like to know whether on this matter there is going to be any negotiation and the Government is thinking in terms of providing social security measures in addition to what they are getting today by way of super-annuation benefits at this stage. Thank you, Sir.

SHRI P. A. SANGMA: Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I am grateful to the honourable Members who have raised questions enabling me to clarify some of the points.

Sir, I concede the point that the statement is very brief and, on the face of it, particularly on matters relating to the pension scheme, it would not be possible for the honourable Members to understand it fully. The point is that the detailed scheme has been finalised and, as I said, we are coming to the House with an amending Bill and at that time the detailed scheme will be available and the Members will be able to know more about it. However, all the three issues, that is, increase of DA, wage negotiation and finalisation of the pension scheme have been agitating the minds of the workers because the final decisions were pending before the Government. It is

not correct to say that the Government had come to the final decision without consulting the trade union leaders; not at all. There have been a lot of consultations, a lot of discussions, at my level with all the trade unions, organizations. Centrally recognized trade union organizations, and I have spent hours and hours talking to them on all the three issues. Therefore the Government had to take a final decision on the basis of the wide consultations that we had.

SHRI SUNIL BASU RAY: Mr. Minister, you said that you had consultations. But did you have agreements?

SHRI P. A. SANGMA: You please listen to me. After listening to one sentence, you come to some conclusion.

It has been done later wide consultations. But it is true that, recently the INTUC served a strike notice for the 19th of this month and, therefore, I had to talk to them separately yesterday and today and we had come to an understanding. There is no agreement signed with them. But we had come to an understanding and, in the meantime, the Government has taken these decisions as a result of which—I have been intimated just a few minutes ago—the INTUC has decided to withdraw the strike on the 19th.

As far as the DA formula is concerned, this matter was lying for a long time. The Government could not come to any understanding with the trade union organizations. The Janata Party Government could not come to an understanding with the workers. The then Finance Minister, Mr. Madhu Dandavate, unilaterally declared that the IDA rate would be raised from Rs. 1.65 to Rs. 1.90 and he made a statement on the floor of the House. The entire trade union organizations rejected it saying that the unilateral announcement by the Government of India would not be

[Shri P. A. Sangma]

accepted by the workers. So, it could not be implemented. That was in 1990. Then the Tripartite Committee was constituted with the Labour Minister as the Chairman. The last meeting was held on the 23rd July 1992 in which we came to a unanimous decision. The increase from Rs. 1.65 to Rs. 2/- as well as debiting 50 per cent to the Provident Fund is not our decision, is not the decision of the Government, but it is the unanimous recommendation of the Tripartite DA Committee wherein all the Central trade union organizations were present. I can give you those who are party to this. They are: Mr. M. K. Pande—CITU; Mr. M. S. Krishnan—AITUC; Mr. Gaya Singh AITUC; Mr. Sankar Saha—UTUS (LS); Mr. R. K. Samantaray—HMS. And the INTUC was also there. Therefore everybody was present. It is true...

SHRI ASHIS SEN (West Bengal): What about BMS?

SHRI P. A. SANGMA: BMS was very much there. You want to know who represented the BMS? Mr. R. K. Bhatt and Mr. M.M.N. Jha were the two representatives from the BMS.

SHRI MENTAY PADMANABHAM: It was strongly represented.

SHRI P. A. SANGMA: Everybody was represented. And the suggestion for sending 50 per cent of it to the Provident Fund did not come from the Government at all. It came voluntarily from the workers' side. And initially of course, the representative of CITU, Dr. M. K. Pande did oppose it. He opposed it saying that they are not agreeable to it. But when they met among themselves—we broke off for half-an-hour—they did come to an understanding. And they said, "All right, we agree to it." Therefore, it is a unanimous recommendation of the Tripartite Committee, with CITU having reservation in the beginning but later on conceding to it. And there, it is not a unilateral de-

cision of the Government of India. I am sure, with the announcement of this today the workers all over the country will be very happy because they have been pressing for it, and this issue could not be resolved for a very long time. I am happy it has been resolved. And I am grateful to the trade union leaders who have very kindly agreed to this. Mr. Mathur or somebody....

SHRI JAGDISH PRASAD MATHUR: What about the slab system?

SHRI P. A. SANGMA: I am coming to that.

SHRI SUNIL BASU RAY: Fifty per cent of what? 50 per cent of Rs. 2 or 50 per cent of the increased amount?

SHRI P. A. SANGMA: 50 per cent of increased amount.

SHRI SUNIL BASU RAY: Then it is a reduction of 65 paise.

SHRI P. A. SANGMA: Sir, somebody asked as to what would be the total liability of the Government. The total liability of the Government comes to Rs. 546 crores. And, of course, 50 per cent will go to the the Provident Fund. Therefore, the cash outflow will be about Rs. 270 crores.

Now, the third recommendation of the Tripartite Committee was for the introduction of the slab system from 1992 onwards. What Mr. Mathur has pointed out is true. But on this issue, though on principle it was recommended to the Government that the slab system should be introduced from 1992 there has not been a unanimous view as to how this slab system will be introduced—for example, how many slabs will be there, whether it will be three slabs or four slabs or five slabs. So, the Unions themselves have not been able to come to any conclusion on that. In fact, they wanted more time to discuss among themselves on how to go

about the slab system. That is why the Government has not taken a final decision on this because the Trade Unions themselves wanted to discuss on this issue. So, that is about the slab system.

Sir, now coming to the guidelines of the New Wage Negotiation, the hon. Members are aware that the new wage negotiation is due for a long time. And there was a ban issued by the Finance Ministry not to start the new wage negotiation. And there was a lot of agitation by the workers there and ultimately the Government has now agreed and the detailed guidelines are being worked out for the DPE, and they will issue the guidelines. But the main features of how it is going to be, perhaps I can just indicate because unless the detailed guidelines worked out by the DPE are available with me I will not be able to spell out everything. But, generally, the understanding is that the Management should be free to negotiate a wage structure keeping in view and consistent with the generation of resources or profits by the individual units. That is more or less, one understanding. Secondly...

SHRI SUKOMAL SEN: Then, why are these guidelines for the DPE?

SHRI P. A. SANGMA: No, no. It is not the guidelines that I am saying. The guidelines which are being worked out will be based on these principles. It will be based on these principles. That is what I am saying.

SHRI P. A. SANGMA: That is what I am saying. The guidelines have been worked out...

SHRI SUKOMAL SEN: you want to restrict it.

SHRI P. A. SANGMA: No, we are giving a free hand to the unions.

SHRI SUKOMAL SEN: What are the guidelines?

SHRI JAGDISH PRASAD MATHUR: If you give a free hand to the unions, they will themselves work it out...

SHRIMATI KAMLA SINHA: Instead of BPE sending these guidelines, you could do it yourself.

SHRI P. A. SANGMA: I don't say it is the guidelines but the point is that wage negotiation has been allowed and we are leaving it to the management to do it, without imposing ourselves on them to do this or do that, or to agree to this or not to agree. We are not giving these guidelines. The thinking is that we will give a free hand to the individual units to negotiate with the workers. That itself could be called a guideline. I do not know whether it can be so called. But perhaps you may call it guideline.

SHRI JAGDISH PRASAD MATHUR: Will the management be compelled or will it be necessary for them to make a reference to the Finance Ministry during negotiations?

SHRI P. A. SANGMA: It is up to them. I am not able to spell out the guidelines because these will be forwarded by the BPE. They must formulate the guidelines and I will come before you later.

Another point raised was about the base year. I can tell you that 1960 is the base year.

Coming to the pension, even the pension scheme has been formulated after a very wide consultation. As the hon. Members are aware, the provident fund is administered by the Central Board of Trustees which is tripartite in nature. So every decision is taken by them. So this scheme has been formulated, accepted and decided by the Central Board of Trustees unanimously. After they had formulated the scheme unanimously in a tripartite body, we placed this sche-

[Shri P. A. Sangma]

me before different categories of subscribers. For example, I had a delegation of five unions of the working journalists and we placed this scheme before them. In the beginning, they had reservations but after we explained to them for about 40 minutes or 45 minutes or an hour or so, we told them that we would give them ten days more before they could give their final views. But the scheme was so attractive that the representatives of the journalists said: 'We do not require ten days. You take it that we have agreed.' It was a good scheme.

On the question of employer-employee contribution, Sir, we have a scheme in the provident fund called the Family Pension Scheme. Actually, we are abolishing this Family Pension Scheme and it is being replaced by the present pension scheme. In the Family Pension Scheme, we have accumulated an amount of Rs. 5,000 crores. They amount is being converted into a corpus for administering the pension scheme. Therefore, the workers need not contribute anything. Employers' normal contribution to the provident fund is 33 per cent which will continue to go to the new pension scheme fund and the workers do not have to contribute anything, and this will be administered by the Provident Fund Organisation and there is no difficulty.

SHRI MENTAY PADMANABH-AM: There is no budgetary support,

SHRI P. A. SANGMA: Money will be deposited in the commercial banks.

SHRI MENTAY PADMANABH-AM: Not in shares?

SHRI P. A. SANGMA: The amount is Rs. 5,000 crores.

SHRI SUKOMAL SEN: What about the contributory provident fund? Will it continue?

SHRI P. A. SANGMA: Everything will continue. It is not a third benefit, as you want to make it. It is not

a third benefit. All other benefits under the employees' provident fund scheme will continue to be available to the workers. They will get the benefits under all the existing scheme, excepting the family pension scheme which is being replaced by the present scheme. I tell you, it is a beautiful scheme.

SHRI RAJNI RANJAN SAHU (Bihar): Very good scheme.

SHRI P. A. SANGMA: It is a very nice scheme. When you get a copy of the scheme, you will also be very happy.

SHRI MENTAY PADMANABH-AM: What about the States?

SHRI P. A. SANGMA: States will be covered by this. All the workers. Seventeen million workers all over the country will be covered. Private and public, Central and State; everybody will be covered.

SHRI ASHIS SEN: It is deceptive.

SHRI P. A. SANGMA: Before I forget, let me say this.

SHRI ASHIS SEN: All right. You have your say.

SHRI P. A. SANGMA: Now, Mishraji's point about two children. He asked whether it is before the scheme or after the scheme. I am reminded of the story of a lady who had put on so much of weight. I read it in some magazine. She was 320 kg. or so. She went to a hospital. The doctor advised her that she should take only one slice of bread. She went home and immediately rang up the doctor. She said: 'Doctor I forgot to ask you. Should I take the slice of bread before or after food?'. Mishraji's question is like that. Well, the scheme contemplates that only two children will be entitled to pension.

SHRI CHATURANAN MISHRA: How can you discriminate?

SHRI P. A. SANGMA: At a time, only two will be entitled. Children upto the age of twenty-five are entitled. If a couple have three children, the moment one of them crosses the age of 25 and becomes 26, he does not get the pension; the other two get the pension. At a time, continuously, two children will get, those who are 25 and below. This is the scheme.

SHRI MENTAY PADMANABH-AM: If there are three children, all below 25?

SHRI P. A. SANGMA: No. only two. This will be the overall limit. Whether before or after the scheme, only two children will get.

Sir, these are some of the points raised by hon. Members. I hope some light has been thrown.

There was one other point. It was asked whether the scheme would cover the coal and steel sectors. This scheme does not cover the coal and steel sectors because they have their separate provident fund organisations. The Steel Minister is here. I was the Coal Minister earlier. I would like to assure you that we are working out a scheme—may not be exactly the same, but a similar scheme—in respect of the coal and steel sectors. Thank your Sir.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SYED SIBTEY RAZI): Now there is a statement to be made by the Minister of Welfare, on socio-economic criteria for exclusion of 'creamy layer' from 'Other Backward Classes'.

SHRI SUKOMAL SEN: Sir, I have a submission. (*Interruptions*) I have a submission. I would suggest that the statement may be made by the Welfare Minister now, but as it is already 7.45 p.m. the clarifications should be taken up tomorrow. Such

a important subject cannot be debated in this way. It is not fair.

SHRIMATI KAMLA SINHA: It should be tomorrow.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SYED SIBTEY RAZI): It is up to the Minister.

SHRI MENTAY PADMANABH-AM: Sir, this is a very serious matter. It is a very important matter. I do not know what importance we are giving to this subject by taking it up at eight in the night. Let him make the statement now, but we should have the clarifications tomorrow.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SYED SIBTEY RAZI): If the Minister agrees, he can make the statement today and the clarifications can be postponed to some other day.

SHRI MENTAY PADMANABH-AM: It should be tomorrow itself.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SYED SIBTEY RAZI): It is upto the Minister.

SHRI MOHD. KHALILUR RAHMAN (Andhra Pradesh): It should be tomorrow itself.

SHRI SITARAM KESRI: I agree to the suggestion made by hon. Members... (व्यवधान) सब हिन्दी में, सब यहां नि लेगा।

श्री राम नरेश यादव : सवाल यह है कि विशेषज्ञ समिति ने जो रिपोर्ट दी है, वह कहाँ है ?

श्री सोदराराम केशरी : सब चीज आपके मिल जाएगा ।

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SYED SIBTEY RAZI): It is mentioned in the statement itself that a copy of the report has been laid on the Table of the House.

SHRI RAM NARESH YADAV: Where is that report?