

SHRI KALYAN ROY: What about the second point? I said that how is it that he is the Minister in charge of thermal power stations and the DESU have not paid about Rs. 100 crores to the ^{Coastal} India. What is the reason for that?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Why not pay them?

SHRI SHIV SHANKAR: Sir, I may improve upon his information that to Badarpur, the DESU has to pay Rs. 270 crores.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It is much more than what he is saying. So, the question is strengthened. Question No. 102.

SHRI KALYAN ROY: And the reply is zero.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Question No. 102.

Verification of Membership of Central Trade Unions

102. SHRI KALYAN ROY:

SHRI LADLI MOHAN
NIGAM VI:

Will the Minister of LABOUR AND REHABILITATION be pleased to state:

(a) whether Government have carried out any verification of membership of various Central Trade Unions in 1981-84 and if so, what are the results thereof;

(b) what are the names of the unions which participate in the verification and those which did not participate;

(c) what were the objections of those which did not participate;

(d) what steps have been taken to meet those objections; and

(e) what is the reaction of Government to serious protests by AITUC and other Central Trade Unions which did not participate in the verification?

†The question was actually asked on the floor of the House by Shri Kalyan Roy.

THE MINISTER OF LABOUR AND REHABILITATION (SHRI VEERENDRA PATIL): (a) The general verification with 31-12-80 as the date of reckoning has been taken up; the process has not been completed.

(b) The INTUC, BMS, UTUC, TUC (LS), TUC, NFITU, NLO and HMS participated in the verification whereas AITUC and CITU boycotted the verification.

(c) The AITUC and CITU had demanded a revision of the existing verification procedure and wanted adoption of the secret ballot system or any other procedure.

(d) and (e) In view of the lack of unanimity amongst trade unions despite several meetings called by Government, verification has proceeded in accordance with the procedure as intimated in Government's letter of 6th October 1981.

SHRI KALYAN ROY: Sir, in the backdrop of rising industrial conflicts and more mandays being lost in the year because of this conflict, the main issues are the collective bargaining agencies. The success of collective bargaining depends on which is that, the firm might or that particular trade union enjoys the confidence of employees whom they are supposed to represent. This is the one issue which is plaguing the industrial relations for the last 30 years and because the Government does not find any democratic solution in order to impose the INTUC on the working class two-thirds of the labour disputes are because of their undemocratic procedure. Is it not a fact that in October, 1981 the then Labour Minister, Shri N. D. Tiwari called a meeting in order to evolve an agreed formula to find out what can be used? The minimum courtesy of consultation agency? But before the discussion was over or concluded or a consensus was arrived at, the Labour Ministry issued a circular for verification, which has been rejected by all the Central trade unions except the INTUC and they further reveal—Sir, the major Central trade unions boycotted. And what is now given is the

Government version of the membership. Now, may I ask the Union Labour Minister that in view of such unanimous opposition by all the leading Central trade union organisations what is he doing? Sir, you know that even the main issue of the Bombay textile strike for one year was the issue of collective bargaining agency. It was said that the Government was refusing to understand the basic issue where even the Tatas castigated the entire verification system. I would like to know in view of the appeal and request by the Central trade unions to evolve a common formula to find out the collective bargaining agency instead of the verification in the present form, what steps the Labour Minister has taken to find out a consensus?

SHRI VEERENDRA PATIL: Sir, in order to find out the consensus with regard to the procedure for verification several meetings were taken. The Central trade union organisations were invited and the Minister had held personally a series of discussions with these organisations. But unfortunately some organisations were not in favour of the present verification formula and some organisations were demanding secret ballot. Sir, it is not correct to say that barring the INTUC all other organisations were in favour of secret ballot. Sir, if the hon. Member wants to know about the discussions that we had on the 30th January, 1984, the INTUC is against secret ballot, the BMS has said that they have no objection to the verification procedure although they would prefer secret ballot, the HMS have endorsed the view of the INTUC and they wanted one more chance for the production of records. They are also not for secret ballot. The UTUC (LS)....

MR. CHAIRMAN: So far as these abbreviations are concerned, Mr. Minister, they mean nothing to me. Why don't you put them in the expanded form?

SHRI VEERENDRA PATIL: I am sorry, Sir. I will repeat that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please explain them.

SHRI VEERENDRA PATIL: Sir, the hon. Member wanted to know why the Central trade union organisations were not taken into confidence before evolving the procedure that was issued in the Government order dated the 6th October, 1981. I said, it is not correct to say that the Government before issuing this circular had not taken the views of the Central organisations into consideration. On the other hand, my predecessor had a series of discussions with all the Central trade union organisations and again it is not correct to say that barring the Indian National Trade Union Congress all other organisations, Central trade union organisations, were for secret ballot. So, I was explaining that the Indian National Trade Union Congress was against secret ballot, the Bharatiya Mazdoor Sangh had no objection to the verification procedure, although they said that they would prefer the secret ballot. The Hindustan Mazdoor Sangh endorsed the view of the Indian National Trade Union Congress. They wanted one more chance for production

of records. The United Trade Union Congress (Lenin Sarani) suggested the adoption of an alternative method for determining the membership strength, as the existing procedure, they said, is defective and secret ballot is not suitable. That is why I said that the contention of the hon. Member, Shri Kalyan Roy that all other organisations barring the Indian National Trade Union Congress were for secret ballot, is not correct. There is a difference of opinion; there is no unanimity among these trade unions with regard to the procedure.

SHRI KALYAN ROY: The statement of the Minister is full of half-truths. Here is a question and answer in this House on 8th July 1982. The question was: Why the trade unions have boycotted the meeting called by the Labour Minister on 15th June, 1982? And the reply by Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad was yes to one of the demands: It was essential to provide for the identification of collective bargaining agent." Now, who is telling the truth. Supply Minister Mr. Azad, or the new Minister, Patil? Mr. Patil didn't do

this home-work before he made this kind of wild allegation in the House. Here is a statement and on the Table of the House that all trade unions, except INTUC, including BMS boycotted this meeting called by the Labour Minister only on the issue of verification and the way to find out collective bargaining agency.

My second point is, is it not a fact that two letters were written in January by the Members of the National Campaign Committee that AITUC, BMS, CIU, TUC (LS) felt that this verification procedure confirmed the worst apprehensions—this is the statement I read out; 'I confirms the worst apprehensions voiced by the Central trade-unions regarding the total, arbitrary and undemocratic nature of the way of determining the strength of the various trade union centres.' This is the statement dated 13th January 1984. So, in view of this rejection by the Central trade unions, except INTUC whom you are trying to impose on the working class why don't you take fresh initiative to set the issue, because here is a journal 'Indian worker' edited by Mr. Bhatt, Member of Rajya Sabha, President of INTUC which has given the verbatim account of what happened at the meeting which he has mentioned, that is 30th January meeting. It states

Mr. Chitta Basu was totally opposed to the verification procedure and wanted that there should be a meeting. Similarly all other Central trade unions, according to INTUC, opposed verification...

MR. CHAIRMAN: You only want that.

SHRI KALYAN ROY: I say some settlement which is acceptable to all the Central trade unions should be reached, and initiative should come from the Minister in view of diametrically opposing versions given by the Labour Minister and INTUCs. Indian worker journal, issue February, 1984.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Minister, Was any initiative taken?

SHRI VEERENDRA PATIL: I will explain the position.

SHRI KALYAN ROY: Can he say that AITUC was represented... *(Interruptions)*

MR. CHAIRMAN: Wait till he has said something.

SHRI VEERENDRA PATIL: According to procedure once verification is over the preliminary results are communicated by the Chief Labour Commissioner to all the Central trade union organisations and they are invited for a discussion if they have any objection. Just now, I have explained the stand taken by different Central trade union organisations at the meeting held by the Chief Labour Commissioner...

SHRI KALYAN ROY: No invitation was extended either to AITUC or CITU. Am I right?

SHRI VEERENDRA PATIL: I am coming to that. This is the stand taken by different Central trade union organisations at the meeting held by the Chief Labour Commissioner on 30th January, 1984. No, how. Member Mr. Kalyan Roy wants to know why the CITU—that is, Central Indian...

SHRI KALYAN ROY: You should know better.

SHRI VEERENDRA PATIL: All-India Trade Union organisation belongs to Communist Party of India and this CITU belongs to CPM...

SHRI KALYAN ROY: There is no Central trade union organisation affiliated to the Communist Party... *(Interruptions)*

SHRI VEERENDRA PATIL: That is my impression that so far as All India Trade Unions Congress is concerned, it is a Wing of the CPI. So far as the CITU is concerned, the Centre of Indian Trade Unions, it is a CPI(M) organisation. The hon. Member is contradicting it, But this is my information.

These two organisations have not been invited by the Chief Labour Commissioner because these two organisations have boycotted. They have not submitted their

claims. They did not co-operate. According to the procedure that was followed and given to the Chief Labour Commissioner, whoever, whichever central organisation had boycotted the verification, they are not to be invited. And whatever has been compiled with regard to the other trade union organisations, is not to be given to these organisations which had boycotted. Since they have boycotted the verification, they have not been invited.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Nigam (*Interruptions*)

SHRI KALYAN ROY: Sir, he has not replied to my question (*Interruptions*) I have asked what steps the Government of India is taking to find out a common formula . . . (*Interruptions*) He has not replied to that I am only telling what you have asked him positively. The Minister has not cared to reply to this.

MR. CHAIRMAN: He has replied that there are many who are boycotting, who are not coming. How can you have unanimity if there is no representation? (*Interruptions*)

SHRI KALYAN ROY: It is a question of principle. The question is whether they will discuss with the central trade unions to find out a common principle? The reply has not come for this.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Let us hear Mr. Nigam. He may throw some light on this.

श्री लाडली मोहन निगम : सम्भाषित महोदय, रोजनी तो उसको दिखाई जाय जिस को अन्धकार से निवाले की जरूरत है। मुझे ऐसा लगता है कि सरकार की नीति यह है कि जिस तरह से, येन केन-प्रकारेण सता में बने रहें। इस के जितने भी आयाय है उन पर कब्जा रखो। अच्छा होता अगर मंत्री जी यह बताने की स्थिति में होते कि हिन्दुस्तान में पिछले तीन वर्षों में जितनी हड़तालें हुई हैं उनमें क्या रिकॉग्नीशन मान्यता की धारा नहीं थी। मान्यता सब से मुख्य मुद्दा बन गया है आज

मजदूर आन्दोलन का। असल में मामला यह है कि जिन को मजदूरों को मान्यता नहीं है, सरकार को और मालिक को मान्यता मिल जाती है, आप समझ सकते हैं कि क्या नहीं कर सकते तो एक बॉल बुनियादी है कि अगर आप का प्रजापक्ष में विश्वास है तो आप चुनाव की पद्धति क्यों नहीं इस्तेमाल करते। आप उस की अवधि दो वर्ष कर दो, तीन वर्ष कर दो। इसके न करने से खतरा हो गया है कि एक ही कारखाने में दस-पांच यूनियन बन जाते हैं और आपस को राइवेलरी में झगड़े में देश का नुकसान होता है। मुझे लगता है कि इन की देश के नुकसान से मतलब नहीं है। तो क्या चुनाव की पद्धति अपनाने का संकल्प करेंगे। दूसरे वेरीफिकेशन की बात आप बार बार करते हैं, कौन करता है वेरीफिकेशन—आप का हाँ नियुक्त आदमी करता है? जोइन्ट वेरीफिकेशन होता है क्या?

श्री सम्भाषित : लेबर कमिश्नर करता होगा।

श्री लाडली मोहन निगम : नहीं—वह लिस्ट ले लेता है, वह जाकर संधे करता है। जितने लोगों ने दावे किये हैं उन सब के नाम ले कर वेरीफिकेशन करता है। और अगर मान लेंजिए गलत वेरीफिकेशन हुआ है तो उस को ठोक करने का तरीका क्या है। अगर मेरा नाम गलत इन्दराज हो गया तो कहीं न कहीं अदालत में जा सकूँ। कोई अदालत नहीं। लेबर कोर्ट में नहीं जा सकते, लेबर ट्रिब्यूनल में नहीं जा सकते। कोई कहे कि मेरा नाम गलत से दूसरा जगह लिखा हुआ है, वेरीफिकेशन आप करते हो, जो चाहोगे करोगे, जिस तरह चाहोगे करोगे। आप की अपील भी नहीं। मैं इस बास्ते गम्भीरता से

कहना चाहता हूँ कि एक ही कारखाने में बहुत सी यूनियनों का बनना तभी रोका जा सकता है जब मान्यता का प्रश्न हल हो जाये और मान्यता के प्रश्न का एक ही हल है, वोट के जरिये यह तय हो सकता है। यह भी आप ने मान लिया है कि हम चाहें न चाहें कहीं न कहीं कुछ हो जाता है, सालों चलता है। बम्बई में एक हड़ताल हुई है दस वर्ष को हिन्दुस्तान का सूता बपड़ा उद्योग पोछे चला गया है। यह भी मैं कहूँ कि हिन्दुस्तान में आज जो सरकारों उद्योग है उन में जो अरांतोष बन गया है उस का क्या निराकरण आप के पास है। मेरे दो प्रश्न हैं। एक तो आप चुनाव का पद्धति को मानने को तैयार हैं या नहीं? उस में समय की अवधि आप चाहे कितनी ही बना दें—दो वर्ष, तीन वर्ष, जो भी चाहें और दूसरे वेरिफिकेशन के लिये अदालत का दरवाजा खोलने को छूट आप देते हैं या नहीं?

SHRI VEERENDRA PATIL: Sir, so far as secret ballot is concerned, I want to make the position of the Government of India clear 'that we have no objection to secret ballot provided all the Central trade unions agree. If there is no unanimity among the Central trade union organisations... (interruptions) I have made it clear that it is only the Indian National Trade Union Congress which is against secret ballot but some other Central trade union organisations, who have nothing to do with the Indian National Trade Union Congress are also against this. Unfortunately . . .

SHRI SURESH KALMADI: Wto₁ is the Government's stand on this? We would like to know that.

SHRI VEERENDRA PATIL: They must allow me to have my say.

SHRI KALYAN ROY: D₀ you allow workers to have their say?

MR. CHAIRMAN; Probably, the second question is better and is more pertinent whether there is any machinery of court which can resolve this.

SHRI VEERENDRA PATIL: I am coming to that, I will cover all the questions that have been put by the hon. Member.

I said that so far as secret ballot is concerned, it is for the Central trade union organisations to sit together, discuss and thrash out a solution. Whatever unanimous solution is there from all the Central trade union organisations, Government is prepared to accept that solution without any hesitation.

Now, Sir, hon. Mr. Roy and Mr. Ladli Mohan Nigam said that strikes are on the increase because this identification is not being followed, I may tell the hon. Members that strikes are on the increase because the trade union organisations on the one side and the management on the other are not observing the code of discipline evolved by them, by their organisation Indian Labour Conference in the year 1958, more by breach than by observing it.

Both are going contrary to the code of discipline that has been evolved by them, that is why strikes have increased. Therefore, it is better if both the management and the union, strictly adhered to the code of discipline that has been evolved by themselves. Then there won't be any trouble in the country.

श्री लाडली मोहन निगम : यही तो मैं कह रहा हूँ कि जो रिक्नाइज यूनियन नहीं होती उन से समझौता होता है। इसीलिये झगडा होता है।

MR. CHAIRMAN; They say, you use the wrong unions.

SHRI VEERENDRA PATIL; There is no question of our using the wrong unions. It is the management and the unions who discuss or fight among themselves. That is the difficulty that they do not follow the code of discipline.

SHRI KALYAN ROY: You have taken away the right to vote of the workers. It is shame on you.

SHRI LAXMI NARAIN: Mr. Kalyan Roy or Mr. Nigam cannot dictate the Union Labour Minister. Trade unions cannot be dictated by Mr. Kalyan Roy or by Mr. Nigam. There is some ethic, some code of discipline which is to be followed, i want a supplementary on this.

SHRI VEERENDRA PATIL: They are not allowing me to complete. They must allow me to complete the reply.

MR. CHAIRMAN: They are giving u& an example of their unanimity. (*Interruptions*).

SHRI LAXMI NARAIN: They want to dictate. They are not allowing the Minister to speak. They do not know how to maintain the decorum of the House.

SHRI DINESH GOSWAMI: The quarrel has come. Will it be followed by strike?

SHRI LAXMI NARAIN: Is any Member at liberty to interrupt the Minister? If they have a right to say, the Minister has also the right to say. (*Interruptions*).

SHRI KALYAN ROY: They have the right to choose their own representatives by secret ballot. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI VEERENDRA PATIL: Sir, please allow me to complete my reply.
(*Interruptions*)

SHRI LAXMI NARAIN: You cannot be allowed to dictate the trade union movement. There are workers who can dictate the trade union movement. Certain hon. Members have taken upon themselves to dictate the movement. They cannot be allowed to do so. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI ARABINDA GHOSH: You stop lin. Sir.

SHRI LAXMI NARAIN: Sir, certain* Members are playing to the gallery.

श्री सभापति : अब आपने आपस में सब झगड़ा तय कर लिया तो जरा मिनिस्टर साहब को सुन लीजिए ।

SHRI VEERENDRA PATIL: So far as the procedure that is being adopted for verification of membership is concerned, I want to tell the hon. Member Mr. Roy, that we are following the procedure that was evolved by all the central trade union organisations in the Indian Labour Conference held at Nainital in May 1958. That is the procedure we are following by and large.

Now the question is whether this procedure is fair or not. The procedure is that the Chief Labour Commissioner asks all central trade union organisations to send their claimed membership to them. Once these lists are received, then the Chief Labour Commissioner supplies the membership lists received from a particular organisation to other organisations. The organisations receive the memberships claimed by another organisation and if they have any objection, they have to send their objections. After receiving the objections and after verifying the membership that is received from all the central trade union organisations

SHRI KALYAN ROY: Who does the verification?

SHRI VEERENDRA PATIL: ... the Chief Labour Commissioner supplies the provisional verification results to all the central trade union organisations. Then he will call for objections, if any. If there are any objections, then a committee is constituted consisting of representatives of all the organisations and it is for that committee to consider. If that committee fails to come to any understanding, then the matter is referred to the Ministry. And in the Ministry we refer it to either a tribunal or an independent body and whatever decision is given by the tribunal or independent body

is accepted both by the Ministry—by the Chief Labour Commissioner—and by all the central trade union organisations. This is the procedure that is being followed and this is the procedure evolved by the central trade union organisations.

SHRI KALYAN ROY: It is the officers who go about verifying.

SHRI SUKOMAL SEN: The hon. Minister has stated that National Labour Commission evolved the procedure for verification of the membership of trade unions. I would like to know from the hon. Minister what the actual recommendation was. Was it not the recommendation that verification should be done by an impartial and independent body and not by the Labour Department? What the Government has done is to do verification through the machinery of the Labour Department? The central trade union organisations have raised the objection that the verification of membership has not been done impartially and that they have shown partiality in regard to this verification. So my question is: why has the Government deviated from the specific recommendation of the National Labour Commission that it should be done through an independent body?

Secondly, in view of the objection raised by AITUC, CITU and other trade unions against verification, I would like to know whether the Government, in order to find a consensus, will just suspend or keep the outcome of the verification pending for the time being and convene a separate meeting of central trade union organisations so as to find out a consensus? This is my question to the hon. Minister.

SHRI VEERENDRA PATIL: It is not correct to say that in the National Labour Commission that was held in 1959, the verification question was given to an independent body. The verification has to be done by the Chief Labour Commissioner. Even now it is being done by the Chief Labour Commissioner, and the decision of the Government

taken after consulting the central trade union organisations in 1959 was also to entrust this whole verification work to the Chief Labour Commissioner and that procedure has been followed.

If the hon. Member is interested to know that, I am prepared to place a copy of that on the Table of the Sabha.

MR. CHAIRMAN; Mr. Lakhan Singh.

SHRI LAXMI NARAIN: Sir, I am not Lakhan Singh; I am Laxmi Narain. ... (Interruption) Lakhan Singh is somebody else.

AN HON. MEMBER: You look like him. ... (Interruptions)

SHRI LAXMI NARAIN: Sir, I want to know from the hon. Minister whether it is a fact that in the National Labour Conference held in 1958, all national leaders of central organisations like Mr. S. A. Dange were present and a code of discipline was unanimously evolved. In that code of discipline the procedure for verification of membership was also prescribed. I want to know whether it is also a fact that since then no unanimous decision has been taken so far to change, revise or modify that procedure of verification of membership and the verification going on at present is strictly being conducted as per the code of discipline agreed to by the national leaders and the national employers and the Government of India ____ (interruptions")

SHRI VEERENDRA PATIL: Sir, I have already said that the Government is following the procedure that was evolved by the Indian Labour Conference in 1958 and, in the Indian Labour Conference at that time, all the central trade union organisations were there and, more so in the case of the CPI; their organisation was also represented. There were only four central trade union organisations at that time and all the four central trade union organisations unanimously decided upon this procedure which we are following more or less.

MR. CHAIRMAN. Last question. Mr. Dhabe ... (Interruptions)

SHRI KALYAN ROY: How many times will you refer to 1958? How many times you have changed your political affiliation?

(Interruptions)

SHRI LAXMI NARAIN: Sir, the last part of my question is not replied. The last part of my question is whether that decision has not yet been modified, altered or changed unanimously.

(Interruptions)

SHRI SHRIDHAR WASUDEO DHABE: That was already replied.

Mr. Chairman, Sir, the point which the hon. Minister is making about unanimity of consent of the trade unions is not a philosophy or principle which this Government follows. Whenever it suits their convenience, they say, consent. Whenever it does not suit them, they say, we do not consult. The Essential Services Maintenance Act—the Prevention of Strikes Act—was brought here without consulting a single trade union including the INTUC. The difficulty with the Government is that they have not got a rational labour policy in this matter. The 1958 decision is too old a story. At that time it was just the beginning—I agree with that—of the idea that they would at least have some recognised union, some representative union, so that work could begin. It was the first step in collective bargaining. But in 1969 this question was reviewed by the Government by appointing a National Labour Commission on the advice of the Supreme Court, and Justice Gajendragadkar was the Chairman. That Commission, after examining all evidence—on which: both Mr. Dange and Mr. Ramanujam were members—had recommended that there should be an Industrial Relations Commission—an independent machinery of the Government—because of the fear that the trade unions which were opposed to the Government may not get justice at their hands. That fear was dispelled by the National Labour Commission and it had suggested a statutory recognition machinery or, what is called, an Industrial Relations Commission presided over by a

retired or sitting High Court Judge which should give the decision as to which should be a recognised union. Three States—Gujarat, Madhya Pradesh and Maharashtra—already have a law of recognition where one union is recognised. It may be defective in many matters including verification, but that has certainly given the result that there is one recognised union in one industry. All over the world, in democratic countries, under the law when there is multiplicity of unions, one union is recognised and ballot is accepted as a principle universally. Even when Mr. Anjaiah when he was the Chief Minister, Andhra Pradesh adopted, secret ballot for recognition of unions—I was told, and I want to know from the hon. Minister whether it was so. May I know from the Minister whether it is not a fact that there is manipulation of membership and it is not possible to verify? There is no set verification. Who would expect two lakh members to verify? The union and the industry get a chance for manipulation of membership. I am asking my question. Are you really interested to have a statutory collective bargaining agent? What happened in the coal industry? Kindly ask Mr. Shiv Shankar, Energy Minister. Is there one recognised union there? He had to call six unions and two groups of HMS. There is no principle accepted by the Government. I would request the Minister, in all fairness, to accept ballot and provide for one statutory, recognised union, as accepted by the Gajendragadkar Labour Commission. When we have a statutory union and one single bargaining agent representing the entire working class, industrial peace and production can be improved. Multiplicity of unions is the direct result of the lopsided policy of the Labour Ministry. They do not want one single union because it does not help them politically. Therefore, may I know from the Minister, whether there is any proposal to have statutory recognition of a union under the amended Industrial Disputes Act, or by bringing about a collective bargaining law, whether the principle of one union would be accepted? In all fairness, ballot will be accepted.

SHRI VEERENDRA PATIL: Sir the problems posed by the hon. Member, Mr. Dhabe, I agree, were considered by the National Labour Commission which recommended constitution of an independent body like a Industrial Relations Commission (IR). These problems were considered by the tripartite committee which was convened in the month of September 1972, and that committee, in turn, constituted another committee under the chairmanship of Mr. Sanat Mehta. The Sanat Mehta Committee has made a lot of recommendations and they are being processed. One of the recommendations is about the procedure for verification. That is under consideration. We have not taken any final decision. Another major recommendation is that of appointing an independent body for all these purposes, for disputes verification and then certification and all that, like an Industrial Relations Commission. That is also under consideration. (Interruptions) But may tell it for the information of the hon. Member that I personally feel that an Industrial Relations Commission headed by either a High Court Judge or a Supreme Court Judge, retired or sitting, is an ideal situation. But, unfortunately, several State Governments are not agreeing; and the West Bengal Government is one of them. It is not agreeing to the proposal for an Industrial Relations Commission. (Interruptions) Shut up.

AN HON. MEMBER: Shame.

SHRI VEERENDRA PATIL: Sir, that is why we wanted to take most of the State Governments, if not all the State Governments, into confidence before we took a final decision. As I have already stated, these are all very important questions; and there are various suggestions which we have received from these committees, and they are under active consideration.

SHRI SHRIDHAR WASUDEO DHABE: My question was about a single union law. Will it come up;

SHRI VEERENDRA PATIL: That is one of the recommendations.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Dhabe, nothing concrete has resulted so far. They are considering and considering and considering.

श्री जगदीश प्रसाद माथुर : मंत्री महोदय ने संसद कमेटी की बात की है (व्यवधान) ...इंटक को छोड़कर सब ने उसका वायकाट किया था (व्यवधान)

MR. CHAIRMAN: That is all right. Question No. 103 and 104 Hon. Members absent.

*103. [The questioner (Shri Amarprosad Chakraborty) was absent. For answer vide cols. 32—40infra.]

*104. [The questioner (Shri B. C. Pannayak) was absent. For answer vide col. 39-40infra.]

Licence to M/s. Warner Hindustan for manufacture of bulk drugs

*105. SHRI MIRZA IRSHADBAIG AIYUBBAIG :
SHRI VITHALRAO MADHAV-
RAO JADHAV:

Will the Minister of CHEMICALS AND FERTILIZERS be pleased to state:

(a) what are the bulk drugs, drug intermediates and formulations for which M/s. Warner Hindustan are licensed;

(b) whether there is any provision for treating drug intermediates at par with bulk drugs for the purpose of ratio parameters in the New Drug Policy;

(c) if not, how clearance was given to this company for treating the drugs intermediates at par with bulk drugs; and

(d) what is the definition of 'drug intermediates'?

' THE MINISTER OF CHEMICAL* AND FERTILIZERS (SHRI VASANT SATHE):
(a) to (d) Statement is laid on the Table of the House.

Statement

(a) M/s. Warner Hindustan hold the industrial licence dated 14th December,

The question was 'actually asked on the floor of the House by Shri Mirza Irshadbaig Aiyubbaig.