[Shri NageshWar Prasad Shahi| U.P.'s industrial progress because of the proregional and pro-capitalist consideration i! the Union Minister of*Heavy Industry and liis bureaucracy.

The story was disclosed in a report prepared by the U.P. Agro-Industrial Corpora Lion.

A confidential report prepared by the Chairman of the Corporation and circulated to the U.P. Government and the Union Government has said: 'The Tal-orkscop (if U.P. State Agro-Industrial Corporation has been the pioneers in introducing Zeitor tractors in the country for the first time. The workshop has assembled and distributed 'Zeitor tractors to all State Agro-Industrial Corporations from October, 1968 to 1971.y But it is really very strange that this workshop which has all the pre-requisiles like building, machinery and technical know-how has not been favoured with a manufacturing licence for the tractor."

The report said: 'So far the Ministry of Heavy Industry has granted industrial licences to 17 firms'."

"Out of this, only two are in the public sector which manufactures only 25 horsepower tractors. This favouritism for the private sector and discrimination against U.P. clearly stamps the present Minisier for Heavy Industry as a man of (be private capital who is also a sectarian and regionalist to the core, according to the report -the repori is of the U.P. Government. The report has pointed oul that the manipulations of the Union Ministry of Heavy Industry's pro-South and pro-capital oriented policies were developed in phases to confuse the industrial planner-, of U.P. The firsl step was a decision of the Board Agricultural Machinery and Imple-. inents held al Delhi not to make ivailable to the State Agro-Industrial Corporation the manufacture of higher irse power tracts n

Sir. the U.P. Corporation possesses everything—know-how. capital, machinery, etc. This factor) lias been the pioneer in producing this type of tractors, and distrifou

thousands of tractors all pvei the coun try. And 1 do not know why the Union Ministry of Heavy Industry is not granting the licence. Such a discrimination again a the U.P. Corporation and favouritism for the private sector on the part of the bure-aucracj is hampering the industrial growth of the State. Sir, this is a very serious matter and with your permission, I wanted to draw the attention of the House- to this

MR. CHAIRMAN: Now, Shri Raghu-nalha Red

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Sir, 1 will say a few words.

| Mr. Deputy Chairmun in the Chair]

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Now. we go, on to the Bill.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Sir, this is a very serious matter. Recently, from both sides of the House, we brought to your notices the Badami affair. Today, Sir, the Government should state the position as to where we stand...

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: That matter has already been raised.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Sir, you get the explanation why those two Bills are not here...

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Redd) ^u move the Bill.

Hit SALES PROMOTION EMPLOYEES (CONDITIONS OF SERVICE) BILL, 1975

I HI- MINISIER OF LABOUR (SHRI K. V. RAGHUNATHA REDDY): Sir, I beg to move for leave to introduce a Bill to,regulate certain conditions of service of ties promotion employees in' certain establishments.

Tht guesti proposed.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Sir. 1 have ibjection.

MR. DEP1 II VIRMAN: You. are opposing I

34

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I havi i have an objection. Why are you putting ihe word into my mo.uh, Sir? I have an injection. Kindly let me say. Because ii is a Motion, we can say. Sir, it is od that we -hall give permission, spc-lally when you are interested and when the Bill is good. We have no objection to that. But the style of it is objected lo. Because, Sir, he has promised us. ihe Government has promised bin not he that the Industrial Relations Bill would be introduced and passed soon. It has not been done. We do not know where he stands. Our information is that actually, it is being sabotaged by the Cabinet because the Cabinet thinks that this Bill, if introduced, would not help such trade unions in their favour. There may be objections by the INTUC, I do not know. Therefore, this whole thing has been sabotaged despite the unions' agreement and the recommendation of the Central Trade Union organizations and the Labour Conference that the Industrial Relations Bill to democratise the industrial relations in the country should be brought forward. The Government should give an explanation and change the style of functioning when they secure permission.

Discussion on wkoring of

With regard to the other Bill, namely, equal pay for equal work. Sir, yesterday we heard many speeches.. Even the Prime Minister spoke and said that women should net equal pay with men for equal work. Whal about thai BUI? When will it come? When will I.L.O. Convention 100 be implemented by legislative action?

SHRI NIREN GHOSH (West Bf Do they respect any I.I..O. Conventions? Oat of 150 I.L.O. Conventions, you have , implemented only 23 or 25 Conventions. Why are these Conventions not being given effect to? I.L.O. has definitely condemned the Government that no freedom of trade union rights exists in India. It ..as circulated to all the member-countries of the I.L.O. What is the Government's reply to

SHRI K V. RAGHUNATHA REDDY:

Sir, 1 very strongly repudiate the allegations made by Shri Bhupsh Gupta. So far as the Industrial Relations Bill is concerned, the provisions of the Bill are very

complicated and they are under the conjideration of the Government With regard to the second question that has been raised. namely, about the I.L.O. Convention, it is ool only provided in the I.L.O. Convention, ii is also a part of the Directive i Principles of our Constitution, 1 am glad i to say. Sir. that 1 will be able to introduce the Bill, if possible, on the very first Jay of ihe next Session and get it passed in ihe next Session itself. The provisions of iht; Bill are being processed and arc in '.he lina! stages.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

"That leave be granted to introduce a Bill to regulate certain conditions of service of sales promotion employees in certain establishments."

The motion was adopted.

SHRI K. V. RAGHUNATHA REDDY: Sir, I introduce the Bill.

DISCUSSION ON THE WORKING OF (III MINISTRY OF COMMUNICA-**TIONS**

SHRI KRISHAN KANL (Haryana): Sir, I am glad that Rajya Sabha is finding time to discuss the working ol the Ministry "I Communications. After the last General Elections in 1971, neither the Lok Sabha nor the Rajya Sabha discussed this Ministry and I think it is for the first time that we are discussing the Mini-try after 1971. I think Dr. Sharma is the fourth Minister. Ministers have come and gone and there is only one permanent Minister, Shri lagannath Pahadia, who is the Deputy Minister, and probably his pti represents the stale of the Ministry of Communications.

(Interruptions)

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr.

karni, you cannot be addressing another Member like that. You have to address through the Chair.

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR (Uttar Pradesh): Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, he always behaves like that.