

श्री जगदीश जोशी : माननीय मंत्री जी क्या यह बताने की कृपा करेंगे कि भारत सरकार ने बलूच गांधी बादशाह खा और सीमान्त गांधी खान अब्दुल गफ्फार खा की नजरबन्दी और निष्कासन के बावत कुछ विरोध पत्र भेजा है।

SHRI BIPINPAL DAS : This does not arise out of this question. But I would like to clarify. We have not raised this question of Badshah Khan or Baluch Gandhi with Pakistan because that will worsen the situation so far as the interests of both are concerned.

श्री जगदीश जोशी : यह उनका आन्तरिक मामला नहीं है। ये भारतीय उप-महाद्वीप के दोनों देशों के बरिष्ठ लोग रहे हैं।

SHRI VEERENDRA PATIL : Sir, the Simle Agreement is being violated time and again. I think the hon. Minister and the Government of India have had sufficient experience of the attitude of Mr. Bhutto. He violates the Agreement and ultimately says that he is not going to do it hereafter. In view of their experience, I want to have a categorical statement from the Government of India whether they feel that there is really any threat to the security of our country from them.

SHRI BIPINPAL DAS : I do not think there is any real threat to the security of our country from Pakistan. I would like to clarify. Violations have taken place in regard to their propaganda. They have used the Press media, radio and so on and so forth. Because of our protest, of late their propaganda against India—what they were doing before—has really been toned down.

240. [Transferred to the 13th May, 1975]

#### Recognition of P & T Union

241. SHRI M. KAMLANATHAN :

SHRI C. D. NATARAJAN :

SHRI G. LAKSHMANAN :†

SHRI M. S. ABDUL KHADER :

Will the Minister of LABOUR be pleased to state,

†The question was actually asked on the floor of the House by Shri G. Lakshmanan.

(a) whether it is a fact that the principle of one union for one industry was accepted by Government for the P & T Department and consequently the realignment scheme was introduced whereby the National Federation of P & T Employees with nine unions affiliated to this federation was formed;

(b) if so, for what reasons Government have deviated from this policy and have recognised another federation in the P & T; and

(c) whether Government propose to take steps for the establishment of one federation for the P & T employees and reintroduce the realignment scheme?

THE DEPUTY MINISTER IN THE MINISTRY OF LABOUR (SHRI BALGOVIND VERMA) : (a) Yes, Sir.

(b) Government had to recognise another Federation because of developments arising out of the general strike of September 1968, and withdrawal of recognition of the National Federation of Post and Telegraph Employees which, however, had subsequently to be restored as a result of the order of the High Court of Andhra Pradesh.

(c) There is no such proposal under consideration of the Government.

SHRI G. LAKSHMANAN : Sir, there were many unions in the P. & T. Department before 1964. Hon'ble Rafi Ahmed Kidwai and Shri Jagjivan Ram were responsible for the introduction of this realignment scheme in order to put an end to the multiplicity of unions in the P. & T. industry. And, therefore, this realignment scheme was introduced thereby completely abolishing all the unions and only giving recognition to the National Federation of P. & T. employees with all the nine unions affiliated to it compulsorily. The understanding was that no other union or Federation should be recognised by the Government and the Federation also cannot expel any union from this Federation. In order to establish one union for one industry, which the Government have accepted in principle why in 1968 they cancelled recognition of one union and gave recognition to another Federation. In 1960 there was a strike

but the recognition to the Union was not cancelled and also another union was not given recognition. In 1968 they have cancelled recognition of that Federation and given recognition to another Federation. They called some people from amongst the P. & T. employees and named somebody as the Secretary-General of the new Federation. And nine unions were given to them. May I ask when such a situation did not arise in the year 1960 when a strike was conducted how is it that the need to recognise another Federation arose in 1968?

**SHRI BALGOVIND VERMA:** In the year 1968 the National Federation of P. & T. employees went on strike which was declared illegal. Therefore, no remedy was left with the Government except to take away the recognition of the Federation. This was then the situation with which the Government was faced.

**SHRI G. LAKSHMANAN:** May I know, Sir, why in 1960 you did not take such a decision? Then also there was derecognition after the strike. Why did you then not think of giving recognition to another Federation?

**SHRI BALGOVIND VERMA:** It is up to the Government to decide when to withdraw recognition and when not to withdraw recognition. They withdrew recognition when they thought that recognition should be withdrawn.

**SHRI G. LAKSHMANAN:** What answer is this?

**SHRI BALGOVIND VERMA:** This is the right of the Government. Even the Andhra Pradesh High Court has ruled the right of the Government to accord recognition or to withdraw recognition whenever they so desire and it is with this view that I think they will understand the motive of the Government. The Government did not withdraw the recognition in 1960 because they did not think it desirable then. But when they thought that they did not deserve recognition they withdrew it.

**SHRI G. LAKSHMANAN:** The principle of the Government is one Union for one industry. They have accepted this principle on the floor of the House. But you accepted another policy, namely recognising another Federation. But this policy was due to a person who was then in charge of the P & T. Department and the Ministry who is now in the last days of public life, I mean Mr. Bahuguna, the Chief Minister of U.P. He is naturally in the last days of his political life. That man was responsible for the break of this Federation. Not only that, you know what he did.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** You are giving out the history. Please put your second supplementary.

**SHRI G. LAKSHMANAN:** And what he does is he sends his own men when a conference is held. Office bearers are elected immediately. It is a counter-list of his supporters. And as Minister he accords them recognition. Therefore, may I know whether the Labour Ministry is following the same policy or, if they are sincere, are they prepared to bring in a realignment scheme, namely one Union for one industry? May I know whether they will again introduce the realignment scheme and establish one Union for one industry in the P. & T. Department?

**SHRI BALGOVIND VERMA:** Sir, the hon'ble Member should try to set his House in order and then he should think of the realignment scheme. There is inter-union rivalry in his own organisation, in the Federation. They are fighting together in the court.

**SHRI G. LAKSHMANAN:** The inter-union policy was followed by you. He has not answered my question. I asked whether, because they have declared their policy of one union for one industry, he is prepared to agree to the re-alignment scheme to establish one union for one industry. Is he prepared?

MR. CHAIRMAN: He wants to know whether you are going to accept the original policy of one union for one industry.

SHRI BALGOVIND VERMA: We have replied "yes". We accept this policy but it will take some time.

SHRI T. V. ANANDAN: Sir, it is a very laudable idea to have one union for one industry. But may I ask the hon. Labour Minister whether it is feasible or practicable to-day in the present political situation in the country when each political party wants a wing of its own in the labour field? In the international field also, Sir, there was one international federation, the Workers' Federation, once upon a time. Then it was divided and ICFTU came. Now there is a third world federation called the Democratic Christian Labour Federation. In this country when there are 37 political parties and when each political party wants a union of its own in the labour field, does the hon. Minister think it feasible to bring about one union in one industry? Forget that idea of one union in one industry.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That is his view.

SHRI K. V. RAGHUNATHA REDDY: As far as the principle of one union for one unit or one industry is concerned, it is a laudable principle which one would desire to have and the Government will welcome the evolution of such a principle. But the facts of life are different. The fact remains that there is fragmentation in the trade union movement. If our hon. friends who are in the trade union movement can help us to solve this knotty problem and help evolve one union for one unit or one industry, the Government would be only too happy.

SHRI G. LAKSHMANAN: I take the responsibility. I assure the hon. Labour Ministry of full co-operation to establish one union for one industry. Is he prepared to accept?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Dr. Kurian.

DR. K. MATHEW KURIAN: Sir, I am involved in the P. & T. employees' movement. So please have some patience.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Everywhere you are involved.

SHRI RABI RAY: In all good acts, not in bad acts.

DR. K. MATHEW KURIAN: Have some mercy, Sir. I am the President of the Kerala Circle P & T Union. I am saying with great agony that the Union Ministry of Communications has been following unfair labour practices. For example, in the recent All India P & T Employees Union (Class III) Conference in Cochin, the vast majority, barring one delegate, elected an executive committee. But one delegate who supports the Government walked out and along with 14 others floated a list and this Ministry is considering recognition of that union. Such blatantly illegal and unfair trade union practices are being pursued in the Union Ministry of Communications. And this trend started with Mr. Bahuguna when he was the Minister. In such a naked fashion it had never happened before Mr. Bahuguna took over, and his successor, Dr. S. D. Sharma, is also following it. My specific question is whether mere participation in a strike in 1968 will call for such massive victimisation as has happened in the case of Comrade N.P. Padmanabhan who was dismissed and who has been asked to be reinstated by the Kerala High Court? Even today the Union Ministry of Communications is refusing to reinstate Padmanabhan though the High Court has said that his dismissal from service was incorrect. I would like to know whether it is true that such illegal practices are being followed by the Union Ministry of Communications even by violating the High Court order. Will they mend their ways and see that only properly elected unions in the P & T are recognised and they will deal with them only and see that at least the normal trade union practices are followed?

**SHRI K. V. RAGHUNATHA REDDY :** With great respect, this question should be addressed to the Ministry of Communications.

**DR. K. MATHEW KURIAN :** I seek your protection. He is the Minister for Labour. I did not ask about some work in the Communications Ministry. I asked him whether he is aware of the unfair labour practices by the Ministry of Communications. He should take collective responsibility.

**MR. CHAIRMAN :** He will report it to the concerned Ministry.

**DR. K. MATHEW KURIAN :** He is not saying that he will refer it. I was speaking about unfair labour practices.

**SHRI K. V. RAGHUNATHA REDDY :** If it is to test my knowledge, I know what is unfair labour practice. But I am not aware about this particular case.

**DR. K. MATHEW KURIAN :** Then he should resign from this Ministry.

**MR. CHAIRMAN :** That is his concern.

**SHRI K. CHANDRASEKHARAN :** The hon. Minister referred to the fragmentation of the trade union movement. May I know whether this fragmentation is not largely due to the fact that Government are making *ad hoc* departures from the policy of one union for one industry? May I also know whether the Government are aware that the unions affiliated to the National Federation of P. & T. Employees have got very little membership and whether a classification is adopted in the matter of minimum membership for the trade union before it is accorded recognition?

**SHRI K. V. RAGHUNATHA REDDY :** As far as this principle of one union for one unit is concerned, as I have submitted already it is a welcome principle and if somebody can help us in evolving this principle, I will welcome it. But the hon. Member knows very well about the trade

union movement and I need not tell him what the difficulties are in the trade union movement. With regard to the National Federation of P. & T. Employees, of which my good friend Shri N. K. Bhatt is the President, according to the information that is available—this is subject to correction because these are all figures—the membership is about two lakhs. There may be different claims on this. But this is our information and therefore it cannot be said that the strength of this Federation is a very negligible and it is without any membership at all.

*Re. Question No. 239*

**SHRI BIPINPAL DAS :** I would like to make a little amendment to my reply to Shri Veerendra Patil who asked whether there was any immediate threat from Pakistan. I said there is no immediate threat from Pakistan. At the same time we have to take note of what Mr. Bhutto said in Washington Post in which he used the language of war and also the fact that Americans have decided to lift the embargo on arms supply to Pakistan. In view of these, we cannot remain complacent and we must be on our guard.

**SHRI K. CHANDRASEKHARAN :** If there is no threat, there is no justification for the emergency.

#### **Charges against the General Manager of Bhilai Steel Plant**

\*242. **SHRI RABI RAY :** Will the Minister of STEEL AND MINES be pleased to state :

(a) whether it is a fact that the Chairman of SAIL and the Secretary in the Department of Steel in the Ministry of Steel and Mines have ordered an inquiry into the allegations of corruption against the present General Manager of Bhilai Steel Plant ;

(b) if so, what are the details of the charges of corruption against the General Manager ;