

# **CALLING ATTENTION TO A MATTER OF URGENT PUBLIC IMPORTANCE**

## **SITUATION ARISING OUT OF THE INDEFINITE STRIKE BY ENGINEERING WORKERS IN JAMSHEDPUR AND OTHER TOWNS IN BIHAR**

SHRI JAGDISH CHANDRA DIKSHIT (Uttar Pradesh) : Sir, I call the attention of the Minister of Labour, Employment and Rehabilitation to the situation arising out of the indefinite strike by engineering workers in Jamshedpur and other towns in Bihar due to non-implementation of the recommendations of the Engineering Wage Board.

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF LABOUR, EMPLOYMENT AND REHABILITATION (SHRI BHAGWAT JHA AZAD): Sir, about thirty to thirty-five thousand workers of seven major engineering establishments in Jamshedpur have been on strike from the 18th of November, 1969 to press their demand for higher wages. The strike followed a series of as yet inconclusive meetings of the State level tripartite committee set up to go into the matter. This Committee was constituted in pursuance of the unanimous agreement reached at an earlier tripartite meeting held at Patna on the 13th of September 1969 for the purpose of working out an agreed wage structure for workers in the Engineering Industry in the State of Bihar, in the context of the report of the Central Wage Board for Engineering Industries. The Wage Board's recommendations not having been unanimous, the approach to implementation has been in terms of State region-wise settlements. The State level Tripartite Committee last met on November 15, 16 and 17, 1969. During the course of these discussions, the Committee was given to understand that the strike at Jamshedpur would take place from the 18th of November, 1969, unless the Committee was able to bring about a wage settlement before then.

The Labour relation machinery of State Government of Bihar is seized of it. The needed law and order arrangements at Jamshedpur have been provided. The State authorities have appealed to the workers to resume work so that the tripartite negotiations can be carried forward in the proper atmosphere.

We are in touch with the State Government and have advised them to try and bring the parties together for further negotiations.

SHRI JAGDISH CHANDRA DIKSHIT : Sir, after all the Wage Board was appointed as far as back as December 1964 and the Report was given as far back as in February 1969 and the Tripartite Committee meeting was held at the national level on the 1st of March. What is the reason that the progress has been so slow and the workers have been left to pine and suffer?

SHRI BHAGWAT JHA AZAD : Sir, as is known—I have already said it also on various occasions in the House—it takes a long time for the Wage Board to give its recommendations. It was given on 1st March. After a couple of months we called a Tripartite Committee in which it was decided that this should be left to the different regions to settle it because the report was not unanimous; it had four sets of recommendations, from the Chairman and independent members, then from the employees, then from the private sector employers and fourthly from the public sector employers. Therefore the State Ministers and all others agreed that it should be left to the State Governments region-wise. In the State of West Bengal it has been done. In Bihar they were meeting but this strike has taken place.

SHRI JAGDISH CHANDRA DIKSHIT : How much more time will you take? Six years have already elapsed. For how many more years should the workers wait for the final determination of their wage claim?

SHRI BHAGWAT JHA AZAD : As I have already said, first the Wage Boards were successful but for the last two or three years the Wage Boards have not been so successful because their recommendations are not enforceable by law. We have to go only by Persuasion in this case. After the Report was received in this case, we immediately went into the matter and took early action but unfortunately the Wage Board recommendations are not unanimous; there are four sets of recommendations and that is why these recommendations are brought at the table of the employers and employees for some kind of settlement.

SHRI MILKA GOVINDA REDDY (Mysore) : Sir, the Government have appointed Wage Boards for many interests and the recommendations of some of the Wage Boards have not been implemented and have not been accepted. In view of the fact that the management will always try not to accept the recommendations of the Wage Boards, will the Government bring forward a legislation to make it obligatory that whenever a Wage Board is appointed, its recommendations, whether they are unanimous or majority recommendations, will be made acceptable and they will be implemented as statutory recommendations? That is number one.

Secondly, I would like to know whether there is any proposal before the Government to discontinue the appointment of Wage boards for settling the disputes arising out of the demands made by the workers in different industries and, if so, what other machinery the Government is thinking of to settle these disputes.

SHRI BHAGWAT JHA AZAD : Sir, as I said before, it is a fact that the working of Wage Boards has not been satisfactory lately because their recommendations are not enforceable by law and, therefore, the workers have to suffer. Their recommendations come after a long period, say, 3, 4 or 5 years. After that when the employers are asked to implement them, they say "No." We can only persuade them and goad them. That is all we can do. In the light of this the National Labour Commission has given a recommendation regarding Wage Boards. We have discussed this recommendation in the 26th Indian Labour Conference; we have discussed it in the Tripartite Committee and a view is coming round that if at all, Sir, a Wage Board has to come, its recommendations should have the basis of enforcement. Therefore this point is very pertinent and we are considering this important recommendation of the National Labour Commission. About the second one, if we accept the first recommendation, then there will be no question of having any more Wage Boards.

SHRI BANKA BEHARY DAS (Orissa) : Mr. Chairman, from the reply of the Minister I think the Government is not alive to the serious situation in Jamshedpur, because all these

engineering industries cater to the needs of Defence industries, Defence Department, and also export promotion work. May I know, Sir, from the Minister, when the Wage Board recommendation has been given and all these recalcitrant owners are not implementing, then why the Government of Bihar declared the strike illegal, following which about 103 workers of TELCO have been suspended by now, and Indian Tubes have also suspended more than 20 workers though everybody says that the strike is absolutely, 100 per cent, peaceful. May I know, Sir, from the Minister in view of the urgency of the matter whether, instead of giving much more importance to the legality or illegality of the strike—I have already asked why—whether, instead of going into the technical aspect of the problem, they will compel the owners of the engineering establishments there to accept the recommendations of the Engineering Wage Board. In this connection I may say that the Minister called a meeting of the Tripartite Committee in Patna in the month of October where some of the owners accepted the position to implement the Wage Board recommendations, and they said it will be done within two months. And when in November, on the 15th, 16th and 17th of November, the Tripartite Committee met, they all went back on the assurance that they had given in the month of October. So in view of this may I request the hon. Minister that the Government should compel in every way the employers to accept and implement the recommendations immediately so that a solution to that strike takes place immediately and export promotion and the Defence industries do not suffer because of the continued strike?

SHRI BHAGWAT JHA AZAD :

I agree with the hon. Member that we should not go into the technicalities about the legality or illegality of the strike. (*Interruptions*) If you will say that, the strike in TELCO has been declared illegal, I do not want to say that because that does not help the workers. Because you are saying, therefore I have to say this. I am only replying to Shri Chitta Basu. What the hon. Member said, I agree with him. I agree that at this hour our important duty should be to maximise production. Sir, the labour is on strike since

LShri Bhagwat Jha Azad]

the 18th and the labour is about 30 to 35 thousand, and therefore I have impressed upon the Government of Bihar and also on the employers and so also the employees that we should try our best to end the strike immediately and maximise production and come to the negotiating table. Only one point I would like to clarify, what the hon. Member has said. Sir, as I have said, we could not do anything excepting that we should bring the parties to the negotiating table. And that we did in the State of Bihar. I had been myself there and called the three parties, and I appointed a negotiating machinery of the employers and employees with the Adviser oil Labour to the Government of India as the chairman. As the hon. Member said, it is true that they had decided on two months to finish the work. On the 17th of October they decided that within two months—that means by the 17th of December—they would finalise it. They had a second meeting on the 6th and 7th November. They had their third meeting on the 15th, 16th and 17th of November. But in the meantime, when they were negotiating, well, the workers were preparing to go on strike. Now I am not pressing that point, but what I am saying is that I have requested the employers and the employees that the strike should be called off immediately. Other things follow, whatever you have said, but we should try to make them call off the strike immediately.

SHRI P. C. MITRA (Bihar) : Sir, just now the Minister was giving some facts about the negotiations. Now, may I know whether it is a fact that the strike was to commence from the 11th of November but if was deferred for a week on the intervention of Shri T. P. Singh, Adviser to the Bihar Governor, who gave an assurance to the Chairman of the Co-ordination Committee of labour unions, who had called the strike, that the Tripartite Committee was to decide the matter within a week; secondly, whether the employers' representatives in the Tripartite Committee instead of coming to a settlement on the question of wages, unnecessarily dragged on the matter and, in order to provoke the workers, refused to continue the negotiations on the 17th of November; thirdly, whether the recognised union of TELCO

workers affiliated to the INTUC did not join in the strike call but the strike call was given by the rival TELCO workers' union of which Dr. M. K. Akhourie is its working president, who is also chairman of the co-ordinating committee of the unions which had called the strike, and whether the president of the INTUC union who has no hold on the engineering workers will not be thrown out of the Tripartite Committee as a representative of the workers who has no *locus standi* as they had not called the strike but yet all the workers are on strike. With such persons or representatives in the Tripartite Committee can we expect any justice, any settlement, as the employers and the workers representatives, both, are in league so that there might not be any settlement? They are only there to refer. Therefore, will the hon. Minister kindly answer these questions?

SHRI BHAGWAT JHA AZAD : Sir, as I have said earlier, I think this should be appreciated in the House; I am saying about the facts. But the views and opinions may be otherwise.

I am saying about the facts. The fact is that the negotiating machinery was sitting all the time. I met on the 18th of October and decided on a time limit of two months. It means they were going to finalise it by the 17th of December. Then their second meeting was on the 6th and 7th November. Then they met again on the 15th, 16th and 17th of November. It is a fact that when this negotiating machinery was going on, there was a Co-ordination Committee there under the chairmanship of the hon. Dr. Akhourie, who has no *locus standi* in the labour world. He does not belong to any union; that is also true. (*Interruptions*) I am only replying to your points. I will not hide anything, I am only replying to your points. I agree with you that on the

11th of November, when the negotiations had been going on, they said, "We will go on strike." The negotiating committee consists of not only the employers and the Government but also all the trade unions. The AITUC union was there. The INTUC union was there. They, at first, requested that the strike be postponed for two months if nothing in the meantime came about within the two months decided on, by the 17th of December. But the strike was on. It was first the employees who withdrew from the negotiations and

then, when the strike was on, the employers, on the 20th, said that they would also withdraw from the negotiations. This is the factual position.

SHRI CHITTA BASU (West Bengal) : Sir, as far as the statement of the hon. Minister is concerned it is partially true but as has been widely reported in the press the negotiating committee at a certain stage of negotiation persuaded the workers not to start the strike on the 11th November and they assured the workers that the finalisation of the wage demand will be done before the 17th November and in case there was no finalisation of the wage dispute the workers could go on strike. Sir, in this case I also want to draw the attention of the hon. Minister to the fact that the employers' representatives and also the INTUC representatives of the negotiating committee withdrew and it is apprehended by the workers that there is a conspiracy to come to a settlement between the employer and the INTUC leader who has got no *locus standi* among the workers. And I thank Mr. P. C. Mitra who has for the first time spoken something true.

MR. CHATTERMAN : Please put your question.

SHRI CHITTA BASU : If it is the case will the hon. Minister make it abundantly clear to the House that no such settlement between the employers and the INTUC will be given recognition by the Government of Bihar because in that case the labour unrest will not be put an end to but rather it will agitate the workers more and bring in the question of law and order to a serious proportion?

In the meantime may I also know from the hon. Minister whether it is not a fact that the employers, particularly the TFLCO, have stopped the delivery of letters to their employees, have forcibly closed Government fair price shops and have also suspended hundreds of workers for their participation in the illegally-declared illegal strike? Therefore may I know from the hon. Minister whether in his endeavour to bring about a speedy settlement of the matter he would advise the Bihar Government to make a concrete suggestion to the employers, particularly to withdraw all those suspension orders and stop all those provocative

actions so that a proper climate can be created for an amicable settlement between the employers and the employees on the lines of the Wage Board recommendation. Meantime they should say that no such agreement between a section of the employees, that is, the INTUC and the employers is going to be recognised by the negotiating committee or the Bihar Government or the Government of India. That alone will create a healthy climate for an immediate settlement of the issue.

SHRI BHAGWAT JHA AZAD:

So far as the first question is concerned it is true that 11th November was the date on which they wanted to go on strike. They had formed a coordination committee consisting of all the non-recognised trade unions plus some political parties and they decided on 11th November as the date on which they should go on strike. That is a fact and the Tripartite Committee persuaded them—it is also a fact—to postpone their strike but it is not a fact that within seven days they said they will be able to bring about a settlement. Sir, it may be appreciated that the Wage Board went into this question for years and could not make any unanimous recommendations. There were four sets of recommendations. This Committee wanted only two months which were not given to them.

About the INTUC representative having no *locus standi* that is the union that is recognised there and therefore it has got a *locus standi* there.

About the third point that no agreement should be brought about between the recognised union and the employers I cannot say what will happen in future. All that I am trying to say is that in this negotiating machinery where all the people concerned are there—the AITUC is there, the INTUC is there—the negotiations should start immediately. For that as the hon. Member has said one of the important things to do is to withdraw suspensions, victimisation etc. and I have advised that the strike should be called off and all these things that had happened should be brought into and immediately the parties should be brought to the negotiating table. I have already advised the Bihar Government on the lines as the hon. Member has suggested.

SHRI D. THENGARI (Uttar Pradesh) : Sir, I want clarification on three points. Firstly it is customary for the Government to examine all the recommendations and to approve some of them or all of them. May I know whether the Government has shirked its responsibility of approving the recommendations in this particular case so that they are leaving everything in the lurch?

Secondly, in view of this experience in Bihar may I know whether the Government has come to realise that the present recognition in law is not the real recognition when the recognised union does not command enough influence to control, guide and direct the workers and therefore does the Government realise that the rules for recognition must be changed, so that instead of relying upon verification of membership secret ballot of either all the workers or of unionised workers is introduced for this purpose?

Thirdly, in view of the expenditure incurred and the time lost in this process of Wage Boards will the Government think of converting the Wage Boards in future by changing their character and composition into tripartite forums for collective bargaining?

SHRI BHAGWAT JHA AZAD : Sir, it is a fact that when Wage Board recommendations used to come before Government in the past we used to call the different parties, know their views and we have taken decisions as in the case of cotton textiles. In this case as I had impressed upon the House this Wage Board had no unanimous or even near-unanimous recommendations. There were four sets of recommendations one by the Chairman and the independent members, second by the private employers, third by the public sector employers and fourth by the workers and that also with some dissent note. Therefore when we called the Tripartite Committee of the trade unions, the State Governments and the employers, they themselves agreed that it should be left to region-wise settlement. Therefore we have not shirked our responsibility: we have acted according to the decision of the Tripartite Committee where there were the workers' representatives also.

Secondly about recognition, it is known to hon. Members that recognition is by verification. We had referred to this matter to the National Labour I

Commission; they have also not suggested whether it should be by verification or by secret ballot. They have left it to the Industrial Relations Commissions to decide what should be done. When I called a meeting of the State Governments at the Indian Labour Conference excepting Delhi and West Bengal the consensus was for verification. Therefore this process continues. I do not agree with the hon. Member that the recognised union in Jamshedpur has not got the following because we go by verification.

About Wage Boards I have already said it should be looked into as to whether in future it should be a decision by the collective bargaining strength of the workers and employers or whether the Government should enter in each stage and set up Wage Boards which take time. It is an important question which we are considering.

SHRI G. A. APPAN (Tamil Nadu); May I know from the hon. Minister the total loss of working days as a result of the strike, the loss of wages, the loss to the industry, the loss in production and the value of the national dividend that we will have to forego in view of the strike? May I know from the hon. Minister if it will not be possible for him to constitute a Committee consisting of Members of the Council of States as well as of the Lok Sabha to go to the spot, study the situation on the spot and make a recommendation to the Government? Will it not also be advisable for the Government to immediately go there rather than sit here and tell the parties what to do? It is necessary that they should study the situation on the spot from all angles, not only from the tripartite point of view but also from the consumers' point of view, from the value point of view and also from the point of view of the national loss. I would request the hon. Minister to reply to all the points that I have raised.

SHRI BHAGWAT JHA AZAD : It is true that there is loss of wages and there is loss of production. That is why on the advice given by Members working in trade unions like Mr. Chitta Basu and Mr. Banka Behary Das, we are trying to see that the strike ends immediately. We are taking all possible measures and the situation is being studied on the spot. The Labour Commissioner is there and other officers are

there. We are in constant touch with them. If I were to go there directly, they would have hauled me up.

**SHRIMATI YASHODA REDDY** (Andhra Pradesh) : I do not profess to have any specialised knowledge in the field of labour or trade unions, but as a lay person I would like to know this. The Minister, answering questions, said that the Wage Board recommendations were coming Very late. They take five or six years and implementation of the recommendations is not feasible. Neither the employers implement them nor is the Government able to get them implemented. May I know why this farce of appointing Wage Boards at all? Why not the Government relieve us of this farce and headache? Is it not a fact that the National Commission on Labour recently recommended the cancellation of these Wage Boards and solve the problem by arbitration? Is the Government seriously considering doing something for labour or is it going to entertain us with this farce for some more years?

**SHRI BHAGWAT JHA AZAD** : This question I have replied to in detail in this House. These Wage Boards were serving a good purpose, but in the last two or three years, as I have repeatedly said, the recommendations were not being implemented and they are not enforceable in Law. Therefore, I agree with the hon. lady Member and it is a fact that the National Labour Commission has given a recommendation. We have discussed it in the Indian Labour Conference and we are giving due weight to it. We are considering what we should do in this case.

**SHRI M. V. BHADRAM** (Andhra Pradesh) : The Minister has said that the Wage Board has taken four years to give four sets of recommendations and already about ten months have passed after the receipt of the recommendations. So, for nearly five years the workers have to wait to get any wage increase. Is it not a prolonged delay? In view of this will the Central Government step in immediately and restore the *status quo* as it obtained on the 17th or 16th November and use its influence as it had done in the case of the late strike in West Bengal? They should call the parties to Delhi and try to settle it as early as possible.

**SHRI BHAGWAT JHA AZAD** : I agree with the hon. Member. As I have said in the past also, it is a prolonged delay. As the Wage Boards are functioning now, they take three, four or five years and the workers have to wait. It is a prolonged delay. That is why we are seriously considering the recommendation of the National Labour Commission on the Wage Board and we shall decide what should be done. The hon. Member has given the advice that we should go back to the previous position, when there was no strike and no victimisation, and try to settle the matter as early as possible. We are taking all possible steps. We are in touch with the Bihar Government. I hope some solution will come out.

**श्री रेवती कान्त सिंह (बिहार) :** मैं मंत्री महोदय से दो तीन प्रश्न पूछना चाहता हूँ। पहली बात यह है और जैसा उन्होंने स्वयं कहा कि अब सरकार इस बात को सोच रही है कि आगे जो वेज बोर्ड बनाये जायें, उनका स्टेटस स्टेट्युटरी रही तब ही वे बनाये जायें अन्यथा नहीं बनाये जायें। यह तो बिहार की बात हुई, लेकिन अभी तक जो वेज बोर्ड बने हैं, उनमें से सिवाय जूट वर्कर्स के वेज बोर्ड को छोड़ कर करीब करीब सबमें वेज बोर्ड नहीं है और वेज बोर्ड की सिफारिशों को लागू करने में इतनी सारी दिक्कतें पेश हो रही हैं, जिनकी चर्चा इस समय यहां पर चल रही है। तो मैं यह जानना चाहता हूँ कि अब तक कि जो वेज बोर्ड की सिफारिशें हैं, उनको लागू करने के लिए सरकार क्या सक्रिय कदम उठा रही है ?

दूसरा सवाल यह है कि जो बात अभी रिक्मनाइजेशन के बारे में मंत्री महोदय ने कही है, उसके बारे में मैं यह जानना चाहता हूँ कि क्या यह सही है कि जितने भी इन्डस्ट्रियल डिस्प्यूट होते हैं, रिक्मनाइजेशन के डिस्प्यूट होते हैं और उनमें से अधिकांश इंटक की कागजी यूनियन को, रिक्मनाइजेशन को लेकर पैदा होते हैं। अभी यहां जमशेदपुर में, जैसा कि मंत्री महोदय ने बतलाया कि इंटक की यूनियन रिक्मनाइज्ड है, लेकिन उस यूनियन

[श्री रेवती कान्त सिंह]

ने स्ट्राइक का काल नहीं दिया, फिर भी 30 और 35 हजार मजदूरों ने तथाकथित अन-रिक्मनाइज्ड यूनियन के काल पर हड़ताल शुरू कर दी। क्या यह एक तथ्य साबित नहीं करता कि जिन यूनियनों को आप कहते हैं किये अन-रिक्मनाइज्ड हैं और जिन्हें मजदूर रिक्मनाइज्ड मानते हैं, तो मालिकों को भी उसे रिक्मनाइज्ड मानना चाहिये। तो मैं यह जानना चाहता हूँ कि सरकार का इस संबंध में क्या कहना है।

तीसरी बात मैं यह जानना चाहता हूँ कि जिस तरह से सरकार ने जूट वर्कर्स को, उनके मालिकों को और बंगाल सरकार के प्रतिनिधियों को दिल्ली में बुलाकर समझौता वार्ता आरम्भ की थी, तो उसी तरह से क्यों नहीं सब लोगों के प्रतिनिधियों को यहां बुलाकर समझौते की वार्ता शुरू नहीं की जाती? मंत्री महोदय को यह बात मालूम है कि आजकल यहां पर बिहार कंसलटंटिव कमेटी की मीटिंग चल रही है और इसी कारण बिहार सरकार के करीब करीब सभी बड़े आफिसर इस समय दिल्ली में मौजूद हैं। मैंने यह भी सुना है कि यहां पर मालिकों और मजदूरों के प्रतिनिधि भी मौजूद हैं। तो इस अवसर का लाभ उठाकर मंत्री महोदय को यह कोशिश करनी चाहिये कि सब लोगों को बुलाकर एक बैठक की जाय, जिसमें समझौता हो सके। आज करीब 17 दिन से वहां पर हड़ताल चल रही है, जिसके कारण राष्ट्रीय क्षति हो रही है और मजदूरों को नुकसान पहुंच रहा है तथा उनको विक्टिमाइज किया जा रहा है। इस तरह की चीज को रोकने के लिए सरकार को जल्द सब पक्ष के प्रतिनिधियों को बुलाकर समझौता वार्ता जल्दी करनी चाहिये। मैं इन तीन बातों का मंत्री महोदय से जवाब चाहता हूँ।

श्री भागवत शा आज़ाद : जैसा मैंने अपने अन्य उत्तर में कहा कि हम इस वेतन आयोग की सिफारिशों को कानून के जरिये से क्रियान्वित नहीं कर सके और इसी वजह से हमारे सामने

कठिनाई पैदा हो जाती है। जहां तक सक्रिय कदम उठाने का सवाल है, उसके बारे में हमने यह कार्यवाही की है कि जो निबन्धक और श्रमिकों के प्रतिनिधि हैं, उनसे मिल कर हम इस तरह की सिफारिशों को कार्यान्वित कराने का प्रयास करते रहते हैं। हम यह नहीं कह सकते हैं कि इस बारे में हमें सफलता नहीं मिली, लेकिन जैसा मैंने कहा कि पिछले दो, तीन वर्षों से कठिनाई हो रही है, मगर इसके पहले वेतन आयोगों की सिफारिशों को कार्यान्वित किया गया था। यद्यपि इस बीच में इसके पीछे अमली जामा नहीं है, फिर भी कार्यान्वित किया गया है।

लेकिन जहां तक दूसरे प्रश्न का सवाल है, अगर वहां के मजदूरों को इंटक पर विश्वास नहीं है, तो इस हड़ताल के बाद भी कोई उनको इस बात के ऊपर मजबूर नहीं कर सकता है और वे अपना संबंध विच्छेद कर लें और जब वैरीफिकेशन की बात आयेगी, तो वे उस समय दूसरी यूनियन में जा सकते हैं।

जहां तक तीसरे प्रश्न का सवाल है, जैसा मैंने पहले बतलाया और जिस तरह का माननीय सदस्य ने सुझाव दिया है, उसी तरह की कोशिश हम भी कर रहे हैं। हम निबन्धक और श्रमिकों के प्रतिनिधियों को टेबल पर बातचीत करने के लिए प्रयास कर रहे हैं। हमारी यह कोशिश है कि उनके बीच जो भी बातचीत हो, वह 17 नवम्बर के पहले जो बातचीत चल रही थी, उसी आधार पर हो और जो वार्ता उस समय चल रही थी उस पर विचार करें।

#### PAPERS LAID ON THE TABLE

ANNUAL ACCOUNTS (1967-68) OF THE POST-GRADUATE INSTITUTE OF MEDICAL EDUCATION AND RESEARCH, CHANDIGARH AND RELATED PAPERS

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF FINANCE (SHRI P. C. SETHI) : Sir, on behalf of Shri K. K. Shah, I beg to lay on the Table, under sub-section (4) of