

D. A. COMMISSION'S REPORT

*65. SHRI D. THENGARI:†
 SHRI U. S. PATIL:
 SARDAR RAM SINGH:
 SHRI M. M. DHARIA:
 SHRI B. N. MANDAL:
 SHRI CHITTA BASU:

Will the Minister of FINANCE be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that the Gajendragadkar Commission on the Dearness Allowance payable to Government employees has submitted its report;

(b) if so, what are its main recommendations;

(c) whether it is also a fact that it has made a recommendation to merge Dearness Allowance wholly or partly with the basic pay of the Government employees; and

(d) if so, what is the Government's decision on the Commission's recommendations?

THE DEPUTY MINISTER IN THE MINISTRY OF FINANCE (SHRI L. N. MISHRA): (a) to (d) A statement is laid on the Table of the House.

STATEMENT

(a) Yes, Sir. The Commission on Dearness Allowance has submitted its report on the limited question of the adequacy of the Dearness Allowance granted from 1-12-65 to Central Government employees drawing pay below Rs. 400. By a separate reference, the Commission has also been asked to examine the principles that should govern the grant of D.A. to such employees in future and its report on this larger question is likely to be submitted after a few months.

(b) The main recommendations of the Commission are as under:

(i) dearness allowance be paid to the employees at the per-

tages of neutralisation specified by the Das Independent Body in regard to the four categories of pay range, viz., 70-109, 110-149, 150-209 and 210-399 respectively, with effect from 1-12-1965 for the entire rise of 65 points over 100 in the 12 monthly average of the Working Class Consumer Price Index Number;

(ii) the adequacy of the rates of dearness allowance payable to the employees, for the period prior to 1-12-65 should not be reopened;

(iii) the average of Working Class Consumer Price Index Number having reached the level of 175 in July, 1966 for the entire rise of 75 points; dearness allowance be paid at the percentages of neutralisation specified by the Das Independent Body to the categories of staff in pay ranges below 400 with effect from 1-8-1966.

(c) No, Sir.

(d) Does not arise.

SHRI D. THENGARI: Sir, may I know whether the terms of reference were determined in consultation with the employees' organisations and, if not, whether the terms of reference are acceptable to those organisations, and if they be not acceptable to some of the organisations, what is the total membership of such organisations and whether, in view of the objections raised by these organisations, which command a majority of the employees, Government is considering relaxing, formally or informally, the terms of reference?

SHRI L. N. MISHRA: Sir, we are not considering revising the terms of

†The question was actually asked on the floor of the House by Shri D. Thengari.

reference. It is an old thing. The terms of reference were decided on a long time ago. Now we have got their interim recommendations also; we have accepted the recommendations of this Gajendragadkar Commission *in toto*. So there is no question of revising their terms of reference.

SHRI D. THENGARI: There is the question of revising, because the major part of the work is yet to be done, the second part of the work. Another thing. In their memorandum the Government have stated that they have fixed the percentages of D.A. rates on a slab system. Is the Government aware that this is a wrong statement? For example, the percentage of 83.5 on the slab of Rs. 70 to 109 for the D.A. of Rs. 38 after the index figure of 165, as worked out by the Government in its memorandum, would work differently for different employees in the same slab; one getting Rs. 70 receives 83.5 per cent neutralisation while one getting Rs. 109 in the same slab receives 53.1 per cent neutralisation. An employee receiving Rs. 109 receives 53.1 per cent neutralisation, while one getting one rupee more, that is, Rs. 110 would receive 81.1 per cent neutralisation, so that the statement of the Government that percentages are fixed is wrong. In view of this fact, would the Government suggest in their next memorandum that this anomaly should be removed?

SHRI L. N. MISHRA: Sir, we have taken all these questions into consideration because these questions had been raised a number of times and the anomaly, if any according to the hon. Member, was pointed out to us, and we have taken all this into account and prepared the first memorandum, and so we are not thinking of revising the memorandum.

SHRI D. THENGARI: Is there any time limit prescribed for the completion of the second part of its work?

SHRI L. N. MISHRA: For the second part the Commission has

issued some questionnaires to different organisations, and individuals also, and the Commission will be visiting the different States also and different places, and the Commission will give a hearing to all the parties concerned, and then the Commission will make recommendations for the second part.

SHRI P. K. KUMARAN: The hon. Minister does not seem to know what the Dearness Allowance Commission has been entrusted to do. Whereas there are two terms of reference, the first report which they have submitted is in respect of the first terms of reference. The second term of reference refers to the long-term aspect of the matter, namely, what should be the basis of dearness allowance, whether, in view of the financial position of the States and the local self-governing bodies, the municipalities, etc., the present system should continue or not. The question is whether you have received any protest from the Central employees protesting against the terms of reference and asking for a revision of these terms of reference.

SHRI L. N. MISHRA: We have received, Sir. This question was raised in this House by the Congress Party also, by Mr. Anandan perhaps, and we had said that we had received objections, and also that some members of the major employees' organisations had protested. We had given consideration to all these points, and after taking all these considerations into account we had framed their terms of reference, and the terms of reference were placed on the Table of the House.

SHRI M. M. DHARIA: Is the Government aware that the employees have been insisting on linking up the dearness allowance with the cost of living index? If it is so, why is it not being accepted by the Government? And, secondly, is the Government aware of the widespread dissatisfaction that exists at the State levels, in State headquarters because of the

difference between the dearness allowance being paid by the Government of India to its employees, and by the State Governments to their employees, and has the Government taken into consideration the effects of the Gajendragadkar award and the dissatisfaction that is likely to increase at the State level because, as a result of this award, the difference between the dearness allowance of the Central Government employees and the State Government employees will be widened? Is the Government thinking of giving any subsidy to State Governments in this regard?

SHRI L. N. MISHRA: Sir, that is our main difficulty. Whenever there is a rise in the emoluments or dearness allowance of the Central Government employees, this question is raised and the State Governments come to the Government of India for additional assistance. But, unfortunately, the Government of India are not in a position to give additional assistance to the State Governments for such purposes. So far as linking the dearness allowance with the rise in the cost of living is concerned, and so far as this anomaly is concerned, namely the repercussion or reaction of the Gajendragadkar Commission's interim report on the salaries and emoluments of the State Government employees is concerned, we do not think it is possible for us to make any commitment, nor are we thinking on those lines.

SHRI NIREN GHOSH: May I know, Sir, whether the Government is opposed to cent per cent neutralisation of the rise in the cost of living index and, if so, if they are consistently giving less neutralisation then, whether the conditions of the employees have gone down during these nineteen years after the gaining of independence as a result, and also whether there is fraudulent compilations of the indices leading to widespread complaints on behalf of the trade union movement, as a result of

which in some States they were forced to rectify them? When they show a 600 per cent rise, actually it is a 1000 per cent rise. So thereby they are also cheated. May I ask whether the Government will take this into account and do something about it? My third question is this. He says that there is anomaly between the Centre and the States in respect of their employees' emoluments and that the States come forward and say that the gap is widening. So in view of that, may I know whether the Government will think of giving them more financial resources, or arrange the finances of the country in such a way that the States can raise more finances. Now-a-days all the levers of finance are concentrated in the Union Government, and the States, even if they want, cannot raise the required finance. That is why they plead their inability. So why can't you have room to manoeuvre and can raise more finance in order to meet their commitments in this regard and to promote development programmes?

SHRI L. N. MISHRA: Sir, I have forgotten many of the questions of the hon. Member.

SHRI NIREN GHOSH: I put three questions, very simple questions.

SHRI L. N. MISHRA: Anyway I am trying to answer as far as I can. So far as the financial question is concerned, the hon. Member knows that it is governed by the Constitution, and we have got the Finance Commission appointed periodically, which goes into this matter of the States' share in the revenues, etc. Therefore, there is that avenue and it is taken advantage of. So far as the anomaly is concerned, as I said earlier also, there is that anomaly and we are not in a position to help the State Governments at this stage and, I think, for some years to come, as things are, the financial position of the country is such that it would be very difficult to give any kind of assurance on that account. The second

thing about the figures, etc., about the cost of living index, etc., we have got reliable figures. They might be wrong here and there, but I do not think they are not to be depended or relied upon. We have got reliable figures; a whole organisation is there . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Next question.

LEGALISATION OF ABORTION

*63. SHRI M. M. DHARIA:†
SHRI D. THENGARI:

Will the Minister of HEALTH AND FAMILY PLANNING be pleased to state:

(a) whether Government have received the report of the Committee appointed under the Chairmanship of Shri Shantilal Shah, the then Health Minister of the Maharashtra State; and

(b) if so, whether Government have taken any decision regarding the liberalisation of the existing provisions on legalisation of abortion?

THE MINISTER OF HEALTH AND FAMILY PLANNING (DR. SUSHILA NAYAR): (a) Not yet. The time for the submission of the report has been extended up to the 30th December, 1966.

(b) Does not arise.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Next question.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: May I suggest, Sir, that Question No. 67, and Question No. 78, which stand in my name, be taken together? They relate to the same matter. The other question, mine, may not be reached during the Question Hour. So I submit that both the questions may be taken together. They are almost the same.

MR. CHAIRMAN: No, I think they will not stand together.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: All right, they have to stand apart.

†The question was actually asked on the floor of the House by Shri M. M. Dharia.

INCOME-TAX ARREARS

*67. SHRI ABDUL GHANI: Will the Minister of FINANCE be pleased to state:

(a) the amount of income-tax which is in arrears at present;

(b) the amount of income-tax which was written off so far in 1966;

(c) the maximum amount written off during 1966 in respect of first ten cases, and the reasons for the writing off; and

(d) what steps are being taken to recover the income-tax arrears?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF FINANCE (SHRI B. R. BHAGAT): (a) The arrears of income-tax as on 30th June, 1966 amounted to Rs. 396.22 crores.

(b) The figures of income-tax arrears written off are maintained according to the financial year, in the income-tax records. The amounts of income-tax which were written off in the financial years 1965-66 and 1966-67 (up to 31-7-66) are Rs. 36,77,823 and Rs. 9,10,52 respectively.

(c) The maximum amount written off during 1966-67 in respect of the first ten cases was Rs. 2,89,836 in the case of M/s. Himansurai Indo International Talkies Ltd. The Company had been struck off the register by the Registrar of Companies and no more assets were available for attachment.

(d) Such steps as are available in law are being taken on the merits and circumstances of each case.

شیخ عبدالغنی : کیا وزیر صاحب

فوری طور پر یہ لالچوں روپیہ تو

اسکے ٹیکس کا ان کو جوڑا گیا ہے اور

جس نے بائے میں آپ کہتے ہیں کہ

ان کی کوئی جائیداد نہیں ہے تو یہ

کیا ایک ہوس کا تھا یا کئی ہوس