

SHRI D. THENGARI : Sir, actually, field workers draw only between Rs. 130 and Rs. 605 and, secondly, in principle, the Government seems to have accepted in their communications that bonus should be paid to Class I employees of the Corporation. In view of all these facts, will the Government assure that it will consider the case of extension of bonus to the field workers and, secondly, that the decisions of the High Courts . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN : You have 'secondly' in this question also.

SHRI D. THENGARI : And, then, Sir, if the decisions of the L.I.C. are not in keeping with the decisions of the High Courts, may I know whether appropriate changes will be suggested or advised by the Government ?

SHRI B. R. BHAGAT : Decisions of High Courts, in which respect ?

SHRI D. THENGARI : In the matter of those fourteen workers, in the matter of their reinstatement in service.

SHRI B. R. BHAGAT : That, Sir, I will look into. I do not have the details with me, details of those fourteen cases, but certainly I will see.

श्री विमलकुमार मन्नालालजी चौरङ्गिया :
(मध्य प्रदेश) : क्या श्रीमान् बतलायेंगे कि इन लोगों की मांग में यह भी मांग है कि जिस तरह से तीसरे और चौथे दर्जे के कर्मचारियों का महंगाई भत्ता लिविंग इन्डैक्स में जोड़ दिया गया है, उसी तरह से जिन लोगों को केवल 130 रु० महावार तनखाह मिलती है, क्या उनका भी महंगाई भत्ता लिविंग इन्डैक्स में जोड़ दिया जायेगा और क्या शासन इस बारे में विचार कर रहा है ?

श्री बी० आर० भगत : इसमें महंगाई भत्ते की कोई मांग नहीं है, यह बात तो बोनास के बारे में है और महंगाई भत्ते का तो मवाल ही नहीं है।

SHRI G. MURAHARI (Uttar Pradesh) : I would like to know whether it is not a fact that this rule is being used to dismiss employees for trade union

activities and, if that is so, I would like to know why Government is treating L.I.C. on a different basis from other Government establishments ?

SHRI B. R. BHAGAT : Sir, so far, our knowledge is that it is not being used for that purpose. There may be a question of judgment, but if the hon. Member has any case, we are prepared to look into that, whether discriminatory treatment has been given in any particular case.

STATEMENT BY MINISTER CORRECTING THE ANSWER GIVEN ON 9TH MARCH, 1966, IN REPLY TO A CALLING ATTENTION NOTICE

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF FINANCE (SHRI B. R. BHAGAT) : Mr. Chairman, Sir, during the course of a discussion in this House on March 9, 1966, in connection with Calling Attention to the reported mass agitation by employees of the office of the Comptroller and Auditor-General of India, I made the following statement :—

"As for the definition of the powers of the Auditor-General, it is contained in the Constitution. However, a special Bill was introduced in the other House, which could not be taken up for want of time. I remember the Bill has been introduced."

Sir, this statement was made under certain misapprehensions. The correct position is that the Bill has not yet been introduced in the Lok Sabha.

PAPERS LAID ON THE TABLE

BUDGET ESTIMATES (1966-67) OF THE DAMODAR VALLEY CORPORATION

THE MINISTER OF IRRIGATION AND POWER (SHRI FAKHRUDDIN ALI AHMED) : Sir, I beg to lay on the Table, under sub-section (3) of section 44 of the Damodar Valley Corporation Act, 1948, a copy of the Budget Estimates of the Damodar Valley Corporation for the year 1966-67. [Placed in Library. See No. IT-5871/66.]