

(d) whether Government have received any representation from the land owners in this connection, if so, what action has been taken thereon?

THE DEPUTY MINISTER IN THE MINISTRY OF DEFENCE (DR. D. S. RAJU): (a) In order to meet the increased requirements of the I.M.A. Dehra Dun, it was agreed in July 1962 that 145 acres of land belonging to F.R. I would be transferred to the I.M.A.

(b) and (c) The question whether the cost of the land be paid or private land be acquired and given in exchange of the F.R.I. land is under consideration. No privately owned lands are under acquisition at present.

(d) Six notices under Section 80 CPC were received in Aug. | Sept. 1962 from cultivators of village Kanwali in Dehra Dun in connection with the intention of Government to acquire their land. The matter was examined and it was considered that the notices were untenable as there could be no constitutional objection to acquisition of land for public purposes under the Land Acquisition Act.

SHRI G. M. MIR: May I know from the hon. Minister how much land has been acquired and how much land has been utilised by the Indian Military Academy, and how much remains to be utilised?

DR. D. S. RAJU: About 85 acres of land have been acquired and they have been utilised. Some assets have also been raised upon them. Other lands also are being utilised.

SHRI G. M. MIR: The hon. Minister has said that to pay compensation for the acquisition of this land this matter is under the consideration of Government. May I know for how long it has been under the consideration of Government and when it is to be finally settled? This land was acquired in 1962 and it is now 1965. May I know why such

long delay has taken place and for how long it will remain under the active consideration of Government?

DR. D. S. RAJU: It has been under consideration since 1962. The F.R.I. had raised objection and said that they wanted the land back, but this question was again discussed with the various Ministries concerned and it was decided that it was not possible for this land to be released to the F.R.I. The question of paying money is under consideration and it will be decided very soon.

SHRI G. M. MIR: Will it be possible for Government to return some of the land, which has not been utilised by the Army authorities, to the Forest Research Institute?

DR. D. S. RAJU: The whole land is expected to be utilised. Eighty-five acres have already been utilised completely. Some assets have been raised there worth Rs. 20 lakhs. The other land is used for training purposes, games and other things.

\*732. [The questioner (Shri C. L. Verma) was absent. For answer, vide col. 4789 infra.]

#### CLASSIFICATION TRIBUNAL

\*733. { SHRI ARJUN ARORA†;  
SHRI M. AJMAL KHAN;  
SHRI N. SRI RAMA  
REDDY;

Will the Minister of DEFENCE be pleased to state:

(a) whether Government have appointed the classification tribunal as recommended by the Second Pay Commission for establishments engaged in defence production; and

(b) if the answer to part (a) above be in negative, what are the reasons therefor?

†The question was actually asked on the floor of the House by Shri Arjun Arora.

THE MINISTER OF DEFENCE PRODUCTION IN THE MINISTRY OF DEFENCE (SHRI A. M. THOMAS): (a) No, Sir.

(b) Government do not consider that there is any need for appointment of a classification tribunal. The various categories of posts in Ordnance Factories have already been classified on a scientific basis. There has been no material change in the conditions or in the processes of work, nor has any trade union brought to the notice of Government anomalous instances of wage fixation, trade designation or gradation in the Ordnance Factories. However, a letter received from Shri S. M. Banerjee, Member of Parliament, in this connection, is under examination. As regards public sector undertakings engaged in defence production, the terms and conditions of their workers are different from those in Government establishments and the recommendation of the Second Pay Commission is not applicable to them.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA: May I know if the Government is aware of the fact that the Second Pay Commission which thoroughly examined the issue made a recommendation that classification tribunals be appointed? The point of view of the Government was placed before the Second Pay Commission, and that Pay Commission rejected the point of view which the learned Minister has given in his reply, and recommended that such classification tribunals be appointed by his Ministry. May I know the reasons for Government's rejection of this recommendation of the Pay Commission?

SHRI A. M. THOMAS: It is not a question of rejection. According to the Second Pay Commission it has been represented by certain employees' organisations that there had been no systematic job evaluation, and on the basis of that representa-

tion the Second Pay Commission made a recommendation in general terms that there might be a systematic job evaluation. But it has to be realised that as far as Ordnance Factories are concerned, as I have already stated in the main answer, the various categories of jobs have already been classified on a scientific and systematic basis. I may say I am frequently holding consultations with the representatives of the various Defence employees' federations. They have not brought any anomalies to my notice. That itself shows that it has been done on a scientific basis. All the same very recently Shri S. M. Banerjee has written to me asking for a classification tribunal, appointment of a Wage Board and other things. If any specific instance is brought to my notice, we shall be certainly prepared to look into it. As far as the employees in other sectors are concerned, wherever instances have been brought to us to the effect that there has been some anomaly, it has been looked into and necessary steps taken.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA: May I know if the classification to which the Minister made a reference just now was done before the report of the Second Pay Commission was published or afterwards?

SHRI A. M. THOMAS: Before the Second Pay Commission report was published.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA: In spite of the so-called classification having been done before the Second Pay Commission submitted its report, the Pay Commission felt the need of it. Why does the Minister want the unions to agitate before he will consider the appointment of a classification tribunal? The very fact that the Pay Commission made a recommendation should be sufficient.

SHRI A. M. THOMAS: Government have also to be convinced that

there is a necessity for it. The statement of mine is not disputed by the hon. Member that the federations themselves have not a case that they have not been properly classified.

**SHRI D. THENGARI:** May I know, Sir, through which competent authority the Government got itself satisfied about the scientific character of job evaluation as it exists today?

**SHRI A. M. THOMAS:** Because various teams have gone into this matter and then classified scientifically.

IMPLEMENTATION OF THE CONCLUSIONS OF INLAND TRANSPORT COMMITTEE OF I.L.O.

\*734. **SHRI P. K. KUMARAN:** Will the Minister of LABOUR AND EMPLOYMENT be pleased to state:

(a) the main conclusions of the 7th Session of the Inland Transport Committee of the International Labour Organisation held in 1961;

(b) whether these conclusions have been ratified by the Government of India;

(c) if so, what action has been or is proposed to be taken to implement the same; and

(d) if answer to part (b) above be in the negative, what are the reasons for the delay?

**THE MINISTER OF LABOUR AND EMPLOYMENT (SHRI D. SANJIVAYYA):** (a) The Committee adopted two Conclusions and ten Resolutions. These relate to:—

- (i) General Conditions of Work of Railwaymen;
- (ii) Social Consequences of Changing Methods and Techniques in Railways and Road Transport;

(iii) Technical Assistance in the Field of Inland Transport;

(iv) Co-ordination of Transport;

(v) Civil Liability of Transport Workers;

(vi) Freedom of Association in Essential Transport Services;

(vii) Labour Inspection in Road Transport;

(viii) Limitation of Loads Carried by One Man;

(ix) Safety and Health of Dock Workers;

(x) Composition of the Committee;

(xi) Vocational Training in Inland Transport in Developing Countries; and

(xii) Agenda of the Eighth Session of the Committee.

(b) These Conclusions and Resolutions are in the nature of suggestions for action, either by the ILO Governing Body or the member States, and do not call for ratification.

(c) The texts of the Conclusions and the Resolutions, which suggested some action on the part of the member states, were forwarded, in April 1962, to the State Governments, the Ministries of Transport and Railways and the all-India organisations of employers and workers for necessary action.

Information is being collected regarding the action taken in the matter by these agencies.

(d) Does not arise.

**SHRI P. K. KUMARAN:** In view of the fact that in our country now rationalisation is taking place in the transport system on the Railways and the road transport, namely, mechanisation, electrification, dieselisation and other forms of rationalisation, in