

THE PRIME MINISTER (SHRI LAL BAHADUR): (a) No.

(b) Does not arise.

JPEACE AGREEMENT WITH NAOAS

814. SHRI P. L. KUREEL *URF* TALIB: Will the Minister of HOME AFFAIRS be pleased to state:

(a) whether the hostile activities of the rebel Nagas have completely ceased since the signing of the peace agreement with them in August, 1964;

(b) whether the rebel Naga leaders or the Government of the Nagaland have made any representation to the Central Government in regard to the peace agreement;

(c) whether there has been any violation of the terms of the peace agreement; and

(d) how many persons including police and military personnel were killed or wounded or kidnapped as a result of the subversive activities of the Naga hostiles during the last six months?

THE MINISTER OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SABDAR SWARAN SINGH): (a) No major incidents have been reported since the 7th September, 1964.

(b) No.

(c) There have been sporadic reports of kidnapping and other incidents which, if true, would be a breach of the terms for the suspension of operations.

(d) For the period 1st March, 1964 to 6th September, 1964:

	<i>Killed Wounded Kidnapped</i>		
(i) Army and Assam Rifles	13	44	..
(ii) Police	11	13	..
(iii) Manipur Rifles	..	1	..
(iv) Border Roads Task Force	..	1	..
(v) Civilians	15	29	539

-s-Transferred *ivom* the 3rd October, 1964.

12 NOON

CALLING ATTENTION TO A MATTER OF URGENT PUBLIC IMPORTANCE

BOYCOTT OF THE 'ONE-MAN INDEPENDENT BODY FOR DEARNESS ALLOWANCE' BY THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES UNIFORMS

SHRI D. THENGARI (Uttar Pradesh) : Sir, with your permission I rise to call the attention of the Minister of Finance to the situation arising out of the total boycott of the 'one-man Independent Body for Dearness Allowance' by the Central Government Employees' Unions.

THE MINISTER OF PLANNING (SHRI B. R. BHAGAT) : Sir, the hon. Member has called attention to the situation arising out of total boycott of the one man Independent Body for Dearness Allowance recently appointed by Government to go into the question whether the compensation so far granted for increase in cost of living is adequate. While it is true that a number of employees' organisations have represented that this Independent Body should also review the basic formula recommended by the Pay Commission and have expressed their unwillingness to present their case before the Independent Body unless its terms of reference are enlarged, the House will be glad to know that many other recognised Associations are fully co-operating and the alleged total boycott does not in fact exist. The preliminary hearing of the Body on 21st September, 1964 was attended by representatives of 14 employees' organisations in Delhi and representatives of 19 such organisations will be appearing for oral evidence before the Body at its regular sittings which commenced yesterday. Besides, a number of other organisations located at outstations have also requested for an opportunity to be heard in person.

It was in July 1960 that Government announced their decision that at least 50 per cent of the increase in

Government do not consider that there has been any developmen to justify departure from the basic principles evolved by the Pay Commission. Moreover, it is important that the Independent Body should make its recommendations as quickly as possible. It is not therefore Government's intention that the one-man Body should be called upon to recommend modifications and departures from the principles and conclusions which a high-powered Pay Commission had formulated after the most careful and detailed investigation by experts in the line. Nevertheless,— this is important—while it is not within the terms of reference of the Independent Body itself to review the basic formula its discretion to make comments in its report if on the basis of facts and representations placed before it by the employees, it is of opinion that the formula itself needs to be further examined, is unfettered. Any such comments will be given the fullest consideration. Government earnestly hope that in view of what I have explained all employees will extend their full support to the Independent Body in making its task as fruitful

SHRI D., THENGARI: One more clarification, Now, that the period of the recommendations of the Pay Com-

(Shri s Thangari mission has already expired on the 1st July last, what are the technical difficulties in consti'tuting another Pay Commission?

SHRI B. R. BHAGAT: Well, Sir, the hon. Member refers to the joint consultative machinery. As you know, there is a recommendation that after five years it may be revised. May I bring to the notice of the hon. Member that the employees have not accepted that formula. When they have not accepted the formula, they cannot raise any objection to its implementation.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA (West Bengal): The principle in this matter is this. The question of the formula for dearness allowance should be included in the terms of reference. That is the demand of the Government employees. Their stand is that the recommendations, whether they have been accepted or not, of the Second Pay Commission have been operative up to a period of five years. In the First Pay Commission's Report it was said that after every five years a Pay Commission should be appointed. The Second Pay Commission came and now the Government can appoint a Third Pay Commission and on the basis of that it can say what it would give. But since it is not doing so, why should not this question of formula have been included in the terms of reference otherwise, within the framework of this reference? The employees are not going to get much benefit at all. The Government's position is quite clear. They are not for 10 per cent neutralisation of the rise in prices and so on. Therefore, the gain will be very negligible, if at all. In view of the fact that five years have passed since the recommendations were made by the Second Pay Commission, the case should go *de novo*, the question of fixing the formula for payment of dearness allowance to this Commit-

tee. We cannot understand why there should be exception to it.

SHRI B. R. BHAGAT: While sympathising with the objective of the hon. Member, may I state that, in fact, the Government can at any time take a decision whether a Pay Commission should be appointed or not. That is a separate matter. As I said, we have tried to do the best. An independent body, an independent person—and I quoted the late Prime Minister and the late Home Minister, who had said that such a revision should be done under the principles framed by the Pay Commission—however competent he may be, cannot go into the pay structure, the formula and others, in which years were spent. A good deal of expertise was gone into. So, we have said that this body, on the basis of facts presented by the employees, can make a recommendation about the formula itself. This body has to submit its report very quickly, by the end of this year, so that the benefit, if at all, will accrue. Government can take a decision on it. I think this is the best *via media* taking all things into consideration. Appointment of another Pay Commission will take one or two years.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: We are not asking for it. We are saying that the formula should be changed.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA (Uttar Pradesh): May I know if the Government is aware of the fact that the trade unions which have boycotted the so-called one-man independent tribunal have pointed out that the gentleman who constitutes this one-man independent tribunal has already on previous occasions expressed himself in a manner prejudicial to the interests of the employees and, if that is so, he is no more independent.

SHRI B. R. BHAGAT: He was an eminent Judge and we believe that he will be an independent body. He will be an independent body, the

Government has no doubt about it. As for the expression of opinion, I am not aware of it.

SHRI A. B. VAJPAYEE (Uttar Pradesh): During the time of the last general strike by the Central Government employees the Government gave an assurance that in the case of a difference of opinion between the Government and the employees on the question of payment of clearness allowance, this question would be referred to arbitration. May I know whether the Government still stands by that assurance?

SHRI B. R. BHAGAT: That refers to the quantum of allowance. That is what is referred to. We are implementing that assurance. What is being demanded is the formula itself recommended by the Pay Commission. As I said, the late Prime Minister and the late Home Minister Pandit Pant, made it clear that the principles should be as laid down by the Pay Commission but the quantum would be the 'Subject matter of arbitration. But now we go a step further that if this independent body comes to the conclusion that there is a need for the formula being revised, if there is a specific suggestion made, we will look into it.

SHRI A. D. MANI (Madhya Pradesh): The hon. Minister stated the difficulties that stood in the way of another Pay Commission being appointed. May I ask him whether in view of the fact that both Houses of Parliament have sanctioned a sudden increase in Members' emoluments, Government would consider that fact itself as sufficient ground for ordering a *de novo* enquiry in the pay structure of all classes of Government servants?

SHRI B. R. BHAGAT: No, Sir.

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR (Uttar Pradesh): May I know whether Government had any consultation with the Central trade union organi-

sations about the terms of reference of this Commission? If not, what was the difficulty in it? I want to know whether he had any consultation about the terms of reference with all these trade union organisations, and if he did not have any consultation, what were the difficulties?

SHRI B. R. BHAGAT: We did not consider it necessary to consult them about the terms of reference. We were very clear about it.

PAPERS LAID ON THE TABLE

REPORT (1964) OF THE WOOLLEN HOSIERY YARN DISTRIBUTION ENQUIRY COMMITTEE

THE DEPUTY MINISTER IN THE MINISTRY OF COMMERCE (SHRI S. V. RAMASWAMY): Sir, I beg to lay on the Table a copy of the Report (1964) of the Woollen Hosiery Yarn Distribution Enquiry Committee. [Placed in Library. See No. LT-3262/64.]

CONCLUSIONS OF THE 22ND SESSION OF THE INDIAN LABOUR CONFERENCE

THE DEPUTY MINISTER IN THE MINISTRY OF LABOUR AND EMPLOYMENT (SHRI RATANLAL KISHORILAL MALVIYA): Sir, I beg to lay on the Table a statement containing the main conclusions of the 22nd Session of the Indian Labour Conference held at Bangalore in July, 1964. [Placed in Library. See No. LT-3254/64.]

THE APPRENTICESHIP (THIRD AMENDMENT) RULES, 1964

SHRI RATANLAL KISHORILAL MALVIYA: Sir, I also beg to lay on the Table a copy of the Ministry of Labour and Employment (Directorate General of Employment and Training) Notification G.S.R. No. 1181, dated the 13th August, 1964, publishing the Apprenticeship (Third