

(b) and (c) Do not arise.

SHRI B. K. P. SINHA: May I know if the secret codes that are used are changed at certain intervals or they continue indefinitely?

SHRI DINESH SINGH: Secret code, Madam, is a cipher system which has various adaptations.

श्री ए० बी० वाजपेयी : क्या शासन का ध्यान चीन में हमारे भूतपूर्व राजदूत स्वर्गीय सरदार पाणिकर को, देश के कुछ अखबारों के बीच में चले हुए इस विवाद की ओर खींचा गया है कि विदेश मंत्रालय से तिब्बत के बारे में जो सन्देश भेजा गया था उसमें "सूजरेंटी" शब्द का प्रयोग किया गया था, लेकिन बाद में उसको "सावरेंटी" कर दिया गया और इस प्रकार "सूजरेंटी" शब्द "सावरेंटी" में बदल गया, तो क्या ऐसी गलतियाँ मैसेज को साइफर करने में हो सकती हैं ?

श्री दिनेश सिंह : इसका सवाल इस प्रश्न से नहीं उठता है क्योंकि यह तो पब्लिसिटी डाइरेक्टिव के बारे में है। मैं जानता नहीं कि इस तरह की गलतियाँ उसमें हो सकती हैं या नहीं। साइफर जो जानते हैं वे बता सकते हैं, लेकिन इस सवाल में यह उठना नहीं है।

SHRI A. D. MANI: Madam, some allegation has been made—it is only an allegation—and I should like to ask the hon. Minister's opinion on that allegation. The allegation has been made that the Chinese have broken our code. Is that true or not?

SHRI DINESH SINGH: If the hon. Member is referring to the allegation that appeared in the newspapers, that has nothing to do with the code. They refer to the publicity directives that we send over the Morse code which most people know. Those mes-

sages are sent in the Morse code for publicity. Some directives are also given but they are not secret.

REPORT OF BONUS COMMISSION

*124. { SHRI P. K. KUMARAN;
SHRI ARJUN ARORA†:

Will the Minister of LABOUR AND EMPLOYMENT be pleased to state:

(a) whether the Bonus Commission has submitted its report;

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

(c) what action has been taken by Government thereon?

THE DEPUTY MINISTER IN THE MINISTRY OF LABOUR AND EMPLOYMENT (SHRI RATANLAL KISHORILAL MALVIYA): (a) Yes.

(b) and (c) The report is under examination.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA: May I know when the Report was submitted?

SHRI RATANLAL KISHORILAL MALVIYA: The Report was submitted on the 24th January 1964.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA: May I know if the Government adheres to the declaration by the former Labour Minister that the Report will be accepted and implemented by the Government, if it is unanimous?

SHRI RATANLAL KISHORILAL MALVIYA: No, Madam.

SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA: May I know the difficulties in giving the main recommendations to the House?

SHRI RATANLAL KISHORILAL MALVIYA: Madam, the commitment made by the former Labour Minister

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

is that if the Report is unanimous, then it can be decided early enough as to what should be done. But then in this case the Report is not unanimous.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: May I know, Madam, who dissented from the Report and did not agree with the majority view, which side— it was a tripartite Report?

(No reply)

SHRI A. D. MANI: Is there any proposal before the Government that before the Government takes a decision on this Report, it should give an opportunity to both Houses of Parliament to consider and discuss this Report so that Government may have before it the views of Members of Parliament on this very important subject?

SHRI RATANLAL KISHORILAL MALVIYA: Madam, there is no such proposal at present. But the Report has been sent to the Ministries concerned and the State Governments for their views. Afterwards it will be seen as to what should be done.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Madam, my question has not been replied to. My question was this: The hon. Minister stated that the Report was not unanimous. May I know who dissented and who constituted that majority, which side, employers or employees?

SHRI RATANLAL KISHORILAL MALVIYA: Employers.

SHRI K. SANTHANAM: May I know if the Report will be placed on the Table of the House?

SHRI RATANLAL KISHORILAL MALVIYA: It will be placed after examination, Madam.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA: Madam, the Bonus Commission was appointed to evolve a new formula in place of the Labour Appellate Tribunal's formula on bonus which was endorsed by the

Supreme Court and which both industry and labour found unsatisfactory. How do the State Governments come in? The Government of India was represented as employer in the public sector, employers in the private sector were represented and labour was represented. How do the State Governments come in? They do not give any bonus to their employees.

SHRI RATANLAL KISHORILAL MALVIYA: They have got interests in the industries and, therefore, they have got to be consulted.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I would like to know whether, at any stage of the meeting of the Bonus Commission, it was made out to the Commission that the Report would also be considered by the State Governments and would be referred to them. If such a statement was not made to the Bonus Commission members in any formal Commission meeting, why is the whole thing being referred to them, to the State Governments, in view of the fact that it was entirely a Central Government matter? Is it to help the State Governments and other interested parties to create public opinion, mobilise opinion, in order that the recommendations may not be implemented and delay may be caused?

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: He asks whether the terms of reference contained a provision at the report should be submitted to the various State Governments?

SHRI RATANLAL KISHORILAL MALVIYA: So far as I understand, no.

DR. SHRIMATI SEETA PARMANAND: As the Wage Board for the coal industry also contains the question about the bonus, will the delay in the acceptance of this report affect the final decision of the Wage Board which should normally be expedited?

SHRI RATANLAL KISHORILAL MALVIYA: It should not delay the decision of the Wage Board in regard to the coal industry because that Board is still in session whereas the report about the Bonus Commission is already on our hands.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Question No. 125.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I rise on a point of privilege.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I have called the next question. Mr. Bhupesh Gupta.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: All right. I will raise it later on, the question of privilege.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: That is later on. I have passed on to the next question.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: That is all right. I will come to the question of a Motion for breach of privilege of this House and the other House.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You put the question now.

AMERICAN REACTIONS ON THE NATIONALISATION OF BANKS

*125. **SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA:** Will the PRIME MINISTER be pleased to state:

(a) whether his attention has been drawn to a news item published in the 'Patriot' of January 4, to the effect that the Indian Ambassador in the United States of America has conveyed to Government the adverse reactions in the United States to the proposal for the nationalisation of banks; and

(b) if so, whether Government had asked for the United States reactions to the proposal?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRIMATI LAKSHMI N. MENON): (a) Yes, Madam.

(b) No, Madam.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: According to the answer given to part (b) of the question, Government did not ask for any information about what the Americans were thinking about the nationalisation proposals. How is it then that Mr. B. K. Nehru, our Ambassador in Washington, obtained the views of the Americans with regard to our internal affairs and also volunteered to send his own views about American reaction? I also would like to know whether the Report that appeared in the 'Patriot' of 4th January is correct.

SHRIMATI LAKSHMI N. MENON: I know that.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: . . . that the views of Mr. B. K. Nehru received weighty consideration, and that he reinforced his objection to the move. Now, will the hon. Minister kindly explain the circumstances under which this opinion was given and how it was considered by the Government? May I also know whether the view point of Government was communicated to Mr. B. K. Nehru so that he could communicate it to them, that the American businessmen have no business to interfere in our internal affairs?

SHRIMATI LAKSHMI N. MENON: Madam, our Ambassador in the United States did not tell us anything about the reaction of the United States Government regarding the nationalisation of banks. Even the report that the hon. Member has mentioned is a report by a special correspondent. It says, "It is understood such and such a thing happened", "It is likely such and such a thing may happen". It does not say that such and such a thing has happened. It is only a kind of subjective speculation about what our Ambassador in the United States might have said. We have made enquiries and we find that no such report has come. As far as the United States itself is concerned,