

which this representation has been made? (*Interruptions.*)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, order.

SHRI B. RATH: I would like to know whether it is not a fact that the national minorities in Bihar are not being allowed to have their education in their own mother-tongue.

DR. K. N. KATJU: My hon. friend was so excited that I could not really follow him.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is it not a fact that the national minorities in Bihar were not allowed to have their education through their mother-tongue?—That was his question.

DR. K. N. KATJU: Just consider this, Sir. Does this come into this question? I have been hearing these allegations for the last five years. I really do not know but the Bihar Government say that this is all ill-founded.

SHRI B. RATH: Knowing these allegations to be there for the last five years, has the hon. the Home Minister made any enquiries?

DR. K. N. KATJU: I was not here in those days.

SHRI B. RATH: Is it not a fact that the hon. Minister was in Bengal and Orissa? Has he made enquiries whether the allegations were correct or not?

SHRI S. MAHANTY: In view of the fact that such allegations have been made continuously for the last five years, will the Government consider the desirability of instituting an enquiry into the whole matter?

DR. K. N. KATJU: I have not been properly understood. I said I have been hearing these allegations. But I have also been hearing the answers. There is really no occasion for making any investigation. Better wait for the Commission.

# TRADE UNIONS RECOGNISED BY THE MINISTRY OF DEFENCE

†\*126. BABU GOPINATH SINGH: Will the Minister for DEFENCE be pleased to state:

(a) the number of trade unions recognised by the Ministry of Defence up to the 31st December 1953;

(b) the number of applications from trade unions for recognition pending sanction on that date and the periods for which these applications have been under consideration of the Ministry of Defence;

(c) the number of trade unions functioning amongst the labour forces employed by the Ministry;

(d) the number of unions of Defence employees registered under the Trade Unions Act;

(e) the number of Defence employees who are members of the trade unions of each of the above categories; and

(f) the number of Defence employees who are not attached to any trade union?

THE DEPUTY MINISTER FOR DEFENCE (SHRI SATISH CHANDRA): (a) Sixty.

(b) Twenty applications have not yet been finally disposed of. They have been pending for periods ranging from one month to two years. In most cases this is due to the fact that the unions have not yet complied with the conditions pre-requisite to the grant of recognition or furnished some information which had been asked for.

(c) and (d). The number of registered trade unions is 85. Information regarding unregistered unions is not readily available and is being collected.

(e) and (f). The necessary information is being collected and will be laid on the Table of the Council in due course.

†Postponed from 25th February 1954.

**SHRI B. K. MUKERJEE:** May I know the authority who takes the decision regarding recognition of these trade unions?

**SHRI SATISH CHANDRA:** Defence Ministry ultimately.

**SHRI B. K. MUKERJEE:** What are the conditions imposed on the trade unions for the purpose of recognition?

**SHRI SATISH CHANDRA:** Firstly, Sir, the union is supposed to be of a representative character if it has on its rolls at least 15 per cent. of members from each category of employees whom it claims to represent. Secondly, it should not consist of too many dismissed or discharged employees who have gone out as a result of disciplinary action. Also, there are other factors and if the hon. Member wants details I can let him have them later.

**SHRI S. N. MAZUMDAR:** May I know what the hon. Minister means by 'too many discharged employees'?

**SHRI SATISH CHANDRA:** Sir, there is a general tendency that those people who are dismissed at a particular place as a result of disciplinary action form a union and become its leaders and ventilate their personal grievances. That is discouraged.

**SHRI S. N. MAZUMDAR:** Is it not a fact, Sir, that employees in the course of their trade union activities happen to incur the displeasure of the authorities and they are victimised and it is in that way that the situation referred to by the hon. Minister arises?

**SHRI SATISH CHANDRA:** I have said before also in this House that if any case of victimisation due to trade union activities is brought to my notice, I will certainly look into it. But that charge is not quite correct.

**SHRI S. N. MAZUMDAR:** But on the charge-sheet it is never mentioned by the authorities that the employee is being discharged for his trade union activities. Anyway, I will go to another question. May I know the

reason why the Government insists on this condition that there should not be too many discharged employees and in certain cases they insist that there shall be no outsider or discharged employee on the executive of the union?

**SHRI SATISH CHANDRA:** The policy is that the new unions, to which we accord recognition, should not have any dismissed employee.

**SHRI S. N. MAZUMDAR:** May I know the reason why the Government is insisting on this condition?

(No reply.)

**DIWAN CHAMAN LALL:** May I ask whether any set of rules has been laid down by the Defence Ministry regarding the procedure for recognition of these unions?

**SHRI SATISH CHANDRA:** Yes, Sir. It is in accordance with those rules that recognition is granted to the unions. Some unions which are local unions have put in that the union can federate with labour unions outside India. It may be all right for the All-India Defence Employees Federation to say so but it will not be advisable for a local union to put that clause in its constitution.

**SHRI B. K. MUKERJEE:** May I know what the Government exactly intends by saying that there shall not be too many discharged employees in the union? What is the meaning of 'too many'?

**SHRI SATISH CHANDRA:** In the case of new unions, not one should be a discharged or a dismissed employee.

**SHRI B. GUPTA:** May I know why there is this discrimination with regard to these unions, in applying the normal trade union rules?

**SHRI SATISH CHANDRA:** Trade union rules govern only registration. Recognition is not governed by trade union rules. There is no provision in the Trade Unions Act that recognition

should compulsorily be accorded to the unions that have been registered.

SHRI B. RATH: Is it not a fact that the Industrial Disputes Act makes provision for the recognition of trade unions, that if it is a registered union and also satisfies certain conditions as laid down, then it must be recognised?

SHRI SATISH CHANDRA: No, Sir. There is no such monetary provision in force.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The questions are over.

### WRITTEN ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

#### THEFT OF A HARVARD AIRCRAFT FROM JODHPUR

185. SHRI M. VALIULLA: Will the Minister for DEFENCE be pleased to state:

(a) what are the names of the two Cadets who stole a Harvard Aircraft from Jodhpur and flew to a foreign country;

(b) whether the aircraft was sold by them in that country; if so the price at which it was sold; and

(c) whether the Cadets were prosecuted; and if so, what was the result of the prosecution?

THE MINISTER FOR DEFENCE ORGANIZATION (SHRI MAHAVIR TYAGI): (a) Flt. Cdt. M. Z. Phillips and Flt. Cdt. K. N. Mehra.

(b) The aircraft was not sold but was delivered back to India.

(c) The Cadets were tried by a Criminal Court and sentenced to 18 months' simple imprisonment and a fine of Rs. 750 each.

#### STRIKES IN ORDNANCE FACTORIES

186. SHRI M. VALIULLA: Will the Minister for DEFENCE be pleased to state:

(a) the number of strikes of labourers in ordnance factories in India during 1953;

(b) the number of labourers who took part in these strikes; and

(c) the number of ordnance factories working on 1-1-1954 and the number of labourers employed in each of them?

THE DEPUTY MINISTER FOR DEFENCE (SHRI SATISH CHANDRA):

(a) Seven.

(b) 3,031, 3,159, 4,965, 39,941, 3,044, 82 and 4,255, respectively.

(c) The number of ordnance factories working on 1st January 1954 was 20.

A statement is laid on the Table of the Council showing the number of workers employed in each ordnance factory. [See Appendix VII, Annexure No. 121.]

#### FINANCE ACCOUNTS OF STATES

187. DR. R. P. DUBE: Will the Minister for FINANCE be pleased to state:

(a) the names of Part A and Part B States whose Finance Accounts for 1950-51 and Audit Report thereon have not so far been issued by the Audit Department; and

(b) the names of Part A and Part B States whose Finance Accounts for the years prior to 1950-51 are overdue for issue by the Audit Department?

THE DEPUTY MINISTER FOR FINANCE (SHRI M. C. SHAH): (a) Part A States: (i) Punjab; and (ii) Bombay.

Part B States: (i) Hyderabad; (ii) Madhya Bharat; (iii) PEPSU; and (iv) Saurashtra.

(b) The Comptroller and Auditor-General became responsible for the Accounts of Part B States only from 1st April 1950 (13th April 1950 in case of PEPSU). As regards Part A States, only Punjab Finance Accounts have not been submitted.