Shri Sham Lal Saraf: May I know whether the Government is thinking of making it obligatory on the authorities or contractors to provide housing facilities for labour as is the case with regard to setting up of industries and plants?

Shri D. Sanjivayya: Yes, Sir; for instance, the Military Engineering Department and the Works and Housing Ministry have made it obligatory.

Shri Priya Gupta: In all such schemes in the past, just because of the lacuna that their money cannot be deducted under the Payment of Wages Act, the employees in the rauways could not share. The Labour Ministry has to modify that to enable them to share in such schemes. What is the intention of the government in this regard?

Shri D. Sanjivayya: Since we are contemplating legislation, all these will be kept in mind.

भी भ्रोंकार लाल बेरवा: क्या भ्रापके पास जो डिपार्टमेंटल मजदूर है, उन से भी कोई शिकायतें भ्राई हैं कि उनके लिए भी कोई क्वाटजं होने चाहियें ? योजना जो भ्रापने बनाई है वह कितने क्वाटजं के लिए बनाई है मौर कितने मजदूरों की शिकायतें भ्राई है?

Shri D. Sanjivayya: We have not received any complaints.

Shrimati Ramdulari Sinha: Maw I know whether any proposal for such housing accommodation on a cooperative basis has been examined?

Shri D. Sanjivayya: No. Sir.

Dr. Sarojini Mahishi: May I know how many projects each costing more than Rs. 25 crores have been started where there is no housing accommodation for the labourers?

Shri D. Sanjivayya: We have no information on that. The Irrigation and Power Ministry may be able to answer it.

Shri P. Venkatasubbalah: When the government formulate the scheme for providing housing facilities, may I know whether casual labour will be taken into consideration and, if so, what arrangements they are going to make for casual labour?

Shri D. Sanjivayya: Yes, Sir; casual labour also will be taken into consideration.

श्री तुलक्षीबास जायव : कितने प्रो-जबट्स हैं जहां वर्कनं के लिए क्वाटनं का प्रबन्ध नहीं किया गया है ?

Shri D. Sanjivayya; I have already made it clear that that information is not available.

Shri K. N. Pande: Has the Labour Ministry any programmes to look after the welfare of such workers in the projects?

Shri D. Sanjivayya: That is what I said. Regarding welfare and other facilities, we are thinking of legislation.

RE: QN. 584

Shri S. M. Banerjee: Question No. 584 may be taken up, Sir. It is very important.

Mr. Speaker: Unless the Minister asks for that, how can I agree? Next question.

## Jewellery Deposited with Indias Embassy in Rangoon

\*580. Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: Will the Minister of External Affairs be pleased to state:

- (a) whether it is a fact that when the Government of Burma expropriated Indian residents of that country last year, several Indians deposited their jewellery with the Indian embassy in Rangoon for reasons of security;
- (b) whether the Ministry submitted a complete list of depositors and their deposits to the Burmese Government;
- (c) whether as a result, the depositors are even today debarred from claiming their deposits; and

(d) if so, the measures being taken to restore the deposits to their owners?

Oral Answers

The Deputy Minister in the Ministry of External Affairs (Shri Dinesh Singh); (a) and (b). Yes, Sir.

(c) and (d). Out of 437 persons who deposited their jewellery with the Indian Embassy, 423 withdrew their jewellery. The remaining owners can claim their pewellery at any time.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: When these hapless refugees deposited their jewellery with the Embassy in Rangoon, was it obligatory on the part of the government to report this matter to the Burmese Government under international or any other law, and if not, why did they report it to the Burmese Government?

Shri Dinesh Singh: It was under an arrangement made between the Burmese Government and us that we reported all these details.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: Is it a fact that a large number of these hapless Indian refugees from Burma could not bring even their women's basic jewellery with them, those who aid not deposit this jewellery with the Indian Embassy Rangoon? in The others could not bring even their women's basic jewellery with them. If that is so, is it a fact that they were discriminated against, compared to the Pakistanis and the Chinese who were not so harshly treated?

Shri Dinesh Singh: I would not say there was any discrimination. The Burmese Government has laid down rules about taking out of their property, and they allowed practically no jewellery to be taken out.

Dr. L. M. Singhvi; May I know whether the Government is prepared to say that because these persons had deposited their jewellery with the Embassy of India, the Embassy was under an obligation to convey the reports to the Burmese Governarrangement ment as an had been made earlier with the Burmese Government? This was tantamount to saying that the Government disclaimed its moral responsibility between the depositors and the Embassy? Is it not more correct to say that the Government and the Embassy of India in Rangoon really wilfully departed from their proper moral responsibility in conveying these reports to the Burmese Government and then forcing depositors to withdraw their jewellery from the Embassy in order to save themselves from embarrassment?

Shri Dinesh Singh: No. Sir.

Shri R. S. Pandey: Apart from the jewellery deposited with the Embassy in Rangoon, may I know what happened to the property left in Rangoon and whether any compensation has been given to these people?

Mr. Speaker: This is about jewellery deposited.

Shri Nath Pal: Sir, the Minister in reply to Dr. Singhvi's question gave a simple 'No'. May I know whether the Government and its envoys do not regard that the embassies represent the sovereignty of India and part of that sovereignty means that any relation between the Indian citizens and the Embassies in confidence cannot be bartered away even under the provisions of the so-called agreement with the Burmese ernment? What is given in dence to the Embassy, we are under no obligation to convey to Burmese Government. When they agreed to do that, they diminished the sovereignty of the country. Is not the Embassy guilty of it? Is not the acquiescing by the Government in this connection, scuttling of the sovereignty of this country?

Shri Dinesh Singh: We bartered away no sovereignty. This was an arrangement which was made for the benefit of the people of Indian origin in Burma.

Shri Hari Vishon Kamath: Sir, I rise to a point of order. He said it was made for the benefit of the people of Indian origin. How? He must explain that.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. The hon. Minister said that it was in pursuance of an arrangement that had been made. But the hon. Members want to know, does not such an arrangement conflict with the sovereignty that every nation has to just have secrets between its citizens and the Embassy without disclosing them to the other Government?

Shri Dinesh Singh: No, Sir; no sovereignty was violated. The people of Indian origin who had deposited their jewellery with us knew that we will give this information to the Burmese.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath; No. no.

Dr. M. S. Aney: How do you know that (Interruptions).

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. This is not the way.

Shri Dinesh Singh: That will be the only way they will be allowed to get out of Burma.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Members feel very much concerned about this fact, whether it was necessary for us to have such an agreement or whether without that agreement our citizens were free to deposit their jewellery and it was not incumbent on us or even not desirable that we should disclose that.

Shri Dinesh Singh: No, Sir, that is not the point. When they deposited this jewellery with us we discussed this matter with them and we said that we may have to give this information to the Burmese Government, and when we made the arrangement with the Burmese Government with the Burmese Government who did not want this information to be given to the Burmese Government was enabled to take away the jewellery. The whole point was, unless

we were able to settle this, the coming away of all people of Indian origin was blocked. So we had to come to this settlement to enable them to come back to India.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: That makes it worse. The Indian Embassy is meant to protect the Indian citizens seeking shelter....

Mr. Speaker: I have called Shri Hem Barua.

Shri Hem Barua: May I know whether initially the Indians were asked to deposit their jewellery with the Indian Embassy and after some time the Indian Embassy was asked not to accept the deposit of jewellery from these Indians? May I know whether this measure was taken by our Government because the Burmese Government ordered our Government not to accept any deposit of jewellery?

Shri Dineeh Singh: No Government can order the Indian Government. The point was that this was not helping the people of Indian origin in bringing their jewellery to India. So, depositing was no solution. What happened to all the jewellery? The whole idea was to enable them to bring it back, or dispose of it and bring the money back, as they wished. We could not keep on holding the jewellery without any purpose.

Shri Hem Barua; Sir, my question was specific, but he has not replied to that.

Mr. Speaker: He has answered it.

Shri Bhanu Prakash Singh: The hon. Deputy Minister has just now stated that it was for the bernefit of the Indian nationals. May I know what benefit the Indian nationals have derived so far because of this agreement?

Shri Dinesh Singh: Hundreds of thousands have been able to come to India

Shri Bhanu Prakash Singh: My question is in respect of the property deposited with our Embassy.

Mr. Speaker: That he has already answered.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: Will they lay a copy of the agreement on the Table? I suppose it is no secret document.

Mr. Speaker: The Question Hour is over.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: This must be clarified as to whether a copy of the agreement will be laid on the Table.

Mr. Speaker: Now, Papers to be laid on the Table. Shri Sanjivayya.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: Sir, would you not direct the Government to lay a copy of the agreement on the Table?

An hon. Member: The matter is over.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: The matter is not over.

## WRITTEN ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

Defence Establishments in Bangalore

\*579. Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: Will the Minister of Defence be pleased to state.

- (a) whether it is a fact that the cost of living index in Bangalore has gone up by 85 points between October, 1964 and June, 1965;
- (b) whether the 45,000 workers of Hindustan Aeronautics Ltd., Bharat Electronics Ltd. and Bharat Earthmovers Ltd. have for several years been demanding interim relief and house rent/city compensatory allowance;

- (c) whether it is a fact that the management of these undertakings is insisting that the Indian Telephones Industries Award giving interim relief in pay, house rent and city compensatory allowance be accepted;
- (d) whether workers employed in the Industries in Bangalore under the State Government get house rent allowance at rates much higher than the I.T.I. Award; and
- (e) if so, the action Government propose to take to settle the demands of the workers in these strategic industries when the prices are ruling so high?

The Minister of Defence Production in the Ministry of Defence (Shri A. M. Thomas): (a) According to Government of India series of Consumer Price Index Numbers for Industrial Workers with base year of 1960, the price index between October 1964 and June 1965 has increased from 131 to 135.

- (b) The total number of employees of Hindustan Aeronautics Ltd., Bangalore Division, Bharat Electronics Ltd., and Bharat Earthmovers Ltd., is about 30,000. The first demand for interim relief and house rent|city compensatory allowance was raised by them in October 1964.
- (c) To afford immediate relief to the workers, the managements of these undertakings have offered to grant interim relief and special accommodation allowance, on the lines of the I.T.I. Award of 29th February 1965. The interim relief and special accommodation allowance granted would be adjusted against the interim relief or the changes in wage structure accepted as a result of the recommendations of the Wage Board.
- (d) Yes, Sir; but the pay scales of the employees in the State Government undertakings are generally lower than those of the employees of Central Government undertakings.
- (e) The offer of the managements is a reasonable interim solution and