

in the Hindu, the eminent Prof. Dante Mathuranayagam, the WHO has admitted that their estimates of AIDS in Africa were not based on the WHO/CDC official definition, but were very 'rough case estimates' obtained by using estimated seropositivity for AIDS to predict number of cases. This procedure has no valid scientific basis.

The Indian Government may take up this matter with the WHO and the African countries involved.

1. A case definition must be formulated perhaps with advice from the CDC and the WHO.
2. Advanced diagnostic procedures must be made available in selected centres with emphasis on quality rather than quantity.
3. Laboratory testing should be done under ideal conditions e.g. prompt performance of tests, proper storage, serum samples etc to avoid false positivity.
4. Define the economics of testing all blood donors for AIDS. If not economically feasible, identify high risk groups for AIDS in Indian donors for exclusion.
5. A countrywide publicity campaign to warn against the use of improperly sterilised needles and syringes in hospitals, mass immunisation campaigns and private practice.
6. All the foreigners should be screened to exclude aids as already a foreigner reported to have aids in Sri Lanka has been deported.

[Translation]

- (viii) Need to consider the situation arising out of the total strike of the Government employees in Uttar Pradesh.

SHRI ARIF MOHAMMAD KHAN (Behraich) : Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, I

want to draw the attention of the House to the following matter under Rule 377.

It is provided under Article 355 of the Constitution that it shall be the duty of the Union to protect every State against internal disturbance.

In Uttar Pradesh, the 16 days old complete strike by the State employees has created a very serious situation there. On account of this strike, the work in offices, courts and hospitals has been completely paralysed. As the essential services have also been affected, the people are facing numerous difficulties. Though the State Government has declared this strike illegal, yet this declaration has made no effect on the striking employees. Presently, there is a Constitutional, administrative and economic crisis in the entire State.

Through this august House, I would urge the Union Government to examine whether within the Constitutional parameters, it has not become desirable to intervene immediately in this matter, and whether the administration has stopped working in consonance with the Constitutional provisions and has not a situation arisen, mentioned in Article 356 of the Constitution ?

- (ix) Need to revise the pay scale of the University teachers in the country.

PROF. CHANDRA BHANU DEVI (Balua) : Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, I want to draw your attention to the following matter under Rule 377.

The reports regarding the demonstrations and 'dharnas' by the teachers of the Universities in Delhi and outside have been received. They have been demanding upward revision of their pay-scale for a long time. One of their demand, *inter alia*, is that their pay-scales which were fixed 13 years ago by the University Grants Commission should be revised. Even after a period of 13 years, their pay scales have not been restructured. The Government had assured that keeping in view the increasing prices and other matters, the

issue of revision of pay-scales will be considered every seven years. The report of the Malhotra Committee has also perhaps been received by the Government but even then the Government has not taken any final decision so far.

I would request the Education Minister to grant the revised pay-scales to the University teachers at the earliest.

12 20 hrs.

STATUTORY RESOLUTION RE :  
DISAPPROVAL OF COAL MINES  
NATIONALISATION LAWS (AMEND-  
MENT) ORDINANCE, 1986

AND

COAL MINES NATIONALISATION  
LAWS (ADMENDMENT) BILL, 1986-  
*contd.*

[English]

SHRI SRIBALLAV PANIGRAHI (Deogarh) : Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, I rise to support the Coal Mines Nationalisation Laws (Amendment) Bill, 1986 brought forward before the House by the hon. Minister for Energy. The Coal Mines Nationalisation Laws (Amendment) Bill refers to two Acts which are being amended i. e. (i) the Coking Coal Mines (Nationalisation) Act, 1972 and (ii) the Coal Mines (Nationalisation) Act, 1973. There is in fact nothing to oppose the amendments brought forward by the hon. Minister. The amendments only seek to clarify the intention of the Parliament keeping in view the judgement of different Courts including the Supreme Court Judgement in the Bhubaneswar Singh's case on payment of value of coal stocks lying in the mines at the time of nationalisation.

There has been some criticism from the other side of the House that the hon. Minister should not have come out with an Ordinance. They have not challenged nor opposed the contents of this amendment Bill. What they have opposed is the promulgation of the Ordinance and that has been made amply clear by the

hon. Minister that there was no way out other than coming out with an Ordinance since there was a directive given by the Supreme Court to enforce something which would have meant double payment to some of the coal mine owners and that would have been given effect to before the 17th October. Since the House was not in session. What else could have been done without resorting to promulgation of an Ordinance? In fact, there is nothing to oppose and that way also there is no opposition from either side of the House.

Also, while commending the Bill for consideration of the House, the hon. Minister has observed that everytime there is a Coal Bill in the House, the entire gamut of the Coal Industry is being discussed. I would say that the hon. Minister should not grudge a discussion on different aspects of the coal industry because the House rightly utilises the opportunity to discuss the different aspects and hon. Members give their valuable suggestions also as to how the working of the coal industry could be improved upon.

While supporting the Amendment Bill, I would like to ask why abundant precaution is not being taken by the Government, particularly by those who deal with the legal aspect of it at the time of drafting Bills. I am constrained to observe, I am pained to observe, that, since 1969, the Congress Government under the leadership of late Prime Minister Shrimati Indira Gandhi has brought forward so many progressive legislations like bank nationalisation, abolition of privy purses, etc., but on some plea or the other, on some pretext or the other, almost all the progressive laws have been challenged in different courts including the Supreme Court. In 1972-73 when the coal industry was being nationalised—it was in fact nationalised—Government should have been very careful at the time of drafting of these Bills—the Coking Coal Mines Nationalisation Bill, 1972 and also the Coal Mines Nationalisation Bill, 1973—so that there should not have been some loopholes provided or opportunity provided for the coal vested interests, that is, in this case the coal-mine owners, to agitate the matter in different courts, including