

The motion was adopted.

17.13 hrs.

Clause 52 was added to the Bill.

BHARAT PETROLEUM CORPORATION
LIMITED (DETERMINATION OF CONDI-
TIONS OF SERVICE OF EMPLOYEES
BILL)

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: There is no amendment to Clauses 53 to 68. The question is:

"That Clauses 53 to 68 stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

[English]

THE MINISTER OF STATE OF THE
MINISTRY OF PETROLEUM AND NATU-
RAL GAS (SHRI BRAHMA DUTT): I beg to
move:

Clauses 53 to 68 were added to the Bill

"That the Bill to empower the Central Government to determine the conditions of service of the officers and employees of Bharat Petroleum Corporation Limited and for matters connected therewith, be taken into consideration."

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Now the question is:

"That clause 1, the enacting formula and the Long Title stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted

Sir, before I go into the Bill, I would like to point out that a mistake has occurred in the Bill. In the statement of Objects and Reasons wherever the word "Tribunal" occurs may be read as "Court".

*Clause 1, the Enacting Formula and
Long Title were added to the Bill*

Sir, there is a historical background which calls for the necessity of bringing forward this Bill before this House. Prior to 1976, the Burmah Shell had two companies in India, namely, the Burmah Shell Refineries as well as its Marketing Organisation. Both were nationalised in 1976. Nationalisation was done under Burmah Shell Acquisition of India Act 1976. After the nationalisation of the company, the company has been able to enter into HPL with all the employees in accordance with the public norms except for a few categories, that is, pre-nationalisation clerical employees, employees of the Marketing Division of the Bombay Region, pre-nationalisation and post-nationalisation of the clerical and labour categories of the Refinery. While the pay of the employees of the pre-nationalisation with whom fresh settlement could not be arrived at, has been

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Minister may now move the Bill for passing.

SHRI J. VENGAL RAO: I beg to move;

"That the Bill be passed."

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The question

"That the Bill be passed."

The motion was adopted.

[Sh. Brahma Dutt]
protected, the company decided to pay only the public sector wages to the employees of the Refineries recruited after nationalisation. This was done with a view to maintain the uniformity in the Public sector wages. In the post nationalisation, the refinery workmen have not accepted this. Therefore, it was not possible to arrive at a new settlement. The proposal now is to lay down the terms and conditions of service of all employees of BPCL, pre-nationalisation as well as post-nationalisation. The intention is to lay down the terms so that they are in line with the public sector norms. It is also proposed that wages of the pre-nationalisation employees would be protected by making good the difference by grant of personal pay to them. Therefore, they will lose nothing.

With these words, Sir, I commend this Bill for consideration.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Motion moved:

"That the Bill to empower the Central Government to determine the conditions of service of the officers and employees of Bharat Petroleum Corporation Limited and for matters connected therewith, be taken into consideration."

Now, Shri B.B.Ramaiah may speak.

SHRI. B.B.RAMAI AH (Eluru): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, about the Bill on Burmah Shell as enacted by the Government of India in 1976, I do not know the reason as to why the Government took so long to bring it to the Parliament to enact this particular Act.

There is one more thing, about which I have some doubts. Along with Burma Shell, there are two more Refineries. One is Caltex and the other is Standard Vacuum Oil Company, and I do not know why you have

not mentioned anything about those two organisations. I do not know whether you do not have any problems with these two organisations.

As was put by the Hon. Minister there are two categories in Burma Shell Company—one is Burmah Shell Oil Refining Company Ltd. and the other is Burmah Shell Storage and Distribution Company. The Burmah Shell Oil Refining Company was taken over by the Government of India in 1976 and the shares were transferred in the name of the President of India. Now it has become one of the public sector organisations along with other categories.

This particular Company has got three categories of people—those whose services continued to be in the Government, those whose services were transferred to the Burmah Shell Refinery under the provision of 1976 Act and those recruited by the Bharat Petroleum after it became a Government Company. Out of these categories, the first category people did not agree to abide by the public sector wage policy. They wanted to continue to enjoy the emoluments and other conditions of service to which they were entitled under the aforesaid Company even after it became a Government Company.

I fully appreciate two points in this. One is the principle of equal pay for equal work and the other thing is the large public sector organisations of the same refineries are working under the same conditions and their wage structure is comparable to that of those newly recruited people in the Burmah Shell. If they have to put in a substantial amount of additional financial burden on the Government, they won't implement the old Burmah Shell wage structure. That is why it is a basic issue which we have to consider very carefully in the interests of the Company in the long run and also of the country and the type of people that are working. It is very difficult

to implement the old Burmah Shell wage structure for the entire new organisation which is growing fast on a large scale, both refining and distribution. In view of this, I full support the Government proposal contained in the Bill.

Sir, this subject pertains to Petroleum Minister, who is also in charge of Oil and Natural Gas Operations. There are huge resources of oil and natural gas in Godavari and Krishna basin in Andhra Pradesh. In view of this, I only want to express that the Hon. Minister should try to do something more in Andhra Pradesh and try to create some opportunities for the people of that area and also have some sort of regular organisation in Andhra Pradesh. That is my personal request.

With these words, I thank you very much.

[Translation]

*SHRI JAGANNATH PATTHAIK (Kalahandi): Mr. Deputy Speaker Sir, I rise to support the Bharat Petroleum Corporation Limited (Determination of conditions of Service of Employees) Bill, 1988. Sir, Burmah Shell had two Companies in India prior to 1976. They were, (i) Burmah Shell Refineries Limited and (ii) Burmah Shell Oil Storage and Distributing Company of India Ltd. The former was exclusively concerned with the refining of Crude while the latter was concerned with the sale, supply and distribution of Petroleum products in the country.

Sir, these two undertakings of Burmah Shell were acquired by the Central Government in 1976. Then all the shares of Burmah Shell Refineries were transferred to a Government Company. The name of that Company is Bharat Petroleum Corporation Lim-

ited. From 1977 it was called Bharat Petroleum in short.

The Bharat Petroleum Company now has three categories of employees. They are as follow:

The first category of employees are those, who continued to serve on that company even after it became a Government company, the second category of employees are the employees of Burmah Shell, whose services were transferred to Burmah Shell Refinery under the provisions on the 1976 Act and the third category of employees are the employees recruited by Bharat Petroleum after it became a Government Company.

Sir, the employees of the first categories have been enjoying certain facilities much before the taking over of the Burmah Shell Refineries and the Burmah Shell Oil Storage and Distributing Companies on which they were working. Therefore, they have not agreed to abide by the Public sector wage policy. If they are allowed to work under the same service conditions as they are opting, there will be a great disparity in the payment of wages between them and the employees working in other public sector companies. Therefore, the Government has brought forward this Bill with a view to remove those disparities. The Government wants that equal wages should be given to each category of employees working in different public sector undertakings. Moreover, the Bill also seeks to regulate the emoluments and other conditions of service of the third category of employees, who are now working under Bharat Petroleum. As you know, Sir, our Government always gives top priority to protecting the interest of the workers. Our Government wants that all the basic facilities should be provided to the

*Translation of the speech originally delivered in Oriya.

[Sh. Jagannath Pattnaik]
workers. The main intention of this Bill is to give legal protection to the workers as well as the employees of the Bharat Petroleum. The necessary help is to be extended according to the provisions of the Constitution. Sir, you know about the performance of different public sector companies. Our Government does not want that injustice is done to the workers of any public sector unit. Therefore, those who believe in socialism, will certainly appreciate this Bill. Those, who believe in the growth of Public sector they will certainly welcome this Bill. This is a progressive piece of legislation. So, it should get the whole-hearted support from all sections of the House.

Then Sir, our Government has given assurance to the public in general and the workers in particulars to allow workers participation in Management. So, it is necessary to protect the interest of the workers before allowing them to participate in the management. As provisions have been made in this Bill to protect the interest of the workers, this will certainly lead in the direction of workers participation in management. So we are going to keep the promise made to the workers in this regard. It is necessary to give due respect to the dignity of labour and this Bill is a step on that direction.

Sir, one more thing I would like to say about the employees as well the workers of different public sector undertakings and corporations. As I have said earlier it is very necessary to provide basic necessities like housing, health care and other facilities to the workers. But as you know Sir, there are some bureaucrats, who are also working on those companies. They are at the top of the administration. You know their attitude towards the employees as well as the workers. They do not think of the welfare of the employees working under them. Despite Government's guidelines, the Bureaucrats towards the workers is not being changed.

They do not give importance to the call of the day. It is really a matter of great concern that the workers are being neglected by the bureaucrats in almost all the corporations. Therefore the workers are not being properly inspired to work wholeheartedly for those companies or Corporations. This has an adverse impact on the production and performance of different public sector companies. So, the attitude of the bureaucrats towards the employees as well the workers should be changed.

The employees working in Steel plant, Cement Plant, Petroleum industries and other factories are exposed to serious health hazards as most of these units are polluted. The poor workers are the victims of some dreaded diseases. So, they must be given adequate health care. They must be saved from untimely death. Because our Government wants that the workers are free from all kind of ailments. In the case of Bharat Petroleum Corporation also, it is very necessary that the conditions of service of the employees should be made comparable with the conditions of service prevalent in other public sector companies in accordance with Government of India's policy. Ours is a welfare State. But it is regrettable that the welfare measures supposed to be adopted in the public sectors have not been adopted in the public sectors units. I request the Government to pay proper attention to it. Sir, mention has been made about the problems of the workers engaged in the petroleum industry. They have got their unions who have taken up the issue at the Government level. I do not want to go into detail about their disputes. But, I would like to appeal to the Government to settle their disputes as far as possible. As they are working in a different environment and under different service conditions they have got some special problems. So, they have made some demands before the Government and their demands are justified and the problems are genuine. Therefore, I request the Gov-

ernment to attend to their problems without any further delay.

Lastly Sir, I thank you very much for giving me the opportunity to speak on this Bill. With these words, I once again support the Bill and conclude my speech.

[English]

SHRI THAMPAN THOMAS (Mavelikara): I have got a very different view about this Bill. I do not know how my friend from opposition supported this Bill because this seems to be in very bad taste in bringing this Bill.

When there is a court order which is in favour of the workers, to circumvent that, a Bill is introduced in this House. If we read the Statement of Objects and Reasons, we find that there is an award in favour of the workers to give wages on par with the workers who are working in the same company to the other also. Again, if the management files a case in the High Court against the award of the industrial tribunal and if no stay is given by the High Court, and then the Government brings a legislation having sovereign power in this House, to decide about a few workers in a particular company.

I would like to know how much money is spend for this purpose in the court and here. If you have paid to those workers to make them on par with the other workers who are working in the same company, it would have been less than the amount you are spending here. I would like to know how many workers are involved in it and how much money is already spent by management for this purpose and why a legislation in the supreme body of elected people in this House is brought about.

PROF. N.G.RANGA(Guntur): Is it in favour of the workers?

SHRI THAMPAN THOMAS: It is not in favour. It is, as stated in the Statement of Objects and Reasons, to make them on par with other public sector and here will be a wage island and to prohibit that wage island, this law is brought.

First of all, I oppose bringing a legislation to circumvent a court's order.

Secondly, being a person representing the people and having known the basic principles of Indian democracy with an independence of judiciary, and independence of legislature and independence of executive and to circumvent the decision of the judiciary, if the Government brings such a Bill and laws, it is in a very bad taste.

It is taking away something from the worker. It is not giving to the worker. A British Company, a foreigner, who is employing people, could pay this much in his company and if you cannot pay that much, is it not ridiculous on your part? Why this happens? What is the wage of a worker? There is a feeling that a worker is getting very much. Are you ready to compare? I say in the United States, a scavenger gets 12 dollars per hour and if he works 10 hours, he will get 120 dollars. That means he can earn more than Rs.1,000/-

In China, the Government takes up the responsibility of the workers. They give them all the facilities to live.

In European countries, you find that 35% of the production costs go to the worker. The worker and management are considered as equal partners in the production apparatus. In that system, there is some sort of equality. If you consider the wage slab and wage system, you will find that 35 per cent of the production cost minimum is given to the worker. But here, it is only 10 per cent or 10-11 per cent. In a production cost, 10-11 per cent is what is given to the partner. What I

[Sh. Thampan Thomas]
have studied in my basic degree of Economics is that even in the old theory or utopian theory the two things worker and labour are the equal partners in a production apparatus. How do we approach the problem? We approach the problem as follows: labour 10 per cent and 90 per cent to other things. This policy reveals that the Government is not having a national wage policy on this.

Sir, the Hon. Minister has moved this Bill. I would like to say that the Cochin Oil Refinery is under the control of the Hon. Minister. From the speech which the Hon. Minister has made and from the notes that have been given to us, what he wants to say is that to remove the disparity he is bringing forward this Bill. May I ask about his own institutions which are under his control? Sir, the Cochin Oil Refinery—has not given the interim relief to the workers. In the next compound, there is the FACT—Fertilisers and Chemicals Travancore Ltd. That company is situated in the next compound. They are giving the wages. On the other hand, there is IRE. Therefore, if you take an industrial belt you will see that industries are discriminated in between; workers and discriminated in between and then the workers working in a factory are discriminated in between. When you go into the details of the Bill you will find what the Government wants. I would like to draw your attention to Section 3(1). It reads like this:

“Where the Central Government is satisfied that for the purpose of making the conditions of service of the officers and employees of the Corporation comparable with the conditions of service of the officers and employees of other public sector companies, it is necessary to do so, it may, notwithstanding anything contained in the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 or any other law or any agreement, settlement,

award or other instrument for the time being in force, and notwithstanding any judgment, decree or order of any court, tribunal or other authority, frame one or more schemes for the purpose of determination of the conditions of service of the officers and employees of the Corporation.”

What is the meaning? The meaning is that notwithstanding court decree, notwithstanding what is said in the Industrial Disputes Act, notwithstanding what is said in the Constitution, notwithstanding what is the common practice of this country, frame one or more schemes. Because, they have this vast majority and they are bringing forward such a Bill, after curtailing, curbing or taking away the rights of the workers. What is the fundamental principle of the Industrial Disputes Act? It is contained therein that the wages of a man cannot be reduced. That is the problem with which they are confronting. In 1947, when the Britishers were in power, they brought a law. The Industrial Disputes Act has not been passed after Independence. It has been passed prior to Independence. In that it has been provided that no wage which is given to a worker can be reduced. If I am paid Rs.10/- today, without my consent that amount of Rs.10/- cannot be reduced. The law is there. There is an Award by a Court. Now, we want to make it in another way and then say: “by a special scheme to retain as a personal thing for those workers for the time being”. My submission is that in view of these things the Government should look at things in the overall national wage structure of this country and the Government should bring forth a national wage policy by which the people are capable of living by which the workers can get their due share and by which the disparities and discriminations are avoided. Therefore, I feel that this Bill is not that much innocent as it looks and as it is spoken but its intention is much more deeper and in no way

I can agree to this approach.

PROF. N. G. RANGA (Guntur): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, I am thankful to Shri Thampan Thomas for having voiced about this peculiar provision in this Bill. I am sure it is not the intention of the Government to discriminate between one section of workers and another within the same ambit of State-ownership and State-Management to the detriment of the workers. I speak subject to correction by the Hon. Minister concerned. If what Mr. Thampan Thomas has held out now is really correct, then there is ample justification for us to feel very much agitated. I would like the Hon. Minister to consider one or two points in regard to this. I can understand their anxiety that there should be uniformity in payment on the basis of the judgement of their relative efficiency, qualifications and all the rest of it between one cadre of workers and another cadre of workers, between one cadre of officers and another cadre of officers. But so far as the present people are concerned, if by any chance the salary is to be reduced or the wage is to be reduced to the detriment of the people concerned when compared to others or when compared to their own present payment, it would stand to reason to argue that Government should have the wisdom to compensate these people, the present incumbents. So far as the people who would be recruited hereafter are concerned, certainly they can give effect to what they are proposing to do to achieve uniformity. If by any chance by imposing this principle of uniformity, any section of workers or officers is likely to be put at a disadvantage, then to that extent they should be compensated so that Government cannot be accused of doing any injustice. About people who are already in service, who are on work, who have been promised certain pay and who have looked upon it as something which is their due, I would like the Hon. Minister to consider this particular matter. It may be an expenditure of

a few lakhs of rupees over a few years, but it does not matter. The reputation of the Government for dealing with people in a just and equal manner would remain.

Secondly, I would like to lend my voice to what my Hon. friend, Mr. Ramaiah, has said, in regard to the future recruitment, especially of workers and also of officers. You remember, Sir, because of the neglect that was persisted in by the previous Government, by the British and later on by our own Administration, there was a lot of discontent and disaffection in Assam and the local people rose against it because not enough of their people were employed there. Therefore, I would like my Hon. friend to keep that in mind and see to it that, now that they are going to open a number of wells in Andhra in the Godavari and Krishna basins and also in Tamil Nadu in the Cauvery basin and also by the Bay of Bengal, special consideration is given to recruitment of personnel as liberally as possible from the local areas, so that the local people would feel that they are gaining something substantial and something deserving of their area. Otherwise, what would happen? The local people would begin to feel that their wealth is being taken away for the benefit of the whole of India and that they are getting nothing at all. You should not give them any scope for that kind of a grievance.

There were very many useful points that my hon. friend from Gujarat has made. They have all got to be given careful attention to by the Government, not merely by this Minister or Ministry, in regard to welfare services that have to be afforded to these people who are employed in these State-managed industries.

DR. DATTA SAMANT: Sir, this is a very important matter where my workers - I am the President of the Union had been fighting for the last twelve years. We had a strike, then the industrial court decision, then the High

[Dr. Datta Samant]

Court decision. We succeeded everywhere. But I oppose totally and condemn the attitude of this Government because whatever decision I got from the court, they are trying to nullify it, you are using the highest House of this country to teach a lesson to the workmen.

The second thing is whatever power are given by the Industrial Disputes Act and whatever decision the industrial court has given under Section 18(3), it is in my favour that workers who are drawing a particular salary that cannot be reduced and workers of one category should get one salary. But you are hampering that by bringing in this Amendment Bill.

The third thing is that the Bharat Petroleum management has gone to the Bombay High Court and the High Court has not given the stay. That is my favour. But again your management came to me and said: we will have interim settlement and whatever decision of the High Court will be, that will be binding on me." The Government has signed that. And that is a breach of the trust that you are making. I am making this statement. Whatever agreement you have signed in which you have mentioned that whatever decision of the Bombay High Court will be that will be acceptable, in order to nullify that, you have added this. It is really shameful. It says here: "Anything contained in the Industrial Disputes Act, which is by the Britishers; then any settlement, any award in continuation of that, and notwithstanding any judgment of the industrial court." Whatever I have done for the last twelve years you have just crushed everything by one stroke of this Amendment. This shows how you are against the workmen. I still appeal to the Government to withdraw this. The working class of this country will say that when we are fighting our battle legally, this Government has come suddenly to reduce the salary. You know by bringing this, my D.A. is in-

creasing with the old slab, every year by about Rs.100 or more. When you introduce the public sector D.A., that is 1.66 every year, that means, you give to the workers hundred rupees less. So long as workers are there, I shall be participating. That is the addition which you have made. You are not doing any great thing. You are introducing new wage scale for the Bharat Petroleum workers. I am happy that one way, my fight has made you to come to the Parliament.

This Burmah Shell is a foreign company doing very well. This company was taken over in 1976 and workers who were working prior to 1976 and workers recruited after 1976 they are drawing the minimum wage, they are not paid very well. On that basis, you forced us to accept this 1.66 DA which I did not. Therefore, you kept these workers starving for eight years. When I approached the Industrial Court, the court said whatever terms and conditions of service are existing, that must continue for all. As per Section 18(3), it is the object.

Then, this public sector unit or Maharashtra started telling me to accept the legal conditions when the Bombay High Court did not give stay order to them. Then this Bharat Petroleum entered into a settlement with me telling me that whatever decision of the court would be, that would be binding on me.

In the INTUC Union, some workers accepted the reduced benefit. This shows how they are working. But a few of them did not accept this reduced benefit as they belonged to my union. In order to curtail this benefit, you are doing all these things. Why are you doing it.

Another thing is that your profits are a few hundred crores of rupees. I don't know that. I want to know that figure. You have the capacity to pay. But the wage structure is not even two to three per cent. When there is a capacity to pay, you should pay that. Why

are you not paying? (*Interruptions*)

I am getting my salary and I am bound by certain conditions. They are in the settlement. But the court has said not to release it. This shows the attitude of the Government and the Congress Party that how you are anti-labour. It is for the first time that you are moving this. Whatever existing service conditions are there, whatever Industrial Disputes Act is there, whatever court decision is there, by bringing this amendment I am reducing all this. You say that this your policy regarding the labour class... (*Interruptions*)...In the public sector you have reduced the wage. My workers are drawing fairly high salary... (*Interruptions*)...I know your Union's way of working. The existing service pattern has been reduced; INTUC has done this sin. You want to continue that with the Datta Samant's union also by bringing this amendment. This shows how your party and the INTUC are working against the labour class.

There is the existing service conditions that you are going to implement. In Bombay all my other workers are drawing more than what you talking of paying by way of parity. The index has gone up. In the Bharat Petroleum the existing workers are not drawing more. You compare with something high. For you workers mean reduce the salary; that is your *Samajwad* ! When there is a capacity to pay more, when they are earning, you must pay more.

PROF. N.G.RANGA: Do you mean to say that all the hundred crores are being earned by you? It belongs to the whole nation.

DR. DATTA SAMANT: It is a highly skilled job with the computer operation. They are all trained people. They are doing such type of skilled work. Therefore I totally oppose this Bill.

Further I will appeal to the Government to withdraw this Bill. This is going to expose you. At least I will expose you in the Bombay labour class as to how this Government is acting anti-labour. Whatever may be the service conditions, whatever the agreement, whatever is the industrial court's decision and the High Court's decision; you have committed a breach of trust against the workers and against my settlement and the interim decision of the High Court is binding. Therefore, you have used such words as industrial courts, settlement, awards, anything will not be binding. I think this will show how this Government is behaving.

There are certain other units. The Government is fooling the workers. In public sector units DA is more. I am talking of Mazagon Dock, I am talking of Richardson and Cruñas. We are not responsible if they are running in losses. You are not giving work to them. You have given work to the Korean Company, their contractors are making money. So don't link that. The failure of the public sector is because of your administration and not because of workers.

I have got another four units in Bombay. There all my workers are getting similar DA. I am fighting the battle again. The High Courts have accepted my view and in certain cases the Supreme Court decisions are there. I am taking up this issue with the Labour Minister. In regard to Mazagon Dock, the Supreme Court Decision is there that the existing service conditions of the workmen cannot be reduced. You are acting against that. This shows that you are overpowering the Supreme Court's decision also. You want to reduce the existing service conditions and bring the workers to your fold. This Government is going to do that ! I am fighting the battle in all the Bombay Units against the reduction in DA and wage structure. I never allowed any employer to succeed. In all my cases the Supreme Court stood by me and given decisions that the existing structures

[Dr. Datta Samant]

cannot be reduced. There some of the units are losing and here you are making profit. Now this shows that the Government is creating the tradition of reduction in DA and bringing the conditions of the workers to a lower level.

This is an anti-labour Bill. This is a Bill by which the basic law of the Industrial Disputes Act which the Britishers have favoured is violated. Even if they were here ruling this country, they also would not have accepted it now. The decision of the industrial courts and whatever undertaking that you have given to the High Court are being crushed with this Bill. Therefore I oppose this bill tooth and nail. I appeal to this Government not to act anti-labour.

[*Translation*]

*SHRI R. JEEVARA-THINAM (Arakkonam): Hon. Deputy Speaker, Sir, I welcome the Bharat Petroleum (Determination of conditions of Service of Employees) Bill, 1988.

I support the provision which seeks to regularise the pay and service conditions of the employees of erstwhile Burmah Shell and Burmah Sell Refineries companies and the employees of the newly born Bharat Petroleum Company of the Government.

I would like to use this opportunity to speak a few words about my constituency.

Farmers in Arakkonam are badly affected because there is no rain for the past few years. Farmers have therefore to use diesel engines for irrigation purposes. Hon. Minister may kindly see that farmers get diesel in adequate quantity by setting up more diesel distribution centres.

The middle class people and others face serious hardship because non-availability of wood and kerosene for fuel. Kerosene is scarcely available in the market. Wood is not available because the forests are being destroyed. Therefore steps must be taken to sanction more LPG connection to the people in constituency. The number of LPG dealers must be increased in Arcot, Panipet, Wallajah and SIPCOT. At least 2 dealers must be there for every 50000 persons. More LPG connections must be sanctioned to people in Pallipet, Rkpet, Solinger and BHEL areas in my constituency. The Minister may kindly note that more than 3000 workers reside in Ranipet area alone. There are all demands from the Public. These demands must be agreed to without inordinate delay. I hope the Minister would do be needful.

I also request that while appointing gas and petrol dealers through selection committees 10% of the dealership should be reserved for freedom fighters, 10% for SC/STs, 10% for ex-servicemen and 10% for educated women should also be reserved in the total dealership quota.

Steps must also be taken to expedite the work at the oil and gas sites recently found in Tamil Nadu. Hon. Member Shri Rangaji rightly pointed out that the local population should be employed in these sites. But what actually happens is that we find only outsiders manning these sites. There is a kind of disgruntlement among the local people about this. Hon. Minister may kindly appreciate the need for appointing local people on priority basis in these sites.

I also request that further exploration must be undertaken to see whether oil and gas reserves are available and such an exploration should cover even forests and

mountains. Oil and gas may even be available in Paler River basin.

The Manali Refinery should be expanded and local people should be given preference in employment in this Refinery.

Adulterated petrol is being used in lorries and trucks. This causes air pollution which affects people with incurable diseases. Hon. Minister say kindly look into this.

Further while appointing dealers for gas and petrol, advertisements thereof should made in English and vernacular languages in all newspapers. The number of dealers in Vellore, Arcot, Ranipet, SIPCOT and Walajah should be increased. I also wrote a letter to the Minister an year ago. Hon. Minister is a freedom fighter. He is able Minister. I hope he would take necessary steps and to the needful.

With these words, I conclude.

SHRI HARISH RAWAT (Almora): Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, I want to say a few words because Shri Datta Samant has just said that the I.N.T.U.C. union has accepted the suggestions of Bharat Petroleum regarding its employees and they want to apply the same formula even in the case of workmen. Since last many years Shri Datta Samant has been advocating the cause of wage parity and uniformity of service conditions in the public sector undertakings. Bharat Petroleum is also such a public sector undertaking where there are three types of employees. The employees of the Burmah Refinery want to enjoy all those facilities which are admissible to the public sector employees. And now when the parity of their wages and emoluments with other employees which has been accepted by one section of the workers, is being discussed, Shri Datta Samant is feeling that we are trying to personally hurt him. He has not tried to see it underlying principles. If there are three

types of workers in a public sector undertaking and the question of a uniform wage structure for all of them is going to be discussed, he should have advocated that cause and prepared the people for the same. Instead of this, he is evading his responsibility and wants to do a wrong thing...(*Interruptions*)

Under what conditions the court gave a decision in your favour, is a separate issue but the way you are trying to hit the Government on the acceptable principles and the way you are trying to denounce the intentions of I.N.T.U.C. has prompted me to oppose it and to tell Shri Datta Samant that two different things can not go together. On the one hand he would say that there should be a uniform wage structure for the workers of the public sector and their service conditions should be the same but on the other hand, when the Government takes any step in that direction, he would oppose it because he wants to please a section of workers who support him and for the rights of whom he claim to have gone to the court. I feel that the way he has presented his point is totally undesirable. Whatever has been done by I.N.T.U.C. is in the broader interest of the workers. There should not be three different things for the workers, there cannot be three types of wage structure for them. There should be uniformity in it. He should have followed what ever has been done by the I.N.T.U.C. but instead of following it the way he is opposing it, is, in my view improper. I welcome this Bill which has been brought here by the Government.

[*English*]

SHRI CHINTAMANI JENA (Balasore): Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, I rise to support the Bill brought forward by the Hon. Minister of Petroleum. Before going to other points about this Bill, I would like to wholeheartedly and strongly contradict the points raised by the Hon. friends, Mr. Thomas and Dr. Datta

[Sh. Chintamani Jena]
Samant.

I was very attentively listening to both the Hon. Speakers, but I am really sorry that without going deep into the matter, that have only gone through the upper face of the Bill saying that you are curtailing the power. We have abolished the privy purse from the ex-rulers who were there when their States were merged with the regular States in the past. Similarly, when our country needed, we have done several amendments when the feudal states were abolished, the Rajas and Maharajas were abolished and at that time there was a system of giving them privy purse. But according to our Constitution, to suit our socialist pattern of society, we have abolished their privy purses.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Mr. Jena, you can continue tomorrow.

MESSAGES FROM RAJYA SABHA-
CONTD

17.59 hrs.

[English]

SECRETARY-GENERAL: Sir, I have to

report the following message received from the Secretary -General of Rajya Sabha:

"In accordance with the provisions of Rule 111 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in the Rajya Sabha, I am directed to enclose a copy of the Code of Criminal Procedure (Amendment) Bill, 1988, which has been passed by the Rajya Sabha at its sitting held on the 12th May, 1988."

CODE OF CRIMINAL PROCEDURE
(AMENDMENT) BILL AS PASSED
BY RAJYA SABHA

[English]

SECRETARY GENERAL: Sir, I lay on the Table the Code of Criminal Procedure (Amendment) Bill, 1988 as passed by Rajya Sabha.

18.00 hrs.

*The Lok Sabha then adjourned till Eleven
of the Clock on Friday, 13, 1988/Vaisakha
22, 1910(Saka)*