

on the construction of institute and
Rs. 32,579]- on residential quarters.

Singareni Collieries

1000. Shri Eswara Reddy: Will the
Minister of Labour and Employment
be pleased to state:

(a) the amount at the credit of
housing account of Messrs Singareni
Collieries Company in the Coal
Mines Welfare Organisation as on
the 31st July, 1964;

(b) whether any claims have to be
paid; and

(c) if so, the main reasons for the
delay in settling the claims?

**The Deputy Minister in the Min-
istry of Labour and Employment
(Shri R. K. Malviya:** (a) The
estimated opening balance as on
1-4-1964 was Rs. 22.13 lakhs. Income
during 1964-65 is estimated at Rs.
8.48 lakhs.

(b) Yes.

(c) Certain defects have been
noticed in some of the houses which
have been constructed. As soon as
this matter is settled, arrangements
will be made for payment of the
outstanding claims.

12.18 hrs.

RE. MOTION FOR ADJOURNMENT (Query)

Mr. Speaker: Shri S. M. Banerjee.

**Shrimati Renu Chakravarty (Bar-
ackpore):** I have tabled an Adjourn-
ment Motion on a very important
matter regarding the colliery lock-
outs; three collieries have been lock-
ed out in the last few days; workers'
quarters have been burnt. I would
like to have some statement made
about this, but it has been disallow-
ed. I have got telegrams on Satur-
day.

Mr. Speaker: I have disallowed
that.

Shrimati Renu Chakravarty: It is
such an important matter; thousands
of workers have been locked out.

Mr. Speaker: It is important, but
there were reasons; I can discuss with
the hon. Member as to why I have
disallowed it.

Shri P. K. Deo (Kalahandi): I also
tabled a notice of an Adjournment
Motion to censure the Government
on their inaction or failure to take
note, in regard to the memorial sub-
mitted to the President about various
charges of corruption against Orissa
Ministers . . .

Mr. Speaker: Well, I have proceed-
ed to the Calling Attention Notice. I
have called the hon. Member, Shri
Banerjee.

12.19 hrs.

CALLING ATTENTION TO MATTER OF URGENT PUBLIC IMPORTANCE

NON-INCLUSION OF REVISION OF DEAR-
NESS ALLOWANCE FORMULA IN TERMS
OF REFERENCE OF ONE MAN INDEPEN-
DENT BODY FOR DEARNESS ALLOW-
ANCE

Shri S. M. Banerjee (Kanpur): I
call the attention of the Minister of
Finance to the following matter of
urgent public importance and I re-
quest that he may make a statement
thereon:

"The non-inclusion of revision
of Dearness Allowance formula
in the terms of reference of 'One
man Independent Body for Dear-
ness Allowance'."

**The Minister of Planning (Shri B.
R. Bhagat):** The dearness allowance
formula recommended by the Pay
Commission and accepted by Gov-
ernment envisages a review of the
rates by Government whenever the
average of the All India Consumer
Price Index during 12 months rises
by 10 points. The Commission did
not favour automatic linking of the
rates of dearness allowance to rise in

[Shri B. R. Bhagat]

cost of living and left it to Government to decide, on a consideration of all the relevant circumstances at the particular time, what the extent of neutralisation on each occasion should be.

2. On the eve of the strike by some Central Government employees in July, 1960, Government announced its decision to compensate the rise in the cost of living by a minimum of 50 per cent and, in the event of disagreement regarding the extent of further neutralisation, to refer the matter to an independent person. While re-affirming this decision in this House on the 8th August, 1960, the late Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant, the then Home Minister, made it clear that there was no question of turning down the basic recommendations of a high-powered body like the Pay Commission. But, he added, the Prime Minister was always prepared to consider matters within the framework of the recommendations of the Commission.

3. That this offer of impartial settlement related only to the quantum of compensation which the Commission had left to the Government to decide on each occasion and not also to the specific recommendations made by the Commission has been clear even from the representations made by the employees from time to time. The employees have not been satisfied with the substantially high neutralisation granted. They have been referring back to the assurances given by the Prime Minister and the Home Minister in 1960. In response to their demand, an Independent Body consisting of Shri S. K. Das has been constituted. The report and recommendation of this body will be given fullest consideration due to a body of this status. It is open to that Body to make relevant general observations on the basis of such facts and representations as may be placed before it. They will also receive proper consideration.

4. There have been hardly any developments during the last 4 or 5 years which would call for a review of the basic principles or formulae which a body of the standing of the Pay Commission recommended after the most careful investigation—after studying the views expressed before it by the employees and by experts in the line and the systems adopted in other countries. Government find it difficult to see how another review can be considered necessary.

Shri Nath Pai (Rajapur): On a point of language, Sir. I know I am not a signatory. But may I point out, he says "substantial neutralisation". If the English language has any meaning, neutralisation is either complete or there is no such thing. He perhaps wanted to say "mitigation". But the House should not be misled in this way by giving ideas which have no justification. Is there anything like substantial or partial neutralisation? Neutralisation is complete and total. May I know what he means thereby?

Shri B. R. Bhagat: The Commission recommended 50 per cent neutralisation, in certain cases. Subsequently at various points of time, when the Government increased the Dearness Allowance, neutralisation was to the tune of 70 to 75 per cent. That is what I call substantial neutralisation.

Shri Umanath (Pudukkottai): What is meant by neutralisation is the question.

Shri S. M. Banerjee (Kanpur): From the statement it appears that their difficulty in referring the question of the revision of Dearness Allowance formula is the specific recommendation of the Pay Commission. May I know whether it is a fact that the Pay Commission award has expired already on 1st July 1964, when five years were completed? As such, is he aware that until the 1st of this month, nearly 22 lakh Central Government employees have declared their utter boycott of the

new body which has been constituted, and no memoranda have been submitted? I want to know whether Government would like to have talks with the representatives once again and solve this deadlock and avert the impending unrest.

Shri B. R. Bhagat: It is precisely the reason that it is not a body which can go into the revision of the formula. If the formula is to be revised as against the quantum which has been referred to the body, then another Pay Commission with all the interests represented on it, will have to be set up. That is precisely one of the difficulties that it is only the quantum and not the basis of the formula that can be called into question at the present moment.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: Sir, I want to seek one clarification. The first part of my question was whether he is aware that the recommendations of the Pay Commission, which tantamount to an award—we say it is not an award—according to the late Prime Minister—were for five years and those five years have been completed? Is it the intention of the Government to appoint another Pay Commission and that is why they are not referring it to this Commission?

Shri B. R. Bhagat: On that there is no decision at present.

Some Hon. Members—rose—

Mr. Speaker: Shri Daji—he is not there.

Shri Prabhat Kar (Hooghly): This is a question which affects a large number of employees. This is a human problem and I think this technical difficulty should not stand in our way.

Mr. Speaker: Hon. Members will kindly appreciate my difficulty. If they want it to be further discussed they might give a separate notice in another form.

Shrimati Renu Chakravarty (Barrackpore): It is a very important question.

Mr. Speaker: I will help them if I can.

12.26 hrs.

RE. CALLING ATTENTION TO
MATTER OF URGENT PUBLIC
IMPORTANCE.

(Query)

Mr. Speaker: We will go to the next item—Papers to be laid on the Table.

Shri Hem Barua (Gauhati): Sir, before you go to the next item, I want to say that I had sent in a Calling Attention Notice about the re-appointment of Shri Biren Mitra as Chief Minister of Orissa because it is against the statement of the Prime Minister....

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. I would not allow that to be raised here now. I have already stopped two hon. Members from raising it. How can I allow him?

Shri Hem Barua: Sir, may I submit....

Mr. Speaker: Order, order.

Shri Hem Barua: Sir, I seek your protection.

Mr. Speaker: I seek my protection from the hon. Member.

Shri Hem Barua: Sir, I seek your guidance.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. He will kindly resume his seat. I have already disallowed two hon. Members. I do not want to make a departure from that procedure now.

Shri Hem Barua: My point is different. I seek your guidance.