

who have been given allotments out-of-turn; the date of such allotments, and the specific grounds meriting such out-of-turn allotments to them?

The Minister of Works, Housing and Urban Development (Shri Mehr Chand Khanna): (a) Yes, these were surplus to the requirements of Members of Parliament.

(b) As these flats were meant for Members of Parliament, these have not been classified like other residential accommodation meant for Government servants. As such these have been allotted temporarily on ad-hoc basis.

(c) (i) 20.

(ii) and (iii). A statement is laid on the Table of the House. [Placed in Library. See No. LT-7417/66].

CORRECTION OF ANSWER TO U.S.Q. No. 2171, DATED 9-12-65 REGARDING SCHEDULED CASTES AND SCHEDULED TRIBES EMPLOYEES IN THE OFFICE OF ACCOUNTANT GENERAL, ORISSA, AT BHUBANESHWAR

The Deputy Minister in the Ministry of Finance (Shri L. N. Mishra): In reply to the Unstarred Question No. 2171, regarding the number of Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes employees in the office of Accountant General at Bhubaneswar, answered by the Finance Minister in the Lok Sabha on 9th December, 1965, certain figures were furnished, which have subsequently been found to be incorrect. It appears that in the figures furnished previously the Accountant General concerned had taken certain categories of employees twice over. I would, therefore, like to make the following correction in the information already furnished:—

Categories of staff	Information already furnished in reply to Question answered on 9-12-65	Correct information in reply to Question answered on 9-12-65
1	2	3
(a) Total No. of employees of all categories	1826	1173

1	2	3
(b) No of employees belonging to Scheduled Casts	114	109
No of employees belonging to Scheduled Tribes	26	23

12 hrs.

CALLING ATTENTION TO MATTER OF URGENT PUBLIC IMPORTANCE

PROPOSED STRIKE BY LIC EMPLOYEES ON 25TH NOVEMBER, 1966

Shri Indrajit Gupta (Calcutta—South West): Sir, I call the attention of the Minister of Finance to the following matter of urgent public importance and I request that he may make a statement thereon:—

“The proposed token strike by the employees of the Life Insurance Corporation on the 25th November, 1966.”

Shri S. M. Banerjee (Kanpur): Sir, I rise to a point of order.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: You do not want this to be admitted?

Shri S. M. Banerjee: Sir, kindly hear me. We are all Members, we are not astrologers.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: What is his point of order?

Shri S. M. Banerjee: Sir, my point of order is under Rule 376(2) which says:

“A point of order may be raised in relation to the business before the House at the moment.”

The business before the House at the moment is Calling Attention Notice.

Sir, may I invite your kind attention to the statement which has been supplied to us, the statement by the Finance Minister in reply to this Calling Attention Notice? May I invite

[Shri S. M. Banerjee]

your kind attention to page 2 of the statement where the hon. Minister has said:—

“The process of swifching over to computers is expected to take some three years.”

I do not want to refer to the whole thing.

“During this period, as a result of this switchover, 383 jobs would disappear but the very process of computerisation would create 225 new jobs. The net reduction in the number of jobs is therefore only 158, that is, about 50 per year.”

I may invite your kind attention to the various assurances given in this House by the hon. Minister when we raised the question of introduction of electronic computers in LIC saying that this will entail reduction in jobs and retrenchment. Assurances were given to us that there was not going to be any retrenchment or reduction in the number of jobs. Now, in the statement the hon. Minister has said that 50 jobs will be less every year. My point of order is that the Minister has misled the House previously and by this statement it has become clear that up to this time the Minister or his deputy or the Minister of State, Shri Bhagat, had been misleading the House throughout. I submit that this is a question of privilege and I want your ruling on this.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: There is no point of order at all. I am very sorry that Shri Banerjee is wasting the time of the House like this.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: You read the Directions by the Speaker.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Order, order. The Finance Minister.

श्री क० ना० तिवारी : (बगहा)
उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, यह स्टेटमेंट बहुत लम्बा है इसको टेबल आफ दी हाऊस पर रख दिया जाये।

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: He is replying to the calling-attention notice.

The Minister of Finance (Shri Sachindra Chaudhuri): I am entirely at the disposal of the House. If it is the desire of the House that I should place the statement on the Table, I shall do that. If, on the other hand, it is the desire that I should not do so, I shall read it.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: They are asking questions on it. You can read it.

Shri K. N. Tiwary: They can ask questions some time afterwards.

Shri Sachindra Chaudhuri: Sir, the All-India Insurance Employees' Association which is one of the Unions representing the Class III and Class IV employees of the Life Insurance Corporation of India, sent a copy of the Resolution adopted by the Working Committee of the Association at its meeting held at Bombay on September 13—15, 1966, and informed the L.I.C. of its decision to direct the L.I.C. employees to go on a day's token strike on Friday, November 25, 1966, as a protest against the introduction of Automation through installation and commissioning of Electronic Computers by the L.I.C.

Introduction of Electronic Computers is only a further step in the process of mechanisation which was started by the erstwhile Life Insurance Companies in the country long before the nationalisation of Life Insurance. A number of office jobs such as issuing of premium notices, premium accounting, commission settlement, compilation of valuation statistics, etc., had been mechanised with the help of punched-card machines. However, these have severe limitations which become more and more pronounced as the size of business increased. The L.I.C. has already reached a size where limitations of the punched-card machines are glaringly apparent and

these affect the efficiency of the administrative operations. It was, therefore, considered imperative to adopt a more advanced mechanised aid to administration than the out-of-date machines, namely installation of Electronic Computers. A Computer at Bombay was installed in November, 1965 and the other at Calcutta which has already been contracted for, is expected to be installed some time next year. The decision to instal the Computers was taken as early as 1964.

Following this decision of the L.I.C., the All-India Insurance Employees' Association mounted a campaign against the introduction of Computers. The main fear voiced against the use of Computers was that it would result in retrenchment or loss of remuneration to some. The L.I.C. has made it very widely known and also given unequivocal assurances to the employees that there would be no retrenchment or even a loss of remuneration to the employees. During the last two years, a large number of questions were asked by the hon. Members in this House as also in the other House and the Government also reiterated the assurances. In this connection, I would invite the attention of the hon. Members to the Starred Question No. 69 answered by my colleague in the Ministry as recently as 3rd November, 1966.

The process of switching over to computers is expected to take some three years. During this period, as a result of this switch-over, 383 jobs would disappear but the very process of computerisation would create 225 new jobs. The net reduction in the number of jobs is therefore only 158, i.e. about 50 per year. This is insignificant as compared to the 1500 or so new jobs created in the L.I.C. every year. None of the employees whose jobs have become redundant will be retrenched or even transferred out of the cities where they are working and they will be fitted in other jobs. This is the assurance given and it is there.

It is unfortunate that in spite of the very clear assurance given by the Corporation the All-India Insurance Employees' Association is still carrying on its campaign and in fact intensifying it. The L.I.C. on its part has been very keen to meet the representatives of the Association and to discuss the matter. During recent months, the L.I.C. invited the Association on five different occasions for discussions. The Association has not responded but has insisted that it would come for a discussion only if the scrapping of Automation was also included as a subject for discussion in the agenda for the meeting. This pre-condition, however, was not agreeable to the L.I.C. as computerisation was considered by the L.I.C. as absolutely essential in the interests of service to the policy-holders and for efficient functioning of the organisation.

Sir, as now the matter has once again been raised through this Calling Attention Motion by several of my hon. colleagues in this House, I would once again reiterate in clear terms that the introduction of Computers by the L.I.C. will, at no stage, result in any retrenchment of the existing staff of the L.I.C. and further that it would not result in any loss of remuneration to the employees.

With the growing volume of business, automation is the only means to ensure a reasonable standard of service to the policy-holders. As this House is aware, there have been complaints in the past from the policy-holders about the service rendered to them. The L.I.C. has been making every effort to improve the standard of service, but a stage has now been reached where substantial improvement could only be effected by mechanising the large number of processes involved. I appreciate that there could be legitimate fears that automation would lead to retrenchment, but these fears should be completely allayed by the repeated assurances which have been given by the L.I.C. and by Government in this House and outside.

[Shri Sachindra Chadhuri]

There may also be objections that automation would reduce the employment-potential of this Corporation. The figures which I have cited earlier would, however, indicate that this reduction is so small as to be of no significance at all. As I have stated, while the L.I.C. offers 1500 new appointments every year, the total effect of computerisation which is now contemplated would be to reduce 158 jobs in three years. From the point of view of employment-potential, therefore, computerisation has no significant effect.

Shri Indrajit Gupta: Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, this is a very exhaustive statement and there are some points in it which require further clarification. So, I would just ask a question with two inter-connected parts. It is rather a complicated question if you don't mind.

My first question is this. There is reference in two places in this statement to the fact that this need for computers is motivated by the growing size, the bigness of the L.I.C. operations. May I know from him whether it is not a fact that the total number of policies at present with the L.I.C. is roughly 1,20,00,000 whereas the policies only in Calcutta and Bombay offices, where the computers are to be installed, number only 20 lakhs, that is, one-sixth of the total number? Therefore, I would like to know how the installation of computers in these two places answers his argument about meeting the needs of bigness or the growing size of the L.I.C. operations. Secondly, with regard to these processes which he has mentioned here, such as, issuing of premium notices, premium accounting, commission settlement, compilation of valuation statistics, etc., is it not a fact that with computers all these processes will be done on magnetic tape and, therefore, all the staff required for these processes at present will be rendered surplus and, if so, how many branch offices in Calcutta and Bombay

will become redundant as a result thereof?

Shri Sachindra Chaudhuri: So far as the first part of the question is concerned, I have not got the figures readily with me. But, for argument sake, I will accept the figures of Mr. Indrajit Gupta. Having done that, what I have said is this that this is necessary having regard to the enlargement of the scope of activities of the L.I.C., the progress that is being made and the desire that there should be more insurance available. We are taking steps for the purpose of seeing that whoever is the policy-holder, whether it is a new policy-holder or an old-established policy-holder, is properly served. Calcutta and Bombay are two sectors and between two of them, they have got 20 lakh policies accepting the figure that my friend Mr. Indrajit Gupta has given. Today, it is 20 lakhs but that does not mean that it will be 20 lakhs next year or in two years time. Therefore, this is a step which is taken, firstly, to give better service to the existing people and also better service to those who come later on.

So far as the question of recording by tape and so on is concerned, I am not so mechanical-minded as my hon. friend assumes that it is so. Even assuming that, the assurance is being given that there will not be any retrenchment. The question will arise only when we try to dispose of any worker of the Life Insurance Corporation and before that, I do not see why this question is being raised.

Shri Indrajit Gupta: Will they become redundant or not? Will he keep them idle?

Shri Sachindra Chaudhuri: No; they will not be kept idle because of the simple reason that I am expecting that there will be development. As I said, the potential of jobs becoming redundant is 158 in three years. You may have a quarrel about that, but I am not in a position to tell you on what basis he is wrong or I am right.

The second thing is this. So far as the potential of employment is concerned, I have said that it is going to be 1500 per annum. If there is any redundancy in any particular case, that will be absorbed.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy (Kendrapara): There will be no retrenchment?

Shri Sachindra Chaudhuri: There will be no retrenchment whatsoever. I have said that over and over again.

Dr. Ranen Sen (Calcutta East): In the statement on page 3, the hon. Finance Minister has said:

"The Association has not responded but has insisted that it would come for a discussion only if the scrapping of automation was also included as a subject for discussion in the agenda for the meeting."

These employees everywhere have got an experience from the experience of the employees of Caltex Petroleum Company. There similarly a few years before when automation was introduced, the Company gave a similar assurance that no person would be rendered surplus, but within a couple of years or three years, a large number of employees were rendered surplus. When these employees wanted a discussion on this specific question, the authorities of the Caltex Petroleum Company and other Petroleum Companies refused to discuss this particular point. In view of this experience which has been gathered by the L.I.C. employees also, what prevents the Government, if it is definite that there will be no surplus created through the introduction of automation, from sitting with the employees' representatives and discussing this point also along with the other points that arose out of the whole situation?

Shri Sachindra Chaudhuri: The matter of introducing computers is a matter of policy decision. Wherever it is a question of affecting the lives

of the employees, we have always been ready for a personal discussion, but the matter, whether we should or should not use computers, is a matter for the Government or the L.I.C., in this particular instance, to decide.

Shri Umanath (Pudukkottai): In the model agreement arrived at the the Tripartite Meeting in 1958 on rationalisation, automation, reorganization, etc., it is clearly stipulated that before any company brings in any scheme of automation or rationalisation, they must give notice to the other side and after mutual discussion, it can be implemented only if there is mutual agreement; otherwise, it must have the process of adjudication, arbitration, etc., before it can be implemented. Now in the LIC this process of giving notice, discussion and mutual agreement has not been gone through by the Corporation before executing it. They have violated this. In view of this early violation of the decision of the Tripartite Meeting by the Life Insurance Corporation, I would like to know from the Minister what is the objection of the Government to call a tripartite meeting of themselves, the Corporation representatives and the LIC employees' representatives on whose agenda there can be the question of examining this *de novo* as well as keeping in abeyance all schemes pending discussion. What is the objection of the Government to have a tripartite meeting? I would like to know this.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: He has already answered this question.

Shri Umanath: No.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: This question has been answered already.

Shri Sachindra Chaudhuri: I shall answer it again.

Shri Umanath: About the tripartite meeting.

Shri Sachindra Chaudhuri: Yes, about the tripartite meeting. Actually, there has been a discussion. I

[Shri Sachindra Chaudhuri]

find from the paper that has been passed on to me that in July, 1966 there has been a tripartite discussion on this matter.

Shri Umanath: No. The decision was taken in 1964 and the talks took place in 1966. But the point is that there must have been prior consultations before implementation.

Shri Sachindra Chaudhuri: Whatever that position may be, there has been discussion now. If there has been any breach of any agreement, that is a matter which can be considered in the discussion that is going to take place with them and which we have offered. If there is any breach of any agreement, that can be discussed. But the only thing that we have ruled out is the discussion as to whether computers should be put in or should not be put in.

Shri Umanath: Why? Why should it be ruled out? They had not consulted earlier. Let him give us the reasons why it should be ruled out.

Shri Sachindra Chaudhuri: I have given the reasons already.

Shri Umanath: The agreement must be applicable to all and not only to the employees. He does not give the reasons at all.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: 40,000 men are going on strike.

Shri Priya Gupta (Katihar): On a point of order....

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: There is no point of order. I am not allowing any point of order.

Shri Kapur Singh (Ludhiana): You can disallow it but you should hear the point of order first. (*Interruptions*).

Shri Ranga (Chittoor): What is this? What is the Chair supposed to be here for? Is the Chair to keep order or not? If it has to keep

order, then it should hear the point of order....

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: If half a dozen people speak simultaneously I cannot tolerate it.

Shri Ranga: If the Speaker or the Chair is to keep order, then if a point of order is raised it has got to be allowed. Are you going to say 'No, I am not going to allow the point of order.'? What is this thing that is going on? You have no right to say that there is no point of order.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Shri Ranga might sit down.

Shri Ranga: What do you mean by 'Sit down'? First of all, you have to behave yourself properly. Why do you say 'I am not going to allow the point of order'? You have to allow it.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: My humble request to you is not to depart from the practice that we have been following. When a Member says that he wants to raise a point of order, you have to hear him first. After the Minister's reply only he has raised the point of order. Of course, you may say that there is no point of order, but you have to listen to him first.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The hon. Minister has not finished his reply yet.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: You may rule it out of order but you have to hear it first.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: How can you rule it out in advance? There can be a point of order really.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: This is the practice that we have been following here so far. Please do not depart from this practice.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Has the hon. Minister finished the answer?

Shri Ranga: Merely because you happen to occupy the Chair you cannot have arbitrary powers. You have got to abide by the convention of the House. When a point of order is raised you have got to listen to it.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Has the hon. Minister finished his answer?

Shri Sachindra Chaudhuri: I have practically finished my answer. But I shall yield to my hon. friend if he wishes to raise a point of order. I do not want to stand in the way of a point of order being raised.

Shri Priya Gupta: My point of order is this. The hon. Minister has just now said..

Some hon. Members: Under what rule? Under what rule?

Shri Priya Gupta: Under rule 376(2)... (Interruptions).

Some hon. Members: Under what rule?

Shri Umanath: The rule has been quoted already. (Interruptions).

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Order, order. We cannot go on in this manner. Hon. Members cannot convert this into a fish market. Let all hon. Members please keep quiet. I am hearing the point of order. Let other Members sit down.

Shri Priya Gupta: My point of order is this. The hon. Minister has said that he is going to have the tripartite meeting, but in the meeting he is not prepared to discuss the policy whether computers will be installed or not. My point of order is this. If this point is not allowed to be discussed, then what points will the tripartite conference discuss?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I am very sorry that there is no point of order. He has already said that it will be discussed at the tripartite meeting.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: I want to raise a point of order.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: There is no point of order. I have heard one already. Now, Shri Vasudevan Nair.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: I want to raise another point of order.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Hon. Members cannot go on like this. There is no point of order. One question has been put and the answer given. Now, I have called Shri Vasudevan Nair.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: On the same item I have another point of order. Kindly hear me.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I am sorry. There is no point of order.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: Do you disallow the point of order?

Shri Kapur Singh: May we respectfully submit that it will be in the best interests of the House if you listen to points of order?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I am sorry. We cannot go on from one point of order to another point of order all the time. We cannot go on like this.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: My point of order is only this.

Shri G. N. Dixit (Etawah): I have a point of order against this point of order.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I am not allowing any point of order.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: Then, there will be trouble in the House.

Shri Vasudevan Nair (Ambalazpuzha): There is a wide disparity between the figures mentioned by the hon. Minister and the figures given by the All India Insurance Employees' Association. The All-

[Shri Vasudevan Nair]

India Insurance Employees' Association maintain on firm grounds with their own arguments that ultimately computerisation will make 30,000 out of 40,000 employees redundant. That is their claim. It is a very serious matter.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: He has given the figures already.

Shri Vasudevan Nair: But when a body of people who know the thing claim that the figure will be 30,000 out of 40,000 we have to take it seriously. We cannot just believe the Government and get away from this. They maintain that the present arrangement can be improved and efficiency can be maintained without resorting to this large-scale computerisation which will make people redundant on a large scale. On the basis of these facts which have been given by the life insurance employees, I should like to know from Government whether they are prepared to sit with the representatives of these employees and if necessary, with other representatives of the people, and discuss the entire matter again on a fresh basis and arrive at a new settlement because this is a serious matter and it may throw out tens of thousands of employees from their jobs.

Shri Sachindra Chaudhuri: I do not accept the facts which have been put forward. As I have said, there may be difference of opinion. But I doubt very much whether there can be that wide discrepancy between the figures.

Shri Vasudevan Nair: When there is such a big difference, and there is a difference of opinion, talks should take place and discussion should take place.

Shri Sachindra Chaudhuri: I have hardly finished my answer. Let me finish my answer. If he does not

want to hear the answer I shall be happy to sit down. What I am saying is this. I do not accept the disparity which has been posed by Shri Vasudevan Nair through the information which he has got. What I have said is this that I am always prepared, and when I say 'I' I mean the LIC; the LIC is prepared to meet representatives of the employees provided they come in to put their points of view without going into the question whether computers should or should not be installed.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: Why?

Shri Sachindra Chaudhuri: I have not finished my answer yet.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: The whole thing has got to be examined.

Shri Sachindra Chaudhuri: As regard that question, it has been settled and we have given the assurance that there will not be any retrenchment or any reduction or any diminution in remuneration. It is not possible for administrative reasons to grant the proposition that has been put forward by Shri Vasudevan Nair.

Shri Dinen Bhattacharya (Serampore): He is trying to mislead the House. The decision was taken in 1964 but there have been no consultations.

Dr. Ranen Sen: Why are Government so shaky about calling such a conference where the introduction of automation can be discussed?

Shri P. Kunhan (Palghat): Government had given an assurance on the floor of the House that there would be no retrenchment. Just now also, the hon. Minister has stated that there will be no retrenchment in the LIC office. If so, may I know why Government failed to take any measures against the foreign oil companies where voluntary retrenchment has taken place?

Shri Sachindra Chaudhuri: That question is entirely unrelated to what is being discussed in the House. Secondly, there are laws in this country which permit Government to interfere or not to interfere. Unfortunately, the laws of the country do not permit the Government to interfere when private companies retrench their men.

would also like Shri Banerjee to go with me. But I certainly will not go into the question whether the computers should or should not be installed.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: Why not?

Some hon. Members: Why should he not?

Shri S. M. Banerjee: Kindly allow a discussion on this. This is arbitrary. People will break the machinery—I can tell you (*Interruptions*).

Shri S. M. Banerjee: The LIC employees' association which is an all-India association wanted to discuss this matter with the LIC, and they wanted that this entire question should be discussed *de novo*. But the LIC is prepared to discuss the consequences flowing out of automation only. May I invite the kind attention of the hon. Minister to the speech which he made here on the 30th April, 1966, while replying to the debate on the Finance Bill, wherein he had said:

"I may tell my hon. friend Shri S. M. Banerjee, as I told him in private, that I shall myself go and see these computers."

I got a letter from him also that he was prepared to go to Bombay in the month of July to see the computer so that we could see it jointly. I would like to know why the hon. Minister could not go to Bombay or anywhere else to see the computers and why he did not invite the representatives of the Federation. He invited me all right, and I had got the letter. What has made him cancel his programme? Is it because it has been decided with the American monopolists that the computers will be there at the cost of LIC Jobs? I want to know why did he not go and whether he is prepared to go now and to discuss the entire question *de novo*.

Shri Sachindra Chaudhuri: So far as I am concerned, it is perfectly true that I had told my hon. friend, Shri S. M. Banerjee, that I would like to go. I would still like to, and I

श्री मधु लिमये (मुंभेर) : 25 तारीख को जो हड़ताल होने जा रही है उस में तृतीय वर्ग के लोग इसलिए हड़ताल कर रहे हैं कि स्वयं चालित यंत्रों का इस्तेमाल किया जा रहा है जिससे बेरोजगारी बढ़ेगी। क्लास दो के जो अफसर या कर्मचारी हैं वे भी इस में हिस्सा ले रहे हैं क्योंकि उनका भी कुछ मांगें हैं। जैसे अभी अभी सुप्रीम कोर्ट का फैसला हुआ है। हिन्दुस्तान एंटी-बायोटेक्स के केस में कि जो सार्वजनिक क्षेत्र में काम करने वाले कर्मचारी हैं जैसे ये बीमा आयोग के कर्मचारी उनको सरकारी नौकर या मित्रिल सर्वेंटस नहीं मानना चाहिए और जो मल्य निर्देशक होता है उसके साथ उनका महंगाई भत्ता जोड़ना चाहिए। दूसरे वर्ग की जो मांगें हैं और ये तीसरे वर्ग और चौथे वर्ग की जो मांगें हैं, क्या उनके बारे में नए सिरे से विचार करने के लिए सरकार कोई विदलीय समिति का आयोजन करेगी जिस के सामने ये सारे सवाल रखे जायें ?

Shri Sachindra Chaudhuri: I have already answered this question. The question is in two parts. There is going to be or there is threatened to be a strike on the 25th November....

Shri S. M. Banerjee: There is going to be.

Shri Sachindra Chaudhuri: I still hope that the employees of LIC will see that no useful purpose will be served by this strike. But supposing

[Shri Sachindra Chaudhuri]

they go on strike, the strike will be on the question of whether there should be automation or not. On that, I have given the answer.

As to the other part, as to what are going to be the emoluments and conditions of service of class II officers, that is a matter entirely separate from the subject matter of the call attention notice.

श्री मधु लिमये : नो । आप कालिग एटेशन पढ़ लीजिये ।

मेरा एक प्वाइंट आफ ऑर्डर है ।

Shri Sachindra Chaudhuri: In any event, so far as they are concerned, I have never said that there will not be discussion or there will not be understanding between the two parties. A tripartite conference is hardly necessary, because let us have a bi-partite first and see what the result of that is.

Dr. Saradish Roy (Katwa): During the last three years, the number of new recruits has been reduced by about 50 per cent. Has this got any relation to the introduction of computer machines in LIC, though the number of new policies has been increasing during the same period?

Shri Sachindra Chaudhuri: Computers have, as I have said, been thought of for some time. Therefore, it has relation to the general growth of business in LIC and the efficiency of LIC. It is not related only to any particular incident or any particular year.

Dr. Saradish Roy: Why has the new recruitment decreased so much? has it anything to do with the introduction of computerisation?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Has reduction in the labour force anything to do with the introduction of computers?

Shri Sachindra Chaudhuri: It has nothing to do with the introduction of computers.

Dr. Saradish Roy: In the past three years, new recruitment has decreased by 50 per cent.

Shri Bade (Khargone): Is it not a fact that in 1958 there was a tripartite meeting and it was decided—there was a moral agreement—that anything like introduction of computers or automation will be considered or will be done only after consulting the employees? Then in 1964 the LIC introduced it without consulting the employees. So, that is the main point in the notice.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Was there any such thing?

Shri Bade: What I want to know is this. According to the Prime Minister there should be swadeshi, that man will be more important than mechanisation in the Congress regime. So, will Government reconsider this, call the employees, and see that this grievance of theirs is removed?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Only the first question will be answered.

Shri Sachindra Chaudhuri: I want notice for that. I have not got the report of the tripartite conference before me.

Shri Bade: We could not hear the reply.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: You combine three questions. I have asked him to answer only the first question. He can take other opportunities.

Shri Bade: Can he not repeat the answer?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: You wanted to know whether there was any such agreement. He says that he does not know of any such agreement.

Shri Sachindra Chaudhuri: What I did say was slightly different. I will have to have notice of it to see

the report of the 1958 tripartite agreement.

Shri Umanath: What is this Government presided over the 1958 conference, and he says he does not know. What are the Ministers here for, I do not understand. They do not know their own decisions.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: We could have computers instead of these Cabinet Ministers.

श्री कशी राम गुप्त (अलवर) : अभी अभी मंत्री महोदय ने बताया है कि हर वर्ष पन्द्रह सी आदमी काम में लिये जाते हैं और इन कंप्यूटर्स की वजह से प्रतिवर्ष पचास आदमी घटेंगे। मैं जानना चाहता हूँ कि यदि ये कंप्यूटर मशीनें न होतीं तो कितने आदमी प्रतिवर्ष अधिक लगते? साथ ही यह भी जानकारी मैं चाहता हूँ कि क्या यह जो फैसला लिया गया है यह केवल एल० आई० सी० ने मंत्री महोदय के आदेश पर ले लिया है अथवा यह नीति के आधार पर लिया गया है? क्या मंत्रिमंडल में भी इस पर विचार किया गया था? मैं यह इस लिए पूछ रहा हूँ कि यह प्रश्न सारे देश के लोगों का है और सारे देश में लोग बेरोजगार होंगे, उनका है। इसलिए, मैं जानना चाहता हूँ कि पन्द्रह सी से कितने आदमी ज्यादा लाने और उस नीति को क्यों नहीं अपनाया गया है?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: If there were no computers, how many people would be recruited? You said 1,500.

Shri Sachindra Chaudhuri: Even with the computers, 1,500 will be recruited. If the computers were not there, I cannot say whether more than 1,500 would or would not be recruited.

Shri Kashi Ram Gupta: What does he say? I have not been able to follow.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: With the computers, 1,500 will be recruited.

Shri Kashi Ram Gupta: Without the computers, how many more would

be employed that he does not reply directly.

Shri Sachindra Chaudhuri: I will have to have notice of that question, I cannot answer off-hand.

Shri Umanath: You come prepared. Why are you Minister here?

Shri Kashi Ram Gupta: He has not replied.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: He wants notice.

श्री अशु लिमये : यह तात्कालिक प्रश्न नहीं है, यह ध्यानाकर्षण का प्रश्न है। इस में नोटिस की कोई बात नहीं है।

Shri Kashi Ram Gupta: The question is whether it was a Cabinet decision or the Minister's decision. There is no question of notice in that.

Shri Umanath: They are sleeping in the Cabinet.

Shri Dinen Bhattacharya: The computer that has been installed in Bombay has a capacity to serve 30 lakhs of policies, and the Minister has said that it will serve only 8 lakhs. What is the decision of the Government to do with the remaining unused capacity? The employees have got first-hand knowledge, they are not like the Ministers getting every report from the Secretaries; they say that out of 40,000 employees in the LIC, 30,000 will be declared surplus in a period of five years. Will the Government consider the suggestion put forward by the LIC employees to consider the issue *de novo* on the basis of the model agreement which is the accepted policy of the Government of India so far as labour relations are concerned? Is the Minister, even at this stage, today—tomorrow there is strike—today at least, at this hour, agreeable to give an assurance to the LIC people as well as Members of Parliament that he will consider the whole issue *de novo*, not only the issue of computers but how many will be made surplus? Will the Government give a simple assurance that there will be no retrenchment? Will he say whether

[Shri Dinen Bhattacharya]

automation is necessary or not in the LIC?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: He has given the answer.

Shri Sachindra Chaudhuri: No, Sir.

Shri Dinen Bhattacharya: The first part of the question has not been answered. That is 30 lakhs. He is now utilising eight lakhs. What will he do with the remaining idle capacity, unused capacity?

श्री हुकम चन्द कछवाय (देवास)

आज समाचारपत्रों में यह समाचार प्रकाशित हुआ है कि अमरीका में पंद्रह लाख डालर के स्वचालित यंत्र मंगाए जा रहे हैं। मैं यह जानना चाहता हूँ कि ये यंत्र कौन कौन से स्थान पर लगने वाले हैं और क्या उन को सरकार मंगवा रही है या गैर-सरकारी क्षेत्र में मंगवाया जा रहा है।

Shri Sachindra Chaudhuri: The decision is made by the LIC.

श्री हुकम चन्द कछवाय : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, क्या उत्तर दिया गया है ?

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय : उन्होंने कहा है कि एल० आई० सी० ने किया है।

श्री हुकम चन्द कछवाय : मैं ने यह प्रश्न पूछा है कि अमरीका से जो पंद्रह लाख डालर के यंत्र मंगवाए जा रहे हैं, वे कहाँ कहाँ लगने वाले हैं। क्या उनको एल० आई० सी० ने मंगवाया है ? इस का उत्तर दिया जाये।

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय : आर्डर, आर्डर।

Shri Umanath: At this rate we can have a computer in place of Mr. Sachindra Chaudhuri; it will be better.

श्री हुकम चन्द कछवाय : क्या यह कोई तरीका है कि प्रश्न का जवाब न दिया जाये ? आप उत्तर दिलवाइये कि वे यंत्र कहाँ कहाँ लगने वाले हैं। उन के पास लिस्ट रखी है।

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: * If you are not satisfied with the answer, there are other methods which you can adopt; you cannot go on like this.

Shri Bade: Quotations are called for; are they called for by the LIC?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: He said 'LIC'.

श्री हुकम चन्द कछवाय : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मेरे प्रश्न का उत्तर नहीं दिया गया है। आप मेरे प्रश्न का उत्तर दिलवाइये।

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Please sit down. If you continue like this I will have to ask you to go out.... (Interruptions.) You are tiring my patience.

Shri D. C. Sharma (Gurdaspur): From the statement made by the Minister it is clear that the decision about the installation of the electronic computers was taken in 1964 and it is being implemented now. It is also clear that against an input of 1500 employees per year, there will be displacement of only about 158 employees in three years which means that there would be no displacement. In view of this, I want to know which are the political parties—the Congress, Communists, Jan Sangh or other political parties which are pressuring these persons?

Shri Umanath: Why do you bring in the political parties?

Shri D. C. Sharma: During the last three months I have seen that behind every agitation there is some political party. That is why I am putting this question. I want to know which are the political parties—the Indian National Congress, the Communist Party, the Jan Sangh, the PSP or the SSP which are the parties that are pressuring the LIC union to embark on this....

Sri S. M. Banerjee: 40,000 men.

Shri D. C. Sharma: ...to embark on this token strike for which at least according to my commonsense there is no justification?

Shri Sachindra Chaudhuri: I have no information.

श्री प्रिय सुप्त : मिनिस्टर साहब ने इन दो तर्कों पर अपने केस को रखा है कि कम्पूटराइजेशन होने से एल० प्राई० सी० में न तो कोई रिट्रैचमेंट होगा और न कोई लास आफ एम्प्लुमेंटस होगा। रेलवेज में जब सिम्प्लीफिकेशन आफ एकाउंट्स हुआ, तो यह कहा गया था कि सरप्लस स्टाफ को एबजावर्ड किया जायेगा, उस को रिट्रैच नहीं किया जायेगा। लेकिन दो साल के बाद हर जोनल रेलवे में पांच सी से सात सी तक क्लर्क सरप्लस हो गए और 1 नवम्बर, 1963 को रेलवे मिनिस्ट्री ने फाइनली कह दिया कि जब काम नहीं है, तो सरप्लस लोगों के बारे में हमारी कोई जिम्मेदारी नहीं है। जब गवर्नमेंट के एक विंग अर्थात् रेलवे मंत्रालय में यह हालत है कि वादे के खिलाफ कार्यवाही की जाती है, तो क्या यह मंत्रालय भी ऐसा ही करेगा? दूसरा प्रश्न "रिट्रैचमेंट" शब्द की परिभाषा का है। श्री जगजीवन राम को खयाल होगा कि जब वह रेलवे मिनिस्टर थे, तो कोर्ट ने शिडयल्ड कास्टस और शिडयल्ड ट्राइब्स के बारे में यह फैसला दिया था कि एंपायटमेंट का मतलब प्रोमोशन ट हायर पोस्टस नहीं है।

Mr. Deputy-Speaker What is your question? Come to the question. We are not talking about Scheduled Castes now.

श्री प्रिय सुप्त : क्या इस मामले में रिट्रैचमेंट का मतलब सिर्फ एंपायटमेंटस ही है, या प्रोमोशन भी है? मिनिस्टर साहब कहते हैं कि कोई रिट्रैचमेंट नहीं होगा। क्या हम समझ लें कि रिट्रैचमेंट न होने का मतलब वह भी है कि एक क्लर्क के सर्विस में दाखिल होने के बाद उस के लिए मौजूदा प्रासिबेकम आफ प्रोमोशन टु हायर स्केल बने रहेंगे? 2204 (A) LSD-6.

अगर आटोमेटाइजेशन से एम्प्लोईज का हायर स्केल में प्रोमोशन का स्कोप कम हो जाता है, तो क्या मंत्री महोदय इस को भी रिट्रैचमेंट कहेंगे या नहीं? सर्विस में कई ग्रेड होते हैं : हायर स्केल, इंटरमीडिएट ग्रेड, लोअर ग्रेड और लोएस्ट ग्रेड। कभी कभी हायर ग्रेडज में भी आफिशल्स सरप्लस हो जाते हैं। क्या उन लोगों को लोअर या लोएस्ट में एबजावर्ड या आफसेट किया जायेगा और हायर ग्रेडज में बविध्य में जो वेंकेशीज होंगी, क्या वे हायर ग्रेडज के सरप्लस स्टाफ से "ईट अप" हो जायेंगी या उन में लोअर ग्रेड के उन लोगों को लिया जायेगा, जिन का प्रोमोशन ड्यू है ?

Shri Sachindra Chaudhuri: I do not understand whether there is any question at all. It is a statement or a speech.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: The question is this. The Minister says that there will be no retrenchment. He asks whether that includes that there will be no promotions also or promotions as usual will continue to be made in the LIC?

Shri Sachindra Chaudhuri: There would be no adverse effect on any of the employees.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Papers to be laid.

12.49 hrs.

RE: POINT OF ORDER

Shri Madhu Limaye (Monghyr): On a point of order.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Under what rule.

Shri Madhu Limaye: 376. It says:

"A point of order shall relate to the interpretation or enforcement of these rules or such Articles of the Constitution as regulate the