

**Surplus amount in Administration Account
No. 2 of EPF Organisation**

*627. SHRI K. LAKKAPPA :

SHRI S.T. QUADRI : Will the Minister of LABOUR be pleased to state :

(a) whether it is a fact that about Rs.57 crores are lying surplus in the Administration Account No. 2 of EPF Organisation collection for the services being rendered by the PF Employees ;

(b) whether it is also a fact that this huge amount was saved by way of non-sanction of staff for years together, non-providing proper office and residential accommodation to employees, curtailing minimum basic facilities and non-implementation of recommendations made by several Committees set up by Labour Ministry since 1968 to 1978 ; and

(c) if so, the reasons for not utilising this amount by Government on the welfare of the PF employees for whose services Government are collecting this money specially when Government insist on implementation of various awards for the private managements and insist for providing several facilities to the employees ?

THE DEPUTY MINISTER IN THE MINISTRY OF LABOUR (SHRI DHARAMVIR) The Employees Provident Fund Authorities have reported as under:—

(a) Account No. 2 operated by the Employees Provident Fund Organisation does not show such surplus.

(b) Staff are sanctioned accommodation and other facilities are provided according to prescribed norms, or in the absence of norms, as assessed. No committee was set up by the Ministry of Labour during the period from 1968 to 1978. Recommendations of the Sub Committee set up by the Central Board of Trustees during this period have been duly considered and those which were accepted have been implemented.

(c) Adequate amount is already being spent on the welfare of the Provident Fund Employees.

SHRI K. LAKKAPPA: This is an evasive answer given by the hon. Minister. My question has been framed based on facts. You can go through the reply given by him. Part (a) of the question that I have asked is ,

“Whether it is a fact that about Rs. 57 crores are lying surplus in the Administration Account No. 2 of EPF Organisation.....”

The reply given by the hon. Minister to that is:

“Account No. 2 operated by the Employees provident Fund Organisation does not show such surplus.”

But a specific question has been asked. According to the information available with me, nearly Rs. 57 crores are lying accumulated in Account No. 2. That amount has been collected for the benefit of the employees, for the pension schemes and other welfare schemes of the employees. Also during the period 1967 to 1978, there were three Committees which were set up, but in his reply he has stated that no Committee was set up. I will put that question in my second supplementary. First I would like to have the correct information about this accumulated surplus of Rs. 57 crores or whatever is available. He is not giving the correct information. I would like to know whether during the period 1978-1980 when anti-laobur policy was being pursued by the then Government and officers were working in connivance with the then Government and reactionary forces were being infiltrated in that organisation.....(Interruptions) I am putting the supplementary with the permission of Speaker I want to know whether the programmes, shemems and reports of the Advisory Committees have been completely scuttled and have not been implemented, and if so, what exactly were the reasons and for how long the accumulated surplus amount was not utilised for the benefit of the employees.

He has given answer to part (b) of my question. kindly go through the answer. The question was:

“Whether it is also a fact that this huge amount was saved by way their of non-sanction of staff for years together”

MR. SPEAKER: You can put one supplementary.

SHRI K. LAKKAPPA: He has given the reply, ‘Staff are sanctioned and accommodation and other facilities are provided according to prescribed norms’. I would like to know. I will give the information to the hon. Minister.....

MR. SPEAKER: Please don't do it.

SHRI K.LAKKAPPA: The accumulated surplus has not been utilised for the purpose for which it was accumulated, like construction of buildings.....

MR. SPEAKER: How much time are you going to take to put one supplementary?

SHRI K LAKKAPPA: I have not even started my supplementary. Sir, we have been paying crores of rupees by way of rent. When funds are available, they have not been allowed to construct the buildings. Madurai, Siliguri, Ranchi, Guntur, Vizag and Calicut—in these places they have no buildings. Nowhere in the important places buildings have been constructed for the staff. Therefore, I would like to know the reasons for that and also how much rent you are paying in these areas. Fabulous rents are paid at the cost of the government. They are squandering the money instead of utilising the funds for the purpose for which it has been accumulated.

THE MINISTER OF STATE OF THE MINISTRY OF LABOUR (SHRI BHAGWAT JHA AZAD): For the political supplementary the answer he is himself giving for political reasons. I will only deal with the factual supplementary.

SHRI K LAKKAPPA: I asked whether it was all due the anti-labour policy followed by the Janata Government.....
(Interruptions)

SHRI SUNIL MAITRA: What do you mean by political supplementary?

SHRI BHAGWAT JHA AZAD: He says there was an anti-labour policy followed when you were also a partner in the Government.....(Interruptions) He says that during the Janata regime there was an anti-labour policy being followed by the government then. That is the political supplementary.....(Interruptions) Mr. Maitra, you have come only after a long time. Mr Lakkappa, being the President of one section of Employees Provident Fund Organisation employees association, can very well say about the anti-labour policy being followed by the Janata Government then. I cannot contradict him because he knows better. It is true that production during those years, during the regime of the Janata Government, had definitely gone down on all fronts and decline in production on all fronts must be due to the reason that the labour was not happy. On that point Mr. Lakkappa is very-right.

Regarding the second point about staff in the Employees Provident Fund organisation, we have certain norms. Whatever staff have been essential we have given the staff. There is no shortage of staff. The question is that this Fund is being extended every day. We want to take the services to the door of the subscribers who are contributors. Therefore, we are increasing the coverage every day. It does not mean that whoever is there is not given the facility. As a matter of fact, the pay and allowances of the employees in the Employees Provident Fund organisation

according to the Third Pay Commission, equal to the Corresponding categories in the Government. That we have given them. Not only that, a part from that, we have given them more—much more than what the Government servants are getting in the Central Government. Therefore, there should be no complaint about being paid less. Government servants in the Central Government get 15% house rent allowance. We give them 20% to 25%. The salary plus 5% we have given them. 10% of the U. D. Cs. in the regional offices get a special pay of Rs. 35 per month. There is no complaint on that side.

So far as the strength of the staff is concerned, we do not fix it arbitrarily. There is a staff inspection unit. At present this unit is going into the norms. The moment they recommend we will consider it.

So far as the construction of quarters for the staff is concerned, so far we have spent about Rs. 7.53 crores and we have a proposal to spend another Rs. 10 crores on staff quarters and buildings. As and when need arises, we are going to spend it. Therefore, on these two scores, there should be no complaint.

Now about the accumulations in the funds, I have given the figures. He has asked for account No. 2 and I have said 'no surplus' in that account. If he had asked for account No A and 24, I would have said 'yes'. Sir, I have given the correct figures. These are accumulations in the funds. After all, these are out of the contributions to the funds that are there which we propose to spend as when the scheme is expanded. We need more quarters for which we require funds. We require funds for pension, gratuity and all that. We also require funds to spend on repairs and maintenance. We shall spend that on these.

SHRI K. LAKKAPPA: Sir, I would like to know from the hon. Minister why he has not implemented the recommendations in the reports of those Committees from 1978.

MR SPEAKER: Which Committee?

SHRI LAKKAPPA: Shall I read those three Committees which were set up?

MR SPEAKER: Don't read. You only name those Committees.

SHRI K. LAKKAPPA: There was one Fakirchand committee there was Bandopadhyay Committee and there was also another committee under the Chairmanship of Shri Anantkrishnan who was the Labour Secretary of the Karnataka Government. He said that no committees were set up. You may go through the answer.

MR SPEAKER: That is all right.

SHRI K. LAKKAPPA: I would like to know this from the Minister. There are certain staff and officers who have infiltrated into this organisation who are following the anti-labour policy. They being in the office and the R. S. S. and Jansangh have been the organisers, how can you expect a progressive outlook from them in the matter of implementation of the welfare schemes as far as employees are concerned. I want to know whether he will have a probe into this thing and fix the responsibility on such of the erring officers who are responsible for the failure of their having a progressive outlook in implementation of the welfare schemes in the provident Fund Organisation.

SHRI BHAGWAT JHA AZAD: Sir, I said that no Committee was appointed by the Government and I still stick to that. What the hon. Member means is about the Committees set up by the Central Board of Trustees—the sub-Committees—and the most important of them was the Fakirchand Committee. He asked: why was the recommendation of that Committee not implemented. I say that many of the recommendations of the Fakirchand Committee have been implemented. The most important recommendation was about the washing allowance, house rent allowance by 25%—Hyderabad—which we have implemented. We have also implemented the recommendation for the grant of special pay of Rs. 35 to 10% of the U. D. Cs. in the regional offices.

We have also implemented upgradation of the posts of C.P.F. Commissioner and Financial Adviser and the Chief Accounts Officer, we have also implemented the recommendation for the creation of a new cadre of the Assistant Accounts Officers. We have accepted in principle the recommendation on bouns linked to productivity. It is being gone into. There are other recommendations which the Government did not think fit to accept. We have implemented the most important recommendations. That is all.

श्री सत्यनारायण जटिया : : ये जो भविष्य निधि के कर्मचारी हैं, इन कर्मचारियों के लिए प्रशासनिक व्यय जो सरकार को करना पड़ता है, वह एम्प्लायर से आता है और इसका जो रेट है वह सन् 1952 में 3 परसेन्ट था, 1962 में 2.4 परसेन्ट था और 1964 के बाद यह 0.37 परसेन्ट रहा है। इसका मतलब यह है कि एम्प्लायर्स

से जो यह पैसा आता है, वह इन कर्मचारियों के वेलफेयर के लिए, उनकी भलाई के लिए, उनकी सेलरीज और उनके अच्छे काम के लिए खर्च होना चाहिए। यह जो सारा पैसा आता है, यह कर्मचारियों के हितों के लिए काम में आना चाहिए। तो मैं मंत्री जी से यह पूछना चाहता हूँ कि इन कर्मचारियों का जो पे-स्केल है; उसका रिवीजन कब हुआ और इन लोगों को जो आप 25 परसेन्ट हाउस रेन्ट इलाउन्स के रूप में देते हैं तो क्या वह आज की स्थिति में पर्याप्त है? क्यों नहीं इन कर्मचारियों के आवास के लिए और दूसरी फॅसिलिटीज के लिए, जो पैसा आता है, उस को खर्च करते हैं?

अध्यक्ष महोदय : इसका जवाब दे तो दिया है।

श्री भागवत झा आजाद : मैंने इस बात का जवाब दे दिया है। फंड के बारे में आप ने ठीक कहा है कि यह हम एम्प्लायर से लेते हैं। आपने यह भी ठीक कहा है कि 0.37 परसेन्ट लेते हैं एडमिनिस्ट्रेटिव चार्जेज प्रोविडेड फंड के लिए। प्वाइन्ट यह है कि आप ने जो इनके वेतन और भत्तों के बारे में कहा है, वे हमने थर्ड पे कमोशन की सिफारिशों की रोशनी में दिया है और सिर्फ इतना ही नहीं फकीर चन्द कमेटी ने जो सिफारिश की है, वह भी दिया है अर्थात् भविष्य निधि के कर्मचारियों को जितना सेन्ट्रल गवर्नमेंट के उसी कटेगरी के कर्मचारियों को मिलता है, उस से अधिक हम ने उनको दिया है। दूसरी बात जो इन्होंने कही कि फंड में जब पैसा है, तो क्यों नहीं उनको वह दे देते; तो यह कोई दान वृत्ति थोड़ी है। आपको धन्यवाद देना चाहिए कि फंड में पैसा इस्लिफ रखा गया है कि हम

जहाँ जहाँ इस स्कीम का विस्तार कर है वहाँ हम अधिक स्टाफ लायेंगे। इनके लिए जो मकान बनायेंगे उन पर भी खर्च करेंगे। साथ ही साथ हमको पेंशन देनी है, ग्रेज्युटी देनी है। इसके लिए भी फंड का निर्माण करेंगे। इसके साथ साथ सिफारिश यह भी है कि मेंटीनेंस, रिपेयर्स वगैरह पर भी फंड लगाएं। अर्थात् इन सब को देने के बाद जो पैसा फंड में है वह इन्हीं की सुविधा के लिए आने वाले दिनों में, सविध्य में लगाया जाएगा।

Lock-out in Hindustan Pilkington Glass Works

*628. SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA
SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES:

Will the Minister of INDUSTRY be pleased to state :

(a) Whether Hindustan-Pilkington Glass Works Ltd. factory at Asansol has been under lockout since May 1980.

(b) Whether the Association of Hindustan-Pilkington Glass works Ltd. in representation to Government had stated that if the factory was not opened by 10 March, 1982, it would be too late to save this unit and its 1600 employees.

(c) Whether Government of India have been in touch with the West Bengal Government in this matter, and

(d) the steps being taken to have the factory opened immediately ?

THE MINISTER OF INDUSTRY AND STEEL AND MINES (SHRI NARAYAN DATT TIWARI) : (a) Yes Sir.

(b) A few representations (including some from Hindustan, Pilkington Glass Works Ltd., Head Office Employees Union and Hindustan Pilkington Glass Works Ltd. Officers and Supervisory Staff Association) have been received for taking over the management of Hindustan Pilkington Glass Ltd.

(c) and (d). It has been suggested to the State Government of West Bengal to Advice the State Labour Commissioner to resolve the labour-management dispute so that lockout is lifted and production resumed. Since the lockout is a labour management problem, it has to

be dealt with by the State Government who are already seized of the matter.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA : Sir, next month we will complete two years of the lock-out of this factory. Labour is a concurrent subject. If this was not a lock out but a strike then we would have heard a different song sung by the Minister. The employers chose to lock-out the factory and it is now going to be two years and we are being told that it is due to labour dispute which has to be settled but the State Government. Assuming that the State Government has not been able to do anything so far is it the attitude-I want to know of the Central Government that this factory which was set up in collaboration with the Pilkington Brothers of U. K. with the latest type of technology can remain closed like this indefinitely and the Government's responsibility is limited to saying that we have asked the State Government to settle the labour dispute ?

Sir, during Question Hour we try to seek information and he should not try to conceal the real state of affairs by relegating it to labour-management problem. He knows that it is not that. He knows that Thapars and Somanis have been very much connected with the whole affair and today it is they who want to reopen the factory on terms more profitable. In this respect I would like to know the many communications which passed between the Centre and the State for re-opening this factory as a viable unit. I would like to know what steps has the Government taken ?

SHRI NARAYAN DATT TIWARI : As I have mentioned in my reply, Sir, this is primarily a matter to be dealt with by the State Government. Conciliation proceedings have not yet been wound up. There were three discussions at three different points of time. It is upto the State Government to take action under Industrial Disputes Act. The song is being heard also by the West Bengal Government. It is primarily they who are responsible for any industrial dispute that arises within their jurisdiction. We did have a letter from the Chief Minister of West Bengal in 1980 narrating the failure of the conciliation proceedings till the time the new management had taken over and we had advised the Chief Minister to carry on the negotiations as a way has to be found out but we are not directly concerned with this question.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA : Sir, I am sorry the Minister continues to repeat that all this prolonged closure of a major industrial unit is due to labour-management dispute. If that had been so is it conceivable when a company is