

**श्री जगन्नाथ पाटिल :** इस प्रोजेक्ट के बारे में जितनी जानकारी चाहिए उतनी मंत्री महोदय की ओर से दी गई और विवरण में ऐसा बताया कि चार पांच सप्ताह में इस प्रोजेक्ट के काम की शुरुआत होगी। अगर मंत्री महोदय जैसा कहते हैं उस तरीके से सही ढंग से शुरुआत हो गई तो मैं ऐडवांस में उनको धन्यवाद देना चाहता हूँ। मंत्री महोदय से मैं यह जानना चाहूंगा कि इस प्रोजेक्ट के लिए जिन किसानों की भूमि अधिग्रहण की गई है उनको उसका मुआवजा दे दिया है या नहीं? अगर नहीं है तो कब तक दे देंगे? इस प्रोजेक्ट के बनने के बाद वहां के स्थानीय लोगों को जो वहां नौकरियां उपलब्ध होंगी वह दी जायेंगी या नहीं?

**श्री गार्गी शंकर मिश्र :** जहां तक धन्यवाद देने का सवाल है मैं संसद सदस्य महोदय की प्रशंसा करता हूँ और जहां तक काम शुरू करने का प्रश्न है जिस प्रकार से बारिश आ रही है, आप को तो पता है आप स्वयं थाने से आते हैं, बारिश के बाद ही काम शुरू हो पाएगा। आप ने सवाल किया कि जमीन का जो अधिग्रहण किया गया है उसके मुआवजे का क्या होगा तो यह स्टेट गवर्नमेंट का मामला होता है। उन के द्वारा ही भूमि का अधिग्रहण किया जाता है। उन के लिए जितना रुपया आवश्यक होता है वह हम स्टेट गवर्नमेंट के पास डिपॉजिट कर देते हैं।

तीसरी चीज आपने यह पूछी है कि जिनकी जमीन ली गई है, क्या उनको कार्य दिया जायेगा - इस पर हम सहानुभूति पूर्वक विचार करेंगे।

**श्री जगन्नाथ पाटिल :** अध्यक्ष महोदय, इस प्रोजेक्ट का प्लान एस्टिमेट जब तैयार किया गया तब इसका खर्चा अन्दाजे से 55 करोड़ बताया गया। मैं जानना चाहता हूँ यह प्रोजेक्ट, जैसा कि मंत्री महोदय ने बताया है, 1984 में पूरा होगा लेकिन जिस ढंग से सरकार के सारे काम चल रहे हैं उनका देखते हुए यह 1984 में पूरा

हो जायेगा, ऐसा नहीं लगता है परन्तु जब भी यह पूरा होगा तब इस प्रोजेक्ट पर कितने करोड़ का खर्चा बढ़ जायेगा?

**अध्यक्ष महोदय :** अभी से क्यों चिन्ता करते हैं, काम करवाने दीजिए।

**श्री गार्गी शंकर मिश्र :** हम लोग आशावादी हैं, निराशावादी नहीं। मैं आपकी बात के साथ नहीं चल सकता क्योंकि आप कहते हैं कि नहीं होगा और हम कहते हैं होगा।

#### Decision to Curb Trade Union Growth

\*310. SHRI AMAR ROYPRADHAN : Will the Minister of LABOUR AND REHABILITATION be pleased to state :

(a) whether it is a fact that Government have decided to curb trade union growth; and

(b) if so, the details thereof and the reasons therefor?

THE MINISTER OF LABOUR AND REHABILITATION (SHRI VEERENDRA PATIL) : (a) No, Sir.

(b) Does not arise.

SHRI AMAR ROYPRADHAN : Mr. Speaker, Sir, the reply is vague. Please help me to get a correct reply. I think, the hon. Minister is not giving to the House a true and honest reply.

The hon. Minister while inaugurating a lecture on the Seminar on "Changes in Industrial Relations in 80s" held in Bombay on 21st May, 1983 under the auspices of the All India Manufacturers' Organisation said :

"...for healthy growth of trade unions some legislation is essential to curb the formation of trade unions."

Sir, this statement of the Minister provoked me to put this Question.

More over, Mr. Speaker, Sir, after N.A., ESMA and Industrial Disputes Act, he is going to add two more black Bills the Trade Union (Amendment) Bill, 1982 and the Hospital and other Institutions Maintenance Bill, 1982. So, I would like to know very clearly from the hon. Minister :

(a) whether it is a fact that except IN TUC, all the trade union organisations of the country have raised vehement protest against these Bills on the ground that it will curb the right of the workers ? and

(b) whether it is also a fact that the I.L.O. General Council pointed out that there are some provisions in these Bills which are violating the ILO guidelines ?

SHRI VEERENDRA PATIL : Sir, the hon. Member has referred to a news-item which has appeared in the Press. If something appears in the Press, he cannot hold me responsible for that.

While addressing one of the meetings, I did say that the mushroom growth of trade unions, was not conducive to the healthy growth of trade unionsim in the country. So, the Trade Union (Amendment) Bill is already before Parliament for consideration. The hon. Member also wanted to know the views expressed by different Central trade union leaders when I consulted them with regard to the Trade Union Bill. Last time, the Trade Union Bill was about to be taken up for consideration but some hon. Members from the other side, particularly those who are working in the trade union field suggested that I should consult the Central trade union leaders before I take up that Bill for consideration, So, I conceded the demand and accordingly, I put off the consideration of the Trade Union Bill. After the session was over, I invited them and I consulted them, I know their views and their views have been recorded and I will keep in view the views expressed by the different trade union leaders at the time of consideration of the Bill.

*(Interruptions)*

SHRI AMAR ROYPRADHAN : Sir, I asked another point also, viz., the ILO has pointed out that in these two Bills, there are some provisions which are violating the ILO guidelines.

SHRI VEERENDRA PATIL : With regard to ILO, I do not have that information with me. I would request the hon. Member to put a separate question.

SHRI AMAR ROYPRADHAN : In the last week in Lok Sabha, in reply to a question, the hon. Minister admitted that 15,564 workers were retrenched in 1982 which was more than the previous years. The number of lock-outs in 1980 were 355, in 1981, there were 344 and in 1982, there were 411. With these figures, you will agree with me, Sir, that some curb is essential on the functioning of industrialists. So, I would like to know from the hon. Minister whether he will come forward with some legislation curb the functioning of industrialists and at the same time, he will withdraw the Trade Union Amendment Bill and the Hospitals and Other Institutions Maintenance Bill.

SHRI VEERENDRA PATIL : So far as the question pertaining to the Trade Union Amendment Bill and the Hospital and Other Institutions Maintenance Bill is concerned, the hon. Members are aware and the House is aware that these two Bills are already before the parliament. There is no question of withdrawing and the Bills will be taken up for consideration.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA : A number of Bills were introduced over the course of last year and a half. Some of them have already been passed by Parliament and some are pending. I would like to know from the hon. Minister whether it is not a fact that these Bills are broadly in conformity with the Government of India's refusal to ratify two very important Conventions of the ILO of which India is a member from the very beginning, from the days of British rule. One Convention relates to the freedom of association and the other Convention relates to the right of collective bargaining. Neither of these Conventions of ILO has been ratified upto this day by the Government of India. I would

like to know from him why these Conventions are not being ratified and whether this is not, in fact, a reflection of the fact that the Government is not prepared to abide by those Conventions.

**SHRI VEERENDRA PATIL :** About the two Conventions that the hon. Member has referred to, it is true that the Government of India has not yet ratified and there are genuine difficulties in ratifying those two Conventions,.....

**SHRI CHITTA BASU :** What are the difficulties ?

**SHRI VEERENDRA PATIL :** If the hon. Member wants to know about that, he has to put a separate question. I do not have that information readily available with me. But I can only say that these two Conventions and the Bills that are before parliament have no inter-connection.

#### Implementation of Schedule A Drugs and Cosmetics Act

\*311. **SHRI HANNAN MOLLAH :** Will the Minister of CHEMICALS AND FERTILIZERS be pleased to state :

(a) how many times Government have deferred a decision on the implementation of Schedule V of the Drugs and Cosmetics Act;

(b) reasons for such deferment; and

(c) Government's policy regarding such matters ?

**THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF CHEMICALS AND FERTILIZERS (SHRI R.C. RATH :** (a) Ministry of Health & Family Welfare laid down the standards for Patent and Proprietary medicines containing multivitamins in July 1978. For implementing the standards, the Ministry of Health and Family Welfare allowed time to the manufacturers up to 30th June, 1979. The implementation required, inter alia, the fixation of the prices of such medicines. The issue of prices was deferred on three occasions.

(b) The deferment was mainly on account of (i) the updating of costs of the various inputs in the medicines, (ii) decision on the mark-up to be allowed on such medicines. Govt. had received a number of representations from a number of manufacturers and their Associations on these issues. These issues were examined in consultation with various Ministries and in interministerial forums.

(c) Government is keen on implementation of the standards referred to in (a) above. Taking into account all relevant factors and having regard to the sentiments expressed in the Parliament in this regard, Government have issued the prices of the medicines. The prices fixed by the Govt., in most cases, show considerable reduction from the current prices charged by the manufacturers, and would benefit the consumers.

**SHRI HANNAN MOLLAH :** The hon. Minister in his reply in part (c) says :

“The prices fixed by the Government, in most cases, show considerable reduction from the current prices charged by the manufacturers and would benefit the consumer.”

Now, I would like to know the actual implication of “considerable reduction.” I want to know what is the ceiling fixed by Schedule V of the Drugs and Cosmetics Act on the maximum profits/returns on the total sale turnover and what is the price fixed by the Government of the drugs of all categories separately. Is there any difference between the ceiling price and the price fixed by the Government ? If so, why and how much ?

**Mr. SPEAKER :** A very pertinent question. ●

**SHRI R.C. RATH :** I would like to inform the House that the sentiments on this issue expressed in the past by the Hon. Members of both Houses of Parliament were taken into consideration by the Government. A decision on the price was taken on 12th instant.