

Unions. We do not want anyone to be victimised because he is taking part in trade union activity. We do not want that anybody should be punished for his trade union activity. But at the same time, we want that trade unions should not have a licence for misbehaviour. They should not be made a tool for keeping away from work or not doing the work properly. Workers should be disciplined, respectful and dutiful. Everyone of us should follow these good principles.

**Shri K. K. Basu:** But conditions must be created for that.

**Shri Abid Ali:** I know that some parties are showing too much sympathy for the workers. They themselves know—and the workers know it more than I and they do—that these parties have no sympathy for the workers; that they do not want the betterment of the workers or of the country; that they want contact with the workers, so that all that is happening in the Government administration should be known to them through trade union contacts. That will not be possible, and that will not be permitted.

**Shri Raghavaiah:** My question has not been answered.

**Shri Abid Ali:** It has been made quite clear that there should be trade union activity. It should be healthy. It should be conducted on trade union lines; not for party purposes. To that extent, workers will have the protection of these regulations and the Constitution. But if, under the name of the trade union and trade union organisation, they want to misbehave, when certainly action will be taken. Even then, the procedure which has been laid down will be followed.

**Shri Raghavaiah:** My question has not been answered.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** It would not be answered. The hon. Minister has stated that it is not relevant. I am not going to allow a debate. He cannot go on interrupting like this. No one can force an answer from a Minister.

**Shri Abid Ali:** I have nothing more to say. In fact there was no room for this discussion. But still as the hon. Member insisted and you were good enough to allow it, I have explained that there has been no contradiction. Registration of a trade union and recognition of a trade union are two different things. So far as industrial workers in Government establishments are concerned, this circular does not concern them and they have full liberty to have their trade union

organisations on the lines on which they are already working.

**Shri K. K. Basu:** Why have a difference for civil services?

**Shri Nambiar:** He says that trade unions of industrial concerns are separate and different from trade unions of civil employees in Government employment. Both these trade unions are registered under the same Trade Unions Act. May I ask what is the exact reason why the second category of trade unions should be treated like that and why they should be prevented from choosing outsiders as their office-bearers? Why should there be a discrimination there? That point has not been clarified.

**Shri Abid Ali:** I have already clarified it. There is a difference between industrial concerns and civil administration. So if it is for instance transport, whether it is managed by a private agency or by Government, they have been given the same status. But there is difference between the transport organisation in Bombay or Calcutta or Madras and administration in Madras or Bombay or Calcutta—the Secretariat. Rigidly, under the present Trade Unions Act, persons working in administration, in the civil services, cannot have a trade union. At some places their registration has been refused, but at some places trade unions of civil servants have been registered. That apart, I have already explained the difference.

*The House then adjourned till Four of the Clock.*

*The House re-assembled at Four of the Clock.*

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER in the Chair.]

#### BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

**Shri H. N. Mukerjee** (Calcutta North-East): May I mention a matter of which I hope the Leader of the House will take note? I would like to request the Leader of the House to find out if some time could be allotted for the discussion of the present posture of our foreign affairs. I make this request because today things are happening, especially in the Middle East, particularly perhaps in Egypt, also in Indo-China and over the peace negotiations in Korea, which are agitating the minds of our people and we feel that now that the House is going to be in recess for more than two months, it should have some opportunity of finding out what exactly is the mind of Government in regard to the present posture of external affairs. Personally, I would like it very much if the Leader of the House can allot some time for a discussion but if it is

[Shri H. N. Mukerjee]

found to be practically impossible to arrange a discussion, at least we perhaps might have a statement by the Leader of the House, because he himself is going abroad and the House is going to be in recess for more than two months and that is why I suggest that some time may be set apart for some kind of a discussion on the present posture of foreign affairs.

**The Prime Minister (Shri Jawahar Lal Nehru):** I am always agreeable to this House to discuss any aspect of foreign affairs. The only difficulty that arises is normally how to find time and we have now got two days more, fairly full days. It is not clear to me how to find time for a discussion. If it so pleases you, Sir, and the House, I can, either tomorrow or the day after, make a brief statement after the Question Hour.

The hon. Member in his suggestion is quite right in saying that there are important issues taking shape all over the world, in the West and East. There is no doubt about that. At the same time, the fact that things are on the move in many places makes it a little difficult to discuss them in detail because one has to be a little cautious about saying things lest something we might say might, instead of helping, hinder, but if it so pleases the House, I shall make a brief statement about some of these matters either tomorrow or the day after, as you think fit.

**Dr. Lanka Sundaram (Visakhapatnam):** Would it at all be possible to have an hour or two tomorrow afternoon or the day after tomorrow for a discussion?

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Particularly in view of the fact that the whole thing is in a fluid condition and we are not responsible for many of these things—we have to watch and see lest we should disturb by our own action or statement or do anything which might be misinterpreted—I think it will be advisable to ask the Prime Minister to make a statement in the manner he chooses without allowing a debate on that matter at that stage. He may make a statement as convenient to him either tomorrow or the day after immediately after the Question Hour.

**Dr. Lanka Sundaram:** In view of your ruling, Sir, can we, belonging to either side of the House, suggest to the Leader of the House the subjects on which we want to have information?

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Any hon. Member can write to me giving particular

points on which he would like to have elucidation.

**Dr. Lanka Sundaram:** We may fix the day after tomorrow for this so that we can send our suggestions.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** We will have it day after tomorrow.

MOTION RE ASSOCIATION OF MEMBERS OF COUNCIL OF STATES WITH PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE—contd.

**Dr. Lanka Sundaram (Viskhapatnam):** I confessed to disillusionment yesterday when the Prime Minister, as Leader of the House, moved a motion before us for discussion this afternoon. I had hoped that this question would be discussed threadbare either in the Business Advisory Committee or in consultation with Leaders and Members of various Groups and parties in this House. I am sorry that such a position was not reached by us, with the result that I considered, with due respect to you and to the Leader of the House, that the motion was rather abrupt in its character and implications. I would like to say at the very outset that there should be no disposition on the part of any Member of this House to dispose of this motion on a party basis, and I hope that my appeal will be heard in the proper quarters, because I feel that the motion, if passed in this House, is fraught with numerous implications of vital importance, not only to the rights and privileges of this House but also to the privileges and rights of the other House.

Yesterday, the Prime Minister said and I hope I am quoting him correctly—that the decision of the Public Accounts Committee was wrong. I feel, and I say so with a sense of responsibility, that a statement of this character coming from the Leader of the House is rather unfortunate, because the Public Accounts Committee is one of the vital organs of this House, and it has come to a unanimous decision on the subject matter of this motion, and I do hope that Members of the Public Accounts Committee who are present here today would stand up and justify the position they have reached.

**The Prime Minister and Leader of the House (Shri Jawaharlal Nehru):** May I intervene? I cast no aspersions on the Members of the Public Accounts Committee. As a matter of fact, it was odd to me to say so. I did not know at all what the Public Accounts Com-