

this token strike and the rest worked as usual. No one, however, worked in the Camouflage Net Section. The Superintendent informed the workmen that those men in the Net Section who were on strike from 1 p.m. on the 23rd August and subsequently would be treated as absent from duty for the period when they did no work.

The revision of the piece-work rates was in accordance with the Government decision on the recommendations of the Kalyanvala Committee. According to that decision, the piece-work rates, which had previously been linked to the rates prior to 1947, were to be revised and linked to the monthly scales following the Pay Commission's recommendations. Generally, this meant a considerable increase in the rates and Government had passed orders that where *prima facie* excessively high profits were being earned, the rates should be reviewed after proper examination and study. There is no question of reducing piece-work rates because production is going up. Government has no intention whatsoever of reducing piece-work rates on that account. On the contrary, Government wants increased production. Wherever, however, the records of earnings of workers show that very excessive profits are being earned, there is surely a case for revising the wrongly fixed piece-work rates. Normally, a piece-worker, working with a reasonable speed, is expected to earn a profit of 25 per cent over his basic wage. A good piece-worker may earn 50 or even 75 per cent profits. Where, however, profits are consistently being earned by many workers over 100 or 200 per cent, it is fairly clear that the piece-work rate was fixed too high and needs revision.

**GOVERNMENT PREMISES (EVIC-
TION) AMENDMENT BILL, 1953**

The Minister of Works, Housing and Supply (Sardar Swaran Singh): I beg to move for leave to withdraw the Bill further to amend the Government Premises (Eviction) Act, 1950,

which was introduced in the House of the People on the 18th March, 1953.

The reason is merely this. This Bill has been before the House for about a year and a half. Recently, in a case decided by the High Court of Bombay, it was held that sub-section (1) of section 3 of the Act does not authorise the eviction of a person who continued to be in occupation of the premises allotted to him even after the due determination thereof, because he was not a person in unauthorised occupation of the premises within the meaning of clause (b) of the said sub-section. The intention of this section has always been that such persons should be deemed to be persons in unauthorised occupation of the Premises.

So, we have decided to amend the Government Premises (Eviction) Act, 1950, in order to make our intention clear in this respect. If the House will permit me to withdraw this Bill, I shall be moving another Bill more comprehensive in nature and covering both the amendments.

Mr. Speaker: The question is:

"That leave be granted to withdraw the Bill further to amend the Government Premises (Eviction) Act, 1950."

The motion was adopted.

**GOVERNMENT PREMISES (EVIC-
TION) AMENDMENT BILL, 1954**

The Minister of Works, Housing and Supply (Sardar Swaran Singh): I introduce the Bill further to amend the Government Premises (Eviction) Act, 1950.

Mr. Speaker: The Bill is introduced.

**CENTRAL EXCISES AND SALT
(AMENDMENT) BILL**

The Deputy Minister of Finance (Shri A. C. Guha): I beg to move for