

of the State Government and the other who is an employee of the Central Government, there is an attempt to force the State Government to suspend that constable, saying "Otherwise I will go on strike". After that some other strike relating to painters, stay-in-strike, this is in one section of the Railways; in another section guards, railwaymen and engine drivers, etc., stores strike. I do not know where this is going to end. A dispute between any employer and employee—it is true that the employer in this case is responsible to this Parliament, it is a department of the Government—but everything between an employer and employee ought not to be brought up here for discussion and settlement. Is this the forum to discuss it and to chastise Government for not conceding every demand? One fact is not disputed, namely that no notices of strike were given. What is the justification for a lightning strike by which the community is disturbed or inconvenienced?

Under those circumstances, I would not like to give any encouragement to using this House as the forum for the purpose of settling differences. The differences will arise and they have arisen, but there are other methods for settling them. It is also clear in this case that though there were unions, the leaders have washed their hands of all responsibility. Mr. Asoka Mehta has said that he does not know. Those persons have started going on strike themselves. Also, I asked them whether any notice was given so far as the strikes were concerned. It is a public utility service; it is not merely a dispute between the employer and the employed. The whole public is inconvenienced by the Grand Trunk Express running late; there is a lot of inconvenience caused to the public. I do not want that there should be any impression created by anyone or by any set of people who are responsible to the country that the public can be held at ransom by any section of the employees, whether of Government or of any other concern. Railway is a public utility service. The Parliament will not be used as a forum for the purpose of forcing either the Government or the public for grant of any special privileges, except by normally and constitutional methods. Under those circumstances, I am not going to

allow this adjournment motion. It is a small matter which arises almost every day between the employer and the employed. Other methods, should be resorted to to settle the differences. So far as this matter is concerned, this adjournment motion is out of order.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee * * * *

Mr. Speaker: I am proceeding to the next item.

PAPERS LAID ON THE TABLE
AMENDMENTS TO INDIAN AIRCRAFT
RULES

The Minister of Communications (Shri Jagjivan Ram): I beg to lay on the Table, under sub-section (3) of section 5 of the Indian Aircraft Act, 1934, a copy of each of the following notifications of the Ministry of Communications, together with the Explanatory Notes, making certain further amendments to the Indian Aircraft Rules, 1937:—

(1) Notification No. AR/1937 (20), dater the 2nd March, 1956.

(2) Notification No. AR/1937 (18), dated the 12th April, 1956.

[Placed in Library. See No. S—1901-56]

AUDIT REPORT (CIVIL) 1955 (PART I)

The Minister of Finance (Shri C. D. Deshmukh): I beg to lay on the Table a copy of the Audit Report (Civil) 1955 (Part I) under Article 151 (1) of the Constitution. [Placed in Library. See No. S—191|56]

REPLIES TO MEMORANDA RECEIVED
FROM MEMBERS re. DEMANDS FOR
GRANTS (RAILWAYS) FOR 1956-57

The Minister of Railways and Transport (Shri L. B. Shastri): I beg to lay on the Table a copy each of certain further statements containing replies to certain memoranda received from Members in connection with Demands for Grants (Railways) for 1956-57 [See Appendix XIV, annexure No. 56].