

White Paper on Indo-  
Chinese Relations

Labour Organisation

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

the eastern Ladakh, Chushu, built 4 or 5 years ago. I went there and it was an exciting trip to the borders of Tibet. But there is no Chinese air-field there.

Shri C. K. Nair: I want to know one thing.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Now it is too late. I will put amendment No. 4 to the vote at the end. So far as other amendments are concerned, may I put them all together?

Shri Braj Raj Singh: Regarding my amendment No. 2, in view of the regrets expressed by the Prime Minister, I would like to withdraw it if the House permits me to do so.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Has the hon. Member the leave of the House to withdraw his amendment?

The amendment was, by leave, withdrawn.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I will not put all other amendments, except amendment No. 4, to the vote of the House.

The amendments Nos. 1, 3, 5, 6, 7 and 8 were put and negatived

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

That for the original motion, the following be substituted, namely:—

"This House having considered the White Paper containing Notes, Memoranda and letters exchanged and Agreements signed between the Governments of India and China, during 1954—59, laid on the Table on the 7th September, 1959 and the further documents in continuation thereof laid on the Table on the 10th September, 1959 agrees with the policy of the Government adopted with regard to the frontier problem existing between the Governments of India

and China and endorses the view and stand taken by them in connection with this problem."(4).

The motion was adopted.

16.42 hrs.

\*GORAKHPUR LABOUR  
ORGANISATION

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The House will now take up the Half-an-hour discussion on the Gorakhpur Labour Organisation.

Shri K. N. Pandey (Hata): Mr Deputy-Speaker, before coming to the subject matter of the discussion today, I would like to give a brief history of the Gorakhpur Labour Organisation.

The Minister of Labour and Employment and Planning (Shri Nanda): May I know the distribution of time between him and me?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Ten minutes.

Shri Nanda: That will be all right.

Shri K. N. Pandey: I should be given more.

This scheme was introduced in 1942 in order to meet the demand of labour at various defence projects. After the war was over, at the request of the employers of coal mining the Central Government agreed that they would also be provided with labour, provided they would agree to bear the entire cost of this scheme. That is why this scheme started the supply of labour to the coal mining areas.

Since then the scheme has been in operation. Now there has been a demand from other sides that as the workers of Gorakhpur are kept in camps this camp system should be abolished and they should be treated as free workers or at par with other workers working in the coal-mining area.

\*Half-an-hour discussion.

In this connection I want to express my opinion and also give information to the House that this scheme does not supply labour only to the coal-mining area but it supplies labour to other fields also. It gives labour to the Government Cement Factory, Churk. It gives labour to work in the quarry. It also sends labour to other parts for colonisation and for constructing dams, power houses and other necessary works demanded by the Government. So, this cry of coal mining, namely that the whole system should be abolished, I fail to understand.

There is another thing also that I want to express here. So far as I have met the workers who are recruited by this Gorakhpur labour organisation, they do not complain that they have to face any difficulty because of being in camps. I have not seen any camp, but as I come from Gorakhpur where these workers are recruited, I have met several of them and have asked them whether they are feeling any difficulties because of this scheme. I have been informed that they are not feeling so much difficulty as others are feeling.

However, there was a demand from some side that this system should be abolished. This question was first raised in 1954 at the time of the Indian Labour Conference in Mysore and the Conference agreed to form a committee to go into the details of this matter and find out whether it is worthwhile or desirable to abolish this scheme. That committee was constituted under the chairmanship of Shri Vishnu Saha, ICS, and consisted of representatives of employers and employees. They made an enquiry and there was a unanimous decision not to abolish this scheme. Instead, they recommended that there should be two advisory committees. There was a complaint from some side that these workers are not only kept in camps but are also used to break strikes. Then this committee recommended that let one advisory committee be formed and if there is a complaint that these workers are used

to break strikes that matter should be dealt with. I have no information till this time that any such complaint has been made to this advisory committee. I have no information about the findings of this advisory committee.

However, this agitation was going on. What was the cause for this agitation? So far as I can understand it was this. The total strength of this Gorakhpur labour is 3 per cent of the total strength of the colliery workers. Whereas their strength is only 3 per cent their production is 12 per cent of the total production. As the other labourers working in the coal-mining area do not give so much production these Gorakhpur labourers are given some extra facility. That they cannot see and that is why there is an agitation. I have no objection if those workers are also given those facilities provided they also give so much production.

**Shri M. K. Ghosh (Jamshedpur):**  
It is not only from the coal mines. The objections were from ore mines also.

**Shri K. N. Pandey:** May be so. Why was this agitation started? It was because they were getting extra facilities. I do not know the reason why the other workers could not give so much production. There was an agitation. I have no objection if other workers also give the same amount of production and get the same facility. There is no harm in it. Let the Ministry take the initiative and persuade the employers to give the same kind of facility to other workers also, instead of creating such an atmosphere, so that the remaining workers or other workers may get those facilities. The decision for abolition of the scheme was taken. Now there is a propaganda and also an agitation that the whole system should be abolished, so that the Gorakhpur labour may give the same amount of production as other ordinary workers are giving. This is the only matter.

Only one other matter I want to place before the House and that is that

[Shri K. N. Pandey]

the Gorakhpur labour organisation does not insist that only workers belonging to Gorakhpur or Deoria are to be recruited through this centre. It is not so. Workers from other parts of the country are also recruited through this centre; because, I have got the papers with me and I see that from Bihar, Andhra, Madras, Punjab and from so many other States workers have come there and they have been recruited. Although their number is small in comparison to the Gorakhpur labour, still the fact is that the workers from other parts also come and are recruited from that centre.

Now I shall just say how this matter arose and how I raised this matter and requested you, Sir, to bring this matter before the House. There was an announcement from the Ministry on the 9th August 1959 that this scheme is going to be abolished, and it was said that it was as a result of the decision taken by the tripartite committee. I am giving you some information about this tripartite committee also. In this tripartite committee the coal miners were also a party, they had also been invited, and a representative of the U.P. Government also was there. Because, the fact is that although this is a big scheme providing work to thousands of workers, the Central Government does not spend a single pie for this scheme. But simply in order to have co-ordination between State and State they are in the picture and they are minding these affairs. In this tripartite committee I do not know—I have no information—whether they agreed to this proposal or not. But this much I can say that the U.P. Government representative did not agree. However, it was announced that this scheme is going to be abolished. And that is why this matter has come up here.

When I put my short notice question on 28-8-59, an assurance was given by the Minister that so far as employment was concerned the Ministry can assure that these workers will be pro-

vided employment and they will take all possible steps in that connection through employment exchanges. What is the condition of these employment exchanges? If a worker goes for employment, first he has to get himself registered in the employment exchange. And then he goes home. And then when a call comes, he has to come; whereas in this scheme when a worker is called for joining work or for being sent anywhere, he is kept for so many days in the recruiting centre and maintained till he is sent to the work-site. This is the difference between employment exchange and this recruitment organisation.

May I know from the Labour Minister whether he can assure us that those workers, even if they are recruited through employment exchanges, will be maintained till the time they are sent to the work-site?

**An Hon Member:** They get railway fare.

**Shri K. N. Pandey:** Railway fare is something else. I am told that every coal-mining worker is entitled to the railway fare. But he is entitled after twelve months, whereas this worker, even if he has not worked for a single day, is entitled to railway fare. So what will be done in that connection?

However, one thing I will say. The only charge against this labour was that they were giving more production, and that is why the employers were ready to spend more on these workers. If these workers are put in the same category or they are treated at par with others, then what charm will remain so that an employer will recruit them? If the hon. Minister can assure me that in spite of this they will get the same amount of production and employment, I have no objection at all.

In summing up, I wish to say that I have some doubt if the assurance given by the hon. Minister before the House will be fulfilled or not. In this connection, I have to point out to the

hon. Minister one thing. I want that, first of all, the House and ourselves should be assured that these workers who were getting employment previously will be getting employment in future also, and that they will be getting the same facilities and amenities that they had so far been enjoying. The next thing that I want to urge upon the hon. Minister is, that till this scheme materialises, the order for abolishing the scheme should be stayed. I want to bring it before the House that the Minister should form a Parliamentary Committee to enquire into the affairs of this scheme. Let that Committee recommend to the House or the Labour Minister whether it is desirable to abolish this scheme and if it is abolished, what other things should be done in this connection.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: One question for each Member.

Shri S. L. Saksena (Maharajanj): I would like to be told what will happen to the present staff and the organisation which they have for recruiting these people in Gorakhpur. There is a big organisation. Several hundreds of people are employed. I ask what will happen to the present Labour recruiting Depot in Gorakhpur. I would like the hon. Minister to make a detailed statement in the matter. Secondly, I would also like to be assured that any modifications that will be made will be an improvement on the present scheme and it will not be worse than what it is today.

Shri T. B. Vittal Rao (Khammam): In view of the fact that this organisation and the scheme, except for the employers, is opposed by every State Government barring U.P.—because in U.P. it would result in unemployment of those labourers who have been recruited under this Gorakhpur Labour force scheme—would the Government consider the question of making them permanent and stop this recruitment, or make the staff permanent or give the option to the present staff whether they want to be

283 L.S.D.—4.

permanent or they want to be repatriated? When they are made permanent, they should not have any discrimination of any sort from local labour. Today, they are housed in separate barracks, under separate discipline. Though nominally they are allowed to join trade unions, they are never allowed to join trade unions except in some places like Hyderabad. It will not create a problem for the U.P. about unemployment. If these workers are made permanent, they can open a depot. We know the conditions in the eastern districts of U.P. The unemployment problem is very acute.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: He should conclude his question.

Shri T. B. Vittal Rao: We know the problem in the eastern districts. A special depot may be opened for recruitment and as soon as they are recruited, they should be treated as other workers.

Shri Sinhasan Singh (Gorakhpur): May I know whether the Ministry of Steel, Mines and Fuel was consulted in this respect before the decision to abolish was taken, and if not, whether the Government thinks it proper to consult that Ministry, because this labour relates to their side of work also? One question more . . .

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: One I had asked.

Shri Sinhasan Singh: I want to know whether the U.P. Government has still represented that this system should be continued because it involves an area which is over-densely populated and it helps the employment problem.

श्री प्र० बा० सिंह (पन्नीनी) :  
उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं माननीय मंत्री जी से  
यह जानना चाहता हूँ कि जो मजदूर इस व्यवस्था  
के अन्तर्गत काम करते हैं और  
विनकी संस्था की ओर १५-१६  
१६ हजार तक हैं, उनको परमानेंट करने की  
कोई स्कीम सरकार के सामने है ?

[श्री म० सा० सिंह]

इसके साथ साथ मैं यह भी जानना चाहता हूँ कि यदि इन मजदूरों को परमानेंट कर दिया जाता है तो प्राइवेट आने वाले मजदूरों की भरती के विषयों में, जो बीजपुरा संकल्प है, उसकी क्या स्थिति होगी और उसकी क्यों खत्म किया गया है और उसकी ही कोड़ी सी इन्फुवनेंट्स करके बनाये में सरकार के सामने क्या दिक्कतें थीं ?

**Shri Kalika Singh (Azamgarh):** The Gorakhpur labour organisation has nothing to do with Gorakhpur or the U.P. It has got its concern with the whole of India. Because, in the Gorakhpur labour organisation, labour is recruited from the Punjab, from Madhya Pradesh, from Bombay and from other States and from Meerut and other western districts. The fact is that it is really a backward areas labour organisation nicknamed the Gorakhpur labour organisation.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Now the question should be put  
17 hrs.

**Shri Kalika Singh:** Yes, Sir, I am putting the question.

In view of that fact, will the hon Minister by changing the name from Gorakhpur labour organisation to Backward Areas labour organisation, maintain this organisation as a special case because it has been there for a very long time and means displacement of 15,000 persons?

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Most of the time would be taken up by these questions if I allow all the Members.

**Shri Nanda:** And the questions would need a minute each to be answered.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** And perhaps only those Members have chosen to sit down who wanted to put questions!

**Shri Keshava (Bangalore city):** Would not the continuation of the

existing system of recruitment at Gorakhpur merely for the reason that the camp labourers have no objection for its continuation be tantamount to perpetuating the evil against the larger interests? Is there no other way of safeguarding the special amenities if any, that they enjoy and yet put an end to this abnoxious system?

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** I am coming to this side also. Shri Ram Shankar Lal.

श्री राज शंकर लाल (दुमरियागंज) मैं एक तो यह पूछना चाहता हूँ कि जो सेबर एरियाफ स जात है क्या उनकी तरह से भी कोई इस तरह की-आवाज रिक्लूमेंट के जिलाफ उठती है या सिर्फ बाहर की एरियाफ के लोग यह आवाज उठा रहे हैं। दूसरे क्या ऐसे जरिदे प्रक्यार किये जावेंगे जिससे इस हल्के के मजदूरों की जो कि बैकवर्ड एरियाफ के है मर्जी बराबर जारी रहे ?

श्री सांगडे (जिलासपुर): इस दृष्टिकोण को मद्देनजर रखते हुए कि राजनगर, बनपुरी, मगरसतान और बिरमिरी ज्यूसीसगढ़ के इन क्वातों में उन्हींने बहुत से परयाचार किये और इंटरनेशनल सेबर कोड के जिस सिद्धांत के अनुसार जो सेवेशन कैम्प बना या रखा है सन् १९५४ से और गोरखपुर सेबर प्रावै-नाइवेशन है उनको बन्द करने का निर्णय किया गया उस सिद्धांत के अनुसार मैं मानना चाहता हूँ कि क्या २० सितम्बर १९५२ तक प्राइवेट एम्प्लायर्स के सेबर प्रावैनाइवेशन को बन्द करने का भी निर्णय किया उस की बन्द करने का इरादा है ? और क्या एम्प्लायमेंट एक्सचेंज बूज जाने के बाद भी और हर तरह की सुविधा हो जाने के बाद भी गोरखपुर सेबर कैम्प की जारी रखने का इरादा है ?

**Shri M. K. Ghosh:** Will the hon. Minister enlighten us as to whether the objections made by the unions

and other organisations were the extra facilities they are getting, or there were other causes, as for instance the constitution not allowing them to become members of the union and of this type of thing?

**Shri Nanda:** There has been considerable anxiety and agitation about something which the Government is supposed to have decided to do which might have certain repercussions, certain consequences for the employment of a considerable number of persons who are now being recruited through what is known as the Gorakhpur labour organisation. I have been asked to give certain assurances so that the interests of the persons who are now having the benefit of this system may be safeguarded.

In the first instance, at the very outset I am prepared to give one or two assurances. The first is that I am in no hurry to make a change if there is any sense, any feeling, of uneasiness among a section of the House as to what it is going to amount to. Therefore, I am going to stay action on this till some other steps have been taken. As far the steps that have to be taken, immediately, I may announce that I am prepared to accept the advice regarding the setting up of a committee of Members of Parliament, in order that they may be able to see what exactly is intended to be done, and how far there is any basis for the nervousness which some hon. friends have given expression to. I need not announce the names of the members on that committee immediately, but I shall take it up at once, and let the Members know whom we shall request to assist in this work of inquiry that is going to be instituted.

But let us understand as to what exactly Government have thought of doing, and what they do not intend to do. The point of the discussion is that about 14,000 workers who are being recruited through this organisa-

tion, possibly, will have their employment interests jeopardised. The position that we have taken, or the decision or conclusion at which we have arrived at amounts to something different. What we propose to do is this. Firstly, so far as the recruiting organisation, namely the Gorakhpur labour organisation is concerned, it has certain functions as a recruiting organisation, which are not exactly the same as those of any labour exchange. Therefore, when it is said that these people can go to the labour exchanges, and we may increase the number of labour exchanges, that is not a sufficient answer, because it is a special case. It has a history. There is a special set up there. And I am not in favour of disturbing and disrupting it at once.

So far as that part of the functions of the Gorakhpur labour organisation is concerned, facilities are being provided to a certain number of workers in a certain area, which is known to be depressed economically, and, therefore, the workers of that area can certainly claim certain special considerations particularly because these have been made available to them so far. Therefore, the argument that it is not only Gorakhpur, but it is the whole country that is affected, I think, undermines the strength of the whole argument for this case. But I accept the other part of it, because it is largely so; it is largely around that area, and not in other parts of the country.

The second point is that the hostility to this has arisen because of something else, which does not go under the name of the Gorakhpur Labour organisation, but which has another name. It is the Coal field Recruiting Organisation. The two things got mixed up, and, therefore, a lot of confusion arises. The labour movement has been opposed to it all along. It was because of this that a certain committee was set up, to which the sponsor of the discussion had made a reference. In that committee's report which I have got with me here, it has been stated clearly what the complaint

[Shri Nanda]

or the substance of the opposition was.

"The complaints brought to the notice of the committee in this regard broadly were: the workers did not have full freedom of movement, their lives were supervised, they were kept segregated from other labour and could not, therefore, feel identity of interests with them, they were in practice not free to join trade unions and were potential blacklegs. Allegations of maltreatment were made. It was also pointed out that the eleven-month period of contract under which this labour was recruited deprived it of certain benefits such as those relating to leave with wages, retrenchment relief and provident fund."

That is from the point of view of the labour movement. We would not like, that in a civilised community, we should have uncivilised practices; and anything which will drive a wedge into the labour movement, which will create a special class, which will be a sore in the eyes of everybody there. We do not want that. It was to that aspect that the committee addressed itself in the beginning, and it had found that the conditions were not really as bad as they were depicted.

But still it says:

"The Committee does not consider it necessary to attempt to record a finding on the various allegations; on the other hand, the basic fact remains that segregation and the restricted period of the contract are factors which tend to keep this labour as a separate class".

Then the Committee says:

"The approach of this Committee, therefore, has been throughout to so alter the conditions as to

make them approximate as much as possible to those of other labour. It is this approach alone which will bring about a lasting improvement in the position".

I think the principle which is enunciated here is one which should be acceptable to everybody. Then the Committee made certain recommendations in order to see that the conditions of Gorakhpur labour approximate to those of other labour. That means that at the point at which they reach the work site, there should be no difference. Since the report of this Committee, objections continued to pour in from all sections of the labour movement, the INTUC, AITUC, Hind Mazdoor Sabha—everybody—passing resolutions against this. We could not but take notice of it. In February, there was a meeting of the Industrial Committee on Coal and there, at the insistence of the labour movement, this question was taken up and a decision was taken. We did not bother about the name at that stage; that organisation might continue. But all forms of control or regulation exercised separately over Gorakhpur labour should cease. There should be a joint co-operative organisation which should look after the various aspects, recruitment, training, welfare of all labour etc. so that there should be no distinction between Gorakhpur labour and other labour. Steps should be taken to devise a scheme for this purpose.

Now a resolution to this effect was passed in February. What I am now trying to explain is that since then no major change has been made. The decision was there. Only the name has been changed. We wanted to attend to the implementation of it. I will again turn to the Report of Committee.

"Regarding the name, it may incidentally be pointed out that the term 'Gorakhpuri labour', derived as it is from the place where the depot is situated, is a

misnomer. The labour handled by the depot does not come from Gorakhpur alone but serves the whole of eastern U.P. and the adjoining districts of Bihar.....”

Because of the association of other malpractices, which everybody wants to abolish, the Gorakhpur Labour Organisation has come to be identified with all those things. I thought of cutting off this nexus, this unhealthy association. This was also one of the suggestions made here, namely, change the name.

Therefore, the idea was that we keep up the recruiting part, the essential purpose of it; a certain number of persons today have a certain facility and they should continue to have that. On the other hand, there is a set of employers who want their services. I was told that three per cent of the mining labour in the country is Gorakhpur labour, or whatever comes under that name, are able to produce 20 per cent of the production. Well and good. It is very welcome news.

This means the employers would be very keen to have them. All right. We won't come in the way of the employers having them. Let the C.R.O.—I do not want to object to its being continued—continue as the recruiting agency, as an indenting agency. They find out which colliery and which employer wants this labour. Let them go on doing it. Let them present their indent. Let the recruiting organisation, with such modifications as will not change its essential purpose, continue to provide them. That is really what I am asked to do, and I am prepared to say that it should be done. This Committee, which we are appointing, should see to it that this is secured. Whether the collective centre is necessary or not is a question which may be seen by this Committee.

There is one factor. Of the labour which presents itself for recruitment, only 10 per cent is being actually recruited, so that conditions have changed during these years. The spe-

cial arrangements which were needed to send people out in the areas to get them and pay them something, are not necessary. Therefore a little change has taken place. The organisation for recruiting purposes will be devised in such a manner that those very interests do not suffer.

I have answered the main question and there are a few other matters. They ask: Will the employer be still interested now? Why will he not be interested? If he is interested in getting these people because they are efficient, and if I enable them to be placed in their hands, then, there should be no difficulty about their being employed. If his interest is in some kind of controlled regimentation and segregation which is most obnoxious, then, of course, we do not want to perpetuate those features.

The other question was about certain facilities that they are getting. Those facilities cease to be of some importance now in view of the higher wages which they get. I would say here that if the employer wants to give him a blanket and other facilities, I will not stop that. I am not at all opposed if he can continue to get all these things, but after they reach the worksite, there should be no offence.

What I want to do is this. They get a contract for 11 months and they have to come back. It is not a very good or a desirable practice. All these 14,000 workers should be made permanent; they should not be made to go back. They may take leave.....

**Shri Sinhasan Singh:** They are not compelled to go back. Those who want to go back, go back; those who want to remain, remain. There are workers who are remaining for years and years there.

**Shri Nanda:** All I would like to see is that the employers give them a permanent status and that they are absorbed permanently in the industry.



[Shri Nanda]

I do not know whether all the hon. Members know that there were some recent developments in Madhya Pradesh on 20th May, 1959 which originated in a quarrel over empty trucks in the Chinnakuri colliery in Madhya Pradesh. I do not want to say much. Somebody said the whole colliery remained closed. I do not know, for two months or so. (*Interruptions*). All these things should not be there; otherwise, their interests would suffer. Gorakhpur labour will suffer on account of this. I think I have covered the general question.

Ten or 12 questions have been showered by my friends. I have fully covered these questions; but if you want me to answer them I am prepared to deal with them separately also.

About staff and organisation. I think Shri Saksena asked that. In the first place, many of them will be absorbed in the reorganised set up. We will look after that.

**Pandit J. P. Jyotishi (Sagar):** I may bring to your notice that the Chirimiri labour have said that if by 30th September the Gorakhpur Commission is not abolished they will resort to satyagraha.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Already there are so many questions. Why should you burden him with more?

**Shri Nanda:** Sir, it is an important question and I would like to deal with it first, because it involves—I do not call it a threat but—rather a development which we should certainly like to avoid. We have taken a decision. The terms of reference of the Committee will be on the basis of this decision. These are special exceptional, abnormal and unusual conditions, and they should be abolished as far as the workers who reach the work site are concerned. So far as Government is concerned, it will not co-operate with

them. If they still remain then certain other remedies may be open. There will be other ways of dealing with the matter.

About making it permanent I have already answered that. It is not the concern of one Ministry and we consult the other Ministries. I know that the people go not only to the mines but they go to so many other places. Therefore, really, several Ministries will be concerned with it.

Now, about the U.P. Government. I have had letters from the Chief Minister and he also is of the same view that we should not disband these because the private contractors and other recruiting organisations are more undesirable. I agree with that view. For the rest, those other undesirable features objected to by the trade unions, etc., should be removed. I do not think there is any substantial difference between the view of the U.P. Government and ours. After all, it is 14 000 compared to three lakhs and half in this field. Let us not forget that when we are urging a point of view, there are repercussions on the minds and attitudes of those 3½ lakhs of workers. We have to balance all that and we must therefore provide for all the vital interests of these workers and yet eliminate those undesirable features. It is on this basis that this committee will be requested to function and I hope that there should be, after what I have stated, no occasion for any feeling of anxiety or uneasiness.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** We have completed our job for this session. It was an important session, no doubt. There were more of discussions than of legislation—discussion on important issues, economic as well as political. If we look back upon what we have done, certainly we can feel satisfied that we have done well. There were occasions when storms have arisen inside the House but they have blown over in a very short time. Convul-

ions have been visible but tranquillity has been restored soon after. Again, differences have arisen on specific issues but as soon as they have been discussed calmness again was regained. So, we can say that we have been successful in pushing forward and promoting democracy, so far as our objective is concerned.

Of course, it is unfortunate that even on the last day, certain hon. Members felt dissatisfied that the Chair had not been just to them. But the Chair has got used to these things. I can assure all the Members that they may feel dissatisfied with the Chair but the Chair never does feel dissatisfied with them. I am really grateful to all sections in the

House that they have given complete co-operation, wherever it was needed and honestly I say that I have no grouse absolutely against any individual or any group whatsoever

Now, the hon. Members shall be going to their constituencies and I wish them well. I hope they would come refreshed and resuscitated to take the more important jobs that we have before us. Now, we have this satisfaction that by and large all sections have been co-operating in the task that we have before us. I wish you all well.

17.25 hrs.

The Lok Sabha then adjourned sine die