

am prepared to allow an hour for the reading of this statement. The hon. Minister has laid the statement on the Table of the House. I do not know why when the statement is there, this kind of impatience should be shown; I cannot understand it at all. Hon. Members forget what they represented earlier.

to the conclusion that the matter will end there, but it behoves the Government to look carefully into the genuine grievances of the employees, and even at this belated hour to listen to the request repeatedly made by the leaders of labour, namely, to sit round a table and hammer out the differences between the two parties.

12.09½ hrs.

RESIGNATION OF A MEMBER

Mr. Speaker: I have to inform the the House that Dr. Gopalrao Khedkar has resigned his seat in Lok Sabha with effect from the 5th August, 1960.

For a moment, I shall recollect very briefly the background which led to the strike. The Pay Commission's recommendations generated great dissatisfaction among the employees, and added to that, there was Government's delay in arriving at decisions on these. It is a matter of deep regret that the recommendations of the Pay Commission, and particularly the recommendations in respect of the most important items, were based on wrong data supplied to the Commission. I do not know who was responsible for that. Matters such as data to the effect that a worker can ordinarily procure two major meals for 56 nP per day are certainly bound to lead the Commission to erroneous conclusions. The workers had a right to disagree with the decisions of the Government. But before going into that, I must point one thing out to this House and dispel an erroneous impression that has been created, namely, that the leaders who sponsored the strike were really trying to eke out a political advantage for their party and that this was not an industrial dispute. I maintain with all the emphasis at my command that if at all there could be an industrial dispute, this was one. This was a *bona fide* and genuine dispute. The labour leaders made repeated efforts at negotiations, and I speak from record. My hon. friend, Shri Nath Pai, speaking in this House on the 17th December 1959, on the Report of the Pay Commission, stated as under:

12.10 hrs.

STATUTORY RESOLUTION RE:
ESSENTIAL SERVICES MAINTENANCE ORDINANCE AND MOTION RE: STRIKE OF SOME CENTRAL GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES

Shri Naushir Bharucha (East Khandesh): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move the following Resolution:

"This House disapproves of the Essential Services Maintenance Ordinance, 1960 (Ordinance No. 1 of 1960) promulgated by the President on the 8th July, 1960".

Sr. in inviting this House to disapprove of the Ordinance—Ordinance No. 1 of 1960—I am not asking the House to hold a *post-mortem* examination on the strike situation, but in fact I am requesting the House to consider the grave questions of our policy towards a healthy development of trade unionism in this country, the question of the efficient working of the Government machinery and indeed also the question of the success or failure of our Third Five Year Plan.

The Government's momentary victory over labour must not lead them

"I would appeal to the Home Minister, the Finance Minister and the Railway Minister that it is not too late to try to sit with the representatives of the employees.