

[Dr. P. Subbarayan]

in a letter from the General Manager to the Guild on the 8th January, 1960.

The management's stand was further clarified by the Chairman of the Corporation at a Press Conference on the 11th January, 1960, at which he also referred to the management's willingness to refer the dispute to arbitration.

Throughout this period, I was greatly concerned with the developments and had been in constant communication with the management. On the 14th January, 1960, I spoke to the President of the Guild on the telephone suggesting that the Pilots should resume work by the following day and that in that case I would personally look into the grievances in due course. I should express my disappointment that this was not accepted by the Guild, who desired to raise certain points which, I suggested, they should discuss with the management. I am, however, glad to say that this paved the way for further discussion between the Guild and the management as a result of which a mutually satisfactory settlement was reached. The strike was called off on the 16th January, 1960, and normal operations were resumed the following day.

I do not wish to dilate on the merits of the issue on which the Indian Pilots' Guild resorted to this extreme step of going on a lightning strike. Hon. Members will agree with me that a strike, in a public utility industry like air transport, without notice and without any attempt to negotiate is unjustified and, at this stage, I would only express the hope that at least in the future the Guild will not resort to the extreme step of a strike, and recourse will always be had to discussions and negotiations with the management.

For the information of hon. Members I place on the Table of the House a more detailed statement together with copies of relevant correspondence between the Guild and the manage-

ment. The House has agreed to pay and allowances of the Pilots as finally agreed to on the 2nd January, 1960.

12.08 hrs.

RESIGNATION OF MEMBER

Mr. Speaker: I have to inform the House that Shri P. V. G. Raju has resigned his seat in Lok Sabha with effect from the 2nd February, 1960. He has since become a Minister in Andhra Pradesh.

Shri S. M. Banerjee (Kanpur): He is here. I saw him.

Mr. Speaker: But he is not here.

12.09 hrs.

PANEL OF CHAIRMEN

Mr. Speaker: I have to inform the House that under sub-rule (1) of Rule 9 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business, I nominate the following Members on the new Panel of Chairmen:

1. Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava
2. Dr. Sushila Nayar
3. Shri Mulchand Dube
4. Shrimati Renu Chakravartty
5. Shri Narayan Ganesh Goray, and
6. Shri Jaipal Singh.

I want to give an opportunity to a number of hon. Members here to conduct the business of the House from time to time so that I may be assured that there will not be repeated occurrences as took place some time ago. All hon. Members will know as to what exactly the duty of the Chair and of the Members is.

So far as hon. Members who have served as Chairmen, Shri Barman and others, are concerned, they have done exceedingly well. It is not as if they have not been doing so. But they

have taken up other onerous tasks. As far as possible I would like to distribute to others and give opportunities to various hon. Members. I thank all the hon. Members who have assisted both myself and the hon. Deputy-Speaker from time to time, much against great inconvenience to themselves, in presiding over the House and in carrying on the deliberations.

12.10 hrs.

ADMINISTRATION OF EVACUEE
PROPERTY (AMENDMENT) BILL
—contd.

Mr. Speaker: The House will now take up further consideration of the following motion moved by Shri Mehr Chand Khanna on the 10th February, 1960, namely,—

“That the Bill further to amend the Administration of Evacuee Property Act, 1950 be taken into consideration.”

Shri D. C. Sharma may continue his speech.

Shri D. C. Sharma (Gurdaspur): I was submitting yesterday that a Bill which deals especially with the refugees, suffering humanity, should be drafted in such a way that it does not become invalid when referred to the High Courts, but taking it for granted that human wisdom is limited and that even the best of draftsmen cannot prepare such Bills, I would like to ask the Minister how much time has passed between the High Court declaring some of the provisions of the Act invalid and the bringing forward of this amending Bill.

I am not sure of the facts, but I am told that several months have elapsed, that all these months have kept the refugees in a state of uncertainty, and that a great deal of harm has been done to some of them. I would have liked the Ministry to bring forward

348(Ai)LS—3.

the amending Bill as early as possible so that there may have been no hardship caused to the refugees.

My second point is this. I find that there has been progressive decline in the qualifications for the appointments to the posts of Custodian, Deputy Custodian and other categories of officers. There was a time when the post of Custodian-General used to go to retired Judges of the High Court, but now I am informed that the Custodian-General is not a retired Judge, he is only a District and Sessions Judge. I have nothing to say against that gentleman, and for aught I know he may be a very worthy gentleman, but I cannot understand why the Ministry should go on appointing persons of lesser and lesser calibre to these posts. At the same time, they are adding to them more and more responsibilities. It is a very strange symptom of the policy of the Ministry: the progressive decline in the qualifications of these officers and the progressive addition in the responsibilities that they have to discharge. I do not know what logic there is, how these two things can be squared, how these two things are at par with each other. My feeling was that these officers should have been kept at a particular level of achievement, but this is not done. Now when these officers are not as highly qualified as they used to be, we are giving them arbitrary powers, we are making them more or less responsible for so many other things; they can assess rent, they can assess any damage that has been caused to the property, they can call upon people to show cause why this or that has not been done. I feel they should not be given these additional powers.

I hear that these officers are already overburdened with work, and I am told by some of the refugees that come to me, and that come to other Members of Parliament, that the way they deal with these cases is not in conformity with the highest judicial traditions and standards of our country; they do not devote as much time