

2. Sanctions under the Code of Discipline;
3. Extensions of the Scheme of Joint Management Councils;
4. The extent to which tripartite decisions would be binding on the parties concerned;
5. Functioning of Works Committees;
6. Additional measures for protection against victimisation;
7. Abolition of Rickshaw Pulling;
8. Workers' Education Scheme;
9. Proposal for establishing an Institute of Labour Relations Research.

(d) Yes.

(e) None.

Shri Tangamani: In view of the fact that the Bonus Commission has been set up, may I know whether the Standing Labour Committee will consider the finalisation of the terms of reference of the Bonus Commission?

The Minister of Labour and Employment and Planning (Shri Nanda): Yes, Sir. It is intended to be done.

Shri T. B. Vittal Rao: Why was it not included in the agenda?

Mr. Speaker: Order, order.

Shri Tangamani: May I know whether the question of enforcing the Wage Board's recommendations by way of legislations or other wise will be considered by the Standing Labour Committee?

Shri Nanda: Yes, Sir; to the extent the matter remains outstanding.

CORRECTION OF ANSWER TO STARRED QUESTION No. 890

The Deputy Minister of Planning (Shri S. N. Mishra): Sir, may I seek your indulgence to correct a figure which I gave in answer to a supplementary question arising from Ques-

tion No. 990? I mentioned that the budget estimate for 1961-62 was Rs. 52,44,000. In fact, this was the proposal made by the Planning Commission, but this was reduced by the Finance Ministry to Rs. 50,18,400.

Mr. Speaker: Reduced by about Rs. 2 lakhs.

Re. S. N. Q. No. 8

Mr. Speaker: There is a Short Notice Question. Shri Ramanathan Chettiar.

Shri Vajpayee: Sir, I rise to a point of order. The subject matter of this short notice question was raised in the form of an ordinary question a few days back, and the hon. Defence Minister was pleased to state that it was not in the public interest to give the information that was being called for. Now, the short notice question has been admitted on the same subject. Are we to understand that the question of public interest is not involved now?

Mr. Speaker: He might have changed his views.

Shri Vajpayee: Can the Ministers change their views so often?

Mr. Speaker: On reconsideration, it might have been changed. Far from welcoming the answer to a question, the hon. Member is raising a point of order. If the hon. Member gives notice of a question, except on a question of prestige, he must be interested in getting an answer somehow, whether it is in answer to his own question or to some other question.

Shri Vajpayee: The point is, if an Opposition Member from this side had tabled a short notice question, the hon. Defence Minister would not have accepted it. Now, a Congress Member has tabled such a question, and so, it has been accepted. (Interruptions).

Pandit K. C. Sharma: It is an insinuation.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. My experience, on the other hand, is that a number of hon. Members from the

Congress Benches have complained that if they table a short notice question, the Ministers do not care to answer.

Shri Raghunath Singh: That is right. Our questions are turned into Calling Attention Notices. (Interruptions).

Mr. Speaker: That is not at all my view. Some of the hon. Members felt that if the Opposition presses, some of the hon. Ministers occasionally yield. Therefore, there is a balance on both sides. Occasionally, short notice questions are tabled by Congress Benches. Short notice questions more often are tabled by the Opposition, and occasionally one or two of them are answered. So, why should there be so much of trouble?

Shri D. C. Sharma: Short notice questions and Calling Attention Notices are always turned down, Sir.

Shri Raghunath Singh: Our short notice questions are turned down on account of the Adjournment Motions given notice of by the Opposition. Always Adjournment Motions and short notice questions are rejected. (Interruptions).

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. Shri Ramanathan Chettiar.

Manufacture of Supersonic Aircrafts

S.N.Q. No. 8. Shri Ramanathan Chettiar: Will the Minister of Defence be pleased to refer to the reply given to Starred Question No. 852 on the 15th March, 1961 and state:

(a) whether he has recently visited the Hindustan Aircraft Limited, Bangalore; and

(b) what further progress is being made in regard to the supersonic aircraft which is being built there?

The Minister of Defence (Shri Krishna Menon): (a) Yes, Sir. I visited the factory on the 17th March.

(b) I am glad to inform the House that the HF 24 Mark I is undergoing

preliminary trials. Progress in this stage of the development of the Aircraft is also very satisfactory. There is no question of the Government not answering questions given notice of by hon. Members from one side or the other. The time element has to be taken into consideration. That particular day was the worst day to answer that question. When an aeroplane of this kind is undergoing preliminary trials . . .

Shri Vajpayee: We are not able to follow the answer. (Interruptions).

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. There is so much of noise in the House that nobody hears anything. I can understand the excitement, but it must cool down immediately. It ought not to be continued permanently. Will the hon. Minister repeat the answer?

Shri Krishna Menon: I thought that out of courtesy to the House I should explain it. I was saying that there was no question of any information being withheld on the ground of public interest, because the enquiry comes, as you yourself have said, from one side or the other. The time element comes in. What may be said at one time may not be the same at another time. The aeroplane is undergoing preliminary trials and when anything is in the sky we cannot put it down. It should be seen in any case that when the previous question was asked the aircraft was in a particular stage when any mishaps might have occurred to it. If a preliminary trial was being held, and the next day, if there was a drop, that would have affected the whole of the production. That was not the opportunity of answering the question. The moment a short notice question came, I could accept it, and in this case I accepted it.

Shri Ramanathan Chettiar: May I know when this aircraft will be completed?

Shri Krishna Menon: It is completed in the sense and to the extent that it is undergoing preliminary

trials; that is to say, the aeroplane cannot move unless it is completed. But, if it is a question of completion in the sense that all the equipment that has come in, I am sorry I am not in a position to say the exact time.

WRITTEN ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

Visit of Maharaja of Sikkim

*997. **Shri Damani:** Will the **Prime Minister** be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that the Maharaja of Sikkim visited this country recently and discussed various problems with Government; and

(b) the salient features of the agreement reached at the aforesaid meeting?

The **Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of External Affairs (Shri Sadath Ali Khan):** (a) and (b). The Maharaja of Sikkim was invited as a State Guest on the occasion of this year's anniversary of Republic Day. After his visit to Delhi, he went on an official tour of certain parts of India. His family accompanied him on this tour. No discussion were held with him.

Loyabad Colliery

*998. **Shri Muhammed Elias:** Will the **Minister of Labour and Employment** be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that at Loyabad Colliery the roof collapsed recently while some workers were engaged underground in coal-cutting;

(b) if so, the number of workers injured and killed;

(c) whether any compensation has been given to the members of the families of those killed; and

(d) if so, how much?

The **Deputy Minister of Planning and Labour and Employment (Shri L. N. Mishra):** (a) and (b). There was an accident by fall of roofs in the colliery on 28th January 1961 while

a miner was working in a depillaring area. As a result, he suffered serious injuries which proved fatal 12 hours later.

(c) and (d). The management has initiated action for depositing the compensation amount with the Workmen's Compensation Commissioner.

Nahan Foundry

*1004. **Shri J. B. S. Bist:** Will the **Minister of Commerce and Industry** be pleased to state:

(a) whether the Nahan Foundry in Himachal Pradesh has to compete in the open market to secure orders from the Railways and the Posts and Telegraphs;

(b) whether on account of this competition this factory, which is owned and operated by Government, has to suffer losses;

(c) whether any effort by the management of this factory was made to secure Government order on a non-competitive basis;

(d) whether the request was denied;

(e) if so, on what grounds; and

(f) whether Bharat Electronics, Hindustan Machine Tools and other Government-owned factories have also to compete in order to sell their goods to Government?

The **Minister of Industry (Shri Manubhai Shah):** (a) Yes, Sir.

(b) The position sometimes, as in case of all industries, is that the Nahan Foundry limited has to accept some orders to avoid idle capacity in the factory.

(c) No, Sir. Generally Government departments are required to buy as advantageously as possible through the tender or rate contract and similar procedures.

(d) and (e). Do not arise.