

श्री हुकम बाबू कच्छबाय: देश में कारों की बहुत कमी है। मांग अधिक है। ऐसी परिस्थिति में क्या आप इस बात की छूट देंगे कि जो भारतीय विदेशों में व्यापार कर रहे हैं या रह रहे हैं वे वहां से कारें ला सकें? क्या आप उनको इसकी अनुमति देंगे, छूट देंगे?

SHRI T. A. PAI: It is true that we manufacture only 42,000 cars at present. But I do not think that the suggestion of the hon. Member that businessmen should be permitted to get cars from abroad is valid because it involves foreign exchange.

SHRI DINEN BHATTACHARYYA: May I know whether after the increase in the price of motor spirit the demand for manufactured cars had gone down? In view of that would the permits for the purchase of new cars be liberalised?

SHRI T. A. PAI: In spite of the fact that petrol costs have gone up, though the demand from a particular section of the people had gone down, there is still a vast section of people who can well afford to pay these prices.... (Some Hon. Members Black-moneyed people). The demand will continue when we view it with reference to the number of cars manufactured in the country.

#### Mediation in Railway Dispute

\*999. SHRI MADHU LIMAYE: Will the Minister of LABOUR be pleased to state:

(a) whether he made any attempt to mediate in the Railway dispute.

(b) if so, the details of the efforts made by him to avert the Railway strike;

(c) the terms offered by him or the Railway Minister to railwaymen;

(d) whether he advised the Railway Ministry not to use the Territorial

army, BSF and the Military to crush the Railway strike but reach a settlement; and

(e) if so, the response of the Railway Ministry?

THE MINISTER OF LABOUR (SHRI RAGHUNATHA REDDY): (a) to (e): Informal meetings were held with the representatives of the Central Trade Union Organisations and Trade Unions of Railwaymen to discuss the various demands put forth by the Unions of Railwaymen and they were assured that the views expressed in the meetings would be communicated to the Railway Ministry. Hope was expressed that negotiated settlement would be possible and the strike would be averted.

श्री मधु लिमये: सबसे पहले मैं आपकी तबज़ह बुलेटिन पार्ट 2 जो ग्राह मई का है उसकी प्रारंभ दिलाना चाहता हूँ। इसमें आपका नया डायरेक्शन 13 (ए) प्रकाशित किया गया है। यह डायरेक्शन इस प्रकार है:

Bulletin part II, dated 8 May.

"After Direction 13, the following new direction, 13A shall be added:

13.A. Answers to questions given in the House shall be complete and as far as possible each part thereof shall be answered separately. If attention is drawn to an answer and the Speaker is satisfied that it does not fulfill this condition, he may direct the Minister to give a complete answer."

अब आप मेरे प्रश्न देखिए। मन्त्री महोदय ने तत्काल साबित किया है कि 8 मई के बुलेटिन के बावजूद मेरे प्रश्न के सी डी और ई का इसमें बिल्कुल जवाब नहीं है। जहाँ तक बी का संबंध है उन्होंने उसकी तफ़्सील भी नहीं दी है। उनको आप पहले आदेश दें कि मेरे सी डी और ई का वह जवाब दें। साथ ही बी का तफ़्सीलवार जवाब आए। उसके बाद मैं अपने दो सप्ली-मेंटरी पूछूंगा।

प्रध्यक्ष महोदय : यह बुलेटिन घाट मई का है। जवाब पता नहीं कब तैयार हो गया होगा।

Can you in one minute split it into three or four parts. Anyway I will see that in future direction is followed strictly. It was only yesterday that the Bulletin was issued.

श्री मधु लिमये : लेकिन पार्लियामेंटरी एफयर्ज मिनिस्टर रूलज कमेटी में हाजिर थे। उनका क्या कुछ कर्त्तव्य नहीं बनता ?

MR. SPEAKER: There is a lot of scope for leniency in this matter and the question also might have reached him much earlier than the Bulletin. They have been doing so in the past.

SHRI MADHU LIMAYE: When did you adopt the direction? I was done many weeks ago.

MR. SPEAKER: I shall personally see to it that this is followed strictly in future. You better ask your supplementary.

SHRI MADHU LIMAYE: Supplementary is meant to elicit more information.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE: As a Member of the Rules Committee, I would say, your Direction should be honoured. (c) and (d) should be answered.

MR. SPEAKER: Except for some Members, I do not think other Members are aware of the Bulletin.

SHRI TRIDIB CHAUDHURI: Sir, apart from your new Direction, the questions are specific. Part (a) says 'whether he made any attempt to mediate in the dispute'. He referred to an informal meeting he had with central trade union organisations. This has no connection with the question. The answer is not connected with that. He must be specific whether he made any attempt or not.

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Raghunatha Reddy, this device was introduced to check evasion. I hope you will be cautious in future. Try to satisfy them by cutting them into parts.

SHRI RAGHUNATHA REDDY: Sir, I respectfully submit that as far as part (a) is concerned, the question was whether I made any attempt to mediate in the railway dispute. If I have to strictly answer the question, I did not mediate between the parties. But, nevertheless, I thought it is my duty to inform the House, with great respect, that I had an informal meeting with the representatives of the trade union organisations to ascertain what their views are so that I may communicate to the Railway Ministry.... (Interruptions).

MR. SPEAKER: I know you are all excited over it. But, try to understand what he says.

SHRI RAGHUNATHA REDDY: For this purpose, with a view first of all to understand the views of the various trade union leaders and the trade union organisations, I had a meeting in a very informal manner. I made it very clear to all the trade union leaders that it was a very informal meeting and it had no formal characteristics of its own. On 4th, 5th, 8th and 9th April, we held a meeting with the individual organisations. Then, on the 11th April, there was a joint meeting of all the organisations together. I appealed to them that having regard to the present economic situation, they should not think in terms of resorting to strike and matters must be settled by negotiations. I also told them that I would communicate their views etc to the Railway Ministry so that the Railway Ministry would be in a position to properly discuss this matter with them. On the 12th, I happened to be present at a meeting which the Railway Ministry held. Beyond this, I did not attend any meeting in regard

to negotiations etc. It may not be correct to use the expression 'mediate' in this matter. With great respect to this house and to you, Sir, I thought it is my duty to at least inform the House what I have done in this matter. So, part (a) and (b) have been answered.

Now, in regard to the question, terms offered by me to railwaymen, there are no terms which I have offered to them. I only tried to find out what their terms are. In fact, terms were offered to us rather than my offering to them. The terms offered by the Railway Minister, terms proposed by the railway trade unions, all have been discussed on the floor of the House elaborately and I do not think I am likely to add anything useful to what has already been done on the floor of the House by the Railway Minister. Coming to (d), whether I advised the Railway Ministry not to use the Territorial Army, BSF and the Military to crush the railway strike but reach a settlement, with great respect, I would say that Mr. Madhu Limaye being a very senior Member, he knows the functions of the Labour Ministry. It is not the function of the Labour Ministry to advise or not to advise. It is the duty of those persons who are in charge of the particular Ministry or Department to consider the various circumstances, the pros and cons and then take a decision.

As far as the responsibility of the Labour Ministry is concerned, that question does not arise.

श्री मधु लिमये : अध्यक्ष महोदय, श्रम मंत्रालय के अन्तर्गत जो मामले आते हैं वे कानून लिस्ट के तहत आते हैं, जिसकी एन्ट्री 24 इस प्रकार है :

"Welfare of labour including conditions of work, provident funds, employers' liability, workmen's compensation, invalidity and old

age pensions and maternity benefits."

जहां राज्य के तहत कुछ मामले आते हैं, वहां भी श्रम मंत्रालय की जिम्मेदारी है। लेकिन रेल मंत्रालय का मामला विशुद्ध केन्द्र का मामला है, और ऐसी हालत में श्रम मंत्री को केवल पोस्टमैन का काम नहीं करना चाहिए था। क्या मंत्री महोदय को यह पता था कि 1 मई को मिनट्स तैयार करने के लिए—मतैक्य का क्षेत्र क्या है और मतभेद का क्षेत्र क्या है, यह लेखबद्ध करने के लिए—एक मीटिंग होने वाली थी, और उसके बाद 2 मई को दोबारा बातचीत का दौर शुरू होने वाला था; यदि हां, तो क्या इस दरमियान 1 मई और 2 मई के दरमियान मंत्र: महोदय रेल मंत्रालय के साथ कोई बातचीत कर रहे थे, क्या वह उसके सम्पर्क में थे और क्या उन्होंने उसको यह सलाह दी थी कि यह रात के समय जो गिरफ्तारियों का दौर शुरू कर रहा है, उससे मामला बिगड़ जायेगा और रेल मंत्रालय तथा गृह मंत्रालय को 2 मई की बातचीत तक रुकना चाहिए, ताकि रेल मजदूरों की हड़ताल टल जाये? श्रम मंत्री का यह कर्तव्य था। मैं उनसे लेबर मिनिस्टर के नाते पूछना चाहता हूँ कि क्या वह रेल मंत्रालय और गृह मंत्रालय के साथ टच में थे और क्या उन्होंने इस तरह की सलाह दी थी, यदि नहीं दी थी, तो न देने का कारण क्या था।

SHRI RAGHUNATHA REDDY: I was only trying to find out the progress of the negotiations. The rest of the matter will not arise....(Interruptions) I was trying to get in touch with the progress of the negotiations. In that context, I used to meet the Railway Minister to find out what exactly is the stage of the negotiations. To that extent, I have been discussing with him; not beyond that.

श्री मधु लिमये : अध्यक्ष महोदय, सारा मामला बिगड़ने का कारण यह है कि 2 मई की बातचीत शुरू होते के पहले श्रम

मंत्रालय की गिरफ्तारियों को रोकने के लिए हस्तक्षेप करना चाहिए था—उस का यह कर्तव्य था। मेरा स्पैसिफिक प्रश्न यह है कि क्या मंत्री महोदय ने इस तरह की मध्यस्थता की थी और यह सलाह दी थी कि ये गिरफ्तारियां न की जायें।

**MR. SPEAKER:** He has already mentioned it.

**SHRI RAGHUNATHA REDDY:** I made it very clear that I met the Railway Minister now and then to find out the progress of negotiations in this regard.

श्री मन्त्रु लिखते : अध्यक्ष महोदय, मेरे प्रश्न का जवाब नहीं आया है, लेकिन मैं इसको छोड़ देता हूँ।

क्या श्रम मंत्री को इस बात का पता है कि रेल मजदूरों की हड़ताल को तोड़ने के लिए कुछ सरकारी तत्व सगठनों के खिलाफ झूठा प्रचार कर रहे हैं? मेरे पास ये दो पोस्टर हैं: एक पोस्टर का शीर्षक है, "गवर्नमेंट स्टूजिज स्टाप मिलाइनिंग ए० आई० ग्रार० एफ०", और दूसरे पोस्टर का शीर्षक है, "व्हाई वाच जाज फरनडीज एस्टेड"? पोस्टर ए० आई० ग्रार० एफ० द्वारा प्रकाशित नहीं किये गये थे। जनरल सेक्रेटरी प्रिय गुप्ता मुझे एक पत्र द्वारा सूचित करते हैं।

"It has been brought to my notice that two posters in English and Hindi have been posted on the walls, bearing the name of AIRF, attacking Mr. S. A. Dange and the CPI. The AIRF has not issued the posters. The posters do not have the full address of the printing press.... Government has to try to find out who is behind the printing of the posters."

अध्यक्ष महोदय, पूरा पत्र मैं नहीं पढ़ता। केवल मंत्री महोदय से जानना चाहता हूँ कि कौन इन पोस्टरों को फेडरेशन एक

मान्यता प्राप्त संस्था है, तो क्या श्रम मंत्री का यह कर्तव्य नहीं है कि जो वाक्य यदा मान्यता प्राप्त रजिस्टर्ड यूनियन्स हैं या मान्यता प्राप्त फेडरेशंस हैं उनके खिलाफ जब इस तरह का झूठा प्रचार किया जा रहा है तो क्या उनको इस बीच में नहीं पड़ना चाहिए? क्या ये इस बात का पता लगाने की कोशिश करेंगे कि इस प्रकार के झूठे पोस्टर कौन छाप रहा है और रेल भवन से वह छापे जा रहे हैं। मेरे पास यह फोटो और पोस्टर है, इसे छाप देखिये। यह रेल भवन में पहरेदार बैठा हुआ है। तो क्या इनकी सम्मति से यह सारा किया जा रहा है? क्या माननीय मंत्री जी मान्यता प्राप्त फेडरेशंस और रजिस्टर्ड ट्रेड यूनियन्स बचाने के लिए, उनकी रक्षा के लिए कोई प्रयास करेंगे?

**MR. SPEAKER:** Don't make the Question Hour a debating time.

**SHRI RAGHUNATHA REDDY:** As far as the posters are concerned, I am also having the benefit of seeing them. Mr. Limaye has shown the posters just now. I do not know what exactly we can do. Anyway, I will take up the point that he has mentioned. (Interruptions).

**SHRI K. MALLANA:** May I know from the hon. Minister whether the Railway, with their offer of terms of settlement, requested the Labour Minister to settle negotiations and, if so, what were the terms of settlement and what was the reaction of the Labour Minister?

**SHRI RAGHUNATHA REDDY:** As I have made clear in my answer itself, I had informal talks before the Railway Minister started negotiations or discussions with the trade union leaders. My talks were only in the nature of informal talks.

**SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA:** Subsequent to these so-called informal talks, the various unions and federations had duly served strike notices. On the 22nd and 23rd of April, the

strike notices were served. I want to know from the hon. Minister whether there is not a statutory obligation on him, irrespective of all other considerations, under the Industrial Disputes Act that, if strike notices are served in an essential service or in a public utility service, then the Labour Ministry must—there is no question of “may”—initiate conciliation proceedings in the matter of dispute and, if that is, why, after the serving of strike notices, the Labour Ministry did not come forward to discharge its statutory obligation under the Industrial Disputes Act, and why he did not call any conciliation meeting to see whether the dispute could be resolved.

**SHRI RAGHUNATHA REDDY:** About 97 unions or so have served strike notices. With respect to the specific question raised by Shri Indrajit Gupta why conciliation proceedings have not been started under the provisions of the Industrial Disputes Act which are considered to be compulsory in respect of any essential service, we have been advised in law that service of a notice of strike under section 22 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, is a violation of the Central Government's order under rule 118 of the Defence of India Rules, 1971, and in view of this, no conciliation proceedings can be held in disputes arising out of illegal strike notices.

**SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA:** Does this reply mean that they would like strikes to take place without any notice being served? If he has been advised in law that the notices themselves are not in order, then the implication is that no notice is required for going on strike. What kind of legal advice has been given and by whom, I want to know.

**SHRI RAGHUNATHA REDDY:** This legal advice has been given by the Law Ministry and the Law Minister.

**SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE:** We appreciate his frankness.

**SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA:** Notice of a strike is given in order to give an opportunity to have conciliation proceedings, so that there is time for a discussion and a settlement. (Interruptions).

**MR. SPEAKER:** Whatever he has got in his basket, he has laid before you. He is not concealing anything from you.

**SHRI PRIYA RANJAN DAS MUNSI:** I would like to know from the hon. Minister whether, on the previous occasions of railway strikes, ten years before and also in the last year, the advice or the cooperation of the Labour Ministry was sought by the Railway Ministry to settle the dispute. Secondly, since the strike is on at the moment, may I know whether the Labour Ministry finds any suggestion to create conditions, in cooperation with the Railway Ministry and the trade union leaders, for a fresh move to settle this disputes and to call off the strike?

**SHRI RAGHUNATHA REDDY:** The position of the Railway Ministry, as far as strike is concerned, has been stated on the floor of this House after a prolonged discussion. I am not in a position to make any further suggestions in this regard.

**श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी :** रेल मंत्रालय रेल कर्मचारियों को इंडस्ट्रियल वर्कर नहीं मानता है और न उन्हें इस बात की छूट देता है कि वे प्लेक्टिव बार्गेनिंग कर सकें। उनका कहना है कि वे गवर्नमेंट एम्प्लॉईज हैं उन्हें पे कमीशन की सिफारिशों को स्वीकार करना चाहिए मैं जानना चाहता हूँ कि क्या लेबर मिनिस्ट्री में इस सवाल पर विचार हुआ है कि रेल कर्मचारियों को भी इंडस्ट्रियल वर्कर माना जाय और उन्हें प्लेक्टिव बार्गेनिंग करने की छूट दी जाय? अगर हुआ है तो क्या नतीजा निकाला है ?

**SHRI RAGHUNATHA REDDY:** There are already certain procedures prevalent in the Railway Ministry for purposes of discussion and agreed to by the recognised organisations of railwaymen. I cannot do anything better than what is being done and I cannot enlighten the hon. members further on this.

**SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE:** I am sorry, perhaps he did not understand my question.

**SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE:** He cannot afford to understand.

**ANOTHER HON. MEMBER:** Put it in English.

**MR. SPEAKER:** He understands it all right, but not in your way.

**SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE:** I want a satisfactory reply.

**MR. SPEAKER:** But not in your own way.

**SHRI RAGHUNATHA REDDY:** This is one of the demands made by some of the Railway employees. For this, as I said, there are already certain procedures in the Railway Ministry and agreed to by the parties concerned like the Joint Consultative Machinery. These are the procedures available and this demand is also one of the demands that are being negotiated.

Regarding the merits of the demand I do not want to say anything.

**SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE:** I wanted the reaction of the Railway Ministry whether the Railway Employees should be considered industrial workers or not.

**MR. SPEAKER:** There is no use of considering the feelings and the reactions. He is giving the information and the reactions are upto you to judge.

**SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE:** Let him say that this question has not been considered in the Labour Ministry and he has no views on this question.

**MR. SPEAKER:** You can take it like that.

**SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE:** He is the Labour Minister of India.

**SHRI S. M. BANERJEE:** The Labour Minister of India is in Paris.

**SHRI VASANT SATHE:** It is well known that under the industrial law, when there is a dispute between two parties, the labour and the management or the employer, the Labour Minister, on representation by either of the parties, can refer the dispute for conciliation. Even, without that, if he finds so, he can send it for conciliation, and the process of adjudication follows. Was this step taken by the Labour Ministry or was there any representation by any of the parties to the dispute to the Labour Ministry for taking this matter to conciliation? ... (Interruptions).

I wanted to know whether there was any representation from any of the parties or the Labour Ministry itself could take it to arbitration or do they want to settle it in between themselves and take it to the streets?

**SHRI RAGHUNATHA REDDY:** I had already respectfully submitted that though it is the normal procedure that when a strike notice is given, the conciliation machinery is set into motion for the purpose of holding conciliation proceedings between the parties, that is the employer and the employee, I want to bring to your attention, that Rule 118 of the Defence India Rules has been invoked and it has been already enforced. Now, under Rule 119 of the Defence of India Rules, strikes are prohibited in respect of the Railways. Therefore, the argument is that in view of the fact that there is already a pro-

hibition against the strike, any notice of strike is illegal and since it is illegal, the notice is ab initio invalid and illegal... (Interruptions).

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No, no.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: How can a notice be illegal?

SHRI VASANT SATHE: I said: was there a dispute? I am not on the point of notice. I was on the point of dispute. Was there a dispute within the knowledge of the Labour Ministry and what steps did they take to see that the machinery under the labour law is set in motion?

SHRI RAGHUNATHA REDDY: That is exactly the question I have been answering. Yes, as far as the strike notices are concerned, they had been served. But, under the Industrial Disputes Act, to commence conciliation proceedings, the prerequisites are these... (Interruptions) But, as we are advised, in view of the fact that Rule 118 is enforced and as a result of that, any strike notice is illegal, you cannot go on conciliating in respect of a notice which is ab initio invalid and illegal... (Interruptions).

SHRI P.M. MEHTA: Why were then negotiations started?

SHRI TRIDIB CHAUDHURI: We all understand and realise the helpless position of the Labour Ministry so far as industrial disputes with public sector enterprises are concerned, particularly, the Railways and also departmental undertakings. These are out of bounds for the Labour Ministry. We all know that. Even then, may I draw your attention to a piece of news that was published on the 1st of May that he was requested by the Railway Ministry to hold himself in the town and cancel his engagements in Calcutta and elsewhere that he had and then suddenly those arrests and other things came. May I know whether there is any basis for the news that was pub-

lished in all the national presses?

Secondly, was there any attempt—we are all grateful to him that on his own and without being requested, he took certain initiatives but they were not so much appreciated in certain quarters—but did the Railway Ministry on its own initiative at any point of time put itself or the Railway Minister in touch with him in order to get his advice or his good offices in the settlement of the dispute?

SHRI RAGHUNATHA REDDY: To the extent I can understand from my discussions with the Railway Minister, the Railway Minister is very sympathetic and is very anxious... (Interruptions).

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No, no.

SHRI RAGHUNATHA REDDY: As far as the cancellation of my tour to Calcutta, I was scheduled to attend the State Conference of INTUC and at that time, the Railway Minister mentioned to me, 'If you are here, your services can be of any use or help and if your services are necessary for any purpose, perhaps it is better you remain in Delhi.' That is why I cancelled it.

SHRI MADHU LIMAYE: You were a party to the arrests.

श्री राम सिंह भार्गव : का मंत्र महोदय यह बताने की कृपा करें कि जब नेशनल-सिक्शन चल रहा हो तब नेशनल-सिक्शन चल रहा हो और "नो सेंट्रल गेट" नहीं हुआ हों तब क्या उपाय पहले ही हड़ताल का निर्णय देकर हड़ताल का तारीख तय की जा सकती है ?

SHRI RAGHUNATHA REDDY: The fact remains that the strike notice was illegal.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE: All the leaders of the Co-ordination Committee of the Railwaymen's struggle

have demanded resumption of negotiations after release of all arrested leaders including Shri George Fernandes. But Shri George Fernandes has gone a step further and he said that in case it is not possible for the Government to release the leaders, let them start negotiations in jail. This is the latest. I would like to know the reaction of the hon. Minister to that and whether he would advise—he had advised and he is likely to advise—the Railway Minister and the Prime Minister and the mighty Home Minister, Shri Uma Shankar Dikshit, to resume negotiations and release the Railwaymen's leaders or start negotiations in the jail. I want to know.

**SHRI RAGHUNATHA REDDY:** I had also noted the point mentioned by Shri S. M. Banerjee. (Interruptions) What advise I can give to the Railway Minister is a matter between one and the Railway Minister.

**SHRI S. M. BANERJEE:** Am I to understand that the Labour Minister is completely out of the picture?

**SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE:** Has the Labour Minister gone into hibernation?

**SHRI S. M. BANERJEE:** Has he advised the Railway Minister or the Government to start negotiations to concede the demands of railwaymen?

**SHRI RAGHUNATHA REDDY:** Advice from one Minister to Railway Minister is a matter between them.

**PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE:** According to Government negotiations were held up because Mr. George Fernandes, the leader of Railwaymen, was carrying on a campaign to provoke people for violence, destruction of property, burning of railways and all that. I am quoting the Minister. But I would like to know from the Minister whether he is aware of the circular issued by the National Co-ordination Committee of Railwaymen's struggle issued under Mr. George Fernandes's signature. This is issued

on 23rd April, 1974. Certain instructions have been given to Railwaymen. Instruction No. 16 stated that passenger trains should not be stopped in the block stations and the engine and other staff should leave the trains at the nearest railway stations so that passengers are not put to inconvenience. Instruction No. 17 states that no attempt should be made to burn or damage the railway stations or other railway property and such attempts is made by agent provocators should be foiled collectively. Instruction No. 18 states that abusive language and filthy propaganda against the individuals, Ministers or the officers should not be allowed to be made and criticisms should be directed only against the policies of the Government. In view of this circular is it not clear that the leader of the Railwaymen's struggle does not want burning or destruction of railway property? Does not the Labour Minister consider that breaking up of negotiations on this plea by the Railway Minister is not justified? Will he take steps to bring about settlement between them?

**SHRI RAGHUNATHA REDDY:** We have a copy of the circular and I have also read it. With regard to the other questions the Railway Minister has already dealt with them.

**PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE:** If you have read the circular you will be convinced that he did not want destruction of railway property at all. And therefore I want to have your opinion whether intercepting negotiations and breaking up of negotiations is wrong or otherwise.

**SHRI RAGHUNATHA REDDY:** This question refers to opinion he does not require any information.

श्री नरसिंह नारायण पांडे : मैं प्रायः माध्यम से माननीय श्रम मंत्री जी से जानना चाहता हूँ कि नेगोसिएशन के बारे में जो विभिन्न नेताओं से बात चीत हुई श्री



जिसके बारे में आपने आश्वासन दिया कि जो **बातचीत** है वह पहले रेलवे मिनिस्टर के पास भेज दी जायेगी तो क्या उसके बाद जो रेलवे मिनिस्टर ने एनाउन्समेंट किया, क्या लेबर मिनिस्टर ने महसूस किया कि उसमें कुछ कमी है और यदि उसमें कुछ कमी है तो फिर रेलवे मिनिस्टर का ध्यान दिलाया ?

दूसरी बात मैं यह जानना चाहता हूँ कि क्या श्रम मंत्री जी विभिन्न ट्रेड यूनियन नेताओं से अपील करेंगे कि वे स्ट्राइक काल आफ करें और ऐसी कडोशनल्स क्रिएट करें जिससे बातचीत का दौर शुरू हो सके ?

**SHRI RAGHUNATHA REDDY:** As regards the first part of his question, the assurance is that the leaders of the trade unions and railwaymen expressed their views which would be communicated to the Railway Minister. In fact I have communicated the views of the leaders of the railwaymen to him.

As regards the second part of his question, it is always felt—I had appealed to the trade union leaders also—that it would not solve the problems by resorting to strike. These are problems which can be settled by negotiations especially in view of the economic situation obtaining.

**SHRI P. M. MAHTA:** Sir, I want to know from the hon. Minister whether his attention has been drawn to the reported press news that in support of the railwaymen's strike, the P&T, Banks, L.I.C. and Defence employees have expressed their intention to go on strike. If so, what measures does the Government propose to take to avert this calamity and to settle the dispute between the railway employees and the Administration?

**SHRI RAGHUNATHA REDDY:** The Labour Ministry does not have

an authoritative information though we have also heard about it.

**SHRI P. M. MEHTA:** Sir, I asked a specific question—what measures does he propose to take to avoid this situation.

**MR. SPEAKER:** It has already been discussed a lot in this House.

**श्री शशि भूषण:** जिस तरह से सरकार मजदूर विरोधी नहीं है उसी तरह से रेलवे कर्मचारी भी सरकार विरोधी नहीं हैं लेकिन इस दुर्भाग्यपूर्ण स्थिति में जो तनावपूर्ण स्थिति पैदा हो गई है उसको दूर करने के लिए कौन से प्रयत्न किए जा सकते हैं जिसके लिए लेबर मिनिस्ट्री सरकार को सुझाव दे? क्या इस सिलसिले में कोई आर्बिट्रेशन या कोई दूसरा रास्ता निकालने की कोशिश की है या कोई और सलाह दी है ?

**SHRI RAGHUNATHA REDDY:** The Railway Minister had made the position very clear. I cannot enlighten further in the matter.

**SHRI DINEN BHATTACHARYYA:** Perhaps this is the last question. I want to know one thing. The Minister admits that throughout the country there is now a strike of railwaymen. He also knows that the B.S.F. and military forces have been deployed all over the country which will aggravate the situation. I want to know whether, at this moment, he considers not only as a Labour Minister but also as a Member of the Cabinet to immediately intervene in this matter so that at least the B.S.F. and the military personnel may be withdrawn from all over the railway lines.

**SHRI RAGHUNATHA REDDY:** Whether there is railway strike or no strike, the Government will have to provide the necessary security and, whatever steps the Government would consider proper in this regard, would have to be taken by it.

**श्री हुकम चन्द कछवाय :** अध्यक्ष जी, मैं आप के माध्यम से श्रम मंत्री से जानना चाहता हूँ कि रेलवे की हड़ताल का बहुत दिन पहले एनाउन्समेंट हुआ था और तीन दिन पहले से देश की सभी रेलवेच पर और 52 डिबीजन्स पर सरकार द्वारा सेना भेज दी गई थी जिससे यह निश्चित था कि हड़ताल होने वाली है। क्या यह बात सही है कि श्रम मंत्रालय पर रेलवे मंत्रालय हावी है और इसीलिए श्रम मंत्रालय किसी प्रकार की सलाह रेलवे मंत्रालय को नहीं दे पाया है और न वह उन की सलाह मानते हैं? क्या यह बात सही है कि जो 6 सूत्री मांग है वह मानी जा सकती थी, और बोनास का मसला भी जायज है, ऐसा श्रम मंत्रालय मानता है या नहीं?

**SHRI RAGHUNATHA REDDY:** All these questions have been debated. The Railway Minister had given an elaborate answer. I cannot add anything further.

**श्री हुकमचन्द कछवाय :** मैंने पूछा है बोनास की जो मांग है श्रम मंत्रालय इस मांग को उचित मानता है या नहीं? इस का उत्तर मंत्री जी ने नहीं दिया।

**अध्यक्ष महोदय :** मानते हैं, नहीं मानते हैं इस के बारे में वह क्या कह सकते हैं। अगर वह कहें कि उचित मानते हैं तो फिर लगड़ा ही किस बात का है।

**WRITTEN ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS  
Khetri Copper Project**

\*997. **SHRI SHIVNATH SINGH:**

**SHRI V. MAYAVAN:**

Will the Minister of STEEL AND MINES be pleased to state:

(a) the cost estimated for completion of Khetri Copper project in Rajasthan originally and the latest revised estimates and money spent up to 31st March, 1974;

(b) what was the approximate date of completion of the project envisaged in the beginning and by what date the project will be completed in its entirety according to the latest calculation;

(c) the daily estimated production of copper from this project in the initial stage and of what purity; and

(d) the feeder projects for raw material and at what stages these projects are at present?

**THE MINISTER OF STEEL AND MINES (SHRI K. D. MALAVIYA):** (a) According to the cost estimates prepared in 1968, the Khetri Copper Project was estimated to cost about Rs. 93 crores. The revised estimates of the project cost are Rs. 115 crores. The total expenditure incurred at Khetri Copper Project upto 31st March, 1974, is about Rs. 103 crores.

(b) The time schedule drawn up in 1968 envisaged the project to be completed in 1972. As per the latest indications, the Project is expected to be completed by the 3rd quarter of 1974.

(c) After successful completion of the trial runs, production of copper metal at Khetri Copper Project in the initial stages is estimated to be about 20 tonnes per day with purity of 99.9 per cent plus.

(d) Two feeder projects are being developed for supplying ore/concentrates to the Khetri Copper Project. A Project of 500 tonnes of copper ore per day capacity is being implemented at Chandmari. A 100 tonnes ore per day project with matching concentrator facilities was commissioned at Dariba in September, 1973 and is working to its rated capacity.

**Letter of Intent Issued to Aluminium Corp. of India, Jaykanagar**

\*1000. **SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU:** Will the Minister of STEEL AND MINES be pleased to state: