

**Mr. Speaker:** They are also raising only points of order.

**Shri Surendranath Dwivedy:** I would request you to kindly give us some protection. We are not asking for the contents of the confidential report. My question is whether any such advice was offered to the Government of India or not. Why should he not say 'Yes' or 'No'? If he wants to say that it is not in public interest to disclose it, then let him say so. How can he say that it comes to the same thing? We are not asking for the report at all. Let him say whether any such advice was offered or not.

**Shri H. N. Mukerjee:** There has to be an answer to this question.

श्री सचिव लिखते : ये फीज हो गये हैं, क्या ?

**Mr. Speaker:** He has said already that he is not prepared to say 'Yes' or 'No'. If hon. Members are not satisfied with this, then there are other methods to which they can take recourse. The hon. Minister has definitely said that admitting it or rejecting it would not be proper for Government; naturally, we would either accept the advice or reject the advice. But the hon. Minister is not prepared to say 'Yes' or 'No'. The hon. Member wants to know specifically whether they did advice or not. And he wants the hon. Minister to say 'Yes' or 'No'. But in reply to an earlier question, the hon. Minister has already said that he could not say 'Yes' or 'No' on that issue.

**Shri Surendranath Dwivedy:** He has said so in regard to the contents of the report. We do not want that report at all. We only want to know whether any such advice was given to him or not. He can say 'Yes' or 'No' to that.

**Shri Morarji Desai:** Does not my hon. friend see this plain fact that when he refers to an advice given in the Bell report, if I say anything about it, it would amount to divulging of the report?

**Shri Surendranath Dwivedy:** How?

**Shri Morarji Desai:** What else does it mean?

**Mr. Speaker:** During the Question Hour, hon. Members cannot have a debate like this. There are other methods for eliciting information and carrying on a debate. If they do not get satisfaction from the answers, then there are other methods open to them.

#### Retrenchment by Oil Companies

†  
\*514. **Shri B. K. Modak:**  
**Shri Umanath:**  
**Shri Ganesh Ghosh:**  
**Shri Bhagaban Das:**  
**Shri Mohammad Ismail:**

Will the Minister of Petroleum and Chemicals be pleased to state:

(a) whether the attention of Government has been drawn to the contention of the foreign oil companies that their staff reduction measures are arising out of Government's Oil Policy;

(b) if so, the reaction of Government thereto;

(c) whether Government have received any complaints that premature retirement plan of the foreign oil companies was in practice a staff reduction scheme; and

(d) if so, the steps taken by Government in the matter?

**The Minister of State in the Ministry of Petroleum and Chemicals and of Planning and Social Welfare (Shri Raghu Ramiah):** (a) Yes Sir, reference has been made to certain aspects of the Government's oil policy.

(b) In the light of the report of the Tripartite Committee constituted by the Government of India in October 1965 to examine the problem of job security and reduction of staff, Government is of the opinion that this contention is not well-founded.

(c) Yes, Sir.

(a) A tripartite meeting of the representatives of foreign oil companies, petroleum workers' unions and the Government of India was held on 28th April 1967 in the Department of Labour and Employment to evolve an agreed formula to solve the problem of job security in the foreign oil companies. Various measures including bipartite negotiations have been suggested and are under consideration of the Government.

**Shri B. K. Modak:** May I know whether in the tripartite conference a decision was arrived at to form a court of inquiry to go into the cases of retrenchment? What has been done in regard to that decision?

**Shri Raghunatha Ramaiah:** That is one of the suggestions from the employees' side. As I said, there are various other suggestions. They are under the consideration of Government.

**Shri B. K. Modak:** May I know whether a press statement was issued on behalf of Government that a decision was arrived at regarding the formation of a court of inquiry? If so, what is the reason for reversal of that decision?

**Shri Raghunatha Ramaiah:** I said that no decision has been taken. It is one of the suggestions made. It is under consideration.

**Shri Umanath:** The Minister said that the staff reduction measures taken by the companies have nothing to do with the Government's oil policy and that it was not well-founded. Recently a report submitted by the Chief of the Esso in India to their head office mentions that the company proposes in their next phase in the next year to reduce the staff by 300 to 400. The exact sentence used is: 'we hope to get the approval of the Government of India'. Already, 9,000 have been retrenched. The implication of this sentence is that they got the approval of the Government of India for the previous retrench-

ment also. I would like to know whether Government know about it. Secondly, is there any tacit understanding between Government and the Esso and other foreign oil companies about this scheme of retrenchment?

**Shri Raghunatha Ramaiah:** There has not been any agreement whatsoever. On the contrary, subsequent to the tripartite negotiations Government have asked them to stop all further action under the so-called voluntary retirement scheme. Whatever hopes they have expressed we are not a party to them.

**Shri Umanath:** What about this letter from the Esso chief to their head office? 9,000 have already been retrenched. Government have not stopped them. Government say there is no tacit understanding. If there is no understanding, how is it that they could retrench in broad daylight 9,000 hands.

**Shri Raghunatha Ramaiah:** When there is no understanding, I cannot say there is an understanding.

**Shri Umanath:** What is the result? 9,000 retrenched.

**Shri Raghunatha Ramaiah:** Let them hope for anything. We have not agreed to it.

**Shri Ganesh Ghosh:** On the 3rd of April last, Government wrote to the Burmah-Shell and perhaps also to the other foreign oil companies not to go ahead with their centralisation scheme till the decision in the tripartite conference was taken. On the 28th of the same month, a tripartite conference was held in which Shri Raghunatha Ramaiah was also present. It was agreed that the foreign oil companies would not take unilateral action in regard to the centralisation scheme. Yet immediately after that, they have been retrenching a large number of people from all over the country. What action has Government taken to stop this unilateral action on the part of the oil companies in spite of the agreement at the tripartite conference?

**Shri Raghu Ramalah:** I was, of course, present, as my hon. friend says. Probably he was also there. If he was there, he would have known that while representatives of the Government and the employees suggested that further action under the retirement scheme should be stopped, it will be recalled that the employers did not agree to it. That is where it stands.

**श्री मुहम्मद इस्माइल :** 6 महीने से वर्कर्स रिट्रैच पड़े हुए है। इस ट्रिपार्टीट कान्फ्रेंस के बाद जो कोर्ट आफ़ इनक्वायरी बैठाने की गवर्नमेंट ने राय दी थी और ऐम्प्लॉईज यूनियन ने भी राय दी थी तों अभी तक गवर्नमेंट उस पर अपना फैसला क्यों नहीं कर सकी है ?

**Shri Raghu Ramalah:** There is not one tripartite meeting. There have been more than one, and Government is in full sympathy with the demands made by the employees, and my colleague. Mr. Hathi, the Labour Minister, has been doing everything possible to see if some basis for negotiation could be arrived at. Failing that, what measures he has to take, I am sure he is considering.

**श्री शिव नारायण :** मैं यह जानना चाहता हूँ कि जो फ़ौरन आयल कम्पनियां हमारे मुल्क में काम करती हैं और जोकि हमारे वर्कर्स को रिट्रैच कर रही हैं तो गवर्नमेंट इन आयल कम्पनीज को अपने हाथ में क्यों नहीं ले लेती है ?

**Shri Raghu Ramalah:** In answer to a question I had to reply some time back that there has been an assurance given to these oil companies at their inception that they would not be taken over for some time.

**Shri Sheo Narain:** There is an agreement between the Government and the oil companies. Why does not Government take any action against them under that?

**श्री हुकम चन्व कछवाय :** पिछली बार इन आयल कम्पनीज ने 9,000 कर्मचारियों की छटनी की थी तो क्या यह जो सम्मेलन हो रहा है और यह जो समिति बनाई है वह पिछले दिनों जो 9,000 लोक छांटे गये हैं क्या उन को पुनः काम पर लाने की चर्चा की जायेगी ? क्या जो इन लोगों की छटनी की गई तो सरकार ने तत्काल कोई कार्यवाही क्यों नहीं की और क्या सरकार उस समय दबी हुई थी जो बैसा नहीं कर सकी ?

**Shri Raghu Ramalah:** I have already said that my colleague is fully seized of the matter, but so far as those who are retrenched are concerned, to the extent it is possible to absorb them in our own establishment, the Indian Oil Co. establishment, we are doing everything possible.

**श्री हुकम चन्व कछवाय :** जो 9,000 लोग निकाल दिये गये हैं क्या उन को पुनः काम में लिया जायेगा ? क्या सरकार उन छटनी किये गये 9,000 लोगों को पुनः काम पर लेने के उपर विचार करेगी ?

#### Demonetisation of Currency

+

\*515. **Shri Bharat Singh Chauhan:**  
**Shri Sharda Nand:**  
**Shri J. B. Singh:**  
**Shri Ranjit Singh:**  
**Shri C. K. Bhattacharyya:**

Will the Minister of Finance be pleased to state:

(a) whether Government have formulated a scheme for the demonetisation of Indian currency in order to bring out unaccounted money;

(b) if so, the details of the scheme; and

(c) if not, the reasons therefor?

**The Minister of State in the Ministry of Finance, (Shri K. C. Pant):** (a) No, Sir.

(b) Does not arise.