

SHRI ERA ANBARASU: There is a weekly magazine in Tamil Nadu....\*\*

MR. SPEAKER: No; this does not come out of the question. Not allowed.  
(Interruptions)\*\*

SHRI SONTOSH MOHAN DEV: Sir, his remarks should not go on record.

(Interruptions)

DR. SUBRAMANIAM SWAMY: Yes, you can take my remarks as off the record.

MR. SPEAKER: Yes, off the record.

DR. SUBRAMANIAM SWAMY: I would like to know from the Minister, she is the Labour Minister too—whether she is aware that the Indian Express has implemented the Palekar Award, and having implemented the Palekar Award, the Indian Express, Bombay, is being subjected to gangsterism in the name of trade unionism. Will she as Labour Minister give protection to those newspapers which have implemented the Palekar Award and see that this paper is not subjected to closure by the use of gangsterism and trade unionism....  
(Interruptions).

DR. SUBRAMANIAM SWAMY: Why am I a Member of Parliament, if I have to go to her office?.....  
(Interruptions).

DR. SUBRAMANIAM SWAMY: Why am I a Member of Parliament, if I have to go to her office?.....(Interruptions).

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: A definite question has been put and we want a definite reply. We are not expected to go to her office....(Interruptions).

DR. SUBRAMANIAM SWAMY: Sir, they are resorting to gangsterism to see that a respected newspaper like the Indian Express closes down.

(Interruptions)

SHRIMATI RAM DULARI SINHA: Sir, the Government is for giving protection to all its workers, but it depends upon merits and demerits of the cases.

(Interruptions)

DR. SUBRAMANIAM SWAMY: Sir, where is the Cabinet Minister for Labour?

SHRI CHINTAMANI PANIGRAHI: May I know from the Hon. Minister as she replied that most of the implementations depend on the State Government's Order, whether the State Governments are serious in implementing the Palekar Award; whether the Central Government has written to the State Governments reminding that most of the State Governments are not helping in the implementation of the Palekar Award in their respective States? And if so, we would like to know whether the State Governments have responded to the reminders of the Central Government in respect of the implementation of the Palekar Award?

SHRIMATI RAM DULARI SINHA: Yes, Sir. The Labour Minister has written to the Chief Ministers of all the States and Union Territories and it was written from our Department also. And a Committee of Ministers has been set up here under my Chairmanship to deal with this question and all the State Governments were requested on 15-9-1981 to initiate proceedings under the Act against the establishments which have not implemented the order so far. And most of the State Governments have responded to it and I have got a list about the steps taken by some of the State Governments regarding this.

#### Proposed Closure of Victoria Works of Burn Braithwaite Jessops Construction Company

\*356. SHRI CHITTA BASU: Will the Minister of INDUSTRY be pleased to state:

(a) whether Government have decided to close the Victoria Works of the

Burn-Braithwaite Jessops Construction Company;

(b) if so, the reasons therefor; and

(c) the steps taken to safeguard the interests of the employees of the concern?

THE DEPUTY MINISTER IN THE MINISTRY OF INDUSTRY (SHRI P. A. SANGMA): (a) to (c). In view of mounting losses incurred by BBJ Construction Co., proposal to restructure its operations, including closing down its uneconomic Victoria Works, is under consideration.

SHRI CHITTA BASU: It is clear from the reply of the Hon. Minister that the Government is considering the closure of the Victoria unit of the BBJ. May I know from the Minister whether they have taken into consideration the fact that a large number of workers will be rendered unemployed because of this proposed closure and in that case what steps does the Government propose to take in order to provide them with alternative job?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF INDUSTRY (SRI CHARANJIT CHANANA): Sir, first of all the Hon. Member has rightly said that the total issue is under consideration and that includes the mounting losses which this particular unit has been incurring for over a period of few years. From 1968 when the losses were 20.83 lakhs the losses as on 31-3-1981 mounted to 4.53 crores. In the year 1978-79 the losses were 44.33 lakhs; in 1979-80 the losses were 45.00 lakhs; in 1980-81, the losses were 83,000 lakhs. The Hon. Member would appreciate that this process of revitalising the whole unit has been continued in the interest of protecting the workers. That was the main issue. But the Hon. Member would also appreciate that we must discriminate between the sick unit and a dead unit and the workers' interests would always be kept under consideration once the fate of a particular unit is decided.

SHRI CHITTA BASU: Sir, may I know whether it is also a fact that the Chief Minister of the Government of

West Bengal recently had a discussion with the Minister of Industries and requested him to devise ways and means to protect the job interests of the workers. May I know in this connection what has been the specific response of the Government of India in regard to that particular proposal made by the Government of West Bengal?

SHRI CHARANJIT CHANANA: Yes, the Chief Minister of West Bengal had a regular meeting on this particular issue with the Minister of Industry on 11th November, 1981.

And from October 1980 whenever this issue was raised by the Chief Minister, the first thing I had, in fact, to suggest was this: if they thought that it was a viable unit, the West Bengal Government could take it over. Once again in the 11th November meeting, the Minister of Industry again suggested to the Chief Minister of West Bengal to take over the unit. But the Chief Minister wanted time and he wanted to examine the whole issue once again. But what has been decided now is that a Working Group has been set up, consisting of the Financial Adviser-cum-Additional Secretary, Ministry of Industry, Chairman of Braithwaite and Co. and Secretary, sick Industries Department of West Bengal Government. So, the West Bengal Government is very much in the picture, and is going through the whole case and examining it, as to whether the whole unit can be revitalized or not; or if it has to be closed down, what would be the implications, and how to reduce the impact of the same on the workers.

SHRI SONTOSH MOHAN DEV: In certain States, especially in West Bengal, it has been made one of the duties of trade unions, especially CPI (M)-led unions to make an industry sick and then demand that the Government should nationalize it. In view of this, may I know from the hon. Minister how much cooperation—after the taking over of the industries in West Bengal by the Central Government—has been received from the

State Government and the unions in West Bengal? If no cooperation has been received, why so?

**SHRI CHARANJIT CHANANA:** The question has to be referred to the West Bengal Government as to why they are not doing it.

**SHRI M. M. LAWRENCE:** Is it the policy of the Government to run these institutions and concerns under the Government only profitably; and if it is not possible, to close them down?

**SHRI CHARANJIT CHANANA:** It is part of the industrial policy of the Government. It is the effort and the duty of the Government to see that the sick units are cured. There is a treatment for the sick units. But it is also a policy of the Government not to allow dead units to remain or to survive—because survival is not possible; a dead unit is a dead unit—under the caption of sick units.

#### **Demand for Jharkhand State ..**

\*357. **SHRI A. K. ROY:**

**SHRI R. N. BAKESH:**

Will the Minister of HOME AFFAIRS be pleased to state:

(a) whether his attention has been drawn to the demonstration demanding Jharkhand State at Ranchi (Bihar) on 31 October, 1981;

(b) if so, facts in detail;

(c) whether a memorandum was submitted to the Prime Minister and to the Commissioner, South Chotanagpur;

(d) if so, main points of the memorandum and the reaction of Government thereto;

(e) whether he is aware of the genuine grievances of the people of Chotanagpur in general and Adivasis in particular symbolised in the demand of Jharkhand; and

(f) if so, steps taken to remove them?

**THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF HOME AFFAIRS (SHRI YOGENDRA MAKWANA):** (a) to (f). A statement is laid on the Table of the House.

#### **Statement**

(a) and (b). The Jharkhand Party (Horo Group) is reported to have observed 'Jharkhand Mang Diwas'—an annual feature at Ranchi on 31st October, 1981 by taking out a procession and holding a public meeting at which that party's demand for a separate Jharkhand State comprising the tribal districts of Bihar, West Bengal, Madhya Pradesh and Orissa was reiterated.

(c) A five-member delegation reportedly submitted to the Commissioner, South Chotanagpur Division at Ranchi a memorandum addressed to the Prime Minister demanding a separate Jharkhand State. This memorandum has not been received in the P. M.'s office.

(d) Does not arise.

(e) and (f). The removal of economic imbalances in a particular State or region is essentially a matter to be tackled through the mechanism of planning and the creation of a separate State is no answer to the problem. The Government of India and the State Governments concerned have been endeavouring to step up the socio-economic development of the tribal people in Chotanagpur area. The strategy of Tribal sub-plan which has been adopted, ensures flow of funds from the State Plan, Central Sector-plan and Centrally sponsored Schemes to the identified areas where the Schedule Tribes are in majority, generally known as Tribal Sub-Plan area. Development schemes are formulated with a focus on the tribal communities and with special stress on development of the critical areas of infrastructural development such as education, health etc.