



REPORT
of the
Committee for
Categorisation of Posts in the
Reading Branches of the
Government of India Presses,
1966

GOVERNMENT OF INDIA
MINISTRY OF WORKS, HOUSING AND SUPPLY
Department of Works and Housing

**REPORT
of the
Committee for
Categorisation of Posts in the
Reading Branches of the
Government of India Presses,
1966**

GOVERNMENT OF INDIA
MINISTRY OF WORKS, HOUSING AND SUPPLY
Department of Works and Housing

CONTENTS

(PART I)

	PAGES
1. Chapter I Introduction	1—2
2. Chapter II The views of the Workers and their Unions .	3—5
3. Chapter III Classification of Reading Branch Staff. .	6—9
4. Chapter IV Pay structure in the Reading Branches. .	10—12
5. Chapter V Recommendations—Pay Structure	13—17
6. Chapter VI Recruitment and promotion in the Reading Branch.	18—22
7. Chapter VII Miscellaneous grievances of the Press Workers in the Reading Branch	23—27
8. Chapter VIII Miscellaneous suggestions for the Reading Branch	28—30

(PART II)

9. Chapter I Introduction	32—34
10. Chapter II Classification of Paper Supplier, Material Supplier and Report Writers.	35—37
11. Chapter III Report Writers—Classification—Its effects and solution	38—40
12. Chapter IV Conclusions	41—42
13. Summary of Recommendations. Part I	43—46
Part II	47—48

APPENDICES

1. Appendix 'A' & A-I	Government of India Resolution regarding Constitution of Committee for the Categori- sation of posts in the Reading Branches of the Government of India Presses and the order on the extension of the life of the Committee.	49—51
2. Appendix 'B'	The list of categories in the Reading Branch of the Government of India Presses with existing Pay scales.	51
3. Appendix 'C'	The list of additional categories entrusted to the Committee.	52
4. Appendix 'D'	Classifications of Categories in the Reading Branch together with those proposed to be created.	52

GOVERNMENT OF INDIA
MINISTRY OF WORKS, HOUSING AND SUPPLY
(DEPARTMENT OF WORKS AND HOUSING)

Committee For Categorisation of Posts in The Reading Branches
of The Government of India Presses

REPORT

PART I

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The Committee was set up by Government of India in the Ministry of Works, Housing & Urban Development by their Resolution No. 15/11/66/PI, dated the 4th July, 1966 (Appendix 'A') to:—

- (i) review and classify the posts in the Reading Branches in the Government of India Presses, under the control of the Chief Controller of Printing & Stationery, into unskilled, semi-skilled, skilled, highly skilled and supervisory.
- (ii) where necessary for the purpose of such review, to examine the service conditions, pay scales, duty hours and the field of recruitment/promotion laid down for each particular post and to suggest modifications therein.

The composition of the Committee was as follows:—

Chairman

Shri P. K. Sen, Deputy Secretary, Ministry of Works, Housing & Urban Development.

Members

1. Shri Manohar Keshav, Deputy Secretary, Ministry of Works, Housing & Urban Development.
2. Shri R. Ramaswamy, Controller of Printing, Office of the C.C.P. & S., New Delhi.
3. Shri G. S. Bhasin, Under Secretary, Ministry of Finance.

Shri N. C. Sanyal, Officer on Special Duty (Labour), Ministry of Works, Housing & Urban Development, acted as Secretary to the Committee.

In 1963, a Committee was set up by Government for the categorisation of Government of India Press workers. After the setting up of the Committee, it decided to exclude the workers in the Reading Branches of the Government of India Presses. This was due to the fact that at that time, some workers of the Reading Branch filed a writ petition in a Court of Law praying that the workers of the Reading Branches of Government of India Presses should be treated at par with Working Journalists under the provisions of Working Journalists (Conditions of Service) and Miscellaneous Provisions Act, 1955 and rules framed thereunder. This petition failed. The judgment was given on 16th March, 1966. Thereafter, Government decided that the Reading Branches of the Government of India Presses should also be reviewed and the workers classified into unskilled, semi-skilled, skilled, highly skilled and supervisory categories as in other branches of the Press.

Subsequently, some isolated categories were also entrusted to the Committee for categorisation into unskilled, semi-skilled, skilled and highly skilled/supervisory groups. These categories were not employed in the Reading Branch but were either left out due to over-sight at the time of earlier classification in 1963, or the Government felt the necessity of re-review.

A list of categories employed in the Reading Branch of the Government of India Presses is given at Appendix 'B'. Categories not belonging to the Reading Branches, but entrusted to the present Committee subsequently are listed in Appendix 'C'.

The Committee started the work of classification by inviting the views of the service unions and Federation of Press Workers. The Committee also heard individuals or groups of individuals who wanted to place their view points before the Committee and recognised service unions who were willing to tender oral evidence before the Committee.

With a view to study on the spot the work of different categories of workers, the Committee visited the Government of India Press, Hastings Street, Calcutta, the Government of India Forms Press, Dharamtalla, Calcutta, Government of India Press, Santragachi, Government of India Press, New Delhi and Government of India Press Nasik. Certain Heads of Presses which could not be visited were interviewed separately by the Committee. While at Bombay, the Committee took the opportunity of studying the service conditions of the Reading Branch of the Times of India Press, with a view to compare the service conditions obtaining in the Private Sector with those controlled by Government of India. The Committee also visited the Government of Maharashtra Press, Bombay.

In all, the Committee heard the oral evidence tendered by eighty persons. A total number of nearly fortythree meetings were held by the Committee.

CHAPTER II

THE VIEWS OF THE WORKERS AND THEIR UNIONS

Like the previous Committee for categorisation of other batches of Press workers, we examined the views of all recognised and even unrecognised trade unions. We also heard the views of individuals or groups of individuals wherever there was an opportunity to do so. The following recognised unions submitted their views before the Committee:—

1. The Federation of Workers of the Government of India Presses.
2. The Government of India Press Workers Union, Simla.
3. The Government of India Press Workers Union, Faridabad.
4. The Government of India Press Workers Union, Nilokheri.
5. The Government of India Press Workers Association, Hastings Street, Calcutta.
6. The Rashtriya Press Kamgar Union, Nasik.
7. The Government of India Press Workers Union, New Delhi.
8. The Government of India Forms Press Workers Union, Calcutta.
9. The Rajkiya Press Mazdoor Sangh, Aligarh.

The unrecognised unions were not formally invited but were offered the opportunity of meeting the Committee individually as well as in groups.

In addition to the above, we heard the views of eighty individual officials.

The Unions were more concerned with the promotional aspects and hours of duty than with other important items. In the beginning an attempt was made by the Unions to persuade the Committee to take up the issues which were rejected by the Court of Law. Quite a substantial period was spent on rather theoretical discussions about the status of the Reading Branch of Government of India Presses *vis-a-vis* Working Journalists. When this failed, the analogy of other Government departments which had small press establishments attached to them was cited. There had, however, been some welcome departure in the case of certain unions who came forward with real constructive suggestions. Like the Committee, the Unions were also undecided as to whether they should fall in line with other industrial workers of the Press Establishment or follow the non-industrial clerical side.

The general trend of representations followed the usual pattern of demanding upgradation of all the categories, with or without justification. The most surprising stand of the union was noticed in the case of Revisers. A very categorical demand was made that the Revisers were equal to Junior Readers in all respects, conveniently forgetting even the initial qualification of passing a departmental test in case of Junior Readers.

The other grievances put forward by the unions were also generally vague except in one or two cases. On the whole, an objective analysis of the problems of the Reading Branch was rarely evident. It was more than apparent that the Reading Branch was not properly represented in the service unions except in the case of Faridabad and Nasik Presses. In one particular case, no Reader was available when a recognised union gave evidence before the Committee.

The demand for more supervisory and promotional posts was again repeated. Except in isolated cases, there was no substance in this demand. In cases where there was some justification for such a demand, they have been dealt with separately later. The subject for holding a test for Readership came in for severe criticism from all the unions. The Committee also examined this problem and our recommendations are given later in the report.

One common grievance of the workers was that there was generally a stagnation at the maximum of the scale for a Senior Reader. There is some truth in this statement but due to the peculiar nature of the Press Establishment and absence of any qualifying period for eligibility to sit for an examination, this is somewhat inevitable. In any case, in an industrial establishment, this cannot be altogether avoided. The pay scales recommended for industrial establishment are surprisingly short and do not take care of direct recruitment of skilled workers.

We found that the unions have not yet appreciated the scope of the Committee as well as the general principles of classification of workers into groups of unskilled, semi-skilled, skilled and highly skilled cells. Again and again, the potentiality of individual workers or isolated cases in which the workers were doing very important job, were cited, although we pointed out that we have necessarily to confine ourselves to the duties expected of each group of workers. The Unions also failed to appreciate that any de-liberalisation incidental to such classification would not affect the existing workers at all. This, however, relates only to the grade in which the existing workers are working. The so-called promotional chances of each individual worker cannot be guaranteed nor perhaps can such a guarantee be asked for as a matter of right.

There was a general apprehension that the Committee's recommendations would not be implemented expeditiously. Some of the Unions cited

the recommendations of the Categorisation Committee for other industrial staff in the Press. Comments were also made regarding modifications of the recommendations of the previous Categorisation Committee. We explained that we were hardly in a position to do anything about it, as our recommendations are in the nature of suggestions to Government and a final decision rests only with the Government. Any delay in implementation of any previous decision was not within the purview of the present Committee.

In spite of all the shortcomings mentioned above, we were extremely impressed by the sincerity and willing cooperation of the Unions in assisting us in our study. Once our difficulties were explained to them, the Unions took a very reasonable attitude and supplied ungrudgingly any information which we required. Some of the individuals interviewed helped us considerably by their unbiased objective opinion even when such an opinion generally went against their own interests.

CHAPTER III

CLASSIFICATION OF READING BRANCH STAFF

The two Pay Commissions in 1947 and 1957 had already examined the case of the Reading Branch Staff separately with the limited purpose of pay scales only but it is nonetheless interesting to note that neither of the Commissions could really classify the Reading Branch staff as industrial workers. The First Pay Commission of 1947 had remarked that "Readers, though classified as amongst the industrial groups, really pertain to the Class III (ministerial group). . . ." Similarly, the Second Pay Commission 1957 had stated about the Proof Reading Staff that they belonged to the group of "single" literary workers and have really excluded the Proof Reading staff from the so-called "workshop staff and artisans".

Thus, it will be seen that both the Pay Commissions had some hesitation in classifying the Proof Reading staff as industrial or manual workers. We had also found it very difficult to classify the Reading Branch staff in the same way as other industrial workers of Government of India Presses. There is no doubt that the Reading Branch staff, like Copyholders, Junior Readers or Senior Readers do possess some technical skill but it is quite difficult to concede that they are at par with other industrial workers like machineman, binders, inkers, compositors, etc., although it may be conceded that their duties are not purely clerical in nature. The Printing and Stationery Department is of the opinion that the Reading Branch being an integral part of a Press comprises of industrial workers. It is not our contention that the Reading Branch is outside the purview of Industrial Disputes Act or Factories Act but the nature of work of the Reading Branch is not comparable to that of a manual worker or an artisan in a factory. This point was discussed at length in the Committee a number of times. In the absence of a clear definition from the Government of India, it is extremely difficult to decide whether a particular set of workers come under the group "industrial workers" or not. The definitions of workman derived from the Industrial Disputes Act, or Factories Act differ from Act to Act and ultimately by taking the least common multiple, we arrive at a very broad definition of industrial workers. For the purpose of categorisation in accordance with the recommendations of the First Pay Commission or Second Pay Commission, it is certainly not possible to take such a broad definition.

As, however, the Government have decided to include the Reading Branch staff in the industrial group of workers in the Government of

India Presses, we have classified them in the same way as the other industrial workers of the Government of India Presses into unskilled, semi-skilled, skilled, highly skilled and supervisory grades.

The following are the categories which are employed in the Reading Branches of the Government of India Presses:

- (1) Copyholders in the grade of Rs. 110—3—131—4—147.
- (2) Revisers in the grade of Rs. 150—5—175—6—205—EB—7—240.
- (3) Junior Readers (formerly designated as Readers Class II) in the grade of Rs. 150—5—175—6—205—EB—7—240.
- (4) Senior Readers (formerly designated as Readers Class I) in the grade of Rs. 168—8—256—EB—8—280—10—300.
- (5) Head Readers in the grade of Rs. 335—15—440.
- (6) There is also a single post of Editor in the grade of Rs. 320—15—425 in the Reading Branch in the Photo Litho Wing of the Government of India Press at New Delhi.

The classification of the above categories presents little or no difficulty except that there is some over-lapping and no classification can bring out the subtle shades of differences in the degree of skill or responsibility in the Reading Branch.

Copyholders.—The duties of the copyholders are to read out the manuscripts clearly and distinctly with the punctuation marks, proper names etc. He has to possess the ability to decipher bad manuscripts and clearly read out or spell out distinctly words so as to enable the Reader to correct the proofs in accordance with what is given in the original manuscript. Thus, the Copyholder has to have somewhat a wider experience and basic knowledge than is ordinarily expected of a candidate for clerical appointment.

The recruitment is made from Matriculates with some previous experience after a test conducted for selection.

From the nature of duties, it is clear that the Copyholders must necessarily be skilled workers inasmuch as the initial qualifications, the basic training and the duties demand. We, therefore, classify the Copyholders as "skilled" workers.

Revisers.—The duties of the Revisers are to revise the corrections made by the Reader and to see that broken letters, dropped types etc., are marked for rectification in the final sheet before the job is actually printed off on the machine. He works independently without the assistance of a copyholder since he does not have to read the proofs with the original manuscripts.

The Copyholders are promoted as Revisers on the basis of their seniority. Normally it takes an average of 5—8 years for a Copyholder to be promoted as a Reviser. It will be seen from the above that the duties and responsibilities carried out by the Reviser are of a much higher order than those discharged by a Copyholder particularly because he is responsible for the textual accuracy of the finally printed work, on the basis of the last proof passed by the Proof Reader.

We, therefore, classify the Revisers as “highly skilled”.

Readers, Class I and Class II (Senior and Junior Readers).—The duties of the Readers are to correct the proof for typographical errors, deviations from the manuscripts, and to ensure uniformity of style and size and make up of the pages. They have to draw the attention of the author to mistakes in respect of grammar and spellings.

From the above, it will be apparent that to perform the above duties efficiently, a Reader must possess a good general education and a practical knowledge of the art of typography. A thorough knowledge of the signs and marks used in group correction is essential. It should be borne in mind that the Readers corrections will ultimately decide the accuracy of the printed matter. The composition Branch is entirely dependent upon the Readers carrying out their corrections on the proofs. A Reader has to have an extensive and varied knowledge as any subject may come up for printing sometime or the other.

The Readers are recruited wholly by promotion from Copyholders after passing a Departmental Readership examination. The Copyholder is promoted to the Grade of Junior Readers or Readers Class II. The promotion from Junior to Senior grade is done on the basis of seniority in the post of Junior Readers.

Considering the duties and responsibilities as well as the initial qualifications and subsequent training a Reader receives, there can be no doubt that both the Junior and Senior Readers belong to the category of highly skilled workers. We, therefore, classify both the groups as “highly skilled”.

Head Readers.—The Head Reader is in charge and exercises general supervision over the Reading Section. He is responsible for the efficiency of the Section. Quite apart from branch supervision, he is also expected to re-read the proofs already read by the Proof Readers with a view to see that the Junior Reader or the Senior Reader, as the case may be, has done his work properly. He is responsible for the quality and quantity of work done in the branch.

The Head Reader being in charge of the Reading Branch is in the category of 'Supervisory'.

Editor in Photo Litho Wing.—There is an isolated post of Editor in the Photo Litho Wing of the Government of India Press, New Delhi. Since the process of production of photolitho is different from the letter press, the Editor in the Photo Litho Wing has to edit the manuscripts before the job goes for reproduction and thereafter recheck that the arrangement of matter is in accordance with what is required in the ultimately printed product.

It is somewhat difficult to categorise this isolated post but there is no doubt that he belongs to the group about which the Pay Commission remarked in 1957, "...these groups for which some exceptional qualifications or other are necessary, are thus distinguishable from the generality of highly skilled workers and can be dealt with more appropriately elsewhere....".

From our point of view, we can only classify the Editor as "highly skilled".

In arriving at the above classification, we have been guided mainly by the arduous nature of the work and the responsibilities attached to the different categories. We have also taken into account the initial qualifications of the entrants at the stage of Copyholders. For reasons already stated earlier, the duties in the Reading Branch could not be compared with the duties assigned to other branches of the Press Establishment. Hence a comparison to ascertain relative skill *vis-a-vis* other artisans will not be relevant. We have, however, taken into account the relative importance of each category in the whole set up of the Press Establishment when we suggest some alteration in the pay structure in later chapter.

Copy Editor.—In a later chapter we have suggested the creation of a new post of Copy Editor for Letter Press, Publication Presses. This will be an operative post and we classify this post as "highly skilled". The duties and responsibilities attached to the post will be discussed at the appropriate place. Classification as above of the existing categories and those recommended to be created are shown in Appendix 'D'.

CHAPTER IV

PAY STRUCTURE IN THE READING BRANCHES

A persistent complaint of the service unions representing the workers of the Reading Branch of Government of India Presses had been that the pay scales attached to the posts in the Reading Branch were inadequate and fell far short of pay and allowances given to similar categories in the Private Sector or even under the Government of India in other departments. One of the main grievance voiced before the Committee was that while in most of the other categories in the Press Establishment there had been an upward revision by the First Pay Commission in 1947, the Reading Branch suffered a serious setback due to the recommendation of the First Pay Commission. Particular reference had been made to the Senior Readers and Head Readers. In going through the records, we find that there is some truth in the assertion that the pay scales attached to the Head Readers which was Rs. 310—350 (pre-1931 scale) was revised to Rs. 250—10—300—15—360 by the First Pay Commission. In the case of Senior Readers, they had as many as four pre-1931 scales *viz.*

- (i) Rs. 250—10—350.
- (ii) Rs. 200—10—250.
- (iii) Rs. 160—10—220.
- (iv) Rs. 110—8—150.

As these four scales were replaced by the one single scale in 1947 *viz.* Rs. 120—8—200—10/2—220, it is apparent that except in the case of the scale mentioned at (iv) above, there has been a downward revision in this particular case. In the case of Reader Class II, Revisers and Copyholders, there has been no deliberalisation and in fact the First Pay Commission suggested improved scales.

Unfortunately, no detailed reasons have been given by the First Pay Commission as to why some of the grades they recommended fell short of the pre-1931 scales. The only comments regarding the Reading Branch are as follows "Readers though classified as amongst the industrial groups really pertain to the Class III (Ministerial) group and they may be assigned into one or other of the following scales:—

- Rs. 64—3—85—4—125.
- Rs. 120—8—200—10/2—220.

Head Readers may be allowed Rs. 250—10—300—15/2—330. In any new classification we consider it essential that there should be uniformity in designation also so that employees may have the satisfaction of knowing that similar categories are similarly remunerated in the different presses”.

The Second Pay Commission (1957) had similarly remarked “except for minor adjustments, no change is called for in the scale of Revisers and Readers Class II. For Readers Class I, the top sector of the upper division scale will be appropriate. In the case of Head Readers also, only minor adjustments are proposed. With these changes and adjustments, the scales recommended for these categories are as follows:—

<i>Designation</i>	<i>Scales of Pay</i>
Head Readers	Rs. 335—15—440.
Readers, Class I	Rs. 168—8—256—EB—8—280—10—300.
Readers, Class II & Revisers.	Rs. 150—5—175—6—205—EB—7—240.
Copyholders.	Rs. 110—3—131—4—147.”

It will be apparent from the above that no detailed study perhaps, was made as to the basic pay structure which is suitable for the various categories in the Presses in general and this applies equally to the Reading Branch. The majority of the service unions complained that their cases were never examined with due importance and care and they have suffered considerably due to the vague and general nature of the recommendations of the two Pay Commissions regarding industrial establishments.

The two Pay Commissions apparently left the question of pay structure and prescription of definite scales to the individual categories to the Department. Unfortunately, the follow up of the recommendation was also mostly general and no minute and detailed scrutiny seem to have been made in this direction. The First Pay Commission did consider the report submitted by Mr. Whitley of the Printing and Stationery Department about the various pay scales suitable for the Press Establishment. The Commission seems to have broadly agreed with Mr. Whitley’s conclusions but the actual application of 1947 scales cannot be said to be in accordance with Mr. Whitley’s recommendations. In the case of the Reading Branch the Commission, however, recommended definite scales without giving any reasons for the recommendations. The Second Pay Commission merely translated the old scales with “minor adjustments.”

It is neither possible nor desirable to take up individual pay scales of the Reading Branch for a general revision at this stage. The scope of the present Committee is clearly defined. We have, therefore, not attempted to rationalise the pay scales in the general context of relative importance of the Reading Branch as compared to the other branches of the Press.

We have, however, suggested some minor modifications keeping in view equivalent posts and their relative responsibilities in other branches of the establishment. We have also suggested some modifications about promotional channels and in that context some slight adjustments of the existing pay scales. We have, however, confined ourselves to the recognised pay scales now obtaining in the Printing and Stationery Department.

While representing their case, the unions cited parallel categories of Press Establishment getting better scales in other Presses under the Government of India. As the Government of India Presses under this Department constitute by far the largest press organisation, we have not conceded the analogy of other smaller Presses under the Government. We made clear to the Unions that we were unable to accept the best scale obtaining in other organisations and prescribe them for the Government of India Presses. We *felt* that it should be the other way round and the other smaller units of Government should follow the pattern in the Government of India Presses under the Chief Controller of Printing and Stationery.

We have thus confined ourselves only to minor adjustments of the existing scales. We have no doubt taken into consideration the relative importance of the posts in the context of the entire Press Establishment as well as other factors of initial qualification, arduousness of duties and promotional avenues. Permanent stagnation is one of the reasons for a comparatively favourable scale of pay being prescribed for a particular post. If, however, stagnation is eliminated to a reasonable extent there is no reason why a particular post should carry a higher scale than comparable posts in the same establishment. This is the principle we had generally adopted while suggesting modifications in the existing scales.

CHAPTER V

RECOMMENDATIONS—PAY STRUCTURE

We now take up the individual categories in the Reading Branch and comment on the remuneration attached to these categories.

Copyholders.—The scale recommended by the Second Pay Commission for the Copyholders is Rs. 110—3—131—4—147 (incidentally, the scale shown in the proof copy of the Press Handbook is incorrect). The First Pay Commission's scale was Rs. 60—5/2—75—3—90. The pre-1931 scales were Rs. 40—2—60/40—45—3—60.

In our study of the Reading Branch, there had been a persistent demand from all concerned that the Copyholder's duties and qualifications are invariably of a more arduous nature and more important than those of a Lower Division Clerk. Although this was refuted by the Second Pay Commission, we felt that the rejection was not wholly justified. The minimum qualifications for recruitment to the grade of Copyholders are similar to those of Lower Division Clerks and we were unable to agree with the averment of the Second Pay Commission that 'the duties of Copyholders are very simple. We consider that it (their scale) should stop some stages short of the maximum of the Lower Division Scale'. The duties of the Copyholders are certainly not less arduous than those of an ordinary L.D.C. In fact, there is some justification to hold that without a thorough knowledge of signs and notations and an ability to decipher bad manuscript no official will ever succeed in discharging the duties of a copyholder. The Committee, therefore, felt that the copyholders should at least be elevated to the same status as an ordinary L.D.C. The monotony in work and longer duty hours of the Copyholders also justify such a recommendation. We, therefore, recommend that the Copyholders should be given a pay scale of Rs. 110—3—131—4—155—EB—4—175—5—180. Our recommendation about the Copyholder is not inconsistent with the skilled pay scale already obtaining in the Press Establishment. Considering the initial qualifications and nature of duties a Copyholder and a Compositor (of the ordinary grade) can roughly be classified to be equal.

Revisers.—The grade of Revisers presents certain anomalies both in respect of recruitment and remuneration. The duties of the Revisers have already been enumerated earlier. He is the link between the operating personnel who carry out the corrections made by the Reading staff and the members of the Reading staff on the other hand. Unfortunately, the method of recruitment so far to this grade has not been sufficiently selective to ensure proper discharge of such onerous duties. The Revisers are

recruited from experienced Copyholders entirely by promotion from the latter grade. In practice, therefore, the selection is made only from senior Copyholders even though they may not have in the meantime qualified by passing the departmental examination for the Junior Readers. It is interesting to note that the grade of Junior Readers and the Revisers are identical. A copyholder, thus, after passing the departmental examination can become either a Junior Reader straightway or as a Reviser till a vacancy of Junior Reader occurs for him. Other Senior Copyholders who fail to qualify as Junior Readers are, however, eligible for the grade of Revisers only by virtue of their respective seniority in the grade of Copyholders. We could not commend this arrangement by which a Copyholder who has successfully passed the Junior Reader's test and a Copyholder who failed to do so are treated at par for the next higher grade. We are strongly of the opinion that only Copyholders who pass the examination for Junior Readers should be eligible to hold the post of Revisers. In effect, this would amount to merger of this category with that of Junior Readers although the designation will continue to be different. Alternatively, if the method of recruitment is not changed, there is a case for downward revision of the scale to Rs. 150—5—175—6—205 or Rs. 130—5—175—EB—6—205—7—212.

When this suggestion was made to the Unions they opposed it unanimously without advancing any cogent reason for disagreement. It was also pointed out that the existing Revisers could be exempted from the operation of this revised procedure but they could not agree to it probably for fear of letting down the senior Copyholders aspiring for the post of Revisers solely on grounds of seniority. We are fully conscious that there will be strong opposition to our suggestion that in future all Revisers should be qualified Copyholders after passing the departmental test for Junior Readers. We would, however, strongly advocate this course of action in the interest of efficiency and to give encouragement to the efficient although comparatively Junior Copyholders. We are extremely critical of the practice of treating the grade of Reviser as a dumping ground for Senior Copyholders who do not succeed in the test for recruitment of Readers.

Our attention was drawn to the limited number of chances which are given to the Copyholders for passing the Readership examination. If our suggestion that only Copyholders who have passed the departmental test should be appointed as Revisers (of course in addition to the appointment as Junior Readers) is accepted, we would recommend that the Copyholders should be given as many chances to pass the examination as they desire to avail of without laying down any restriction regarding the number of chances. Our recommendations regarding the method of determination of seniority of successful Copyholders, have been given separately later in this report as in our opinion, the present Seniority Rules require radical

alterations. The Committee felt that the present pay scale of the Revisers which is identical with the pay scale for Junior Readers can only be justified if the promotion to the grade of Revisers is made after proper screening in the same way as the Junior Readers. Promotion to the grade of the Reviser should at least be done through a departmental test, this has been discussed in detail later.

Junior Readers or Readers Class II.—The question of limited direct recruitment to the grade of Junior Readers in the Government of India Presses with a view to give avenues of employment to the personnel specially trained by training institutions was discussed in the Committee and the Committee felt that this question should be considered by the Department and Government separately. The Committee however felt that this is a very important issue and should be examined carefully in the context of the requirements of the Press Establishment as well as to encourage more and more trained personnel to enter Government service. The workers to whom this suggestion was made opposed it without reserve.

As for the existing Junior Readers no special recommendations are necessary, for their pay scales seem to be adequate considering their duties and responsibilities. There was some complaints about the method of reckoning seniority of the passed candidates on entering the Junior Readers grade. This matter will be discussed later in this report.

Readers Class I or Senior Readers.—The present grade of the Senior Readers is Rs. 168—8—256—EB—8—280—10—300. There were as many as four pre-1931 scales for Readers Class I. These were (i) Rs. 250—10—350, (ii) Rs. 200—10—250, (iii) Rs. 160—10—220, and (iv) Rs. 110—8—150. All these four scales were revised into a single scale by the First Pay Commission viz., Rs. 120—8—200—10/2—220. Ultimately by merging Dearness Allowance this scale was translated to the present one after the recommendations of the Second Pay Commission. We have already pointed out earlier in this report that no reasons were given for replacing the four pre-1931 scales by a single scale of Rs. 120—220 which is a compromise between the two lowest pre-1931 scales. The workers made a capital out of this unfair revision. We, however, concede that it is too late now to go back 20 years in order to rectify the alleged injustice. We have, therefore, not taken into consideration the pre-1931 scales while recommending a slight adjustment of the present scale.

The present scale which starts at an odd stage of Rs. 168 is on the low side. It was pointed out that no person promoted from Junior Reader actually draws anything less than Rs. 200 or Rs. 208. To that extent, the initial stages of Rs. 168 to Rs. 200 is inoperative. If that is so, we have no objection in keeping the minimum of the scale as it is for the sake of rounding up it may even be put at Rs. 160 instead of Rs. 168. We however, felt that the Readers Class I should at least be brought on par with

Offset Machineman Grade II. In that event, we recommend that the pay scales of the Readers Class I be revised to Rs. 175—6—205—7—240—EB—8—280—10—320. The comparative cost for this revision is negligible although theoretically, changing the maximum and minimum will increase the average cost of the post. This slight upward revision is justified as in actual practice, there is very little scope for further promotion for a Senior Reader. A Senior Reader occupies a key post in a Press Establishment and some avenue to reduce the present stagnation in the maximum of the existing scale is necessary. Even otherwise, the duties and responsibilities of this post justify its equalisation with the post of Offset Machine Operator or even Head Mechanic (Lino-Mono).

Head Readers.—The pay scales for Head Readers in the past were as follows:—

Pre-1931 Rs. 300—10—350.

1947 Rs. 250—10—300—15—360.

Existing scale Rs. 335—15—440.

As has already been pointed out, this is practically the highest post in the Reading Branch and is essentially a supervisory post. The Head Readers are eligible for further promotion as Overseers in the grade of Rs. 325—575 and thereafter to Assistant Managers in the grade of Rs. 350—800. In actual practice, however, a Head Reader hardly gets any further promotion and retires as a Head Reader in most cases. There are at present nine Head Readers in the Department. This number is likely to go up and it is quite improbable that all these Head Readers will have some further promotion.

The general demand of the workers was that the Head Reader should be equated to the Overseers with a higher initial salary. We regret that we cannot accept this stand. We, however, feel that the scale for the Head Reader should be somewhat longer than it is now and that Head Readers should be eligible for promotion direct as Assistant Manager without being promoted as Overseers first if they are otherwise found suitable. We would, therefore, recommend a scale of Rs. 325—15—475 for the Head Readers.

Editors.—At present, there is an isolated post of Editor in the Photolitho Wing of the New Delhi Press, in the scale of Rs. 320—15—425. There was an unanimous demand from the workers that on the letter press side certain Senior Readers are engaged for discharging in a rather crude way, editorial functions in respect of gazette printing and publications. This work should be entrusted to responsible officials separately assigned for the purpose. It was further argued that such a person will operate from his having an intimate knowledge of the work of proof reading as is expected of a Senior Reader. He will also have a knowledge of the editing

of manuscripts and arrangement of matter before the job goes for printing. We are inclined to agree with this view but the point for consideration is whether it is necessary to have a designation of an Editor similar to that already existing in the Photolitho Wing. We are of the view that the Photolitho process being different and the functions of the Editor also include that of supervising a small number of personnel in the branch, it would not be right to keep the proposed post at par with the existing post of Editor in the Photolitho Wing. We, therefore, recommend that the proposed post should be designated as 'Copy-Editor' and should have the pay scale of Rs. 250—10—290—15—380.

The Committee found further justification for this post from the point of view of efficient working of the Reading Branch. The duties prescribed are now crudely performed partly by Senior Readers and partly by Head Readers. It is desirable that this important work should be entrusted to a responsible official of the Reading Branch. As this will be a distinct post from the existing Editors of the Photolitho Wing, there will have to be some suitable designation assigned to either of these categories. In order to avoid confusion and consequential demand for revision of pay at a future date, we thought that a pay scale of Rs. 250—10—290—15—380 will be appropriate to this newly formed grade. We have adopted a designation of Copy-Editor. It should, however, be left to the Department to adopt any appropriate designation of this post. This post will however be created out of the existing cadre of Senior Readers.

Our attention was drawn to a number of instances where the Reading Branch of a Press is not under the supervision of a Head Reader. The workers demanded that in the Reading Branch of all Presses, there should be a Head Reader. We were not convinced about this demand but felt that wherever the number of Readers is too small to justify a Head Reader, a post of Reader-in-charge should be created to perform the supervisory duties which are inescapable in the Reading Branch. There was a suggestion that the Reader-in-charge should be given some special pay or duty allowance. These suggestions did not commend themselves to us. We feel that the post of Reader-in-charge should be distinct from the other Readers in order to ensure proper supervision and coordination. We, therefore, recommend that the Reader-in-Charge should be a separate post carrying a pay scale of Rs. 250—10—290—15—380. We, however, also recommend that *the post of Reader-in-charge shall be found from within the existing posts of Senior Readers in the Presses.*

The post of Copy-Editor, if created, will be classified as "highly skilled" Similarly, the post of Reader-in-charge, if created, will be classified as "Supervisory".

CHAPTER VI

RECRUITMENT AND PROMOTION IN THE READING BRANCH

The main grievance of the staff, apart from general dissatisfaction about pay scales, was regarding inadequacy of the promotional avenues. We were forced to listen to a long list of instances about disparity of promotional chances in the various presses. We made it clear to the Unions that we were helpless in this matter as each press is taken as a unit of promotion and unless they were prepared to move from one press to another, it will not be possible to equalise the promotional chances in each press under the C.C.P. & S. Some responded to this suggestion but the consensus was more or less against a common cadre for all the presses.

It was also pointed out that in some cases, Copyholders who have successfully passed the departmental test have to wait for years before their chance for promotion materialises. Instances were quoted about two or three persons in Simla Press where berths had to be found for successful Copyholders after a long wait by sending some Junior Readers to the Census Organisation. Frankly speaking, such a situation cannot be avoided altogether. If examinations are to be held regularly, there will be long waiting in certain units. If on the other hand, examinations are not held in certain presses where the need for new appointments to the grade of Junior Readers is not felt, it will be a genuine grievance of the workers. Either way, it does not help the Copyholders of that particular press.

It, however, appears to be reasonable that the departmental examination for recruitment to the post of Junior Readers should only be taken when the necessity for it actually arises. We have earlier recommended that the examination should also be made compulsory for promotion to the post of Revisers also. If this recommendation is accepted, the difficulties will be somewhat minimised as vacancies are likely to occur more frequently in either of the two grades. It cannot, however, be ruled out completely that in a particular press, there may be instances when the examination will not necessarily be held regularly. We come back to the only theoretical solution that all posts of Junior Readers and Revisers should be filled up by promotion on an All India basis, from the list of successful Copyholders in all the presses taken as a whole. Alternatively, the examination for Junior readership should be made on a competitive basis with a small cushion for leave vacancies so that the Administration is not confronted with a long list of 'qualified candidates'. We, however, doubt whether this solution.

will appeal to the workers. But there is no real solution to the problem unless the cadre is made an All India Cadre which is hardly feasible.

With the expansion of some of the presses and in the setting up of new presses, this disparity in promotion to the grade of Junior and Senior Readers will be even more pronounced in future. At least in the new presses, which are to be opened or which have been opened recently, an attempt should be made to post volunteers from the waiting lists of qualified candidates from other presses subject, however, to the suitability of the candidates being reasonably conversant in the regional languages.

There was an important suggestion that the qualifying examination for Junior Readers from the Copyholders should be converted into a *competitive one*. There are distinct advantages in adopting this suggestion. We have already mentioned above that this will do away with a waiting list of qualified candidates. This will also presumably encourage talented but comparatively Junior Copyholders to compete for the post of Junior Readers. In any case, all the benefits of competitive examination can be derived by taking recourse to this suggestion. Adopting competitive examination as the basis of promotion from Copyholders to the grade of Junior Readers will necessarily mean that the seniority of the successful candidates will be determined solely by their performance in the competitive examination. This will completely reverse the present method of determining seniority of Junior Readers. We must confess that under the existing rules, the seniority list of Junior Readers both for the purpose of confirmation and further promotion as Senior Readers can hardly be worked out with any degree of certainty. The reasons for this confusion will be given later.

Arguments will invariably be advanced against the system of competitive examination. Competitive examination will naturally be welcome to junior and ambitious Copyholders and will definitely be unpopular with senior workers. In order to accommodate some of the aged and senior men, we would recommend to Government that a reasonable percentage of vacancies (not exceeding say, 25 per cent) should be set-apart for promotion of senior Copyholders to the grade of Revisers without coming through the competitive examination. *It should, however, be clearly understood that such promotees will not be eligible for any further promotion unless they compete in the examination for readers like any other Copyholders.*

Yet another alternative was suggested that the promotion from Copyholders to Junior Readers should be partially by qualifying examination and partially on competitive basis. In certain departments promotions from L.D.Cs. to U.D.Cs. grade are regulated in this manner. We also commend this method to Government as the second best in the case of Copyholders for promotion to the grade of Junior Readers. We feel that the present system lacks sufficient incentive for the younger Copyholders to try for

earlier promotion as in any case, even after qualifying, they are likely to be held up for want of vacancies and perhaps have to wait indefinitely till all their seniors who have qualified are absorbed one by one. The present system also suffers from the disadvantage that a person qualified years ago is given his promotion long after he had qualified. It has got the disadvantage of making a qualified Copyholder somewhat complacent. It is, no doubt, true that most of the draw-backs of the present system can be eliminated by restricting the number of qualified candidates strictly in accordance with expected vacancies but such an action, as had already been pointed out above, will accentuate the disparity of promotional avenues in the various presses.

In this connection, we would like to draw the attention of Government to a very important aspect of the examination which is now being conducted in the various presses to select Copyholders for promotion to the grade of Junior Readers. Each Press holds its own examination. The Presses are expected to hold it at least once in two years even if the vacancies are not forth-coming. We have already commented on the evils of holding infructuous examinations. We would also like to point out here that the practice of holding different examinations in different presses is not at all conducive to efficiency. Such local examinations will result in the standard varying from examination to examination as well as from unit to unit. The standard will also depend entirely on the set of examiners for a particular examination. We have considered this problem very carefully, and we feel that only a central examination with adequate room for local languages will ensure uniformity as well as quality of the successful candidates. This will also do away with rather uncertain time-tables of the various units and will certainly eliminate local prejudices.

We recommend that the central examination should be conducted once a year by the Chief Controller of Printing & Stationery.

This examination would of course be held simultaneously at different centres press-wise.

At present only three chances are given to each candidate for passing the Readership examination. There is no apparent reason why the chances are restricted to three. Possibly, this is an attempt to reduce the number of candidates. Under the present conditions, it is essential to restrict the number of candidates. If, however, the examination is made competitive, there is no reason why the number of candidates should be restricted artificially.

Once aspect of the present qualifying examination has to be mentioned here. Under the present system, a Copyholder who has qualified for Readership is, no doubt, certain of getting promotion as and when his turn

comes. This certainly makes him complacent. The incentive to improve his own work thus totally vanishes. This is a most undesirable state of affairs. In this connection, we would like to draw the attention of Government to the Office Memorandum No. 1/25/65-Estt(D), dated the 11th October, 1966, issued by the Ministry of Home Affairs, wherein they have commented upon the complacency thus generated in the Government servants aspiring for promotion.

To sum up it is our considered view that the examination for Readership should be conducted on a competitive basis. Government, however, may make some allowance for senior Copyholders to get a quota of promotion as Revisers by virtue of their seniority on condition that further promotion of such persons will be permissible only after they compete in the examination for Readers.

There was some suggestion that the promotion from Junior to Senior Readership will also be regulated by holding the competitive examination or by selection. We, however, do not agree with this suggestion. Although competitive examination is perhaps the best method of selection, it is not desirable to have far too many tests for promotions, as such a system tends to make the worker more anxious to pass an examination than to improve his skill in his own trade. We would, therefore, recommend that the present system of promotion from Junior to Senior Readers should continue.

There was a persistent demand from the workers to amalgamate the two grades of Junior and Senior Readers and to have a long integrated scale. We do not see any justification for this. The work assigned to Junior and Senior Readers may appear to be somewhat alike on a superficial observation but invariably the Senior Readers are entrusted with more responsible and complicated work. Thus, there is enough justification to distinguish between the Readers by having two separate grades.

If our suggestion to create a new post of Copy Editor is accepted by Government, this post may be filled up from amongst Senior Readers purely by Selection on merit. Whether the Head Readers' post will be filled up from Copy Editor or also from Senior Readers or from the senior Readers alone will have to be determined by the department.

The present practice of promoting Head Readers first in the grade of Overseers and then to Assistant Manager's grade does not appear to us to be useful. We would recommend that the Head Readers should be made eligible for promotion direct to the grade of Assistant Manager without routing them through the Overseers' grade. We have earlier recommended a slightly higher scale for the Head Readers taking into consideration this aspect of the promotional chances.

Before concluding this chapter, mention must be made of some suggestion that the quality of the Copyholders should be improved. At present, only matriculates with some experience are admitted as Copyholders after passing through a departmental screening. This is a matter for the department to consider in consultation with Government. So long as the minimum qualifications of comparable categories in Government of India remains Matriculation we do not see how it can be unilaterally changed in this particular case. Any raising of standard for recruitment will result in a reasonable demand for upward revision of wages.

CHAPTER VII

MISCELLANEOUS GRIEVANCES OF THE PRESS WORKERS IN THE READING BRANCH

We are unable to deal with all the points raised by the workers before the Committee because of shortage of time and most of the points raised appear to us to be more connected with day to day administration than with the work entrusted to the Committee. Some of the points raised were quite irrelevant to the issue of classification and stream-lining duties, responsibilities and Pay scales. There are certain items, however, which deserve consideration.

A majority of the workers raised the question of duty hours in the Press Establishment. Their principal claim was that the Reading Branch in the Government of India Presses invariably have longer duty hours than their counter-parts elsewhere. The major demand of the workers was that they should be at par with Working Journalists. We have already mentioned earlier how this demand failed in a court of law. Some of the unions tried to raise this issue again before the Committee. For obvious reasons, it was not possible for us to go into the details of working hours in each establishment of comparable status. We, however, felt that workers, irrespective of their status as industrial or non-industrial, who are required to work in a factory or a production unit, should invariably follow the usual hours prescribed for other workers in the establishment. It can safely be presumed that while prescribing pay scales for each category, the working hours and the arduousness of duties are invariably given due weightage. Any enhancement of usual duty hours is compensated by over-time allowance or wages. Sudden reduction in duty hours is neither practicable nor desirable. Theoretically, such a step can lead to downward revision of pay scales.

This view of the Committee is nothing new. Similar views were expressed by the Second Pay Commission while discussing the duty hours of non-industrial workers working side by side with industrial workers in an industrial establishment. In this connection attention is drawn to Paragraph 14 Chapter XXV of the Second Pay Commission's Report. The claim for uniformity in weekly hours in various establishments under Government has also been refuted by the Second Pay Commission in Para 11 *ibid.*

The question of relative seniority of successful Copyholders entering the grade of Junior Readers was raised by the Unions. Under the existing

rules, normally three chances are available for every Copyholder to qualify for the grade of Junior Reader. As this is a qualifying examination, all successful Copyholders retain their *inter-se* seniority even after they enter the grade of Junior Readers. Copyholders who do not qualify in the first chance but qualify in the subsequent attempt also retain their seniority *vis-a-vis* a Junior Copyholder who has succeeded in the first attempt. The seniority of a Copyholder who comes out successful in the third attempt was not protected. The relevant rule in March, 1942 was:—

“Qualified revisers and copyholders will be appointed or promoted as readers according to seniority and not according to position in the examination or the date of passing it; provided that a reviser or copyholder, who, having been permitted to appear in the examination for the third time as a special case under rule (4), qualifies, will, irrespective of his seniority, not be appointed or promoted as a reader before those who qualified in an earlier examination”.

(Government of India Deptt. of Labour Memo. No. A350 dated 13th March, 1942)

This was subsequently modified on 18th September, 1944 as follows:—

“Out of every five vacancies of readers filled, the first four will go in order of seniority to the men who have qualified in the first or second chance (to be referred to as the “first or second chance men”), the fifth vacancy being filled by the seniormost man among those who have qualified in the third chance (to be referred to as the “third chance men”). In other words 20% of the appointments in the readers grade will be reserved for the “third chance men” who having qualified at a third chance granted to them as a concession are to be treated as on a different footing from the “first and second chance” man.

(Government of India Deptt. of Labour
Memo. No. A360 dated 18th September, 1944.)

Even these concessions, from time to time, did not satisfy the workers. At one time, a particular workers union came forward with a refreshingly reasonable suggestion that “the date of passing the prescribed examination should be the sole criterion in determining seniority among qualified Copyholders and Revisers for appointment as Readers except in case of persons passing in the same year where seniority in service should determine their respective seniority for this purpose. This suggestion seems to have been over-ruled in favour of the majority demand of third chance-sympathisers.

It appears curious to us that the emphasis in the Reading Branch of the Press Establishment is always on the unsuccessful candidates. Even in our deliberations, we noticed the tendency of the workers to protect the interests of persons who could not qualify for the Readership examination. Without being dogmatic on the subject, we feel that the present emphasis on seniority alone has not proved very beneficial to the Department. The present method of reckoning seniority of the officiating Readers Class II or the Junior Readers is extremely difficult to follow and we do not understand how these bulky rules are actually implemented. As we have pointed out above, the seniority of any successful Copyholder can be determined only after all his erstwhile senior Copyholders have exhausted the chances of passing. The curious thing is that the chances mentioned are not reckoned as two consecutive examinations but any two chances a Copyholder chooses to appear in. This means that the seniority list is never finalised and is liable to interpolation as and when senior Copyholders come out successful in the examination after examinations. We do not know how confirmation can be made in a grade where the seniority list is so fluid. The question of further promotion to the grade of Senior Readers which is purely by virtue of seniority in the grade of Junior Readers is equally difficult to understand. Under the existing rules a Junior Reader whose seniority in the grade is reckoned in terms of his seniority as Copyholder, will get preference over officiating Junior Readers whom might be officiating for a much longer time than him. The method of reckoning seniority in a grade by virtue of seniority in a lower Grade irrespective of date of appointment in the higher grade is contrary to all known rules on the subject. It could work if only the Copyholders are given a single chance of passing the examination but by extending the chances to two or three the whole position has become impossible.

The solution about the vexed question of reckoning seniority of Readers has already been suggested by us earlier when we recommend the substitution of the present qualifying examination by a competitive test. The rank in the competitive test will determine the seniority in the higher cadre irrespective of the *inter-se* seniority in the lower grade. If, however, our recommendation is not accepted we feel that the existing method of reckoning seniority should be completely revised. Seniority in the higher cadre should solely be determined by the date of passing the qualifying examination. Any subsequent qualification will mean loss of seniority in the higher cadre. In other words, all first chance candidates should rank senior to all second chance candidates and so on.

We need not highlight the merits of the above suggestion. Under the existing conditions, it is extremely improbable that a candidate should take his first chance seriously. On the other hand, a candidate who has been declared successful on his first attempt will have to wait perhaps for

years before all his erstwhile senior Copyholders are either successful or finally unsuccessful. We do not see any merit of the present system.

A compromise was suggested as follows:—

“A senior Copyholder ‘A’ has failed in his first attempt and his junior ‘B’ has been successful, and if subsequently ‘A’ passes the examination in his second attempt, ‘B’ will be reckoned senior to ‘A’ if he has *actually been appointed as a Reader before ‘A’ took the second chance.* If, however, ‘B’ has not actually been appointed as Junior Reader, in the meantime, then ‘A’ will retain his original seniority as Copyholder also in the grade of Junior Readers.”

Although we feel that this is somewhat reasonable, we would still recommend that the date of passing the qualifying examination should be the sole criterion for determining seniority in the higher grade. This will eliminate a lot of unnecessary administrative work and is unexceptionable on merits.

We would, however, again reiterate the merits of the competitive examination which will eliminate all difficulties about reckoning seniority as are experienced today. Much has been said against the system of competitive examination in some context or the other but it appears to us to be the best method of selection to higher posts, so far evolved.

There should be some yardstick for creation of extra posts in the Reading Branch. We have not been able to ascertain what exactly is the method followed at present for creation of extra posts. We presume that the success of a proposal will be determined by the amount of persuasion which can be put forward along with a proposal. Certainly, with the vast experience at the command of the Department, it should be possible to evolve some scientific and reasonable yardstick for creation of extra posts. It is high time that suitable yardstick be evolved both in the interest of the Department as well as the workers.

We were asked by the workers to recommend as to what should be the ratio between senior and junior Readers. Although we studied the problem carefully, we could not come to any definite conclusion for the simple reason that the distribution of Senior and Junior Readers varies from press to press and it does not follow any set pattern. The Managers were also rather vague about the distribution of work between Senior and Junior Readers. We can only say that in a normal press of moderate size, the number of Senior Readers, should not exceed the number of Junior Readers. It may be possible to arrive at some proportion once the yardstick for creation of posts is determined.

We, however, feel that there should be at least a Reader-in-Charge wherever there are more than ten officials in the Reading Branch including the Revisers and the Copyholders. Similarly, there should be a Head Reader when the strength of the Reading Branch is fifty or more. *In a small press, where the strength of the Reading Branch falls short of ten, the Senior-most Reader should be given a special pay between Rs. 30 and Rs. 40 to look-after the supervisory duties of the branch.*

The above recommendations about Reader-in-Charge or special pay to the senior-most Reader should also apply to Reading Cells doing special or secret work.

Before we conclude this Chapter, we would like once again to draw the attention of Government to the question of some direct recruitment to the grade of Junior Readers. There is no doubt, that it will be strongly resisted by the workers but to improve the quality of the Readers and consequential raising of standard of efficiency of the entire Reading Branch, we feel that some direct recruitment of suitably qualified candidates as Junior Readers is necessary. There will, no doubt, be some administrative adjustments necessary once it is decided to have direct recruitment to the grade of Junior Readers but this can be undertaken by the Department if a decision to this effect is taken. Our recommendations about Reading Branch are, however, based on the assumption that the existing procedure and arrangements will continue. If direct recruitment is resorted to, quite a number of minor adjustments will be necessary. The maxima and minima of the scales will assume more importance than at present and we had earlier pointed out that the present maxima and minima of the intermediary scale are merely of theoretical value as pay of an official is always adjusted in accordance with Pay Fixation Rules, and the actual maxima and minima are really inoperative except in the ultimate and the initial time scales.

of Revisers without competition in the departmental examination. This will determine their confirmation as Revisers only in their own turn, *i.e.*, in accordance with the quota fixed for their confirmation.

The next problem will be about the existing, *officiating* Revisers. For all officiating Revisers on long term basis, we recommend that their chances for *confirmation should be protected*. In other words, they will be eligible for confirmation against all permanent posts which may fall vacant from time to time till all of them have either been confirmed (or retire or are found unfit for confirmation otherwise). In other words, all existing officiating Revisers and Junior Readers will rank senior for the purpose of confirmation as Readers to all future promotees to these cadres irrespective of whether they come through competitive examination or through the reserved quotas.

We have already recommended earlier that the newly created posts of Copy Editor should be filled up by promotion from Senior Readers. We would prefer that the criteria for such promotion should only be selection on merit. Similarly we would recommend that the filling up of the existing post of Editor Photo Litho should be from Senior Readers as well as Copy Editors by selection only. It is not necessary that only Copy Editors should be eligible for the post of Editors in Photo Litho Wing. Similarly, for the post of Head Readers, we would recommend the existing Editor Photo Litho, the proposed Copy Editors, the Readers-in-Charge as eligible, the later being treated at par with Copy Editors.

It will be seen from Chapter V that we have not suggested any upgrading or downgrading of any category. There will, therefore, be no necessity of screening of workers before any recommendation is implemented. Where the scale has been slightly improved by raising the maximum, the revised scale should automatically be applied to all the existing and future incumbents.

The Second Pay Commission had prescribed Efficiency Bar in majority of the pay scales, even in cases where there were no such bars under the First Pay Commission or pre-1947 scales. Efficiency Bar in an industrial establishment is somewhat incongruous. In short pay scales applicable to industrial staff where entry and promotion are by trade tests, the introduction of Efficiency Bar is somewhat anomalous and appears to be redundant.

While the above observations are true for strictly industrial scales. Efficiency Bar cannot be said to be redundant in case of all the Reading Branch of the Press Establishment. It should be possible for the department to take advantage of the Efficiency Bar in the Reading Branch to

of Revisers without competition in the departmental examination. This will determine their confirmation as Revisers only in their own turn, i.e., in accordance with the quota fixed for their confirmation.

The next problem will be about the existing, *officiating* Revisers. For all officiating Revisers on long term basis, we recommend that their chances for *confirmation should be protected*. In other words, they will be eligible for confirmation against all permanent posts which may fall vacant from time to time till all of them have either been confirmed (or retire or are found unfit for confirmation otherwise). In other words, all existing officiating Revisers and Junior Readers will rank senior for the purpose of confirmation as Readers to all future promotees to these cadres irrespective of whether they come through competitive examination or through the reserved quotas.

We have already recommended earlier that the newly created posts of Copy Editor should be filled up by promotion from Senior Readers. We would prefer that the criteria for such promotion should only be selection on merit. Similarly we would recommend that the filling up of the existing post of Editor Photo Litho should be from Senior Readers as well as Copy Editors by selection only. It is not necessary that only Copy Editors should be eligible for the post of Editors in Photo Litho Wing. Similarly, for the post of Head Readers, we would recommend the existing Editor Photo Litho, the proposed Copy Editors, the Readers-in-Charge as eligible, the later being treated at par with Copy Editors.

It will be seen from Chapter V that we have not suggested any upgrading or downgrading of any category. There will, therefore, be no necessity of screening of workers before any recommendation is implemented. Where the scale has been slightly improved by raising the maximum, the revised scale should automatically be applied to all the existing and future incumbents.

The Second Pay Commission had prescribed Efficiency Bar in majority of the pay scales, even in cases where there were no such bars under the First Pay Commission or pre-1947 scales. Efficiency Bar in an industrial establishment is somewhat incongruous. In short pay scales applicable to industrial staff where entry and promotion are by trade tests, the introduction of Efficiency Bar is somewhat anomalous and appears to be redundant.

While the above observations are true for strictly industrial scales. Efficiency Bar cannot be said to be redundant in case of all the Reading Branch of the Press Establishment. It should be possible for the department to take advantage of the Efficiency Bar in the Reading Branch to

ascertain whether an official continues to have the expected degree of skill in the trade in which he is working or he is merely continuing by virtue of passing some sort of departmental test years ago. We would recommend that the Efficiency Bars in the grade of Senior Readers should be strictly enforced and should not be allowed to become a routine affair as is generally the case in all Government establishments. Crossing of the Efficiency Bar should be after rigid screening subject, however, to the usual conditions of continued good work and conduct. Even at the risk of facing strong opposition, we would recommend that there should be some test to ensure continued efficiency of the Readers.

We had received a number of requests to look into the working conditions of the Presses, as well as a number of grievances regarding rotation between night and day shifts. This should appropriately be looked into by the Administration. We would, however, like to mention that the working conditions have got a direct bearing on production in any unit and as far as practicable, there should be continuous attempts to improve and maintain the standard amenities for the press workers as a whole and to the Reading Branch in particular. The level and quality of lighting are very important in the Reading Branch. The space allotted to a particular set should also be sufficient. The Accommodation allotted to the various units should be standardised as far as practicable. These aspects should be taken into account at the earliest possible stage of a project for a new press and to the extent possible improved in the old Presses as well.

P. K. SEN,

Chairman.

MANOHAR KESHAV,

Member.

R. RAMASWAMY,

Member.

G. S. BHASIN,

Member.

N. C. SANYAL,

Secretary.

**Report on Categorisation of Government of India Press Workers in the
Reading Branch**

(Classification of certain miscellaneous categories)

of

Government of India Presses

(Part II)

PART II

CHAPTER I

CLASSIFICATION OF CERTAIN MISCELLANEOUS CATEGORIES OF THE GOVERNMENT OF INDIA PRESSES UNDER CHIEF CONTROLLER OF PRINTING AND STATIONERY

In this section, we are required to deal with the following categories, not pertaining to the Reading Branch, of the Government of India Presses:

- (1) Mounter.
- (2) Mounter and Finisher.
- (3) Material Supplier.
- (4) Report Writer.
- (5) Paper Issuer.

Of the above, the Mounter and Mounter and Finisher had been categorised by the Committee for Categorisation of the Government of India Press Workers, 1964. A fresh reference to the present Committee has been made as it has been felt that the previous categorisation was done on erroneous data. The other three categories, *viz.*, Material Supplier, Report Writer and Paper Issuer had also been reviewed by the earlier Categorisation Committee who felt that these categories really pertain to non-industrial group. Hence they did not classify them with the other industrial workers.

Obviously, Government had not accepted the view of the earlier Committee that these categories belong to the non-industrial group. Consequently, Government have referred back these categories to the present Committee.

We had earlier in Part I discussed the difficulties in classifying a worker in Government establishment either as industrial or non-industrial. A clear definition of an 'industrial worker' by Government even for their own employee is yet to be formulated.

The Committee for categorisation of the Press Workers in 1964, had remarked ".....there are a number of categories in the Presses which have been somewhat loosely termed as industrial. Some of these categories also existed in other establishments where they are treated as purely non-industrial. Although it is conceded that such workers may be governed by some of the labour Laws, it is felt that it will not be proper to classify

them as purely industrial workers. These categories like Report Writers, Despatcher, Paper Issuer, Material Supplier, etc. were left out from our classification.....”

In the absence of a clear definition of an industrial worker in Government employ, much can be said in favour of or against the above views of the previous Committee without coming to a definite conclusion. Admittedly, most of the Press workers are governed by the Factories Act and hence can be classified as ‘industrial workers’. On the other hand, identical categories will be found in other non-industrial establishments under Government. It is doubtful whether it will be proper to take the view that since the latter are not working in a Factory and are working in a purely non-industrial establishment, they should not be classified as industrial workers, although their counterparts in a Factory automatically come under the purview of the Factories Act. We recognise that there is no ban in employing industrial workers to a non-industrial establishment and *vice versa* but it will not be fair to deny classification of one set of workers and omit their counterparts simply on the ground that they are not governed by the Factories Act or some similar labour legislation. Once a category has been categorised either way in any establishment, it will be impossible to resist the demand for similar classification and consequential benefits, if any, to similar staff engaged elsewhere in Government. We do not know whether this aspect of the question has been examined thoroughly by the Ministry of Works, Housing & Supply. It will be interesting to recall that the First Pay Commission had recommended that there should be “no differentiation between the industrial employées of Government and those employed in private industries” in the matter of categorisation. Obviously, this recommendation applies with greater force in the case of basic categorisation as industrial or non-industrial.

For the present, however, we shall proceed on the assumption that the categories of Report Writer, Paper Issuer and Material Supplier have been included in the industrial group by the Department after considering all aspects of the problem. It is, however, surprising that no orders on the subject from Government (i.e. Ministry of WH&S) are traceable on this subject. An important matter like this should not be left to the discretion of the Heads of Departments. We cannot imagine a situation where different Heads of Departments classify workers in different ways.

Our discussions among the departmental officers have strengthened our views that this matter has not received proper attention so far, and they have hazy notions about industrial workers under Government. Even under the same Department, the same category has been categorised both as industrial in some establishment and non-industrial in some other establishment. Again, if a particular category is filled up by promotion from industrial workers, the entire category has been dubbed as industrial irres-

pective of the fact that the duties attached to the category are purely clerical. We would strongly recommend to Government that this aspect of the problem is examined earnestly and thoroughly in consultation with the Ministry of Labour and other Government Departments engaging industrial staff and a common definition arrived at otherwise we feel that a serious deadlock will occur in the near future.

With the exception of one, the categories entrusted to this Committee for categorisation fall under the group which we may, at best, call as the doubtful group. *Our own views on the subject are that the categories of Paper Supplier, Report Writer and Material Supplier should not be included in the industrial group.* Nonetheless, for reasons stated earlier, we have to classify these categories into the groups of highly skilled, skilled, semi-skilled and unskilled workers.

The reference made by Government to this Committee also included the category of Paper Issuer. In the proof copy of the Press Handbook, there is a mention of 3 kinds of Paper Issuers, viz. (i) Paper Issuer (Clerical)—pay scale Rs. 110-180, (ii) Transit Clerk and Paper Issuer—pay scale Rs. 110—180 and (iii) Paper Issuer—pay scale Rs. 75—95 (pp. 6 & 10, Chapter 3 of proof copy of the Press Handbook). It is clear from the above that the same designation applied both to the clerical and to the non-clerical workers dealing with issue of paper for printing purposes. On our enquiry into the multiplicity of this designation, it was found that Paper Issuer belongs to purely clerical cadre. The Paper Issuer in the scale of Rs. 75—95 was in fact co-terminous with Paper Supplier. After some difficulty, we were supplied with a copy of Chief Controller's Memo. No. 13/43/63-F. I(Pt.) dated the 23rd September, 1964 in which the Chief Controller conveyed the sanction "to the re-designation of permanent Class IV posts of Paper Issuers" to Paper Suppliers in the scale of Rs. 75—95 in Minto Road and Aligarh Presses. The same Memo. also mentions that the post of Paper Supplier will be a Class IV industrial post as in other Government of India Presses. We have, therefore, presumed that we are not to classify the category of Paper Issuer any longer.

As the reference of the categories of Paper Supplier, Material Suppliers and Report Writer to the Committee was somewhat belated, it was not possible for the Committee to hear the views of the Unions or workers about these categories nor did we receive any Memorandum from the workers on these categories. We have, therefore, relied on the technical opinion from our Technical Member and Departmental officers as well as our own observations of the categories to arrive at the following conclusions.

CHAPTER II

CLASSIFICATION OF PAPER SUPPLIER, MATERIAL SUPPLIER AND REPORT WRITER.

Paper Supplier.—The main duty of the Paper Supplier is to assist the clerical staff in the Press stores in supplying paper for printing. The Paper Supplier, therefore, has to have some knowledge of the various kinds of papers used in printing, to locate such paper in the store and to ensure proper supply against each indent. It is thus clear that the duties of Paper Supplier require experience as well as knowledge of the various kinds of paper used in modern printing. He is also expected to ensure accurate quantity of supplies against each indent. It is apparent that the job expected of a Paper Supplier is of semi-skilled group. We, therefore, classify the Paper Supplier as semi-skilled.

Material Supplier.—The duties of a Material Supplier are to supply paste and other materials required for the bindery staff. He is not, however, required to prepare the paste nor is he the custodian of any of the material. His duties are confined to the simple act of physical delivery of miscellaneous articles required for the bindery staff.

This is an isolated category existing only in Government of India Press, Calcutta. The duties and responsibilities can justify only the classification of the category as unskilled. We would, however, recommend that this category be abolished and the duties should be entrusted to the category of labourers who could do the job equally effectively. Too many isolated categories pose different administrative problems.

Report Writer.—The Report Writer is the one who records the output of operatives in the machine, bindery and mechanical branches of the press in the appropriate time memos and registers. He is expected to have some knowledge of the various operations involved in these branches and it is on this consideration that this class of operatives whose work is more or less of a clerical nature, used to be entrusted to purely clerical personnel recruited from the open market. Since literate operatives were not available in such branches as bindery and machine-room, it was the practice to recruit from the market Matriculates and these persons were made to acquire working knowledge of the technical operations for the purpose of discharging their duties. Subsequently, the recruitment rules were changed with a view to enable the literate operatives from the respective industrial branches being promoted against these posts. It was the view that the possession of a knowledge of the technical operations of the work of the different branches was necessary in addition to the possession of educational qualifications for

discharging the major portion of the clerical duties attached to the post. Considering, however, the fact that the Report Writer's duties are essentially clerical in nature, the classification of the operatives as Industrial employees does not appear to be in order. It is more appropriate to categorise him as a non-industrial employee. If, however, it is decided that the category of Report Writers should form a part of the industrial establishment, we can only classify this category as skilled. Our recommendation is, however, based merely on the fact that the present Report Writers are recruited from the literate employees from the skilled groups of binders and machinemen. No technical skill is involved in discharging the duties of Report Writers nor it is supervisory in nature.

Thus, we could not adopt the ordinary criteria for classification in this particular case. Admittedly, some knowledge of the operations in the branch is essential but that cannot be assessed in terms of technical skill.

Mounter & Finisher.—This is a category of employees engaged in the Process Block-making Section of the Press. His duties are to prepare the mounts, test them for correct thickness, mount the original or duplicate plates on to them. He has also got to rout, finish to size the block or duplicate plates and drill holes for nailing or screwing the plates on the mounts. It will thus be seen that apart from possessing a sufficient knowledge of carpentry work, he has also got to handle small machines like router/planer, beveller etc. and is responsible for making over the blocks or plates in a perfectly finished condition. He has, therefore, to be placed under the category of 'skilled' with a pay scale of Rs. 140—5—175.

Mounter.—Originally, this was the designation given to the employees in the block-making section engaged wholly on mounting of blocks on to wooden bases after planing the mounts and ensuring that the height of the mounted block is of the correct thickness. This work is more or less analogous to carpentry work and it would be, therefore, right to classify him like a skilled carpenter. We do not, however, see any necessity for having a separate post of Mounter. It would be sufficient to have an integrated designation of Mounter and Finisher who has to attend to all the finishing work including that of the mounting of blocks.

We would once again recommend that a thorough study be undertaken about all the existing categories in the Press Establishment with a view to reduce the number further, irrespective of the recommendations of the previous Categorisation Committee and the present Committee. Categories which were brought on to the Government of India Press Establishment from other presses taken over by Government from time to time should not be allowed to continue as isolated categories thereby posing avoidable problems. What we want to emphasise is that it is not necessary to wait for suggestions from any Committee before odd categories can be eliminated or designations can

be charged to have a uniform pattern. Redundant categories with little or no difference from established categories impose an unnecessary burden on the Administration not only adding to the number unnecessarily but also to evolve artificial distinctions about pay, status, duties etc. This aspect can be reviewed conveniently while revising the recruitment rules which in any case, have to be undertaken as a result of the recommendations of the previous Committee as well as our own recommendations.

from industrial categories to revert back to their parent cadre. This is no doubt true but is made to minimise the hardships that may be caused due to the declaration of the category as non-industrial.

The present method of drafting industrial workers to the grade of Report Writers is to say the least, very unsatisfactory. We concede that it is essential to have literate binders or machinemen only to be taken as Report Writers. At the same time, there should be some firm rules about such selection between the eligible binders or machinemen. One interesting point was raised as to whether a Report Writer retains his technical skill after performing the duties of Writing the Reports for a number of years. The answer clearly is in the negative. Technical skill cannot ordinarily be retained without constant application. This was conceded by some of the departmental officers whom we consulted.

It will, therefore, be apparent that drafting technically skilled workers to this job cannot be said to be a proper utilisation of a skilled worker. On the other hand, it has even got the effect of making a man lose his efficiency and skill when he is selected for the post of Report Writer and retained in that post for long periods.

CHAPTER IV

On the question of remuneration we have very little to suggest about the few categories with whom we have dealt with in the earlier chapters. We would, however, like to point out again that the scope of this Committee is quite limited and revision of pay scales on an *ad hoc* basis is not within our competence. A large number of representations were made for wholesale upward revision of pay scales. As however the classification of the categories does not automatically justify any upward revision, we are not in a position to recommend any increase in pay.

A somewhat belated representation was received regarding the upgradation of the category of Report Writers as highly skilled. This was perhaps done with a view to fit in the industrial employees engaged on report writing. We have already recommended that the grade of Report Writers should be filled up by clerical hands. We are, therefore, unable to recommend the upgradation of this category to the highly skilled group. The pay scale of Rs. 110—180 is, therefore, considered suitable for this grade.

We have already taken into account the individual cases of industrial employees engaged as Report Writers. Admittedly their position is somewhat anomalous. It is for this reason that we had suggested earlier special protection for them till they are found eligible for promotion to higher posts in the industrial line. They should, however, be allowed to revert to their parent grade if they so desire. It should be remembered that their drafting into the grade of Report Writers was not actually a case of promotion, although in effect it might be so. They were selected mainly on the ground of their being literate and their ability to perform the clerical job required from the Report Writers. It is quite possible that some of the Report Writers drafted from the grade of machinemen and binders might not have been senior enough to be appointed as Report Writers. Nor is it clearly established that this was a regular system of promotion under the rules. It appears that such appointments were made mainly on consideration of literacy from the grades of binders and machinemen. As, however, mass reversion to the parent grades will disturb these grades, we had suggested that special protection might be given as mentioned earlier.

We would, however, like to mention in this connection that conversion of the posts of Report Writers to the clerical grade may ultimately upset the balance of the clerical grades. Government will, no doubt, take adequate steps by creation of the required number of additional posts of Upper Division Clerks to maintain the balance. We are mentioning this as these minor

details are likely to be lost sight of when isolated reforms like the present one are carried out.

Before we conclude this report, we would again express our gratitude to the workers, unions and officials of the Printing & Stationery Department for the invaluable help they have rendered to the Committee in preparing this report. The time at our disposal was not enough considering the fact that all the members had to undertake this review in addition to their normal duties. It has been possible to complete the study only with the willing and cheerful cooperation of the workers and the officials.

We are aware that we have not been able to conduct a thorough study of each category but as we have already pointed out, our terms of reference were restricted to classification of workers and only consequential modifications regarding recruitment, promotion and remuneration.

With this review we trust that the classification of industrial workers in the Press establishment is complete. We would however like to point out that this is only the first categorisation of Press workers as recommended by the first Pay Commission in 1947. This classification will have to be reviewed from time to time *vide* para 224 of the recommendations of the Central Pay Commission 1947 (Part II).

P. K. SEN,
Chairman.

MANOHAR KESHAV,
Member.

R. RAMASWAMY,
Member.

G. S BHASIN,
Member.

N. C. SANYAL,
Secretary.

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

PART I

I. Modifications in Pay Scales.

1. The existing pay scale of Rs. 110—3—131—4—147 of Copyholders should be revised to Rs. 110—3—131—4—155—EB—4—175—5—180 (same as L.D.C.)

(Chapter V, page 13)

2. The existing pay scale of Rs. 168—8—256—EB—8—280—10—300 of Readers Class I or Senior Readers should be revised to Rs. 175—6—205—7—240—EB—8—280—10—320. (or to Rs. 168—8—256—EB—8—280—10—320).

(Chapter V, page 16)

3. The existing pay scale of Rs. 335—15—440 of Head Readers should be revised to Rs. 325—15—475.

(Chapter V, page 16)

II. Creation of new posts with suggested pay scales.

1. A new post designated as Copy Editor should be created for editorial work in letter-press and handling Gazettes, Journals & Periodicals in the pay scale of Rs. 250—10—290—15—380. It is left to the Department to suggest other appropriate designation for this new post, when created. This post will, however, be created out of the existing Cadre of Senior Readers.

(Chapter V, page 17)

2. A new post of Reader-in-charge should be created to perform the Supervisory duties in the Reading Branch when the strength of Readers (including Revisers and Copyholders) would be ten, but less than fifty in the pay scale of Rs. 250—10—290—15—380. The post of Reader-in-charge shall be *found from within the existing posts of Senior Readers in the Presses.*

(Chapter V, page 17 & Chapter VII pages 26-27)

3. When the strength in a Reading Branch is fifty or more a post of Head Reader should be created.

(Chapter VII, page 27)

4. In a small Press where the strength of the Reading Branch falls short of ten the Senior most Reader looking after the supervision of the Branch should get a special pay between Rs. 30/- and Rs. 40/-.

(Chapter VII, page 27)

5. The recommendation of new post of Reader-in-charge and special pay to the Senior most Reader should also be made applicable to the Reading Cells engaged in separate Sections as in J.C.B., Secret Section etc.

(Chapter VII, page 27)

III. Change in the Recruitment Rules.

1. Copyholders who pass the examination for Junior Readers should only be eligible to hold the post of Revisers.

(Chapter V, page 14)

2. The question of limited direct recruitment to the grade of Junior Readers is an important issue which may be examined carefully by the Government.

(Chapter V, page 15)

3. A reasonable percentage of vacancies not exceeding 25 per cent may be set apart for promotion of Senior Copyholders to the grade of Revisers without coming through the examination, with the proviso, that such promotees will not be eligible for any further promotion except through examination.

(Chapter VI, page 19)

4. The new post of Copy Editor should be filled up from amongst the Senior Readers purely by selection on merit.

(Chapter VI, page 21 & Chapter VIII, page 29)

5. The post of Editor, Photo Litho, should be filled up from Senior Readers and Copy Editors by selection only.

(Chapter VIII, page 29)

6. The post of Head Reader should be filled up from the Editor, Photo-Litho, Copy Editors and Reader-in-charges.

(Chapter VIII, page 29)

7. The Head Readers should be made eligible for promotion direct to the post of Assistant Manager instead of their being promoted first to the post of Overseers.

(Chapter V, page 16)

IV. Changes in the Rules of Seniority.

1. The seniority of the successful candidates will be determined solely by virtue of their performance in the competitive examination. Alternatively, the date of passing the examination should be the sole criterion for determining the seniority in the grade of Junior Reader.

(Chapter VI, page 19 & Chapter VII, page 26).

2. All existing officiating Revisers and Junior Readers will rank senior for the purpose of confirmation as Readers, to all future promotees to these cadres either through competitive examination or through the reserved quota.

(Chapter VIII, page 29)

V. Miscellaneous Recommendations.

1. The Copyholders should be given as many chances, to pass the examination, as they desire to avail of.

(Chapter V, page 14)

2. A central competitive examination for the post of Readers should be introduced. Such examination should be conducted once a year simultaneously at different Centres by the Chief Controller of Printing and Stationery.

(Chapter VI, page 20)

3. Any deliberalisation in the existing condition of service by virtue of the recommendations of the Committee should not affect the existing incumbents in any category, in any way, except in the case of promotional chances. The existing conditions of even officiating persons should not be deliberalised unless such officiation is purely temporary or on *ad-hoc* basis.

(Chapter VIII, page 28)

4. The Revisers who have not competed in the departmental test for Junior Readers will only be eligible for confirmation as Revisers in their own turn from the quota fixed.

(Chapter VIII, page 28)

5. The chances for confirmation of all existing officiating Revisers on long term basis should be protected.

(Chapter VIII, page 29)

6. No screening of any kind of workers would be necessary while implementing the recommendations of the Committee:

(Chapter VIII, page 29)

7. The Efficiency Bar in the grade of Senior Readers should be strictly enforced after rigid screening.

(Chapter VIII, page 30)

8. The level and quality of lighting as well as space allotted to a particular set of Readers should receive importance for ensuring better working conditions.

(Chapter VIII, page 30)

9. All the aspects relating to working condition should be taken into account at the earliest stage of a project for a new Press and improved in the old Presses.

(Chapter VIII, page 30)

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

(PART II)

1. The Category of Paper Supplier is classified as "Semi-skilled".

(Chapter II, page 35)

2. The isolated category of Material Supplier be abolished and the duties be entrusted to the category of Labourers.

(Chapter II, page 35)

3. The category of Moulder and Finisher is classified as "Skilled" in the scale of Rs. 140—5—175.

(Chapter II, page 36)

4. The category of Moulder is classified as "Skilled". There is no necessity of a separate post of Moulder. An integrated designation of Moulder & Finisher is recommended.

(Chapter II, page 36)

5. Isolated and redundant categories in Government of India Presses should not be encouraged. Thorough review should be undertaken in this regard despite reduction of number of categories as a result of the recommendations of the Categorisation Committees.

(Chapter II, page 36)

6. Reviews of recruitment rules should be undertaken as a result of the recommendations of the previous and present Committee.

(Chapter II, page 37)

7. The category of Report Writers really belongs to the "Non-industrial" group. The duties of Report Writers should be entrusted to Lower Division Clerks.

(Chapter III, pages 38 & 39)

8. The existing Report Writers promoted from the industrial categories can be given an option to revert back to industrial categories from which they were recruited, if they so desire.

(Chapter III, page 39 and Chapter IV, page 41)

9. The Report Writers who are direct recruits should be merged with the general grade of L.D.Cs.

(Chapter III, page 39)

10. The existing industrial workers performing the duties of Report Writers, should alternatively be allowed to continue till they are promoted in the industrial establishment or are otherwise wasted out.

(Chapter III, page 39)

11. There should not be any transfer or reversion of existing Report Writers who had been drafted from the grade of Binders & Machinemmen. If, however, their turn for promotion has come, they should be allowed promotion in the industrial side, the resultant vacancy being filled up by direct recruitment of clerical hands.

(Chapter III, page 39)

12. Those Report Writers merged with L.D.Cs. will reckon their seniority from the date of their recruitment as Report Writers in the scale of Rs. 110—180, provided, however, they got the minimum qualification required for recruitment as L.D.Cs. direct.

(Chapter III, page 39)

13. The conversion of posts of Report Writers to the Clerical grade may ultimately upset the balance of the Clerical grades. Adequate steps, therefore, have to be taken by creation of the required number of additional posts of U.D.Cs. to maintain the balance.

(Chapter IV, page 41)

14. The classification of workers in Government of India Presses will have to be reviewed from time to time *vide* para 224 of the recommendations of the Central Pay Commission, 1947 (Part II).

(Chapter IV, page 42)

APPENDIX "A"

No. 15/11/66/P.I.

GOVERNMENT OF INDIA

MINISTRY OF WORKS, HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT.

New Delhi, dated the 4th July, 1966

RESOLUTION

SUBJECT.—*Constitution of Committee for the categorisation of posts in the Reading Branches of the Government of India Presses.*

The Committee set up by the Government in November, 1963 for the categorisation of Government of India Press workers has submitted its recommendations in respect of various categories of industrial workers, excepting the staff employed in the Reading Branches of the Presses. This omission was due to the fact that a writ petition filed by some workers of the Reading Branches was pending in a Court of Law. The petition having been rejected, it has now been decided to set up another Committee to examine and make recommendations in respect of the categories in the Reading Branches. This Committee shall be called "The Committee for Categorisation of posts in the Reading Branches of the Government of India Presses."

2. The Committee will consist of the following:—

Chairman

Shri P. K. Sen, Deputy Secretary, Ministry of Works, Housing and Urban Development.

Members

1. Shri Manohar Keshav, Deputy Secretary, Ministry of Works, Housing and Urban Development.
2. Shri R. Ramaswamy, Project Officer, Office of the C.C.P. & S., New Delhi.

3. Shri G. S. Bhasin, Under Secretary, Ministry of Finance.

Shri N. C. Sanyal, Officer on Special Duty (Labour) Ministry of Works, Housing and Urban Development, will act as Secretary to the Committee.

3. *Terms of Reference.*—The terms of reference of the Committee will be:—

- (i) to review and classify the posts in the Reading Branches in the Government of India Presses, under the control of the Chief Controller of Printing and Stationery, into “unskilled”, “semi-skilled”, “skilled”, “highly-skilled” and “supervisory”;
- (ii) Where necessary for the purpose of such review, to examine the service conditions, pay scales, duty hours and the field of recruitment/promotion laid down for each particular post and to suggest modifications therein.

4. The Committee will complete its work and submit its report to Government within four months from the date of its formation.

5. The Committee will be free to lay down the method of its working and other procedural matters.

6. The Chief Controller of Printing and Stationery and the Managers of the Government of India Presses will give their full co-operation to the Members of the Committee and assist them by furnishing all information required by them and making available to them official records and documents required.

PREM KRISHEN,

Secretary to the Government of India.

No. 15/11/66/P.I.

New Delhi, the 4th July, 1966.

ORDER

1. Ordered that the Resolution be communicated to all Ministries of the Government of India.

2. Ordered also that the Resolution be published in the Gazette of India.

PREM KRISHEN,

Secretary to the Government of India.

APPENDIX 'A'-1

GOVERNMENT OF INDIA

MINISTRY OF WORKS, HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

New Delhi, Dated the 12th December, 1966.

RESOLUTION

—*Constitution of Committee for the categorisation of posts in the Reading Branches of the Government of India Presses.*

15/11/66/P.I.—The Government of India have decided to extend the 28th February, 1967, the period of the Committee for Categorisation posts in the Reading Branches of the Government of India Presses set up *vide* Resolution No. 15/11/66/P.I., dated the 4th July, 1966.

ORDER

Ordered that the Resolution be communicated to all Ministries of the Government of India.

Ordered also that the Resolution be published in the Gazette of India.

R. F. ISAR,

Joint Secretary to the Government of India.

APPENDIX 'B'

The list of categories in the Reading Branch of the Government of India Presses.

<i>Sl. No.</i>	<i>Name of Category</i>	<i>Existing pay scales</i>
1	Editor	Rs. 320—15—425.
2	Head Reader	Rs. 335—15—440.
3	Senior Reader (Reader, Class I)	Rs. 168—8—256—EB—8—280—10—300.
4	Junior Reader (Reader, Class II)	Rs. 150—5—175—6—205—EB—7—240.
5	Reviser	Rs. 150—5—175—6—205—EB—7—240.
6	Copyholder	Rs. 110—3—131—4—147.

APPENDIX 'C'

The list of additional categories entrusted to the Committee.

<i>Sl. No.</i>	<i>Name of Category</i>	<i>Existing scale of pay</i>
1	Mounter	Rs. 140—5—175.
2	Mounter & Finisher	Rs. 140—5—175.
3	Material Supplier	Rs. 70—1—80—EB—1—85.
4	Report Writer	Rs. 110—3—131—4—143—EB—4—171— EB—4—175—5—180.
5	Paper Issuer <i>viz.</i> , Paper Supplier, who supplies paper in Machine	Rs. 75—1—85—EB—2—95.

APPENDIX 'D'

Classifications of categories in the Reading Branch, together with those proposed to be created.

<i>Sl. No.</i>	<i>Categories</i>	<i>Classifications</i>
1	Copyholder	Skilled.
2	Reviser	Highly skilled.
3	Reader Class I & Cl. II (Junior & Senior Readers)	Highly skilled.
4	Head Reader	Supervisory.
5	Editor in Photo-Litho	Highly skilled.
6	*Copy Editor	Highly skilled.
7	*Reader in-charge	Supervisory.

*Categories proposed to be created.