

(a) the number of Motor and Bus routes which are common to Punjab and Himachal Pradesh;

(b) how the percentage for the plying of vehicles on the roads is fixed between Punjab and Himachal Pradesh;

(c) whether it is a fact that the Himachal Pradesh Administration is running no buses or power wagons from Aut to Luhri; and

(d) whether it is also a fact that this route belongs to Himachal Pradesh Administration?

The Minister of Transport and Communications (Shri Jagjivan Ram): (a) to (d). The information required is being collected from the Government of Punjab and the Himachal Pradesh Administration and will be laid on the Table of the House as soon as it becomes available.

Linking of Hoshiarpur with Dasuya

2024. Shri Daljit Singh: Will the Minister of Railways be pleased to state:

(a) whether there is a proposal to link Hoshiarpur and Dasuya by rail;

(b) whether a survey was undertaken long ago in this respect; and

(c) if so, the reasons for delay in its implementation?

The Deputy Minister in the Ministry of Railways (Shri S. V. Ramaswamy): (a) No.

(b) A Traffic Survey was carried out in 1931 for a rail line between Hoshiarpur and Tanda Urmur only.

(c) The project was not found financially justified. The line is also not included in the railways' programme of construction of new lines during the Third Five Year Plan.

Scheduled Castes Class IV Railway Employees in Ferozepur and Delhi Divisions

2025. Shri Daljit Singh: Will the Minister of Railways be pleased to state:

(a) the number of class IV employees appointed by the Divisional Superintendents Offices of Ferozepur and Delhi Divisions for Northern Railway during 1960-61 and 1961-62; and

(b) the number of Scheduled Castes among them?

The Deputy Minister in the Ministry of Railways (Shri Shah Nawaz Khan): (a)

Division	Number appointed during 1960-61	Number appointed during 1961-62
Delhi	573	689
Ferozepur	76	145

(b)

Division	No of Scheduled Castes appointed during 1960-61	No. of Scheduled Castes appointed during 1961-62
Delhi	159	263
Ferozepur	18	60

12:06 hrs.

RE: MOTION FOR ADJOURNMENT AND

CALLING ATTENTION TO MATTER OF URGENT PUBLIC IMPORTANCE

Mr. Speaker: I have received three calling-attention-notice and one adjournment motion regarding the statement made by Shri B. K. Nehru, Indian Ambassador to the U.S.A. Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath may read out the Calling-attention-notice.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee (Calcutta Central): Before Shri Hari Vishnu

[Shri H. N. Mukerjee]

Kamath reads out his calling-attention-notice, may I make a submission? I gave notice, along with some of my colleagues here, of the adjournment motion, and I am sure it is not your intention that every adjournment motion should be converted, if possible, into a calling-attention-notice. I say so because I gave notice of the adjournment motion not in order to call the attention of the Minister but to censure the Government on account of something which is reported by very reputable press agencies, and which represents something which is going against the dignity of this country. That is why I submit that you consider the question of the validity or otherwise of the adjournment motion first, and then if you consider that the adjournment motion need not be taken up as such but that a calling-attention-notice might be adequate, you may give a clear direction accordingly.

Mr. Speaker: It is right that the adjournment motion should be taken up first. But no facts are known as to whether there has been a failure or not, whether there has been a statement or not, and whether Government have any information or not. Unless I know some facts, I cannot decide. I have not said that I rule out the adjournment motion. I do not say that I shall not allow it or whether I shall give my consent or not. Therefore, I said that I had received calling-attention-notices as well as an adjournment motion.

Some press report has appeared, from where the Members have taken up this clue that some statement has been made. I want to know some facts before I can decide whether I can give my consent or not. I thought that if the Government could give some facts, then I might decide whether I should give my consent to the adjournment motion or not. That was my purpose, because beyond what has appeared in the papers, hon. Members also have no knowledge of the facts.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: May I make a submission? It is this namely that the matter of raising an adjournment motion is a right which no Opposition anywhere can discard. That is to say, this is a matter which on principle should be conceded, that on occasions which warrant the bringing in of adjournment motions, we should be permitted to bring them forward.

The procedure according to our rules is that when an adjournment motion is brought forward, the urgency of the matter has to be considered by the Chair and then the ruling is given. Now, if a calling-attention-notice is read out in the usual manner, and Government give some answers, and then some further questions are asked for purposes of elucidation, it detracts entirely from the entire procedure devised for purposes of adjournment motions.

Mr. Speaker: I have no objection, but in order to determine whether I should give my consent or not, I shall find out from the hon. Minister whether any facts are known to her.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath (Hoshangabad): The calling-attention-notice may be read out first. Otherwise, how will the hon. Minister know at all what the notice is about?

Mr. Speaker: Now, let us know whether there are any facts known to Government.

The Minister of State in the Ministry of External Affairs (Shrimati papers and some of these facts seem the reports published in the newspapers and some of these facts seem to be torn out of the context. Therefore, we are waiting for the transcript from New York to find out what exactly our Ambassador said during the television interview.

Mr. Speaker: In such a case, all these Calling-attention-notices and the adjournment motion may be held over.

May we expect any reply by tomorrow?

Shrimati Lakshmi Menon: I cannot very well say whether we shall get the reply by tomorrow. We have asked for it. As soon as the reply comes, we shall inform the House.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: May I submit that our Ambassador is reported to have made a series of statements? I want to pin-point one particular statement, and on that the hon. Minister can say whether he made that statement or not.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. That is exactly the difficulty with me, because nothing is known so far. Therefore, I put that question to the hon. Minister whether she had got any facts within her knowledge which could help me to decide whether I should give my consent or not. She has said that she has asked for the information; for the present, she cannot say anything beyond what has appeared in the papers which she also has seen.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: In that case, as soon as she is ready with the material, you may listen to her and then decide.

Mr. Speaker: That was exactly what I was going to say. If only the hon. Member had waited, he would have found that that was exactly what I was going to say, that we could wait till any information is received, and as soon as it is received, that information would be given to the House, and then I shall decide whether to admit it or not.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: On a point of clarification. May I know whether the hon. Minister proposes to lay on the Table of the House or tell the House the full text of the television interview given by the Indian Ambassador to the U.S.A., or she is going to tell us only about the particular statement raised in the calling-attention-notice or in the adjournment

motion? Which one is she going to tell the House?

Mr. Speaker: All the information that she can get now has been asked for. Let that information come and then we will decide whether it relates only to one particular aspect or the whole of it.

We have asked for information about the statement made during the television interview by that envoy of ours. That would be transmitted here, and I think it will give us all the information.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: The full transcript of the interview may be called for.

Mr. Speaker: Shri Tyagi:

Shri H. N. Mukerjee rose—

Shri Tyagi (Dehra Dun): I am not prepared to yield. Adjournment motion is the richest privilege of the Opposition, because thereby the Opposition can put forward what they want to say and the majority party in power also gets the benefit of being able to answer those questions so that no misunderstanding may be created. For this purpose, our rules permit adjournment motions. I would like you to consider this in consultation with Members of the Opposition and of the Treasury Benches and formulate some specific rules according to which the House may know under what conditions they are permitted. Our rules only refer to 'any matter of urgent public importance'. In that connection, is it open to the Chair to investigate before admitting it whether this is factual or not? May I submit that it is for the Treasury Benches to say that it is not factual? It is for us to reply. If there is any allegation, they want to come forward and censure the Government. We shall expose them. Now there are no means to expose . .

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. I have heard him sufficiently. Our rules are very clear. The Speaker also decides

[Mr. Speaker]

on the facts that he can get from both sides. The Opposition has not got any information beyond what has appeared in the newspapers.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: Quite right.

Mr. Speaker: The Government have only said that probably it has been torn out of context. Where is the material on the basis of which I can decide whether I should give my consent or not? Unless some information is available either with the Opposition or with Government, I cannot give any decision. Both sides are still in the dark. There is no material before me.

Shri Tyagi: Quite right. That was not my point. What I was hinting at was that the question under consideration was whether this matter was relevant or not. If it is relevant, it can be taken up and the information had. The question is whether such type of information based on press reports can form the basis for giving notice of an adjournment motion or not. When you give your ruling, it will be our precedent for the future. The Government wanted time to get at all the facts. You have been pleased to give that time. But the ruling has not to be given on the basis of that information; ruling has to be given on the basis of the merits of the question raised.

Mr. Speaker: If there is no question raised, what should the ruling be? Unless there are facts, there cannot be any decision. No adjournment motion can be allowed and discussed unless some facts are there. At present we have absolutely no facts.

Shri S. M. Banerjee (Kanpur): The facts are given here in the press report.

Mr. Speaker: Should I believe them and take them as true? Has he got any other information than that?

Shri S. M. Banerjee: This is sufficient

Mr. Speaker: Not at all. I cannot proceed purely on the basis of newspaper reports. We must have some satisfaction. That was why I asked Government whether they had any information, and could say something about it. Government have said that they are trying to get some information. I will keep these things in abeyance and after some facts are known, then alone we can discuss them.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: Will the Minister please give us the information tomorrow?

Mr. Speaker: On Monday at least.

Shri Harish Chandra Mathur (Jalore): On a point of order. When you asked Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath to read out the calling notice, I do not know how it can be switched off. When Government accepts the calling attention notice, it clearly means that they have got information to give. Otherwise, they do not accept it. It is accepted on a day when they have got certain information. The very fact that Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath has tabled a calling attention notice and Government have accepted it proves that.

Some Hon. Members: No, no.

Shri Harish Chandra Mathur: You had called Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath to read out the calling attention notice. You have not said that it should be switched off.

Mr. Speaker: There is no point of order in that respect. There is no consent of Government necessary when a calling attention notice is given. I had made it clear on the very first day that because even on trivial matters also adjournment motions are given—I am not considering this particular adjournment motion—where no censure is intended, I would convert them. I get the notice in the morning and there is no question of Government agreeing or not.

I call upon the Minister to make a statement.

In this particular case, I read out that there were three calling attention notices and one adjournment motion as well. I wanted to know some facts in order to help me in coming to a decision whether I should give consent or not. I had made it clear already that, therefore, I call them calling attention notices so that facts might be known. When Shri Mukerjee raised the objection that he insists on his adjournment motion and that he would not agree to its being converted, then, I only wanted the facts to be known, and I made it clear to the House as well, if Government had any information. There is no question that Government has agreed to answer this calling attention notice. Even when it had been called, the answer would have been the same that there are no facts available yet and, therefore, the Government is trying to get that. That is what has been said even now and that was what was going to be said if the calling attention had been taken up.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: Can any definite date be fixed? As Shri Kamath said, Monday would be better.

Mr. Speaker: I have already said that, probably, the information would be had by Monday.

12.17 hrs.

CALLING ATTENTION TO MATTER
OF URGENT PUBLIC IMPORTANCE

RAILWAY COLLISION AT SIVARAMAPURAM

Mr. Speaker: There is another about the railway accident, by Shri S. M. Banerjee, Shri Bishanchander Seth, Shri Ram Sewak Yadhav and some others. I will ask Shri Banerjee to read it.

Shri S. M. Banerjee (Kanpur): Sir, under rule 197, I call the attention of

the Minister of Railways to the following matter of urgent public importance and I request that he may make a statement thereon:—

“The Head-on collision between a Military Special Goods train and an ordinary goods train on 24.5.62 near Sivaramapuram in Southern Railway resulting in serious injury of 15 persons.”

The Deputy Minister in the Ministry of Railways (Shri Shahnawaz Khan): Sir, in reference to the Call Attention Notice given by the hon. Member, I have to inform the House that at 2:24 hours on 24-5-1962, a collision took place between a goods train No. 1590 Up Goods and a Military Vehicle Special No. V 414 at Sivaramapuram station on the Madras-Guntakal section.

The two trains were due to cross each other at Sivaramapuram station. The signals were lowered for the goods train to be received first. As the goods train was entering, the Military Vehicle Special, for which the signals had not been lowered, passed the Down Outer, Home and Starter Signals at Sivaramapuram station at danger and collided with the goods train between Up Home and Down Advanced Starter.

As a result of the collision, the leading engines of both the trains got derailed. One TLR of the Military Special next to the engine was partly smashed and derailed and thirteen KMs on the train derailed.

Ten of the military personnel escorting the train suffered injuries. One out of these sustained serious injuries and the others, simple injuries. In addition, five railway employees received simple injuries. Medical relief was rushed to the spot from Gooty and Nandalur. Nine of the injured military personnel were sent to the Cuddapah Government Hospital.

Through running of trains was obstructed. Permanent way was damaged for about six rail lengths. Transhipment of passengers was arranged.