

have already been issued to the Khadi Commission that until such time as the number of match sticks shown on the rubber stamp corresponds to the actual number of sticks in the box, the sale of these match boxes should be stopped.

12.33 hrs.

**PUNJAB REORGANISATION BILL\***

**The Minister of Home Affairs (Shri Nanda):** I beg to move for leave to introduce a Bill to provide for the reorganisation of the existing State of Punjab and for matters connected therewith.

**Mr. Speaker:** The question is:

"That leave be granted to introduce a Bill to provide for the reorganisation of the existing State of Punjab and for matters connected therewith."

*The motion was adopted.*

**Shri Nanda:** I introduce† the Bill.

12.34 hrs.

**MOTION RE : RECENT RAILWAY ACCIDENTS—Contd.**

**Mr. Speaker:** Dr. Singhvi to reply to the debate.

**Dr. L. M. Singhvi (Jodhpur):** I am grateful to the Members who participated in the discussion on the statement of the Railway Minister with regard to railway accidents. The hon. Minister, Mr. S. K. Patil, with his characteristically disarming spirit of accommodation, accompanied by his characteristic diplomacy, has replied to the various points raised in general and has not met any of the points that were made here in particular.

**Mr. Speaker:** I wish particularly to emphasise that we here in this House are not engaged in mere talking marathons; we are interested in finding solutions and in helping to formulate policies. We are here to elicit specific and concrete replies to specific and concrete suggestions which are made here. In extension of the hon.

Minister's speech it may be said that since he had accepted in general the various suggestions made here and also very good-humouredly agreed to look into the various suggestions in greater detail, perhaps he did not feel called upon to clarify the various issues raised here. Unfortunately, many points that were raised with respect to the all-important question of railway accidents therefore remain in confusion. I had mentioned particularly that Dr. Kunzru had said that the various recommendations made in the report of the railway accidents enquiry committee had not been fully implemented and I suggested that either Dr. Kunzru himself or some other committee should be appointed to go into the question of the quality and quantum of the implementation of the various recommendations made in the committee's report. I would like a very specific reply to this.

Various demands were made about instituting a thorough enquiry into the recent spate of accidents and a clear and specific answer has unfortunately not been forthcoming. A charge was made in a written article by an hon. Member of this House, Mr. Kamal Nayan Bajaj, that inferior equipment was being supplied by the contractors and that substandard quality equipment was being used for the maintenance and preparing the track. Unless this charge is not suitably replied to, doubts remain in our mind as to whether what the railway administration has done is adequate or not. I think it would be in the interest of the Railway Administration itself to see that this charge is met squarely and straightforwardly. I had also mentioned in respect of the shortage of staff and the poor planning of staff requirements. The hon. Minister was good enough to say that he would look into this matter sympathetically and in a scientific spirit. I hope this is done soon and he reports to the house as to what he has done in fulfilment of this assurance. I had particularly raised one question in respect of the shortage of the proportion of the supervisory personnel and cited

\*Published in Gazette of India Extra-ordinary, Part II, Section 2, dated 3rd September, 1966

†Introduced with the recommendations of the President.

several figures about the great hiatus which exists in various workshops of the railways where supervisory personnel are in extreme short supply. I would request the Minister to do something about it and to augment the ratio of the supervisory staff and to see that adequate supervisory staff is made available to man the various workshops and other points. I want particularly to draw the attention of the House to the many points that were made here in respect of complaints of nepotism. In matters of this sort it is very difficult to substantiate a specific complaint or to make a general charge. When a general charge is made, the administration naturally says that it is too general a charge and they say, give us specific instances. Because of the rules of this House, specific instances cannot be agitated in this House. When some issues are raised, the Minister says: well, this has been done according to the standards that are now prevailing. No satisfactory answer is forthcoming. Apart from the railway administration this question touches upon the very principle of parliamentary control on the administration and the nature and extent of that control. If specific questions of nepotism cannot be dealt with at some level, through some machinery, parliamentary supervision on administration would remain wholly unsatisfactory and inadequate.

Mr. Speaker, a point was made here especially about the conditions of the running staff and the hon. Minister was good enough to say that he would look into that matter sympathetically. But we want a specific machinery to look into these various complaints about the working conditions of the running staff and we want that something is done in addition to the very heartening assurances that the hon. Minister has given on the floor of this House.

In respect of the insurance of railway passengers also, the hon. Minister was pleased to say that they will give it their utmost consideration. What we want is that this matter which has been pending for quite sometime before the Government should now be finalised and some scheme of railway passengers' insurance should be

devised before too long. Too often, sound and worth-while ideas are lost and diluted either by delay or by too many amendments. I hope that something is done in this regard.

One more point and I shall have done. This is in respect of the reorganisation of railways particularly in respect of the creation of a metre-gauge zone. The hon. Minister, I am sure, found the figures that I gave from his own documents to be irrefutable evidence of the fact that in the metre-gauge zone, the incidence of railway accidents has been much larger, and the situation is such as to warrant great concern. As a matter of fact, in most of the metre-gauge lines, we find that the incidence of railway accidents is twice as much as those on the broad-gauge lines. This is not merely an accident, and it is not correct to say therefore, that a mere zonal reorganisation would not cure the problem of accidents on the metre-gauge. Certainly, a reorganisation of that sort is one of the most basic things which should be attempted by the Government. The Government have variously and at various times reacted in this matter by saying that there is a possibility of creating this zone and at other times they have said that there is no immediate possibility of creating this zone. I would like to see that the Government comes out at least with a commitment in principle, accepting the soundness of the idea, and perhaps giving us a phased programme if their financial stringency is at present such that it does not permit them to take up the programme of zonal reorganisation immediately. I hope the Government will not allow its policies and its assurances to lapse into lethargy and that this House would take the reassurances not merely through the disarming candour and the spirit of accommodation of the hon. Minister who is a politician and a diplomat, but also a reinsurance through the actual implementation of those assurances.

Mr. Speaker: The question is:

"That this House takes note of the statement on recent railway accidents laid on the Table of the House on the 25th July, 1966."

*The motion was adopted.*

**Shri Priya Gupta** (Katihar): Sir, there has been a contradiction in the Railway Minister's statement.

**Mr. Speaker:** When he made that statement on that day, he might have asked for it.

**Shri Priya Gupta:** He said that they will not find any increase in expenditure. I want to know how far it is correct. (Interruption).

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, order.

#### RE. BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

**The Leader of the House (Shri Satya Narayan Sinha):** Sir, last Friday I had announced in this House that the discussion on the motion about Gold Control would start at 4 p.m. Some requests were made to me, and I also think, that one hour will not be quite sufficient for it. I therefore request the House to take it up at 3.30.

**Shri M. R. Masani** (Rajkot): We wanted two hours; it may be from 3 to 5.

**An hon. Member:** We may sit till 5.30.

**Mr. Speaker:** There are two half-hour discussions, starting from 5.

**Shri Satya Narayan Sinha:** One and a half hours may be given.

**Shri Sezhiyan** (Perambalur): At least two hours should be given.

**Shri Satya Narayan Sinha:** Let it then start at 3 p.m.

**Mr. Speaker:** All right. We will take up that discussion at 3 O'clock

12.44 hrs.

#### REPRESENTATION OF THE PEOPLE (AMENDMENT) BILL—*contd.*

**Mr. Speaker:** The House will now take up further consideration of the Representation of the People (Amendment) Bill,—the motion for reference to a Joint Com-

mittee, moved by the Minister of Law on the 1st September, 1966.

**Shri P. K. Deo** (Kalahandi): Sir, before the House takes up further discussion of this Bill, before anybody points out, I think it is my duty to inform the House *suo motu*, pointing out the inadvertent mistake that has occurred in my speech yesterday. While quoting from the judgment of the Madhya Pradesh High Court in the case of *Khubchand Baghel v. Vidyacharan Shukla*, I read out a wrong line; it was by mistake. I request that it may be deleted. The relevant line in that regard should read as follows:

“Thus, it is clear that those allegations are false. It is also difficult to see how a person of normal intelligence and decency could commit any honest mistake in this regard.”

I am very sorry about this thing. I apologise to you and to the House.

**Shri K. L. More** (Hatakanangle): Sir, I welcome this measure. At the outset, I congratulate the Law Minister on bringing this measure. I would like to make two observations on this occasion. The first is regarding the security deposits. The Report of the Election Commission on the third General Elections has recommended the increase of the security deposit to Rs. 1500 in the case of Lok Sabha and Rs. 750 in the case of Assemblies. In my humble opinion, this increase is not good. The report of the commission says that there were a large number of light-hearted contestants, who had no substantial electoral support; they were coming into the contest only to gain something or strike bargains, etc. Therefore, they had recommended that the security deposit should be increased. But in my humble opinion, this increase is going to bring many hardships to the poor candidates who have substantial electoral support, especially the scheduled castes and scheduled tribes. These poor people will be put to very great difficulty. Therefore, this recommendation has not been accepted by the Minister and I congratulate him on that.