

LOK SABHA DEBATES

(Part II—Proceedings other than Questions and Answers)

Dated 11.3.2015

8957

8958

LOK SABHA

Monday, 21st May, 1956.

The Lok Sabha met at Half Past Ten of the Clock.

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

(See Part I)

11-31 A.M.

MOTIONS FOR ADJOURNMENT

STRIKE OF RAILWAY EMPLOYEES IN CENTRAL RAILWAY

Mr. Speaker : I have received notice under rule 216 from Shri M. L. Agarwal relating to the firemen's strike at Kazi-pet Junction. I admitted it on the 18th and I fixed the date, that is, 23rd May, in consultation with the hon. Minister of Railways and he will make a statement on that day about the matter.

Today I have received a notice of adjournment from Sarvashri A. K. Gopalan and Ananda Nambiar, practically relating to the same business :

"The serious situation arising out of the callous indifference shown by the Ministry of Railways in rejecting the reasonable grievances of the Loco-firemen and other sections of railwaymen whose legitimate claims of promotion have been overlooked by direct recruitment, as expressed in the present strike of railway employees in the ex-Nizam State Railway region of the Central Railway a strike which is fast threatening to spread all over Indian railways and as a result of which movement of goods, particularly coal, has been dislocated, passenger traffic is badly affected, and additional fares are being extracted."

1—133 L. S.

In view of the fact that I have already admitted the previous notice for a statement by the hon. Minister, given so early as the 18th May, and I have fixed the date for that statement to be made, that is, on the 23rd May—the hon. Minister has also agreed to it—I am not prepared to give my consent to this adjournment motion. After the statement is made on that date, short notice and other questions may be put later on in the proper manner to elicit further information, if necessary.

STRIKE IN KHARAGPUR RAILWAY WORKSHOP

Mr. Speaker : I have received another notice of adjournment motion from Sarvashri A. K. Gopalan and Ananda Nambiar relating to the following :

"The serious situation that has developed as a result of the strike of 10,000 workers of Khargpur Workshop of the South Eastern Railway which has spread to the Electrical and Stores Sections, threatening to further spread to the open lines, due to the illegal extraction of work from 112 painters of the Wagon Section and consequent illegal lock-out declared."

The Minister of Parliamentary Affairs (Shri Satya Narayan Sinha) : The Government is collecting information with regard to this also, and as you have fixed the 23rd May for the other adjournment motion, I would request you to take this up on the same day.

Mr. Speaker : Rule 216 notice and this adjournment motion will stand over till that day, the 23rd May, for a statement by the hon. Minister of Railways.

Shri Sadhan Gupta (Calcutta—South-East) : I wish to submit this in respect of the adjournment motion. You will appreciate that under rule 216, the Minister only can make a statement and we have no right to put questions. The object of the adjournment motion obviously is to raise a discussion on the matter, and the matter is sufficiently important to be thrashed out because railway services have been dislocated. The

[Shri Sadhan Gupta]

other day there was a report that the Grand Trunk Express had reached 15 hours late. Obviously this kind of things cannot be allowed to go on on the Railways. Therefore, I would request Your Lordships,—I am sorry—I would request you, Sir, to allow the adjournment motion and to have it discussed on merits—and it deserves a discussion.

Mr. Speaker : I can only say that adjournment motion is not the only method of bringing the matter to the notice of the House. This matter was brought to the notice of this House already and the hon. Members were not the first to bring it to the notice of the House here. Even on the 18th instant, a notice calling attention to this under rule 216 was made. Let us wait and hear what the hon. Minister has to say. Thereafter, it is always open to any hon. Member to say that in view of the serious consequences involved we might raise a discussion or debate on this matter. Later on, I shall find out what exactly the situation is and try to take such steps as are necessary. Nobody's intention is to avoid any discussion.

Shri Nambiar (Mayuram) : This adjournment motion also will stand over till the 23rd. Is that so, Sir?

Mr. Speaker : I have already disallowed the adjournment motion for two reasons : that the matter is going to come up before the House under rule 216 and I have already admitted it; secondly, this matter will come up, it is not a matter which has been there only yesterday or today but it has been there from the 18th and earlier. Therefore, notice of adjournment motion is not the proper method of discussing this matter. I have not given my consent to this, but that does not mean that the House will not have an opportunity in the proper manner to discuss whatever necessary things have to be discussed.

So far as the other adjournment motion is concerned, it will stand over till the 23rd May, when the hon. Minister of Railways will be in a position to come here, gather material and make a statement.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Shri Kamath (Hoshangabad) : May I make a brief request to you with regard to the statement made by the hon. Minister of Parliamentary Affairs on Friday

evening at about 5 o'clock? He ought to have made it in the morning but unfortunately something must have happened which prevented it. You, Sir, were not present at that time and so I could not raise this point at that time. I wanted your presence for this purpose and I now raise it with your permission.

I do not know what has caused this sudden change in the programme. You were pleased to announce firmly to the House sometime ago that the House will sit till the 31st May, and on that basis some of us have tabled questions so as to be ripe for answer on the 31st. That is the first aspect of the matter. I do not know whether the statement was made in consultation with you—I suppose it was. The Chairman, Shri Barman, was not given a copy of it at that time. What was the purpose of making the statement then? It was very wrong on the Minister's part to have done so. I believe it has been done with your consent.

Mr. Speaker : But what is it that the hon. Member is driving at?

Shri Kamath : It uproots our questions coming up on the 31st. They may not now come up before the House at all. I would, therefore, request that the questions tabled for the 31st May may be answered on the 28th, the previous rota day. May be other hon. Members agree. I personally think that these changes have been made so as to suit the convenience of the hon. Members opposite on the treasury benches for their Bombay meeting. That should not have been done.

Mr. Speaker : Hon. Members will countenance some amount of difficulty. I am not in a position to go into all those details. All that I can say is that the suggestion which the hon. Member is making will be considered.

Shri Kamath : That is one part of the story. The other part is this. In paragraph 3 of the statement, it is stated that the discussion on the Preventive Detention Act has not been postponed, but the exact words are "time permitting" it will be discussed. The discussion of this Act has been postponed from session to session and we thought at least in this session we would have a firm announcement, and discussion of this Act. But it is stated there "time permitting". I think this should not now be countenanced by you, because this has been postponed for the last three sessions. If necessary, we will have to sit a day