

(Part II—Proceedings other than Questions and Answers)

OFFICIAL REPORT

671

672

HOUSE OF THE PEOPLE

Thursday, 25th February, 1954

The House met at Two of the Clock

[MR. SPEAKER in the Chair]

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

(See Part I)

3 P.M.

AIR CRASH NEAR DELHI

Shri Kasliwal (Kotah-Jhalawar): Will you kindly permit me, Mr. Speaker, to mention a small matter? News has just reached the House of the crash of Dakota near the Jamuna bridge at Delhi. Will the hon. Minister kindly make a statement?

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. That is not the way to raise or mention a matter, unless it happened in the House itself after 2 o'clock and the commencement of question-hour. The hon. Member may see me in the Chamber and state the matter. I will then consider whether he may be permitted to mention the matter. I believe he has the remedy of a short notice question; he can table one.

We shall now take up the Supplementary Demands for Grants in respect of Railways for 1953-54. The time set apart for these Supplementary Demands is from 3 P.M. to 4-30 P.M.

The Minister of Communications (Shri Jagjivan Ram): A mention has been made just now about the crash. Naturally, it will cause anxiety in the House. Therefore, may I say a few words with your permission?

739 P.S.D.

Mr. Speaker: It is very irregular to put a question like that at the last moment or on the spur of the moment. The moment anything is flashed across, a question is put. That is not, I believe, a proper method to follow. Some time—whether a little or more—must elapse before you can get definite facts, and it is no use getting panicky about a thing the moment one hears something. So, I would recommend that hon. Members may restrain themselves to some extent.

Shri Jagjivan Ram: I am entirely in your hands.

Mr. Speaker: They need not be in an anxiety that a crash has taken place. If it has at all taken place, then what has happened is a fact by now; it cannot be remedied by merely raising the question and hearing from the hon. Minister some information. For that purpose, they might refer to the evening edition of the newspapers or make enquiries from newspaper agencies, or later on elicit information by questions in the House.

Shri T. N. Singh (Banaras Distt.—East): We regret the irregularity, but since the point has now been raised by the hon. Minister...*(Interruption.)*

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. I do not want to encourage in this House that kind of practice of allowing questions to be put in that manner and answers being given to them. Hon. Members must treat the proceedings here not so lightly as that. They can get the information from any newspaper office

[Mr. Speaker]

or from any news agency. If they like, they can contact the Minister in private and get the information, and after they have ascertained the facts, then they may come to the House. But the present attempt is such a very queer way of raising a point or "mentioning" a matter.

DEMANDS FOR SUPPLEMENTARY GRANTS (RAILWAYS)*

Mr. Speaker: We shall now take up the Supplementary Demands for Grants in respect of Railways. The time is from 3 P.M. to 4-30 P.M., but in view of the five minutes that have been taken up in this discussion, the time will now be up to 4-35 P.M.

[PANDIT THAKUR DAS BHARGAVA in the Chair]

DEMAND NO. 1—RAILWAY BOARD

Mr. Chairman: Motion is:

"That a supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 1,14,000 be granted to the President to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March 1954, in respect of 'Railway Board'".

Shri N. B. Chowdhury (Ghatal): In this connection, I want to move my cut motion No. 9.

Mr. Chairman: There are several cut motions, but so far as No. 9 is concerned, I am afraid it is out of order as it relates to policy. In relation to supplementary demands for grants, the point was made clear yesterday that the question of policy cannot be discussed unless it relates to a new service. As it relates to a question of policy, I am afraid it is out of order.

Shri Nambiar (Mayuram): It is not exactly a question of policy here. The point is: more staff is required, etc. So, more money has to be spent. More staff is required by the Railway Board which does not implement the Government decisions. That is a particular issue.

Mr. Chairman: When the indications are clear in the note in regard to specific matters, only those specific matters can be discussed and not a question of policy. This is a question of policy. The words are: "Inefficiency of the Railway Board in implementing Government decisions." It is exactly a matter of policy. What else can it be? It is not a composite matter. It is clearly a question of policy. I am sorry. It is out of order in my opinion.

Shri T. B. Vittal Rao (Khammam): There is my cut-motion No. 1, under Demand No. 1.

Mr. Chairman: In regard to cut motion No. 1, it relates to "Discrimination in the refusal of payment of Railway Board allowance to officers deputed to Railway Board from the various Railway administrations." The question at issue is whether, in the notes given, under this Demand, there is any such matter as can be directly related to this particular and specific point. I understand that no such point arises as has been indicated by the hon. Member's cut-motion. Therefore, I am inclined to think that this is also out of order.

Shri T. B. Vittal Rao: The point is, some additional posts have been created in the Board. In the Railway Board, whenever an officer is deputed to work in the Board, he is paid a certain amount of allowance. In the case of some officers who have been recently deputed to the Railway Board from the various railway administrations, the allowances have not been given to them. There was a decision, I believe, by the Member (Staff) of the Railway Board that these officers should be paid the allowances, but again it went to the Financial Commissioner and he disallowed it. So, under this Demand, additional posts are created, and unless the names and other details are given, we cannot say whether that particular officer or officers have been affected or not. I want to say that such sort of discrimination should be removed. That is my point.

*Moved with the recommendation of the President.