

के दिल्ली केन्द्र से १२५ गढ़वासी लोक गीत और अन्य कार्यक्रम प्रसारित किये गये।

12-10 hrs.

#### PAPERS LAID ON THE TABLE

##### TRADE AND MERCHANDISE MARKS RULES

**The Minister of Commerce (Shri Kanungo):** I beg to lay on the Table, under Section 134 of the Trade and Merchandise Marks Act, 1958, a copy of the Trade and Merchandise Marks Rules, 1959, published in Notification No. S.O. 2603 dated the 25th November, 1959. [Placed in Library. See No. LT-1776/59.]

##### REPORTS OF TARIFF COMMISSION

**The Minister of Industry (Shri Manubhai Shah):** I beg to lay on the Table, under sub-section (2) of Section 16 of the Tariff Commission Act, 1951, a copy of the following papers:

- (i) Report (1959) of the Tariff Commission on the continuance of protection to the Plastic (Phenol Formaldehyde Moulding Power and Buttons) Industry.
- (ii) Government Resolution No. 27 (2)-T.R./59, dated the 8th December, 1959. [Placed in Library. See No. LT-1778/59.]
- (iii) Report (1958) of the Tariff Commission on the Fair Selling Prices of Caustic Soda, Chlorine, Hydrochloric Acid and Bleaching Powder.
- (iv) Government Resolution No. CH(I)-31(38)/58, dated the 27th October, 1959.
- (v) Statement explaining the reasons why a copy each of the documents at (iii) and (iv) above could not be laid on the Table within the period prescribed in the said sub-section. [Placed in Library. See No. LT-1779/59.]

#### CALLING ATTENTION TO MATTER OF URGENT PUBLIC IMPORTANCE

##### BREACHES ON SOUTHERN RAILWAY

**Shri Ayyakannu (Nagapattinam—Reserved—Sch. Castes):** Under Rule 197, I beg to 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 dislocation of railway traffic due to the breaches on the chord line between Vilupuram and Tiruchirapalli as well as between Tiruchirapalli and Madurai on the 29th November, 1959.”

**The Deputy Minister of Railways (Shri S. V. Ramaswamy):** Due to very heavy and incessant rains breaches occurred on the 28th of November, 1959 between Vriddhachalam and Puvanur, Vriddhachalam and Talanallur and Vriddhachalam and Mukhasa Parur Stations of the Vriddhachalam-Vilupuram, Vriddhachalam-Tiruchirapalli and Vriddhachalam-Salem sections respectively, on the metre gauge system of the Southern Railway. It is understood that the rainfall at Vriddhachalam on the 28th and 29th November, 1959 totalled to 291 mm (11.4 inches approx.) while within a radius of 21 miles all round, the rainfall was as much as 347 mm (13.6 inches approx.) during the same period. This resulted in the breaching of about 20 irrigation tanks also which aggravated the situation.

The breaches between Vriddhachalam and Puvanur stations were repaired and traffic restored on the 3rd December, 1959. The breaches on the Vriddhachalam-Tiruchirapalli section were also repaired and traffic restored on 7th December, 1959.

On the Vriddhachalam-Salem section as a girder bridge was also damaged and there was continuous rainfall even upto 30-11-1959, restoration work could be started only later. The work is, however, in progress and is

expected to be completed and traffic restored by 10th December, 1950.

The approximate cost of repairs to the damages due to these breaches has been estimated at Rs. 1.80 lakhs.

Skeleton services were maintained on the Villupuram-Ulundurpet and Tiruchirapalli-Ariyalur sections between Salem and Chinna Salem on the Salem-Vridhdachalam section till completion of the restoration work.

On the Tiruchirapalli - Madurai section also, due to heavy rains, four irrigation tanks as well as the left bank of Koduvanar river breached and the railway embankment was washed away at mile 260/4-19 between Vadamadura and Tamarapadi stations on 1-12-1950. Restoration work which was taken up immediately was completed and traffic restored at 10.00 hours on 3-12-1950. The approximate cost of repairs to the damages is estimated at Rs. 40,000.

Train services were suitably regulated during the interruption of through communication and some of the important trains viz., Madras-Egmore-Tuticorin Express, Madras Egmore-Trivandrum Central Express and Madras Egmore-Tinnevely Express were diverted via the Main Line.

**Shri Tangamani (Madurai):** I want a clarification. The hon. Minister stated that some of these express-trains have been diverted by the main route. I would like to know whether the direct service has been restored, and whether, when this diversion took place, the extra fares were collected from the passengers.

**Shri S. V. Ramaswamy:** The existing rules provide that when owing to interruption of through communications due to breaches etc., traffic is restricted on any route, passengers holding tickets, single or return, which are purchased before the introduction of the restriction are allowed to travel by the shortest or

quickest open route, whichever they prefer, without any extra charge. Passengers booked after the notification of restriction are charged by the longer route by which they travel.

**Shri Braj Raj Singh (Firozabad):** What is the fault on the part of the passengers that they should be charged extra fare?

**Mr. Speaker:** But after the notification, it is open to him to keep to his own house. He need not travel. If he travels, that is the only method.

**Shri Braj Raj Singh:** Government cannot make the arrangements, and the passenger has to travel when he has very important business.

**Shri Tangamani:** Breaches have occurred in this particular area; it is almost a yearly occurrence, and whenever breaches take place, there is diversion for a week or ten days. The hon. Minister knows, and you, Sir, also know, that when the diversion takes place, it has to be only through the main route, which means Rs. 2 extra for a third class passenger. Under the circumstances, I would request the hon. Minister to consider whether extra fare should be collected from the passengers because it is no fault of theirs.

**Mr. Speaker:** It cannot be done on the spur of the moment.

**Shri Braj Raj Singh:** May I know if he will consider a proposal to amend the rules?

**Shri T. B. Vittal Rao (Khammam):** Last time you yourself asked the Minister why this extra fare should be charged when the diversion takes place.

**Mr. Speaker:** I am satisfied with the answer today. Let this not be taken as an opportunity for discussing this matter.

**Shri Tangamani:** I want to know whether the route has been restored now.

**Shri S. V. Ramaswamy:** Starred question No. 11 was answered on 14-9-1958. A view was put forward by certain hon. Members of the Lok Sabha that when diversion of passenger traffic is due to accidents, natural calamities such as breaches etc., even passengers who are booked after the notification of the restriction in booking on the interrupted route should be charged fare by the booked route although carried by the longer diverted route. The matter is under the consideration of the Board.

**Shri T. B. Vittal Rao:** For well over a year?

**Shri Tangamani:** He has not answered whether that route has been restored.

**Mr. Speaker:** Hon. Member can know. He comes from that area.

**Shri S. V. Ramaswamy:** I said this line will be restored on the 10th, that is today. The Vriddhachalam-Puvanur route has been restored on the 3rd instant. The Vriddhachalam-Salem route will be restored today. Skeleton service has been maintained on these two routes, Vriddhachalam-Ulundurpet and Trichy-Ariyalur. So far as Trichy-Madura route is concerned, that has been restored on the 7th itself.

12.16 hrs.

#### STATEMENT RE: CHINAKURI MINE DISASTER

**The Deputy Minister of Labour (Shri Ahd Ali):** During the discussion in the Lok Sabha on the 2nd April, 1959 regarding the Chinakuri accident, certain allegations of a personal nature were made against the Chief Inspector of Mines. I wish to place before the House the correct position in this regard.

**Shrimati Renu Chakravarty** observed that the Chief Inspector gave a good chit to the colliery and that this

statement appeared in the "Statesman" after he was appointed as an assessor in the Court of Inquiry. The Chief Inspector has denied that he ever made such a statement.

Again, she said that the Regional Inspector had stated that he had sent various notes to the Chief Inspector but that he never got any reply. This was in accordance with the usual procedure, under which the Chief Inspector would record his observations—and convey them to the Inspecting Officers only where he considers their action to be inadequate. There was, therefore, no default on his part.

**Shrimati Renu Chakravarty** alleged that the Chief Inspector had gone about telling people personal things about her. The Chief Inspector has denied this.

She further mentioned that according to the Mines Act, the Chief Inspector should not, directly or indirectly, be interested in any person or relation employed in any mining area, but that a large number of relations of the present Chief Inspector were so employed. The Mines Act does not contain any such provision. A specific allegation was that the Chief Inspector's brothers, brother-in-law etc. are employed in mining concerns or near mining areas. The correct position is that the Chief Inspector has no such brother-in-law and he has only one brother employed in a non-coal mine. Other allegations were that his brother is the General Manager of the Raniganj Coal Association, that his brother-in-law is a Welfare Officer in a mine, that one of his brothers is an agent of Shaw Wallace Collieries, and that a very large number of his relations are in the mining areas. All this is incorrect, the position being, that there is a cousin of the Chief Inspector employed in the Raniganj Coal Association, and a distant relation in a mine. I may add that the Chief Inspector had taken the permission of Government whenever such permission was necessary.