

उत्तर प्रदेश की चीनी मिलें

६५३. श्री मोहन स्वयंकर : क्या खाद्य तथा कृषि मंत्री यह बताने की कृपा करेंगे कि :

(क) उत्तर प्रदेश की चीनी मिलें किन तिथि से कार्य प्रारम्भ कर रही हैं; और

(ख) इस वर्ष नवम्बर में गन्ने की पिराई के समय रिकवरी के आधार पर गन्ना का क्या न्यूनतम मूल्य निर्धारित किया जा रहा है;

(ग) क्या यह सच है कि उत्तर प्रदेश की कुछ चीनी मिलों ने गन्ने उत्पादकों से कोई समझौता किया है जिसके आधार पर गन्ना उत्पादक १ रुपया ७ आने प्रति मन से कम मूल्य लेने की तैयार हो गये हैं; और

(घ) गन्ने के मूल्य सम्बन्धी सुझावों पर सरकार की क्या प्रतिक्रिया हुई है ?

खाद्य तथा कृषि मंत्री (श्री भ० प्र० जैन) :

(क) : चीनी की एक मिल ने २६ अक्टूबर से, दूसरी ने ३० अक्टूबर से, और २१ मिलों ने पहली नवम्बर से १८ नवम्बर के बीच में, गन्ना पेरना प्रारम्भ कर दिया है। लगभग ३० मिलों के इस मास के अन्त तक और १५ के दिसम्बर, १९५७ में चलने की आशा है।

(ख) गन्ने का न्यूनतम मूल्य, चीनी चाहे जितनी उपलब्ध हो, गेट डिलीवरी पर १ रु० ७ आने प्रकृति मन, और रेल केन्द्र पर १ रु० ५ आने है।

(ग) राज्य सरकार से ऐसा कोई प्रस्ताव प्राप्त नहीं हुआ है।

(घ) केन्द्रीय सरकार गन्ने के न्यूनतम मूल्य में कमी करना नहीं चाहती। केवल विशेष हालातों में उत्पादक के हित में अथवा राज्य सरकार की सिफारिश पर अनुमति देता है।

बिहार को अनाज का संभरल

६५४. श्री अनिलचन्द्र सिंह : क्या खाद्य तथा कृषि मंत्री यह बताने की कृपा करेंगे कि :

(क) बिहार राज्य में सूखे के कारण फसलों के नष्ट हो जाने से जो अभाव उत्पन्न हो गया है, उसे दूर करने के लिये बिहार सरकार ने प्रतिमास केन्द्रीय सरकार से कितना और किस प्रकार का खाद्यान्न मांगा है;

(ख) केन्द्रीय सरकार उन्हें प्रतिमास किस प्रकार का कितना अनाज देने के लिये सहमत हो गई है; और

(ग) यह अनाज कब से दिया जा रहा है, अथवा देने का विचार है और कब तक दिया जाता रहेगा?

खाद्य तथा कृषि मंत्री (श्री भ० प्र० जैन) :

(क) से (ग) : बिहार सरकार ने केन्द्रीय सरकार से प्रतिमास ८० हजार टन गेहूं, चावल, चना और मोटे अनाजों की मांग ४ मास, दिसम्बर, १९५७ से मार्च, १९५८ तक के लिये की है। केन्द्रीय सरकार ने इस मांग को स्वीकार कर लिया है, परन्तु कौन सा अन्न कितना दिया जाए यह समय समय पर अन्न की उपलब्धि पर निर्दिष्ट किया जायेगा।

MOTIONS FOR ADJOURNMENT

ACCIDENT TO BOMBAY-CALCUTTA MAIL
ON 23RD NOVEMBER, 1957

Mr. Speaker: A number of adjournment motions, as many as 11, have been tabled, all relating to the unfortunate tragic train accident to the Calcutta Mail near Bombay. The earliest is by Sarvashri N. G. Goray, Nath Pai and Y. N. Jadhav relating to the "grave accident to the Calcutta mail on the 23rd November, 1957 involving the tragic deaths of more than 50 passengers and

[Mr. Speaker]

serious injuries to more than 100 passengers, causing great anxiety to the public." The others, except one, are more or less of the same nature arising out of the same accident.

The second is by Shri Vajpayee "to discuss the serious situation arising out of the reported statement of the Minister of Railways." There is a little difference in this. This says, "to discuss the situation arising out of the reported statement of the Minister of Railways that sabotage was the cause of the derailment of the Bombay-Calcutta Mail on the Igatpuri Bhusaval section of the Central Railway resulting in the death of 9 persons and injuries to 46."

This seems to be somewhat different.

Shri Goray (Poona): Originally it was 100 injured but today's figures give it only as 9 dead.

Mr. Speaker: I would like to hear the statement of the hon. Minister.

The Deputy Minister of Railways (Shri Shah Nawaz Khan): Sir, I would like to make a brief statement.

The House is already aware of the unfortunate accident to No. 1 Dn. Bombay-Calcutta Mail at about 22.45 hrs. on 23rd November, 1957 between Padali and Asvali Stations on the Igatpuri-Bhusaval section of the Central Railway. The hon. Minister for Railways, accompanied by the Member, Transportation, Railway Board, left by a special plane yesterday morning for the site of the accident to have first hand information of this accident and, on his return, sometime this afternoon, he will give the House full details. However, I would like to mention brief particulars as known so far.

The Bombay-Calcutta Mail left Bombay at 19.10 hrs. on 23rd November, 1957 with a load of 11 bogies. It passed through Padali at 22.42 hrs. and met with an unfortunate accident

at about 22.45 hrs. The engine and luggage and brake next to engine got derailed, next four bogies capsized, next three bogies derailed and last three bogies were on the track. In an earlier message received immediately after the accident, it was feared that about 35 persons were killed and about 75 injured. On clearance of the wreckage, however, 9 dead bodies were found. The number of injured is 62, of whom 39 have been admitted in the Igatpuri Railway Hospital and 4 in the Military Hospital at Deolali and the remaining 19 were given medical attention and they proceeded to their destinations.

Relief trains with medical vans were rushed to the site of the accident from Igatpuri, Bhusaval, Kalyan and Bombay. Civil and Military Doctors from Deolali and Nasik also arrived at the site of the accident and attended to the injured.

Arrangements were made to transport about 500 passengers of the ill-fated train into an empty rake, which was run as Duplicate Bombay-Calcutta Mail. It left the site of the accident at 4.25 hrs. on 24th November, 1957.

The General Managers and the principal officers of the Central Railway are at the site, attending to relief operations.

The Government Inspector of Railways, Bombay, who left Bombay at 6.20 hrs. on 24th November, 1957, has visited the site of the accident and is holding a statutory enquiry today at Nasik Road.

As regards the reported statement of the hon. Minister at Igatpuri that *prima facie* it is a case of sabotage, the House would hardly expect me to say anything at this stage. The hon. Minister is due back shortly and will apprise the House with fuller details.

Shri Feroze Gandhi (Rae Bareilly): I am very sorry to have to point this out today. You have yourself known

this. Every time I have raised this point that when an accident occurs the reports on these accidents are not made available to the House. The Minister of Railways accused the Minister of Communications and the Minister of Communications accuses the Law Minister and in the last six months we have had no report of the Railway Inspector.

On the last occasion I had raised this question about the serious accident on the electrified Harbour branch of the Central Railway and also in regard to other major accidents that have taken place in the last 2½ years. They have all been on the Central Railway, Jangaon, Mahboobnagar, Harbour branch and the head-on collision of the Pathankot Express and now it is the Calcutta-Bombay Mail. We cannot know anything about these things unless the reports are given to us. In the last 10 years it never happened that the Law Ministry or any other Ministry has come in the way of such reports being made available. I have also checked that nowhere in the world there is any regulation to prevent the publication of the Government Inspector's report on such accidents. They are made available immediately everywhere.

I would like you to intervene in this matter because I do not like raising this question again and again and I myself feel a little bit silly doing this every time such an accident happens. (*Interruption*) The Railway Minister said that he was not responsible and the Communications Minister said that he was not responsible and both of them are throwing the responsibility on the Law Ministry. We would like to have a clarification on this.

Mr. Speaker: I remember the other day the hon. Member raised the same matter. Both the Railway Minister and the Communications Minister were here as also the Home Minister. The hon. Railway Minister said that the publication of the report was within the jurisdiction of the hon. Minister of Communications because he appoints the Inspector and the

report is submitted to him. It is no doubt sent to the Railway Minister for his information. But whether it ought to be published or not is entirely in the hands of the Communications Minister. The Communications Minister said that in case prosecutions had to be launched it may not be possible to place it before the House. The hon. Home Minister, if my recollection is correct, intervened and said that this matter will be examined. I would like to know at what stage it is.

If the report ought not to be placed before the House, there is no need for a report, so far as the Railways are concerned. If a decision has to be taken about launching of prosecutions it must be done immediately after the report. With respect to all major accidents, I would urge upon the Government to place the report here and I might even say that with respect to major accidents there ought to be a discussion and debate in this House so that in future the difficulties may be avoided.

It is a matter of life and death. It appears as if even air journey is preferable to train journey now.

Shri Feroze Gandhi: I would like to make one correction. I was not present in the House the day when the hon. Communications Minister made the statement that where a prosecution is launched, the report is withheld. There is a relative of Mr. Bharucha, who is involved in a case and who was a driver of electric trains. That case is going on and that has been made public. So, it is not correct to say that where there is a prosecution, the report is not made public.

Shri Naushir Bharucha (East Khandesh): It was not a criminal prosecution; it was a civil suit.

The Minister of Home Affairs (Pandit G. B. Pant): I had the opportunity of making a few remarks in this connection the other day. I adhere to them and if I may say so,

[Pandit G. B. Pant]

I fully appreciate all that you have been pleased to observe even now. I share the feelings of the House that unless there are any serious reasons to the contrary, such reports should be placed on the Table of the House. I say that the Government will take into account the strong feelings that exist in the House in this regard and also the remarks that you have been pleased to make. I doubt if I am required or expected to say more.

Shri Feroze Gandhi: Then, when can we have the report?

Pandit G. B. Pant: That depends on the value which you attach to what I say.

Mr. Speaker: In response to a suggestion made by some Members and by me, the hon. Minister of Railways said the other day that they will themselves come to the House and make reports in the first instance and investigation and report by an officer there will follow in the usual course. The Home Minister says that no attempt will be made to withhold any of the reports except in cases where legal advice or any other advice says it is prejudicial to any particular prosecution. That is what I understand from the hon. Home Minister's statement.

So far as these accidents are concerned, the hon. Minister in charge of Railways has gone to the spot. He is there. Let him come and let us see. He will come and make a report to this House. Even if he makes a report to this House, I do not know whether it is necessary to keep an adjournment motion pending here.

Always in all cases where there is death on account of any accident, I will allow a discussion on that matter to avoid a recurrence, so that the House, the Government, the Ministry and all persons may take heed and try to locate any mistakes that have happened. As regards sabotage, no officer of the Government is responsible—I am talking of the Ministry here. They themselves say they suspect sabotage. So far as the adjournment motions are concerned, we have had

some information regarding this matter from the hon. Deputy Minister. His senior colleague will come and explain to us also. So, I do not think it is necessary.....

Shri Braj Raj Singh (Ferozabad): No objection has been taken to the moving of the adjournment motions in the House on that side.

Mr. Speaker: It is not necessary; it is for me to decide. Neither merely because he makes an objection I am going to disallow nor merely because he keeps quiet, I am going to allow.

Shri Tangamani (Madurai): The purpose of a discussion and the purpose of an adjournment motion are two different things. If my recollection is correct, on the 23rd November, 1956, we had the Ariyalur accident and on the 23rd November, 1957, we have this Calcutta Mail accident. These accidents have been a recurring feature. Through an adjournment motion, it is forcibly brought to the notice of the Government as to how the House feels about it. That is the purpose of the adjournment motion. I have also tabled an adjournment motion.

Shri T. B. Vittal Rao (Khammam): About this accident and discussion, it is true that we should have some more information and the Railway Minister is coming today or tomorrow; we will have a full statement from him. But I would say that a discussion should be held immediately with all the information at our disposal, so that this House can give a direction to the Railway Ministry as to what sort of enquiry is to be conducted, because the enquiries that have been conducted under the Chief Inspectorate which is under the Communications Ministry have not been able to avoid any accident at all. On the other hand, the accidents are on the increase. So, our faith in that machinery has been absolutely shattered, much more in the Railway Board and their members. Therefore, we would like that we

should have a discussion with whatever little information we have. The adjournment motion relates to a matter of urgent public importance. The moving of the adjournment motions satisfies the three conditions necessary. Therefore, I would request that either the adjournment motions may be held over till tomorrow or admitted.

Shri S. A. Dange (Bombay City—Central): I learn from the papers that the Railway Minister, having looked at certain fish-plates made the statement that the cause of the accident might be sabotage. Such a statement on the part of a responsible Minister will prejudice the future enquiry. Is it politically and morally correct for the Minister just to look at a few things and form a judgment of his own, because I think that would influence the future enquiries, influence the evidence and influence the conclusions. I think such a practice on the part of Ministers in such cases should be prevented, if possible.

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Dange himself has said that if the Minister, after looking into some of those things, comes to a conclusion, he might have kept quiet without bringing it out. That is what he says. Whoever goes and sees it, will come to some conclusion regarding that. The only quarrel with the Minister is that he ought not to have made such a statement. If the Minister's statement, who is responsible, ought to be avoided, would I be well-advised to allow a discussion on all these matters which will still more prejudice any investigation? That is what is passing in my mind. Therefore, let us wait. After the Minister comes, let us see if there is something which can be done immediately or if it is necessary for us to focus attention. I agree it is a definite matter of urgent public importance. But recently we have been under the impression that these are all censure motions. Let us also take it up as a matter of censure and censure the Government

for it. Therefore, there are two difficulties in this. It may be a censure and it may be also prejudice any investigation. Anyhow, I have no objection to hold it over until the Minister comes. Let us hear the Minister and see what can be done. When is he coming?

Shri Shah Nawaz Khan: This afternoon.

Mr. Speaker: A statement will be made tomorrow morning. All these motions will stand over till tomorrow.

PAPERS LAID ON THE TABLE

REPORT OF INDIAN DELEGATION TO JOINT UNITED NATIONS/UNESCO SEMINAR

The Deputy Minister of Commerce and Industry (Shri Satish Chandra): I beg to lay on the Table a copy of the Report of the Indian Delegation to the Joint United Nations/UNESCO Seminar on Urbanisation in the ECAFE region held at Bangkok in August, 1956. [Placed in Library. See No. LT-386/57.]

REPORTS OF LAW COMMISSION

The Minister of Law (Shri A. K. Sen): I beg to lay on the Table a copy of each of the following papers:—

- (1) Fifth Report of the Law Commission on the British Status Applicable to India. [Placed in Library. See No. LT-387/57.]
- (2) Sixth Report of the Law Commission on the Registration Act, 1908. [Placed in Library. See No. LT-388/57.]
- (3) Seventh Report of the Law Commission on the Partnership Act, 1932. [Placed in Library. See No. LT-389/57.]
- (4) Statement of the work done by the Law Commission during the period 21-5-1957 to 20-11-1957. [See Appendix II, annexure No. 86.]