

should not be the guide for our railway provinces; we have got our own system of administration". Let them have it, but they must look to the convenience of the people. Therefore, a compact South Central Zone may be formed as I have already indicated.

There is the DBK Railway—opening of about 480 KM. Last time I pleaded that it should be handed over to the South Central Zone. I suppose before the session ends, the Railway Minister would be able to say that it has been so done.

There is somebody in the Secretariat here who, I think, is very angry with Visakhapatnam.

15.57 hrs.

EXPUNCTION OF REMARKS MADE

BY SHRI S. M. BANERJEE IN
COURSE PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I have to attend the meeting of the privileges committee. Before that, I have to say something about Mr. S. M. Banerjee's remarks exceeding the limits I laid down. I have got the text now. Before I leave the Chair, I would like to say. . .

Shri Tenneti Viswanatham (Visakhapatnam): Take this matter to the privileges committee and be done with it.

Shri Vasudevan Nair (Peerwade): It is only proper that you should do this when he is present in the House.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I have already ruled that I shall get the original record and if I find that he has exceeded the limits I laid down when I permitted him to make a personal explanation, I shall expunge those portions. I will now read out those sentences.

Shri Umanath (Pudukkottai): Already on the question of a previous statement of his, he had a grievance that it was made in his absence. Nothing will be lost if it is postponed

till tomorrow or till he is present here today. Again there should not be a grievance for a member to say that it was taken up today itself in his absence. Do not give any ground for that.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: All sorts of imaginary issues can be made about a point of grievance or point of order. I have already ruled that I will go through the record and if he has gone beyond the permission I have given, those things will stand expunged. I have got the record here. Only two sentences stand expunged according to that ruling. He has no say in that matter.

16 hrs.

श्री जार्ज फरनेन्जीस (बम्बई-दक्षिण) : मेरा एक व्यवस्था का प्रश्न है। रूल 380 की ओर मैं आपका ध्यान खींचना चाहता हूँ। उसमें सफ़ और स्पष्ट लिखा हुआ है :

"If the Speaker is of opinion that words have been used in debate which are defamatory or indecent or unparliamentary or undignified, he may, in his discretion, order that such words be expunged from the proceedings of the House."

मैं "चार कारणों से किसी भी चीज़ को एक्सपंज करने का अधिकार स्पीकर ने अपने हाथ में रखा है। इन चार के बाहर किसी भी बात को जो इस सदन में कही गई हो, एक्सपंज करने वाला मामला यहाँ नहीं आता है। आपने अभी कहा है कि जितनी आपने उनको इजाजत दी थी उसके बाहर जा कर उन्होंने कोई बात कही है तो आप उसको एक्सपंज करना चाहते हैं मेरा निवेदन यह है कि इन चार बातों के आधार पर ही आप एक्सपंज करने का आर्डर दे सकते हैं, इनके बाहर जाकर नहीं दे सकते हैं।

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: From the words you will realise that they are defamatory *per se*, if you know something about law.

Shri C. K. Bhattacharyya (Raiganj): Sir, the Chair's authority is not a matter of argument. It is not final because it is right, but it is right because it is final. You have given the ruling and that is final. Let not the whole thing be reopened *de novo*.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: These sentences—for the record I am making it clear—

are absolutely defamatory, beyond the permission that I have accorded to him, and these remarks stand expunged.

Shri Gunanand Thakur (Saharsa): rose—

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Order, order. If everybody gets up after the Chair has given a ruling, this House has no meaning. Please sit down.

16.03 hrs.

DEMANDS FOR GRANTS (RAILWAYS), 1967-68—Contd.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Shri Tenneti Viswanatham may continue his speech. I am sorry I had to interrupt him.

Shri Tenneti Viswanatham: That does not matter, Sir, I will take another 15 minutes.

Sir, I had just come to Visakhapatnam when this Privileges matter came in again. I was saying that there is somebody who is very angry with Visakhapatnam here in this Secretariat. I will tell you why. A steel plant was promised in 1963, and it was denied in 1966. A zinc smelter plant was almost about to be included and, then, the Budget Explanatory Memorandum says that somehow or other it could not be included and it was taken away. Then, Rs. 50 lakhs was provided for a dry dock at Visakhapatnam shipyard and Rs. 15 lakhs were spent. Suddenly it was dropped by the time of the elections. Finally,

coming to the Railways, what happens to the railway station at Visakhapatnam? The re-construction of Waltair station was taken half way and then it was stopped. What has Visakhapatnam done to members of the Secretariat here, I really cannot understand. Let the blot be removed by the Railway Minister. Let the reconstruction of the railway station be completed and for the sin of having stopped it in the middle let him make it a much better building and one of the best buildings in India.

16.05 hrs.

[SHRI C. K. BHATTACHARYYA in the Chair]

On the question of employees' machinery, we have got great difficulty with regard to dealing with these employees of the railways. The railway employees are not expected to go to Members of Parliament. There is no good machinery with a judicial frame of mind set up by the Ministry to hear their grievances or complaints. The present methods of hearing their appeals or representations are so involved and so time-consuming that people get frustrated. If they do not work well, we cannot really complain. What I say is that you should have an officer who is unconnected with the regular administration, who has got some judicial training to receive the complaints directly. Whenever somebody has got any grievances, he must receive them, immediately go through the complaints, hear both sides, the employees as well as the officers complained against, and then advise the final authority who has got to pass the order. If the Government pass orders like that, there would not be much scope for complaints and the employees need not hang about the corridors of Members of Parliament. It is not dignified, either to the officers of the railways or the Members of Parliament to hear these complaints and frustrations daily.