

demands entered in the second column thereof—

Demand Nos. 1, 2, 7, 9, 15 and 16.”

*The motion was adopted.*

[The motions for Demands for Supplementary Grants which were adopted by the Lok Sabha are reproduced below—Ed.]

**DEMAND NO. 1—RAILWAY BOARD**

“That a supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 3,05,000 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, 1962, in respect of ‘Railway Board’.”

**DEMAND NO. 2—MISCELLANEOUS EXPENDITURE**

“That a supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 28,61,000 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, 1962, in respect of ‘Miscellaneous Expenditure’.”

**DEMAND NO. 7—ORDINARY WORKING EXPENSES—OPERATION (FUEL)**

“That a supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 4,91,32,000 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, 1962, in respect of ‘Ordinary Working Expenses—Operation (Fuel)’.”

**DEMAND NO. 9—ORDINARY WORKING EXPENSES— MISCELLANEOUS EXPENSES**

“That a supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 3,02,25,000 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, 1962, in respect of ‘Ordinary Working Expenses—Miscellaneous Expenses’.”

**DEMAND NO. 15—CONSTRUCTION OF NEW LINES**

“That a supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 3,00,000 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, 1962, in respect of ‘Construction of New Lines’.”

**DEMAND NO. 16—OPEN LINE WORKS— ADDITIONS**

“That a supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 1,00,000 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, 1962, in respect of ‘Open Line Works—Additions’.”

13.20 hrs.

**MAJOR RAILWAY ACCIDENTS**

**Shri Rajendra Singh (Chapra):** Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, I beg to move:

“That this House takes note of the statement made by the Minister of Railways in the House on the 20th November, 1961 on major accidents which occurred recently.”

The day this Session began the hon. Minister of Railways made a statement on three major accidents in which several lives were lost with a heavy heart. While initiating the debate on this matter I assure you that it is equally with a heavy heart that I am doing so.

In the course of his statement the hon. Minister also recapitulated many steps that he decided to take at the time he assumed office and subsequent to that. A close perusal of the entire statement discloses that all the endeavours or attempts that the hon. Minister or the Railway Board had made have proved an utter failure. The situation today remains what it was when his predecessor resigned.

[Shri Rajendra Singh]

When he says that things may improve I look at the matter with a deep sense of pessimism. I do not say that these accidents in any way reflect on the personality of the hon. Minister or even on the administration of the Railway Board. But if a man of his stature, intelligence and imagination could not be able to improve the situation even to a significant extent, what the future would be is difficult to envisage.

The most painful thing in this regard to my mind has been the statement of the Chairman of the Railway Board. The Chairman is a man of science. To hear from a man of science that it has been his bad luck to have this series of accidents is painful in the sense that he has exhibited an unscientific attitude. Much as I deplore this attitude I would now like to proceed to tell you that the country is disconcerted at these three accidents. Not only that, in fact the accidents on the railways have been so numerous and pathetic from the point of view of property and time lost that it takes one's breath away and one wonders how it will at all be a going concern. The figures which have been given to us by the hon. Minister in the course of his statement reveal that in one year there have been.....

**Shri Shahnawaz Khan:** Which year?

**Shri Rajendra Singh:** I am talking of 1960-61.

Even if you claim that there has been some reduction in the percentage of accidents, the fact remains that every day, according to this calculation, you are having more than 30 accidents on your railways.

**An Hon. Member:** Every day?

**Shri Rajendra Singh:** Yes, 8,808 is the total number of accidents in one year. Divide it by the number of days and you will find the result. Similarly, if you calculate it in that manner you will find that on every three or, say, four miles to be exact of your railways

you are having one accident. Look at it from any point of view. The situation is really pathetic and abnormal.

**The Minister of Railways (Shri Jagjivan Ram):** What is the definition of an accident?

**Shri Rajendra Singh:** I am coming to that.

**Shri Tangamanj (Madurai):** He is now talking only about major accidents. There were about 1,500 minor accidents also.

**Shri Rajendra Singh:** The hon. Railway Minister neither at the time when the Budget is presented to this House nor on any other occasion has taken the trouble of giving the real state of affairs. Although he has said in his statement that he presented to this House a review of the accidents which took place during the last twenty years, if you look at that pamphlet you will find that enough of shrewdness has been shown by the Railway Board in not disclosing the real state of affairs. For the benefit of this House I would like to read out the extent, the number and the types of accidents which will reveal the true and actual state of affairs. To that extent I would beg of your indulgence. Please let me read out the different type of accidents which have happened and are happening with a vengeance on the railways.

During the last six months there had been 1,883 accidents. The break-up of these accidents is as follows:—

“The break-up of the accidents which took place during April-September this year shows that there were 61 collisions, 763 derailments, 37 averted collisions, 70 cases of trains ignoring danger signals, 30 breaches of block rules, 787 instances of trains parting and 135 instances of fires in trains. While it is true that a considerable number of these accidents was in the nature of minor mishaps the rest not less numerous were po-

tential major disasters. Though there has been a small decrease in the number of fires in trains, the number of train accidents has increased in all zones. The rise in the number of accidents can be traced in the main to more cases of train partings....."

I want to underline it.

".....as well as trains passing signals at danger." Two aspects are there, namely, mechanical failure when the train parts and very serious negligence of duty on the part of the individual or a set of individuals concerned when they take or allow to take the train against signals. Then it says:

"The category causing the greatest anxiety is train derailment particularly mid-section derailments."

Most of all, one thing which cannot lead to any reasonable squaring up is the mid-section derailment. The hon. Minister, or for that matter the Board, might say that this is because of the weak track or because of some defect in the rolling stock. That might be so. But when the hon. Minister assumed office he assured this House that all possible steps would be taken to improve the equipment of all varieties, types and nature. I want to know what steps have been taken to see that the equipment was improved. I fear he might say a lot of things. But so far as results are concerned, we feel and are convinced that no improvement has so far taken place. One argument that he might advance is that there is rapid development of the railways all over the country. That is as it should be. But, none-the-less, safety cannot be ignored. This can never be an excuse to tell the country that since development works are going on, therefore, the country should be prepared to suffer losses in life and suffer losses in property. That cannot be an argument in an age when science and reason are predominant. To that extent I feel that the Railway

Board has not functioned with a sense of efficiency and responsibility which it should have.

It is again a regrettable fact that the Railway takes all possible care to hide away from the sight of the general public all these accidents. If they fail, then, they try to minimise them. Just I am quoting the figure for six months. One thousand eight hundred and eighty three accidents took place from April to September this year. The law is that as soon as an accident takes place, within three months, an enquiry report should be submitted to the Board. Now, 60 per cent of the cases have not yet been covered by the Inspector's report. Final reports have not yet been given. Things are lingering on. There is a basic defect in the Inspector's enquiry. The Inspector does not have the power to call witnesses and to cross-examine them. No enquiry—whether judicial or quasi-judicial or technical—can be possible or can be adequate or can be acceptable to a reasonable man unless the enquiring man has the power to do all that a Judge has the power to do. All these reports, whatever be their findings, are full of doubts and full of defects. The manner in which the enquiry is conducted and the final reports that are given to us are such that they take away from the sight of the actual state of affairs and to that extent, I think, we remain ignorant of what is happening.

There is another aspect of it. It has been whispered sometimes very loudly, that quite a few of the accidents are because of sabotage. Well, Sir, I know a bit of the railways, and I do not think that there is any reasonable evidence to support it. Even suppose you admit it for a minute as a hypothesis, the Railway Minister, at the very outset, when he assumed office, said that he has outlined certain measures which in collaboration with the respective States he wanted to be taken so that sabotage could be detected, minimised and if possible, stamped out. But, Sir, with what results? I have not come

[Shri Rajendra Singh]

across—subject to correction by the Minister and his Board—a single case of derailment, other than the report of the Inspector, proved to be the result of sabotage by many judicial body or by even intelligence. Railway disaster is a great matter. It is much more than a case of an individual homicide. If homicide cases could be detected and the offender could be brought to book, is it not thinkable or believable that sabotage, not in one case, but all over the country, could not be detected? The fact is, there is nothing to be detected. If the Railway does not find any other excuse or cannot hide its own faults or its failures and shortcomings, they jump on one proposition that there has been sabotage. One example is Ghatsila. The Minister is smiling. Of course, you will have your turn. Why are you smiling at me? I am saying what my feelings are and my feelings are shared by a large number of millions in this country.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Why should he object to a smile, because it is innocent?

**Shri Rajendra Singh:** I am not objecting.

**Shri Jagjivan Ram:** I am not interfering.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** He feels that even a smile would interfere.

**Shri Rajendra Singh:** I cannot object....

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Instead of noticing him smile, the hon. Member should look at me.

**Shri Rajendra Singh:** There is Ghatsila. I had a number of talks with people who had been on that ill-fated train. They told me—this is something on which you have to depend. I have not got the papers at the moment before me. I can vouch-safe what I am saying. In the Calcutta, the papers, *Amrita Bazar*

*Patrika* and *Statesman*, many of the people who had been travelling in that train, came out with statements and Letters to the Editor that the fish plates which were not found in the track were found inside some of the carriages and they told us that it is not a case of sabotage. It was just a case of negligence, because, if I am not very wrong—subject, again, to correction,—half an hour before . .

**Some Hon. Members:** Fifteen minutes.

**Shri Rajendra Singh:** . . . fifteen minutes before the train met with the accident, another train had passed smoothly and safely over the track. Within fifteen minutes, a miscreant would come and take away the fish plates and derail the train—is it believable?

Then, again, derailment must be a purposeful derailment, must have a certain meaning. What could be the meaning? The meaning could be loot. The meaning could be vengeance. Meaning could be wreaking certain national revenge. For example, somebody may be an agent of some country hostile to us and they would try to put us to loss. I have not come across even a single instance where such a thing could be supported by evidence. Then, when the train was derailed, there would have been looting. I am told that for fourteen hours, the rescue party or the medical party and those things which are needed on such an occasion, could not go to the spot.

**Shri Jagjivan Ram:** Fourteen hours?

**Shri Rajendra Singh:** That is what I am told; again, you will correct me. They did not go there for at least a few hours. When there is a mid-section derailment, news has to go to a bigger station, a breakdown van has to be brought and it takes time. If there had been a case of sabotage with the purpose of looting the passengers, there would have been such accidents. No such accident has so

far been reported. Similarly, when, elsewhere, it is said that at Katihar there have been cases of sabotage, I take it with a ton of salt—not with a pinch of salt but with a ton of salt. I refuse rather to believe everything that the Railway Board would like us to believe. It is really a serious matter.

There are all types of accidents—not one type of accident, but all types of accidents—sometimes, coupling giving way, etc. The most surprising thing is which takes one's breath away is that a few days before, the Railway Minister's own coach caught fire. If the Minister's saloon can catch fire, then what to speak of the carriage in which a poor man like me travels?

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** The hon. Member's saloon would go all right. It would not be touched. It is only the Minister's car which would be touched.

**Shri Rajendra Singh:** I am coming to that, and I shall point out what the difference is. The Minister's saloon is something which does not move constantly; it moves only when a very high officer or a Minister has to go from one place to another. So, its life is very much preserved. Further, whenever it is to go on the line, many checks are made. If, after all these checkings, axle fire takes place, then, can it be denied that it is because of the sheer negligence on the part of the railways, whosoever it may be? It does not matter whether the person concerned is an ordinary employee or an officer; both of them are equally responsible. If this kind of thing happens with the Railway Minister's car, then I do not know what will happen to the ordinary cars or carriages.

I have come across several employees who have told me that the train examiners who are responsible for checking the wheel, the tyre, axle etc. and seeing whether they are in order, are not given enough time to check the carriages, with the result that the carriages roll on and on, at

the mercy of God, and when God wills otherwise, there is an accident. This is not the way in which such a huge organisation which has taken upon itself such a tremendous responsibility of carrying people safely from one place to another should behave.

About a month before, I was coming in a 'crack' train, and the train came to a halt at the outer signal at Dohad. It stopped there for fifteen minutes, and it was then about to berth itself at the station, when it collided against an empty engine. What are we to call it?

**Shri D. C. Sharma (Gurdaspur):** Was my hon. friend there?

**Shri Rajendra Singh:** Unless it collides against my hon. friend's head, he cannot understand it.

**Shri S. M. Banerjee:** That will be a head-on collision.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Heads should not collide against one another at least here.

**Shri Nath Pai:** Head-on collisions are very dangerous.

**Shri Rajendra Singh:** The point that I am driving at is that such colossal negligence cannot be excused. My information is that the Railway Board are ignoring it. If that is the case, I do not know to what extent they will carry us to our final extinction.

Having said all these things, I would like to make a few suggestions. These are the things, bad as they are, but, after all, human efforts must be put forth to redeem and to improve. According to me, the first thing that the Railway Minister has to do is to order at once a judicial enquiry. Whatever be the extent of the accident, whether it be a goods train accident or a passenger trains accident, it should be reported to the people at large, or throughout the country, and judicial enquiries should be made with full right to the presiding officer of the enquiry to call for

[Shri Rajendra Singh]

any witnesses, to call for records, and to report not to the Railway Board first but to Parliament; I want that such reports should be made available to Parliament first, and then only they should go out elsewhere. Unless this kind of thing is done by the hon. Minister, the Railway Board cannot be inspired, and cannot be whipped into the proper attitude. This is my first suggestion.

My second suggestion is that whenever there is even an averted accident, whosoever is responsible, whether he be a locoman, or a man in the loco-shed, or a man on the car or the man who has been deputed to check or the man somewhere higher up, should be dealt with mercilessly. One of the correspondents of a newspaper—I do not vouchsafe for what he says; I do not vouchsafe for its accuracy—says that many of the offenders have not only not been properly dealt with, but have been excused. If such sort of encouragement is given to the employees, I do not know what will happen. I have my sympathies for the urges of the employees, but none-the-less, the life of the nation, the property of the nation, and the safety of the travelling public are far more important than the grievance of this section or that section of the railway employees. It is from that point of view that I wish that deterrent punishment should be meted out.

The hon. Minister has said in his statement that he has a measure to educate the people. I am not aware of what measure of education he has devised and how it is being injected into the minds of the railwaymen wherever they may be in the hierarchy. According to me, there is no such thing.

Therefore, I want that there should be swift and deterrent punishment; even before the report of the inspector or the report of the judicial enquiry is out, such men should be punished and they should be given as

much punishment as is possible within the framework of the railway rules.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** The hon. Member wants that even before the report is out, the punishment should be given?

**Shri Rajendra Singh:** What I mean is that the man must be suspended. Otherwise, it becomes very difficult. Supposing, I am out of this House, and a man comes and says that Shri Rajendra Singh has committed murder, then, before I am...

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** The hon. Member wants that the punishment should be given before the guilt is proved?

**Shri Rajendra Singh:** What I am saying is that the man must be suspended. I say that the punishment should be within the framework of the rules.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Supposing the man commits murder and he is executed straightway, then of what benefit would the enquiry be?

**Shri Rajendra Singh:** Excuse me, Sir. You have not cared to listen to the full sentence. I have only said that the punishment possible within the framework of the rules should be given, I do not say that the punishment outside the rule should be given.

**Shri S. M. Banerjee:** He may be released on bail later on.

**Shri Rajendra Singh:** There is no question of bail here.

**Shri Vajpayee (Balrampur):** There should be summary trial.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** The hon. Member's time is up. He has already taken about half an hour.

**Shri Rajendra Singh:** Have I? Then, I would conclude in a minute.

I feel that at least in the matter of ensuring safe travel for the passen-

gers, and in ensuring the safety of the railway properties, the Railway Board and the Railway Minister have severally and jointly failed and failed miserably. I do not think that any word would be strong enough to pull them up. Swift action is needed.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Motion moved:

"That this House takes note of the statement made by the Minister of Railways in the House on the 20th November, 1961, on major accidents which occurred recently."

The hon. Mover has already taken about half an hour. I believe the hon. Minister also would require about half an hour.

**Shri Jagjivan Ram:** Yes.

**Shri Nath Pai (Rajapur):** It is our turn to discuss; his is to look after the safety of passengers, and to avert accidents.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Do hon. Members not want a reply from the Minister?

**Shri Nath Pai:** We want him to prevent the accidents.

**Shri S. M. Banerjee (Kanpur):** We want the reply also.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** The reply would take about half an hour. So, we have got only one hour left for those who want to participate in the discussion. May I know how many Members are desirous of speaking? I find that there are eight Members who want to speak.

**Shri S. M. Banerjee:** At least those who have tabled the motion may be given a chance.

**Shri Vajpayee:** I have an amendment also to this motion.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** I believe the hon. Member Shri Vajpayee also would like to speak.

So, we have 60 minutes to be divided between eight Members; so, each Member can take 7 minutes.

Shri Vajpayee may move his amendment now. He may take about ten minutes.

**श्री वाजपेयी :** उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मेरा संशोधन यह है :

"मूल प्रस्ताव में यह जोड़ा जाये :

यह सदन सरकार से सिफारिश करता है कि वह इन दुर्घटनाओं की अदालती जांच कराने की वांछनीयता के सम्बन्ध में विचार करे।"

रेलवे मंत्री जी के वक्तव्य में तीन बड़ी दुर्घटनाओं का उल्लेख किया गया है। यह तीनों दुर्घटनायें २० दिन के भीतर हुई हैं, जिन में ७५ व्यक्ति मरे और २४० बुरी तरह घायल हुये हैं। इन दुर्घटनाओं के परिणाम स्वरूप रेल यात्रियों का इस बात में विश्वास हिल गया है कि रेलवे उन्हें गन्तव्य स्थान तक सुरक्षा के साथ पहुंचा सकती है। रेलवे प्रशासन यात्रियों को बैठने की जगह नहीं दे सका है, जो माल डोया जाता है उसे ही ठीक तरह से पहुंचाने में रेलवे विफल रही है, रेल कर्मचारी भी पर्याप्त सुविधायें प्राप्त नहीं कर पा रहे हैं, किन्तु कम से कम यह आशा तो की जाती है कि जो यात्री रेलगाड़ी में बैठ कर यात्रा करते हैं उन्हें वह अपनी जगह पर पहुंचा देगा। यह प्रमुख कार्य है जिसे रेलवे अभी तक नहीं कर पा रही है।

मुझे रेलवे मंत्री जी के वक्तव्य में रांची एक्सप्रेस की दुर्घटना के बारे में जो आंकड़े दिये गये हैं उन्हें पढ़ कर बड़ा ताज्जुब हुआ। मेरा निवेदन है कि इस वक्तव्य में जो आंकड़े दिये गये हैं उनका जोड़ ठीक नहीं बैठता है। वक्तव्य में कहा गया है कि ४५ लोग मर गये और ६ बाद में मर गये। इस के अलावा ११ लोगों को बुरी चोटें लगीं १८४ व्यक्ति ऐसे थे जिन्हें हलकी चोटें लगीं। जिन में से ७१ व्यक्ति फर्स्ट एंड के बाद छोड़ दिये गये, ६२ व्यक्तियों को अस्पताल

## [श्री बाजपेयी]

में चिकित्सा के बाद छोड़ दिया गया, और ३२ व्यक्ति ऐसे हैं जो कि जिस दिन उन्होंने वक्तव्य दिया था उस दिन भी अस्पताल में थे। अब अगर यह ३२ व्यक्ति, ७१ व्यक्ति और ६२ व्यक्ति को हम जोड़ दें तो उन का जोड़ १६५ होता है, १८४ नहीं। जो लोग अस्पताल में हैं उन्हें भी अगर शामिल कर लिया जाये तो भी जोड़ १६५ होता है और रेलवे मंत्री जी कहते हैं कि जिन व्यक्तियों को चोटें लगी उनकी संख्या १८४ थी, और इस में हलकी चोटें वाले भी शामिल हैं। मैं जानना चाहूंगा कि किस आधार पर यह आंकड़े दिये गये हैं जो कि रेलवे मंत्री के वक्तव्य में दिये गये आंकड़ों पर ठीक नहीं बैठते, और इन दुर्घटनाओं के सम्बन्ध में रेलवे प्रसाशन की ओर से जो बात कही जाती है उन्हें किस तरह से ठीक माना जा सकता है ?

रांची एक्सप्रेस की दुर्घटना के बारे में कहा जाता है कि वह तोड़ फोड़ का परिणाम है और इस के लिये गवाही दी जाती है रेलवे इन्स्पेक्टर की। कहा जाता है कि रेलवे इन्स्पेक्टर रेलवे से संबंधित नहीं हैं, वह ट्रांसपोर्ट और कम्प्यूनिकेशन मिनिस्ट्री के हैं। मैं बड़ी नम्रता से कहना चाहता हूँ कि रेलवे इन्स्पेक्टर दूसरे मंत्रालय से संबंधित हैं, केवल इसी आधार पर उन की रिपोर्ट को ठीक नहीं कहा जा सकता। अभी तक रेलवे मंत्री जी ने यह नहीं बतलाया है कि आखिर तोड़ फोड़ करने का मन्तव्य क्या था। उस क्षेत्र में इस से पहले तोड़ फोड़ की कोई घटनायें नहीं हुई। हाँ, जम्मू तथा काश्मीर की सीमा के निकट पंजाब के क्षेत्र में तोड़ फोड़ की कार्रवाइयें हुई हैं। जिन में कुछ लोगों पर सन्देह करने का कारण हो सकता है। लेकिन उस क्षेत्र में जहाँ पर कि रांची एक्सप्रेस की दुर्घटना हुई कोई तोड़ फोड़ की कार्रवाई करेगा, इस प्रकार का सन्देह करने के कोई कारण नहीं हैं, और अगर

हों तो मैं रेलवे मंत्री जी से कहूंगा कि वे रेलवे इन्स्पेक्टर को रिपोर्ट दिखला कर जनता के मन में जो सन्देह पैदा हो गये हैं दूर नहीं कर सकते। उन को दूर करने का एक ही तरीका है कि इस दुर्घटना की जांच किसी हाई कोर्ट जज के द्वारा कराई जाय। समाचार पत्रों में इस प्रकार की बातें छपी हैं कि दुर्घटना की बात को मानने के लिये हम तैयार नहीं हैं। मैं इस सम्बन्ध में अपनी कुछ राय देना नहीं चाहता लेकिन मेरा निवेदन है दुर्घटना की बात कह कर आप लोगों का समाधान नहीं कर सकते। अगर तोड़ फोड़ हुई है तो किस ने की? उस का उद्देश्य क्या था? किसी भी सन्देह के परे यह बात साबित होनी चाहिये कि यह दुर्घटना तोड़ फोड़ का परिणाम है, अन्यथा इस पर विश्वास करना सम्भव नहीं होगा।

मैं मुख्य रूप से मैनपुरी के निकट जो दुर्घटना हुई है उस के बारे में अपने विचार प्रकट करना चाहता हूँ। मैं ने घटनास्थल पर जा कर के भी कुछ जानकारी प्राप्त की है, मैंने रेलवे कर्मचारियों से भी कुछ बात की है। यह जो दुर्घटना हुई है इस का कारण दिया गया है कि रेलगाड़ी तेज रफ्तार से चल रही थी और रेल मंत्री जी कहते हैं कि नियम-अनुसार ३० मील की रफ्तार से इस इंजिन को नहीं चलना चाहिये था। उन का कहना है कि तेज रफ्तार से चल रही थी लेकिन उन के वक्तव्य से यह प्रकट नहीं होता कि कितनी तेज रफ्तार से चल रही थी। जहाँ तक मेरी जानकारी है, और मैंने रेलवे कर्मचारियों से बात चीत कर के पता लगाया है, जहाँ तक मेरा अनुमान है, रेल गाड़ी १२ मील प्रति घंटे की रफ्तार से चल रही थी। जिस स्टेशन से रेल गाड़ी चली, अगर आप उस का हिसाब लगाय कि कितने घंटे पर रेलगाड़ी वहाँ पहुँची, कितने बजे वहाँ पहुँची और कितने बजे वहाँ से छूटी तो आप को सारी बातें मालूम हो जायेंगी। यह दुर्घटना



किसी रेलवे स्टेशन पर नहीं हुई थी, बीच में हुई थी। बहरहाल सवाल यह उठता है कि यह रेलगाड़ी अगर तज रफ्तार से चला रही थी तो क्यों चल रही थी। अगर यह मान लिया जाये कि रेलगाड़ी तीस मील की रफ्तार से चल रही थी तो क्यों चल रही थी? क्या रेल गाड़ी लेट थी? कितनी लेट थी? क्या ड्राइवर को आदेश दिया गया था कि रेलगाड़ी तेज रफ्तार से चलाई जाय।

13.58 hrs.

[SHRI JAGANATHA RAO in the Chair]

रेलगाड़ी में जो मुसाफिर थे, मैं ने उन से भी बात की थी और उन्होंने कहा कि रेलगाड़ी तेज रफ्तार से नहीं चल रही थी। जिस वक्त दुर्घटना हुई है वहां आस पास खेतों में काम करने वाले लोग भी कहते हैं कि रेल गाड़ी बहुत तेज रफ्तार से नहीं चल रही थी। जहां तक मुसाफिरों का सम्बन्ध है, अगर मुसाफिर किसी गाड़ी में बैठते हैं और यह गाड़ी तीस मील प्रति घंटे के हिसाब से ज्यादा तेज चलती है तो पैसजरो के लिये यह पहचानना कठिन नहीं है कि रेल गाड़ी बहुत तेज चल रही है। अगर उस रेल गाड़ी में बैठे हुए यात्री कहते हैं कि रेल गाड़ी तेज रफ्तार से नहीं चल रही थी। अगर यह मान भी लिया जाये कि तेज चल रही थी तो क्यों चल रही थी? फिर रेल मंत्री जी यह कहते हैं कि ड्राइवर ने ब्रेक लगाया। मैं पूछना चाहता हूँ कि ब्रेक क्यों लगाया गया? क्या रेल मार्ग पर कोई बाधा पैदा हो गई थी? बीच में कोई धादमी आ गया, कोई ब्रैलगाड़ी आ गई, कोई और संकट आ गया मार्ग में? फिर ड्राइवर को ब्रेक लगाने की जरूरत क्यों पड़ी?

यहां पर ए० डब्ल्यू० डी० एजिनो की चर्चा की गई। क्या यह बात सच नहीं है कि अगर इस इंजिन पर एक दम से ब्रेक लगा दिया जाये तो इतनी बड़ी दुर्घटना नहीं हो सकती? जो ड्राइवर इन एनजिनो को ले जाते हैं, मैं ने उन से बात चीत की, और

उन्होंने कहा कि अगर एक दम से ब्रेक लगा भी दिया जाय, यद्यपि यह स्पष्ट नहीं है कि एक दम से ब्रेक क्यों लगाया गया, लेकिन अगर यह मान भी लिया जाय कि एक दम से ब्रेक लगा दिया गया, तो भी इतनी बड़ी दुर्घटना होने का कोई कारण नहीं है। मैं चाहूंगा कि रेल मंत्री जी इन बातों पर प्रकाश डालें। केवल इतना कहने से काम नहीं चलेगा कि गाड़ी तेज रफ्तार से चल रही थी, ड्राइवर ने ब्रेक लगा दिया और गाड़ी पटरी पर से उतर कर चली गयी। इस संबंध में रेल मंत्री जी का वक्तव्य तयों पर प्रकाश नहीं डालता। रेलवे इंस्पेक्टर की जांच पर विश्वास करके हम नहीं बैठ सकते।

14 hrs.

मैं यह भी जानना चाहूंगा कि क्या यह सच नहीं है कि रेलवे ड्राइवरों को गाड़ी को तेज रफ्तार से चलाने के लिये प्रोत्साहित किया जाता है? रेलवे गजट देखन से पता चलता है कि ड्राइवरों को इस बात के लिए इनाम दिये जाते हैं कि वे गाड़ी को तेज रफ्तार से ले गये और मैं एक ऐसा मामला भी जानता हूँ कि जिस में एक ड्राइवर के खिलाफ इसलिये कार्रवाई की गई कि वह गाड़ी लेट हो गई थी। यह कहा गया कि तेज रफ्तार से चलाओ तो उस ने कहा कि मैं बूढ़ा हो गया हूँ, मैं तेज रफ्तार से नहीं ले जा सकता यह मेरी शक्ति में नहीं है तो उस रेलवे ड्राइवर के खिलाफ कार्रवाई की गयी। अगर आप रेलवे ड्राइवरों को इसलिये प्रोत्साहन देंगे कि वे गाड़ियों को तेज रफ्तार से चलायें तो फिर दुर्घटनाओं से नहीं बचा जा सकता।

मैं यह भी जानना चाहूंगा कि क्या यह सच नहीं है कि यह इंजिन जिस ट्रैक पर चल रहा था वह ट्रैक इतने इंजिन का बोझा नहीं सह सकती थी। यह ट्रैक ६० पाउंड की थी जबकि इस प्रकार के इंजिन के लिए १२६

## [श्री बाजपेयी]

पाउंड की ट्रेक होनी चाहिये। क्या इस बात का पता लगाया गया है कि इस ट्रेक की ठीक से जांच नहीं की गई थी। मुझे पता चला है कि पिछले तीन साल से इस लाइन पर ट्रेक रिक्वाडिंग नहीं किया गया है। इस ट्रेक रिक्वाडिंग मशीन के द्वारा ट्रेक की छान बीन की जाती है, पर यह पिछले तीन साल से नहीं की गई थी। डी० एस० की स्पेशल भी इस बात पर कई महीने से नहीं पहुंची। मैं मंत्री जी से जानना चाहूंगा कि तथ्य क्या हैं? और यदि ट्रेक खराब थी तो रेलवे का जो ड्राइवर मारा गया उस के माथे पर सारा दोष थाप कर रेलवे मंत्री और रेलवे प्रशासन अपनी जिम्मेदारी से नहीं बच सकते।

सभापति जी, मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि अगर गाड़ी तेज रफ्तार से चल रही थी और ड्राइवर को ब्रेक लगाना था तो हमें यह नहीं भुलना चाहिये कि वह अनुभवी व्यक्ति था और अगर इंजिन को ब्रेक लगाने से गाड़ी के लौट जाने और मुसाफिरों और ड्राइवर के मारे जाने की आशंका होती तो वह ऐसा कभी न करता क्योंकि कोई भी ड्राइवर अपनी जान की और यात्रियों की जान की चिन्ता किये बगैर नहीं रह सकता और अगर एक दम से ब्रेक लगाने से गाड़ी के उलट जाने की सम्भावना हो तो ड्राइवर इस को जान सकता है।

मैं यह भी जानना चाहूंगा कि क्या इस ट्रेक पर गाड़ी ले जाने से पहले ड्राइवर में शिकायत नहीं की थी कि यह ट्रेक ठीक नहीं है, इस में मुझे कठिनाई का अनुभव होता है। आप का आज तो ऐसा कहना सरल है कि ऐसी कोई शिकायत नहीं की गयी। मगर मुझे छान बीन से पता लगा है कि इस तरह की शिकायतें पहले ड्राइवरों न की थीं अगर कोई कार्रवाई नहीं की गई, ट्रेक की जांच बढ़ताल नहीं की गई और इस का परिणाम यह है कि वह दुर्घटना हमारे सामने आ गयी।

मैं यह भी जानना चाहूंगा कि क्या यह सच नहीं है कि इंजिनों के फेल होने की ठीक रिपोर्ट नहीं की जाती। क्या यह सच नहीं है कि शैंड से डिफेक्टिव इंजिन दिये जाते हैं और क्या यह सच नहीं है कि अगर कोई ड्राइवर शिकायत करता है कि यह इंजिन खराब है मैं इस को नहीं ले जाऊंगा तो उस के खिलाफ कार्रवाई की जाती है। मुझे मालूम है कि एक ड्राइवर को ऐसे डिफेक्टिव इंजिन की शिकायत करने के लिये और उसे न ले जाने के लिये चार्जशीट दिया गया।

श्री जगजीवन राम : मैं इस केस को जानना चाहूंगा।

श्री बाजपेयी : मैं इस मामले को आप के सामने रखूंगा।

श्री स० मो० बनर्जी : ऐसी शिकायतें बहुत हैं।

श्री बाजपेयी : मैं अपने भाषण को समाप्त करते हुए अन्त में यही मांग करूंगा कि इन रेल दुर्घटनाओं की अदालती जांच की जाये। रेलवे की विभागीय जांच या सरकार के दूसरे मंत्रालय से संबंधित अधिकारी की जांच जनता में पैदा हुए संदेहों को दूर नहीं कर सकती।

मैं ने रांची एक्सप्रेस के सम्बन्ध में कुछ नहीं कहा है यद्यपि उस के बारे में भी कहने की बहुत सी बातें हैं; लेकिन मैं नपुरी दुर्घटना के सम्बन्ध में जो तथ्य सामने आये हैं उन के आधार पर मैं कह सकता हूँ कि रेलवे प्रशासन तथ्यों को छिपाने की कोशिश कर रहा है। सही बात किसी के सामने नहीं आने देना चाहता और इस प्रकार अपने पापों पर परदा डालना चाहता है। इसलिए मेरा निवेदन है कि जब तक इस मामले की अदालती जांच नहीं होगी रेलवे प्रशासन जनता के जीवन के साथ खिलवाड़ करने के अपने दोष से नहीं बच सकता।

अभी मेरे मित्र श्री राजेन्द्र सिंह ने कहा कि श्री लाल बहादुर शास्त्री द्वारा दिये गये त्यागपत्र के उदाहरण का अनुकरण करते हुए हमारे वर्तमान रेल मंत्री जो त्याग पत्र दें। लेकिन उन से ऐसी आशा नहीं है, यद्यपि यह त्याग पत्र देने का समय है क्योंकि चुनाव आ रहे हैं। जिस समय श्री शास्त्री ने त्यागपत्र दिया था उस समय कहा गया था कि हम स्वस्थ लोकतंत्री परम्पराएं कायम कर रहे हैं और उस का ढिंढोरा पीटा गया था। उस समय प्रधान मंत्री जी ने सदन में खड़े हो कर कहा था :

"I do feel, from constitutional propriety, that we should set an example in this matter."

शास्त्री जी ने त्यागपत्र दिया तो कहा गया कि हम उदाहरण उग्रस्थित कर रहे हैं, यद्यपि प्रधान मंत्री जी ने कहा था कि शास्त्री जी किसी पुत्र के टूट जाने के लिए व्यक्तिगत रूप से जिम्मेवार नहीं हैं। मैं जानना चाहूंगा कि अब वे लोकतंत्री परम्पराएं कहाँ गयीं, रेलवे मंत्री उस उदाहरण का अनुगमन क्यों नहीं करते अपने प्रशासन और रेलवे कर्मचारियों की कमजोरियों के लिए और यात्रियों की जिन्दगी के साथ खिलवाड़ करने के लिए। रेलवे मंत्री जी के लिए सम्मानजनक रास्ता यही है कि वे इस समय अपने पद से त्याग पत्र दे दें और उस से पहले इन दुर्घटनाओं की अदालती जांच का आदेश दें।

**सरदार अ० सिंह सहगल (जंजगीर) :**

सभापति महोदय, माननीय रेलवे मंत्री महोदय ने रेलवे दुर्घटनाओं के बारे में अपना वक्तव्य दिया है। मैं बड़े अदब से उन का ध्यान उस रेलवे डीरेलमेंट की ओर दिलाना चाहता हूँ जो कि १५ अक्टूबर सन् १९६१ को भवनाटक और खुनहरा के बीच साउथ ईस्टर्न रेलवे में हुआ। इस के मुताल्लिक मैंने एक पत्र माननीय मंत्री जी को लिखा, एक पत्र चेयरमैन रेलवे बोर्ड को लिखा और एक पत्र जनरल मैनेजर, साउथ ईस्टर्न रेलवे, को लिखा। मैंने उस में

यह दर्शाया था कि एक्सीडेंट होने के बाद ४१ घंटे तक मुसाफिरों को वहाँ पड़ा रहना पड़ा। वहाँ पर मुसाफिरों का शान्त रखने के लिए जिस प्रकार कार्य किया गया था उस के लिए वहाँ के स्टेशन मास्टर आदि गवाह हैं। यही नहीं आप के अफसर दलाल साहब भी बतला सकते हैं कि मुसाफिर किस कदर ऐजीटेटेड थे और उन को संभालना और कानू में रखना एक कांग्रेसी होने के नाते और इस मुल्क की जनता का एक व्यक्ति होने के नाते और जो डिमाक्रेसी आज चल रही है उसके नाते मेरा कर्तव्य हो गया था। मुसाफिर लोग गाड़ियों को जला देना चाहते थे वे इतने ऐजीटेटेड हो गये थे। मैंने और मेरे कुछ अन्य मित्रों ने उन को समझाया कि आखिर एक्सीडेंट हुआ करते हैं और गलती हो जाया करती है।

मैं निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि १५ अक्टूबर को एक्सीडेंट हुआ और १७ तारीख को १० बजे खोड़ी से गाड़ी वहाँ से जाती है बिनासपुर के लिए। मैं माननीय मंत्री महोदय से प्रार्थना करूंगा कि इस की तहकीकात करें और देखें कि इतनी देर क्यों लगायी गयी। जो इंजिनियर वहाँ पर मौजूद थे उन्होंने माँके पर बताया कि गाड़ी १६ को ही ६ बजे, फिर उसके बाद ९ बजे रात को जायेगी फिर उसके बाद ३ बजे रात को रीजनल सुपरिन्टन्डेन्ट साहब से टेलीफोन पर बात करनी चाही क्योंकि हम उन को स्थिति बताना चाहते थे। लेकिन उन से बात करने का अवसर टेलीफोन आपरेटर ने नहीं दिया। आप तहकीकात करेंगे तो आप को मेरी बात की सचाई का पता लगेगा। मैं आप से अर्ज करना चाहता हूँ कि ऐसे समय में हर एक का कर्तव्य हो जाता है कि जल्दी से जल्दी लोगों को सहायता पहुँचायी जाये। ऐसे समय में बहुत समझदारी से काम लेना चाहिए और अपने कर्तव्य का पूरी तरह पालन करना चाहिए। ऐसा नहीं होना चाहिए कि ऐसा स्टेटमेंट दे दिया जाये कि लोग और भड़क उठें। मैं समझता हूँ कि ऐसे मौकों पर बिना किसी देर के मंत्रालय को इन कठिनाइयों

## [सरदार अ० सि० सहगल]

को दूर करने के लिए सामने आना चाहिए और स्थिति को समझ कर कदम उठाना चाहिए। और मंत्रालय जब आगे आता है तो हमें देखना चाहिए कि कहां तक यह चीज ठीक है। प्रेस में दौड़ जाना और वहां पर अपनी ही बात को रखना मैं समझता हूँ आजकल के जमाने में अच्छी चीज नहीं है। हम प्रजातंत्रीय सिद्धान्तों पर चल रहे हैं और इन सिद्धान्तों को देखते हुए कोई ऐसी चीज की जाये तो वह अच्छी नहीं होगी।

इन सब बातों को देखते हुए हमारा यह पहला फर्ज होना चाहिए कि हम देखें कि दरअसल वे क्या कारण थे कि जिन की वजह से ये डिरेलमेंट हुए, क्या कहीं पर कोई फिशप्लेट्स तो नहीं निकाली गई है या जो हमारे वाइंट्समैन हैं, उन की गलतियों की वजह से तो ये नहीं हुए हैं? ये सब चीज हैं जिन की तरफ हमें ध्यान देना है। हमारे यहां के जो पदाधिकारी हैं, वे पहले इन बातों की तहकीकात करते हैं और उन को यह करना भी चाहिए।

यहां पर यह मांग की गई है कि ज्यूडिशल इन्क्वायरी होनी चाहिए। मैं समझता हूँ कि अगर ज्यूडिशल इन्क्वायरी की जरूरत होगी तो हमारे माननीय मंत्री जी उसको करवाने में कर्मा भी पीछे नहीं रहेंगे और खुद ही आगे आ कर कहेंगे कि ज्यूडिशल इन्क्वायरी हो। लेकिन होता यह है कि जब थोड़ी सी बात को हम आगे बढ़ा देते हैं तो बहुत शंका में पड़ जाते हैं। इन सब चीजों से बचने के लिए मैं समझता हूँ कि हम ठंडे दिमाग से काम लें और यह देखें कि जो कुछ भी हुआ है उस में दरअसल मंत्रालय की कितनी गलती है।

मेरे एक माननीय मित्र ने कहा है कि शास्त्री जी ने इस्तीफा दे दिया था जब कोई एक्सीडेंट हुआ था। मैं समझता हूँ कि अपने अपने काम करने के तरीके होते हैं। उन्होंने देखा होगा कि वे इस चीज को बरदाश्त नहीं

कर सकते हैं, इस वास्ते उन्होंने इस्तीफा दे दिया। इसी आधार पर जितने भी मंत्रालयों के लोग हैं उन सभी को अगर आप कहेंगे कि वे इस्तीफा दे दें तो मैं समझता हूँ कि एक गलत चीज होगी। इस तरह से कोई भी सरकार नहीं चल सकती है।

अन्य में मैं यही कहना चाहता हूँ कि इन सारी चीजों पर आप गौर करें और जो बातें मैं ने रखी हैं, उन की तहकीकात करने की कृपा करें।

**Shri Tangamani:** Mr. Chairman, Sir, when the Session commenced on the 20th of November, the hon. Minister was pleased to lay a statement expressing his concern. The House was also concerned and we all expected that the discussion will be initiated by the hon. Minister himself. I am very sorry to say that this discussion had to be initiated by some of the hon. Members of this House.

Since the first accident took place on the 20th October, several newspapers have come out with editorial comments about the weak controlling of this administration; and the latest one is the editorial in *The Hindu* of Madras, dated the 30th November, 1961. For want of time I only request the hon. Minister and the Railway Board to go through this very carefully. One of the demands that have been made is not only for a judicial enquiry but also for an enquiry by a high-power committee to consider—

"How far is track maintenance adequate to the extra pressures to which tracks have been subjected because of heavier engines and the vastly increased traffic?" and

"An independent committee consisting of senior Members of Parliament, retired officials and representative public men, with special reference to travel safety and operational efficiency".

This is more or less the gist of the demand. This has also been demanded by those who wanted this discussion to start. We wanted to discuss the need for the appointment of a high-power committee to go into the working of the Railways with particular reference to accidents and difficulties of administration; the need for judicial enquiry into the accidents referred to in the Statement; and the need to create a reassuring climate in the country regarding the efficient working of the Railways.

In 1956 when the Ariyalur accident took place, there was a judicial enquiry. I am very sorry to say that most of the points which were referred to by the Judge in that judicial enquiry have not been rectified or taken up seriously by the Railway Administration. That will be my first submission. That is a serious omission and serious error on the part of the Railway Administration.

Then the Shahnawaz Khan Committee was appointed. In their report also they had mentioned that there is a heavy percentage of overdue wagons, locomotives etc. on the line. I think it is in paragraph 168. And in paragraph 138 they say that there was regular want of repair materials. These things do continue even to this day. That is why, for going into the entire question in detail, I want that there should be a judicial enquiry, on the three major accidents that took place, on the 20th October, the 29th October and the 9th November, taking the death toll to 76. That, more or less, is the record which was created in 1957-58.

Coming to the accidents, many of the Calcutta papers, irrespective of their political affiliations, have published in detail the evidence given by some of the passengers themselves. That may be taken into consideration. One point to which the hon. Member, Shri Vajpayee also referred, is the

death of such an experienced driver like A. V. Rao, with 30 years of service. He had to lay down his life. This very engine WP7354 has been subjected to severe criticism, shall I say, or severe strictures by eminent locomotive drivers. I have got the names of all these people. They have complained about this very engine and this has been always known as 'the mad engine'.

**Shri Ranga (Tenali):** Will the hon. Minister enlighten us whether this engine is still put into service?

**Shri Jagjivan Ram:** It has been more or less dismantled for the examination of the Inspector.

**Shri Tangamani:** There are the different Schedules. Schedule I is about what has happened after the locomotive has travelled 2,000 miles; Schedule II is what has happened after 6,000 or 10,000 miles; and there is the MOH about what has happened after it has travelled 50,000 miles. May I know whether any of these have been followed in the Kharagpur Loco Shed or any of the Loco Sheds? That has got to be gone into in great detail.

**Shri Ranga:** In regard to other engines also.

**Shri Tangamani:** Having said this, I want to disabuse the minds of people of sabotage. The Mover of this Motion also stated that sabotage is not possible. It is on record that first class passengers travelling by this train had said that there was no indication of that. There is also the evidence of the RMS employees. They have said that they were carrying valuables and there was no attempt to loot. Shri S. V. Ramaswami himself has stated that 15 minutes before this train passed this particular point there was a train which had gone. There are about 280 yards before we come to the main road. The preliminary enquiry has tried to divert the attention of people by saying that there was sabotage. Is it not a case of riveted rails? I would like to know whe-

[Shri Tangamani]

ther they were wooden sleepers or steel sleepers. We have to disabuse our minds of the question of sabotage because this does not appear to be the intention, economic or political—whatever it is.

About the second accident I do share the feeling of the hon. Minister. In this accident about 16 pilgrims from Ceylon were killed. I am sure, the sentiments expressed by the hon. Minister would be appreciated by the people of Ceylon. This happened in a passenger train.

Another thing which I would like to mention is the way these locomotives are maintained and the conditions of the track. Then, in the case of the second accident and the third accident, there has been this telescoping. In other words, the bogies that were being used were not integrated bogies—integral coaches. How long are we going to use these trains and old carriages which, when telescope, take a heavy toll of human lives? By what time are we going to replace them? It is on record now that as a result of telescoping, a large number of people have been killed. This is a point on which I want a categorical reply. Naturally the hon. Members are very angry. 75 people were killed between 20th October and 9th November; it is a very serious thing and we do not want the record to go beyond 76 by the end of this year. I also want to refer the hon. Minister to certain statements made by responsible members of the legislature in Bengal. One such statement was made by Narayan Chaudhuri, an M.L.A. representing Kharagpur. That may be gone into. Several hon. Members referred to the question of the resignation of the Minister or Ministers. Resignation alone would not solve the problem. In 1956, an hon. Minister resigned and we were all very happy that at least the hon. Minister resigned and the Prime Minister made a reference to this. But even after the resignation things do not appear to have changed very

much. That is the real point. How far are we going to tone up this administration and also take into confidence the views of those brilliant men who had to lay down their lives—Shri A. V. Rao and others, very senior men working in the locos. In this connection I say—though with some hesitancy—let the members of the Railway Board spend more time in India than outside. Instead of taking trips to the other countries, let them go and spend time in various loco sheds and workshops. Let not Kharagpur be repeated in Golden Rock, in Perambur. If you go into the whole question, you will know that the very things which had been raised in the Shahnawaz Khan Committee still continue in many of the workshops.

In conclusion, I feel that it is necessary that a judicial enquiry is ordered into these three major accidents. It is also necessary that a high-powered committee should go into the whole question of accidents and to tone up the administration. In conclusion, I would like to say, as *The Hindu* has mentioned in its editorial, that the assurances of the Minister had not allayed the fears of the MPs. We want to be told categorically as to what he proposes to do beyond what he has already stated when he laid the statement on the 20th of last month at the beginning of this session.

**Shri S. M. Banerjee:** Mr. Chairman, I associate myself with the sentiments expressed by my hon. friends Shri Tangamani, Vajpayee and Shri Rajinder Singh. Accidents in the railways, I may say, take place due to failure on the part of the human elements employed on the operation of railway transport of failure of permanent way and signalling equipment or failure of rolling stock. Now another reason had been attributed to the accident: sabotage but in these three accidents I do not think the sabotage theory has been proved nor has anyone been apprehended for the act of sabotage. After the major accident at Mauri,

there was a good atmosphere and there were of course minor accidents. But after some time came the Siliguri accident which Shri Vittal Rao wanted to discuss in this House. After the Siliguri accident, came the Ghatsila accident and then the Mainpuri accident. 75-76 persons have lost their lives. I do not know whether we should demand the resignation of the hon. Minister. It is no use demanding the resignation of the Minister; if we are not interested in his continuing, we should try our best to see he is defeated in the elections. But I would surely ask the hon. Minister to consider very seriously and soberly whether this group of pensioners in the Railway Board should continue any more. After retirement they are allowed extensions because they are very efficient and I do not know whether these accidents are an ugly or glorious manifestation of efficiency in our country. Why should pensioners be allowed to function at the cost of human life? Are we not getting good officers? There are very good officers who could be promoted and asked to do the work with efficiency. But some people are kept on deliberately like this and I do not know why, with what relations, they are getting along like this. I would request the hon. Minister to demand the resignation of the Railway Board members who are responsible directly. The Minister after all is an elected representative and one can make him resign. But the Railway Administration should be geared up. The Railway Board members must behave not in this fashion when the news of the accident appears, they want to wriggle out of it by saying that it is a sabotage. Had it been any other country, when accident after accident appears to be happening, not only the Members of Parliament but the people of the country would have demanded the resignation of the entire cabinet. But we are patient and generally contented. We do not want that people should die and we should be only sorry for it. We are equally sorry for the death of the Buddhist pilgrims.

1544(A) LSD—6.

What has happened to the Shanawaz Committee report? Here is a glaring instance as to how the recommendations of the Railway Accident Enquiry Committee has been ignored. He was the Chairman of the committee and in para 168 of its report the committee mentioned "heavy percentage of overdue periodical wagons are on line."

What is happening in the coal belts? It is welcome that new lines are laid but they do not take into consideration whether those box wagons or big engines can go in those lines safely. It is true that we are short of wagons and we want more trains. But it is equally necessary to consider whether those lines are capable of bearing those engines and wagons. It is a matter to be considered very seriously.

Much has been said about the Mainpuri accident by my hon. friend Shri Vajpayee and it was said that the train was running at more than 30 miles speed. I have travelled many times in that particular line and I feel that I should be happy that these passenger trains are running at all. Their condition is so bad that it will not be a wonder if on some day those passenger trains did not run at all. I think that we should not attribute motives to the poor driver who must have spent a major portion of his life and his youth, working for the country either as a driver of a particular engine or in some other capacity. If there is a judicial enquiry it will at least prove whether there was sabotage or not and what were the factors which contributed or aggravated the accident. A judicial enquiry is absolutely essential. It is also high time that some committee is appointed which should formulate rules and regulations relating to the safety of the railway transport, and effecting maintenance of the rolling stock and permanent way to a desired standard and for effecting regular inspection over the Railways in respect of safety. The question has been very rightly put by

[Shri S. M. Banerjee]

Shri Tangamani and we do not know what is the answer. If an engine is not working properly and a driver says that he is not going to have that engine, he is given a chargesheet. The hon. Minister wanted such instances. I can give him many instances. If the train is late due to bad coal or due to other reasons, he is asked to go and reach the destination in time. Much has been said in this House about the late running of the trains. The time table has been adjusted in a particular way. Suppose a train starts from Delhi at a particular time. Supposing it is to reach Howrah at 10 A.M., it must reach Howrah exactly at 10 A.M. If the train is late in between, that is not taken into account. The driver should see that train reaches at 10 A.M., whether with less passengers, or more passengers, whether with driver or without driver. Drivers have a genuine complaint that they are made to work like this and certain factors which are responsible for the accidents are not satisfactorily attended to and there is no proper supervision over maintenance of rolling stock.

Of course, we cannot get back the lives of those who have been killed in these accidents; but we should try and see that such accidents do not take place in future. I once again associate myself with the sentiments expressed by my hon. friends and earnestly request the hon. Minister to consider seriously whether this group of pensioners should be allowed to be in the Railway Board or whether they should not be made to resign and that will be good for the railway employees, whether of class II or class III, because they cannot share the responsibility of the Board.

**Mr. Chairman:** The House will now take up Private Members' Business.

**Shri T. B. Vittal Rao:** I have a submission to make. In view of the im-

portant nature of the discussion, I request that more time may be allotted for this, because many more Members want to participate. We need not adhere rigidly to the rules.

**Mr. Chairman:** That will be considered the next day by the Speaker.

14.32 hrs.

#### HINDU SUCCESSION (AMENDMENT) BILL\*

(INSERTION OF NEW SECTION 23A) BY  
SHRI AJIT SINGH SARHADI

**Shri Ajit Singh Sarhadi (Ludhiana):** I beg to move for leave to introduce a Bill further to amend the Hindu Succession Act, 1956.

**Mr. Chairman:** The question is:

"That leave be granted to introduce a Bill further to amend the Hindu Succession Act, 1956."

*The motion was adopted.*

**Shri Ajit Singh Sarhadi:** Sir, I introduce the Bill.

#### FILM INDUSTRY WORKERS (IMPROVEMENT OF WORKING CONDITIONS) BILL\*

By SHRI GORAY

**Shri Goray (Poona):** Sir, I beg to move for leave to introduce a Bill to provide machinery for fixation of wages and for improvement of working conditions of workers in the Film Industry.

**Mr. Chairman:** The question is:

"That leave be granted to introduce a Bill to provide machinery for fixation of wages for improvement of working conditions of workers in the Film Industry."

*The motion was adopted.*