

**STATEMENT RE BONUS COMMISSION REPORT (1964)**

THE DEPUTY MINISTER IN THE MINISTRY OF LABOUR AND EMPLOYMENT (SHRI RATANLAL KISHORILAL LVIYA) : Sir, I beg to lay on the Table a copy of the Report of the Bonus Commission.

The Report raises a number of important issues and there is a Note of Dissent. The Report is still under study and it is not possible to state at this stage what the decisions of the Government will be on the Report.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA (West Bengal): How long the study will take, because when the Commission was appointed we were given to understand that the Government would act in the matter expeditiously? Now, we find that the Report has been in session of the Government for some time and I do not know why they have sent it to the States for their opinion. That was not meant originally. Now, we are told in the middle of the Budget Session that they will take still some more time. What is the reason, when a broad measure of agreement was arrived at a tripartite meeting? Just because some people have given a Note of Dissent the Government have to delay its decisions. Is it not necessary that the Government should expedite its consideration and announce its decision before the country?

THE MINISTER OF LABOUR AND EMPLOYMENT (SHRI D. SANJIVAYYA) The Report was received on the 24th January this year.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: One month has passed.

SHRI D. SANJIVAYYA: Yes, one month has passed. But the financial implications have got to be worked out. The Ministries which are in charge of the public sector undertakings have to be consulted because the recommendations in the Report apply to the public sector undertakings also. In a similar way, the State Governments are also in charge of certain public sector undertakings. They have

got to be consulted. Therefore, certainly it will take some time. But we will see to it that this examination and consultation is expedited, the recommendations are taken into consideration and decisions taken thereon early.

SHRI NIREN GHOSH (West Bengal) : If you want to consider it, it should be in a better direction. Generally your consideration is to move in a worse direction, retrograde direction.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think he has made his point clear.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA (Uttar Pradesh) : The public sector was represented on the Commission. Mr. K. B. Mathur was a Member of the Commission on behalf of the public sector and when the public sector was represented, why is it that now the Minister comes forward and presents the public sector in the country as the reason for the delay? When Mr. Mathur represented the public sector, he represented both the Centre and the State Governments which run the public sector.

SHRI D. SANJIVAYYA: That is true, but there is a Minute of Dissent also by one of the representatives of the employers in the private sector. How far the objections raised by him are valid should be taken into consideration before we finally take a decision.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The House would be happy if the consideration is expedited.

SHRI D. SANJIVAYYA: That is what I assure the House.

SHRI KHANDUBHAI K. DESAI: (Gujarat): I want to put a small question, whether the majority report is by the representatives of the public sector and whose is the dissenting voice.

SHRI D. SANJIVAYYA: I have already made it very clear that the Minute of Dissent is by the representative of the private sector management.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I make a submission. It is a strange procedure. It was a joint Commission represented by all sections. Now, a Minute of

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta.]

Dissent was written by a representative of the employers. Surely that matter has been discussed in the Commission itself and the Commission has rejected it. That is why you got the recommendations of the Commission, although they are majority recommendations. But that matter has been settled and settled in the presence of the Government, the Government being a party to the Commission, participant in it. Why suddenly has it become necessary for the Government to be so solicitous in the matter? Just because they did not succeed in the Commission itself to carry with them the majority, the whole thing should be delayed now, in order to please the employers and their men. This is holding it to ransom. This is a kind of blackmail.

SHRI D. SANJIVAYYA: Government always takes into consideration the various views from whichever quarter they might come.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA: Sir, I would like to ask . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: No. I do not think any further useful information can be elicited at this stage. We will proceed to the discussion of the Railway Budget. I would ask Shri Shah Nawaz Khan to continue his speech.

#### THE BUDGET (RAILWAYS), 1964-65 — continued

THE DEPUTY MINISTER IN THE  
MINISTRY OF RAILWAYS (SHRI  
KHAN): Sir, yesterday  
House rose, I was discussing  
the subject of accidents due to over  
work. By and large the House will  
me that there has been a  
in the total number  
been indicated  
in full] in the review of railway

The numbers have come down  
progressively from 2272 in 1960-61 to 2084  
in 1961-62 and 2030 in 1962-63. This  
includes all types of the more serious  
accidents—collisions, derailments,  
trainrecking; tr\* < n\*

running into road traffic, fires, etc. So there  
has been by and large a decline in the total  
number of accidents.

My hon. friend, Shri Kumaran, referred to  
two cases particularly, in which he alleged  
that drivers and station masters had been  
working overtime. Sir, in the first instance he  
talked about the assistant station master at  
Bauridand, where one Shri Roy was the station  
master concerned. This station was in the  
process of being remodelled, the  
signalling equipment etc. was out of order, and  
the staff were working under those conditions  
when the station was working non-  
interlocked. It is a station which is not very  
heavily worked. There are 19 runs in 24 hours.  
Shri Roy was on duty from 8 A.M. to 8 P.M. He  
was on 12 hours' duty. Just at the time when he  
was due to be relieved, his colleague sent word  
to him that he would not be able to come and re-  
lieve him just then but that he would relieve him  
four hours later, that is, at about midnight. Shri  
Roy in order to accommodate his colleague,  
readily agreed to continue at work, just as he  
was going off duty the accident took place.  
He was on duty for about sixteen hours at  
a stretch, but the House will agree with me  
that he himself had readily agreed to work  
four hours extra in order to accommodate  
another colleague.

Then my friend quoted another instance of  
a driver, Shri Narayan. In this particular case,  
Shri Narayan ran past the signals and collided  
with a stationary train. He had had eleven  
hours' rest before he came on duty. So it could  
not be said that he was fatigued. He came on  
duty at 16 hours, that is 4 P.M. He was at Bhilai  
for 3 hours and 40 minutes, where he took rest  
during this time. He left Bhilai at about  
midnight and he should have reached Bilaspur  
at about 3.41 in the morning. But  
unfortunately on the way back just before he  
got to Bhilai, the train was detained at Tilda  
for an hour and a half due to hot axle. That is  
a thing which could not be foreseen by  
anybody, and if we take