

# 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 the possession 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 now 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 SHAH NAWAZ KHAN):** Sir, yesterday

House rose, I was discussing the number of accidents due to overloading. I said that the House will be concerned that there has been a decline in the total number of accidents. This has been indicated in the review of railway accidents.

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; trains

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 relieve 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 18 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 3.45 in the morning. But unfortunately on the way back just before he got into 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