

THE DEPUTY MINISTER FOR COMMUNICATIONS (SHRI RAJ BAHADUR): One.

SHRI S. MAHANTY: What is that one place, Sir?

SHRI RAJ BAHADUR: It is Keonjari district.

SHRI S. MAHANTY: When is it going to be linked up?

SHRI RAJ BAHADUR: Before the 31st March 1954.

\*227. [The questioner (Shri K. C. George) was absent. For answer, see col. 1693 infra.]

#### SERVICE RULES FOR THE CALCUTTA PORT EMPLOYEES

\*228. SHRI S. N. MAZUMDAR: Will the Minister for TRANSPORT be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that the Commissioners for the Port of Calcutta have forwarded a draft of the service rules for the employees of that port for Government's consideration;

(b) if so, whether the representatives of the recognised unions of the port employees were consulted before the drafting of the said rules; and

(c) whether the rules have been considered and approved by Government?

THE DEPUTY MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS AND TRANSPORT (SHRI O. V. ALAGESAN): (a) Yes.

(b) No.

(c) The matter is under consideration.

SHRI S. N. MAZUMDAR: Is my friend aware that a printed circular under the caption 'The Commissioners for the Port of Calcutta—Standing Orders' without the signature of any authority was circulated among the employees and that the departmental heads are strictly following the rules embodied in that circular?

SHRI O. V. ALAGESAN: Sir, that is a compilation of rules which, I

think, the hon. Member is referring to, and they were circulated, I think, in both the languages, both English and the local language. It is so.

SHRI S. N. MAZUMDAR: But may I know whether the opinions of the recognised unions were taken as regards this?

SHRI O. V. ALAGESAN: Sir, these rules will be certainly placed before the Port Commissioners and there are two representatives of labour sitting there.

SHRI C. G. K. REDDY: In answer to the question the hon. Minister said that the rules are being considered by the Government. My hon. friend then asked whether a certain printed circular containing certain rules was circulated to departmental heads and whether those departmental heads are following those rules in respect of conditions of service of employees. If the answer, as has been given by the hon. Minister, is 'Yes', how does he reconcile these two things? Under what authority were those rules circulated and under what authority are the departmental heads following them?

SHRI LAL BAHADUR: There are two sets of rules. One concerns the Standing Orders and the other is about the Fundamental and Subsidiary Rules, which are applicable to all Government of India servants. So, as regards the Standing Orders, as the Deputy Minister has said, they are merely a compilation of old rules and they have been circulated and they are being implemented and the administration is being run according to those rules. As regards the Fundamental Rules, they are generally applicable to the employees of the Port Trust but certain changes were suggested in a revised set of rules. Those revised rules had been sent here to the Transport Ministry. We are looking into them. They will again be referred to the Port Trust on which there are two labour representatives and they will get an opportunity to express their opinion there. The rules will be finalised after the Port Trust and the representatives of labour have ex-

pressed their views. As the labour representatives will have their say the hon. Member need not worry, and then only they will be finalised.

**PAYMENT OF BONUS TO THE TEMPORARY EMPLOYEES OF THE CALCUTTA PORT**

\*229. **SHRI S. N. MAZUMDAR:** Will the Minister for TRANSPORT be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that the temporary employees under the Commissioners for the Port of Calcutta who were recruited during the last war were given certain assurances regarding payment of bonus;

(b) if so, what were the assurances given; and

(c) whether these assurances have been carried out by the Port authorities?

**THE DEPUTY MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS AND TRANSPORT (SHRI O. V. ALAGESAN):** (a) Yes.

(b) The assurance relating to bonus was that one month's pay for each completed year of service would be granted to all temporary men who ceased to be in the Commissioners' employ by reason of death, discharge due to ill-health or for reasons other than misconduct or inefficiency.

(c) Yes.

\*230. [For answer, vide col. 1686 infra.]

\*231. [The questioner (Shri K. C. George) was absent. For answer, vide col. 1693 infra.]

\*232. [For answer, vide col. 1687 infra.]

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Opposition are putting questions but the Members are not here.

**ENQUIRY INTO THE SURROUNDING OF THE GENERAL MANAGER OF THE CHITTARANJAN LOCOMOTIVE WORKS BY THE WORKERS**

\*233. **SHRI S. N. MAZUMDAR:** Will the Minister for RAILWAYS be pleased to refer to the replies given to the supplementary questions asked in respect of

Starred Question No. 301 in the Council on the 14th September, 1953, and state:

(a) whether any enquiry has been made to ascertain the details of the incident in which the employees of the Chittaranjan Locomotive Works surrounded the General Manager;

(b) if so, what are the findings of the said enquiry; and

(c) whether Government have received any report in respect of the said incident from the General Manager?

**THE DEPUTY MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS AND TRANSPORT (SHRI O. V. ALAGESAN):** (a) and (b). A Committee of three senior officers which was set up to enquire into the details of the incident found some employees guilty of certain charges. I may add that it was not the General Manager who was involved in the incident but two other officers.

(c) Yes.

**SHRI S. N. MAZUMDAR:** May I know the date on which this incident took place?

**SHRI O. V. ALAGESAN:** Towards the end of May this year.

**SHRI S. N. MAZUMDAR:** May I know who is the officer involved?

**SHRI O. V. ALAGESAN:** One was the District Electrical Engineer and the other was the Town Engineer.

**SHRI S. N. MAZUMDAR:** May I know the details of the incident?

**SHRI O. V. ALAGESAN:** It was simple rowdyism. They surrounded these gentlemen and coerced them into attending the meeting and they made very objectionable speeches. A committee of senior officers, as I said, went into the whole thing and found them guilty, and they were punished also.

**SHRI S. N. MAZUMDAR:** I think the hon. Minister is confusing between the two things. The question was in reference to an answer given by the hon. Railway Minister to a previous question that the employees surrounded the General Manager to present some