

THE
PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES
(Part I—Questions and Answers)
OFFICIAL REPORT

Acc. No. 2526

Date 06/12/54

2073

HOUSE OF THE PEOPLE

Monday, 19th April, 1954

The House met at Two of the Clock.

[MR. SPEAKER *in the Chair*]

ORAL ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

B.C.G. VACCINATION

*1862. **Sari Dabhi:** Will the Minister of Health be pleased to state:

(a) the number of persons who have been tuberculin-tested and B.C.G. vaccinated so far in the Bombay State;

(b) whether any of the persons so vaccinated have suffered from any unfavourable reactions; and

(c) whether any of them have contracted Tuberculosis?

The Deputy Minister of Health (Shrimati Chandrasekhar): (a) Up to the end of February, 1954, 1,209,795 persons have been tuberculin tested and 208,588 persons have been B.C.G. vaccinated in Bombay State.

(b) and (c). No reports of any such cases have been received.

Shri Dabhi: May I know in which towns and cities of the State the people were tuberculin-tested and B.C.G. vaccinated and the figures for each of them?

Shrimati Chandrasekhar: I have not got the break-up.

Shri Dabhi: May I know what period lapses before the effect of the B.C.G.

94 PSD.

2074

vaccination can be tested and whether there is any approximate period for which this vaccination can give immunity?

The Minister of Health (Rajkumari Amrit Kaur): In regard to this, as far as experiments in Europe are concerned, they hope that the period of immunity will last for several years, but we have not got any actual information to be placed before the House.

Shri Dabhi: May I know whether there is any difference of opinion among the medical experts regarding the efficacy or otherwise of this vaccination?

Rajkumari Amrit Kaur: No, Sir, the majority opinion is in favour of it.

Shri T. S. A. Chettiar: May I know whether B.C.G. vaccination is done only through governmental agency or also through private agencies?

Shrimati Chandrasekhar: Non-governmental agencies also take up B.C.G. vaccination.

VILLUPURAM GOODS YARD

*1863. **Shri Muniswamy:** Will the Minister of Railways be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that the Villupuram goods yard is not adequate to deal with the present day increased goods traffic; and

(b) if so, what steps, if any, Government propose to take in this respect?

The Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Railways and Transport (Shri Shah Nawaz Khan): (a) The capacity of Villupuram Goods Yard

is adequate to meet normal current requirements. On occasions, however, abnormal pressure results in slight hold ups.

(b) Keeping in view the urgency of works at different locations and their priority, improvements in the Villupuram Yard, with a view to eliminating the occasional hold ups, will be taken in hand in due course.

Shri Muniswamy: May I know whether representations explaining the difficulties of the Villupuram Yard have been received by Government and if so what action has been taken?

Shri Shahnawaz Khan: Certain representations were received and they received due consideration. I would like to inform the hon. Member that since August, the situation has very materially improved there.

Shri Muniswamy: Are Government aware that the staff in the goods yard there are punished often, because of this inconvenience and the congestion in goods yard?

Mr. Speaker: The insinuation seems to me to be that though the conveniences offered by the yard are not probably good, the staff is held responsible and they are punished.

Shri Shahnawaz Khan: It is true that the holding capacity of the Villupuram yard is very limited. It is 602 vehicles and the daily incoming trains and vehicles going out from there come to 550. There is a lot of congestion and we are taking steps to improve the yard facilities.

Mr. Speaker: He has not replied whether the staff are punished.

Shri Shahnawaz Khan: The staff are not punished. The yard facilities may not be adequate and we are taking steps to improve it.

Mr. Speaker: But are the staff punished or not?

The Deputy Minister of Railways and Transport (Shri Alagesan): We have no knowledge of it.

P. L. M. WEEK

*1864. **Pandit D. N. Tiwary:** Will the Minister of Railways be pleased to state:

(a) whether there has been any improvement in the safe transit of packages after the observance of Pack, Label and Mark Week;

(b) if so, to what extent; and

(c) the number of packages lost or misdirected in 1952-53 and 1953-54?

The Deputy Minister of Railways and Transport (Shri Alagesan): (a) Yes, Sir.

(b) A statement giving the required information is laid on the Table of the House. [See Appendix VIII, annexure No. 34.]

(c) Railways do not maintain statistics to enable them to give this information. They have, however, been asked to compile figures showing number of consignments for which claims have been preferred during the two years on account of loss or misdirection. The information when collected will be placed on the Table of the House.

Pandit D. N. Tiwary: May I know what amount of claim the railways had to pay in the last year?

Shri Alagesan: These figures have been given in the House off and on, but just now I have not got the figures with reference to claims.

Pandit D. N. Tiwary: May I know whether any expense was incurred in connection with this P.L.M. week which was observed?

Shri Alagesan: Now we have made the observance of this week half yearly and for a period of years we have found that this has improved matters quite considerably. When it was first introduced only 60 per cent. packages went without any defect; in the week that was observed during December, 1953, 84 per cent. of the packages went without any defect.

I cannot give the expense incurred. I do not think there is any expenditure incurred, except that all the staff are put on duty to check these things.