other cases. This is the broad division of work between the Central organisation and the vigilance organisations on the various railways.

Shri Nambiar: Is it a fact that all cases concerning the big officers are reported to this officer at the Centre and not to the individual vigilance officers on the different railways?

Shri Alagesan: As I said, that is the division that has been kept.

Shri Nambiar: The public do not know that.

Shri Alagesan: The Central organisation will be in a better position to handle bigger cases and cases connected with gazetted officers. I think it is an advantage.

Shri Nambiar: The people do no know it.

Mr. Speaker: Now, it is known to them.

Railway Delegation to Europe

*684. {Shri K. S. Rao: Dr. Ram Subhag Singh:

Will the Minister of Railways be pleased to state:

- (a) whether the Railway Board has since concluded their examination of the report submitted by the delegation which toured Europe to find out how 'Thomas Steel' could be utilised on our railways;
 - (b) if so, the result thereof; and
- (c) whether a copy of the report will be placed on the Table of the Sabha?

The Deputy Minister of Railways and Transport (Shri Alagesan): (a) and (b). The Railway Board have accepted the recommendations concerning Thomas Steel made by the Indian Fact Finding Mission except two which are still under consideration.

(c) Copies of the Report are placed in the library of the House.

Dr. Rama Rao: May I know whether the Thomas quality steel is manufactured in India?

Shri Alagesan: No, I do not think it is available in India. We have to import it and procure it from abroad.

Railway Employees on Southern Railways

*685. Shri Nambiar: Will the Minister of Railways be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that the services of many clerks of the Accounts Department of the ex-M. & S. M. Railway

at Madras were treated as "broken service" for seniority purposes in 1950 though they were previously appointed as early as 1947 in connection with the Pay Commission work; and

(b) whether the policy followed in this connection is uniform in all Railways?

The Deputy Minister of Railways and Transport (Shri Shahnawas Khan): (a) There was no break in service. The seniority of the clerks recruited locally in 1947 was counted from October 1948 when they had been vetted and approved by the Railway Service Commission.

(b) No such cases on other Railways.

Shri Nambiar: Is it not a fact that there are about 32 clerks from the Accounts Department of the Ex-M. & S. M. section on the Southern Railway, against whom break in service was reported, as stated in the question?

Shri Shahnawaz Khan : The seniority of these persons was fixed before the regrouping of railways. And we do not think it proper to alter that seniority.

Shri Nambiar: May I know the procedure followed in the Eastern Railway in respect of the same category of employees recruited during the period of the Central Pay Commission? May I know whether their services were treated as 'broken service' or otherwise?

Shri Shahnawaz Khan: As I have said, there are no such cases on the other railways.

Shri Nambiar: May I know the reason why there is a distinction between the men on the Southern Railway and those on other railways in this respect?

Mr. Speaker: He does not admit it.

Shri Nambiar: He admitted just now that from the ex-M.&.S.M. Railway, there are a few clerks who have been treated like this for some other reason. I want to know why there should be a difference between the men on the Southern Railway and those on other railways?

Mr. Speaker: If they are of the same category, then why should there be that difference?

Shri Shahnawaz Khan: I have just submitted that there are no such cases of a similar nature on other railways.

Shri Velayudhan: May I know why this 'broken service' has come into vogue? Could it not be avoided in some way so that these employees who are already on regular service may not suffer?