

**Accident at Level Crossings in
Tamil Nadu**

4617. SHRI N. DENNIS: Will the Minister of RAILWAYS be pleased to state:

(a) whether Government are aware of increasing number of accidents at level crossings in Tamil Nadu in recent years;

(b) if so, the total number of cases that proved fatal, resulted in permanent disablement etc.;

(c) the number of men and women involved in the accidents;

(d) the number of cases in which compensation has been paid, under dispute and rejected; and

(e) the amount of compensation paid to them?

THE DEPUTY MINISTER IN THE MINISTRY OF RAILWAYS (SHRI MALLIKARJUN): (a) to (c). Information regarding level crossing accidents which took place in Tamil Nadu during the last 3 years, i.e., 1977-78 to 1979-80 is given in the following table:

Year	Total number of accidents	Accidents involving fatal injuries	Accidents involving grievous injuries	Others	Number of persons			
					Killed		Grievously injured	
					Men	Women	Men	Women
1977-78	8	1	2	5	1	..	2	..
1978-79	7	2	1	4	2	..	2	2
1979-80	6	2	..	4	5	1	1	1

Information regarding the number of cases in which grievous injuries resulted in permanent disablement is not available.

(d) and (e). The accidents such as level crossing accidents, collision with road vehicles, etc. in which passengers are not involved, are not covered under provisions of Section 82A of Indian Railways Act 1890 and as such no compensation is payable to the persons killed or injured in such accidents. The victims or their dependents can claim relief under the law of torts and the compensation is paid if any contributory negligence is proved on the part of the Railway Administration or the railway staff. The quantum of compensation is decided by the Courts on merits of each case.

The details of such cases during the last three years are given below:

	1977-78	1978-79	1979-80
<i>Paid</i> — Death
Grievous
Minor
<i>Under Dispute</i> — Death	..	1	..
Grievous	..	2	..
Minor

1977- 1978- 1979-
78 79 80

Rejected-Death	1
Grievous	1
Minor

Courts have not yet directed the Railway Administrations for payment of compensation in any of these cases. Hence, no compensation has been paid to any of these victims.

Non-utilisation of Budget Provision for Family Welfare

4618. SHRI DIGVIJAY SINH: Will the Minister of HEALTH be pleased to state the causes for non-utilisation of funds provided for the Family Welfare Programme, in the Demands for Grants pertaining to his Ministry for the years 1977-78, 1978-79 and 1979-80?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF HEALTH (SHRI NIHAR RANJAN LASKAR): Figures of Budget provision and expenditure (Plan and Non-Plan) year-wise for the last three years are as given below:—

	(Rupees in lakhs)	
	Budget Provision	Expenditure
1977-78	10767.34	9357.99
1978-79	12208.61	11073.73
1979-80	12754.32	12117.00*

*Provisional

Main reasons for under-utilisation of funds during the period are as follows:—

(1) Non-achievement of performance targets.

(2) Delay in finalisation of the project agreement for; "Strengthening of M.C.H. and Family Welfare facilities in rural and semi-urban areas" with assistance from International Agencies.

(3) Non-procurement of vehicles and equipment due to economy instructions.

(4) Delay in construction of buildings for Rural Family Welfare Centers at P.H.Cs., Sterilization Wards and Theatres at Sub-Divisional Hospitals under the 'Scheme for Voluntary Sterilization facilities', Post Partum and Building for Auxiliary Nurse Mid-wife Training Schools and Primary Health Centre Annexes.

Steps to gear up all the above activities is under way.

Demands of Employees of Shipping Corporation of India and Mogul Lines Limited

4619. SHRI R. K. MHALGI: Will the Minister of SHIPPING AND TRANSPORT be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact, that the charter of demands of employees of Shipping Corporation of India Limited, and Mogul Lines Limited, are pending for settlement since 1st January, 1975;

(b) whether recruitment of Class III and IV employees in the Shipping Corporation of India is being made on ad-hoc salary basis, whereas in Mogul Lines Limited, it is being made as per the prevalent pay scales;

(c) how many Class III and IV employees were recruited on ad hoc basis during 1st January, 1977 to 31st January, 1980, and how many employees were recruited in Mogul Lines Limited on existing pay scales during the same period; and

(d) what are the reasons of the two different yard sticks being applied in two organisations when their pay scales and service conditions are same?