

satisfied that there is an under-valuation. A lacuna in the law has been filled up in the Finance Bill which I have brought. Certainly we will try to exercise this power in the larger measure. But I must take the House into confidence and say that the attempts made by the Government in this regard have always been—I would not say, thwarted—held up because of a number of stay granted by courts. We have not been able to acquire one single flat. I would like the House to support me when I come forward with a different measure, in which I will see that in respect of these purchases... (*Interruptions*). This is a very important matter and I am very keen that this kind of transactions, in which half the payment is over the table and half is under the table, should be nipped in the bud. I can do it, provided I get assistance so that I can buy property which is under-valued. If there is no obstruction to the Government buying the property, which is under-valued, then this great evil will be completely stopped. I am taking steps to see how I can strengthen this. As I have already said, I have brought an amendment in the Finance Bill.

श्री राम विलास पासवान : मैं एक क्लेरिफिकेशन चाहता हूँ, मंत्री महोदय ने कहा कि ठीक है, मैं इस से सहमत हूँ कि सरकार उसे खरीद सकती है लेकिन अभी उनके पास कोई अधिकार नहीं है तो क्या सरकार जब अधिकार मिल जायगा तो इस का उपयोग इस पर करेगी ? अभी भी अधिकार है मंत्री महोदय को और जब यह मामला सामने आ गया है तो क्या वह इस पर विचार करेंगे कि इस मामले में इस अधिकार का प्रयोग करें ?

12.56 hrs.

STATEMENT BY MEMBER

STRIKE BY YARDMEN OF BOMBAY
CENTRAL TERMINUS

SHRI BANATWALLA (Ponnani):
Mr. Speaker, Sir, With your permission, I make the following statement under Direction 115:—

"In reply to my Unstarred question No. 4341, (answered on 18th December, 1980) as to whether the yardmen of the Bombay Central Terminus had gone on strike recently, the Hon'ble Deputy Minister of Railways has replied in the negative. I submit that the reply is inaccurate and misleading.

I submit that on 14th November, 1980, some yardmen approached the then D.R.M. in connection with their grievances and demands; but they were turned out of office. The consequent resentment among the yardmen led to strike and there was a stoppage of work from 11.30 a.m. to 2.15 p.m. It was only when certain officers intervened assuring that their demands would receive due consideration that the yardmen returned to work. It is unfortunate that instead of appreciating the enlightened act of labour to return to work after a brief strike, there is a total denial of the stoppage of work.

,I further submit that as a result of the stoppage of work, there was delay in train service. Ahmedabad Passenger train was subject to delay.

Further, in reply to part (c) of my said question as to the demands of the yardmen and government reaction thereon, the reply of the Hon'ble Deputy Minister is to the effect that it does not arise. The reply thus suggests that there are no grievances among the yardmen including demands that those working in the yard and at the station as substitutes or on ad hoc basis be made permanent, that uniforms be supplied etc.

I request the Hon'ble Minister to make a statement in the House and also to take action against the concerned officer for submitting to him inaccurate information misleading the House."

THE DEPUTY MINISTER IN THE MINISTRY OF RAILWAYS AND IN THE DEPARTMENT OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS (SHRI MALIKARJUN): Sir, I submit that the reply given by me to Lok Sabha Unstarred Question No. 4341 on 18-12-80 is neither inaccurate nor misleading as stated by the Hon'ble Member. I reiterate that there was no stoppage of work by the Yardmen of the Bombay Central Terminus on 14-11-80. What had happened was that on 14-11-80 some members of an unrecognised body calling itself Pashchim Railway Karmachari Parishad, who were not on duty, wanted to see the Divisional Railway Manager, Bombay Central, but could not see him because he was in a Union Meeting. They then went to the Bombay Central Yard to instigate the Yard Staff to stop work. When Senior Divisional Operating Supdt., Bombay Central came to know of this design on the part of the workers of the Pashchim Railway Karmachari Parishad, he immediately rushed to the Yard and explained to the staff on duty that they should not be misled by the workers of an unrecognised union as any stoppage of work would result in "no work, no pay" in addition to break in service. The Yard staff therefore, remained on duty and as such there was no stoppage of work. The reply given to part (a) is, therefore, factually correct.

13.00 hrs.

There was no dislocation of train services. However, Ahmedabad Passenger train was delayed, not on account of any action by the Yard Staff, but for replacement of some coaches on rakes due to shortage of coaching stock at the time.

In part (b) of the Question the Hon'ble Member desired to know the

causes of strike. Since there was no strike, the reply had to be in the negative, which is also factually correct.

In part (c) of the Question the Hon'ble Member wanted to know the demands of the Yardmen and Government reaction thereto. Apparently this had to be considered in the context of parts (a) and (b) of the Question and could not be considered in isolation. There have, however, been some grievances voiced by the Yardmen from time to time which have been dealt with in the PNM meetings with the recognised Unions as well as on their personal memoranda/representations. The Yardmen had also gone to the Regional Labour Commissioner some time in April 1980 and they had represented a number of issues. These issues were generally discussed in the Regional Labour Commissioner's Court and the case was closed on 22-7-80 after the Regional Labour Commissioner was satisfied that adequate attention has been paid to these issues by the railway administration. These demands were, however, not the subject matter of the incident referred to in para one above which occurred on 14-11-80 and obviously, therefore, the reply to part (c) of the Question had to be in the negative.

I, therefore, submit that the information given by me in reply to the aforesaid Question was not inaccurate.

13.03 hrs.

Matter Under Rule 377

(i) COMPENSATION TO FARMERS FOR DAMAGE TO CROPS BY HAIL-STORM IN VARIOUS STATES

श्री मनीराम बागड़ी (हिसार) :
उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, किसानों को फसल उगाने के लिए बिजली और सिंचाई की सुविधायें बहुत आवश्यक हैं। बिजली और सिंचाई की सुविधाओं की कमी के अलावा किसानों को समय-समय पर बहुत सी अन्य विषम परिस्थितियों का सामना करना पड़ता है।