

**Union Office Bearers Transferred from Delhi to Jodhpur Division**

\*498. SHRI CHANDRADEO PRASAD VERMA: Will the Minister of RAILWAYS be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that some office bearers of recognised Railway Union of Delhi Division were transferred from Delhi Division to Jodhpur Division in April, 1978

(b) whether some departmental enquiry proceedings were instituted against them during emergency for some previous claim cases;

(c) whether all other employees, against whom same or similar proceedings have been instituted, have also been transferred; if not, the reasons thereof;

(d) whether there are policy orders to the effect that office bearers of recognised union cannot be transferred without the consent of the unions, unless it is a case of promotion or a vigilance case is substantiated against such office bearers; if so, whether the trade union officials so transferred to Jodhpur Division come under the above category; and

(e) whether it is also a fact that thirteen Members of Parliament had made the representation in May/June, 1978 against the above mentioned transfers; if so, whether the transfers are being cancelled or pending as a result thereof?

THE MINISTER OF RAILWAYS (PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE):

(a) A Chief Parcel Clerk at New Delhi Station, who is also the Vice President of the Uttar Railway Mazdoor Union, New Delhi Branch, was relieved on transfer to Jodhpur Division on 30-4-1978.

(b) Proceedings under the Railway Servants Discipline & Appeal Rules 1969 for imposition of a major penalty were initiated against him in September 1976.

(c) No, Sir. Orders transferring the Chief Parcel Clerk were issued for administrative reasons.

(d) The extent policy orders to provide that the office bearers of recognised unions should not be transferred without the concurrence of the unions. However, the General Managers of the Zonal Railways have special powers to order transfers even without such concurrence, after giving them an opportunity to have their say.

(e) Yes, Sir. Representations have been received from Members of Parliament against the transfer. The case is under consideration.

**Delay in Laying Pipelines system from Salaya to Viramgam and Koyali Refinery**

\*499. Shri D. N. TIWARY: Will the Minister of PETROLEUM, CHEMICALS AND FERTILIZERS be pleased to state:

(a) whether there has been considerable delay in laying the pipeline system from Salaya to Viramgam and from Viramgam to Koyali refinery;

(b) when the tender was called for and when it was finalised;

(c) the reasons for the delay in the execution of this project; and

(d) losses incurred due to non-laying of this pipeline?

THE MINISTER OF PETROLEUM AND CHEMICALS AND FERTILIZERS (SHRI H. N. BAHUGUNA): (a) to (d). Separate tenders, one for the construction of the Viramgam-Koyali pipeline, and another for the Salaya-Viramgam pipeline were called by Indian Oil Corporation in December, 1975 and March, 1976 and the orders were placed in March, 1976 and July, 1976 respectively. The Viramgam-Koyali section was to be completed by June, 1977 and the Salaya-Viramgam section by October, 1977. The works were, however, actually completed in May, 1978 and June, 1978 and there was thus a delay of 11 months and 8 months respectively beyond the contract dates.

2. The pipeline project is designed to feed crude to the Koyali Refinery in the context of its capacity expansion from 4.3 million tonnes per annum to 7.3 million tonnes per annum.

3. The delay in the completion of the contracts for laying the pipelines as compared to the completion dates mentioned in the contracts is mainly due to (a) delay in arrival of specialised construction equipments from abroad, (b) non-availability of blasting material, (c) failures occurring in the pipes during hydro-static testing of the Viramgam-Koyali pipeline, etc. Particular mention may be made of the numerous failures in the 18" line pipes used in the Viramgam-Koyali pipeline which has contributed mainly to the delay in completion. In fact the pressure rating of the pipeline had to be reduced from 93 kg/cm<sup>2</sup> as originally specified to 80 kg/cm<sup>2</sup> in order to successfully complete testing of the pipeline. However, the desired throughput of 5 million tonnes per year will still be achieved.