

**PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE  
(1969—70)**

(FOURTH LOK SABHA)

**HUNDRED AND SEVENTH REPORT**

**Audit Report (Civil), 1969 relating to the Ministries of  
Home Affairs, External Affairs and Department of Par-  
liamentary Affairs**



**LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT  
NEW DELHI**

*April, 1970 (Chaitra, 1991) Saka*

*Price: Rs. 0.50 plus p.c.*

336.395112  
K9

**LIST OF AUTHORISED AGENTS FOR THE SALE OF LOK SABHA  
SECRETARIAT PUBLICATIONS**

Sl. No.	Name of Agent	Agency No.	Sl. No.	Name of Agent	Agency No.
<b>ANDHRA PRADESH</b>					
1.	Andhra University General Cooperative Stores Ltd., Waltair (Visakhapatnam).	8	12.	Charles Lambert & Company, 101, Mahatma Gandhi Road, Opposite Clock Tower, Fort, Bombay.	30
2.	G.R. Lakshminipathy Chetty and Sons, General Merchants and News Agents, Newpet, Chandragiri, Chittoor District.	94	13.	The Current Book House, Maruti Lane, Raghunath Dadaji Street, Bombay-1	60
<b>ASSAM</b>					
3.	Western Book Depot, Pan Bazar, Gauhati.	7	14.	Deccan Book Stall, Ferguson College Road, Poona-4.	65
<b>BIHAR</b>					
4.	Amar Kitab Ghar, Post Box 78, Diagonal Road, Jamshedpur.	37	<b>MYSORE</b>		
<b>GUJARAT</b>					
5.	Vijay Stores, Station Road, Anand.	35	16.	M/s. Peoples Book House Opp. Jagamohan Palace, Mysore-1.	15
6.	The New Order Book Company, Ellis Bridge, Ahmedabad-6.	63	<b>RAJASTHAN</b>		
<b>HARYANA</b>					
7.	M/s. Prabhu Book Service, Nai Subzmandi, Gurgaon, (Haryana).	14	17.	Information Centre, Government of Rajasthan, Tripolia, Jalpur City.	38
<b>MADHYA PRADESH</b>					
8.	Modern Book House, Shiv Vilas Palace, Indore City.	13	<b>UTTAR PRADESH</b>		
<b>MAHARASHTRA</b>					
9.	M/s. Sunderas Gianchand, 601, Gurgaon Road, Near Princess Street, Bombay-2.	6	18.	Swastik Industrial Works, 59, Holl Street, Meerut City.	2
10.	The International Book House (Private) Limited, 9, Ash Lane, Mahatma Gandhi Road Bombay-1.	22	19.	Law Book Company, Sardar Patel Marg, Allahabad-1.	48
11.	The International Book Service, Deccan Gymkhana, Poona-4.	26	<b>WEST BENGAL</b>		
			20.	Granthaloka, 5/1, Ambica Mookherjee Road, Belgharia, 24 Parganas.	10
			21.	W. Newman & Company Ltd., 3, Old Court House Street, Calcutta.	44
			22.	Firma K.L. Mukhopadhyay, 6/1A, Banchharam Akur Lane, Calcutta-12.	82
			23.	M/s. Mukherji Book House, 8B, Duff Lane, Calcutta-6.	4

<u>Page</u>	<u>Para</u>	<u>Line</u>	<u>for</u>	<u>read</u>
Contents (iii)	App I	3	flours	flours
	Sr. No. 2	-	flours	flours
	Sr. No. 12	-	flour	flour
(v)	2	8	in _____	on 26th March, 1970
1	1.1	4	infraction	infraction
		5	administration	administration
2	-	24	job	job
5	1.9	2	affect	effect
14	2.9	4	chauffeurs	chauffeurs
15	Sr. No 4	2	job	job
20	2.21	8	reason	reason;
21	-	1	surveyors	surveyors'
23	-	1	locally	locally
24	2.26	4&7	dry-rot	dry-rot
25	2.29	5	the works	other works

## CONTENTS

	PAGE
COMPOSITION OF THE PUBLIC ACCOUNT COMMITTEE 1969-70 . . . . .	(iii)
INTRODUCTION . . . . .	(v)
CHAPTER I Ministry of Home Affairs . . . . .	I
CHAPTER II Ministry of External Affairs . . . . .	II
CHAPTER III Department of Parliamentary Affairs . . . . .	27

### APPENDICES

APPENDIX I Details of Internal Works as on re-decoration of interior, resurfacing of polished floors, and repolishing hardwood fixtures-carried out in 'SUN-HOUSE' . . . . .	35
APPENDIX II Details of other extra-items— carried out in 'SUN-HOUSE' .	39
APPENDIX III Renovation of Floors—carried out in 'SUN HOUSE' .	
APPENDIX IV Summary of main conclusions/recommendations .	

### PART II

Minutes of the 18th Sitting held on 16th July, 1969 .	
Minutes of the 20th sitting held on 31st October, 1969 .	
Minutes of the 42nd sitting held on 22nd January, 1970 .	
Minutes of the 48th sitting held on 26th March, 1970 .	

---

\*Not printed (one cyclostyled copy laid on the Table and 5 copies placed in the Parliament Library).

**PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE**

(1969-70)

**CHAIRMAN**

**Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee**

**MEMBERS**

2. Shri Syed Ahmesd Aga
3. Shri Bhagaban Das
4. Shri C. Chittibabu
5. Shri K. G. Deshmukh
6. Shri Bimalkanti Ghosh
7. Shri K. M. Koushik
8. Shri Mohan Swarup
9. Shri H. N. Mukerjee
10. Chaudhary Nitiraj Singh
11. Shrimati Sushila Rohatgi
12. Shri Ram Avtar Sharma
13. Shri Ramshekhar Prasad Singh
14. Shri Tayappa Hari Sonavane.
15. Shri Balgovind Verma
16. Dr. Z. A. Ahmad
17. Shri A. P. Chatterjee
18. Prof. Shanti Kothari
19. Shri S. S. Mariswamy
20. Shri G. H. V. Momin
21. Shri N. R. M. Swamy
22. Shri Tarkeshwar Pande.

**SECRETARIAT**

**Shri Avtar Singh Rikhy—Joint Secretary.**

**Shri A. L. Rai—Deputy Secretary.**

**Shri K. Seshadri—Under Secretary.**

## INTRODUCTION

1, the Chairman of the Public Accounts Committee, as authorised by the Committee, do present on their behalf this Hundred and Seventh Report on Audit Report (Civil) 1969 relating to the Ministries of Home Affairs, External Affairs and Department of Parliamentary Affairs.

2. The Appropriation Accounts (Civil) 1967-68 and the Audit Report (Civil) 1969 were laid on the Table of the House on the 18th April, 1969. The Committee examined paragraphs relating to the Ministries of Home Affairs and External Affairs and Department of Parliamentary Affairs at their sittings held on the 16th July, 1969, (FN) 31st October, 1969, (FN) and 22nd January, 1970. (FN). The Committee considered and finalised this Report at their sitting held on ————. The Minutes of these sittings form part of the Report (Part II\*).

3. A statement showing the summary of the main conclusions and recommendations of the Committee is appended to the Report (Appendix IV). For facility of reference these have been printed in thick type in the body of the Report.

4. The Committee place on record their appreciation of the assistance rendered to them in their examination of these accounts by the Comptroller and Auditor General of India.

5. The Committee would also like to express their thanks to the Officers of the Ministries of Home Affairs, External Affairs and the Department of Parliamentary Affairs for the cooperation extended by them in giving information to the Committee during the course of evidence.

NEW DELHI;  
April 4th 1970.  
Chaitra 14th 1892 (Saka).

ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE,  
Chairman,  
Public Accounts Committee.

---

\*Not printed (one cyclostyled copy laid on the Table of the House and five copies placed in Parliament Library).

**CHAPTER I**  
**MINISTRY OF HOME AFFAIRS**

**Audit Paragraph**

*Delay in posting of officers to duty posts*

In paragraph 2.8 of their 62nd Report, the Public Accounts Committee (1966-67) considered a case where an officer of Government was kept without any charge for long time; and observed that apart from entailing infructuous expenditure such a case was likely to have a demoralising effect on the administration.

1.2. Five recent cases, where officials were not posted to duty posts on return from leave or deputations are mentioned below:—

Name of officer.	Period during which the officer was without any charge	Emoluments per month Rs.	
A.	1-9-68 to 1-7-69	4,075	Posting orders of the officer have not yet been issued (February, 1969).
B	1-9-67 to 15-1-68	1,975	
C	5-5-67 to 15-8-67	1,425	
D	14-7-67 to 8-10-67	1,775	
E	11-9-67 to 5-10-67	2,175	

[Paragraph No. 133—Audit Report (Civil.) 1969.]

1.3. During evidence, the Committee were informed that proposals in regard to postings of officers above a certain level have to be approved by the Appointments Committee of the Cabinet. This Committee consists of three Members with the Prime Minister as the permanent Chairman, the Home Minister as a permanent Member and the Minister in charge of the Ministry or Department in which the appointment is proposed to be made. The Appointments Committee does not meet as such: proposals are mooted on files and processed through the files which are seen by all the Members of the Committee.

1.4. Indicating the difficulties experienced in finding a suitable for 'A' the Cabinet Secretary stated that he had to wait for a post from September, 1968 to July, 1969. The expenditure incurred on salaries and allowances during this period was Rs. 40,750. This was rather "an unusual case". The officer entered service in the U.P. Cadre of I.C.S., from which he was permanently seconded to the foreign service. From 1947 to 1959 he held various posts in the Missions abroad and in the Secretariat. Subsequently he held the post

of Joint Secretary, Additional Secretary and Secretary. When the UNCTAD Conference was held, he was deputed for the work of organising the Conference. The post to which he was deputed lapsed on 1st May, 1968 and the officer went on leave for four months. When he returned from leave, there was no post at the Secretary's level "readily available for his posting". "Several proposals were pushed up" to the appointments Committee. Efforts were made on 3rd September, 5th September, 11th September, 17th September and 3rd October, 1968 to adjust him in a post at the level of Secretary in the Departments of Communications, Food, Commerce, Rehabilitation and Statistics. "For various administrative reasons none of the proposals materialised." Several suggestions were put up thereafter also. On 1st January, there was a post in the Ministry of Works, Housing and Supply. But the Minister raised an issue that he would like to have two posts, existing in the Ministry to be combined. Early in March, Government tried to get the officer fitted into a job in Foreign Affairs in one of the Missions which almost went through. But then "for good reasons", this did not materialise. Ultimately a post was found for him from 1st July, 1969. This particular post would last for six months and relates to foreign language requirements of the External Affairs Ministry. A particular questionnaire has been given to him to prepare a programme and a scheme. As soon as that is over the post would become redundant..... There is another job in the office which may require his services"

1.5. In regard to the other officers mentioned in the audit paragraph, namely, B,C,D and E, in whose case there was a delay ranging from 25 to 137 days in fitting them in suitable posts (expenditure on their salaries and allowances: Rs. 20,434), the Secretary, Ministry of Home Affairs explained the position in the following terms:

"In these four cases the officers had to wait compulsorily for a period ranging from less than a month to 4½ months. In each case the Establishment officer started making efforts to fix up the officer while he was still on leave. In each case the officer had gone on leave and there was difficulty about his posting on return from leave. We have roughly 100 postings of Central Secretariat officers at the level of Under Secretary and Deputy Secretary in a year. In 1967 and 1968 there were about 200 postings; out of these there were four postings in which there was compulsory waiting.

Generally, the Establishment Officer offers the name of the officer to the Ministry or Ministries where there is a vacancy and the attempt is to persuade the Ministry to accept



implement this decision with effect from 23rd February, 1968.

The post of Director-in-charge, Pipelines Division of the I.O.C. was, therefore, abolished with effect from 23rd February, 1968 and the officer became accordingly available for posting elsewhere. Since the time it was known that the officer would become available his name was suggested for the following posts:—

<i>Name of the post</i>	<i>Date when suggested</i>
Commercial Manager, Food Corporation of India (Department of Food)	1-1-1967.
Chief Controller of Printing & Stationery, Ministry of Works, Housing and Supply.	19-12-1967
Iron & Steel Controller, Calcutta (Department of Iron and Steel).	3-1-1968
Chief Secretary, Himachal Pradesh.	5-2-1968
Commercial Manager, Food Corporation of India, (Department of Food).	15-2-1968.

Since the officer was not selected for any of the above mentioned posts, the matter was placed before the Central Establishment Board regarding his next posting. The Board considered this question at 7 meetings held on 4th April, 18th April, 25th April, 2nd May, 16th May, 27th May and 6th June, 1968. The Board advised that the Ministry of Commerce (now Department of Foreign Trade) should find a suitable posting for him. The Commerce Secretary informed the Secretary (Services) on the 8th July, 1968 that they had selected the officer for appointment as Development Commissioner, All India Handicrafts Board which post was in the scale of Rs. 2000-2250. Since the officer was previously working in the scale of Rs. 2500-3000. It was suggested that he may be allowed pay in this post @ Rs. 2500/- p.m., on a personal basis. The Board approved this proposal at their meeting held on 15th July, 1968. The officer was also allowed to take over the post of Development Commissioner, All India Handicrafts Board on the 15th July, 1968 (FN).

Pending his actual posting, the officer remained on leave from 8th February, 1968 to 5th June, 1968 and from 6th June, 1968 to 14th July, 1968 he had to remain on compulsory waiting, as he had no leave on average pay to his credit for this period. A salary of Rs. 2500/- p.m. has been authorised for the period of waiting."

Audit have pointed out that, apart from the case mentioned by the Ministry above, there was another officer—Secretary, Department of Parliamentary Affairs—who had to wait from 7th June, 1967 to 16th July, 1967, before he could be posted as Commissioner of Social Welfare and *Ex-officio* Joint Secretary. The emoluments paid to him during this period amounted to Rs. 3496.

1.7. The Committee pointed out that for posting of officers below the rank of Secretary, the procedure adopted by Government provided for the matter being specifically reported to the Appointments Committee of the Cabinet, if a posting did not materialise in time. According to the representative of the Ministry of Home Affairs, this had eliminated delay in posting. The Committee enquired whether some similar procedure could not be adopted for appointments to higher posts like Secretaries to Government, so that cases of the type reported by Audit may not recur. The Secretary, Ministry of Home Affairs replied "it can be done up to a point. But, a Minister may accept a Deputy Secretary who may not be entirely up to his expectations but who is found suitable. But he would not accept a Secretary who is not up to his expectations".

1.8. Asked whether in appointments of this type, the Ministers' choice was final, the Cabinet Secretary replied: "At this level, various points of view do arise. Compatibility is one of them. The Minister does have some say in the matter". When the Committee enquired whether situations of this type, could arise in future, it was stated: "I would not say a categorical 'No'.....To be frank, I have not yet found a remedy...." It was added by the Secretary, Ministry of Home Affairs: "I can only say, as the Cabinet Secretary has said, that we cannot say categorically that such a situation will not arise in future. I can say, with some experience of the last 13 years, that this is the second case\* of this kind that has arisen..... We only hope that such a case will not arise in future. We will try to do our best to see that such a case does not arise.....At the lower levels (below Secretary) we have evolved a procedure which I hope will prove satisfactory". He stated further: "At the Secretary's level the vacancies are few indeed. As you go lower down the number of vacancies increases. Therefore, it is much easier to fit in a person at the lower level.

1.9. The Committee enquired whether cases of this type would not have a demoralising affect on the services. The Secretary, Ministry of Home Affairs replied: "It is certainly something which is distressing and cannot say that a case like this will raise the morale of the services. It may have some unfortunate effect on the morale". Asked further whether experiences of this kind will not deter Government servants from going on leave, the witness stated that "by and large" officers who proceed on leave return to their posts. It is

---

\*Vide para 2.3 of P. A. C's 62nd Report (Third Lok Sabha).

only when an officer goes on very long leave, it becomes difficult to make temporary arrangements in his place.

1.10. The Committee pointed out that "there is in the mind of the public a very persistent idea that we have an excess of high-ranking officers". They enquired whether it was because of this that Government could not find a suitable assignment for "A". The Secretary, Ministry of Home Affairs stated that "Government are aware that there is a general impression that the administration is top heavy", but submitted that it was his "considered judgement..... that our administration, if anything, is bottom-heavy and not top heavy". He added: "I have had occasion to make a comparison of our structure with the structure in several other countries and I would not say that, compared to other countries, we have a top-heavy structure". The Committee pointed out that there is "a vicious circle because a bottom heavy structure requires a top-heavy superior cadre". The witness stated:

"This question has been examined from time to time. Some years ago in the Home Ministry itself we made a close examination of it and reduced the staff at the lower levels by about 30 per cent. Of course, we waited until they could be absorbed and fitted elsewhere. We stopped fresh recruitment so that people could be adjusted and did not have a feeling that they were not wanted. Periodically we make a review and try to adjust people but I would say that still there is room for a further review and, I think, something is likely to be set in motion in a systematic way while considering the recommendations of the Administrative Reforms Commission".

1.11. The Committee asked for details regarding the recommendations made by the Administrative Reforms Commission on the question of staffing pattern in Government offices and the action taken on these recommendations. In a note on this point, the following information has been furnished:

"The problem of overstaffing in the Government offices has been dealt with in the following reports of the Administrative Reforms Commission:—

1. *Report on Finance, Accounts and Audit.*— Para 62 and Recommendation No. 15, where it was recommended that proposals for additional staff or creation of new posts should be considered by an independent agency namely a well-equipped and well-trained Staff Inspection Unit.

2. *Report on the Machinery of the Government of India and its Procedures of Work.*—Paragraph 119 to 136 and Recommendation No. 14. It may be mentioned in this connection that the Study Team (Deshmukh Study Team) on the Machinery of Government of India and its Procedures of Work, observed that there were too few officers and too many dealing hands. In a typical secretariat wing the proportion between officers and the dealing hands was 7 : 48. To remedy this defect the Study Team recommended the introduction of the desk officer system, which has been broadly supported by the Administrative Reforms Commission in recommendation No. 14.
3. *Report on Personnel Administration.*—Paragraph 21, 22, 23, 28, 29, 30 and 31 of Chapter IX and Recommendation No. 67.
4. *Report on Delegation of Financial and Administrative Powers.*—Paragraphs 4 and 5 of Chapter III. The Reports referred to at items 2, 3 and 4 above are under the consideration of Government. The recommendations referred to in the Report at item No. 1, namely Finance, Accounts and Audit, was not accepted by the Government in view of certain practical difficulties. However, the Administrative Reforms Commission has reiterated their suggestions in their Report on the delegation of Financial and Administrative Powers where they have made some suggestions to overcome the difficulties pointed out by the Government, "This Report, as already mentioned, is under consideration." Although no general decision applicable to the entire Government has yet been taken regarding the introduction of the desk officer system the Department of Administrative Reforms during the course of its studies has recently recommended the introduction of this system in a few organisations such as the Police Wing of the Ministry of Home Affairs and the Shipping Coordination and Chartering Organisation of the Ministry of Shipping and Transport."

1.12. The Committee enquired whether the experience in these cases did not indicate that the record of the Government servant concerned was not so good. In the circumstances, they asked whether Government could not have prematurely retired them after giving admissible terminal benefits. The Secretary, Ministry of Home Affairs replied "Here the problem is not about a man who may not be particularly good, but about a person for whom we are not able to find a job. That is a wholly fortuitous misfortune. Weeding out

has got to be done and systematically done. But the axe should not fall on the man without a job at a particular time". It was added that prematurely retiring persons whom Government are not able to fit into jobs due to the fortuitous circumstances of their proceeding on leave would amount to "inflicting a discriminatory punishment on him compared to others who may be equally bad but who are kept on, because they have not vacated the posts by going on leave.

1.13. The Committee regret that, due to delay in finding suitable posts of certain officers on their return from leave/deputation, Government had to incur an infructuous expenditure of about Rs. 68,000 as salaries paid to them for the period of their 'compulsory waiting'. In one case alone, involving an officer of the rank of a Secretary, the period of waiting amounted to as much as ten months and the official had to be paid during this period salaries amounting to Rs. 40,750.

1.14. The Committee had occasion to comment on a similar case in paragraph 2.8 of their Sixty-Second Report (Third Lok Sabha). Apart from entailing infructuous expenditure, the recurrence of these cases will have a demoralising effect on the administration.

1.15. The Committee would like effective procedures to be evolved to prevent repetition of cases of this kind. A drill for this purpose is stated to have been worked out in respect of appointments to posts below the rank of Secretary to Government where the fear that the matter may be brought to the notice of the Appointments Committee of the Cabinet is stated to have worked as a deterrent against delays. For appointments to the level of the Secretary, it is the Appointments Committee of the Cabinet which has to approve the appointments. A procedure will have to be worked out to ensure that all proposals are processed for approval by this Committee well in time.

1.16. There is another point which the Committee would like to mention in this context. There are grounds to believe that a number of organisations under Government carry surplus staff on their rolls. The Committee had called attention to this matter in paragraph 1.8 of their Ninetieth Report (Fourth Lok Sabha) where they had pointed out that on an average one out of seven posts was found surplus in organisations examined by the Staff inspection units of Ministry of Finance between 1964-65 and 1968-69. The studies conducted by the staff inspection unit had also disclosed that the number of surplus posts has tended to increase over the years. The findings in a later

part of this Report would also show that one of the bigger Indian Mission Overseas has surplus staff to the extent of 30 per cent of its sanctioned strength. The representative of the Ministry of Home Affairs also admitted that there was "room for review" of the staff position. The Committee would, therefore, like to reiterate their earlier recommendation for a periodical review of the staff position in Government organisations on the basis of which suitable action should be taken.

1.17. In order to check further unnecessary increase in staff strength the Committee would also suggest sifting of all proposals for further accretion to the present strength in Government Organisations by an independent and well equipped agency like the Staff Inspection Unit as recommended by the Administrative Reforms Commission.

#### Audit Paragraph

##### *Extra Expenditure*

1.18. In response to a tender for transportation of supplies in N.E. F.A. during 1966-67 a contractor offered Rs. 6 per quintal for Mohanbari-Miao as against his rate of Rs. 23.75 per quintal accepted for 1965-66. The tenders for 1966-67 were opened on 14th February 1966 and finalised on 31st March 1966.

1.19. On 17th March 1966 the Director of Supply and Transport entrusted this contractor with carriage of 6,000 quintals of rice from central godown at Gauhati to Miao by 31st March 1966 and paid him at Rs. 30.05 per quintal (Rs. 6.30\* per quintal from Gauhati to Mohanbari and Rs. 23.75 per quintal for Mohanbari to Miao). The requirement was based on the indent of Circle Officer, Miao for stock piling for monsoon season against which it had already been decided that despatch from Gauhati to Miao should be completed by 30th April, 1966. Between 25th and 30th March 1966 the contractor carried 5,962 quintals of rice from Gauhati to Miao and was paid Rs. 1.80 lakhs.

1.20. Had the carriage been deferred till 1st April, 1966 when the new rate of Rs. 6 per quintal was to come into force, the department could have saved extra expenditure of Rs. 1.06 lakhs.

1.21. The case was reported to Government by Audit in May 1966; their remarks are awaited (January 1969).

1.22. The Committee enquired about the stocks with the circle officer, Miao at the end of March, 1966. They were informed that the circle officer had 9191.63 quintals of rice in stock at the end of March, 1966. The Committee asked on what basis the orders for despatch of 6,000 quintals of rice to the circle officer were issued as late as 17th March, 1966, particularly when it had become known at that time

\*Approved rate of another Contractor. [Paragraph 41—Audit Report (Civil), 1966].

that the contractor had offered rates much lower than the current rates. The reduced rate would have become effective from 1st April. The Committee enquired whether, in view of this, the despatch of rice, which actually took place between 25th March and 30th March, could not have deferred for a few days till April, saving Government thereby an extra expenditure of Rs. 1.06 lakhs. The Committee were informed that there were two indents from the circle officer, Miao, one for 6,308 quintals and another for 6,000 quintals. These were placed on 5th January 1966 and 15th January, 1966 respectively. The latter indent had been complied with by 14th March, 1966, when the circle officer, Miao asked for compliance against his earlier indent. The Director of Supply and Transport after reviewing the position ordered for 6,000 quintals to be despatched. It was added: "The decision to stockpile rations for the monsoon period by March, 1966, was taken due to apprehension of breach of communications during the monsoon. When the decision was taken, bridges over the two branches of Kharsang river had just been constructed and it was feared (as it actually happened in June 1966 in case of one bridge) that these bridges which were of timber construction might not be able to withstand the heavy rains and floods. Further, the problem of transporting rice from Miao to the settlement sites had to be taken into account. This transport had to be in small head-loads and was possible only in fair weather. However, looking at the entire matter in retrospect now, it appears that the postponement of at least a part of the transportation till the beginning of April 1966, would not have caused any great harm to the regular supply of rations to the refugees as monsoon generally breaks out in that area as late as June."

1.23. The Committee were also informed that the case was referred to the Central Bureau of Investigation on 15th July, 1969. The investigation was yet to be completed.

1.24. The Committee note that Government transported 5,982 quintals of foodgrains between 25th March, 1966 and 30th March, 1966, when they could well have deferred the transport for a few days till April, 1966, when the same contractor could have been asked to transport them at rates which were much lower. The resultant extra expenditure was Rs. 1.06 lakhs. The case is stated to have been referred to the Central Bureau of Investigation. The Committee would like to be apprised of the findings and the action taken thereon.

**CHAPTER II**  
**MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS**

Audit paragraph

*Excessive office accommodation of an Indian Mission abroad*

2.1. An Indian Mission abroad is housed in four buildings three of which with effective office space of 51,579 sq. ft. have been taken on long lease on a rent of £20,250 (Rs. 3.65 lakhs) per annum and the other one (effective office space of 25,943 sq. ft.) has been taken on rent of £37,242 (Rs. 6.70 lakhs) per annum. According to the scale laid down by Government, the Mission should have only 50,808 sq. ft. of effective office space against 77,522 sq. ft. (after excluding the area occupied by gangways, records etc.) the Mission has.

2.2. The Mission's surveyors had indicated in January, 1964 and September, 1965 that the landlord of one of the leased buildings (having an effective area of 13,163 sq. ft.) might wish to terminate the lease (which otherwise expires by June, 1969) and in that event the Mission would have the advantage of being freed from the liability (it has under the lease) of restoring the building, on expiry of the full lease period, to its original condition. In January, 1968 Audit suggested that in view of the surplus office space the Mission might agree immediately to the landlord terminating the lease and, further that 9,483 sq. ft. of surplus space in the other rented building surrendered. This would have brought down the surplus office space from 26,714 sq. ft. to 4,068 sq. ft. resulting in a saving of £20,828 (Rs. 3.75 lakhs) per annum. No decision has been taken so far (December, 1968).

[Paragraph 35—Audit Report (Civil), 1969].

2.3. The Committee drew the attention of the witness to the fact that the Mission was housed in four buildings, out of which three buildings (effective office space 51,579 sq. ft.) had been taken on long lease on a rent of Rs. 3.65 lakhs per annum and the other one (effective office space 25,943 sq. ft.) had been hired on a rent of Rs. 6.70 lakhs per annum. The Committee desired to know why there was such disparity in rent. The Secretary, Ministry of External Affairs stated that the buildings had been rented at different points of time on different terms and conditions. One of these buildings belonged to the Government of India. The other three buildings were leased in 1940 and 1948. Of these, one of these is a British



Government owned building which was at one time a prisoner-of-war camp and it is being shared.

2.4. In a note containing further information on the above point, the Ministry have furnished the following information:

Building	Effective office space	Rent	Date of building hired	Date of expiry
Indian House (owned by Government)	26,700† sq. ft.	Ground rent £ 6000 or Rs. 1,08,000*	25-12-27	24-12-2926
55, Jermyn Street	12,200 sq. ft.	£8500 or Rs. 11,333 per annum@.	24-6-48	23-6-1969
8, South Audley Street	9,000 sq. ft.	£ 5750 or Rs. 1,03,500* per annum.	25-12-48	24-12-2047
Bromyard Avenue, Acton.	29,700 sq. ft.	£ 28770 or Rs. 5,17,860@ per annum.	29-9-54	24-12-1970

2.5. The witness also stated during evidence that the Mission gave up the building at Jermyn Street on expiry of the lease therefor. The Mission have also decided to give up the other building at Bromyard Avenue, Acton in the next two or three years.

2.6. The Committee pointed out that, as against the effective office space of 77,522 square feet actually hired by the Mission, it was entitled, according to the scales of accommodation laid down by Gov-

\*at the present rate of exchange.

@at the old rate of exchange—pre-devaluation Re. 1 = 1 sh. 6d.

†An additional space of 4356 sq. ft. has since been created under seventh floor of this building.

ernment, only to 50,808 square feet. In other words, the Mission had 26,714 square feet of surplus accommodation. The Committee asked why excessive space had been hired by the Mission. The witness stated that there was difficulty in tailoring the accommodation to the fluctuating staff position. In 1947, the Mission had a staff consisting of 1165 personnel. After 1947, there was some slight increase due to developmental needs, the needs of the purchase and supply departments and Accounts Officers and Financial Advisers who had to be appointed. The staff in the Mission continued to grow till 1956-57 and upto 1958 it used to have 1300. From 1958 onwards there had been a very steady attempt at cutting down the surplus establishment and pruning some of the unnecessary staff. As on 1969, there were 738 people in the Mission. The staff in the Mission's office belonged to several Ministries of the Government of India and partly to the Ministry of External Affairs, who had the overall administrative control. The Mission was recently visited by the Inspectors of the Ministry who had gone into the staff position once again and recommended a further reduction in some of the wings—some of the associated wings. That would bring down the Mission's staff to the level of 500. The witness added: "We hope that this reduction will be achieved in the course of the next two or three years."

2.7. The Committee drew attention of the witness to paragraph 1.16 of their 46th Report (Fourth Lok Sabha) regarding work-load studies conducted by the Staff Inspection Unit of the Ministry of Finance and enquired whether it would not be appropriate that the Staff Inspection Unit of the Ministry of Finance should be entrusted with the work of conducting work-load studies in the Mission instead of the inspectors of the External Affairs Ministry. The witness stated that the staff requirements were assessed on the basis of work studies conducted by the Internal Work Study of the External Affairs Ministry in addition to the studies conducted by the Work Study Unit of the Ministry of Finance. The Ministry of External Affairs had its own O&M unit which also conducted work studies both at headquarters and in the Missions abroad. The inspection carried out of the Missions abroad was a joint inspection—one of the inspector was a senior officer of the External Affairs Ministry and another a senior officer of the Ministry of Finance. Whenever the need of a special assessment was found, a special unit of the Ministry of Finance was associated.

2.8. At the instance of the Committee, the Ministry have furnished data of the sanctioned strength and actual strength of the Mis-

tion during each of the last five years as shown below:

Year	Sanctioned strength	Actual strength
1964-65	1011	935
1965-66	988	893
1966-67	958	875
1967-68	853	773
1968-69	814	738

2.9. Audit have informed the Committee that the above figures include—(i) figures relating to Tourist Office, London and Consular Offices at Liverpool, Birmingham, and Glasscow and (ii) posts of chauffers messengers labourers (which should not have been taken into account for calculating accommodation requirements as the available accommodation figures have been worked out after excluding messengers, lobbies).

It may also be mentioned that the figure of 814 shown against the year 1968-69 includes 162 such posts.

2.10. A summary of the proposals for reduction of staff contained in latest Inspection Report (June—July, 1969) of the Foreign Service Inspectorate of the Ministry has also been furnished as under:

	India-based	Local
<i>"1. Ministry of External Affairs"</i>		
(a) Secretariat	..	—10
(b) Political Department	..	—5
(c) Establishment Department	—6	—16
(d) Finance Department	—1	—1
(e) Consular Department	+6	—11
(f) Legal Adviser's Department	..	+1+1
(g) I.S.I.	+1	—5
(h) Accounts Department	+3	—43
(i) Security Guards	+3	..
(j) Minor Grades	..	—70
	+6	—160

2. Ministry of Commerce (Commerce Department)	+2	-10
3. Ministry of Education (Education Department)	—	-5
4. Ministry of Health (Med. Adv. Department)	-1	-3
5. Ministry of Transport (Seamen's Welfare Office)	—	-1
6. Ministry of Tourism (India Tourism Office)	—	—
7. Ministry of Railways (Railway Adv. Department)	-3	-1
8. Ministry of Works, Housing and Supply (ISM)	-9	-40
9. Ministry of Defence :		
(i) Army	-10	-2
(ii) Navy	-3	-9
(iii) Air Force	-3	-6
	-21	-237

NOTE.—Government's final decision on these recommendations has not yet been taken."

2.11. In regard to the review of staff strength in other missions visited by the Staff Inspection Unit, the following position has been indicated:

(i) *Khatmandu*

"Recommendation regarding reduction of posts	Action taken
--	--------------

<i>India-based</i>	<i>India-based</i>
Second Secretary	} One post of Second Secretary to be reduced shortly. Post of Registrar to be retained. Five posts of Assistants to be retained. Hindi Stenographer to be reduced in April 1970. One post of Assistant in lieu of the post of clerk to be reduced. Post of stenotypist to be reduced shortly. Post of Civil Surgeon to be retained."
Registrar	
Assistant	
Hindi Stenographer	
Clerk	
Steno-typist	
S/Guard	
Down gradation of the post of Civil Surgeon to Asstt. Surgeon.	

## (ii) Colombo

Local		
"As recommended by Staff Inspection Unit	24	Reduction of the posts as recommended has been done in full. So also, is creation of additional posts."
<i>India-based</i>		
First Secretary . . . . .	1	
Assistant . . . . .	2	
Personal Assistant . . . . .	1	
Clerk . . . . .	2	
<i>Local</i>		
Senior Clerk . . . . .	3	
Sinhala Translator . . . . .	1	
Junior Clerk . . . . .	1	
Peon . . . . .	3	
(FSI's '69)		
<i>Local</i>		
Clerk . . . . .	1	

## (iii) Rangoon

*India-based*

SIU (October-November, 1967)	
Registrar (Report received in 1968)	1
Clerk . . . . .	2

*Local*

Assistant . . . . .	2	Fully implemented.
Clerk . . . . .	3	
Daftv . . . . .	2	
Peon . . . . .	3	

*India-based*

## FSIs

December, 1967 (Report received in 1968)	
Counsellor . . . . .	1
Registrar . . . . .	2
Assistant . . . . .	1
Clerk . . . . .	2

2.12. Referring to the question regarding excessive accommodation acquired by the Mission, the witness stated: "Our own calculations which are based on slightly different scale and slightly different consideration indicate only 8,000 square feet, which is in excess of our requirements. Our calculations are based not so much on the scales which were laid down as guide-lines in 1954

but on practical utilisation of space. For example, it would not be possible to take into account certain corridors or certain areas which do not have adequate security arrangements as accommodation suitable for offices. Secondly, we have certain sections in every Mission which function as secret sections—for example, security room or the cash section—where the utilisation cannot be strictly limited to the demands of staff..... The scales are to be recognised as guidelines on determining what will be the requirements of a particular Mission. In most cases our Heads of Missions do not have the financial powers to conclude the leases for the accommodation without a reference to Government. A reference to Government is required to be made giving full details of the building proposed to be rented, the space available, the type of buildings, the amount of space required to be used for public purposes. And it is only after the External Affairs Ministry in consultation with other Ministries such as Defence, Works, Housing and Supply and others, go into every single details, the Government approves of renting the accommodation."

2.13. The Committee pointed out that according to the Audit paragraph, the Mission was having 26,714 square feet of surplus accommodation while according to the witness, the surplus accommodation was 8,000 square feet. The Committee desired to know the reasons for the variation. The witness stated: "There is a difference in the scales which Audit has taken into account and which our Mission has reckoned. We have gone by U.K. scales of accommodation rather than those laid down by us here, for the single reason that we have a large staff based on U.K. conditions. I am not suggesting that this is altogether a satisfactory reply. Tailoring accommodation to a reducing staff presents great problems. Ten years ago we had 1300 people; today we have 750 people. We are in the process of reduction of staff and also of accommodation. There is a timelag and that could be inevitable to some extent. We have already given up one building which had an area of 12,200 square feet. That more than accounts for the discrepancy that exists today. We have also decided to give up another building in Bromyard Avenue which has an area of 29,700 square feet. This will mean that within the next 2 or 3 years when the staff will be reduced to the level of 500, accommodation will be reduced to the level of 47,000 or 48,000 square feet, or 40,000 square feet which will be just commensurate with the staff requirements. At that stage I hope it will be static but if the situation of the staff is no longer static, these considerations may not hold good."

2.14. The Committee asked for a copy of instructions issued by Government laying down the scales of accommodation for embassies. From a copy of these instructions dated 29th July, 1954, the Committee observe that they do stipulate that the norms laid down will apply "to actual usable space" not including "space occupied by corridors, bath rooms, pillars etc." The scales prescribed also take cognizance of the needs of the cypher section.

2.15. The Committee enquired whether it was not necessary for the Mission to have approached the Government for prior sanction when the guide-lines could not be followed in certain cases for practical reasons. The witness stated: "This matter was brought on the basis of the Audit paragraph in 1968. The Government have considered it. Government have in fact seen a point in it to the extent that we have circularised to our Missions that when a similar situation occurs they should immediately bring the fact to the notice of the Ministry of External Affairs for consideration and, if necessary, special sanction... The main control over renting of accommodation is not exercised by the Head of the Mission but by the Government of India. Government must be satisfied that the accommodation is such that it meets the requirements of a Mission in a particular country."

2.16. The Committee enquired whether the Government considered it necessary to revise the guidelines for future in view of the practical difficulties faced by the Missions. The witness stated: "Guidelines have not been revised... They remain as guidelines. Decisions are taken by the Government of India. There are guidelines to the extent that when a Head of a Mission proposes the renting of buildings, he will follow these guidelines and decide whether the buildings should be rented or not. Those cases where the guidelines cannot be strictly observed, really come to the Government of India..... We have brought this particular aspect of the non-conformity of actual accommodation rented to staff requirements to the notice of all concerned. We have told them that whenever there is a reduction of staff necessitating reconsideration of accommodation requirements they should immediately bring it to the notice of Government and seek Government's approval."

2.17. The Committee pointed out that the Surveyors of the Mission had indicated in 1964-65 that the landlord of one of the leased buildings (at Jermyn Street) might wish to terminate the lease which was expiring in 1969 and in that event the Mission could have the advantage of being free from the liability of restoring

the building to its original condition on the expiry of the lease-period. In 1968, the Audit had also suggested to the Mission that in view of surplus office space, the Mission might agree immediately to the landlord terminating the lease. The Committee enquired why, if there was surplus accommodation, this building was not surrendered, when Government could have thereby saved also expenditure on restoration of building which they would have had to incur before giving the building back to the owner. The witness stated that the factor was fully taken into account. In one of their letters to the Mission, the Surveyors made this suggestion. The landlord was sounded but he did not confirm what the Surveyors had surmised. Besides no claim was made by the landlord for restoring the building to its original condition.

2.18. In reply to a question whether the lease for the building at Jermyn Street contained no provision for its termination before expiry of the period of the lease at the option of either parties, the witness indicated that his information was that the lease was for a fixed period and contained no provision giving option to the parties concerned to terminate it earlier.

2.19. The Committee observe that the Indian High Commission at London is at present housed in three buildings, two of which have been leased from outside parties. The rent paid for the leased buildings amounted to £ 34,520 per annum (or Rs. 6.2 lakhs). The Mission was actually occupying four buildings paying a rent of £ 43,020, till 1969, when it surrendered one of the buildings on the expiry of its lease. The data furnished to the Committee indicates that for quite some time, even after application of U.K. liberal scales of accommodation, which were at variance with the officially approved scales, as well as a progressive reduction in the strength of staff, the accommodation with the Mission has been substantially in excess of requirements. The situation could not possibly be remedied earlier, as the lease for one of the buildings, which was given up in 1969 was for a fixed term. Even then the Mission could have explored the possibility of surrendering part of the accommodation in another building (at Acton) which it has been sharing with other parties.

2.20. The question of excess accommodation has, however, now assumed greater importance, in view of further reduction in the staff strength of the Mission which is under the contemplation of Government. A team of Foreign Service Inspectors who inspected the Mission in June-July, 1969 had recommended that 258 posts in the Mission should be reduced. This constitutes over 30 per cent



of the sanctioned strength of the Mission which as on 31st March, 1969 was 814. The Committee note that these proposals are under the consideration of Government. The Committee would like Government to come to an immediate decision on this question, so that the Mission may not continue to be burdened with surplus staff. As an off shoot to this, Government should also explore the possibility of giving up immediately either in whole or in part, as may be warranted, the accommodation in one of the buildings the lease for which is due to expire in December, 1970.

2.21. The Committee have pointed out earlier that the Mission calculated its requirements of accommodation on scales which were at variance with those officially prescribed. It was explained during evidence that the Mission employed a large complement of staff based on U.K. conditions, and that therefore, it was felt that the scales of accommodation laid down by the U.K. Government should be adopted. The Committee do not consider this a very valid reason the representative of Ministry of External Affairs himself admitted that "it is not altogether a satisfactory reply". The Committee hope that Government will ensure that Missions abroad adhere to scales prescribed by Government, while hiring accommodation, due allowances being made, however, wherever circumstances so warrant.

2.20. An important question arises out of the data made available to the Committee in this case. The number of posts recommended for reduction in the Mission, which is relatively one of the bigger missoins overseas, amounts to over 30 per cent of the sanctioned strength of the Mission. In some of the other Missions also, which were inspected by the Staff Inspection Unit, a fairly substantial reduction has been made, on their recommendations as would appear from the data given at pages 15-16 of their report. A doubt does, therefore, arise whether other Missions abroad also carry on their rolls staff in excess of requirements. The Committee has already touched upon this matter in paragraph 1:16 of their Forty-Sixty Report (Fourth Lok Sabha). They would like Government to consider a comprehensive review of the position in all the bigger missions by an independent agency like the Staff Inspection Unit of Ministry of Finance.

Audit paragraph

*Repairs and re-decoration of 'Sun-House'.*

2.23. For residence of the Deputy High Commissioner of India in the U.K., 'Sun House' constructed in 1936 was acquired in 1946 for

£ 13,750. On the basis of the Mission's surveyors annual report for 1964, the High Commission decided in 1965 to undertake certain essential interior decorations and external repairs to that building. The estimates for the works were prepared by the surveyors and tenders called for in March, 1965 and the lowest tender for £1,648 was accepted. Subsequently, on the basis of oral instructions from the High Commission the surveyors obtained from that tenderer estimate for certain additional works such as re-decoration of the whole of the interior, resurfacing polished floors and repolishing hardwood fixtures. The estimate (£1,882) for these additional works was accepted and these works also entrusted to that tenderer. As the work progressed, further oral instructions were issued to the surveyors to carry out more additional works none of which was contemplated in the surveyors report of 1964 on the building. No estimate was obtained for these additional works and the contractor who was doing the original work was asked to carry out these works also on the authority of 'variation orders' issued by the surveyors. Inclusive of the fee of £119 paid to the surveyors the total expenditure on all the works (which were repairs and re-decorations) was £6,225\* (Rs. 1.12 lakhs). This was nearly 50 per cent of the original price of the building viz., £13,750. The cost of the works for which tenders had been obtained was £1,648 only. Re-decorations and repairs for £4,458 were carried out for which no tenders were invited.

(Paragraph 36—Audit Report (Civil), 1969)

2.24. The Committee drew the attention of the witness to the fact that the building was purchased in 1946 at a cost of £13,750. On the basis of the Mission's Surveyors' annual report for 1964, repairs and re-decoration were carried out in 1965-66 at a cost of £6,225 (Rs. 1.12 lakhs) which was nearly 50 per cent of the original price of the building. The Committee asked whether the sanction of the Ministry was obtained for excessive expenditure incurred. In this connection they pointed out that in para 1.13 of the 42nd Report (Third Lok Sabha), it had been recommended by the Committee that the Heads of Missions should not sanction expenditure beyond their financial powers, without the prior sanction of the Ministry. Explaining the position, the witness stated: "The building was built in 1936 and was acquired by us in 1946 for an amount of £13,750. Despite the building having been one of the best architectural pieces, there were certain defects which came to light with the passage of time. The defects were internal.... The concrete

\*Includes flooring work costing £542 which was got done through another agency.

PARLIAMENT LIBRARY  
 (Library & Finance Service)  
 Central Govt. Publications  
 Acc No R 33056 (3)

structure did not allow fully for the contraction etc. of the building due to seasonal effects..... (and..... certain corrosion of the steel rods was also noticed.... In 1957-58, extensive internal re-decoration was carried out for the first time. Again in 1959-60,\* external re-decoration was effected. In 1964, the official surveyors to the Mission.... actually recommended to the Mission comprehensive renovation of the building, as they indicated that this had not been carried out for a number of years. Their recommendations briefly were that there should be extensive repairs to the walls, paint work and to the wood work and metal work... However, when this report was received by the Mission, due to the then instructions which made it imperative that all Missions should strictly curtail their expenditure in foreign exchange, the Mission itself instructed the surveyors to ask for tenders for a limited internal and external renovation of the building. There were three estimates received for the limited works which had been indicated by the Mission. The lowest tender was £1,648 and the highest was £2,707. The surveyors recommendation was that the assignment of the work should be made to the lowest tenderer. While the work was actually being done by the firm in question further defects came to light. The surveyor then thought that it would be in Government's interest not to delay the carrying out of these further defects because they said that when the firm of constructors or renovators were already on the job, it would be economical for that firm to carry through the rest of the defects which had come to light. The Head of the Mission considered these recommendations and set up a small Committee for the purpose. The Committee consisted of the Deputy High Commissioner, the officer-in-charge of Administration and the Financial Adviser to the Mission. This Committee came to the conclusion that any further delay in the work of renovation would only result in serious deterioration of the building and would also prove highly uneconomical in the long run. In fact, the recommendation of the Committee had the full concurrence of the Financial Adviser to the Mission. These items were approved by the Committee and verbal instructions were given to the surveyors at the site not only to expedite the completion of the work but also to avoid any extra expenditure which would otherwise have been unavoidable if such repairs were postponed. In the circumstances, the prior approval of the Ministry could not be obtained but subsequently the approval of the Ministry was obtained. The work actually commenced in the second week of September, 1965 and was finished in a period of 16 weeks. During this period the recommendations made by the Surveyors for the continuation of the work of repair and renovation was exa-

---

\*An amount of £938 was spent on major repairs in 1956-57 and £1062-18-10 in 1957-58.

mined by the local Committee and approved locally by the Mission subject to the *ex-post-facto* sanction of the Government. The sanction was accorded in 1968 when all the facts had been gone into. The payments were made in 1965, 1966 and 1967. A sum of about £4000 was paid in 1965, another sum of £159 in 1965-66 and the balance was paid in 1967-68. The point was also made that the total cost incurred on these repairs and renovations was out of proportion to the initial capital cost. The initial capital cost was incurred in 1946. The repairs were carried out after almost 20 years in 1965. So there cannot be any strict correlation of the repairs carried out in 1965 to the capital cost in 1946 . . . . . It has also to be considered in relation to the expenditure that Government of India would have incurred if they had not purchased it in 1946 but had rented property for the Mission. The estimate is about £23,200, starting over a period of about 20 years from 1946 to 1965. So on both calculations we believe that the proposition was a sound one and despite the fact that heavy expenditure was incurred on repairs and renovations, Government had a commercially sound building in their hands."

2.25. The Committee pointed out that the entire work was carried out piecemeal. Heavy expenditure was incurred in excess of the normal authorities of the Head of the Mission without the prior sanction of the Ministry and the expenditure so incurred was later regularised by *ex-post-facto* sanction of the Ministry. The witness stated that such a procedure was in the interests of Government as a whole, because the surveyors had themselves pointed out that sooner or later those defects would have to be rectified. Government had taken a decision to carry out only partial repair work in the imperative needs of economy at that time. When the work was actually commenced graver defects were pointed out, which it was thought, undesirable to postpone. The Head of the Mission who was the man on the spot, therefore, in his best judgement, in the interests of the building and in the interests of the Government as a whole agreed to the recommendation that the rest of the work should also be done despite the then instructions for keeping expenditure down to the utmost extent. The normal maintenance expenditure had been laid down as 2.15 per cent of the capital cost of the building. Within that permissible limit expenditure can be incurred by the Head of the Mission for normal maintenance. The total expenditure included two items, i.e., one was a servicing charge of £384 and the other was an item of £542 on the flooring which were within the competence of the Mission itself. The Head of the Mission took the view in the larger

interest of Government. He was not strictly complying with the rules and regulations which require the prior approval of Government. The overall interests are, in fact, the guiding consideration. Government was satisfied that in the ultimate analysis, repairs were carried out for the proper maintenance of the building and accordingly sanctioned it.

2.26. When the Committee enquired about the major defects noted later on, the witness stated that the nature of the defects was essentially in relation to dampness which had penetrated into the structure of the building. There was also an attack of dry-rot in the wood-work of the building. The corrosion of the steel rods had been indicated by the surveyors in their report, but the inner attacks of dry-rot in the wood-work and the dampness as such had not been anticipated in the earlier report of the surveyors. That was thrown open when the work of repair and renovation of the building was being done by the firm of contractors. The work was commenced in the second week of September and the contractors had hoped to finish it by the end of October. Due to leakage of water into the walls, they were wet. As a result of that the redecoration work had to be held up till the walls were dry. Also some of the fittings which were initially installed in 1936 had been found to have been damaged and leaking and required replacement. So to some extent it was clear that these defects were discovered while the work was actually being done and to some extent also the defects were known before the work commenced.

2.27. The Committee asked for details of the work done. These have been furnished by the Ministry of External Affairs and are indicated below:

1. Fender for external work . . . . .	£1648
2. Internal works as on redecoration of interior, resurfacing of polished floors and repolishing hardwood fixtures . . . . .	£1881
3. Other extra items . . . . .	£1769
4. Renovation of floors . . . . .	£542
5. Surveyors fees . . . . .	£266
TOTAL . . . . .	<u>£6106</u>

The details of internal works, other extra items and floor renovations are indicated in Appendices I to III to this report.

2.28. The Committee enquired when special instructions were issued by Government to the Missions abroad to effect economy in expenditure as a result of emergency. They were informed that instructions in this regard were issued in December, 1965 and that these instructions were received by the High Commission after the work had been started on 'Sun House'. The instructions to the surveyors had been issued earlier in August, 1965.

2.29. The Committee pointed out that estimates for the works relating to certain essential interior decorations and external repairs to the building were prepared by the surveyors and tenders were called for and the lowest tender for £1648 was accepted. The other works viz. redecoration and repairs were carried out to the extent of £4458 on the basis of oral instructions and without inviting tenders. The Committee desired to know the reasons for the departure from the normal procedure of calling for tenders. The witness stated that the initial tenders were called for only the inescapable work. Subsequently while the men were on the job, additional work had to be carried out. The Head of the Mission thought that the best way to cut out delay and also in the overall interests of economy was to set up a small Committee composed of two or three officers to go into the items and assess the reasonableness of the amounts quoted and to sanction it on the spot. The witness further added that the surveyors had pointed out that in the very first instance when tenders were called for, there was very wide disparity. The lowest tender was £1648 and the highest was £2707—more than one and half times. They had also indicated that if, at that stage tenders were again called for, there would be no guarantee that it could at all be done within the amount quoted by the firm that was working on the limited renovations.

2.30. The Committee note that an expenditure of about £ 6,100 (Rs. 1.8 lakhs) was incurred in 1965 on the renovation of the residence of the Deputy High Commissioner in London. The work was started on an assessment which put the cost at £ 1,648. Repairs of this order were considered essential in view of the condition of the building. However, by stages, the scope of the work was progressively increased till it amounted to about £ 6,100. It was stated by the representative of Ministry of External Affairs that the magnitude of the work increased, because more and more defects came to notice as the repairs progressed and it was considered undesirable to postpone these items of work. The Committee, however, observe from the details of the supplementary work carried out that the bulk of the work related to redecoration. Items like

fixing "new bathroom suite", constructing "kitchen unit in recess below window", "installation of bookshelves", "changing colour of paintwork to windows", fitting "formica tops" or redecorating "cooks' bedroom and W.C." etc. could hardly be considered essential items of repairs arising out of the bad condition of the building.

2.31. The Committee see little justification for public funds being expended in this manner by Missions abroad for provision of superfluous amenities. In this case, the value of works executed without calling for tenders amounted to thrice that of the original work. Moreover, the expenditure was incurred by the Mission without the requisite sanction of Government who regularised it ex-post facto. The Committee would like Government to issue instructions to the Missions abroad to exercise utmost prudence in expending public funds, so as to avoid recurrence of instances of this type. The procedure prescribed in the matter of sanctions to expenditure should also be scrupulously adhered to by them.

---

## CHAPTER III

### DEPARTMENT OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS

#### Audit Paragraph

##### *Government Deputy Chief Whips*

3.1. On 12th December, 1967, orders were issued by the President appointing four Members of Parliament as 'Government Deputy Chief Whips' in the Lok Sabha, Rajya Sabha and Informal Consultative Committees.

3.2. In May, 1968, Government issued orders granting to each of the 'Government Deputy Chief Whips' salary of Rs. 1,650 per month, in lieu of the monthly salary and daily allowance which as Members of Parliament they are entitled to receive under the Salaries and Allowances of Members of Parliament Act, 1954.

[Paragraph No. 132, Audit Report (Civil), 1969]

3.3. During evidence the Committee enquired about the appropriateness of Government regulating by an executive order the emoluments payable to Deputy Chief Whips. They drew the attention of the witness in this connection to the opinion expressed by Ministry of Law that while there may be "no legal impediment" to Deputy Chief Whips being given salary by virtue of an executive order, it is a different matter "whether from the point of view of propriety this course need be adopted or the law should be amended." The Secretary, Department of Parliamentary Affairs explained the position in regard to the issues arising out of the Audit paragraph in the following terms:

"There are three important points involved. First, whether the Government Chief Whip and the Deputy Chief Whips are party functionaries or whether they also perform useful and important Government functions, because if they are performing only party function, then it is obvious that it would be wrong to make any payment to them from the Consolidated Fund of India. That is the first point.

The second point is this. Even assuming that they perform Government functions, whether there is any line of demarcation between the party functions and the Government



functions. This becomes important if we make payment to them from the Consolidated Fund.

Thirdly, assuming that they do perform Government functions and also that there is such a line of demarcation, still, whether it is within the competence of the Union Government to make them payment by an executive order and not by legislation.

In order that I may be able to answer these points satisfactorily, I would like to give you briefly the origin and growth of the office of the Government Chief Whip. Before the Indian Independence Act came into force, an officer of the Legislative Department used to be nominated to the Indian Legislative Assembly. He was responsible for the arrangement of Government business before the House, and generally assisted the hon. the Leader. He maintained close contacts on the one hand with the hon. Members in charge of the various departments of the Government and, on the other, with the hon. Speaker and the officers of the Legislative Assembly Department.

With the coming into force of the Indian Independence Act, 1947, the officials ceased to be nominated to the legislature. Hence the functions which those officials used to perform devolved upon the Chief Government Whip who was initially not remunerated by any extra salary or allowance. It was, however, subsequently felt that it was unfair to call upon the Chief Government Whip to continue to shoulder the additional responsibility without any remuneration. On the analogy of the practice obtaining in the House of Commons, the Chief Government Whip was, therefore, designated as Secretary to hon. the Leader of the Constituent Assembly (Legislative) by an executive order and was given a monthly salary of Rs. 1,500 plus a motor-car allowance of Rs. 200 per month with effect from 1st February, 1948. This was in lieu of the allowances he was entitled to as a Member of the Constituent Assembly.

The functions assigned to him were the following:

1. To arrange Government business before the House.
2. To maintain liaison between the hon. Ministers and the other members of the House in relation to official and non-official business before the legislature.

3. To maintain contact with the hon. the Speaker and the Legislative Assembly Department in relation to Government business.
4. To arrange priority of Government business in consultation with the hon. Ministers concerned and the Ministry of Law.
5. During the non-session period, to attend to arrangements connected with the holding of meetings of the various Select Committees in consultation with the Legislative Assembly Department and the Ministries concerned; and
6. Generally to act under the directions of the hon. the Leader.

In October, 1948, the Government Chief Whip and the Secretary, Lok Sabha, during their visit to London, met the Rt. Hon. Mr. William Whitely, Government Chief Whip, and Mr. Charles Harris, Secretary to the Government Chief Whip, House of Commons, with the object of gathering first-hand information about the actual organisation and working of the Chief Whip's office in the United Kingdom. Verbatim proceedings of this meeting are available. These proceedings amply prove that the Government Chief Whip in the United Kingdom is entrusted with many important Government functions. In the words of Mr. Whitely, 'The Chief Whip is the Government's Managing Director in the House of Commons. He is the Prime Minister's agent for seeing that Government legislative programme is put through the Commons'.

In view of the growing importance of the work allotted to the Government Chief Whip in India, he was given the status of a Minister of State on 14th December, 1948.

In the light of the information collected during his visit to London referred to above, the Government Chief Whip recorded a note on 14th December, 1948 containing a proposal for the creation of a separate office for the Government Chief Whip and centralisation therein of work relating to management of parliamentary business in the House . . . . . With the concurrence of the Ministries of Law and Finance, a nucleus office was created in the Ministry of Law for the office of the Government Chief Whip on 26th January, 1949.

On 16th May, 1949, the following notification was issued by the Government of India, Ministry of Home Affairs:

'The Governor-General is pleased to announce the creation with immediate effect of a Department of Parliamentary Affairs under the Minister of State for Parliamentary Affairs. This Department will take over from the Ministry of Law the work in connection with the functions of the Government Chief Whip and other Parliamentary Affairs.'

This will clearly indicate that the Department of Parliamentary Affairs under the Minister of State for Parliamentary Affairs was created with the specific purpose of taking over the work in connection with the functions of the Government Chief Whip.....

In view of the increasing pressure of work of the Government Chief Whip, who was also the Minister of State for Parliamentary Affairs, two Government Deputy Chief Whips were appointed, one for the Council of States and one for the House of the People respectively *w.e.f.* 20th August, 1952, to assist him in his duties. Since they were to assist Government Chief Whip in his governmental functions and since the latter's functions had already been demarcated by giving the Chief Whip the status and designation of Minister of State for Parliamentary Affairs, it was not considered necessary to give them a separate designation to demarcate their governmental functions. While considering the question of emoluments to these Government Deputy Chief Whips, the Minister of Parliamentary Affairs made a specific reference to the Minister of Law enquiring whether it would be necessary to introduce a Bill in Parliament authorising payment of such emoluments. The then Minister of Law..... replied on 11th October, 1952 that apart from the question of removal of any disqualification which they might otherwise incur on the ground that they would hold an office of profit under the Government, he saw no reason why a Bill should be necessary for the appointment of Government Deputy Chief Whips for giving them any emoluments. Accordingly, the Prevention of Disqualification Act, 1950 was suitably amended in January, 1954 to remove the disqualification. Thereafter, with the concurrence of the Ministries of Law, Home and Finance, the Government took a decision on 13th October, 1954 that Government Deputy Chief Whips should be

given the same privileges and amenities as were allowed to Parliamentary Secretaries, but that no separate entertainment allowance need be given to them. Thus, the Government Deputy Chief Whips continued to have the same privileges and amenities as were allowed to the Parliamentary Secretaries from the year 1954 till 31st March, 1968. I may add here that the privileges and amenities to the Parliamentary Secretaries at the Centre have all along been regulated by executive orders and not by legislation.

After the Fourth General Elections the party composition of the Central and State Legislatures changed radically and a general feeling grew that it would be necessary to enlist the cooperation of various political parties to a much greater degree for the smooth and efficient transaction of Government business in Parliament by strengthening the Whips' organisation. This feeling was reflected in the following unanimous recommendations made by the Sixth All India Whips' Conference held at Simla in October, 1967:

'The Government Chief Whips of the States/Union Territories should be Ministers of Parliamentary Affairs as in the Centre; the Government Deputy Chief Whips should be either Deputy Ministers or given the status of Deputy Ministers; the Chief Whips of the recognised Opposition Parties in Parliament/Legislatures should be given facilities as available to Deputy Ministers; and the Regional Opposition Groups in Parliament/Legislatures should be given the facilities as are available to Parliamentary Secretaries. Suitable facilities should be provided to Whips of different parties in the Metropolitan Council also.'

It was decided to implement this recommendation by stages. The first stage of the recommendation already stood implemented at the Centre and was meant for the States.

After considering all the aspects of the matter and after prolonged discussions with the various Ministries, Government took a decision on 10-5-1968 to raise the status of Government Deputy Chief Whips from that of Parliamentary Secretaries to that of Deputy Ministers with corresponding emoluments and facilities with some minor modifications. The above step was taken by an executive order.

I shall now briefly explain Government's stand regarding the correctness of this step from three aspects—constitutional and legal angles and propriety.

Taking the constitutional aspect first, the relevant article of the Constitution in this respect is article 102(1)(a) which reads as under:

'A person shall be disqualified for being chosen as, and for being, a member of either House of Parliament:

- (a) if he holds any office of profit under the Government of India or the Government of any State, other than an office declared by Parliament by law not to disqualify its holder;'

Since by section 3 (b) of the Members of Parliament (Prevention of Disqualification) Act, 1959, the office of the Deputy Chief Whip is not disqualifying its holder from being a Member of either House, this constitutional bar does not operate.

Coming to the legal aspect, prior to taking a decision in this matter a specific reference was made to the Ministry of Law, enquiring whether in the event of government's approval to treat the Deputy Chief Whips on par with the Deputy Minister, any amendment of the Act would be necessary or whether the object could be achieved by issuing an executive order. The Law Ministry gave the categorical advice that there was no legal impediment to Deputy Chief Whips being given the same status as the Deputy Ministers regarding the payment of salaries and allowances.

•             •             •             •

I will now briefly deal with the propriety aspect. One point raised by the Accountant-General about propriety is that a Member of Parliament is being paid out of the Consolidated Fund more than what the appertaining legislation, namely, the Salaries and Allowances of Members of Parliament Act, 1954, provides. This Salaries and Allowances Act makes provision for payment in regard to duties of Members of Parliament in the House, or in the Committees or work connected therewith, but it does not prevent the Government from assigning work to Members of Parliament and making payment for that. As you are well

aware, from time to time Government appoint Members of Parliament to various governmental committees and pay them for attending those committees. These are decided by executive orders issued by the Ministry of Finance from time to time. The only care that has to be exercised therein is that it should not attract the provisions of the Constitution disqualifying members from being Members of Parliament.....

The other point about propriety aspect is whether these are essentially party posts. I have tried to explain the position both in the United Kingdom and in India. Essentially, they are not.

The third propriety aspect is whether Government was trying to do something behind the back of Parliament. I would very respectfully submit that the Government had not done anything behind the back of Parliament. I would have pleaded guilty to that charge if we had not accepted the suggestion made by the Accountant General in his very first letter, wherein he told us to the effect 'please go in for supplementary demands for grants for this purpose and also open a separate sub-head which will clearly indicate the salaries payable to the Government Deputy Chief Whips'. We have agreed to this suggestion and the supplementary demands did attract the attention of Members of Parliament. As a matter of fact, Sir, as you are well aware, your distinguished predecessor moved a cut motion and raised some objection. When the Minister met those objections in his reply the House was pleased to throw out that cut motion and the House agreed to the demands. So, those supplementary demands became part of the Appropriation Act. We had no intention of doing anything behind the back of Parliament, because this was supported by the parties both at the Centre and in the States. There is no question of trying to do something behind the back of Parliament.

. . . . .

There is one more point of propriety which the Auditor-General has not raised but which this august body can very legitimately raise, namely, the Government has implemented only the first and second stages of this recommendation; what about the subsequent stages? I am happy to inform the Committee that the Government have accepted in principle that the recommendation of the Sixth

All India Whips' Conference should be implemented *in toto* and that suitable legislation should be brought forward for this purpose. I hope this will satisfy the Auditor-General also."

3.4. The Committee feel that it was highly improper for Government to have issued executive orders fixing *ad hoc* the emoluments payable to Government Deputy Chief Whips. These orders virtually equated Deputy Chief Whips with Deputy Ministers, though Government were fully aware that the Salaries and Allowances of Ministers Act, 1952 does not recognise such an equation or authorise such remuneration.

3.5. The Deputy Chief Whips are Members of Parliament and their entitlement, in the normal course, is regulated by the Salaries and Allowances of Members of Parliament Act, 1954 and Rules made thereunder. If Government wanted to remunerate them on a basis different from that laid down in or under this Act in consideration of their discharging certain functions, propriety required that they should have brought the matter before Parliament through suitable legislation.

3.6. What is particularly regrettable is that Government should have chosen to issue executive orders on the subject even after the Ministry of Law had indicated that in the interests of "propriety" Government should enact legislation on this subject. Pointing out that "there is no legal impediment to Deputy Chief Whips being given the same status as Deputy Ministers", one view expressed in the Ministry of Law stated that "the proper course for implementing the proposal would be to make suitable amendments in the Salaries and Allowances of Members of Parliament Act, 1954" It was also "recalled" in this connection "that on an earlier occasion this Ministry (Ministry of Law) had advised that provisions for facilities like a free furnished house, free telephone and daily allowance on duty given to Deputy Chief Whips should be made by making suitable provision in the Salaries and Allowances of Members of Parliament Act, 1954, and not by an executive order."

3.7. While deprecating what has been done, the Committee note that Government have since decided to bring forward suitable legislation before Parliament to cover all these matters. The Committee would like this to be done without any further delay so that further payments do not continue indefinitely without specific Parliamentary authorisation therefor. . .

NEW DELHI;

April, 4th 1970

Chaitra, 14th 1892 (S)

ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE,

Chairman Public Accounts Committee.

## APPENDIX I

*Details of Internal Works as on redecoration of Interior resurfacing of Polished floors, and repolishing Hardwood fixtures carried out in the building "Sun House" (1881)*

(Ref. para 2:27 of the Report)

**Humbert & Flint**

6, Lincolins Inn field, and  
9 Stone Building, London.  
24th August, 1968.

### *Lounge and Dining Room*

	£	sh.	d.
Redecorate . . . . .	140	10	0
Repair defective flooring . . . . .	50	0	0
Repolish fireplace . . . . .	5	5	9
Repolish fitted unit . . . . .	26	9	0

### *Servory*

Redecorate . . . . .	15	15	0
Repair and repolish fitment . . . . .	17	8	6

### *Kitchen*

Redecorate . . . . .	42	0	0
Repolish cabinets . . . . .	41	9	0
Wall tiling below front window . . . . .	30	0	0
Renew sink waste (Provisional) . . . . .	20	0	0

### *Cook's W. C.*

Redecorate . . . . .	12	4	0
----------------------	----	---	---

### *Cook's Bedroom*

Redecorate . . . . .	35	7	6
----------------------	----	---	---

### *Cloakroom*

Redecorate . . . . .	51	5	0
----------------------	----	---	---

### *Airing Cupboard*

Redecorate . . . . .	6	0	0
----------------------	---	---	---

### *Store Room*

Redecorate . . . . .	17	7	6
----------------------	----	---	---



	£	sh.	d.
<i>Cleaners Cupboard</i> . . . . .			
Redecorate . . . . .	4	0	0
<i>Rear Addition Bedroom</i>			
Redecorate . . . . .	47	14	6
<i>Lobby adjoining last</i>			
Redecorate . . . . .	21	10	0
Repolish skirtings . . . . .	2	2	0
<i>Hall and Staircase to Entrance</i>			
Redecorate . . . . .	67	10	0
Repolish skirtings . . . . .	1	14	6
Repolish No. 6 doors . . . . .	26	16	0
<i>Lobby to Kitchen:</i>			
Redecorate . . . . .	20	0	0
<i>Staircase Ground Floor to Roof</i> . . . . .			
Redecorate . . . . .	129	0	0
Repolish margins . . . . .	4	12	0
<i>Main Bedroom</i> . . . . .			
Redecorate . . . . .	53	12	6
Repolish fitting under window . . . . .	16	13	6
<i>Lobby Bedroom, Bathroom</i> . . . . .			
Redecorate . . . . .	17	2	0
Repolish fitment . . . . .	4	7	9
<i>Addition Room off last</i>			
Redecorate . . . . .	20	3	0
<i>Main Bathroom</i> . . . . .			
Redecorate . . . . .	20	2	0
Replace cracked Viarolite (Provisional) : : :	50	0	0]

	£	sh.	d.
Resilver mirrors (Provisional) . . . . .	20	0	0
Resurface block wall linings . . . . .	60	0	0
Renew low-level W.C. suite . . . . .	30	0	0
<i>Bedroom 2 (Dressing Room)</i>			
Redecorate . . . . .	52	1	0
Repolish wardrobe . . . . .	19	6	6
Repolish two units inside and out . . . . .	19	6	6
Repolish dressing table . . . . .	2	0	3
Repolish bedside cabinet . . . . .	5	3	6
<i>Bedroom 3 (Left Front)</i>			
Redecorate . . . . .	47	14	0
<i>Second W.C.</i>			
Redecorate . . . . .	12	18	0
Renew low-level W.C. suite . . . . .	30	0	0
<i>Second Bathroom</i>			
Raise level of the wall tiling and redecorate . . . . .	32	17	0
<i>Bedroom 4 (Right Room)</i>			
Redecorate . . . . .	47	6	6
<i>Bedroom 5 (Left Rear)</i>			
Redecorate . . . . .	73	1	0
<i>Laundry Room</i>			
Construct screen to tanks . . . . .	40	0	0
Renew defective sink . . . . .	20	0	0
Redecorate . . . . .	31	11	0
<i>Garage</i>			
Redecorate . . . . .	30	6	3
<i>Generally</i>			
Lining to walls, if required, allow 500 sq. yds. @4/- per sq. yd. . . . .	100	0	0
Repair, overhaul, renew parts as necessary to all door furniture, locks, window fittings and door springs (Provisional) . . . . .	50	0	0
Contingency sum to be expended as directed or deducted in whole or in part if not so used. . . . .	100	0	0
TOTAL . . . . .	1881	13	6

## APPENDIX II

*Details of other Extra items—carried out in "Sun-House"*

(£ 955 plus £ 814=£ 1,769)

(Ref. Para 2.27 of the Report)

Details of £ 955/-

Outhbert Lake & Clapham	9, Stone Buildings, Lincoln's Inn London 30th November, 1967			
			£	sh. d.
Installation of bookshelves as authorised in your letter of 25th November, 1965		76	0	0
Additional charges in respect of changing colour of paint-work to windows as advised in our letter of 29th December, 1965		20	0	0
Additional works as confirmed in our letters of 21st July and 19th Aug. 1966				
Repairs to asphalt roofs include major repairs to main roof		156	8	3
Repair of fractures to balcony in front of Lounge		15	10	0
Repair of south-west corner due to defective rainwater pipe		12	2	5
Completely stripping soffit of balcony to lounge & redecorating due to breakdown of old decorations as reported in our letters of 21st July and 19th Aug., 1966		95	0	0

	£	sh	d
Additional works as instructed in your letter of 4th April 1967 and confirmed in our letter of 7th April, 1967:			
Repairs to cloakroom shower fitting & tiling . . . . .	17	1	0
Redecorations in guests bedroom . . . . .	9	0	0
Reinstatement of decorations to lounge . . . . .	43	11	1
Additional works in accordance with instruction given to us and the contractors on site during progress of works :			
<i>Main Bedroom</i>			
Strip and repolish invalid tables, disconnect wall light over bed and seal off, and take off headboard from bed and fix pelmet . . . . .	10	16	6
<i>Main Bathroom</i>			
Extra cost of retiling wall and ancillary work, as instructed over and above work included in estimates . . . . .	101	0	6
<i>Bedroom No. 2</i>			
Take out cupboard and make good, repair of pop up waste and attend to airlock in hot water pipe to sink and renew pelmet . . . . .	15	9	0
<i>Guests Bathroom</i>			
Extra cost in retiling bathroom in lieu of work included in estimates and provision of plate glass shelf, bathroom cabinet and toilet roll holder . . . . .	23	9	8
<i>Dining Room</i>			
Remove sun emblem from glass . . . . .	0	15	0
<i>Lounge</i>			
Extra for hanging silk paper, repainting walls different colour, making good defective venetian door and taking off all cupboard door, easing and refixing and providing moulding to pelmet . . . . .	50	0	5
<i>Cloakroom</i>			
Take down mirror and make good and fit different mirror, take down coat hooks and backboard make good and fit new backboard and hooks, supply and fix plywood screen to top of shower opening, renew pane of glass and provide new bathroom cabinet and toilet roll holder . . . . .	37	18	0
<i>Kitchen</i>			
Extra for bright finish to cupboards, taking out frame of serving hatch and building up and plastering both sides taking out cupboards, forming access panel and making good floor and walls . . . . .	33	19	8

	£	sh.	ds
Take out 2 No. doors and assist with positioning of refrigerator	4	4	0
Extra cost of work to sink unit including additional repairs to pipework where defective over and above approximate estimate and casing in pipes on floor	29	18	3
<i>Generally</i>			
Take off doors to ease after floortiler.	13	10	0
Remove television aerial and make good.	2	7	6
In addition it was necessary to carry out extra works externally to obtain a satisfactory finish and details are given as follows :			
Extra cost of window repairs above provisional sum included in estimates	27	6	9
Rebed additional coping stones and renew extra stones	12	15	0
Extra cost for chimney stack repairs over and above specification	21	15	0
Extra making good to wall surfaces prior to redecorating due to resting for reinforcement	100	0	0
Damp-proofing to retaining wall	25	0	0
TOTAL	955	0	0

*Details of other extra Items—Carried out in "Sun House"*  
 £955 plus £814—Total £1,769)

(Ref para 2.27 of the Report)

*Details of £ 814 0 0*

HUMBERT & FLINT

6, Lincoln's Inn  
 Field,  
 and  
 9, Stone Buildings,  
 London  
 16th November, 1965

*Extra works as instructed*

V.O. 1	Take down mirror and dressing table unit Bedroom 2, fit small mirror & provide t e splashback	9	1	3
	Provide glass shelf Bedroom No. 2	3	10	0

		£	sh.	d.
	Take down mirror in Main Bedroom and make good wall. Cut chases for and make good after electrician . . . . .	8	5	0
V.O. 2	From 12"X12" ventilator in store cupboard	6	18	10
	Extend wood casing to chimney breast and provide moulded supports for mantel . . . . .	9	0	0
V.O. 3	Cover fractured wall in Bedroom No. 2 Polish terrazzo to staircase . . . . .	20	0	0
		15	0	0
V. O. 4	Hack off and renew asphalte to store roof and roof over addition . . . . .	227	17	0
	Form R.W. Channel at rear of Lounge	25	0	0
	Provide and fix new bath room suite . . . . .	200	0	0
	Cut down cupboard door in lobby and form mullion . . . . .	7	6	0
	Fit 'Formica' topsto units in Main Bedroom	21	6	6
	Fix white glazed tiles to Kitchen walls from right of entrance door, around window wall and finish on arris adjoining Servery door	39	5	8
	Provide 'Hygena' cupboard fitting between cooker and sink . . . . .	27	10	0
	Construct Kitchen unit in recess below window . . . . .	48	10	0
V. O. 5	Provide and fix bathroom cabinet . . . . .	15	10	1
	Provide glass shelf in Bathroom . . . . .	3	14	0
	Provide fluorescent strip light in Main Bathroom . . . . .	10	15	0
	Renew defective hot water pipes in Kitchen	18	0	0
	Cover fractured wall in Bedroom No. 3 as before . . . . .	30	0	0
	Replace mirror and reposition basin in Cloakroom . . . . .	1	0	0
	Various electrical works as instructed on site	56	17	0
	TOTAL . . . . .	<hr/> <hr/>		
		814	0	0
		<hr/> <hr/>		

### APPENDIX III

#### *Renovation of floors—Carried out in "Sun House" (£542/-)*

(Ref. Para 227 of the Report)

J. W. SWAN & Co. Ltd.,

52, Eleanor Road,  
London,  
9th September, 1965

*Specification* To uplift existing floor covering and to supply and lay on over all screed of latex/cement to provide a suitable surface for our material. To supply and lay materials as detailed below.

<i>Area, Design &amp; Price</i>	<i>Best Bedroom, Dressing Room &amp; Corridor</i>	<i>£</i>	<i>sh</i>	<i>d</i>
	Armstrong's Cork tile 12" x 12" x 3/16" waxed finished.			
	43 square yards @ 69/- . . . . .	148	7	0
	<i>Best Bathroom</i>			
	Armstrong's vinyl colour "Cautilian" tiles 9" x 9" colour 1446 5 square yards @ £12 . . . . .	60	0	0
	<i>Bedrooms (3) and Toilet</i>			
	Armstrong's "Acooflex" tiles 9" x 9" x 1/10" colour. CV785 Moonstone. 40 square yards @ 59/- . . . . .	116	0	0
	<i>Guests Bathroom and Toilet</i>			
	Armstrong's sheet vinyl "Patrician" colour 86011. 4 square yards @ £ 5 . . . . .	20	0	0
	<i>Washroom and W.C.</i>			
	Armstrong's Cork tile 12" x 12" x 3/16" wax finished 8 square yards @ £69/- . . . . .	27	12	0
	<i>Kitchen</i>			
	Armstrong's sheet vinyl "Montina" colour 86700.1 9 square yards @ £ 7 . . . . .	133	0	0
	TOTAL . . . . .	506	19	0

<i>Area</i>	Corridor First Floor.
<i>Design</i>	Armstrong's cork tiles 12" x 12" x 3/16" Medium shade as laid to Best Bedroom and Dressing Room.
<i>Price</i>	To uplift existing flooring and to supply and lay an overall screed of latex/cement. To supply and lay Cork tiles as above and to supply and fit one Ferodo aluminium nosing to top tread of stairs.
	or the sum of
	£43 2 6d
	<hr/>
	Total
	£550 1 6d*
	<hr/>

\*A sum of £542/- was paid to the firm.



## APPENDIX IV

### Summary of Main Conclusions Recommendations.

Sr. No.	Para No.	Ministry Deptt. concerned	Conclusions Recommendations
1	2	3	4
1		Ministry of Home Affairs	The Committee regret that, due to delay in finding suitable posts for certain officers on their return from leave deputation, Government had to incur an infructuous expenditure of about Rs. 68,000 as salaries paid to them for the period of their 'compulsory waiting'. In one case alone, involving an officer of the rank of a Secretary, the period of waiting amounted to as much as ten months and the official had to be paid during this period salaries amounting to Rs. 40,750.
2	1.14	—do—	The Committee had occasion to comment on a similar case in paragraph 28 of their Sixty-Second Report (Third Lok Sabha). Apart from entailing infructuous expenditure, the recurrence of these cases will have a demoralising effect on the administration.
3	1.15		The Committee would like effective procedures to be evolved to prevent repetition of cases of this kind. A drill for this purpose is stated to have been worked out in respect of appointments to posts below the rank of Secretary to Government where the fear that the matter may be brought to the notice of the Appointments Committee of the Cabinet is stated to have worked as a deterrent against delays. For appointments to the level of the Secretary, it is the Appointments Committee of the Cabinet which has to approve

the appointments. A procedure will have to be worked out to ensure that all proposals are processed for approval by this Committee well in time.

4 1.15

—Jo—

There is another point which the Committee would like to mention in this context. There are grounds to believe that a number of organisations under Government carry surplus staff on their rolls. The Committee had called attention to this matter in paragraph 1.8 of their Ninetieth Report (Fourth Lok Sabha) where they had pointed out that on an average one out of seven posts was found surplus in organisations examined by the Staff inspection units of Ministry of Finance between 1964-65 and 1968-69. The studies conducted by the staff inspection unit had also disclosed that the number of surplus posts has tended to increase over the years. The findings in a later part of this Report would also show that one of the bigger Indian Mission Overseas has surplus staff to the extent of 30 per cent of its sanctioned strength. The representative of the Ministry of Home Affairs also admitted that there was "room for review" of the staff position. The Committee would, therefore, like to reiterate their earlier recommendation for a periodical review of the staff position in Government organisations on the basis of which suitable actions should be taken.

45

5 1.17

—Jo—

In order to check further unnecessary increase in staff strength the Committee would also suggest shifting of all proposals for further accretion to the present strength in Government Organisations by an independent and well equipped agency like the Staff

1	2	3	4
			Inspection Unit as recommended by the Administrative Reforms Commission.
6	1.24	Ministry of Home Affairs	The Committee note that Government transported 5,982 quintals of foodgrains between 25th March, 1966 and 30th March, 1966, when they could well have deferred the transport for a few days till April, 1966, when the same contractor could have been asked to transport them at rates which were much lower. The resultant extra expenditure was Rs. 1.06 lakhs. The case is stated to have been referred to the Central Bureau of Investigation. The Committee would like to be apprised of the findings and the action taken thereon.
7	2.19	Ministry of External Affairs	The Committee observe that the Indian High Commission at London is at present housed in three buildings, two of which have been leased from outside parties. The rent paid for the leased buildings amounts to £ 34,520 per annum (or Rs. 6.2 lakhs). The Mission was actually occupying four buildings paying a rent of £ 43,020, till 1969, when it surrendered one of the buildings on the expiry of its lease. The data furnished to the Committee indicates that for quite some time, even after application of U.K. liberal scales of accommodation, which were at variance with the officially approved scales, as well as a progressive reduction in the strength of staff, the accommodation with the Mission has been substantially

in excess of requirements. The situation could not possibly be remedied earlier, as the lease for one of the buildings, which was given up in 1969 was for a fixed term. Even then the Mission could have explored the possibility of surrendering part of the accommodation in another building (at Acton) which it has been sharing with other parties.

8 2:20

Ministry of External Affairs

The question of excess accommodation has, however, now assumed greater importance, in view of further reduction in the staff strength of the Mission which is under the contemplation of Government. A team of Foreign Service Inspectors who inspected the Mission in June-July, 1969 had recommended that 258 posts in the Mission should be reduced. This constitutes over 30 per cent of the sanctioned strength of the Mission which as on 31st March, 1969 was 814. The Committee note that these proposals are under the consideration of Government. The Committee would like Government to come to an immediate decision on this question, so that the Mission may not continue to be burdened with surplus staff. As an off shoot to this, Government should also explore the possibility of giving up immediately either in whole or in part, as may be warranted, the accommodation in one of the buildings the lease for which is due to expire in December, 1970.

47

9 2:21

—do—

The Committee have pointed out earlier that the Mission calculated its requirements of accommodation on scales which were at variance with those officially prescribed. It was explained during evidence that the Mission employed a large complement of staff based on U.K. conditions, and that therefore, it was felt that the

scales of accommodation laid down by the U.K. Government should be adopted. The Committee do not consider this a very valid reason the representative of Ministry of External Affairs himself admitted that "it is not altogether a satisfactory reply". The Committee hope that Government will ensure that Missions abroad adhere to scales prescribed by Government, while hiring accommodation, due allowances being made, however, wherever circumstances so warrant.

An important question arises out of the data made available to the Committee in this case. The number of posts recommended for reduction in the Mission, which is relatively one of the bigger missions overseas, amounts to over 30 per cent of the sanctioned strength of the Mission. In some of the other Missions also, which were inspected by the Staff Inspection Unit, a fairly substantial reduction has been made, on their recommendations as would appear from the data given at pages 15 and 16 of this report. A doubt does, therefore, arise whether other Missions abroad also carry on their rolls staff in excess of requirements. The Committee had already touched upon this matter in paragraph 1.16 of their Forty-Sixth Report (Fourth Lok Sabha). They would like Government to consider a comprehensive review of the position in all the bigger

missions by an independent agency like the Staff Inspection Unit of Ministry of Finance.

11 2:13 Ministry of External Affairs

The Committee note that an expenditure of about £ 6,100 (Rs. 1.8 lakhs) was incurred in 1965 on the renovation of the residence of the Deputy High Commissioner in London. The work was started on an assessment which put the cost at £ 1,648. Repairs of this order were considered essential in view of the condition of the building. However, by stages, the scope of the work was progressively increased till it amounted to about £ 6,100. It was stated by the representative of Ministry of External Affairs that the magnitude of the work increased, because more and more defects came to notice as the repairs progressed and it was considered to be undesirable to postpone these items of work. The Committee, however, observe from the details of the supplementary work carried out that the bulk of the work related to redecoration. Items like fixing 'new bathroom suite', constructing "kitchen unit in recess below window", "installation of bookshelves", "changing colour of paintwork to windows", fitting "formica tops" or redecorating "cooks' bedroom and W.C." etc. could hardly be considered essential items of repairs arising out of the bad condition of the building.

12 2:31

—Do—

The Committee see little justification for public funds being expended in this manner by Missions abroad for provision of superfluous amenities. In this case, the value of works executed without calling for tenders amounted to thrice that of the original work. Moreover, the expenditure was incurred by the Mission without the

---

1

2

3

4

---

requisite sanction of Government who regularised it *ex-post facto*. The Committee would like Government to issue instruction to the Missions abroad to exercise utmost prudence in expending public funds, so as to avoid recurrences of instances of this type. The procedure prescribed in the matter of sanctions to expenditure should also be scrupulously adhered to by them.

13      3.4      Deptt. of Parliamentary Affairs

The Committee feel that it was highly improper for Government to have issued executive orders fixing *ad hoc* the emoluments payable to Government Deputy Chief Whips. These orders virtually equated Deputy Chief Whips with Deputy Ministers, though Government were fully aware that the Salaries and Allowances of Ministers Act, 1952 does not recognise such an equation or authorise such remuneration.

30

14      3.5

~~—do—~~

The Deputy Chief Whips are Members of Parliament and their entitlement, in the normal course, is regulated by the Salaries and Allowances of Members of Parliament Act, 1954 and Rules made thereunder. If Government wanted to remunerate them on a basis different from that laid down in or under this Act in consideration of their discharging certain functions, propriety required that they should have brought the matter before Parliament through suitable legislation.

15      3.8

~~—do—~~

What is particularly regrettable is that Government should have chosen to issue executive orders on the subject even after the Minis-

try of Law had indicated that in the interests of "propriety" Government should enact legislation on this subject. Pointing out that "There is no legal impediment to Deputy Chief Whips being given the same status as Deputy Ministers" one view expressed in the Ministry of Law stated that "the proper course for implementing the proposal would be to make suitable amendments in the Salaries and Allowances of Members of Parliament Act, 1954". It was also "recalled" in this connection "that on an earlier occasion this Ministry (Ministry of Law) had advised that provisions for facilities like a free furnished house, free telephone and daily allowance on duty given to Deputy Chief Whips should be made by making suitable provision in the Salaries and Allowances of Members of Parliament Act, 1954, and not by an executive order."

While deprecating what has been done, the Committee note that Government have since decided to bring forward suitable legislation before Parliament to cover all these matters. The Committee would like this to be done without any further delay so that further payments do not continue indefinitely without specific Parliamentary authorisation therefor.



Sl. No.	Name of Agent	Agency No.	Sl. No.	Name of Agent	Agency No.
<b>DELHI</b>					
24.	Jain Book Agency Connaught Place, New Delhi.	11	33.	Oxford Book & Stationery Company, Scindia House, Connaught Place, New Delhi-1.	68
25.	Sat Narain & Sons, 3141, Mohd. Ali Bazar, Mori Gate, Delhi.	3	34.	People's Publishing House, Rani Jhansi Road, New Delhi.	76
26.	Atma Ram & Sons, Kashmere Gate, Delhi-6.	9	35.	The United Book Agency, 48, Amrit Kaur Market, Pahar Ganj, New Delhi.	88
27.	J. M. Jaina & Brothers, Mori Gate, Delhi.	11	36.	Hind Book House, 82, Janpath, New Delhi.	95
28.	The Central News Agency, 23/90, Connaught Place, New Delhi.	15	37.	Bookwell 4, Sant Narakari Colony, Kingsway Camp, Delhi-9.	96
29.	The English Book Store, 7-L, Connaught Circus, New Delhi.	20	<b>MANIPUR</b>		
30.	Lakshmi Book Store, 42, Municipal Market, Janpath, New Delhi.	23	38.	Shri N. Chaoba Singh, News Agent, Ramlal Paul High School Annex, Imphal.	77
31.	Bahree Brothers, 188 Lajpatral Market, Delhi-6.	27	<b>AGENTS IN FOREIGN COUNTRIES</b>		
32.	Jayana Book Depot, Chhaparwala Kuan, Karol Bagh, New Delhi.	66	39.	The Secretary, Establishment Department, The High Commission of India India House, Akiwych, LONDON, W.C.—2.	59

---

(C) 1970 BY LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT

PUBLISHED UNDER RULE 382 OF THE RULES OF PROCEDURE AND CONDUCT OF  
BUSINESS IN LOK SABHA (FIFTH EDITION) AND PRINTED BY THE GENERAL MANAGER,  
GOVERNMENT OF INDIA PRESS, MINTO ROAD, NEW DELHI.

---

