

**COMMITTEE
ON
GOVERNMENT ASSURANCES
(1996-97)**

(ELEVENTH LOK SABHA)

SECOND REPORT

(REQUEST FOR DROPPING OF ASSURANCES)

(Presented on 7 May 1997)



**LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT
NEW DELHI**

Price Rs. 15.00

C O R R I G E N D A

to the Second Report of the Committee
on Government Assurances (1996-97) -
Eleventh Lok Sabha.

Page No.	Para No.	Line No.	Correction
4	2.4	16	<u>For</u> trails <u>read</u> trials
6	3.3	2	<u>Delete</u> Annexure-II
6	3.3	4	<u>For</u> March 20 1996 <u>read</u> March 20, 1996
12	1	4	<u>For</u> 87 (84) <u>read</u> 387

CONTENTS

	PAGE No.
COMPOSITION OF THE COMMITTEE (1996-97)	(iii)
INTRODUCTION.....	(v)
REPORT	
Request for dropping of assurances (accepted)	
(1) SQ No. 63 dated 3.8.95 regarding "Fencing on Borders"	1
(2) USQ No. 5222 dated 10.5.95 regarding "Filariasis"	3
(3) USQ No. 3792 dated 21.12.95 regarding "Minimum Consumption Expenditure"	4
APPENDICES	
1. Minutes of the Eighth sitting of the Committee held on 28.1.1997 (Appendix-I)	8
2. Minutes of the Twelfth sitting of the Committee held on 5.5.1997 (Appendix-II)	11
ANNEXURES	
1. O.M. No. I/3012/2895-IS (D-VII) dated 11.4.97 from Ministry of Home Affairs (Annexure-I).	12
2. Statement referred to in reply to Unstarred Question No. 3792 dated 21/12/95 (Annexure-II).	14

**COMPOSITION OF THE COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT
ASSURANCES***
(1996-97)

Shri E. Ahamed — *Chairman*

MEMBERS

2. **Shri Rajendra Agnihotri**
3. **Shri Mukhtar Anis**
4. **Shri Illiyas Azmi**
5. **Shri L. Balaraman**
6. **Shri Dileep Singh Bhuria**
7. **Shrimati Bhavana Chikhalia**
8. **Shri Paban Singh Ghatowar**
9. **Dr. Ramkrishna Kusmaria**
10. **Shri Sanat Mehta**
11. **Shri Hannan Mollah**
12. **Dr. Jayanta Rongpi**
13. **Dr. C. Silvera**
14. **Shri Tilak Raj Singh**
15. **Shrimati Purnima Verma**

SECRETARIAT

1. **Dr. A.K. Pandey — *Addl. Secretary***
2. **Shri P.D.T. Achary — *Director***
3. **Shri K. Chakraborty — *Deputy Secretary***
4. **Km. J.C. Namchoy — *Assistant Director***

* The Committee was nominated by the Speaker w.e.f. September 13, 1996 *vide* para 456 of Lok Sabha Bulletin Part-II dated 16 September, 1996.

INTRODUCTION

I, the Chairman of the Committee on Government Assurances having been authorised by the Committee to submit the Report on their behalf, present this Second Report of the Committee on Government Assurances.

2. The Committee (1996-97) was constituted on September 13, 1996.

3. The Committee at their eighth sitting held on January 28, 1997 considered *inter-alia* the memoranda Nos. 5, 6 and 9 on requests received from the Ministries/Departments of the Government of India for dropping of three pending assurances and their decisions are contained in this Report.

4. At their sitting held on 5 May 1997, the Committee considered and adopted the draft Second Report.

5. The Minutes of the aforesaid sittings of the Committee form part of this Report. (Appendices)

6. The conclusions/observations of the Committee are contained in this Report.

NEW DELHI;
May 5, 1997

Vaisakha 15, 1919 (*Saka*)

E. AHAMED,
Chairman,
Committee on Government Assurances.

REPORT

1. FENCING ON BORDERS

1.1 S/Shri Janardhan Misra and Guman Mal Lodha, MPs addressed the following Starred Question No. 63 for answer by the Minister of Home Affairs on August 3, 1995:—

“(a) whether the Government are erecting fencing on Indo-Pak and Indo-Bangladesh borders;

(b) if so, whether the Government of Pakistan/Bangladesh has shown any resentment over erecting of such fencing;

(c) if so, the reaction of the Government thereto; and

(d) the time by which the work is likely to be completed?”

1.2 In reply to the above question, the then Minister of Home Affairs (Shri S.B. Chavan) stated as follows:—

“(a) Yes, Sir.

(b)&(c): on the Indo-Pak Border, fencing in Punjab has been completed and in Rajasthan, 334 Kms. of fencing has been completed in Ganganagar and Bikaner districts and work on 387 Kms. is under progress in Jaisalmer and Barmer districts. Fencing has also been sanctioned for 180 Kms. of International Border in the Jammu Sector, where the work had to be suspended temporarily due to intermittent firing by Pakistan Rangers. Necessary measures are being taken to resume the work shortly.

With regard to Indo-Bangladesh Border fencing, the target for fencing is 896 Kms. out of which 501 Kms. have been completed. A protest was received from 15 Bn. Bangladesh Rifles conveying their concern about erection of fencing which will affect the movement of Bangladesh nationals to 33 Bangladesh enclaves in India opposite District Lalmonirhat, in West Bengal. The matter was discussed during the last DG level coordination meeting between Bangladesh Rifles and BSF authorities held from 26th to 30th June, 1995. The fencing work on Indo-Bangladesh Border is in progress.

(d): The last phase of fencing in Rajasthan is scheduled to be completed by December, 1996. Fencing work on Indo-Bangladesh Border is expected to be completed by March, 1998”.

1.3 During the supplementary to the question, Shri Janardhan Misra pointed out that earlier on 29th March, 1995, the Government had stated that the fencing of 387 Kms. on Indo-Pak Border in Jaisalmer and Barmer districts was in progress and it was the same reply on that day too. The Hon'ble MP, therefore, enquired to know about the progress made so far

in the fencing in that area and if no progress was made he wanted to know the reasons thereof.

1.4 In reply to the above supplementary question, the then Minister of State in the Ministry of Home Affairs (Shri Rajesh Pilot) *inter-alia* stated that he would send the figures of the work completed so far to the Hon'ble Member.

1.5 The above reply to supplementary of the question was treated as an assurance and was required to be implemented by the Ministry of Home Affairs by November 2, 1995 i.e. within three months of the date of assurance given by the Minister.

1.6 The Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs *vide* their U.O. Note No. XIV/HA(1)SQ-63-LS95 dated October 19, 1995 have forwarded a request of the Ministry of Home Affairs for dropping of the assurance on the following grounds:—

“That after going through the copy of Lok Sabha's proceedings dated 3.8.1995 it has been found that the first part of Question asked by the Honourable Member of Parliament (which the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs has shown in the assurance proforma) was replied the same day and thus the assurance was fulfilled as follows indicates:—

“Mr. Speaker, Sir, as regards the details you have sought, in 1st supplementary Question I would like to state that during the 1st phase the work of fencing is complete in 121 Kms. area in Jaisalmer Sector, in phase II the work of fencing in 146 Kms. area in Barmer sector will be completed by Dec. 1995. I had got the information to the question, asked earlier.

This is to mention that the total fencing area, in Jaisalmer and Barmer sector is 387 Km. the fencing in this area is to be completed in 3 phases. The 1st Phase 121 Km. which is already complete, IInd Phase, 146 Kms. which will be completed by Dec. 1995 and the IIIrd Phase 120 Km. which has to be completed by 31.6.1996. As such the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs should not treat this as an assurance since the Government is not having any more details in this regard.”

1.7 The Committee considered the aforesaid request for dropping of the assurance at their sitting held on January 28, 1997, but did not see substantial ground to concur with the proposal of the Ministry, simply because Ministry of Home Affairs had no more details to add. The Committee instead desired to know about the latest position with regard to the fencing in the border areas. Accordingly, the decision of the Committee was conveyed to Ministry of Home Affairs. Subsequently, following information regarding completion of fencing work in all the three phases of Jaisalmer and Barmer sector was received from the Ministry of Home

Affairs *vide* their O.M. No.-I-13012/12895-IS (D.VII) dated 11.4.1997:—
(Annexure-I)

Phase	Sector	Length	Date of Completion
I	Jaisalmer	121 Kms.	15.05.95
II	Barmer	146 Kms.	15.01.96
III	Barmer	120 Kms.	31.12.96

After considering the above information, the Committee acceded to drop the assurance.

1.8 The Committee are however concerned to learn that in Jammu sector, the work of fencing for 180 kms. of international border had to be suspended temporarily due to intermittent firing by Pakistan Rangers. The Committee are of the opinion that Government should in no way be deterred in their work of fencing because of threats across the border. The Committee recommend that the matter should be settled amicably with Pakistan and target date for completion of work in Jammu sector should be worked out at an early date. So far as fencing in the Indo-Bangladesh Border is concerned, the Committee were informed that out of target for fencing of 896 kms., fencing of 501 kms. have since been completed despite protest from Bangladesh Rifles. The Committee note that target date for completion of fencing of Indo-Bangladesh Border is March, 1998. The Committee feel that the Government will be able to complete the work by the target date. The Committee however desire that the Ministry should furnish a report indicating the latest position in regard to the progress made in the Indo-Bangladesh Border areas.

2. FILARIASIS

2.1 Shri Paras Ram Bhardwaj, M.P. addressed the following Unstarred Question No. 5222 to the Prime Minister on May 10, 1995:—

“(a) whether drug derived from the medicinal plant ‘shakhotaka’ has been found to be effective in treating lymphatic Filariasis;

(b) if so, the details thereof; and

(c) the steps taken by the Government to popularise this treatment?”

2.2 In reply to the above question, the then Deputy Minister in the Ministry of Health and Family Welfare (Shri Paban Singh Ghatowar) stated as follows:—

“(a) to (c): The Ayurvedic Drug “SHAKHOTAKA” is under trial by the ICMR and the report is awaited.”

2.3 The above reply to the question was treated as an assurance and was required to be implemented by the Ministry of Health and Family Welfare by August 9, 1995 *i.e.* within three months of the date of assurance given by the Minister.

2.4 The Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs *vide* their U.O. Note No. XIII/HFW(17)USQ 5222-LS/95 dated 15.3.96 have forwarded a request of

the Ministry of Health and Family Welfare for dropping of the aforesaid assurance on the following grounds:—

“..... that the studies conducted on animals at the Centre for Advanced Research at CDRI, Lucknow by the Indian Council of Medical Research revealed ‘SHAKHOTAKA’ to possess both Micro-filaricidal and Macro-filaricidal activities. However, the experimental studies are still in progress and the Council plans to initiate clinical studies in patients with Burgian Filariasis. The clinical trials in any disease is a long drawn procedure and a minimum of two to three years would be needed to come to a definite conclusion.

In view of the above, the assurance given in reply to Lok Sabha Unstarred Question No. 5222 dated 10.5.95 cannot be fulfilled till the results of clinical trials proposed to be undertaken by ICMR are known. It is, therefore, requested that the Committee on Government Assurances may kindly be moved for dropping the assurance as the results of the clinical trials on the Ayurvedic Drug would be known only after 2-3 years.”

2.5 The Committee considered the request for dropping of assurance at their sitting held on January 28, 1997 and acceded to the request of the Ministry of Health & Family Welfare. The Committee however note that while the assurance was to be fulfilled within three months *i.e.* by August 1995, the Ministry had almost taken one year to indicate the latest position with regard to the trial of Shakhotaka, the drug reported to possess micro-filaricidal and macro-filaricidal activities. The Committee also note with satisfaction that the ICMR plans to initiate clinical studies on patients with Burgain Filariasis. While appreciate the fact that the results of clinical trials of the drug could be known only after two or three years, the Committee feel that unduly long period should not be taken, particularly when thousands of patients are suffering from Failariasis which in certain cases may lead to elephantiasis too. The Committee, therefore, want the Ministry to submit the latest position of the results of clinical trial of the Ayurvedic drug obtained so far on patients with Burgain filariasis.

3. MINIMUM CONSUMPTION EXPENDITURE

3.1 Shri V. Sobhanadreeswara Rao, M.P. addressed the following Unstarred Question No. 3792 to the Minister of Planning and Programme Implementation on December 21, 1995:—

“(a) whether it is a fact that as per the Government’s estimates, the minimum consumption expenditure for living a standard life above poverty line is fixed at Rs. 11,000/- per annum for rural areas and Rs. 11,800/- for urban areas;

(b) if so, the minimum consumption requirement for a three unit family;

(c) whether minimum wage of the Central Government employees is commensurate to this requirement; and

(d) the names of the States which have revised the minimum wage for maintaining living standard of three consumption unit family above poverty line?"

3.2 In reply to the above question, the then Minister of State in the Ministry of Planning and Programme Implementation (Shri Balram Singh Yadava) stated as follows:—

"(a) & (b): The poverty line estimate made by the Planning Commission is in terms of monthly per capita expenditure of Rs. 181.5 in rural areas and Rs. 209.5 in urban areas at 1991-92 prices. This is the minimum consumption expenditure required to maintain a standard of life above poverty line. In terms of annual house-hold expenditure this is expressed as Rs. 11060 in rural areas and Rs. 11850 in urban areas rounded off to Rs. 11000 and Rs. 11800 respectively. The poverty line for the household is based on average family size of 5.08 in rural areas and 4.71 in the urban areas derived from National Sample Survey data on consumer expenditure of 43rd round (1987-88). The minimum consumption requirement for a three member family would be Rs. 6534 for rural areas and Rs. 7542 for urban areas.

(c) & (d): Under the Minimum Wages Act, 1948, both the Central Government as well as the State Governments are the appropriate government for the fixation/revision of minimum rates of wages for scheduled employments falling under their respective jurisdiction. The Central Government is responsible for the fixation of minimum rates of wage in respect of 40 scheduled employments and the wages fixed for these employments are commensurate with the minimum consumption requirement estimated by the Planning Commission. There are no uniform criteria adopted by the different State Governments for fixation of minimum wages.

The State Governments, in addition to the criteria recommended by the Indian Labour Conference (1957), have also been taking into account various factors such as socio-economic conditions, market forces varying cost of living, etc. while fixing/revising the minimum wages. A statement indicating the range of minimum wages for unskilled workers in different States/Union Territories is as under (*vide* Annexure-II)

In the Statement, it was *inter-alia* stated at S.No. 21 as under:—

Sl.No.	Name of State Govt./U.T. Administration	Minimum rate of wages & date of revision	Remarks
XXXXX 21.	XXXXX Sikkim	XXXXX Nil	XXXX Minimum Wage Act, 1948 is yet to be extended and enforced.
XXXXX	XXXXX	XXXXX	XXXXX

3.3 The above reply at Sl. No. 21 of the statement annexed to parts (c) & (d) Annexure-II of the question was treated as an assurance and was required to be implemented by the Ministry of Planning & Programme Implementation by March 20 1996 i.e. three months of the date of assurance given by the Minister.

3.4 The Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs vide their U.O. Note No.XV/PP(1)USQ-3792-LS/95 dated 10.5.96 have forwarded a request of the Planning Commission (Perspective Planning Division) for dropping of the aforesaid assurance on the following grounds:

“.....At the outset, it may kindly be noted that the question under reference had a major part dealing with the poverty line and hence had been answered by the Hon'ble Minister for P&PI though it also contained some aspects regarding the “Minimum Wages” which is under the jurisdiction of the Ministry of Labour.

Further, it is understood that with regard to the extension and enforcement of Minimum Wages Act, it is primarily the responsibility of the Sikkim Government to initiate action.

Under the above circumstances, the said answer may not be treated as an assurance.”

3.5 The Committee considered the request of the Planning Commission at their sitting held on January 28, 1997. The Committee acceded to the request for not treating the reply to Unstarred Question No. 3792 as an assurance.

3.6 The Committee however note that the question has two parts, one dealing with poverty line and the other with the Minimum wages and as such both Ministry of Planning and Programme Implementation and Ministry of Labour are involved. The Committee also note that the Union Government is responsible for fixation of minimum rates of wage in respect of 40 scheduled employments and the wages fixed for these employments are commensurate with the minimum consumption requirement, as estimated by the Planning Commission. The Committee are not aware of the aforesaid forty scheduled employments and as such, desire that the Ministry of labour would come forward with a list of those forty scheduled employments along with the wages fixed and criteria followed in the fixation of such wages.

3.7 In the Annexure, supplied by the Ministry of Planning Commission (PPD), (vide Annexure-II) the Committee note that in certain States like Andhra Pradesh, Assam, Arunachal Pradesh etc., the rates of minimum wages for unskilled workers vary from employment to employment whereas in States like Haryana, Jammu & Kashmir, Meghalaya, etc., single rate for all employment has been followed. Though socio-economic conditions, Market forces, varying cost of living etc. are certain important factors considered for fixing/revising the minimum wages, the Committee however feel that both States as well as Union territories should endeavour to have

single rate of minimum wages for all the employments instead of varying rates, as the very purpose of having the minimum rate of wages is defeated, if rates differ from employment to employment.

3.8 The Committee note that Minimum Wages Act, 1948 is yet to be extended and enforced in the State of Sikkim. The Committee further note that both the State Government as well as the Central Government are the appropriate Governments for the fixation as well as revision of minimum wages for scheduled employments falling under their jurisdiction. The Committee however are concerned that the Government of Sikkim are yet to act in this regard. The Committee therefore, recommend that the Union Government would persuade the Government of Sikkim to revise and fix the minimum wages in the interest of the people.

NEW DELHI;
May 5, 1997

Vaisakha 15, 1919 (Saka)

E. AHAMED,
Chairman,
Committee on Government Assurances.

APPENDIX I

MINUTES

EIGHTH SITTING

MINUTES OF THE SITTING OF THE COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT ASSURANCES ON JANUARY 28, 1997 IN COMMITTEE ROOM 'C', PARLIAMENT HOUSE ANNEXE, NEW DELHI

The Committee met on Tuesday, January 28; 1997 from 11.00 hrs. to 11.40 hrs.

PRESENT

Shri E. Ahamad — *Chairman*

MEMBERS

2. Shri Rajendra Agnihotri
3. Shri L. Balaraman
4. Smt. Bhawana Chikhalia
5. Shri Paban Singh Ghatowar
6. Dr. Ramkrishna Kusmaria
7. Shri Hannan Mollah
8. Dr. C. Silvera
9. Shri Tilak Raj Singh

SECRETARIAT

1. Shri P.D.T. Achary — *Director*
2. Shri N.L. Thakur — *Under Secretary*
3. Kum. J.C. Namchyo — *Committee Officer*

2. The Committee *inter-alia* considered the following 3 memoranda regarding dropping of assurances seriatum:—

Memorandum No. 5 Request for dropping of assurance given on 10 May 1995 to Unstarred Question No. 5222 regarding Filariasis.

The Committee took up for consideration the aforesaid request for dropping of the assurance in pursuance of the communication received

from the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs *vide* their U.O. Note No. XIII/HFW(17)USQ 5222-LS/95 dated 15.3.1996 forwarding therewith the request of the Ministry of Family Welfare on the following grounds:—

“..... that the studies conducted on animals at the Centre for Advanced Research at CDRI, Lucknow by the Indian Council of Medical Research revealed ‘SHAKHOTAKA’ to possess both Micro-filaricidal and Macro-filaricidal activities. However, the experimental studies are still in progress and the Council plans to initiate clinical studies in patients with Burchinal Filariasis. The clinical trials in any disease is a long drawn procedure and a minimum of two to three years would be needed to come to a definite conclusion.

In view of the above, the assurance given in reply to Lok Sabha Unstarred Question No. 5222, dated 10.5.95 cannot be fulfilled till the results of clinical trials proposed to be undertaken by ICMR are known. It is, therefore, requested that the Committee on Government Assurances may kindly be moved for dropping the assurance as the results of the clinical trials on the Ayurvedic Drug would be known only after 2-3 years.”

After discussing the matter in detail, especially in view of the fact that the clinical trials may involve longer time, the Committee acceded to the request of the Ministry of Health and Family Welfare for dropping of the assurance.

Memorandum No. 6:—Request for dropping of assurance given on August 3, 1995 in reply to Starred Question No. 63 regarding Fencing of borders.

The Committee considered the aforesaid request for dropping of the assurance in pursuance of the communication received from the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs *vide* their U.O. Note No. XIV/HA (1) SQ-63-LS/95 dated October 19, 1995 forwarding therewith the request of the Ministry of Home Affairs as under:—

“That after going through the copy of Lok Sabha’s proceedings dated 3.8.1995 it has been found that the first part of question asked by the Honourable Member of Parliament (which the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs has shown in the assurance proforma) was replied the same day and thus the assurance was fulfilled as follows indicates:—

“Mr. Speaker, Sir, as regards the details you have sought, in 1st Supplementary Question I would like to state that during the 1st phase the work of fencing is complete in 121 kms. area in Jaisalmer Sector, in phase II the work of fencing in 146 km. area in Barmer sector will be completed by Dec. 1995. I had got the information to the question, asked earlier.”

“This is to mention that the total fencing area, in Jaisalmer and Barmer sectors is 387 k.m. The fencing in this area is to be completed in 3 phases. (1st phase, 121 k.m. which is already completed, IInd phase, 146 k.m. which will be completed by December 1995 and the IIIrd phase 120 k.m., which has to be

completed by 31.6.1996). As such the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs should not treat this as an assurance since the Government is not having any more details in this regard."

The Committee considered the aforesaid request for dropping of the assurance, but did not see substantial ground to concur with the proposal of the Ministry, simply because Ministry of Home Affairs had no more details to add. The Committee noted with satisfaction that the first phase of fencing (121 k.m.) in Jaisalmer and Barmer sector was already over. However in their communication, Ministry of Home Affairs have no where mentioned whether the work in the second and third phase of fencing (146 km and 120 km) is already over or not, as an assurance had already been given that the same will be completed by December 1995 and 31 June, 1996 respectively.

The Committee were of the view that the Ministry of Home Affairs be asked to furnish the latest position in regard to fencing in borders in the first instance.

**

**

**

**

**

**

Memorandum No.9: Request for dropping of assurance given on December 21, 1995 in reply to Unstarred Question No. 3792 regarding Minimum Consumption Expenditure.

The Committee considered the request for dropping of the aforesaid assurance in pursuance of the communication received from the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs vide their U.O. Note No. XV/PP(1) USQ-3792—LS/95 dated 10.5.96 forwarding therewith the request of the Planning Commission on the following grounds:—

"..At the outset, it may kindly be noted that the question under reference had a major part dealing with the poverty line and hence had been answered by the Hon'ble Minister for P & PI though it also contained some aspects regarding the "Minimum Wages" which is under the jurisdiction of the Ministry of Labour.

Further, it is understood that with regard to the extension and enforcement of Minimum Wages Act, it is primarily the responsibility of the Sikkim Government to initiate action.

Under the above circumstances, the said answer may not be treated as an assurance."

2. The Committee acceded to the request of the Planning Commission for not treating the reply to Unstarred Question No. 3792 as an assurance.

3. Thereafter, the Committee decided to hold their next sitting during the ensuing Budget Session.

The Committee then adjourned.

APPENDIX II

MINUTES

TWELFTH SITTING

MINUTES OF THE SITTING OF THE COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT ASSURANCES HELD ON MAY 5, 1997 IN COMMITTEE ROOM 62, PARLIAMENT HOUSE, NEW DELHI

The Committee met on Monday, May 5, 1997 from 15.00 hours to 16.00 hours.

PRESENT

Shri E. Ahamed — *Chairman*

MEMBERS

2. Shri Dilcep Singh Bhuria
3. Shrimati Bhavana Chikhalia
4. Shri Paban Singh Ghatowar
5. Shri Hannan Mollah
6. Shri Tilak Raj Singh

SECRETARIAT

- | | | |
|------------------------|---|---------------------------|
| 1. Shri P.D.T. Achary | — | <i>Director</i> |
| 2. Shri K. Chakraborty | — | <i>Deputy Secretary</i> |
| 3. Km. J.C. Namcho | — | <i>Assistant Director</i> |

2. The Committee considered the draft 2nd and 3rd Reports and adopted the same. The Committee authorised the Chairman to present the reports during the current budget session of Parliament.

3. The Committee also decided to undertake a study tour during the month of June, 1997. Details in this regard are to be worked out.

The Committee then adjourned.

ANNEXURE I

MOST IMMEDIATE PARLIAMENT ASSURANCE

No. I-13012/128/95-IS(D.VII)
Government of India/Bharat Sarkar
Ministry of Home Affairs/Grih Mantralaya

New Delhi, the 11th April, 1997

OFFICE MEMORANDUM

SUBJECT: Assurance given during the XIV Session, 1995 of the 10th Lok Sabha — Starred Question No. 63, dated the 3rd August, 1995.

The undersigned is directed to refer to Lok Sabha Secretariat's endorsement No. 12/2/86-Q(CGA) dated the 2nd April, 1997 on the subject mentioned above and to say that the entire work of fencing taken up in three Phases over an additional border length of 87 Kms. in Jaisalmer and Barmer districts of Rajasthan has been completed by December, 1996. With the completion of this work, a total length of 1172 Kms. along Indo-Pak Border in the States of Punjab and Rajasthan has been fenced. Erection of fencing along the remaining border is being taken up in Phases. The work along 387 Kms in three Phases has been completed as under:

<i>Phase</i>	<i>Sector</i>	<i>Length</i>	<i>Date of Completion</i>
I	Jaisalmer	121 Kms	15.05.95
II	Barmer	146 Kms	15.01.96
III	Barmer	120 Kms	31.12.96

2. This may be brought to the notice of the Committee on Government Assurances so that the decision in regard to dropping of the said Assurance could be taken at the earliest. Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs may please accordingly inform this Ministry of the position in this regard.

3. This issues with the approval of Joint Secretary (IS.II) in the Ministry of Home Affairs.

Sd/-
(K.S. SAWHNEY)
Under Secretary to the Government of India
Tel.: 3015422

To

The Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs
(Shri B.C. Ray, Under Secretary),
12/11, Jamnagar House Barracks,
New Delhi.

No.I-13012/128/95-IS(D.VII) dated the 11th April, 1997.

Copy to:

1. Lok Sabha Secretariat (Question Branch), New Delhi.
2. Parliament Section, Ministry of Home Affairs, New Delhi.

Sd/-

(K.S. SAWHNEY)

Under Secretary to the Government of India

ANNEXURE II

MINIMUM RATES OF WAGES FOR THE UNSKILLED WORKERS IN DIFFERENT STATES/UNION TERRITORIES ADMN.

Unstarred Q. No 3792

As on 3.8.1995

S. No.	Name of Govt./U.T. ministration	State Ad- wages & date of revision	Remarks
I. STATE			
1.	Andhra Pradesh	Rs. 11.00 to* Rs. 40.00 p.d. (11.10.94)	Rates vary from employ- ment to employment.
2.	Arunachal Pradesh	Rs. 21.00 to Rs. 24.00 p.d. (1.11.90)	Rates vary from employ- ment to employment and areas to areas.
3.	Assam	Rs. 25.30 to* Rs. 32.00 p.d. (10.2.92)	Rates vary from employ- ment to employment.
4.	Bihar	Rs. 21.00 to Rs. 34.00 p.d. (19.7.93)	Rates vary from employ- ment to employment.
5.	Goa	Rs. 14.00 to Rs. 27.00 p.d. (7.2.92)	Rates vary from employ- ment to employment.
6.	Gujarat	Rs. 15.00 to* Rs. 37.50 p.d. (1.4.94)	Rates vary from employ- ment to employment (ac- cording to zones).
7.	Haryana	Rs. 1189.30 p.m.* (1.7.94)	Single rates for all employ- ment.
8.	Himachal Pradesh	Rs. 24.00 p.d. to Rs. 26.00 p.d. (14.11.93)	Double rates for all em- ployment.
9.	Jammu & Kashmir	Rs. 15.00 p.d. (24.3.89)	Single rates for all employ- ment.
10.	Karnataka	Rs. 23.44 to* Rs. 32.53 p.d. (22.7.92)	Rates vary from employ- ment to employment (ac- cording to zones).

S. No.	Name of Govt./U.T. ministration	State Ad- wages & date of revision	Remarks
11.	Kerala	Rs. 19.50 to* Rs. 76.40 p.d. (31.3.92)	Rates vary from employ- ment to employment (ac- cording to zones).
12.	Madhya Pradesh	Rs. 30.36 p.d.* Rs. 33.92 p.d. (29.1.94)	Rates vary from employ- ment to employment.
13.	Maharashtra	Rs. 8.00 to* Rs. 69.10 p.d. (29.6.94)	Rates vary from employ- ment to employment (ac- cording to zones).
14.	Manipur	Rs. 37.90 p.d. (for plain) Rs. 40.90 p.d. (for Hill areas) (1.6.90)	Double rate for all employ- ment.
15.	Meghalaya	Rs. 35.00 p.d. (16.3.94)	Single rate for all employ- ment.
16.	Mizoram	Rs. 28.00 p.d. (6.7.92)	Single rate for all employ- ment.
17.	Nagaland	Rs. 25.00 p.d. (6.7.92)	Single rate for all employ- ment.
18.	Orissa	Rs. 25.00 p.d. (1.7.92)	Single rate for all employ- ment.
19.	Punjab	Rs. 40.52 p.d.* (1.3.93)	Single rate for all employ- ment.
20.	Rajasthan	Rs. 22.00 p.d. (2.7.90)	Single rate for all employ- ment.
21.	Sikkim	NIL	Minimum Wages Act, 1948 is yet to be extended and enforced.
22.	Tamil Nadu	Rs. 10.00 to* Rs. 56.25 p.d. (27.1.93)	Rates vary from employ- ment to employment (ac- cording to zones).
23.	Tripura	Rs. 11.80 to Rs. 23.65 p.d. (1.1.90)	Rates vary from employ- ment to employment (ac- cording to zones).

S. No.	Name of Govt./U.T. ministration	State Ad- wages & date of revision	Remarks
24.	Uttar Pradesh	Rs. 468.00 to* Rs. 1038.00 p.m. (3.1.94)	Rates vary from employ- ment to employment (ac- cording to zones).
25.	West Bengal	Rs. 17.40 to* Rs. 45.16 p.d. (1.1.93)	Rates vary from employ- ment to employment (ac- cording to zones).
26.	Andaman & Nicobar	Rs. 27.00 to Rs. 28.00 p.d. (13.8.92)	Rates vary from employ- ment to employment (ac- cording to zones).
27.	Chandigarh	Rs. 1043.50 p.m.* (22.2.90)	Single rate for all employ- ment.
28.	Dadra & Nagar Haveli	Rs. 19.50 to Rs. 29.65 p.d. (15.12.92)	Rates vary from employ- ment to employment (ac- cording to zones).
29.	Daman & Diu	Rs. 22.00 to Rs. 27.00 p.d. (19.3.93)	Single rate for all employ- ment.
30.	Delhi	Rs. 57.50 p.d.* (1.2.95)	Single rate for all employ- ment.
31.	Lakshadweep	Rs. 30.00 p.d. (1.1.93)	Single rate for all employ- ment.
32.	Pondichery	Rs. 8.00 to Rs. 14.00 p.d. (15.12.89)	Rates for agricultural workers.
II	*CENTRAL GOVERNMENT	Rs. 31.02 to Rs. 46.42 p.d. (1.4.95)	Rates vary from employ- ment to employment (ac- cording to areas).

©1997 By Lok Sabha SECRETARIAT

Published under Rule 382 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of
Business in Lok Sabha (Eighth Edition) and printed by the Manager
(P.L. Unit) Government of India Press, Minto Road, New Delhi-110002.
