

HUNDRED AND SECOND REPORT
PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE
(1986-87)

(EIGHTH LOK SABHA)

NATIONAL HIGHWAY BY-PASS SRINAGAR

MINISTRY OF TRANSPORT

(DEPARTMENT OF SURFACE TRANSPORT)

[Action taken on 46th Report (8th Lok Sabha)]



Presented in Lok Sabha on 30 April, 1987

Laid in Rajya Sabha on 30 April, 1987

LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT
NEW DELHI

April, 1987/Vaisakha, 1909 (Saka)

Price Re 1.00

CORRIGENDA TO 102 REPORT OF THE PUBLIC
ACCOUNT COMMITTEE (8TH LOK SABHA)

<u>Page</u>	<u>Para</u>	<u>Line</u>	<u>For</u>	<u>Read</u>
(iii)	-	Sr.2	Shri Chokka Rao	Shri J.Chokka Rao
1	1.3	2	Recommendations	recommendations
2	1.4	2	Projects	Project
2	1.4	5	not	got
4	1.10	34	astonishing	astonishing
5	1.11	16	National	Natural

**PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE
(1986-87)**

CHAIRMAN

Shri E. Ayyapu Reddy

MEMBERS

Lok Sabha

2. Shri Chokka Rao
3. Shri Amal Datta
4. Shri Ranjit Singh Gaekwad
5. Shrimati Prabhawati Gupta
6. Shri G. S. Mishra
7. Shri Vilas Muttemwar
8. Shri G. Devaraya Naik
9. Shri Rameshwar Neekhra
10. Shri Rajmangal Pande
11. Shri H. M. Patel
12. Shrimati Jayanti Patnaik
13. Shri S. Singaravadivel
14. Shri Simon Tigga
15. Shri Girdhari Lal Vyas

Rajya Sabha

16. Shri Bhuvnesh Chaturvedi
17. Shri K. L. N. Prasad
18. Shri Ghulam Rasool Kar
19. Shri A. K. Antony
20. Shri Nirmal Chatterjee
21. Shri M. S. Gurupadaswamy
22. Shri Virendra Verma

SECRETARIAT

1. Shri K. H. Chhaya—*Joint Secretary*
2. Shri Brahmanand—*Senior Financial Committee Officer*

INTRODUCTION

1. The Chairman of the Public Accounts Committee, as authorised by the Committee, do present on their behalf this Hundred and Second Report on action taken by Government on the recommendations of the Committee contained in their 46th Report (8th Lok Sabha) relating to National Highway By-pass, Srinagar.

2. The Committee in their Original Report had observed that in this particular case, the various components of the project got delayed inordinately as various problems were not anticipated and provided for. As Government have not furnished details of remedial measures intended to be adopted in future to avoid delays, the Committee have in this Report desired to be apprised of the detailed guidelines issued to avoid delays in execution of projects.

3. The Committee have also pointed out that due to delay in settling of the claim for acquisition of land, Government had to incur substantial additional expenditure. The Committee have suggested that the control at higher level should be efficient to ensure the observance of prescribed procedure for expeditious settlement of compensation cases pertaining to acquisition of land.

4. The Committee considered and adopted this Report at their sitting held on 22 April, 1987. Minutes of the sitting form Part II of the Report.

5. For facility of reference and convenience, the recommendations and observations of the Committee have also been reproduced in a consolidated form in the Appendix to the Report.

6. The Committee place on record their appreciation of the assistance rendered to them in the matter by the Office of the Comptroller and Auditor General of India.

NEW DELHI:
27 April, 1987
7 Vaisakha, 1909 (Saka)

E. AYYAPU REDDY
Chairman,
Public Accounts Committee.

CHAPTER I

REPORT

1.1 This Report of the Committee deals with the action taken by Government on the Committee's recommendations/observations contained in their 46th Report (8th Lok Sabha) on Paragraph 39 of the Report of Comptroller and Auditor General of India for the year 1982-83, Union Government (Civil) relating to National Highway By-pass, Srinagar.

1.2 The Committee's 46th Report (8th Lok Sabha) was presented to Lok Sabha on 29 April, 1986. It contains 7 recommendations/observations. Action taken notes on all these recommendations/observations have been received from the Ministry of Transport (Department of Surface Transport). These recommendations have been broadly categorised as follows:—

- (i) Recommendations and observations which have been accepted by Government:

Sl. Nos. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 and 7

- (ii) Recommendations and observations which the Committee do not desire to pursue in the light of the replies received from Government:

—Nil—

- (iii) Recommendations and observations replies to which have not been accepted by the Committee and which require reiteration:

6.

- (iv) Recommendations and observations in respect of which Government have furnished interim replies:

—Nil—

1.3 The Committee will now deal with action taken on some of their recommendations/observations.

Delay in execution of the various components of the project
(Sl. No. 3—Paragraph 29)

1.4 Commenting upon the inordinate delay in execution of the various components of the Projects, the Committee in Para 29 of their 46th Report had observed as follows:

“The Committee are unhappy to note that various components of the Project not delayed inordinately ranging from 18 to 71 months. For example, work relating to soil investigation for embankment design was delayed by 71 months. The original job of drilling bore holes for soil investigation for the embankment in the marshy unstable area is stated to have been completed within the scheduled period. However, the fact that it was considered necessary to have additional bore holes for high embankment (for establishing embankment) stability goes only to indicate that the project investigation carried out initially had not been thorough. This view point is further strengthened by other factors reported to have obstructed timely completion of various components. Revision of formation levels in case of earth works Kms. 2.4 to 5, change in design of the culverts in view of the soil conditions encountered in foundation in case of minor drainage crossing kms. 0 to 2.4 and complete revision of design in case of combined bridge over Doodh-ganga Nalla are pointers to the same conclusion. Similarly contractual problems availability of capable contractors, shortage of construction materials and their transportation to site and limited working season in this region are, in the Committee’s view, only management problems that could and should have been anticipated and provided for before taking up the project and while drawing its completion schedules.”

1.5 In their action taken note, the Ministry of Transport (Department of Surface Transport) have stated as follows:

“The above observations of the Committee have been noted.”

1.6 The Committee are unhappy to point out that the Government have merely noted the observations of the Committee and have not furnished details of remedial measures intended to be adopted in future to avoid delays in the execution of the project. In this particular case the various components of the project got delayed inordinately ranging from 18 to 71 months as various problems were not anticipated and provided for. The Committee would also like to be apprised of the detailed guidelines issued by the Ministry to avoid delays in execution of projects.

*Acquisition of land for the project***(Sl. No. 5—Paragraph 31)**

1.7 Commenting upon the slow acquisition of land for the project, the Committee in Paragraph 31 of their 46th Report had observed as follows:—

“Slow acquisition of land for the project has been the other major factor for delay in its execution. The Committee are unhappy to observe that acquisition process has been handled rather erroneously. The original compensation rate of Rs. 500 per kanal was fixed in 1973. The owners did not accept the award due to the fact that they had to make huge investment on the development of this Marshy land to make it fit for cultivation. Yet this award was first imposed on them and later it had to be revised to Rs. 3000/- per kanal to get the project expedited. This level of compensation had to be allowed because a similar land in the area was acquired six years later at this rate in December 1979 for laying a housing colony. According to original estimate in August 1972, land measuring 1408 kanals was proposed to be acquired gradually by the end of 1973-74 at a cost of Rs. 75.37 lakhs. The progress of acquisition of land remained slow. By 1982-83 expenditure to the tune of Rs. 163.21 lakhs had been incurred towards it and 40 kanals of land were yet to be acquired as in August 1983. The cost of land was subsequently revised to Rs. 175 lakhs. The Committee are of the view that the question of reasonable compensation to the land owners could have been settled more realistically in the very beginning in consultation with the Owners’ representatives and once amicably settled there was no question of revision of compensation rates at a later stage. Had this been done the land would have cost less.”

1.8 In their action taken note, the Ministry of Transport (Department of Surface Transport) have stated as follows:—

“The above observations of the Committee have been noted.”

1.9 The Committee are unhappy to observe that the Government have merely noted the observation of the Committee and have not detailed the steps envisaged to be taken in future to settle compensation cases on the reasonable basis. The Committee note

that due to delay in the settling of the claim for acquisition of land, Government had to incur substantial additional expenditure. The Committee would like to be apprised of the procedure formulated by the Government to facilitate expeditious settlement of compensation pertaining to acquisition of land. The Committee suggest that the control at higher level should be efficient to ensure the observance of prescribed procedure.

Execution of works

(Sl. No. 6—Paragraph 32)

1.10 Commenting upon the recording of ground level, the Committee in Paragraph 32 of their 46th Report had observed as follows:

“The Committee observe that the ground levels taken at the time of survey were found to be different from the ground levels noticed at the time of execution of earthwork in kms. 0 (take off point) to 2.4. The difference in the ground levels was such that a large quantity of earthwork to the tune of 1.48 lakh cubic metres over and above what was provided in the estimates had to be carried out at a cost of Rs. 46.50 lakhs. The Committee were informed that the difference in the ground level was due to the land being marshy and some erosion having taken place during the interval between the first and the second set of measurement. The Committee have also been informed that the levels were taken by the Public Works Department staff at the initial and revised stage and were also test checked by Officers at the revised stage. The Committee wonder why there should be difference in the two stages, if measurements were not done by qualified engineers. It has been stated by the Ministry that the recording of ground level is generally done by survey staff and checked by Assistant Engineer and that this procedure was followed in this case. The Committee are surprised that the supervision and checking was left only to the junior officers level (Assistant Engineer). It is astonishing that a project involving huge sums was placed in supervision of the junior staff and even an Executive Engineer was not asked to test check the levels at the initial stage. The Committee would suggest that higher supervisory officers should conduct test check personally. The Committee would like this matter to be examined in depth to fix

responsibility for the lapses in this regard and the Committee apprised of the action taken in the matter.”

1.11 In their action taken note, the Ministry of Transport (Department of Surface Transport) have stated as follows:

“The Government of Jammu and Kashmir which is the Executing Agency, has reported that as per the standing test check rules, the Assistant Engineer is called upon to record test check of 100 per cent for all such works in token of the correctness of the work executed and the Executive Engineer has to record a percentage check depending upon the nature of work as an endorsement to full check certificates recorded by the Assistant Engineer. However, in respect of underground works including the excavation, full test check is to be recorded by the Executive Engineer though the levelling is generally done by the Survey staff including the Assistant Engineer which is fully checked by him and subsequently verified by the Executive Engineer. The present case related to the National Surface Level *i.e.* general ground levels and it is confirmed by the Executive Agency that it was fully test checked by an Executive Engineer according to the prescribed procedure which was duly followed in this case, only then the full payment was made *i.e.* after prescribed test check by the Executive Engineer in accordance with the procedure mentioned above. Therefore, it would appear that the responsibility was not left only to a junior level Engineer in this case. The difference in levels obtained at initial stage and at the time of execution are explained firstly due to difficulty in exact levelling because of the marshy and water logged condition of the original ground and secondly due to erosion that took place in the 4-year interval between the initial levelling and execution. This note has not been vetted by Director of Audit.”

1.12 The Committee are not satisfied with the explanation that the difference in levels obtained at initial stage and at the time of execution are due to difficulty in exact levelling because of marshy land and water-logging condition of the original ground and secondly due to erosion that took place with the 4-year interval between the initial levelling and execution. The same explanation was given by the Government earlier also and the Committee had desired that responsibility for the lapse resulting in additional expenditure of

**Rs. 46.50 lakhs shou'd be fixed. The Committee suggest the Govern-
ment to re-examine the matter with a view to fixing responsibility
for the lapse. The Committec also recommend that the existing sys-
tem of recording ground levels in such marshy areas should be exa-
mined by experts and suitable improvements made to eliminate such
variations which are prone to leakages. The Committee would like
to be informed of the action taken in the matter.**

CHAPTER II

RECOMMENDATIONS/OBSERVATIONS WHICH HAVE BEEN ACCEPTED BY GOVERNMENT

Recommendation

Pathankot-Jammu-Srinagar Road—National Highway No. 1A—passes through Srinagar city. The intensity of the traffic through Srinagar has increased considerably due to construction of a motorable road to Leh. Large convoys of civil as well as army vehicles move to and from Leh. These vehicles had to pass through Srinagar city. The traffic moving along the National Highway No. 1A to Baramulla and Uri had also to pass through Srinagar city besides the ever increasing local traffic. Owing to increase in the intensity of traffic passing through city portion of the highway, the need for providing a bye-pass was felt as far back as in 1962 but the final alignment (length 17.80 kms) was fixed and approved by the then Ministry of Shipping and Transport in June, 1971. The project, however, got started only in October, 1975. The Committee observe that the wide gap between the conception of the urgent need of the work in 1962 and the beginning of its execution from 1975 was mainly due to time taken in fixing up the agency for execution of the work, resource crunch and delay in acquisition of land. The Committee observe that on the one hand the need for such a bye-pass was considered urgent but on the other when the work was proposed to be entrusted to BRDB it was suggested that the latter had not included this in their immediate programme of construction and therefor ultimately the work was allotted to be carried out through the State Public Works Department despite the so-called urgency much time was lost in debating about the agency to execute the work and other formalities. The Committee feel that all this should have been avoided if the work was really urgent and important. The Committee have also reservations on the choice of agency in this case. Experience shows that if this work had been executed through BRDB, it would have been possible to save a lot of time and resources. The Committee, therefore, recommend that Government should take steps to ensure that, unless unavoidable, important works involving urgent operational requirements of defence especially in border and hill areas are executed only through the agencies like BRDB who have

the expertise and are well organised and equipped to undertake such works and execute them within fixed time schedules.

[Sl. No. 1 (Para 27) of 46th Report of Public Accounts Committee (Eighth Lok Sabha)]

Action taken

The recommendation of the Committee has been noted. This note has been seen and vetted by Audit.

Recommendation

The Committee are unhappy to observe further that even when it took Government so much time to start the project it was started without preparing an integrated project report. The estimates for different components were prepared by authorities from time to time through the period of execution of the project. Further, although the project was estimated to cost over Rs. 7 crores (which actually turned out to about Rs. 10 crores upto March 1983) approval of the Cabinet, required for projects exceeding the estimated cost of Rs. 5 crores, was not obtained. It was only in 1978 before further work was to be sanctioned that a total estimated cost of Rs. 9.31 crores was projected to the Expenditure Finance Committee. The plea of the Minister in this regard that it was taken up as an urgent work as per operational requirements of Ministry of Defence hardly holds ground in the context of inordinate delays that the project actually suffered in its execution right from the very beginning. It is argued that the work required construction of road in water logged and swampy area including a major bridge across Jhelum. Therefore, the work of land acquisition and detailed soil investigation was sanctioned first and started immediately in view of the importance of the matter. However, the fact remains that both these works, viz., detailed investigations and land acquisition works were taken up in a haphazard manner and these very jobs accounted for the major delay in completion of the project. Deviating from normal procedures was, thus hardly of any avail or even cogent. The Committee believe that, instead if the project had been taken up in an integrated manner and comprehensively planned, results would have been much better. The Committee, therefore, disapprove of the disregard shown to the prescribed procedures in this matter and would like it to be taken note of.

[Sl. No. 2 (Para 28) of 46th Report of Public Accounts Committee (Eighth Lok Sabha)]

Action taken:

The recommendations of the Committee have been noted. This note has been seen and vetted by Audit.

Recommendation:

The Committee are unhappy to note that various components of the project get delayed inordinately ranging from 18 to 71 months. For example, work relating to soil investigation for embankment design was delayed by 71 months. The original job of drilling bore holes for soil investigation for the embankment in the marshy unstable area is stated to have been completed within the scheduled period. However, the fact that it was considered necessary to have additional bore holes for high embankment (for establishing embankment) stability goes only to indicate that the project investigation carried out initially had not been thorough. This viewpoint is further strengthened by other factors reported to have obstructed timely completion of various components. Revision of formation levels in case of earth works kms. 2.4 to 5, change in design of the culverts in view of the soil conditions encountered in foundation in case of minor drainage crossing Kms. 0 to 2.4 and complete revision of design in case of combined bridge over Doodh-ganga Nalla are pointers to the same conclusion. Similarly contractual problems, availability of capable contractors, shortage of construction materials and their transportation to site and limited working season in this region are, in the Committee's view, only management problems that could and should have been anticipated and provided for before taking up the project and while drawing its completion schedules.

[Sl. No. 3 (of para 29) of 46th Report of Public Accounts Committee (Eighth Lok Sabha)]

Action taken

The above observations of the Committee have been noted.

Recommendation

Time over run in these circumstances which led to escalation of cost of the project, was inevitable. The project was started in October 1975 and was expected to be completed during 1984-85. The actual expenditure incurred upto March 1983 was Rs. 978.09 lakhs against the approved estimates of Rs. 708.93 lakhs. The work was divided into 17 jobs and in respect of 14 jobs the revised estimated cost showed an increase of Rs. 538.01 lakhs over the original esti-

mates and accordingly revised estimates for Rs. 1,166.65 lakhs were submitted in respect of these jobs to the Ministry. Percentage of increase in respect of 14 jobs ranged from 12 to 456.

The Committee thus cannot but conclude that the project has been poorly managed from its very inception. Avoidable delays have occurred at all stages resulting in increased costs. They take a particularly serious view of the delay in view of the fact that project had been taken up as an urgent work in view of operational requirements of defence. At this stage they would like the whole affair to be taken up as a test case for examination by experts so as to draw lessons from the failures therein for guidance of all in formulation and execution of similar projects in future.

[Sl. No. 4 (Para 30) of 46th Report of Public Accounts Committee (Eighth Lok Sabha)]

Action taken

As desired by the Committee, a Committee of Experts has been set up by this Ministry to examine the case and to recommend suitable guidelines for formulation and execution of similar projects in future. A copy of the orders constituting the Committee of Experts is enclosed. The Committee of Experts will submit its report within a period of 4 months from the date of its first meeting. A copy of the Report of the Experts Committee when received along with the action proposed to be taken by the Government of their recommendations would be furnished to the Public Accounts Committee. This note has been seen and vetted by Director of Audit.

[Ministry of Surface Transport (Roads Wing) O.M.
No. RW|NIA|JK|474|W dated 23-12-1986.]

Recommendation

Slow acquisition of land for the project has been the other major factor for delay in its execution. The Committee are unhappy to observe that acquisition process has been handled rather erroneously. The original compensation rate of Rs. 500 per kanal was fixed in 1973. The owners did not accept the award due to the fact that they had to make huge investment on the development of this Marshy land to make it fit for cultivation. Yet this award was first imposed on them and latter it had to be revised to Rs. 3000/- per kanal to get the project expedited. This level of compensation had to be allowed because a similar land in the area was acquired six years later at this rate in December, 1979 for laying a housing colony. According to original estimate in August, 1972, land measur-

ing 1408 kanals was proposed to be acquired gradually by the end of 1973-74 at a cost of Rs. 75.37 lakhs. The progress of acquisition of land remained slow. By 1982-83 expenditure to the tune of Rs. 163.21 lakhs had been incurred towards it and 40 kanals of land were yet to be acquired as in August 1983. The cost of land was subsequently revised to Rs. 175 lakhs. The Committee are of the view that the question of reasonable compensation to the land owners could have been settled more realistically in the very beginning and once amicably settled there was no question of revision of compensation rates at a later stage. Had this been done the land would have cost less.

[Sl. No. 5 (para 31) of 46th Report of Public Accounts Committee (Eighth Lok Sabha)]

Action taken

The above observations of the Committee have been noted.

Recommendation

The Committee are particularly surprised to note that two sets of level books in which the ground measurements were recorded are not available with the State Authorities. Disappearances of such basic record even before the project completion report had been approved is in clean contravention of the provisions in this regard in the Public Works Department Manual and a serious lapse indicative of *mala fide* action. They recommend that the matter should be examined at a high level and the individual responsibility on these responsible for the safe custody of such records fixed. The Committee would like to be informed of the action taken in this matter.

[Sl. No. 7 (para 33) of 46th Report of Public Accounts Committee (Eighth Lok Sabha)]

Action taken

The Government of Jammu and Kashmir have entrusted to an Superintending Engineer to investigate the matter regarding the disappearance of records of original survey. The Committee would be informed as soon as the findings of investigations are available to this Ministry. This note has been vetted by Director of Audit.

[Ministry of Surface Transport (Roads Wing)'s O.M.
No. RW|NIA|JK|474|W-III dated 23-12-1986.]

CHAPTER III

RECOMMENDATIONS/OBSERVATIONS WHICH THE COMMITTEE DO NOT DESIRE TO PURSUE IN THE LIGHT OF THE REPLIES RECEIVED FROM GOVERNMENT

—NIL—

CHAPTER IV

RECOMMENDATIONS/OBSERVATIONS THE REPLIES TO WHICH HAVE NOT BEEN ACCEPTED BY THE COMMITTEE AND WHICH REQUIRE REITERATION

Recommendation

The Committee observe that the ground levels taken at the time of survey were found to be different from the ground levels noticed at the time of execution of earthwork in Kms. 0 (take off point) to 2.4. The difference in the ground levels was such that a large quantity of earthwork to the tune of 1.48 lakh cubic metres over and above what was provided in the estimated had to be carried out at a cost of Rs. 46.50 lakhs. The Committee were informed that the difference in the ground level was due to the land being marshy and some erosion having taken place during the interval between the first and the second set of measurement. The Committee have also been informed that the level were taken by the Public Works Department staff at the initial and revised stage and were also test checked by Officers at the revised stage. The Committee wonder why there should be difference in the two stages, if measurements were done by qualified engineers. It has been stated by the Ministry that the recording of ground level is generally done by survey staff and checked by Assistant Engineer and that this procedure was followed in this case. The Committee are surprised that the supervision and checking was left only to the Junior Officers level (Assistant Engineer). It is astonishing that a project involving huge sums was placed in supervision of the junior staff and even an Executive Engineer was not asked to test check the levels at the initial stage. The Committee would suggest that higher supervisory officers should conduct test check personally. The Committee would like this matter to be examined in depth to fix responsibility for the lapses in this regard and the Committee apprised of the action taken in the matter.

[S. No. 6 (para 33) of 46th Report of Public Accounts Committee (Eighth Lok Sabha)]

Action taken

The Government of Jammu and Kashmir which is the Executive Agency has reported that as per the standing test check rules, the

Assistant Engineer is called upon to record test check of 100 per cent for all such works in token of the correctness of the work executed and the Executive Engineer has to record a percentage check depending upon the nature of work as an endorsement to full check certificates recorded by the Assistant Engineer. However, in respect of underground works including the excavation, full test check is to be recorded by the Executive Engineer though the levelling is generally done by the Survey staff including the Assistant Engineer which is fully checked by him and subsequently verified by the Executive Engineer.

2. The present case related to the Natural Surface Level i.e. general ground levels and it is confirmed by the Executive Agency that it was fully test checked by an Executive Engineer according to the prescribed procedure which was duly followed in this case, only then the full payment was made i.e. after prescribed test check by the Executive Engineer in accordance with the procedure mentioned above. Therefore, it would appear that the responsibility was not left only to a junior level Engineer in this case. The difference in levels obtained at initial stage and at the time of execution are explained firstly due to difficulty in exact levelling because of the marshy and water logged condition of the original ground and secondly due to erosion that took place in the 4 year interval between the initial levelling and execution. This note has been vetted by Director of Audit.

[Ministry of Surface Transport (Roads Wing)'s O.M. No. W/NIA/JK/474/W-III dated 23-1-1987.]

CHAPTER V

**RECOMMENDATIONS/OBSERVATIONS IN RESPECT OF
WHICH GOVERNMENT HAVE FURNISHED INTERIM REPLIES**

—NIL—

NEW DELHI;
27 April, 1987
7 Vaisakha, 1909 (Saka)

E. AYYAPU REDDY,
Chairman,
Public Accounts Committee.

PART-II

Minutes of the 58th Sitting of the Public Accounts Committee held on 22nd April, 1987 held in Committee Room No. 50, Parliament House, New Delhi

The Committee sat from 1500 hours to 1810 hours.

PRESENT

Shri E. Ayyapu Reddy—*Chairman*

MEMBERS

2. Shri J. Chokka Rao
3. Shri Ranjit Singh Gaekwad
4. Shri H. M. Patel
5. Shri Simon Tigga
6. Shri Girdhari Lal Vyas
7. Shri M. S. Gurupadaswamy
8. Shri Virendra Verma

SECRETARIAT

Shri S. M. Mehta—*Senior Financial Committee Officer*

REPRESENTATIVES OF THE OFFICE OF C&AG OF INDIA

1. Shri D. K. Chakravorty—Addl. Dy. C&AG (RC)
2. Shri R. Parameswar—DACWM-I
3. Shri M. M. B. Annavi—DARS
4. Shri S. B. Krishnan—Director (Reports)
5. Shri K. Krishnan—JD (DT)
6. Shri N. L. Chopra—JD (DS)
7. Shri S. K. Gupta—JD (Indirect Taxes)

2. The Committee considered and adopted the following draft Report(s) with certain modifications as in Annexure

(i) * * * *

(ii) Action taken on 46th Report (8th Lok Sabha) reg. National Highway By-pass, Srinagar.

(iii)	*	*	*	*
(iv)	*	*	*	*
(v)	*	*	*	*

3. The Committee also approved the modifications/amendments suggested by Audit as a result of factual verification of the afore-said draft Report.

4. The Committee also authorised the Chairman to present these Reports to the Lok Sabha.

The Committee then adjourned.

ANNEXURE

Amendments/Modifications made by Public Accounts Committee at their sitting held on 22nd April, 1987 in Draft report on action taken on 46th Report (8th Lok Sabha) relating to National Highway By-Pass, Srinagar

Page	Para	Line(s)	Amendments/Modifications
5	1.9	2.3	<i>For</i> "settle cases.....land-owners" <i>Substitute</i> "compensation cases on the reasonable basis".
5	1.9	10-11	<i>For</i> "It is also.....to ensure" <i>Substitute</i> "The Committee suggest that the control at higher level should be efficient to ensure"
7	1.12	2nd from bottom	<i>For</i> "would urge" <i>Substitute</i> "suggest"
7	1.12	last line	<i>For</i> "and fix" <i>Substitute</i> "with a view to fixing"

APPENDIX

Observations/Recommendations

S. No.	Para No.	Ministry/Deptt.	s/Observation	Recommendations
1	2	3		4
1	1.6	Ministry of Transport (Deptt. of Surface Transport)	The Committee are unhappy to point out that the Government have merely noted the observations of the Committee and have not furnished details of remedial measures intended to be adopted in future to avoid delays in the execution of the project. In this particular case the various components of the project got delayed inordinately ranging from 18 to 71 months as various problems were not anticipated and provided for. The Committee would also like to be apprised of the detailed guidelines issued by the Ministry to avoid delays in execution of projects.	
2	1.9	-Do-	The Committee are unhappy to observe that the Government have merely noted the observation of the Committee and have not detailed the steps envisaged to be taken in future to settle compensation cases on the reasonable basis. The Committee note that due to delay in the settling of the claim for acquisition of land, Government had to incur substantial additional expenditure. The	

