

**COMMITTEE ON SUBORDINATE LEGISLATION  
(FOURTEENTH LOK SABHA)  
(2005-2006)**

**SEVENTH REPORT**

**(PRESENTED ON 6 DECEMBER, 2005)**

**S**

**E**

**A**

**L**

**LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT**

**NEW DELHI**

**PRICE :**

## **C O N T E N T S**

	<u>Para No.</u>	<u>Page No.</u>
<u>COMPOSITION OF THE COMMITTEE</u>		(iii)
<u>INTRODUCTION</u>		(iv)
REPORT		
<u>I</u> Frequent Amendment of the CENVAT Credit Rules, 2002	1.1 – 1.5	1- 3
<u>II</u> Discrepancy in the Schedule to Recruitment Rules	2.1 – 2.4	4-5
<u>III</u> The Jute Manufacturers Development Council (Procedural) Rules (Amendment), 2001 and the Jute Manufacturers Development Council (Procedural) Rules, 2002	3.1 – 3.12	6-10

## **A P P E N D I C E S**

- I. Summary of main recommendations/observations made by the Committee.
- II. Extracts from the Minutes of the 9<sup>th</sup> and 11<sup>th</sup> sittings of the Committee held on 4.5.2005 & 6.7.2005.
- III. Extracts from the Minutes of the second sitting of the Committee held on 8.9.2005.

**COMPOSITION OF THE COMMITTEE ON SUBORDINATE LEGISLATION  
(2005-2006)**

1. Shri N.N. Krishnadas - Chairman
2. Shri Omar Abdullah
3. Shri Ajoy Chakraborty
4. Shri Bikram Keshari Deo
5. Shri N.Y. Hanumanthappa
6. Shri Ram Singh Kaswan
7. Shri Vijaykumar Khandelwal
8. Shri Sudam Marandi
9. Shri Anantha Venkata Rami Reddy
10. Shri Chandra Shekhar Sahu
11. Shri Sita Ram Singh
12. Shri Bhupendrasinh Solanki
13. Shri Ramjilal Suman
14. Shri P.C. Thomas
15. Shri Madhu Goud Yaskhi

SECRETARIAT

1. Shri John Joseph - Secretary
2. Shri R. C. Ahuja - Joint Secretary
3. Shri R.K. Bajaj - Deputy Secretary
4. Shri J.V.G. Reddy - Under Secretary  
(iii)

## INTRODUCTION

I, the Chairman, Committee on Subordinate Legislation having been authorised by the Committee to submit the report on their behalf, present this Seventh Report.

2. The matters covered by this Report were considered by the Committee on Subordinate Legislation at their sitting held on 4.5.2005 and 6.7.2005.

3. The Committee considered and adopted this Report at their sitting held on 8 September, 2005.

4. For facility of reference and convenience, recommendations/observations of the Committee have been printed in thick type in the body of the Report and have also been reproduced in summary in Appendix I of the Report.

5. Extracts from the Minutes of the Ninth & Eleventh sitting (2004-2005) and Second sitting (2005-2006) relevant to this Report are included in Appendix II & III.

**NEW DELHI;  
SEPTEMBER, 2005  
BHADRAPADA, 1927 (SAKA)**

**N.N. KRISHNADAS  
CHAIRMAN  
COMMITTEE ON SUBORDINATE LEGISLATION**

# I

## FREQUENT AMENDMENT OF THE CENVAT CREDIT RULES, 2002.

The CENVAT Credit Rules, 2002 have been amended 12 times between 25 March, 2003 and 25 June, 2003 i.e. within a period of three months, by the Ministry of Finance (Department of Revenue) as shown below:-

Sl. No.	No. of Notification	Date	No. of Amendment	Provision
1.	GSR 243-E	25-03-2003	5 <sup>th</sup> Amendment	Transitional provision
2.	GSR 292-E	01-04-2003	6 <sup>th</sup> Amendment	Declaration to be made before 7 April,2003
3.	GSR 335-E	10-04-2003	7 <sup>th</sup> Amendment	Declaration to be made before 15 April,2003
4.	GSR 337-E	16-04-2003	8 <sup>th</sup> Amendment	Declaration to be made before 25 April,2003
5.	GSR 355-E	25-04-2003	9 <sup>th</sup> Amendment	Declaration to be made before 2 May,2003
6.	GSR 361-E	30-04-2003	10 <sup>th</sup> Amendment	*
7.	GSR 378-E	01-05-2003	11 <sup>th</sup> Amendment	Declaration to be made before 12 May,2003
8.	GSR 392-E	12-05-2003	12 <sup>th</sup> Amendment	Declaration to be made before 26 May,2003
9.	GSR 406-E	14-05-2003	13 <sup>th</sup> Amendment	*
10.	GSR 460-E	06-06-2003	14 <sup>th</sup> Amendment	Declaration to be made before 15 June,2003
11.	GSR 465-E	09-06-2003	15 <sup>th</sup> Amendment	*
12.	GSR 516-E	25-06-2003	16 <sup>th</sup> Amendment	*

\* Amendment of Rules.

1.2 The Ministry of Finance were asked about justification for amending the rules in such a quick succession and were enquired whether it does not amount to abuse of delegated powers.

1.3 The Ministry of Finance (Department of Revenue) vide their OM dated 16.2.2004 responded as under:-

*“Under the ‘deemed credit’ scheme, manufacturers of textile fabrics and garments were allowed to take credit of duty paid on their inputs as per prescribed rates without production of duty paying documents. This scheme was withdrawn with effect from 1.4.2003, and announcement to that effect was made in Budget 2003. However, since the textile industry was used to deemed credit scheme, it was felt that it would take time for the industry to get used to take credit on the basis of duty paying documents. Consequently, a transitional provision for textile and textile articles was also made vide notification no. 25/2003 –Central Excise (NT) dated 25<sup>th</sup> March, 2003(called the Fifth Amendment Rules to the CENVAT Credit Rules). These Rules, inter alia provided that a manufacturer, producer, first and the second stage dealer of yarns and unprocessed fabrics or a manufacturer of processed fabrics, could avail credit of the duty paid on the inputs lying in stock as on 31<sup>st</sup> March, 2003 either on*

*actual basis (i.e. on production of documents evidencing actual payment of duty) or in a manner prescribed under the said rules or calculated at such rates as may be notified by the government (i.e. in cases where the person availing credit is unable to produce documents evidencing actual payment of duty). This notification also provided that for availing such credit, the beneficiary had to make a written declaration of description, quantity and value of stock of input lying as on a specified date.”*

2. *Since making of such a declaration could not have been an open ended process, vide the Sixth Amendment Rules to the CENVAT Credit Rules, 2002 (issued vide notification No. 28/2003-CE (NT) dated 1<sup>st</sup> April, 2003), provided that such declaration has to be made on or before 7.4.2003.*

3. *Subsequent to prescription of such last date, there were reports of agitations in the textile trade. Besides, a number of Hon'ble Members of Parliament had also requested the FM to have a total review of the duty structure so that the smaller units are kept outside the excise control. It was also reported that the beneficiaries who wanted to make such declaration were prevented from doing so by the section of trade agitating against the excise duty scheme for textile announced in Budget 2003 (that came into effect from 1.4.2003). Considering the demand for extension of the last date, made by the section of trade willing to make such declarations, the said date was initially extended to 15.4.2003. However, as the agitation continued in different parts of the country and such requests were received at different times, the said last date was further extended to 25.4.2003 (vide notification dated 16.4.003), to 2.5.2003 (vide notification dated 25.4.2003), to 12.5.2003 (vide notification dated 1.5.2003), to 26.5.2003 (vide notification dated 12.5.2003) and to 15.6.2003 (vide notification dated 6.6.2003).*

4. *These extensions were justified and do not amount to abuse of power given for Subordinate Legislation for the following reasons:-*

- *The provisions relating to availment of one time credit based on stock of inputs is a beneficial legislation. Measures taken were necessary to ensure that the beneficiaries are not prevented from availing such intended benefit due to extraneous reasons.*
- *The extension upto 2.5.2003 was also necessitated in view of the fact that the government was still examining the new duty structure on textile in view of the debate that was taking place in the Parliament on the Finance Bill. Till such time a decision was taken in this regard, it was felt that in the event of no change being made in the duty structure, smaller units should not be deprived of the facility of availing credit on a deemed basis, as a one time measure. Subsequently, Government had given exemption to the smaller units, so that such units could be kept out of excise control.*
- *The situation thus stabilized only after the passing of the Finance Bill and the textile industry could only then know as to which sectors were entitled to exemption and which one were required to pay duty.*
- *As the decentralized textile industry was brought under excise control for the first time, as a facilitation measure, it was considered desirable to extend the time limit so that they could file declarations after getting themselves familiar with the excise procedure.*
- *It may be noted that the amendments did not give any extra benefit, but only allowed the units a one time facility of availing credit on the stock of inputs lying on the first day of the next financial year.*
- *It is thus submitted that the extension of time given on various occasions was mainly on account of large number of representations received for the review of the duty structure, and the Government had to extend the dates till a final view could be taken on these representations. Subsequently a number of small units were prevented from complying with these requirements because of threat of strikes and agitations, and it was only at*

*their request, which was supported by Members of Parliament, that the date had to be extended so as to allow the small units to take benefit of the entire scheme.*

1.4 The Committee considered the above rules at their sitting held on 4 May, 2005.

**1.5 Amendments to the CENVAT Credit Rules 2002 were issued as many as 12 times in a short span of three months between 25 March, 2003 and 25 June, 2003. The amendment dated 25.3.2003 related to making a provision regarding availment of one time credit, based on stocks of inputs as on 31 March, 2003; seven amendments related to specifying a date for making a declaration of the stock of input and extending the last date thereof ; and four amendments related to modification of the CENVAT Credit Rules. The Committee feel that the frequency of amendments in such a short period, for whatever reasons, smacks of adhocism and casual approach in the matter of rule making and amounts to abuse of the delegated powers by the bureaucracy. The Committee are not satisfied with the explanation of the Ministry of Finance (Department of Revenue) that the last date for declaration was required to be extended till the passing of the Finance Bill. The Ministry's explanation does not clarify as to why the Ministry revised the date six times especially when the likely date of passing of the Finance Bill can be anticipated by the Ministry. The Committee desire that the rule making powers conferred by the statute should be exercised by the Ministry of Finance (Department of Revenue) with extreme care and responsibility and amendments, if any, should be preceded by careful consideration of all relevant factors and ground realities.**

## II

### DISCREPANCY IN THE SCHEDULE TO RECRUITMENT RULES

\*\*\*\*\*

The Ministry of Chemicals and Fertilizers, Department of Chemicals and Petrochemicals (Daftry, Senior Peon and Record Sorter) Recruitment Rules, 2002 (GSR 506 of 2002) were published in the Gazette of India, Part-II, Section 3 (i) dated 14 December, 2002. The mode of recruitment for the posts of Daftry, Senior Peon and Record Sorter prescribed under column 11 of the Schedule to the Recruitment Rules was by “promotion”. The corresponding provisions in column 5 of the Schedule should have been “non-selection”. The Ministry of Chemicals and Fertilizers (Department of Chemicals and Petrochemicals) ,however, depicted the Column ‘5’ as “Not applicable”.

2.2 On the discrepancy being pointed out, the Ministry issued a corrigendum, correcting the relevant provision of column 5, of the Schedule. The Ministry vide their communication dated 9<sup>th</sup> February, 2004 enclosed a copy of the amendment published in the Gazette of India GSR 463, Part-II, Section 3(i) dated 27 December, 2003. The Ministry have now made the following amendments:-

- (i) for column heading, “Whether selection-cum-seniority or selection by merit’, the column heading “whether selection post or non-selection” shall be substituted.
- (ii) For entry, “not applicable”, the entry “non-selection” shall be substituted.

2.3 The Committee considered the above rules at their sitting held on 4 May, 2005.

**2.4 The Committee note that there was a discrepancy in the Ministry of Chemicals and Fertilizers, Department of Chemicals and Petrochemicals (Daftry, Senior Peon and Record Sorter) Recruitment Rules, 2002. The mode of recruitment for all the three posts of Daftry, Senior Peon and Record Sorter was shown under column 11 of the Schedule to the Rules as “promotion”. However, the entry in column 5 of the Schedule was shown as “Not applicable” which should have been prescribed as “Non-Selection”. On being pointed out, the Ministry have issued corrigenda rectifying the discrepancy. The Committee would like the Ministry to be vigilant and ensure that error of this nature does not recur in future.**



### III

#### **THE JUTE MANUFACTURERS DEVELOPMENT COUNCIL (PROCEDURAL) RULES (AMENDMENT), 2001 AND THE JUTE MANUFACTURERS DEVELOPMENT COUNCIL (PROCEDURAL) RULES, 2002**

The Jute Manufacturers Development Council (Procedural) Rules (Amendment), 2001 (GSR 808-E of 2001) were published in the Gazette of India – Extraordinary Part-II Section 3(i) dated 29 October, 2001. The scrutiny of these amendment rules revealed that the rules contained neither the commencement date of the rules nor the foot-note which is normally appended to amendment rules to indicate the particulars of publication of the principal rule and the subsequent amendments made thereto.

3.2 The Ministry of Textiles in their reply dated 1 July, 2002 have stated that the rules were deemed to be effective from the date of its publication in the Official Gazette. As regards the foot note, it was stated that since the amendment in the Jute Manufacturers Development Council (Procedural) Rules had been made for the first time and the introductory para of the Notification described the purport of the principal rules, foot note was not appended to the Notification.

3.3 The introductory para in the amendment rules, however, did not make any mention of either the date of publication of the principal rules or GSR No. under which the rules were published. This position as well as the need for Commencement Clause as underlined by the Committee on Subordinate Legislation in the past was brought to the notice of the Ministry of Textiles. In response to this, the Ministry of Textiles took action and brought out the Jute Manufacturers Development Council (Procedural) Rules, 2002 in supersession of earlier rules and notified the same on 24 December, 2002 vide Notification GSR 836-E of 2002.

**3.4 The Committee observe that the Jute Manufacturers Development Council (Procedural) Rules (Amendment), 2001 contain neither a Commencement Clause nor a footnote bringing out particulars of publication of the principal rules and subsequent amendments. The Committee note that on these lacunae being pointed out, the Ministry of Textile have taken action and brought out the Jute Manufacturers Development Council (Procedural) Rules, 2002 in supersession of earlier rules.**

3.5 The examination of the Jute Manufacturers Development Council (Procedural) Rules, 2002 dated 24.12.2002 brought out in supersession of the earlier rules disclosed two shortcomings as discussed below: -

**A. Absence of safe-guards**

3.6 Rule 6(2) of the Jute Manufacturers Development Council (Procedural) Rules, 2002 provided that the Central Government can appoint another person in the place of a member of the Council if it is of opinion that such member has ceased to represent the interests, he was appointed to represent.

3.7 It may be seen that the above rule did not provide safeguards to meet the requirement of natural justice and to prevent arbitrary exercise of powers. Affording an opportunity to present his case before an adverse action is taken against a person is one of the basic tenets of natural justice. Recording of reasons before taking action against a person is a safeguard against arbitrary exercise of powers. The rule under reference did not contain both these safeguards.

3.8 When the above shortcoming was pointed out, the Ministry of Textiles amended the relevant rule to provide for the above mentioned safeguards and notified the same vide Notification No. GSR 6-E dated 3 January, 2004. The rule 6(2) as amended reads as under :-

Rule 6 (2)

- (a) *It shall be competent for the Central Government to appoint another person in the place of a member appointed under sub-section (4) of Section 3 of the Act before the completion of two years, if it is of opinion that such member has ceased to represent the interests, he was appointed to represent. Before appointing another person in the place of a member of the Council, reasons therefor have to be duly recorded.*
- (b) *Before taking any action under this sub-rule against a member, he shall be given an opportunity to present his case.*

**3.9 The Committee observe that Rule 6 (2) of the Jute Manufacturers Development Council (Procedural) Rules, 2002 provide that the Central Government can appoint another person in the place of a member of the Council, if it is of the opinion that such member has ceased to represent the interests, he was appointed to represent. The rule does not provide for affording an opportunity to such member to present his case before he is replaced nor does it contain any provision requiring recording of reasons before an adverse action is taken against a member. These safeguards are necessary to meet the requirement of natural justice and to prevent arbitrary exercise of powers. The Committee note that on being pointed out, the Ministry of Textiles have amended the relevant rule to provide for these safeguards. The Committee expect the Ministry to take due care while formulating such rules in future.**

**B. Notice period for suggesting subjects for discussion**

3.10 Rule 12 (3) of the Jute Manufactures Development Council (Procedural) (Amendment) Rules, 2002 stipulated that a meeting of the Council shall be fixed by giving at least ten clear days' notice. The notice period prescribed under rule 12 (4) for a member to suggest any subject for discussion by the Council was also ten clear days. These stipulations in effect meant that no member could suggest any subject for discussion after the date for a meeting is fixed. In order to enable members to suggest subjects for discussion, the notice period required for making such a suggestion ought to be lesser than the notice period for fixing a meeting.

3.11 When the aforesaid point was referred to the Ministry of Textiles, the notice period for a member to suggest subject for discussion has been brought down from ten clear days to five clear days. This amendment was notified vide the Jute Manufacturers Development Council (Procedural) Rules (Amendment) 2002 Notification No. GSR 6-E dated 3 January, 2004.

**3.12 The Committee observe that the period of notice prescribed under Rule 12(3) and Rule 12(4) for fixing a meeting for the Council as well as for a member to suggest any subject for discussion by the Council was the same, viz. ten clear days. This means that no member can suggest any subject for discussion after the date for a meeting is fixed. The Committee note with satisfaction that on this shortcoming being pointed out, the notice period prescribed for making such a suggestion has been brought down from ten days to five days and the relevant rule has been amended accordingly.**

**NEW DELHI;  
SEPTEMBER, 2005  
BHADRAPADA, 1927 (SAKA)**

**N.N. KRISHNADAS  
CHAIRMAN  
COMMITTEE ON SUBORDINATE LEGISLATION**

APPENDIX –I

(Vide Para 4 of the Introduction of the Report)

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS MADE IN THE REPORT OF THE  
COMMITTEE ON SUBORDINATE LEGISLATION

(FOURTEENTH LOK SABHA)

Sl. No.	Reference to Para No. in the Report	<u>Summary of Recommendations</u>
1	2	3
1.	1.5	<p><b><u>Frequent amendment of the CENVAT Credit Rules, 2002.</u></b></p> <p>Amendments to the CENVAT Credit Rules 2002 were issued as many as 12 times in a short span of three months between 25 March, 2003 and 25 June, 2003. The amendment dated 25.3.2003 related to making a provision regarding availment of one time credit, based on stocks of inputs as on 31 March, 2003; seven amendments related to specifying a date for making a declaration of the stock of input and extending the last date thereof ; and four amendments related to modification of the CENVAT Credit Rules. The Committee feel that the frequency of amendments in such a short period, for whatever reasons, smacks of adhocism and casual approach in the matter of rule making and amounts to abuse of the delegated powers by the bureaucracy. The Committee are not satisfied with the explanation of the Ministry of Finance (Department of Revenue) that the last date for declaration was required to be extended till the passing of the Finance Bill. The Ministry's explanation does not clarify as to why the Ministry revised the date six times especially when the likely date of passing of the Finance Bill can be anticipated by the Ministry. The Committee desire that the rule making powers conferred by the statute should be exercised by the Ministry of Finance (Department of Revenue) with extreme care and responsibility and amendments, if any, should be preceded by careful consideration of all relevant factors and ground realities.</p>

2.	2.4	<p><b><u>Discrepancy in the Schedule to Recruitment Rules</u></b></p> <p>The Committee note that there was a discrepancy in the Ministry of Chemicals and Fertilizers, Department of Chemicals and Petrochemicals (Daftry, Senior Peon and Record Sorter) Recruitment Rules, 2002. The mode of recruitment for all the three posts of Daftry, Senior Peon and Record Sorter was shown under column 11 of the Schedule to the Rules as “promotion”. However, the entry in column 5 of the Schedule was shown as “Not applicable” which should have been prescribed as “Non-Selection”. On being pointed out, the Ministry have issued corrigenda rectifying the discrepancy. The Committee would like the Ministry to be vigilant and ensure that error of this nature does not recur in future.</p>
3.	3.4	<p><b><u>The Jute Manufacturers Development Council (Procedural) Rules (Amendment), 2001 and the Jute Manufacturers Development Council (Procedural) Rules, 2002.</u></b></p> <p>The Committee observe that the Jute Manufacturers Development Council (Procedural) Rules (Amendment), 2001 contain neither a Commencement Clause nor a footnote bringing out particulars of publication of the principal rules and subsequent amendments. The Committee note that on these lacunae being pointed out, the Ministry of Textile have taken action and brought out the Jute Manufacturers Development Council (Procedural) Rules, 2002 in supersession of earlier rules.</p>
	3.9	<p>The Committee observe that Rule 6 (2) of the Jute Manufacturers Development Council (Procedural) Rules, 2002 provide that the Central Government can appoint another person in the place of a member of the Council, if it is of the opinion that such member has ceased to represent the interests, he was appointed to represent. The rule does not provide for affording an opportunity to such member to present his case before he is replaced nor does it contain any provision requiring recording of reasons before an adverse action is taken against a member. These safeguards are necessary to meet the requirement of natural justice and to prevent arbitrary exercise of powers.</p>

	3.12	<p>The Committee note that on being pointed out, the Ministry of Textiles have amended the relevant rule to provide for these safeguards. The Committee expect the Ministry to take due care while formulating such rules in future.</p> <p>The Committee observe that the period of notice prescribed under Rule 12(3) and Rule 12(4) for fixing a meeting for the Council as well as for a member to suggest any subject for discussion by the Council was the same, viz. Ten clear days. This means that no member can suggest any subject for discussion after the date for a meeting is fixed. The Committee note with satisfaction that on this shortcoming being pointed out, the notice period prescribed for making such a suggestion has been brought down from ten days to five days and the relevant rule has been amended accordingly.</p>
--	------	---

**APPENDIX-II**  
**(Vide Para 5 of the Introduction of the Report)**

**CONFIDENTIAL**

**EXTRACTS FROM THE MINUTES OF THE NINTH SITTING OF THE  
COMMITTEE ON SUBORDINATE LEGISLATION (FOURTEENTH LOK  
SABHA)(2004-2005)**

—————

The Committee met on Wednesday, 4 May, 2005 from 1500 to 1545 hours in Committee Room 'D', Parliament House Annexe, New Delhi.

**PRESENT**

Shri N.N. Krishnadas - Chairman

**MEMBERS**

2. Shri Omar Abdullah
3. Justice (Retd.) N.Y. Hanumanthappa
4. Shri A. Venkatarami Reddy
5. Shri Chandra Shekhar Sahu
6. Shri Sitaram Singh
7. Shri Ramji Lal Suman
8. Shri Madhu Goud Yaskhi

**SECRETARIAT**

1. Shri John Joseph, Additional Secretary
2. Shri A. Louis Martin, Director
3. Shri J. V. G. Reddy, Under Secretary

XX

XX

XX

3. Thereafter, the Committee took up the following memoranda for consideration:-

XX

XX

XX

(2) Memorandum No. 11 regarding frequent amendment of the CENVAT Credit Rules , 2002.

XX

XX

XX.

(4) Memorandum No. 13 regarding discrepancy in the Schedule to Recruitment Rules.

4. Having considered the memoranda at Sl.No. (2), (3) and (4) above, the Committee decided to prepare a report thereon with suitable comments.

XX

XX

XX

The Committee then adjourned.

-----

---

xx Omitted portion of the Minutes are not relevant to this Report.



**EXTRACTS FROM THE MINUTES OF THE ELEVENTH SITTING OF THE  
COMMITTEE ON SUBORDINATE LEGISLATION (2004-2005)**

---

The Committee met on Wednesday, 06 July, 2005 from 1500 to 1545 hours in  
Committee Room No. 62, Parliament House, New Delhi.

**PRESENT**

Shri N.N. Krishnadas - Chairman

**MEMBERS**

2. Shri Omar Abdullah
3. Shri Ajay Chakraborty
4. Shri Bikram Keshari Deo
5. Shri Ram Singh Kaswan
6. Shri Vijay Khandelwal
7. Shri A. Venkatarami Reddy
8. Shri Chandra Shekhar Sahu
9. Shri Sitaram Singh
10. Shri Ramji Lal Suman
11. Shri P. C. Thomas
12. Shri Madhu Goud Yaskhi

**SECRETARIAT**

Shri A. Louis Martin, Director

2. At the outset, the Chairman welcomed the members to the sitting of the Committee on Subordinate Legislation and thereafter took up the following memoranda for consideration: -

XX

XX

XX

1. Memorandum No.15 regarding the Jute Manufactures Development Council (Procedural) Rules (Amendment) 2001 and the Jute Manufacturers Development Council (Procedural) Rules, 2002.

XX

XX

XX

3. In regard to memoranda mentioned at Sl. No. 1, 2 and 5 above, the Committee decided to comment suitably in their next Report.

XX

XX

XX

The Committee then adjourned.

---

xx Omitted portion of the Minutes are not relevant to this Report.

**APPENDIX-III**  
**(Vide Para 5 of the Introduction of the Report)**

**CONFIDENTIAL**

**EXTRACTS FROM THE MINUTES OF THE SECOND SITTING OF THE  
COMMITTEE ON SUBORDINATE LEGISLATION (FOURTEENTH LOK  
SABHA)(2005-2006)**

—————

The Committee met on Thursday, 8 September, 2005 from 15.00 to 15.45 hours in  
Committee Room No. '53', Parliament House, New Delhi.

**PRESENT**

Shri N.N. Krishnadas - Chairman

**MEMBERS**

2. Shri Ajoy Chakraborty
3. Shri Bikram Keshari Deo
4. Shri Ram Singh Kaswan
5. Shri Chandra Shekhar Sahu
6. Shri Bhupendrasinh Solanki
7. Shri Ramjilal Suman
8. Shri P.C. Thomas
9. Shri Madhu Goud Yaskhi

**SECRETARIAT**

1. Shri R.K. Bajaj, Deputy Secretary
2. Shri J. V. G. Reddy, Under Secretary

2. The Committee took up for consideration the draft Seventh Report and adopted the same without any modification. The Committee also authorized the Chairman to present the same to Lok Sabha.

XX

XX

XX

The Committee then adjourned.

.....

---

xx Omitted portion of the Minutes are not relevant to this Report.