

COMMITTEE ON SUBORDINATE LEGISLATION
(THIRTEENTH LOK SABHA)
(2003-2004)

FOURTEENTH REPORT

(PRESENTED ON 23.12.2003)

LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT

NEW DELHI

C O N T E N T S

COMPOSITION OF THE COMMITTEE

INTRODUCTION

REPORT

1. The Prasar Bharati (Broadcasting Corporation of India) (Procedure and Conduct of Business) Regulations, 2000.
2. The Indian Foreign Service Branch “B” (Stenographers’ Cadre) Senior Principal Secretary Recruitment Rules, 2001 (GSR 587 of 2001)
3. The Army Educational Corps Training and Centre Instructor in Bhutanese Language (Group A Posts) Recruitment Rules, 2000 (SRO 171 of 2001)
4. The Ministry of Agriculture, Department of Agriculture and Cooperation, Directorate of Extension, Director (Extension), Joint Director (Extension), Extension Officer, Assistant Extension Officer and Technical Assistant (Agriculture) Recruitment Rules, 2000. (GSR 374 of 2000)
5. The Coast Guard Organisation Group ‘B’ and “C” Draughtsman posts (Chief Draughtsman, Draughtsman Grade I, Draughtsman Grade II And Draughtsman Grade III) Recruitment Rules 2001. (SRO 136 of 2001)

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 5th sitting of the Committee held on 25.6.2003.
 - III. Extracts from the Minutes of the 6th sitting of the Committee held on 15.7.2003.
 - IV. Extracts from the Minutes of the 7th sitting of the Committee held on 4.8.2003.
 - V. Minutes of the Tenth sitting of the Committee held on 21.11.2003
-

COMPOSITION OF THE COMMITTEE ON SUBORDINATE LEGISLATION
(2003-2004)

1. Dr. B.B. Ramaiah - Chairman
2. Shri S.K. Bwiswmuthiary
3. Shri Ramdas Rupala Gavit
4. Shri Paban Singh Ghatowar
5. Shri Talib Hussain Chowdhary
6. Dr. M. Jagannath
7. Shri Ram Singh Kaswan
8. Shri Suresh Kurup
9. Shri Pravin Rashtrapal
10. Shri Anadicharan Sahu
11. Prof. I.G. Sanadi
12. Dr. Ram Lakhani Singh
13. Shri Ramjiwan Singh
14. Shri Tufani Saroj
15. Dr. N. Venkataswamy

SECRETARIAT

1. Shri S.K. Sharma - Joint Secretary
2. Shri A. Louis Martin - Director
3. Shri Ashok Balwani - Under Secretary

INTRODUCTION

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

The matters covered by this Report were considered by the Committee at their sittings held on 25.6.2003, 15.7.2003 and 4.8.2003. The Committee took oral evidence of the representatives of Ministry of Information and Broadcasting. The Committee wish to express their thanks to the representatives of the Ministry for appearing before the Committee and furnishing the information desired by them.

The Committee considered and adopted this Report at their sitting held. The Extract from the Minutes* of the sittings relevant to this Report are included in Appendix II to IV.

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

NEW DELHI;

**(B.B. RAMAIAH)
CHAIRMAN
COMMITTEE ON SUBORDINATE LEGISLATION**

The Prasar Bharati (Broadcasting Corporation of India) (Procedure and Conduct of Business) Regulations, 2000.

The Prasar Bharati (Broadcasting Corporation of India) (Procedure and Conduct of Business) Regulations, 2000 were published by Prasar Bharati in the Gazette of India, Extraordinary, Part III, Section 4 dated 1 February, 2001. Regulation 7 which provides for Constitution of Prasar Bharati Management Council is reproduced below:-

“7(1) There shall be a Council to be known as a “Prasar Bharati Management Council” consisting of -

<i>(a) Executive Member</i>	<i>-</i>	<i>President</i>
<i>(b) Member (Finance)</i>	<i>-</i>	<i>Member</i>
<i>(c) Member (Personnel)</i>	<i>-</i>	<i>Member</i>
<i>(d) Director-General (Akashvani)</i>	<i>-</i>	<i>Member</i>
<i>(e) Director-General (Doordarshan)</i>	<i>-</i>	<i>Member</i>
<i>(f) Engineer-in-Chief (Akashvani)</i>	<i>-</i>	<i>Member</i>
<i>(g) Engineer-in-Chief (Doordarshan)</i>	<i>-</i>	<i>Member</i>

(2) Any business relating to matters of finance, or personnel management and administration, which is proposed to be placed before the Prasar Bharati Board shall first be considered by the Prasar Bharati Management Council.

Provided that the Executive Member may propose any business for the consideration of the Prasar Bharati Board without placing any such matter before the Prasar Bharati Management Council.”

(3) No business shall be proposed for the consideration of the Prasar Bharati Board by any member of the Prasar Bharati Management Council.

1.2. The sub-regulation (2) of Regulation 7 made it mandatory for the Prasar Bharati Board to place any business relating to matters of Finance or personnel management and administration before the Prasar Bharati Management Council. The proviso to the sub-

regulation, however, empowered the Executive Member to propose any business without placing any such matter before the Prasar Bharati Management Council. The proviso did not specify the circumstances in which the extraordinary step of by-passing the Management Council can be resorted to by the Executive Member. In the absence of this information, the sub-regulation (2) and the proviso appeared to be contradicting each other.

1.3. When the matter was taken up with the Ministry of Information and Broadcasting, the Prasar Bharati notified an amendment deleting the entire Regulation 7. This would mean scrapping of “Prasar Bharati Management Council.” The rationale for the step by Prasar Bharati was not clear. In order to seek clarification in this regard, the Committee took oral evidence of the Ministry/Prasar Bharati on 15 July, 2003.

1.4. In a brief submitted to the Committee, the Prasar Bharati stated that normally a proviso does not enlarge the rule, and in most cases cuts down and makes an exception from the ambit of the main provision. The proper functions of a proviso is to except and deal with a case which would otherwise fall within the general language of the main rule and its effect is confined to that case.

1.5. Prasar Bharati further stated that Regulation 7 is not consistent with the Prasar Bharati Act, 1990 which does not make a mention of such a Council or the manner in which the business of the Prasar Bharati Board will be transacted through this Council. Under Section 33 of the Prasar Bharati Act, the Corporation is required to make

regulations, not inconsistent with the Act and Rules made hereunder. It has been further stated that after going through the whole regulations, it was felt that all reference to Management Council may be deleted since it is not compatible with other provisions of these Regulations. Separately by an administrative office order, a deliberative Management Committee has reportedly been set up to discuss matters connected with the improvement of the performance of Prasar Bharati.

1.6. During the course of oral evidence, the Committee were informed that the idea to constitute the Prasar Bharti Management Council originated in view of the fact that at that time, the Prasar Bharti Board was highly truncated and had only 3 members. Further, the Additional Secretary of the Ministry was holding additional charge of CEO of Prasar Bharati, DG(AIR) and DG (Doordarshan). Therefore, physically it was impossible for him to have gone into various issues. In the circumstances, this Management Council idea was brought about to make sure that items go to the Board with proper application of mind. A resolution of the Board, was, therefore, passed for its constitution. The CEO, Prasar Bharati stated during evidence that there is no provision for a Management Council in the Prasar Bharati Act. To do away with this inconsistency, a separate Notification was reportedly issued on 24 September, 2002 deleting clause 7 of the regulations relating to the Prasar Bharati Management Council.

1.7. The Management Council has been replaced by two Management Committees – one for the Doordarshan and the other for AIR again by a resolution of the Board. They

were reportedly constituted in April 2002 and May 2003 respectively. Regarding the role of the Management Committees, the CEO stated during evidence:-

“Under the administrative arrangement that we made in the Management Committee, one for AIR and another for Doordarsan, we only discuss issues. The first para of the minutes of those Management Committee meetings, issued every time, make it crystal clear that the discussions and suggestions that are arrived at in the Management Committee meeting are not approved. It is only discussed and a certain suggestion comes out of these Management Committee meetings. Then we say whatever discussions have taken place, the idea that is discussed, will have to be approved on file, approved by a competent authority. Then only it can go to the Board. The Management Committee decisions by themselves are not final. They have again to be circulated. The approval of the competent authority within Prasar Bharati is taken and if required, they go to the Board. The Constitution of the Management Council was envisaged on the basis of the recommendation given by Narayanmurthy Committee, constituted by the Government. That Committee only has suggested that the Management Council should be constituted, chaired by the Chief Executive, Prasar Bharati with senior Executives. So, before this recommendation was sent, the Management Committee also has been formed in the Prasar Bharati”.

1.8. On the legal status of these management Committees, the Committee were informed that this was only an administrative arrangement. Though Section 3(vi) of the Prasar Bharati Act provides that the corporation may appoint such Committees as may be necessary for the efficient discharge of its functions, the two management Committee have reportedly been constituted administratively and not in terms of Section 3 of the Prasar Bharati Act. A representative of the Corporation stated in this connection as follows:-

“Once we constitute a Committee in terms of Section 3 (iv), it will have its function mandatory as well as statutory also. We are not having all Members of the Board who can constitute the Committee. That is why, we have been delaying it.”

1.9. On being asked as to whether the extant regulations were vetted by the Legislative Department of the Ministry of Law, a representative of the Ministry stated that the Law Ministry was consulted at the initial stage and quoted the opinion of Legislation department as follows:-

“We feel that the regulations of the statutory bodies to be made without prior approval of the Central Government may not require even vetting by the Legislative Department.”

1.10. The Committee’s examination of the Prasar Bharati (Broadcasting Corporation of India) (Procedure and Conduct of Business) Regulations, 2000 reveals that certain clauses of the Regulations are inconsistent with the Prasar Bharati Act, 1990. The Committee note that regulation 7 and proviso to its sub – regulations (2) regarding Prasar Bharati Management Council and its functioning were contradictory in nature. When this matter was taken up with the Ministry of Information and Broadcasting, the Prasar Bharati took the extreme step of dissolving the Prasar Bharati Management Council and deleting the entire regulation 7 on the plea that it was not compatible with the provisions of the Act. The Committee wonder how a regulation which was inconsistent with the Act came into being. Obviously, sufficient care was not exercised in framing the regulations. The Committee view this state of affairs very seriously. Rule making power delegated to the Corporation under Section 33 of the Prasar Bharati Act is sacrosanct and should be exercised with extreme care. The Committee hope that the corporation will not be found wanting in this respect in future.

1.11. The Committee note that the Prasar Bharati Management Council has now been replaced by two Management Committees - one for AIR and another for Doordarshan as an administrative arrangement. In terms of the powers conferred by section 3(vi) of the Prasar Bharati Act, these Management Committees ought to have been given legal status with needed powers for their effective functioning. Instead, these Committees have been constituted as mere discussion fora without any decision making powers. It has been stated that the Corporation is not having all Members of the Board who can constitute these committees. The Committee are not convinced of this reason. The fact that the corporation do not have all Members of the Board even 13 years after enactment of the legislation does not speak well either of the corporation or of the Ministry of Information and Broadcasting. The Committee stress that all necessary steps to constitute the Management Committee in accordance with the provisions of the Act be taken forthwith.

II

The Indian Foreign Service Branch 'B' (Stenographers' Cadre) Senior Principal Private Secretary Recruitment Rules, 2001 (GSR 587 of 2001)

The Indian Foreign Service Branch 'B' (Stenographers' Cadre) Senior Principal Private Secretary Recruitment Rules, 2001 were published in the Gazette of India, Part – II, Section 3(i) dated 27 October, 2001.

2.2. Rule 14 of the above rules regarding "Interpretation" stated as under:-

“..... Where a doubt arises as to the interpretation of any of the provisions of these rules and the regulations made thereunder the matter shall be referred to the Central Government in Department of Personnel and Training whose decision thereon shall be final.”

2.3. It was felt that the wording 'decision of the Government shall be final' were apt to give an impression of ousting the jurisdiction of the law courts. As per the oft-repeated recommendation of the Committee, the rules should not be so worded as to give such an impression. The matter was therefore taken up with the Ministry of External Affairs.

2.4. The Ministry vide their notification No. GSR 473 dated 16th July, 2002 have since deleted the words "whose decision shall be final" from the rule.

2.5. The Committee feel that the words 'decision of the Government shall be final' occurring in interpretation clause of the Indian Foreign Service Branch 'B' (Stenographers' Cadre) Senior Principal Private Secretary Recruitment Rules, give

an impression of ousting the jurisdiction of the Law Courts. The Committee therefore, reiterate their oft-repeated recommendation that, the rules should not be so worded as to give an impression of ruling out the intervention of Courts. The Committee express their satisfaction that on being pointed out, the Ministry have since issued an amendment deleting the words “decision of the Government shall be final” from the said rules vide Gazette of India Notification No. GSR 473 dated 16 November, 2002.

The Army Educational Corps Training College and Centre Instructor in Bhutanese Language (Group A Posts) Recruitment Rules, 2000 (SRO 171 of 2001)

The Army Educational Corps Training College and Centre Instructor in Bhutanese Language (Group A Posts) Recruitment Rules, 2000 were published in the Gazette of India, Part II, Section 4 dated 29 September, 2001. It was observed therefrom that the year in the short title was indicated as 2000 whereas the rules were published in the year 2001. As per oft-repeated recommendation of the Committee on Subordinate Legislation, the year in the short title should correspond to the year of publication of the Gazette. The Ministry of Defence were, therefore, requested to state reasons for deviation from normal practice followed in this respect.

3.2. The Ministry vide their reply dated 27 March, 2002 inter-alia stated that the discrepancy in the year occurred inadvertently and a corrigendum to remove the said discrepancy has been vetted by Ministry of Law and a copy of the corrigendum would be sent to Committee on Subordinate Legislation of Lok Sabha after its publication. The Ministry vide their reply dated 3 October, 2002 furnished a printed copy of the Gazette Notification carrying the requisite corrigendum and notified vide SRO No. 99 dated 11 May, 2002.

3.3. The Committee note from the Army Educational Corps Training College and Centre Instructor in Bhutanese Language (Group A Posts) Recruitment Rules, 2000 that the year in the Short title was indicated as '2000' whereas these rules

were published in the year 2001. As per the requirement of the subordinate legislation, the year in the short-title to all rules whether original or amended should conform to the year of publication of the Gazette Notification. The Committee, however, note with satisfaction that on being pointed out, the Ministry of Defence (Army Educational Corps Training College and Centre Instructor in Bhutanese Language) have issued a corrigendum carrying out suitable correction in the short-title and notified the same vide SRO 99 dated 11 May, 2002. The Committee desire the Ministry to evolve suitable procedural safeguards against recurrence of such lapses.

IV

**The Ministry of Agriculture, Department of Agriculture and Cooperation,
Directorate of Extension, Director (Extension), Joint Director (Extension),
Extension Officer, Assistant Extension Officer and Technical Assistant
(Agriculture) Recruitment Rules, 2000 (GSR 374 of 2000)**

The aforesaid Recruitment Rules were published in the Gazette of India, Part-II, Section 3(i), dated 30 September, 2000. It was observed therefrom that for the post of Assistant Extension Officer, the probation period prescribed for direct recruits was one year and for promotees it was two years. The Ministry of Agriculture were, therefore, requested to state the rationale behind prescribing a longer probation period for promotees as compared with that of the direct recruits and for treating the candidates at two different footings in the matter of probation. In this connection, attention of the Ministry was also invited to the Department of Personnel and Training O.M. No. 21011/94 Estt. (C) dated 20 April, 1995 which requires prescription of uniform probationary period for both promotees and direct recruits.

4.2. The Ministry's response to the above issue was not forthcoming and the Ministry had to be reminded several times and the attention of the Ministry was also invited to the following recommendation of the Committee on Subordinate Legislation made in para 15 of their Fourth Report (Seventh Lok Sabha) regarding delay in replying to Parliamentary References:-

“The Committee, take serious note of the inordinate delay in furnishing information to the Committee. The Committee have time and again stressed that inordinate delays like the present one unnecessarily disturb the schedule of work of the Committee. The Committee desire the Ministry to streamline their procedure and devise suitable measures to eliminate the delays in dealing with the Parliamentary references.”

4.3. The Ministry of Agriculture thereafter prescribed an uniform period of probation for promotees and direct recruits for the post of Assistant Extension Officer vide notification No. 120 dated 13 April, 2002.

4.4. The Committee observe from the Ministry of Agriculture, Department of Agriculture and Cooperation, Directorate of Extension, Director (Extension), Joint Director (Extension), Extension Officer, Assistant Extension Officer and Technical Assistant (Agriculture) Recruitment Rules, 2000, that the probation period prescribed for direct recruits is one year and for promotees it is two years. The Committee disapprove this differential treatment in the matter of probation amounting to discrimination which is also not in line with the relevant instructions issued by the Department of Personnel and Training regarding probationary period. The Committee, however, note with satisfaction that on being pointed out, the Ministry of Agriculture have prescribed uniform period of probation for both the promotees and the direct recruits and notified the amendment vide Gazette of India, Notification number GSR 120 dated 13 April, 2002. However, the Committee express their dissatisfaction over the unduly long time taken by the Ministry in notifying the requisite amendments and direct the Ministry to handle Parliamentary References expeditiously.

V

The Coast Guard Organisation Group 'B' and 'C' Draughtsman posts (Chief Draughtsman, Draughtsman Grade I, Draughtsman Grade II and Draughtsman Grade III) Recruitment Rules, 2001.

The aforesaid Rules were published in the Gazette of India, Part-II (Section 4, vide SRO 136) dated 25 August, 2001 (Annexure). During the course of examination of these Rules it was observed that the probation period prescribed for the post of Draughtsman Grade-I was one year in case of direct recruits whereas it was two years in the case of promotees. Prescription of longer probation period for promotees and shorter for the direct recruits appeared to be discriminatory. The matter was, therefore, referred to the Ministry of Defence for ascertaining the rationale behind prescribing longer probation period for promotees.

5.2. The Ministry of Defence in their reply dated 20 March, 2002 stated as under:-

“The probation period of two years in case of both direct recruits and promotees was prescribed in the proposal initiated by Coast Guard Organisation in respect of Draughtmen Grade I and the same was approved by DOP&T. However, in the approved Recruitment Rules as forwarded by UPSC the probation period of one year in case of direct recruits and two years in case of promotees was prescribed by UPSC.

Therefore, UPSC is being requested to intimate the reasons for difference in the period of probation in case of promotees and direct recruits.”

5.3. Vide their letter dated 13 June, 2002 the Ministry stated as under:-

“The UPSC has forwarded the revised Recruitment Rules in respect of Draughtsmen Grade I of Coast Guard Organisation, wherein the existing provision of probation period of one year for direct recruits and two years in the case of promotees have been amended as one year for both direct recruits and promotees.

Based on the letter from the UPSC, amendment to the existing SRO No. 136 dated 24 July, 2001 has been taken up. Subsequent to obtaining the

approval from DOP&T, Ministry of Law and Justice and Official Language Wing of Ministry of Law, necessary notification will be issued.”

5.4. The Ministry of Defence have since issued an amendment to the Recruitment Rules vide SRO 45 dated 14 February, 2003.

5.5. The Committee observe that recruitment rules governing Draughtsmen Grade-I of the Coast Guard Organisation published on 25 August, 2001 prescribed a probation period of one year for direct recruits and two years for promotees . Prescription of longer probationary period for promotees appeared to be discriminatory and in violation of the guidelines issued by the DOP&T. The Committee, however, note with satisfaction that when the matter was taken up with the Ministry of Defence, an amendment notification was issued vide SRO 45 dated 14 February, 2003 published in the Gazette of India Part-II Section 4 dated 8th March, 2003 prescribing uniform probation period of one year for both direct recruits and promotees. The Committee urge that the Ministry should exercise care in future and strictly adhere to the guidelines issued by the DOP&T while framing the Recruitment Rules.

NEW DELHI;
_____,2003

(B.B. RAMAIAH)
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

(THIRTEENTH LOK SABHA)

Sl. No.	Reference to Para No. in the Report	Summary of Recommendations
1	2	3
1.	<p data-bbox="370 890 428 926">1.10</p> <p data-bbox="370 1661 428 1696">1.11</p>	<p data-bbox="773 747 1544 816"><u>The Prasar Bharati (Broadcasting Corporation of India) (Procedure and Conduct of Business) Regulations, 2000</u></p> <p data-bbox="764 894 1552 1619">The Committee's examination of the Prasar Bharati (Broadcasting Corporation of India) (Procedure and Conduct of Business) Regulations, 2000 reveals that certain clauses of the Regulations are inconsistent with the Prasar Bharati Act, 1990. The Committee note that regulation 7 and proviso to its sub – regulations (2) regarding Prasar Bharati Management Council and its functioning were contradictory in nature. When this matter was taken up with the Ministry of Information and Broadcasting, the Prasar Bharati took the extreme step of dissolving the Prasar Bharati Management Council and deleting the entire regulation 7 on the plea that it was not compatible with the provisions of the Act. The Committee wonder how a regulation which was inconsistent with the Act came into being. Obviously, sufficient care was not exercised in framing the regulations. The Committee view this state of affairs very seriously. Rule making power delegated to the Corporation under Section 33 of the Prasar Bharati Act is sacro-sanct and should be exercised with extreme care. The Committee hope that the corporation will not be found wanting in this respect in future.</p> <p data-bbox="764 1661 1552 1873">The Committee note that the Prasar Bharati Management Council has now been replaced by two Management Committees - one for AIR and another for Doordarshan as an administrative arrangement. In terms of the powers conferred by section 3(vi) of the Prasar Bharati Act, these Management Committees ought to have been</p>

2.	2.5	<p>given legal status with needed powers for their effective functioning. Instead, these Committees have been constituted as mere discussion fora without any decision making powers. It has been stated that the Corporation is not having all Members of the Board who can constitute these committees. The Committee are not convinced of this reason. The fact that the corporation do not have all Members of the Board even 13 years after enactment of the legislation does not speak well either of the corporation or of the Ministry of Information and Broadcasting. The Committee stress that all necessary steps to constitute the Management Committee in accordance with the provisions of the Act be taken forthwith.</p> <p><u>The Indian Foreign Service Branch ‘B’ (Stenographers’ Cadre) Senior Principal Private Secretary Recruitment Rules, 2001 (GSR 587 of 2001)</u></p> <p>The Committee feel that the words ‘decision of the Government shall be final’ occurring in interpretation clause of the Indian Foreign Service Branch ‘B’ (Stenographers’ Cadre) Senior Principal Private Secretary Recruitment Rules, give an impression of ousting the jurisdiction of the Law Courts. The Committee therefore, reiterate their oft-repeated recommendation that, the rules should not be so worded as to give an impression of ruling out the intervention of Courts. The Committee express their satisfaction that on being pointed out, the Ministry have since issued an amendment deleting the words “decision of the Government shall be final” from the said rules <u>vide</u> Gazette of India Notification No. GSR 473 dated 16 November, 2002.</p>
----	-----	---

3.	3.3	<p><u>The Army Educational Corps Training College and Centre Instructor in Bhutanese Language (Group A Posts) Recruitment Rules, 2000 (SRO 171 of 2001)</u></p> <p>-----</p> <p>The Committee note from the Army Educational Corps Training College and Centre Instructor in Bhutanese Language (Group A Posts) Recruitment Rules, 2000 that the year in the Short title was indicated as ‘2000’ whereas these rules were published in the year 2001. As per the requirement of the subordinate legislation, the year in the short-title to all rules whether original or amended should conform to the year of publication of the Gazette Notification. The Committee, however, note with satisfaction that on being pointed out, the Ministry of Defence (Army Educational Corps Training College and Centre Instructor in Bhutanese Language) have issued a corrigendum carrying out suitable correction in the short-title and notified the same vide SRO 99 dated 11 May, 2002. The Committee desire the Ministry to evolve suitable procedural safeguards against recurrence of such lapses.</p>
4.	4.4	<p><u>The Ministry of Agriculture, Department of Agriculture and Cooperation, Directorate of Extension, Director (Extension), Joint Director (Extension), Extension Officer, Assistant Extension Officer and Technical Assistant (Agriculture) Recruitment Rules, 2000 (GSR 374 of 2000)</u></p> <p>The Committee observe from the Ministry of Agriculture, Department of Agriculture and Cooperation, Directorate of Extension, Director (Extension), Joint Director (Extension), Extension Officer, Assistant Extension Officer and Technical Assistant (Agriculture) Recruitment Rules, 2000, that the probation period prescribed for direct recruits is one year and for promotees it is two years. The Committee disapprove this differential treatment in the matter of probation amounting to discrimination which is also not in line with the relevant instructions issued by the Department of Personnel and Training regarding probationary period. The Committee, however, note with satisfaction that on being pointed out, the Ministry of</p>

5.	5.5	<p>Agriculture have prescribed uniform period of probation for both the promotees and the direct recruits and notified the amendment vide Gazette of India, Notification number GSR 120 dated 13 April, 2002. However, the Committee express their dissatisfaction over the unduly long time taken by the Ministry in notifying the requisite amendments and direct the Ministry to handle Parliamentary References expeditiously.</p> <p><u>The Coast Guard Organisation Group 'B' and 'C' Draughtsman posts (Chief Draughtsman, Draughtsman Grade I, Draughtsman Grade II and Draughtsman Grade III) Recruitment Rules, 2001.</u></p> <p>The Committee observe that recruitment rules governing Draughtsmen Grade-I of the Coast Guard Organisation published on 25 August, 2001 prescribed a probation period of one year for direct recruits and two years for promotees . Prescription of longer probationary period for promotees appeared to be discriminatory and in violation of the guidelines issued by the DOP&T. The Committee, however, note with satisfaction that when the matter was taken up with the Ministry of Defence, an amendment notification was issued vide SRO 45 dated 14 February, 2003 published in the Gazette of India Part-II Section 4 dated 8th March, 2003 prescribing uniform probation period of one year for both direct recruits and promotees. The Committee urge that the Ministry should exercise care in future and strictly adhere to the guidelines issued by the DOP&T while framing the Recruitment Rules.</p>
----	-----	--