

FORTY-SIXTH REPORT

ESTIMATES COMMITTEE

(1986-87)

(EIGHTH LOK SABHA)

MINISTRY OF URBAN DEVELOPMENT
C.P.W.D.—MAINTENANCE OF BUILDINGS

**Action taken by Government on the Recommendations
contained in the Thirty-Third Report of Estimates
Committee (Eighth Lok Sabha)**



Presented to Lok Sabha on 27 April, 1987

LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT
NEW DELHI

April, 1987/Vaisakha, 1909 (Saka)

Price : Rs. 2.00

295A

CONTENTS

| | PAGE |
|---|-------|
| COMPOSITION OF THE ESTIMATES COMMITTEE | (iii) |
| COMPOSITION OF THE STUDY GROUP ON ACTION TAKEN REPORT OF ESTIMATES COMMITTEE (1986-87) | (v) |
| INTRODUCTION | (vii) |
| CHAPTER I Report | 1 |
| CHAPTER II Recommendations/Observations which have been accepted by Government | 15 |
| CHAPTER III Recommendations/Observations which the Committee do not desire to pursue in view of Government replies | 26 |
| CHAPTER IV Recommendations/Observations in respect of which replies of Government have not been accepted by the Committee . | 29 |
| CHAPTER V Recommendations/Observations in respect of which final replies of Government are awaited | 39 |
| APPENDIX Analysis of Action Taken by Government on the recom- mendations contained in the 33rd Report of Estimates Com- mittee (8th Lok Sabha) | 42 |

ESTIMATES COMMITTEE
(1986-87)

CHAIRMAN

***1. Smt. Chandra Tripathi**

MEMBERS

2. Shri Jai Prakash Agarwal
3. Shri Sarfaraz Ahmad
4. Shri T. Basheer
5. Shri Manoranjan Bhakta
6. Shri Birinder Singh
7. Shri Saifuddin Chowdhary
8. Shri Somjibhai Damor
9. Prof. Madhu Dandavate

****10. Shri Bipin Pal Das**

11. Shri N. Dennis
12. Shri G. L. Dogra
13. Shri H. A. Dora
14. Shri H. N. Nanje Gowda
15. Shri Keyur Bhushan
16. Shri Mahabir Prasad
17. Shri Hannan Mollah
18. Shri Ajay Mushran

*****19. Arvind Netam**

20. Shri Ram Pyare Panika
21. Shri Uttamrao Patil
22. Shri Jagannath Patnaik
23. Shri Balwant Singh Ramoowalia
24. Shri Naviachandra Ravani
25. Shri C. Madhav Reddy
26. Shri P. Selvendran

***Elected on 24th July, 1986 vice Smt. Sheila Dikshit appointed Minister. Nominated Chairman w.e.f. 20-11-1986 vice Shri Chintamani Panigrahi appointed Minister.**

****Elected on 24th July, 1986 vice Smt. Krishna Sahi appointed Minister.**

*****Elected on 28th November, 1986 vice Shri Chintamani Panigrahi appointed Minister.**

27. Prof. Nirmāla Kumari Shaktawat
28. Shri Satyendra Narain Sinha
29. Shri P. K. Thungon
30. Shri D. P. Yadav

4

SECRETARIAT

1. Shri N. N. Mehra, *Joint Secretary.*
2. Shri T. S. Ahluwalia, *Chief Financial Committee Officer.*
3. Shri J. C. Malhotra, *Senior Financial Committee Officer.*

**STUDY GROUP ON ACTION TAKEN REPORTS OF ESTIMATES
COMMITTEE**

(1986-87)

1. Smt. Chandra Tripathi—*Chairman*
2. Prof. Madhu Dandavate—*Convener*
3. Shri G. L. Dogra
4. Shri Ajay Mushran
5. Shri Satyendra Narain Sinha
6. Shri Manoranjan Bhakta
7. Shri Jai Prakash Agarwal
8. Shri Ram Pyare Panika
9. Shri C. Madhav Reddy

INTRODUCTION

I, the Chairman of Estimates Committee having been authorised by the Committee to submit the Report on their behalf present this 46th Report on Action Taken by Government on the recommendations contained in the 33rd Report of Estimates Committee (8th Lok Sabha) on the Ministry of Urban Development—CPWD—Maintenance of Buildings.

2. The 33rd Report was presented to Lok Sabha on 30th April, 1986. Government furnished their replies indicating action taken on the recommendations contained in that Report by 27th February, 1987. The draft Report was adopted by the Committee on 15th April, 1987.

3. The Report has been divided into the following Chapters :

- (i) Report.
- (ii) Recommendations which have been accepted by Government.
- (iii) Recommendations which the Committee do not desire to pursue in view of Government's replies.
- (iv) Recommendations in respect of which replies of Government have not been accepted by the Committee.
- (v) Recommendations in respect of which replies of Government are awaited.

4. An analysis of action taken by Government on the recommendations contained in the 33rd Report of Estimates Committee is given in Appendix. It would be observed therefrom that out of 31 recommendations made in the Report 17 recommendations i.e. about 54.8% have been accepted by Government and the Committee do not desire to pursue 2 recommendations i.e. about 6.6% in view of the Government replies. Replies of Government in respect of 7 recommendations i.e. about 22.6% have not been accepted by the Committee. Replies of Government in respect of 5 recommendations i.e. about 16.0% are still awaited.

NEW DELHI;
April 22, 1987
Vaisakha 2, 1909 (S)

CHANDRA TRIPATHI,
Chairman,
Estimates Committee.

CHAPTER I

REPORT

1.1 This Report of the Estimates Committee deals with Action Taken by Government on the recommendations contained in their Thirty-Third Report (8th Lok Sabha) on CPWD—Maintenance of Buildings which was presented to Lok Sabha on 30 April, 1986.

1.2 Action Taken Notes have been received in respect of all the recommendations contained in the Report. These Notes have been categorised as follows :—

- (i) Recommendations/observations which have been accepted by the Government;
Sl. Nos. 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 11, 12, 17, 19, 20, 21, 23, 25, 26, 27, 29 and 30.

(Total 17—Chapter II)

- (ii) Recommendations/observations which the Committee do not desire to persue in view of Government's replies;
Sl. Nos. 4 and 24

(Total 2—Chapter III)

- (iii) Recommendations/observations in respect of which Government's replies have not been accepted by the Committee;
Sl. Nos. 1, 2, 3, 9, 13, 18 and 22.

(Total 7—Chapter IV)

- (iv) Recommendations/observations in respect of which final replies are still awaited;

Sl. Nos. 14, 15, 16, 28 and 31.

(Total 5—Chapter V).

1.3 The Committee will now deal with action taken by Government on some of the recommendations.

Maintenance of Government Buildings

Recommendation (Sl. No. 1, Para 1.11)

1.4 Expressing their concern over the bad neglect of maintenance of Government buildings by CPWD, the Estimates Committee in their 33rd Report had observed as follows :—

“The Committee are concerned to note that maintenance of Government buildings has come to be badly neglected by CPWD. This fact was admitted by the Chief Engineer CPWD when he confessed before the Committee during evidence that “Maintenance has been our weakest area.” The Prime Minister of India, some years ago had also mentioned about “the inadequate attention given to maintenance resulting in breakdowns and considerable public disillusionment with the efficiency of Government”. The

representatives of the Ministry ascribed this poor maintenance mainly to the "low productivity" and "scant discipline among the workers at the lower level." The Committee totally disagree with this line of thinking and feel that with the same human material as is available, better results could be achieved if there is better training given to the staff, better supervision and element of firm accountability is ensured. Proper maintenance also includes preventive maintenance which, if properly and timely attended to, could prevent, comparatively with small amount of expenditure, minor damage to the buildings furniture/electrical installations from turning into a major one requiring huge funds for repairs/replacements. For example, if a leaking water tap or a water storage tank or a choked drain pipe is not set right immediately although being a minor complaint lodged with the CPWD Enquiry or coming to their notice *suo moto* during the course of routine inspection, the entire building is likely to get major damaged by seepage and thereby, besides great inconvenience to the users of the building, it will require huge funds for plastering and repairing. The Committee regret to note that this has happened in the case of one of the most prestigious buildings, e.g. Parliament House itself. The Committee are also of the considered opinion that a solution for maintenance problem of Government buildings cannot be found in handing over the maintenance work to private contractors. During the course of evidence the Committee were informed that a thinking was going on "to utilise more the private sector, i.e. to give contract for maintenance of these houses and we are trying it out as an experimental basis so that the dependence on staff and all the others can be reduced." The Committee consider this move to be most unfortunate. This amounts to abdication of their responsibility. The alleged low productivity, inefficiency, lack of devotion and non-cooperation of the workers should not be ground for handing over the work for which a permanent machinery exists and there is a separate Government Department, to private contractors. The Committee would like the Ministry of Urban Development to reconsider the matter as awarding the maintenance work to private contractors will prove to be doubly costly. On the one hand the contractor will include the cost of his labour in the amount to be charged by him and on the other, the labour force employed by the Department will not have full work. The Committee may not be wrong in pointing out that there is already a tendency in various CPWD Enquiry Offices to award even minor jobs to contractors or employ casual labour on daily wages for doing the work which their regular staff could and should do in the normal course. The Committee are of the firm opinion that if a system of accountability is introduced and rigorously enforced and the senior officers and supervisory staff put their soul in educating and training the workers, and enforcing discipline in them and make them do the work assigned to them with care the results achieved would be much better than what could be achieved through private agencies. The Committee recommend that immediate steps should be taken to have training/refresher courses for skilled and non-skilled workers and supervisory staff, at least, upto the

level of Assistant Engineer. The Committee would also like the Government to lay down accountability norms at all levels and impress upon the senior and supervisory officers to improve the supervision in the context of these norms and ensure quality work in the maintenance of Government buildings. The Committee strongly feel that unless the entire maintenance set-up of CPWD is revamped, work ethos evolved and firm accountability enforced, things are not going to improve."

1.5 In their reply, the Ministry of Urban Development have stated as follows :—

"Maintenance of Government buildings has not been neglected by Central PWD. The Chief Engineer, CPWD has reported that the observations attributed to him in second sentence has been quoted out of context. The Chief Engineer, while explaining the position of Central PWD, with reference to maintenance of government buildings, was quoting from extracts taken from a book on Maintenance of buildings in U.K. The book is entitled "U.K. R & D Bulletin" published by the Ministry of Public Buildings and Works. The extracts quoted by the Chief Engineer are reproduced under :—

"It is unfortunate that at present building maintenance is accorded little or no merit and while it remains a neglected backwater, the morale of those involved in its managements and execution must suffer and productivity will remain low. It has to be admitted that there is little glamour in maintenance, although many of the managerial and technical problems of maintenance are more demanding than those in new work. The policy of some property owners is to do only that which they cannot decently avoid, to budget on a yearly basis only and to keep that budget under constant hostile review. There is unwillingness to incur maintenance expenditure because its results are often invisible and the money spent does not appear to provide a return. The long term consequences of this hostility or indifference are either ignored or not understood."

The Chief Engineer only desired to impress upon the members of Estimates Committee that maintenance appeared to be a weak area of attention all over the world including in advanced countries like U.K.

In so far as "low productivity" and "scant discipline" are concerned, it may be stated that both the above factors are widely prevalent phenomena and the Central PWD cannot be completely insulated from their effects. The Department has made and continues to make, all efforts to ensure that the personnel involved in the maintenance of important buildings, are continuously trained to remain upto date with the job requirements, and are accountable for their output. Preventive and proper day to day maintenance are ensured.

As far as Parliament House is concerned, there has been no neglect in the past. Central PWD is conscious of the importance of this building

and has been maintaining it to proper standards. However, there might have been occasional slips here and there, which were always promptly taken care of soon after they came to notice. The leakages have been primarily on account of change of use, intensive, unplanned utilisation of services and change in living habits. To cite a few examples, many toilets in the Parliament House have been converted for use as office rooms. Increase in the number of users should have necessitated construction of more toilets. Instead, on account of pressure on office accommodation, the existing toilets have had to be closed. In addition, personal toilets attached to the rooms of VIPs, have been added in the past. Closure of toilets and addition of more at locations where no provision existed in the original plans has had their own unavoidable consequences.

In addition to the above, the Parliament House was never designed to be air-conditioned. However, in the year 1982, work started on air-conditioning of Lok Sabha, Rajya Sabha chambers and a few VIP rooms. The work of Central airconditioning involved laying of ducts, chilled water pipes from a Central plant to the terrace and then downwards to respective air-handling units. Pipes had to be taken under the roads, below the basement and then raised vertically to the terrace where water tanks have been provided. From the terrace the downtake pipes have been taken to various areas to be air-conditioned.

Laying of these pipes and ducts, for which no provision existed in the building, necessitated breaking of the old structure at several points, which led to leakages noticed by the user departments, who interpreted this as a symptom of poor maintenance.

The Estimates Committee have observed on the poor maintenance of the stone, used in the facade of the Parliament House and other monumental buildings. Similar stone has been used in many buildings constructed in Delhi around the same period. The decay of stone in Parliament House has not been any more than in other contemporary buildings, and it is, therefore, not correct to presume that the poor maintenance of Parliament House has led to decay of the sand stone which is a natural weathering phenomenon.

In so far as maintenance and caretaking through private contractors vis-a-vis departmental labour is concerned, it may be stated that the activity of maintenance can be divided into day-to-day maintenance and periodical maintenance (preventive as well as in the nature of renovations). Day-to-day maintenance, which includes attending to complaints of various items, has to be done by departmental labour. For periodical repairs like white-washing, painting and minor items of renovation, contractors have always been employed in the past and this procedure will continue in future also. Similarly, caretaking work like day-to-day sweeping, dusting of walls, removal of cowwebs etc., is carried out through departmental labour. It is proposed to continue with the existing system of deployment of contractors for periodical items of caretaking like large-scale cleaning of floors with machines etc. which has been found to be more effective and economical.

It may be added here that the workers on workcharged establishment as well as on daily wages are enrolled by Central PWD on the basis of prescribed norms for each category. The norms are in the nature of a spe-

cified area to be swept per day by sweepers, given plinth area of the building per person for each category of works. The engagements of labour on date is on the basis of approved norms and there has been no curtailment in the strength of labour below the prescribed norms. Similar is the case with staff deployed on caretaking of the building."

1.6 The Committee totally disagree with the reply of the Ministry that the maintenance of Government buildings has not been neglected by the CPWD. A cursory visit to the Government buildings even in Delhi will prove beyond doubt how badly these are being maintained by CPWD. The Committee did not quote the observations of the Chief Engineer out of context. It was an open admission of neglect of Government buildings when he confessed before the Committee that "Maintenance has been our weakest area". The Committee deprecate the escapist tendency on the part of the Department to try to derive satisfaction from the fact that maintenance appeared to be weak area of attention all over the world. In the opinion of the Committee this does not provide an alibi to the Department to neglect the maintenance of buildings.

1.7 The reply of the Ministry that 'low productivity' and 'scant discipline' are widely prevalent phenomena and the CPWD cannot be insulated from their effects is highly deplorable. In the opinion of the Committee there is no reason why with better training of the staff, continuous and improved supervision and fixing of accountability, better productivity cannot be achieved. That the Ministry has chosen to remain silent on the recommendations of the Committee for training of staff, laying down of accountability norms at all levels, revamping of entire maintenance set-up of CPWD, evolving of work ethos and enforcing firm accountability only goes to how the casualness in their approach to tackle the problem.

1.8 The Committee would have appreciated if instead of trying to justify their failings they would have taken some concrete action in the matter. The Committee desire the Ministry to seriously consider the recommendations once again and take positive steps for bringing about improvement in this important area of CPWD activity.

Maintenance of Parliament House

Recommendation (Sl. No. 2, Para 2.7-2.10)

1.9 In their original Report, the Committee had observed as follows :

"The Committee are extremely unhappy over the manner in which Parliament building of national importance, which is visited by lakhs of people from all walks of life including high dignitaries from abroad, is being maintained by CPWD. The Committee are pained to note that within a short span of less than sixty years except for its exterior impressive structure the edifice has almost lost its glory due to low standards of maintenance being observed, despite the fact that a large amount of money is being spent on it every year. Deep depressions, cavities and weathering away of the beautiful red stone; patches and scars throughout the building due to seepage and leakage of water, awful conditions in the basement of the building and bad smell in different sectors bear

ample testimony to the fact that so called inspections of the building by CPWD for its maintenance are carried out only as an eye wash without any positive results and even if something is pointed out or complaint lodged, no proper follow up action is taken to set the defects right promptly and within the minimum possible time. The Committee deprecate the tendency on the part of CPWD authorities to advance one excuse or the other to cover up its failure to maintain the building to its original standard. The Committee cannot believe that in the decades gone by no suitable effective solution could be found to remove the defects which have developed. In the present modern and advanced scientific age proper solution to the defects can be found easily and the only thing needed is will on the part of the Department to set things right. The Committee, however, feel that this will is precisely missing for the reasons best known to the Department.

The Committee recommend that regular, intensive and realistic inspections at the level not below the rank of Executive Engineer be regularly and effectively carried out to note specific points requiring attention and immediate effective follow up action should be taken so that this important building is maintained in top condition. A record of the defects noted and the action taken should be available so that if any surprise inspection is made by the Committee or any other agency, responsibility could be fixed for not noticing the defect and removing it earlier. The Committee would like to inspect the building again after the defects pointed out have been removed within a maximum period of three months.

The Committee are perturbed to note that no regular lists of furniture, furnishing and carpets etc. are maintained by the CPWD and there seems to be effective check on the removal and branding the almost new and costly items as 'worn out' and removing them without even informing the user department, for example, in one such case wherefrom Room No. 129, Parliament House Annexe a costly wall to wall carpet, almost in new condition, seems to have been disposed of as 'worn out'. The Committee desire that a thorough enquiry into this matter should be made and finding submitted to the Committee within three months in regard to this and all other similar cases of removal from the precincts of Parliament Estate and disposal of costly items by CPWD. The Committee recommend that rigorous standard and checks should be maintained by the Department to ensure that no malpractices are indulged in. The Committee would also recommend that a fool proof system should be evolved; room-wise lists of furniture, furnishing and costly electrical items etc. kept and regular surprise inspection carried out at a suitably high level.

The Committee note that whenever any store items beyond a particular value is to be purchased for the Parliament House or Parliament House Annexe, CPWD has to obtain administrative approval and expenditure sanction. But, whenever any store item is to be disposed off, CPWD do not seem to be taking any approval from the user department. The Committee recommend that any store item of Parliament House or Parliament House Annexe should

be removed only when the CPWD are asked to do so by the Department and in any case, prior administrative approval must be obtained for disposal just as it is done for purchase."

The Ministry in their reply have stated as follows :

"As suggested in recommendation No. 5, experts of Archaeological Survey of India have been approached for suggesting methods for preserving the sand stone blocks and enhancing their life. While their detailed report is awaited it has been observed that the depressions and cavities in the stone are only few in number and are scattered. The deterioration of the red sand stone in Parliament House as compared to similar contemporary buildings, some of which are maintained by the Archaeological Survey of India, has not been more. It would be appreciated that stone, as a building material, is obtained by quarrying from natural stone deposits. The strength and consequent durability of the stone depends on its location in the quarry. It is obvious that at the time of construction of the building it is not possible to ensure that every stone used in the facia is excavated from the same depth and possesses the same hardness, denseness and wearing qualities. Therefore, wherever stone with inadequate strength has appeared in a particular spot in the building it does not withstand the rigours of weathering action as effectively as other stronger pieces of stone etc. Such deterioration does not appear to have been the result of any leakages in the building. The Parliament House is an important building and the CPWD continue to devote high level of maintenance effort to this building. However, inspite of all efforts, leakages do appear at some place or the other due to tempering with the structure in the process of making additions and alterations, for which it was not originally designed. These have been attended to it. It would be appreciated that this building has many areas where stone facia is exposed to rain and consequently markings, due to splash of rain water, are unavoidable. Here again, it may be stated, even at the cost of repetition, that maintenance has not been lacking and has not caused decay of stone at any place. Notwithstanding the above, silicon treatment has been applied to larger areas of the exposed surface. Another treatment called peter Co-treatment for preventing rising of moisture through stone at the floor level has also been carried out. This treatment was done to this Building as it has not been provided with Damp Proof Coarse at the time of its original construction, when the sub-soil water level in Delhi was much lower than at present.

Para 139 of the CPWD Code requires the Executive Engineer to inspect all the buildings, where serious defects have been brought to his notice and to ensure that adequate steps have been taken to remedy them. He also inspects the important buildings once a year and gets the defects, if any rectified. In the Enquiry Office, a register of complaints and compliance thereof is always available. Whenever serious defects are brought to the notice of the Executive Engineer, the same are being inspected and looked into and proper remedial measures are being taken. The Executive Engineer is in charge of not only Parliament House but also a

number of buildings as his jurisdiction extends over a large area on account of workload determined in financial terms.

The defects are brought to the notice of the Enquiry Office as and when observed by the clients. These are attended to.

As recommended by the Committee, the Inspection note is being kept in Enquiry Office for specific points requiring attention. Action taken on those points is also being kept for perusal of higher authorities.

The Estimates Committee inspected the building again on 9-1-1987.

The movement of furniture or furnishings from one area to another in Parliament House, and the Annexe is done by the respective Secretariats. CPWD officers do not come into the picture at all. The records of the CPWD do not indicate that a wall to wall carpet ever existed in Room No. 129 of Parliament House Annexe. The Superintending Engineer in charge of Parliament House Annexe has reported that no wall to wall carpet of Parliament House Annexe had been disposed off within the last 10 years over this period, small size carpets, which were mouth-eaten and had become unserviceable, had been disposed off, after observing all codal formalities. It may be added that, in all Ministries/Departments of Government of India, the responsibility for maintenance of furniture and furnishings vests with the concerned user Ministry/Department. In the case of Parliament House and Parliament House Annexe, however, the position has been somewhat different. Here, the services of CPWD is being utilised for purchase of furniture as well as for its write off. To bring about uniformity and to avoid complaints, it is suggested that the purchase and maintenance of furniture and furnishings in the Parliament House and the Annexe be taken over by the respective Secretariats. The assistants of the CPWD can be taken as and when necessity arises in individual cases."

1.10 The Committee inspected the Parliament House again on 9th January, 1987 and observed that the maintenance of the building was still not upto the mark and there was tremendous scope for improvement. The building continued to be marred by patches due to leakages and dampness. Decay of red-stone on various places was noticeable. Conditions in the basement though better than before, still left much to be desired. Some rooms in the basement were found locked with no name-plates on them. The Committee noticed that either there had been no intensive and regular inspections of the buildings as recommended by the Committee or these inspection had been carried out in an imperfect manner.

1.11 The Committee are unhappy to learn that there is a provision in CPWD code requiring Executive Engineer to inspect important buildings only once a year. If the Jurisdiction of the Executive Engineer extends to a large number of buildings and it leads to inadequate attention being given to the buildings, nothing prevents the Government from rationalising the work load by adding additional hands, if necessary, in the interest of proper

maintenance of Government buildings. The Committee reiterate that regular, intensive and realistic inspections not below the rank of Executive Engineer should be carried out at least thrice a year with a view to improving the maintenance of Parliament House. The Committee would like to inspect the building again within a period of three months from the date of presentation of this Report to see the improvements made in the maintenance of Parliament House.

1.12 The Committee do not see any justification in the suggestion of the Ministry that purchase and maintenance of furniture and furnishings in the Parliament House and Parliament House Annexe should be taken over by the respective Secretariats when there is full fledged Parliament Works Division for maintenance of Parliament House.

1.13 The Committee note that the Ministry has carefully chosen not to reply to the recommendations made by the Committee regarding maintenance of room-wise list of furniture, furnishings and costly electrical appliances and taking approval of the administrative department whenever any store items are to be disposed off by the CPWD. The Committee urge the Ministry to implement these recommendations forthwith.

Norms for Expenditure on Maintenance

Recommendations (Sl. No. 3, Paras 2.32 and 2.33)

1.14 The Committee noted that norms of expenditure on maintenance were revised by the Ministry in 1983 on the basis of recommendation made by an expert Committee which was specifically appointed to determine the norms. The Committee also noted that although the norms were revised in 1983 yet they were actually based on the figures worked out by the expert committee as on 1-10-79. The expert committee had recommended that norms would be updated every year based on the rise in price indices.

1.15 It had to be admitted that proper maintenance of Government buildings was not possible unless requisite funds were made available. The Committee had recommended that in order to provide adequate funds for proper maintenance of Government buildings, the norms of expenditure should be realistic and updated every year as had been suggested by the Expert Committee taking into account the cost escalations of the materials consumed.

1.16 The Ministry in their reply have stated :—"This year's maintenance index, which is indicative of the norms for maintenance, has been updated to July, 1986. However, funds for maintenance are allocated on year to year basis depending on the overall resources position and are generally short of requirements."

1.17 The Committee had observed that proper maintenance of Government buildings was not possible unless requisite funds were made available. The Committee are concerned to note that funds for maintenance are allocated on year to year basis depending on the overall resources position and are generally short of requirements. The Committee fail to understand how there can be realistic maintenance of buildings without adequate funds.

1.18 The Committee, therefore, call upon the Government to provide adequate funds for proper maintenance of Government buildings and would impress upon the Department to spend the funds allotted with utmost care by avoiding any wasteful expenditure.

Deterioration in the Standard of Cleanliness of Parliament House

Recommendation (Sl. No. 9, Paras 2.66 and 2.67)

1.19 Concerned over the deterioration of standard of cleanliness in Parliament House Estate the Committee had in their original report stated that there had been increase in the number of complaints regarding appearance of mosquitoes, beehives, flies and rats. There had also been no solution to the menace of birds droppings which disfigures the building.

1.20 The Committee recommended that concrete steps should be taken in close coordination with NDMC to combat the menace of mosquitoes, bees, flies, rats and birds in the area and to improve the general standard of cleanliness in Parliament House Estate and the Office complexes and buildings nearby.

1.21 The Ministry in their reply have stated as follows :—

“CPWD is responsible for the maintenance of the building. Activities which relate to eradication of mosquitoes, beehives, flies, rats etc. do not fall within the ambit of the work of CPWD. However, the CPWD have been taking the help of the NDMC authorities for anti-mosquito measures.

As far as flies, beehives and rats are concerned, these have to be eradicated with the help of the NDMC. Though, in the past, the CPWD have adopted various measures to get rid of these pests, the results do not seem to have been to the satisfaction of the Committee. As long as there is extensive greenary around Parliament House, no permanent solution to these problems or that of bird droppings can be found as it is these flora which attract various kinds of insect life and a variety of birds. Destruction of such flora around this monumental building would be too heavy a price to pay for getting rid of these pests, which too have their own place in the eco-system.

1.22 The contention of the Ministry that as long as there is extensive greenary around Parliament House, no permanent solution to the problem of mosquitoes, beehives, flies and rats or that of bird droppings can be found is hardly tenable.

1.23 In the opinion of the Committee what is lacking is the will on the part of the CPWD to grapple with these problems in coordination with the concerned agencies.

1.24 The Committee still feel that by taking concrete steps in close coordination with the NDMC this problem can be minimised if not altogether eliminated.

Caretaking of Parliament House

Recommendation (Sl. No. 13, Paras 2.85 and 2.86)

1.25 Expressing their unhappiness over the sharp fall in the standard of caretaking of Parliament House, the Committee had observed that it was rather strange that in a prestigious building like Parliament House, the job of caretaker had been entrusted to an official of the rank of Upper Division Clerk and the Ministry inspite of being aware that this was one of the main causes of un-satisfactory upkeep and maintenance, of Parliament House Estate had not been able to tackle the problem and to find a suitable incumbent for the post. The Committee further observed that this was proof enough of the apathy of the Ministry and consequent sorry state of affairs. What surprised the Committee most was the Ministry's own admission that it was all along aware that the caretaking staff in Parliament House had never been adequate. The Committee disapproved of the lakadaisical manner in which the Ministry had been functioning in regard to the staff requirements of Parliament House.

1.26 The Committee had recommended that the requirement of the caretaking staff at Parliament House should be immediately assessed and adequately strengthened both qualitatively and quantitatively keeping in view the objective of regular maintenance and upkeep of the prestigious buildings to the best possible standards. The Committee had observed that in case a review was to take some time, the post of caretaker should immediately be upgraded to the rank of Junior Engineer and suitable person selected and posted without loss of time and the proposals agreed to after the review for upgradation and/or increase of officers and staff should also be implemented without any loss of time.

1.27 The Ministry in their reply have stated as follows :—

“Caretaking is a labour intensive work which requires constant supervision. In the absence of Caretakers, Jamadars and other maintenance staff and due to other pre-occupations of the Junior Engineer, the caretaking work could not be properly supervised. So far, it has not been possible to up-grade the pay-scale of the post of caretaker.

The Government took a decision in 1974 that caretaking should be carried out by the administrative Ministry which is occupying the building through a full time qualified caretaker. In view of this, the Caretakers' post is also a dying cadre in the CPWD. After the Government took this decision, in 1974, efforts were made to transfer the caretaking of Parliament House Complex to the Lok Sabha Secretariat and accordingly, Parliament House Annexe is looked after by them. In addition Library Sector in Parliament House, Reception area and the rooms of Lok Sabha Secretariat are also being looked after by the Lok Sabha Secretariat themselves.

In these circumstances, the Lok Sabha Secretariat have again been requested to take over the caretaking work of Parliament House. This matter is being further pursued with the Lok Sabha secretariat.”

1.28 The Committee deprecate the casual and indifferent reply of the Ministry that in the absence of Caretakers, Jamadars and other maintenance staff and due to other preoccupations of the Junior Engineer, the caretaking work in Parliament House could not be properly supervised. The Committee are equally concerned at the open admission of failure on the part of the Ministry that so far it has not been possible to upgrade the pay-scale of the post of Caretaker. The Committee had expected that CPWD should have been able to find a suitable person for the caretaking of Parliament House during the period of about a year. They, however, fail to understand what is coming in the way of the Ministry to upgrade the pay-scale of the post of caretaker. The Committee cannot but view it as a deliberate attempt on the part of the CPWD to neglect the upkeep of Parliament House. That a decision was taken in 1974 that the caretaking should be carried out by the administrative Ministry does not absolve the CPWD of their responsibility for the upkeep of Parliament House all these years. That the 1974 decision had not been given effect to in respect of Parliament House by itself is proof enough that this prestigious building has for obvious reasons, to be treated on different footing when compared to other Buildings. The Committee also do not see any reason why the caretaking of Parliament House should be carried out by user Department when there is a full-fledged Parliament Works Division to look after the maintenance of Parliament House.

Inspection of Buildings by Supervisory Staff

Recommendation (Sl. No. 18, Paras 3.29 and 3.30)

1.29 The Committee were unhappy to note that there had been no regular inspection of buildings by the supervisory staff to locate defects in the buildings. Although frequency of inspection of building by the officers at various levels had been prescribed, in actual practice this was not being adhered to due to alleged excessive workload with the officers. The Committee hoped, that after the workload norms had been suitably revised, the inspection of buildings by officers at various levels would be rigorously enforced and monitored and action taken against officers who failed to perform this important part of their job.

1.30 In order to keep a correct record of the workload and give satisfaction to clients, the Committee had recommended that a system of keeping an "Inspection Card" with the occupant of buildings/houses be introduced immediately and the inspecting staff, namely, Jr. Engineer, Asstt. Engineer or Ex. Engineer would record his observations on the card at the time of his visit and initial it with date. A duplicate copy of the inspection card should be kept in the enquiry office. The action taken about the points recorded after inspection should also be recorded in the card.

1.31 In their reply, the Ministry have stated as follows :—

"The CPWD Code provides for regular inspection of buildings by the Supervisory staff to locate the defects etc. in the buildings. But due to heavy workload, this could not be strictly followed. The National Productivity Council which is studying the workload norms as well as staffing pattern of the CPWD is expected to submit its Report by March, 1987.

With the present workload of the units, it may not be possible to maintain inspection cards, as recommended by the Committee, as it will increase the workload of the Supervisory staff. It is a welcome recommendation and its implementation can be considered after the report of National Productivity Council, which is studying the workload norms and staffing pattern of CPWD, is received."

1.32 The Committee are distressed at the reply of the Ministry that with the present workload of the units, it may not be possible to maintain inspection cards. The Committee do not see how this will result in the increase in the workload and why the implementation of this recommendation should await the report of National Productivity Council. In the opinion of the Committee the Ministry is only shying away from the implementation of this recommendation obviously due to the fact that with the introduction of inspection cards C.P.W.D. will be made more accountable in regard to maintenance.

1.33 The Committee, therefore, urge that their recommendation of maintaining inspection cards should be implemented forthwith.

Productivity in Maintenance Work

Recommendation (Sl. No. 22, Para 3.47)

1.34 The Committee were deeply concerned to note that productivity in the maintenance work had considerably gone down and nothing had been done to check this trend even when the facts were well known to the administration. During evidence it was revealed by the Ministry that workers spent lot of their time in thinking about their demands rather than doing the work. The Committee considered this state of affairs to be very serious. In their opinion there was clear lack of supervision and some strong action was needed to stop the rot. The Committee had recommended that a detailed study should be conducted to identify the specific causes for reduction of productivity on maintenance works and in the light of findings of the study urgent steps should be taken to remedy the situation. The Committee desired that in the meantime each employee should be required to maintain daily diary and those found not doing the work allotted to them or delaying it should be severely dealt with and disciplinary action taken against them.

1.35 In their reply the Ministry have stated as follows :—

"The main reason for the fall in productivity is the excessive politicalisation of labour unions, indiscipline amongst labour, their defiant attitude and lack of accountability. This phenomenon is widely prevalent and may not be viewed in isolation in respect of Central Public Works Department."

1.36 The Committee are unhappy to note the scant reply of the Ministry that main reason for the fall in productivity is the excessive politicalisation of labour unions, indiscipline amongst labour, their defiant attitude and lack of accountability. There cannot be a better example of abdication of responsibility than the reply of the Ministry that this phenomenon is widely

prevalent and may not be viewed in isolation in respect of C.P.W.D. The Committee has no reason to change their earlier opinion that there is a clear lack of supervision and some strong action is needed to stop the rot.

1.37 The Ministry has not replied whether any detailed study, as recommended by the Committee, was conducted by the Ministry to identify the causes for reduction of productivity on maintenance works. They are also silent over the other recommendation made by the Committee for maintenance of daily diary by the employees. This only proves the apathy on the part of the Ministry and their half-hearted approach in the matter. The Committee reiterate their recommendation and expect the Ministry to implement them in all seriousness with a view to increasing the productivity on maintenance works.

Implementation of recommendations

1.38 The Committee would like to emphasise that they attach the greatest importance to the implementation of recommendations accepted by Government. They would, therefore, urge that Government should keep a close watch so as to ensure expeditious implementation of the recommendations accepted by them. In cases where it is not possible to implement the recommendations in letter and spirit for any reasons, the matter should be reported to the Committee in time with reasons for non-implementation.

1.39 The Committee desire that reply in respect of the recommendations contained in Chapter V of the Report may be finalised and final reply of the Government furnished to Committee expeditiously.

CHAPTER II

RECOMMENDATIONS/OBSERVATIONS WHICH HAVE BEEN ACCEPTED BY GOVERNMENT

Recommendation (Sl. No. 5, Para 2.49)

The Committee note that with a view to halting the process of decay of Red Stone in Parliament House Estate two kinds of treatment have been tried by the Central P.W.D. While the external treatment i.e. silicone treatment has been claimed to be successful, the result of internal treatment of injecting chemical solution is still under observation. The Committee were informed that for a third alternative, steps were being worked out for replacement, such as in the form of stone veneers and that this work would be taken up as and when necessary. The Committee are of the opinion that considering the overall importance of the Parliament House Estate and the Central Secretariat and President's Estate, for the construction of which red stone has been used, some effective steps are necessary to maintain the beauty of these buildings. Red Fort, Delhi, Red Fort Agra and Fatehpur Sikri are magnificent buildings all built centuries ago with red stone. Since these buildings are being maintained by the Archaeological Survey of India, CPWD must keep liaison with them for finding out latest techniques to maintain the red stone. Till a satisfactory and easily implementable solution is found some interim action should be taken to set right the stone which has weathered away at some places and has developed deep depressions.

Reply of Government

The Committee has made comments with regard to Red Stone of Delhi Red Fort, Agra and Fatehpur Sikri. The extent of decay in red stones in these buildings is far more severe compared to the extent of decay in Parliament House. Even the decay of the stones has happened only in a few places, which testifies to the probability that these stones were selected wrongly at the time of construction.

Efforts are being made to get advice from some of the experts in the field who are connected with the Archaeological Survey of India. The treatment suggested by them will be tried.

[Ministry of Urban Development O.M. No. 15011/2/85-W.3/W.I dt. 27-2-1987].

Recommendation (Sl. No. 6, Para 2.59)

The Expert Team set up by the Ministry of Urban Development (Then Ministry of Works & Housing) had recommended in 1983 for supply of furniture of uniform type in Parliament House. The Ministry has also admitted that furniture of uniform type for Parliament House was preferable. The Ministry has however not implemented the recommendation of the expert body as they are awaiting the report of new Committee set up under the Chairmanship of Minister of Food and Civil Supplies which was

looking into various issues connected with a number of buildings including Parliament House. However that Committee has not yet examined the provision of furniture in Parliament House. The Committee feel that Parliament House, being a prestigious building, have been separated from other buildings and, if there was a need to do so, a separate Committee should have been set up exclusively for Parliament House. The Committee, recommend that uniformity of furniture in Parliament House, within different areas or group of rooms should be the ultimate aim. However as an interim measure the existing furniture should be so distributed as to ensure that the furniture in each wing or at least in a room was of uniform type. The distribution of furniture at present was not according to these norms and earnest efforts should be made to achieve this objective early.

Reply of Government

As suggested in reply to Recommendation No. 2, it is submitted that the purchase, maintenance & disposal of furniture and furnishings in Parliament House may be handled by Lok Sabha Secretariat or Rajya Sabha Secretariat, as the case may be.

As on date, the furniture is being provided in various rooms depending on the taste of the occupants and as decided by the administrative authority. Since furniture in individual rooms is provided on the requirements of the concerned occupants the CPWD have been finding it difficult to adopt a uniform pattern. Now that a special committee has been set up, to provide furniture in Parliament House, it should be possible to have uniform design of furniture over a period of time.

The furniture is also moved by the occupants, according to their requirements, without consulting the C.P.W.D., who are unable to prevent such movement of furniture from one room to another.

[Ministry of Urban Development O.M. No. 15011/2/85-W.3/W.I dt. 27-2-1987].

Recommendation (Sl. No. 7, Para 2.60)

The Committee are not satisfied with the standard of cleanliness of furnishing, curtains etc., in Parliament House and desire that these should be regularly inspected and properly cleaned and where necessary redyed or replaced after fixed intervals.

The Committee note that standard of polishing of Tables in various rooms is also not upto the mark. The Committee were told that the Architect had advised against polishing of furniture in Parliament House and recommended only waxing. The Committee have no desire to comment on the views of architect. They however do want the furniture to look neat and shining irrespective of the mode of maintenance or polishing. If increase in frequency of waxing of furniture in Parliament House can achieve the desired result, it should be implemented forthwith.

Reply of Government

The Central P.W.D. have been trying their best to maintain the required standard of cleanliness of furnishings such as curtains; carpets etc.,

despite being handicapped due to non-availability of adequate staff and inadequate funds.

In monumental buildings, it is generally considered desirable to provide waxing instead of spirit polishing so that the timber retains its original features. However the observations of the Committee have been noted.

[Ministry of Urban Development O.M. No. 15011/2/85-W.3/W.I dt. 27-2-1987].

Recommendation (Sl. No. 8, Para 2.61)

The Committee are unhappy over the standard of cleanliness and maintenance being observed in the Lady M.Ps Lounge in the Central Hall of Parliament House. This is one more instance of lack of supervision and apathy on the part of CPWD authorities. The Committee desire that all the short-comings in Lady M.Ps Lounge should be removed immediately and steps taken to ensure that the furniture, fixture and curtains of the Lounge should be in tip top condition. Regular inspections should be carried out by CPWD to ensure that there is no let off in the proper maintenance of this Lounge.

Reply of Government

Efforts are being made to maintain ladies lounge to the satisfaction of the users.

[Ministry of Urban Development O.M. No. 15011/2/85-W.3/W.I dt. 27-2-1987].

Recommendation (Sl. No. 10, Para 2.72)

The Committee deplore the poor maintenance of toilet blocks in Parliament House especially in the Library Sector. The Committee were informed that there was a system of weekly inspection of Parliament House by Officials. The Committee find it all the more surprising as to how the defects in several lavatory blocks were not noticed during the course of weekly inspections. The Committee are aware that Members of Parliament have making complaints from time to time about poor up keep foul smell, dirty towels, leaking taps and other deficiencies in the toilets. The Committee therefore cannot but reach the only logical conclusion that the inspections are being done in a perfunctory manner. Trying to give some sort of justification for the poor performance, the Committee were told by the representative of the Ministry that there was only one Assistant Engineer for Parliament House and a building of this magnitude required total inspection at the level of the Executive Engineer. At present there was no Executive Engineer to look after six office buildings. The Committee are not convinced by this explanation. Very senior officers are expected to conduct invariably surprise inspections to ensure that their subordinates are discharging their responsibilities faithfully and efficiently. Even then the Committee desire that the basic requirement for officers and other staff needed to look after proper maintenance of Parliament House Estate should be gone into by the Ministry on a priority basis and requisite staff strength provided immediately. The Committee also recommend that both regular and surprise inspections of the Parliament House

should be carried out at appropriate levels from time to time so that the maintenance of the building is always in the top condition. A record of the points noted in the inspection and action taken to rectify the defects should be maintained. Where records show that the same lapses are being committed time and again severe action should be taken against the officers and staff responsible therefor.

Reply of Government

Every complaint that is being brought to the notice of the Department is being attended to. The observations made by the Inspections Team are also invariably attended to and checked in subsequent inspection. However, it is noted that there is always scope for improvement and every effort is being made to ensure better maintenance.

[Ministry of Urban Development O.M. No. 15011/2/85-W.3/W.I dt. 27-2-1987].

Recommendation (Sl. No. 11, Para 2.75)

The Committee find that there had been frequent breakdowns of lifts in Parliament House and Parliament House Annexe. The Committee do not agree with the stereo-typed reply given by the Ministry that the lifts are electrical equipment and their breakdown cannot be totally avoided. In the opinion of the Committee if the preventive maintenance of the lifts is done properly and regularly and the staff deputed to operate them is given the necessary training, the number of breakdowns can be reduced to considerable extent, if not eliminated altogether. It is very irritating to find the sign "lift out of Order" put up at one lift or the other almost every day.

Reply of Government

Rigorous preventive maintenance of the lifts is being done regularly to keep the break down of the lifts to the minimum.

The "Lift out of Order" board is put at the lift whenever there is breakdown of lift or when the lift is taken out for servicing and preventive maintenance works.

The servicing and preventive maintenance works will be taken up as far as possible outside the office hours or on holidays so that stoppage in lift service is reduced to the minimum.

[Ministry of Urban Development O.M. No. 15011/2/85-W.3/W.I dt. 27-2-1987].

Recommendation (Sl. No. 12, Para 2.79)

The Committee note that out of 8 recommendations made by the Fire Adviser to Ministry of Home Affairs regarding Fire fighting arrangements in Parliament House Estate, only two recommendations have been implemented so far. The Committee feel that this important matter is not re-

ceiving the urgent attention it deserves. The Committee want the Ministry to implement the remaining recommendations of the Fire Adviser expeditiously in order to make the Fire fighting arrangements in Parliament House Estate foolproof.

Reply of Government

All Civil works pertaining to fire fighting arrangements have been completed.

As per recommendations all the estimates required have been submitted to Lok Sabha Secretariat for accord of administrative approval and expenditure sanction. The work will be taken up on receipt of the approval. The estimates that have been forwarded are as follows :—

1. Installation of Smoke and Heat detector system in Parliament House.
2. Installation of smoke and Heat detector system in Parliament House Annexe.
3. Installation of exhaust fan in the basement of Parliament House which will start running automatically in case of any fire.
4. Installation of illuminated sign boards on the exit of basement of Parliament House.
5. Installation of Mulsifyre system for transformers of Parliament House Annexe housed in the basement.

The work of providing Wet Rising system in Parliament House has been already commissioned and is in operation.

[Ministry of Urban Development O.M. No. 15011/2/85-W.3/W.I dt. 27-2-1987].

Recommendation (Sl. No. 17, Paras 3.24 and 3.25)

The Committee find that the Junior Engineers and Assistant Engineers in Central PWD are burdened with a lot of paper work with the result that they cannot concentrate on their field work. The Ministry agreed during the evidence that there was considerable scope for reduction of paper work particularly by using Word Processors. A proposal for purchase of 60 Word Processors had already been made by CPWD to the Ministry which is under process.

The Committee hope that the proposal would be processed expeditiously. The Committee would also urge upon the Ministry to devise other methods so as to reduce the paper work by a considerable extent leaving the Engineers to concentrate on the field work for which they are actually meant.

Reply of Government

Ministry of Urban Development have agreed to the purchase of 20 Word Processors and accessories to start with. Selection of the supplier has been made, 17 have been installed and the rest will be installed soon.

Proposal to purchase 40 additional work processors is processed in the CPWD for obtaining the sanction of the Government.

Study of system and procedures with modern equipments has since been entrusted to the National Productivity Council.

[Ministry of Urban Development O.M. No. 15011/2/85-W, 3/W.I.
dated 27-2-1987]

Recommendation (Sl. No. 19, Paras 3.35 and 3.36)

The Committee note that the Ranganathan Committee (1975) had recommended for preparation of check-lists for preventive maintenance in order to identify the points to be checked periodically and also to simplify the process of these checks. The Committee find that while detailed check lists have been prepared for electrical and mechanical installations, this has not been done in the case of civil constructions. The Committee desire that as in the case of electrical and mechanical installation detailed check lists be prepared for civil side also and regular periodic inspections actually carried out to derive gains of preventive maintenance.

It was brought to the notice of the Committee the electrical fittings, fans and other fixtures replaced in the name of preventive maintenance were of much inferior quality that the fittings and fixtures replaced with result that allottees of the houses felt more inconvenienced after preventive maintenance. The Committee desire that the Ministry may circulate a questionnaire to allottees of all Government houses in New Delhi where electrical fittings have been replaced during the last five years for preventive maintenance and fix responsibility and take suitable steps in the light of data collected.

Reply of Government

By the very nature of work, operational maintenance check lists can be prepared and have been prepared for electrical machinery. The same is not possible for fittings and fixture of Civil and Engineering category. For example, a wash basin can break or a tap start leaking or drainage joint start leaking without notice or remain in-satisfactory service for a number of years. On the Civil Engineering side, repairs to fixtures and fittings are done as and when defects come to notice. For maintenance of structures, inspection schedule is already laid down in the D Code.

It is denied that electrical fittings, provided by the CPWD, are of inferior quality. Only fittings and fixtures having ISI certification mark are provided. However, action is being taken by the CPWD to ascertain the views of users in selected areas.

[Ministry of Urban Development O.M. No. 15011/2/85-W, 3/W.I.
dated 27-2-1987].

Recommendation (Sl. No. 20, Paras 3.39 and 3.40)

The Committee are astonished to find that 2000 newly Constructed Quarters and a building for Zoological Survey of India in Calcutta are lying unoccupied for a considerable period as the Department had not been able

to get work charged posts sanctioned, for their maintenance, resulting in non-utilisation of Government assets built at a high cost. Taking into account the fact that residential accommodation is very acute in Calcutta, this must have been causing inconvenience and disappointment to the employees who have been waiting for the quarters to be allotted to them apart from causing loss to the exchequer by way of rent for the accommodation.

The Committee recommend that immediate steps should be taken to complete the formalities of sanctioning requisite posts etc. so that the buildings constructed at high costs do not remain unoccupied and continue to cause avoidable loss to the exchequer.

Reply of Government

The sanction for workcharged posts has already been issued for maintenance of newly constructed buildings including Zoological Survey of India in Calcutta.

Simultaneously a proposal to treat the CPWD as an "Operational Department" is being processed.

[Ministry of Urban Development O.M. No. 15011/2/85-W. 3/W.I.
dated 27-2-1987].

Recommendation (Sl. No. 21, Para 3.42)

The Committee are constrained to note the poor standard of maintenance of the Nizam Palace, Central Government Guest House, Calcutta. The Committee feel that the occupancy rate of the guest house remains low as the Central Government Officers' requests for reservation of accommodation in the Guest House are either not confirmed at all even when the accommodation is available, or are confirmed at a very late stage by which time the officials concerned have already made alternative arrangements. The Committee recommend that the system for reservation in the guest house should be properly looked into and improved so that requests for reservations are promptly attended to and reservation confirmed well in time. The Committee also recommend that standard of maintenance of the guest house should be improved immediately, the rooms white washed, furniture polished and curtains washed/dyed or replaced. It should also be ensured that food of reasonably good quality is served in the canteen of the Guest House at reasonable rates.

Reply of Government

With the updating of the maintenance cost index to July, 1986, it would be possible, subject to overall budgetary constraints, to allocate more funds for maintenance and thereby ensure better upkeep of Nizam Palace Hostel also. As an immediate measure, certain estimates for works, which have been received from the Central P.W.D. in respect of the Hostel, are being examined in consultation with the Chief Engineer (Eastern Zone), Calcutta. The question of streamlining the procedure for reservation of accommodation in the Hostel so as to achieve maximum occupancy rate is also receiving the attention of the Directorate of Estates.

[Ministry of Urban Development O.M. No. 15011/2/85-W. 3/W.I.
dated 27-2-1987].

Recommendation (Sl. No. 23, Paras 3.53 and 3.54)

The Committee are constrained to find that tenders far below the CPWD rate schedules, though clearly unworkable in actual practice, are being accepted knowing fully well that this would result in use of sub-standard material despite the best supervision. It was revealed during evidence that although the officers had the powers, to reject such unworkable tenders but such powers were not being exercised mainly for the reason that no officer wanted to take the responsibility because later on they have to answer to the audit about such rejection.

The Committee feel that acceptance of unworkable tenders is mainly responsible for a number of malpractices arising out of collusion of CPWD staff with contractors which could be the main cause of poor maintenance of Government buildings which are valuable national assets. The Committee recommend that the relevant rules should explicitly provide for rejection of unworkable tenders when they are below a particular percentage of the CPWD rate schedules. The Committee would impress upon the Ministry the need for rigorous supervision by the supervisory staff on the quality of material used by the contractors. The Committee also desire that the Department should impress upon the higher supervisory authorities of CPWD to carry out surprise inspections to ensure that no vested interest have been created between the staff of CPWD and the contractors.

Reply of Government

It has been decided that in case of maintenance work, if the rates quoted by the contractors are lower by more than 25% of the justified rates based on current market rates, the tender may be straightaway rejected. This decision has been circulated to all the officers of Central Public Works Department.

[Ministry of Urban Development O.M. No. 15011/2/85-W. 3/W.I. dated 27-2-1987].

Recommendation (Sl. No. 25, Paras 3.61 and 3.62)

The Committee are surprised to note, that delegation of financial powers to officers at various levels for purchase of stores have not been revised after 1976 even though there has been substantial price escalation in the meantime. The Committee were informed during evidence that the matter was under consideration and would be finalised in a week's time.

The Committee hope that the matter has since been finalised and financial powers suitably revised. The Committee would like to be informed about the revised delegation of powers. The Committee also recommend that the delegation of financial powers should be reviewed after every five years to assess whether any change is called for in the light of price escalation.

Reply of Government

It is not correct to say that delegation of financial powers to officers at various levels for purchase of stores has not been revised after 1976. Financial powers delegated to officers at various levels for purchase of stores and

in respect of works are taken up for review periodically and existing powers suitably enhanced. Such revised orders had been issued by this Ministry last in September, 1986.

[Min. of UD O.M. No. 15011/2/85-W3/WI/dated 27-2-87].

Recommendation (Sl. No. 26, Para 3.65)

The Committee note that the office of the Executive Engineer on the maintenance side is not located in the area under his charge. The Committee recommend that in the interest of smooth functioning the office of the Executive Engineer should be located in the area under his charge, preferably within the Enquiry Office building and the Assistant Engineers should also work in the office of the Executive Engineer instead of having separate offices of their own.

Reply of Government

The office of the Executive Engineer for maintenance side are mostly located in the area under his charge. It may not be possible to locate the office within the Enquiry Office Building as one Division has a number of Enquiry Officers under its control. However, the office of the Assistant Engineer should be located in the area under his control so that he can effectively supervise the works in his jurisdiction.

[Min. of UD O.M. No. 15011/2/85-W3/WI dated 27-2-87].

Recommendation (Sl. No. 27, Para 3.72)

The Committee find that whenever CPWD, being a service department, undertakes any departmental work, it gets a certain percentage as departmental charges. The Director General of Works, however, cannot create posts required for execution of work. In view of the general ban on creation and filling up of posts, approval of the Cabinet has to be sought for the creation of required posts which takes considerable time and hinders the implementation of the project. The Committee feel that there should be some flexibility in this regard and the Director General of Works may be empowered in appropriate cases to create and fill up posts of workcharged staff for the departmental works even when the ban on filling up of posts is in operation.

Reply of Government

Government have now modified the ban orders. According to the modified orders, while creating new assets such as purchase of vehicles, establishment of new organisation etc., staff required for running such assets should also be provided. The number of posts that can be made available by re-deployment from existing strength should be taken into account in deciding the staff requirement.

As regards creation of posts under Plan Schemes, the staff component should be considered as part of the plan project at the formulation stage. While approving Plan projects under the delegated powers, no piecemeal decision should be taken in respect of the project alone, leaving aside the staff component. In other words, when a plan project is approved, staff necessary for its execution should also be provided for. However, while

taking these decisions, condition should be imposed that the precise timing of filling up of such posts should be indicated with reference to the various phase of completion of the project or scheme.

Apart from this, the proposal to declare CPWD as Operational Department has also been taken up, which, if approved will facilitate early sanctioning of posts.

[Min. of UD O.M. No. 15011/2/85-W3/WI dated 27-2-87].

Recommendation (Sl. No. 29, Paras 4.3 and 4.4)

The Committee are unhappy over the quality of workmen employed by the CPWD. Although the Ranganathan Committee had recommended that workers should be trained in more than one discipline, the Committee understand that this recommendation was not accepted by the Government as the Harish Chandra Committee had expressed the view that training of workmen in more than one discipline was not needed. The Committee, however, find that the workers are not properly trained even in one trade because, as admitted by the Ministry during the evidence, they do not have adequate number of training Institutes. The Committee were informed during the evidence that there was a proposal to set up a training Institute at Ghaziabad.

The Committee recommend that with a view to improving the quality of workmen, training arrangements should be strengthened by setting up more training centres. The training of workers at least in one trade should be made compulsory and they should be required to undergo training before their actual deployment on work after recruitment. Those workers who agree to undergo training in more than one trade should be given efficiency bonus of Rs. 50/- per month after successful completion of the training. Persons trained in more than one discipline should be posted in Enquiry offices so that they can attend to complaints pertaining to more than one trade as part of their normal routine.

Reply of Government

CPWD has to take an overall view whether the training of the workers in more than one discipline will have any impact on the improvement of service to the tenants. Statistics will have to be collected from various Enquiry Offices to find out whether the workers have spare time to attend to the complaints of more than one discipline.

The Training Institute was established in CPWD in the year 1980 with the objective of arranging Refresher Courses for the in-service officers of the Department, training of direct recruits at the officers' level for Group A and B Services and training of workers. Presently, the Training Institute is located in 'E' Wing of Nirman Bhawan, where the accommodation is very limited and it is not possible to expand its activities. It is proposed to shift the Training Institute, in the next few years, to Ghaziabad where sufficient accommodation is likely to be made available for expansion of the training facilities for different categories of staff of CPWD. During the year 1986-87, 4 batches of Assistant operators/Operators, 4 batches of Wiremen/Assistant Wiremen and 1 batch of Lift Operators are likely to be offered training facilities.

As and when more training facilities are made available after the Training Institute is shifted to Ghaziabad, more courses will be arranged for training of workmen. At that time, it may also be possible to strengthen the training arrangements in centres outside Delhi. At present, even the facilities at Delhi, where 75% of the workmen are employed, are not adequate.

The question of giving efficiency bonus of Rs. 50/- per month if the workers agrees to undergo training in more than one trade can be considered only when the activities of the Training Institute are expanded.

[Min. of UD O.M. No. 15011/2/85-W3/WI dated 27-2-87].

Recommendation (Sl. No. 30, Paras 4.7 and 4.8)

The Ranganathan Committee had recommended that the essential maintenance staff engaged on maintenance should be provided with residential accommodation in the area of their work. The Committee note that this recommendation is being partly implemented by the Department.

In order to enable the maintenance staff to render more efficient service, the Committee recommend that all essential staff deployed on maintenance should be provided residential accommodation near the area of their work.

Reply of Government

The recommendation is accepted.

[Min. of UD O.M. No. 15011/2/85-W3/WI dated 27-2-87].

CHAPTER III

RECOMMENDATIONS OBSERVATIONS WHICH THE COMMITTEE DO NOT DESIRE TO PURSUE IN VIEW OF GOVERNMENT'S REPLIES

Recommendation (Sl. No. 4, Paras 2.39 to 2.43)

The Committee note that a study team was set up in 1983 by the Ministry to go *inter-alia* into the causes of leakage of water from the roof of Parliament House, which in its report submitted in March, 1984 identified the sources of leakages/dampness among others as due to defunct air-conditioning plants; leaking water connections and water flowing through them, lack of outlet for water collected in electrical cable ducts on first floor and damage to water proofing treatment as terrace during structural works for central air-conditioning of Parliament House.

The Committee during the course of their inspection of the Parliament House on 5th February, 1986 were pained to see patches due to leakage and dampness in almost all parts of the building occurring for a number of years now more particularly in the Library Sector (1st Floor) and even leakage in the comparatively recently construction Reception Office of Parliament House. The Committee found that instead of tackling the root of the problem CPWD have been plastering and replastering the spots affected by the leakages of water and dampness at substantial costs. The repair and plastering work done has left scars all over including electrical fittings. What pained the Committee most was that after completion of plastering and repairs, the senior officers of CPWD failed to pay attention to these scars and allowed payments to be made to contractors before making them to clean the fittings etc., and remove the mortar deposited on them.

The Committee are surprised at the neglect in maintenance and poor standard of inspection and supervision of a prestigious and historical edifice, which is frequently visited by most important national and international personalities and where the representatives of the Nation sit and deliberate. They can well imagine the standard of maintenance and supervision of other less important Government buildings. The Committee are of the considered view that had there been a high standard of inspection and supervision these defects would either have not occurred at all or would have been detected soon after occurrence for immediate remedial action and not after the damage had been done. The Committee desire that responsibility should be fixed on officers who were responsible for the maintenance and Committee informed of the action taken.

The Committee recommend that most rigorous and high standards of inspection, supervision and maintenance should be observed in Parliament House Estate and other Government buildings complexes like Rashtrapati Bhavan, North and South Blocks in New Delhi.

The Ministry have assured that 60 to 70 percent of the cause listed in the Expert Committee report have already been removed and the

balance will be removed after the current Budget Session (1986) of Parliament. The Committee trust that Ministry would strictly adhere to this target. The Committee, however, would like to be informed of the progress made in this regard.

Reply of Government

Action on the Report submitted by the Committee has been taken. The Central Air-conditioning Plant is still undergoing tests. It has not been extended to all the areas. Due to puncturing work of the building, carried out at various places in connection with air-conditioning, leakages and dampness appeared on the surface. Once the work is completed, the leakages are expected to stop.

These buildings have been constructed without Damp Proof Coarse since, at the time of their construction, the subsoil water table in Delhi was much lower than at present. Rising of the moisture cannot be prevented or controlled effectively in the absence of the Damp Proof Coarse. Wherever dampness is noticed in the walls, treatment to prevent damage to the surface is carried out. Parliament House building has thick walls, and the roof consists of arches and domes. There are many hollow pockets in the arches. It, therefore, becomes difficult to arrest the wet patches soon after these are noticed. Even after repairs are carried out, patches take months to die out. Since moisture absorbed in the thick masonry keeps on reaching the surface—for long periods, efforts have been made to keep the building free from damp patches.

During the last four years, the CPWD have made considerable efforts to improve the maintenance of Parliament House buildings despite the difficulties created by a number of additions/alterations carried out in the building not contemplated at the time it was constructed. These difficulties have been brought out in reply to the earlier recommendations. The observations of the Committee have been brought to the notice of the CPWD for guidance.

The electrical and sound installations in Parliament House are being maintained in the best possible manner and regular inspection is being conducted by the Executive Engineer and the Superintending Engineer.

The cleaning of cable ducts on the first floor of Parliament House has been taken up in phases. About 1/3rd of the total ducts have already been cleaned and the cable has been rearranged in the ducts for easy flow of accumulated water inside the ducts. The rest of the work is planned to be taken up in available inter-session periods and it will thus take about a year to complete the whole job.

[Ministry of Urban Development O.M. No. 15011/2/85-W. 3/W.I.
dated 27-2-1987]

Recommendation (Sl. No. 24, Para 3.58)

The Committee note that the Ranganathan Committee had recommended that maintenance should be separated from construction as the work content of both was widely different and that this should be given effect to first in Delhi and thereafter in other metropolitan cities. In the

absence of any facts placed before the Committee that similar separation was tried at any place outside Delhi, the Committee do not agree with the Ministry that outside Delhi such segregation is not always feasible. The Committee recommend that maintenance should be separated from construction in places outside Delhi especially in the metropolitan cities first on experimental basis and later the position may be reviewed and necessary steps taken.

Reply of Government

In Delhi, where concentrated maintenance works are there, maintenance units are already separated from construction units. Similarly, in other cities also, wherever concentrated maintenance work-load justified, maintenance has been separated from construction to the extent practicable.

[Ministry of Urban Development O.M. No. 15014/2/85-W. 3/W.I.
dated 27-2-1987]

CHAPTER IV

RECOMMENDATIONS/OBSERVATIONS IN RESPECT OF WHICH THE GOVERNMENT'S REPLIES HAVE NOT BEEN ACCEPTED BY THE COMMITTEE

Recommendation (Sl. No. 1, Para 1.11)

1.11 The Committee are concerned to note that maintenance of Government buildings has come to be badly neglected by CPWD. This fact was admitted by the Chief Engineer CPWD when he confessed before the Committee during evidence that "Maintenance has been our weakest area." The Prime Minister of India, some years ago had also mentioned about "the inadequate attention given to maintenance resulting in breakdowns and considerable public disillusionment with the efficiency of Government". The representatives of the Ministry ascribed this poor maintenance mainly to the "low productivity" and "scant discipline" among the workers at the lower level. The Committee totally disagree with this line of thinking and feel that with the same human material as is available, better results could be achieved if there is better training given to the staff, better supervision and element of firm accountability is ensured. Proper maintenance also includes preventive maintenance which, if properly and timely attended to, could prevent, comparatively with small amount of expenditure, minor damage to the buildings furniture/electrical installations from turning into a major one requiring huge funds for repairs/replacements. For example, if a leaking water tap or a water storage tank or a choked drain pipe is not set right immediately although being a minor complaint lodged with the CPWD Enquiry or coming to their notice sue moto during the course of routine inspection, the entire building is likely to get major damage by seepage and thereby, besides great inconvenience to the users of the building, it will require huge funds for plastering and repairing. The Committee regret to note that this has happened in the case of one of the most prestigious buildings, e.g. Parliament House itself. The Committee are also of the considered opinion that a solution for maintenance problem of Government buildings cannot be found in handing over the maintenance work to private contractors. During the course of evidence the Committee were informed that a thinking was going on "to utilise more the private sector, i.e. to give contract for maintenance of these houses and we are trying it out as an experimental basis so that the dependence on staff and all the others can be reduced." The Committee consider this move to be most unfortunate. This amounts to abdication of their responsibility. The alleged low productivity, inefficiency, lack of devotion and non-cooperation of the workers should not be the ground for handing over the work for which a permanent machinery exists and there is a separate Government Department, to private contractors. The Committee would like, the Ministry of Urban Development to reconsider the matter as awarding the maintenance work to private contractors will prove to be doubly costly. On the one hand the contractor will include the cost of his labour in the amount to be charged by him and on the other, the labour force employed by the Department will not have full work. The Committee may not be wrong in pointing out that there is already a tendency in various CPWD

Enquiry Offices to award even minor jobs to contractors or employ casual labour on daily wages for doing the work which their regular staff could and should do in the normal course. The Committee are of the firm opinion that if a system of accountability is introduced and rigorously enforced and the senior officers and supervisory staff put their soul in educating and training the workers, and enforcing discipline in them and make them do the work assigned to them with care the results achieved would be much better than what could be achieved through private agencies. The Committee recommend that immediate steps should be taken to have training/refresher courses for skilled and non-skilled workers and supervisory staff, at least, upto the level of Assistant Engineer. The Committee would also like the Government to lay down accountability norms at all levels and impress upon the senior and supervisory officers to improve the supervision in the context of these norms and ensure quality work in the maintenance of Government buildings. The Committee strongly feel that unless the entire maintenance set-up of CPWD is revamped, work ethos evolved and firm accountability enforced, things are not going to improve.

Reply of Government

1. Maintenance of Government buildings has not been neglected by Central PWD. The Chief Engineer, CPWD has reported that the observations attributed to him in second sentence has been quoted out of context. The Chief Engineer, while explaining the position of Central PWD, with reference to maintenance of government buildings, was quoting from extracts taken from a book on Maintenance of buildings in U. K. The book is entitled "U.K. R & D Bulletin" published by the Ministry of Public Buildings and Works. The extracts quoted by the Chief Engineer are reproduced hereunder :—

"It is unfortunate that a present building maintenance is accorded little or no merit and while it remains a neglected backwater, the morale of those involved in its managements and execution must suffer and productivity will remain low. It has to be admitted that there is little glamour in maintenance, although many of the managerial and technical problems of maintenance are more demanding than those in new work. The policy of some property owners is to do only that which they cannot decently avoid, to budget on a yearly basis only and to keep that budget under constant hostile review. There is unwillingness to incur maintenance expenditure because its results are often invisible and the money spent does not appear to provide a return. The long term consequences of this hostility on indifference are either ignored or not understood."

The Chief Engineer only desired to impress upon the members of Estimates Committee that maintenance appeared to be a weak area of attention all over the world including in advanced countries like U. K.

2. In so far as "low productivity" and "scant discipline" are concerned, it may be stated that both the above factors are widely prevalent phenomena and the Central PWD cannot be completely insulated from their effects. The Department has made and continues to make, all efforts to ensure that the personnel involved in the maintenance of important

buildings, are continuously trained to remain upto date with the job requirements, and are accountable for their output. Preventive and proper day to day maintenance are ensured.

3. As far as Parliament House is concerned, there has been no neglect in the past. Central PWD is conscious of the importance of this building and has been maintaining it to proper standards. However, there might have been occasional slips here and there, which were always promptly taken care of soon after they came to notice.

The leakages have been primarily on account of change of use, intensive, unplanned utilisation of services and change in living habits. To cite a few examples, many toilets in the Parliament House have been converted for use as office rooms. Increase in the number of users should have necessitated construction of more toilets. Instead, on account of pressure on office accommodation, the existing toilets have had to be closed. In addition, personal toilets attached to the rooms of VIPs, have been added in the past. Closure of toilets and addition of more at locations where no provision existed in the original plans has had their own unavoidable consequences.

4. In addition to the above, the Parliament House was never designed to be air-conditioned. However, in the year 1982, work started on air-conditioning of Lok Sabha, Rajya Sabha chambers and a few VIP rooms. The work of Central air-conditioning involved laying of ducts, chilled water pipes from a central plant to the terrace and then downwards to respective air-handling units. Pipes had to be taken under the roads, below the basement and then raised vertically to the terrace where water tanks have been provided. From the terrace the downtake pipes have been taken to various areas to be air-conditioned.

5. Laying of these pipes and ducts, for which no provision existed in the building, necessitated breaking of the old structure at several points, which led to leakages noticed by the user departments, who interpreted this as a symptom of poor maintenance.

6. The Estimates Committee have observed on the poor maintenance of the stone, used in the facia of the Parliament House and other monumental buildings. Similar stone has been used in many buildings constructed in Delhi around the same period. The decay of stone in Parliament House has not been any more than in other contemporary buildings, and it is, therefore, not correct to presume that the poor maintenance of Parliament House has led to decay of the sand stone which is a natural weathering phenomenon.

7. In so far as maintenance and caretaking through private contractors vis-a-vis departmental labour is concerned, it may be stated that the activity of maintenance can be divided into day-to-day maintenance and periodical maintenance (preventive as well as in the nature of renovations). Day-to-day maintenance, which includes attending to complaints of various items, has to be done by departmental labour. For periodical repairs like white-washing, painting and minor items of renovation, contractors have always been employed in the past and this procedure will continue in future also. Similarly, caretaking work like day-to-day sweeping, dusting

of walls, removal of cobwebs etc., is carried out through departmental labour. It is proposed to continue with the existing system of deployment of contractors for periodical items of caretaking like large-scale cleaning of floors with machines etc. which has been found to be more effective and economical.

8. It may be added here that the workers on workcharged establishment as well as on daily wages are enrolled by Central PWD on the basis of prescribed norms for each category. The norms are in the nature of a specified area to be swept per day by sweepers, given plinth area of the building per person for each category of works. The engagements of labour on date is on the basis of approved norms and there has been no curtailment in the strength of labour below the prescribed norms. Similar is the case with staff deployed on caretaking of the building.

[Ministry of Urban Development O.M. No. 15014/2/85-W. 3/W.I.
dated 27-2-1987]

Recommendation (Sl. No. 2, Paras 2.7 to 2.10)

2.7 The Committee are extremely unhappy over the manner in which Parliament building of national importance, which is visited by lakhs of people from all walks of life including high dignitaries from abroad, is being maintained by CPWD. The Committee are pained to note that within a short span of less than sixty years except for its exterior impressive structure the edifice has almost lost its glory due to low standards of maintenance being observed, despite the fact that a large amount of money is being spent on it every year. Deep depressions, cavities and weathering away of the beautiful red stone; patches and scars throughout the building due to seepage and leakage of water, awful conditions in the basement of the building and bad smell in different sectors bear ample testimony to the fact that so called inspections of the building by CPWD for its maintenance are carried out only as an eye wash without any positive results and even if something pointed out or complaint lodged, no proper follow up action is taken to set the defects right promptly and within the minimum possible time. The Committee deprecate the tendency on the part of CPWD authorities to advance one excuse or the other to cover up its failure to maintain the building to its original standard. The Committee cannot believe that in the decades gone by no suitable effective solution could be found to remove the defects which have developed. In the present modern and advanced scientific age proper solution to the defects can be found easily and the only thing needed is will on the part of the Department to set things right. The Committee, however, feel that this will is precisely missing for the reasons best known to the Department.

The Committee recommend that regular, intensive and realistic inspections at the level not below the rank of Executive Engineer be regularly and effectively carried out to note specific points requiring attention and immediate effective follow up action should be taken so that this important building is maintained in top condition. A record of the defects noted and the action taken should be available so that if any surprise inspection made by the Committee or any other agency, responsibility could be fixed for not noticing the defect and removing it earlier. The Committee

would like to inspect the building again after the defects pointed out have been removed within a maximum period of three months.

The Committee are perturbed to note that no regular lists of furniture, furnishing and carpets etc. are maintained by the CPWD and there seems to be effective check on the removal and branding the almost new and costly items as 'worn out' and removing them without even informing the user department, for example, in one such case wherefrom Room No. 129, Parliament House Annexe a costly wall to wall carpet, almost in new condition, seems to have been disposed of as 'worn out'. The Committee desire that a thorough enquiry into this matter should be made and finding submitted to the Committee within three months in regard to this and all other similar cases of removal from the precincts of Parliament Estate and disposal of costly items by CPWD. The Committee recommended that rigorous standard and checks should be maintained by the Department to ensure that no malpractices are indulged in. The Committee would also recommended that a fool proof system should be evolved; room-wise lists of furniture, furnishing and costly electrical items etc. kept and regular surprise inspections carried out at a suitably high level.

The Committee note that whenever any stone items beyond a particular value is to be purchased for the Parliament House or Parliament House Annexe, CPWD has to obtain administrative approval and expenditure sanction. But, whenever any store item is to be disposed off, CPWD do not seem to be taking any approval from the user department. The Committee recommend that any store item of Parliament House or Parliament House Annexe should be removed only when the CPWD are asked to do so by the Department and in any case, prior administrative approval must be obtained for disposal just as it is done for purchase.

Reply of Government

As suggested in recommendation No. 5, experts of Archaeological Survey of India have been approached for suggesting methods for preserving the sand stone blocks and enhancing their life. While their detailed report is awaited it has been observed that the depressions and cavities in the stone are only few in number and are scattered. The deterioration of the red sand stone in Parliament House as compared to similar contemporary buildings, some of which are maintained by the Archaeological Survey of India, has not been more. It would be appreciated that stone, as a building material, is obtained by quarrying from natural stone deposits. The strength and consequent durability of the stone depends on its location in the quarry. It is obvious that at the time of construction of the building it is not possible to ensure that every stone used in the facade is excavated from the same depth and possesses the same hardness, denseness and wearing qualities. Therefore, wherever stone with inadequate strength has appeared in a particular spot in the building it does not withstand the rigours of weathering action as effectively as other stronger pieces of stone etc. Such deterioration does not appear to have been the result of any leakages in the building. The Parliament House is an important building and the CPWD continue to devote high level of maintenance effort to this building. However, inspite of all efforts, leakages do appear at some place or the other due to tempering with the structure in the process of making additions and alterations, for which it was not originally designed.

These have been attended to. It would be appreciated that this building has many areas where store facia is exposed to rain and consequently markings, due to splash of rain water, are unavoidable. Here again, it may be stated, even at the cost of repitition, that maintenance has not been lacking and has not caused decay of stone at any place. Notwithstanding the above, silicon treatment has been applied to larger areas of the exposed surface. Another treatment called peter Co-treatment for preventing rising of moisture through stone at the floor level has also been carried out. This treatment was done to this Building as it has been provided with Damp Proof Coarse at the time of its original construction, when the subsoil water table in Delhi was much lower than at present.

Para 139 of the CPWD Code requires the Executive Engineer to inspect all the buildings, where serious defects have been brought to his notice and to ensure that adequate steps have been taken to remedy them. He also inspects the important buildings once a year and gets the defects, if any, rectified. In the Enquiry Office, a register of complaints and compliance thereof is always available. Whenever serious defects are brought to the notice of the Executive Engineer, the same are being inspected and looked into and proper remedial measures are being taken. The Executive Engineer is in charge of not only Parliament House but also a number of buildings as his jurisdiction extends over a large area on account of workload determined in financial terms.

The defects are brought to the notice of the Enquiry Office as and when observed by the clients. These are attended to.

As recommended by the Committee, the inspection note is being kept in Enquiry Office for specific points requiring attention. Action taken on those points is also being kept for perusal of high authorities.

The Estimates Committee inspected the building again on 9-1-87.

The movement of furniture or furnishings from one area to another in Parliament House, and the Annexe is done by the respective Secretariats. CPWD officers do not come into the picture at all. The records of the CPWD do not indicate that a wall to wall carpet ever existed in Room No. 129 of Parliament House Annexe. The Superintending Engineer in charge of Parliament House Annexe has reported that no wall to wall carpet of Parliament House Annexe had been disposed of within the last 10 years. Over this period, small size carpets, which were moth-eaten and had become unserviceable, had been disposed off, after observing all cedal formalities. It may be added that, in all Ministries/Departments of Government of India, the responsibility for maintenance of furniture and furnishings vests with the concerned user Ministry/Department. In the case of Parliament House and Parliament House Annexe, however, the position has been somewhat different. Here, the services of CPWD is being utilised for purchase of furniture as well as for its write off. To bring about uniformity and to avoid complaints, it is suggested that the purchase and maintenance of furniture and furnishings in the Parliament House and the Annexe be taken over by the respective Secretariats. The

assistance of the CPWD can be taken as and when necessity arises in individual cases.

[Ministry of Urban Development O.M. No. 15011/2/85-W. 3/W.I.
dated 27-2-1987]

Recommendation (Sl. No. 3, Paras 2.32 and 2.33)

The Committee note that norms of expenditure on maintenance were revised by the Ministry in 1983 on the basis of recommendation made by an expert Committee which was specifically appointed to determine the norms. The Committee also note that although the norms were revised in 1983 yet they were actually based on the figures worked out by the expert committee as on 1-10-1979. The expert committee had recommended that norms should be updated every year based on the rise in price indices.

It has to be admitted that proper maintenance of Government buildings is not possible unless requisite funds are made available. The Committee recommend that in order to provide adequate funds for proper maintenance of Government buildings, the norms of expenditure should be realistic and updated every year as was suggested by the Expert Committee taking into account the cost escalations of the materials consumed.

Reply of Government

This year's maintenance index, which is indicative of the norms for maintenance, has been updated to July, 1986. However, funds for maintenance are allocated on year to year basis depending on the overall resources position and are generally short of requirements.

[Ministry of Urban Development O.M. No. 15011/2/85-W. 3/W.I.
dated 27-2-1987]

Recommendation (Sl. No. 9, Para 2.66 and 2.67)

The Committee are greatly concerned that of late the standard of cleanliness in Parliament House Estate has considerably deteriorated. There have been increase in the number of compliants regarding appearance of mosquitoes, beehives, flies and rats. There has also been no solution to the menace of birds droppings which disfigures the building.

The Committee recommend that concrete steps should be taken in close coordination with NDMC to combat the menace of mosquitoes, bees, flies, rats and birds in the area and to improve the general standard of cleanliness in Parliament House Estate and the Office complexes and buildings nearby.

Reply of Government

The C.P.W.D. is responsible for the maintenance of the building. Activities which relate to eradication of mosquitos, beehives, flies, rats etc. do not fall within the ambit of the work of CPWD. However, the CPWD have been taking the help of the NDMC authorities for anti-mosquito measures.

As far as flies, beehives and rats are concerned, these have to be eradicated with the help of the NDMC. Though, in the past, the CPWD have

adopted various measures to get rid of these pests, the results do not seem to have been to the satisfaction of the Committee. As long as there is extensive greenery around Parliament House, no permanent solution to these problems or that of bird droppings can be found as it is these flora which attract various kinds of insect life and a variety of birds. Destruction of such flora around this monumental building would be too heavy a price to pay for getting rid of these pests, which too have their own place in the eco-system.

[Ministry of Urban Development O.M. No. 15011/2/85-W.3/W.I., dated 27-2-1987.]

Recommendation (Sl. No. 13, Paras 2.85 and 2.86)

The Committee are most unhappy over the sharp fall in the standard of caretaking of Parliament House. It is rather strange that in a prestigious building like Parliament House, the job of caretaken has been entrusted to an official of the rank of Upper Division Clerk and the Ministry inspite of being aware that this is one of the main causes of unsatisfactory upkeep and maintenance of Parliament House Estate have not been able to tackle the problem and to find a suitable incumbent for the post. This is proof enough of the apathy of the Ministry and consequent sorry state of affairs. What surprises the Committee most is the Ministry's own admission that it was all along aware that the caretaking staff in Parliament House had never been adequate. The Committee disapproves of the lakadaisical manner in which the Ministry has been functioning in regard to the staff requirements of Parliament House.

The Committee recommend that the requirement of the caretaking staff at Parliament House should be immediately assessed and adequately strengthened both qualitatively and quantitatively keeping in view the objective of regular maintenance and upkeep of the prestigious buildings to the best possible standards. In case such a review is to take some time, the post of caretaker should immediately be upgraded to the rank of Junior Engineer and suitable person selected and posted without loss of time. The proposals agreed to after the review for upgradation and/or increase of officers and staff should also be implemented without any loss of time.

Reply of Government

Caretaking is a labour intensive work which requires constant supervision. In the absence of Caretakers, Jamadars and other maintenance staff and due to other pre-occupations of the Junior Engineer, the caretaking work could not be properly supervised. So far, it has not been possible to up-grade the pay-scale of the post of Caretaker.

The Government took a decision in 1974 that caretaking should be carried out by the administrative Ministry which is occupying and building through a full time qualified caretaker. In view of this, the Caretaker's post is also a dying cadre in the CPWD. After the Government took this decision, in 1974, efforts were made to transfer the caretaking of Parliament House Complex to the Lok Sabha Secretariat and accordingly, Parliament House Annexe is looked after by them. In addition, Library Sector in Parliament House, Reception area and the rooms of Lok Sabha

Secretariat are also being looked after by the Lok Sabha Secretariat themselves.

In these circumstances, the Lok Sabha Secretariat have again been requested to take over the caretaking work of Parliament House. This matter is being further pursued with the Lok Sabha Secretariat.

[Ministry of Urban Development O.M. No. 15011/2/85-W3/W.I.
dated 27-2-1987].

Recommendation (Sl. No. 18, Paras 3.29 and 3.10)

The Committee are unhappy to note that there has been no regular inspection of buildings by the supervisory staff to locate defects in the buildings. Although frequency of inspection of buildings by the officers at various levels has been prescribed, in actual practice this is not being adhered to due to alleged excessive workload with the officers. The Committee are not convinced with this explanation. The Committee hope that after the workload norms have been suitably revised, the inspection of buildings by officers at various levels would be rigorously enforced and monitored and action taken against officers who fail to perform this important part of their job.

In order to keep a correct record of the workload and give satisfaction to clients, the Committee recommend that a system of keeping an "Inspection Card" with the occupant of buildings/houses be introduced immediately and the inspecting staff, namely, Jr. Engineer, Asstt. Engineer or Ex. Engineer would record his observations on the card at the time of his visit and initial it with date. A duplicate copy of the inspection card should be kept in the enquiry office. The action taken about the points recorded in the card.

Reply of Government

The CPWD Code provides for regular inspection of buildings by the Supervisory staff to locate the defects etc. in the buildings. But due to heavy workload, this could not be strictly followed. The National Productivity Council which is studying the workload norms as well as staffing pattern of the CPWD is expected to submit its Report by March, 1987.

With the present workload of the units, it may not be possible to maintain inspection cards, as recommended by the committee, as it will increase the workload of the Supervisory staff. It is a welcome recommendation and its implementation can be considered after the report of National Productivity Council, which is studying the workload norms and staffing pattern of CPWD, is received.

[Ministry of Urban Development O.M. No. 15011/2/85-W.3/W.I.
dated 27-2-1987].

Recommendation (Sl. No. 22, Para 3.47)

The Committee are deeply concerned to note that productivity in the maintenance work has considerably gone down and nothing has been done

to check this trend even when the facts are well known to the administration. During evidence it was revealed by the Ministry that workers spend lot of their time in thinking about their demands rather than doing the work. The Committee consider this state of affairs to be very serious. In their opinion there is clear lack of supervision and some strong action is needed to stop the rot. The Committee recommend that a detailed study should be conducted to identify the specific causes for reduction of productivity on maintenance works and in the light of findings of the study urgent steps should be taken to remedy the situation. In the meantime each employee should be required to maintain daily diary and those found not doing the work allotted to them or delaying it should be severely dealt with and disciplinary action taken against them.

Reply of Government

The main reason for the fall in productivity is the excessive politicalisation of labour unions, indiscipline among labour, their defiant attitude and lack of accountability. This phenomenon is widely prevalent and may not be viewed in isolation in respect of Central Public Works Department.

[Ministry of Urban Development Q.M. No. 15011/2/85-W.3/W.I.
dated 27-2-1987].

CHAPTER V

RECOMMENDATIONS/OBSERVATIONS IN RESPECT OF WHICH FINAL REPLIES ARE STILL AWAITED

Recommendation (Sl. No. 14, Para 2.87)

The Committee need hardly emphasise that the lawns and garden areas in precincts of Parliament House should be a model for others to follow as parliament is the representative and the symbol of sovereignty and freedom of the people of India. People come to Parliament House from all parts of the country and even abroad. The Committee recommend that there should be a separate well-equipped Horticulture Division for Parliament House Estate on the same pattern as exists for the President's Estate and the same norms for staff etc. should be followed.

Reply of Government

1. Efforts are being made to maintain the area of Parliament House (Internal as well as External Courts) at a high standard.

2. High Power Committee has deputed Shri Ravindra Bhan, Architect to finalise the landscape plan of Parliament House Complex. Improvements will be carried out accordingly as soon as this finalised plans are received.

3. The National Productivity Council has been entrusted with the study of selected units, including the discipline of Horticulture, with a view to recommending appropriate norms for staffing. A review of the staff strength of the CPWD, including the Horticultural Directorate, will be possible only after the NPC submits its report.

[Ministry of Urban Development O.M. No. 15011/2/85-W.3/W.I.
dated 27-2-1987]

Recommendation (Sl. No. 15, Para 3.10)

The Committee find that maintenance Divisions in CPWD are sanctioned on the basis of maintenance expenditure. If the funds earmarked for maintenance are reduced, the number of houses coming to the share of Junior Engineer increases. In the opinion of the Committee, this is not a sound criterion and has resulted in poor attention being paid to the maintenance of houses. The reason behind the present practice appears to be the increasing tendency for awarding even minor maintenance jobs to contractors or daily wage worker and keeping the permanent employees idle. The Committee feel that instead of creating Divisions on the basis of funds earmarked for maintenance it should be done on the basis of covered area. It should also be examined whether it would be economical to have adequate permanent staff who may be properly trained and required to do all maintenance jobs departmentally. The Committee were informed that an expert body had been assigned to specifically go into this question. The Committee hope that sound criterion would be evolved for creating divisions in Central PWD.

Reply of Government

National Productivity Council was entrusted the job to study the working of 16 units of various disciplines, Civil Engineering, Electrical Engineering, Horticulture and Architects and recommend norms for staffing pattern for achieving improved performance. Their report is expected in March, 1987.

[Ministry of Urban Development O.M. No. 15014/2/85-W. 3/W.I.
dated 27-2-1987]

Recommendation (Sl. No. 16, Paras 3.20 and 3.21)

The Committee have been informed that the present workload with each category of Engineers in CPWD was too high to permit proper supervision of a high level and allow contact at suitable officer level with the concerned Ministry, Department or allottee. The Committee are surprised at the lassitude on the part of the Ministry even to get the workload norms examined by a professional body within a reasonable time frame, when it knew fully well that such a study would go a long way in ultimately reducing the workload and result in proper supervision of work by engineers. The Committee are unhappy over the undue delay in giving effect to the suggestion of Ranganathan Committee regarding setting up of a Committee to go into amendment of CPWD codes and for suggesting simplification of procedures.

The Committee hope that matters, both relating to examination of workload norms of different categories of Engineers as also simplification of procedures, will get the urgent attention they deserve, and decided within a reasonable time frame so that some result-oriented changes can be brought about within minimum time.

Reply of Government

The CPWD Code has since been updated and revised with reference to the latest instructions/orders of the Government and the revised draft has been referred to the Ministry for approval. Draft revised manual has been prepared by the CPWD. Regarding amendment of the CPWD Code and simplification of procedures, the matter is under examination in consultation with the CPWD.

The study of selected units in the CPWD, comprising all disciplines, which has been entrusted to the National Productivity Council, is expected to be completed by March, 1987.

[Ministry of Urban Development O.M. No. 15011/2/85-W.3/W.I.
dated 27-2-1987].

Recommendation (Sl. No. 28, Para 3.76)

The Committee note that the CPWD being a multi-disciplinary department has no organisational flexibility and has to approach the Ministry for policy decisions, which many a time delays things. In order to provide more autonomy to the Department in regard to its functioning and to facilitate its work, the Committee recommend that a Central Construction Board, should be created on the lines of P&T Board or Railway Board. In

the opinion of the Committee a better organised and autonomous Board would definitely lead to better performance not only in construction work but also in maintenance of buildings.

Reply of Government

The matter is under consideration.

[Ministry of Urban Development O.M. No. 15011/2/85-W. 3/W.I.
dated 27-2-1987]

Recommendation (Sl. No. 31, Paras 4.11 and 4.12)

It is really surprising that although the CPWD is a vast and old Department, it does not have any Research and Development Cell of its own. The codes and manuals of CPWD are also very old and need revision and updating in the light of subsequent developments.

In order to provide basic infrastructure in tackling day-to-day problems relating to maintenance most effectively and efficiency, the Committee recommend that to begin with, a small R&D Cell should be set up in the Department.

Reply of Government

The recommendation is under examination.

[Ministry of Urban Development O.M. No. 15011/2/85-W.3/W.I.
dated 27-2-1987].

NEW DELHI

April 22, 1987

Vaisakha 2, 1909(S)

CHANDRA TRIPATHI

Chairman

Estimates Committee

APPENDIX

(Vide Introduction)

Analysis of action taken by Government on the 33rd Report of Estimates Committee (8th Lok Sabha)

| | | |
|-----|--|-------|
| I | Total number of recommendations | 31 |
| II | Recommendations which have been accepted by Government (Sl. Nos. 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 11, 12, 17, 19, 20, 21, 23, 25, 26, 27, 29 and 30) | 17 |
| | Percentage to total | 54.8% |
| III | Recommendations which the Committee do not desire to pursue in view of Government's replies (Sl. Nos. 4 and 24) | 2 |
| | Percentage to total | 6.6% |
| IV | Recommendations in respect of which replies of Government have not been accepted by the Committee (Sl. Nos. 1, 2, 3, 9, 13, 18 and 22) | 7 |
| | Percentage to total | 22.6% |
| V | Recommendations in respect of which final replies of Government are still awaited (Sl. Nos. 14, 15, 16, 28 and 31) | 5 |
| | Percentage to total | 16.0% |

LIST OF AUTHORISED AGENTS FOR THE SALE OF LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT PUBLICATIONS 1987

| Sl. No. | Name of Agent | Sl. No. | Name of Agent |
|-----------------------|--|----------------------|--|
| ANDHRA PRADESH | | UTTAR PRADESH | |
| 1. | M/s. Vijay Book Agency, 11-1-477, Mylargadda, Secunderabad-500361. | 12. | Law Publishers, Sardar Patel Marg, P.B. No. 77, Allahabad, U.P. |
| BIHAR | | WEST BENGAL | |
| 2. | M/s. Crown Book Depot, Upper Bazar, Ranchi (Bihar). | 13. | M/s. Manimala, Buys & Sells, 123, Bow Bazar Street, Calcutta-1. |
| GUJARAT | | DELHI | |
| 3. | The New Order Book Company, Ellis Bridge, Ahmedabad-380006. (T. No. 79065). | 14. | M/s. Jain Book Agency, C-9, Connaught Place, New Delhi. (T. No. 351663 & 350806). |
| MADHYA PRADESH | | 15. | M/s. J. M. Jaina & Brothers, P. Box 1020, Mori Gate, Delhi-110006. (T. No. 2915064 & 230936). |
| 4. | Modern Book House, Shiv Vilas Palace, Indore City. (T. No. 35289). | 16. | M/s. Oxford Book & Stationery Co., Scindia House, Connaught Place, New Delhi-110001. (T. No. 3315308 & 45896). |
| MAHARASHTRA | | 17. | M/s. Bookwell, 2/72, Sant Nirankari Colony, Kingsway Camp, Delhi-110009. (T. No. 7112309). |
| 5. | M/s. Sunderdas Gian Chand, 601, Girgaum Road, Near Princes Street, Bombay-400002. | 18. | M/s. Rajendra Book Agency, IV-DR59, Lajpat Nagar, Old Double Storey, New Delhi-110024. (T. No. 6412362 & 6412131). |
| 6. | The International Book Service, Deccan Gymkhana, Poona-4. | 19. | M/s. Ashok Book Agency, BH-82, Poorvi Shalimar Bagh, Delhi-110033. |
| 7. | The Current Book House, Maruti Lane, Raghunath Dadaji Street, Bombay-400001. | 20. | M/s. Venus Enterprises, B-2/85, Phase-II, Ashok Vihar, Delhi. |
| 8. | M/s. Usha Book Depot, 'Law Book Seller and Publishers' Agents Govt. Publications, 585, Chira Bazar Khan House, Bombay-400002. | 21. | M/s. Central News Agency Pvt. Ltd., 23/90, Connaught Circus, New Delhi-110001. (T. No. 344448, 322705, 344478 & 344508). |
| 9. | M&J Services, Publishers, Representa- tive Accounts & Law Book Sellers, Mohan Kunj, Ground Floor 68, Jyotiba Fuele Road, Nalgaum-Dadar, Bombay-400014. | 22. | M/s. Amrit Book Co., N-21, Connaught Circus, New Delhi. |
| 10. | Subscribers Subscription Services India, 21, Raghunath Dadaji Street, 2nd Floor, Bombay-400001. | 23. | M/s. Books India Corporation, Publishers, Importers & Exporters, L-27, Shastri Nagar, Delhi-110052. (T. No. 269631 & 714465). |
| TAMIL NADU | | 24. | M/s. Sangam Book Depot, 4378/4B, Murari Lal Street, Ansari Road, Darya Ganj, New Delhi-110002. |
| 11. | M/s. M. M. Subscription Agencies, 14th Murali Street, (1st floor) Mahalingapuram, Nungambakkam, Madras-600034. (T. No. 476558). | | |

EC No. 1158

© 1987 BY LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT

PUBLISHED UNDER RULE 382 OF THE RULES OF PROCEDURE AND CONDUCT
OF BUSINESS IN LOK SABHA (SIXTH EDITION) AND PRINTED BY THE
MANAGER, GOVERNMENT OF INDIA PRESS, FARIDABAD
