

(1)	(2)	(3)
	All Mizoram Manipuri Association, Aizawl	Manipuri
	Manipuri Sahitya Parishad, Imphal	Manipuri
	All Assam Manipuri Student Union, Silchar, Assam	Manipuri
	Student Union Leh Road College, Leh	Manipuri
	Lala Rural Student College, Lala	Manipuri
	Batrapur Manipuri Student Union, Cachar, Assam	Manipuri
	Manipuri Sahitya Parishad, Assam	Manipuri
	All Assam Manipuri Womens Welfare Assam, Silchar	Manipuri
	Progressive Youth Front Assam	Manipuri
	The Assam Pradesh Manipuri Association	Manipuri
	The Young Union Club, Imphal	Manipuri
	Vankhe Rashtra Bhasha Mahavidyalaya, Imphal	Manipuri
	Chief Editor, 'Jalte Deep' Daily, Joanpur, Rajasthan	Rajasthani
	Rajasthani Bhasha Vikas Samiti, Jamshedpur,	Rajasthani
	Maithili Mahasangh, Patna, Bihar	Maithili
	Akhil Bhartiya Maithili Parishad, Darbhanga	Maithili
	Various Representations from individuals	Rabha
1988	Konkani Bhasha Prachar Sabha, Cachar, Assam	Konkani
	Shri Prithibi Majhi, Member of Parliament	Santhali

**Single Administrative Tribunal for Central and State Government Employees**

istrative Tribunals functioning for Central and State Government employees;

\*415. SHRI V.S. KRISHNA IYER: Will the PRIME MINISTER be pleased to state:

(b) if so, whether there is any proposal to have a single Administrative Tribunal to deal with service matters of both Central and State Government employees; and

(a) whether there are separate Admin-

(c) if so, the details thereof?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF PERSONNEL, PUBLIC GRIEVANCES AND PENSIONS AND MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF HOME AFFAIRS (SHRI P. CHIDAMBARAM): (a) Yes, Sir. The Central Administrative Tribunal with its Benches at various parts of the country adjudicate service cases of Central Government employees. Similarly State Administrative Tribunals have been set up in Orissa, Himachal Pradesh and Karnataka for deciding service cases of the State Government employees concerned.

(b) and (c). There is already provision under section 4(5) in the Administrative Tribunals Act to have a common Tribunal for Central and State Government employees in cases where it is considered necessary and desirable.

#### **Permission to Avail Foreign Contribution**

\*417. SHRI SYED SHAHABUDDIN: Will the Minister of HOME AFFAIRS be pleased to state:

(a) the names of legislators, office-bearers of political parties, journalists and Government servants who have been permitted to avail of foreign contribution during the last three years;

(b) the names of foreign hosts, the extent of contribution received and the purpose thereof in each case; and

(c) the names of persons in the above mentioned categories whose applications for approval of acceptance of foreign contribution was refused by Government, year-wise during the last three years?

THE MINISTER OF HOME AFFAIRS (S. BUTA SINGH): (a) to (c). Members of Legislature; office-bearers of political parties; correspondents, columnists, cartoonists, editors, owners, printers or publishers of a registered newspaper and Government servants, inter alia, are prohibited from accepting any foreign contribution under section 4 of the Foreign Contribution (Regulation) Act, 1976, except what is exempted under section 8 of the said Act. For accepting foreign contribution of more than Rs. 8000/- per year from their relatives (foreign source) such persons require prior permission under the said Act. No such permission has been sought by any such person during the last three years.

#### **Supply of Sub-Standard Pulses to Army Supply Corps**

\*418. SHRIMATI PATEL RAMABEN RAMJIBHAI MAVANI: Will the Minister of DEFENCE be pleased to state:

(a) whether some of the officers belonging to Army Supply Corps were allegedly reported to be involved in the acceptance of sub-standard pulses in connivance with FCI officers at Delhi during 1984-85; and

(b) the result of CBI inquiry into the matter and the action taken against the officers held responsible for accepting sub-standard pulses offered by the F.C.I.?

THE MINISTER OF DEFENCE (SHRI K.C. PANT): (a) Yes, Sir.

(b) The CBI authorities had recommended that action be taken against five Army officers allegedly involved in this case. The Army authorities had the allegations investigated by a Court of Inquiry. The Court did not find any of the five officers responsible for any lapse. The case against the Army officers has, therefore, been closed.