

so far as the Class Project is concerned, and the Computer Literacy Project is concerned, we do want at a particular level to cover the entire country.

SHRI UTTAM RATHOD: Sir, here in the fourth line they have said, "The recommendations of the Committee were circulated among all the States" I would like to know what does the Central Government expect from the State Governments.

SHRI P.V. NARASIMHA RAO: Sir, we expect some State Governments, if they are so interested, to introduce these courses. They have been found to be, more or less, satisfactory. Naturally there will be lot of improvement as we go along, but we have no programme, we have no scheme to introduce this course in the entire country. As I said, CBSE has tried in some schools. Now we have passed on the recommendations of this Committee to the State Governments so that if they so wish, they could introduce it in some of their selected schools or all the schools depending upon the money available with them. So far as we are concerned we find that we are not able to do it. We are spending money on 'Operation Blackboard' and so many other things which, according to us, deserve a higher priority. It is not that this is not going to come at all, but right now we do not have any scheme of this magnitude.

SHRIMATI JAYANTI PATNAIK: Sir, the hon. Minister has said that they are evaluating this project. I would like to know whether any evaluation report has been received from any organisation like Application Centre, Ahmedabad. If so, what are the details and what action has been taken on that and if not, what are the reasons for the delay in receipt of the report?

SHRI P.V. NARASIMHA RAO: Sir, I think this is specifically about a particular course. Specifically I have stated in the answer that the position is that we do not have a fully operative or to be made operative scheme over the whole country. Class Project I have already explained. The only

thing is there has been a committee and that committee has given some recommendations. We have sent those recommendations. Now the latest thing is about teachers. We are not able to find the teachers. So, that is the greatest complaint. Even if you have all the money, the constraint is about teachers and it will take some time before we are able to take on a programme like this.

Supply of cranes and equipments to Major Port Trusts

*869. **SHRI BANWARI LAL PUROHIT**
SHRI V SREENIVASA PRASAD

Will the Minister of SURFACE TRANSPORT be pleased to state:

(a) whether most of the major Port Trusts have placed orders with a Bombay based company for supply of heavy duty cranes and other heavy engineering equipments;

(b) whether the company has supplied technically sound equipments and adhered to the time-schedule;

(c) if not, the reasons thereof;

(d) whether the delay has also affected the time bound projects; and

(e) if so, the action taken by Government in this regard?

THE MINISTER OF STATE OF THE MINISTRY OF SURFACE TRANSPORT (SHRI RAJESH PILOT): (a) to (e). A statement is given below.

STATEMENT

(a) Since the name of the Bombay based company has not been mentioned, information is given below for all the major Ports which have placed orders for supply of heavy duty cranes and other heavy engineering equipments from companies based in Bombay.

Name of the Port	Item ordered	Name of the Company
Visakhapatnam Port	2 Nos. Electric Level Luffing Cranes	M/s Mukund Iron & Steel Works, Thane, Bombay.
Paradip Port	One Rail Mounted Stacker/Reclaimer	M/s WMI Cranes Ltd., Bombay
Madras Port	One 25 Tonnes Top Lift Truck	M/s Voltas Ltd., Bombay
Kandla Port	(a) 3 Wharf Cranes	M/s WMI Cranes Ltd., Bombay
	(b) 5 Electric Wharf Cranes	M/s Mukund Iron & Steel Works, Bombay.

(b) and (c). In Visakhapatnam Port the Company M/s Mukand Iron & Steel Works could not adhere to time schedule though the equipment was technically sound. The reason for this was the lock out in the firm for nearly 8 months.

In Paradip Port the firm, M/s WMI Cranes Ltd Bombay could not supply stacker/reclaimer in time due to delay in fabrication, labour problem in their work and poor management

In Madras Port the firm M/s Voltas Ltd supplied the Top Lift Truck within time.

In Kandla port, none of the 3 cranes has yet been delivered by M/s WMI Cranes Ltd. to the Port. One crane suffered damage while being test checked. The others are yet to be handed over. The delay took place due to slow progress of work and lock out in the factory. M/s Mukand Iron & Steel Works could not also adhere to the time schedule at kandla but their cranes were technically acceptable. The delay in the erection of the cranes was due to delay in import of critical components, non-availability of requisite steel, labour unrest and lock out.

(d) and (e) Non-supply of cranes by WMI Cranes Ltd to kandla has led to the commissioning of the 6th Cargo Berth without the cranes. As far as Paradip Port

is concerned, the erection of the stacker-cum-reclaimer was a replacement of the existing stacker/reclaimer which had been in existence for 20 years. The supply of cranes to Visakhapatnam Port was in replacement of existing cranes, therefore, no project was affected

Visakhapatnam Port has imposed the maximum penalty, i.e Rs. 81955000 under the contract on M/s Mukand Iron & Steel Works, Thane, Bombay for delay in the supply of cranes

Kandla Port has levied full compensation of Rs 5.84 lakh on M/s WMI Cranes Ltd and Rs 7,11,400 on M/s Mukand Iron & Steel Works, Bombay for delay in the supply of cranes

Paradip has issued Show Cause Notice to M/s WMI Cranes Ltd for delay in the supply of stacker/reclaimer. Liquidated damages at the rate of 7% (maximum provided in the contract) is being deducted from all the bills of the firm.

The Government has brought to the notice of all Major Ports the poor performance of M/s WMI Cranes Ltd, Bombay.

[Translation]

SHRI BANWARI LAL PUROHIT: Mr. Speaker, Sir, it is clear from the reply of the

hon Minister that these companies are not supplying cranes and other heavy engineering equipments within time and as a result, the projects worth crores of rupees are getting delayed. A penalty of Rs. 7 to 8 lakhs is levied at that time, but the actual loss is many times more. I want to know about M/s WMI Cranes Ltd of the Paradip Port about which you have not clarified as to when the orders were placed and by when were they to supply the equipment and when did they supply the same and how much penalty was imposed on them?

SHRI RAJESH PILOT: Mr. Speaker, Sir, if the hon Member had furnished the name of the particular company in his question, then my reply would have been more specific, but the question was written in a manner that

MR SPEAKER: His question was very clear

SHRI RAJESH PILOT: If it was so clear in writing, then he could have asked it in very clear terms orally also. Then my reply would have been more clear

Mr Speaker, Sir, WMI Cranes Ltd was assigned this contract at Paradip Port in 1981. The contract was to be executed during 1983. It is true that the company did not adhere to the time-schedule. Show-Cause Notices etc have been issued and nearly 94 per cent of the work has been completed. However, the information of the hon. Member is true that this company has not fulfilled its agreement at this port and in other ports like the Kandla Port etc. Last time also when I was asked questions relating to this matter, I had assured the House that strict action will be taken in the matter. Now also we will take strongest steps to ensure that the companies which are not able to fulfill the agreements are penalised. We have informed every port about this company and written to them that this company has not executed its agreement at this port in a proper manner. We have cautioned them that in case they give any contract to this company in future, they should be vigilant about its

efficiency. We are trying to take even stronger steps to see that the companies which do not adhere to the agreements and which results in the escalation of costs are blacklisted so that they are not given any contract in any port in future.

SHRI BANWARI LAL PUROHIT: Mr Speaker, Sir, the contract was awarded in 1981 and the condition was to execute the agreement by 1983, but the work has not been completed so far. I want to know as to what penalty has been imposed and how much cost has been increased by the company? All this is not clear in the reply.

SHRI RAJESH PILOT: Mr Speaker, Sir, the initial cost in the year 1981, that is, at the time of awarding the contract, was Rs 2.5 crores and on revision it rose to Rs 4.07 crores. A penalty of 7 per cent has been imposed which will be recovered from the payment to be made to the company. According to the rules and regulations of the port, only this much can be recovered. The position of the work is such that even if the Government cancels the contract and imposes penalty, then also the Govt will have to suffer losses. Hence, it has been decided to allow them to complete their work after imposing penalty upon them. As regards the future contracts, this company will be blacklisted. These are some strong steps which we can take in the interest of the Department.

SHRI BANWARI LAL PUROHIT: Mr Speaker, Sir, the contract of Rs 2 crores was mutually binding. The Government's money is not surplus; it belongs to the people. The costs have escalated to Rs 4 crores, but the work could not get completed even by 1987. What is the Government doing? At least, you should see that such 2 or 3 companies are blacklisted. Can the work not be carried out without such companies? Let other companies get the opportunity. Other offers will come and you should encourage them. But you are harping on what you will do in future and that you will take action if conditions are not fulfilled in contracts undertaken in future. They have not adhered to the condi-

tions You are aware that they have supplied sub-standard equipments elsewhere. Some people were killed in Neyveli and the machines which they has supplied went out of order Such companies must be blacklisted Is the Government going to take a decision at the earliest in this connection so that such companies which are hoodwinking the Government are blacklisted

MR SPEAKER: Alright, you have said that you wanted to say

SHRI RAJESH PILOT: Mr Speaker, Sir, I agree with the hon. Member and I also accept that the Department has made efforts to take as strong steps as possible in this regard.

MR. SPEAKER: Then penalise them by blacklisting them.

SHRI RAJESH PILOT: I have assured that not only this company, but many other companies will have to be black-listed as well.

SHRI RAJ KUMAR RAI: Mr. Speaker, Sir, the hon. Minister has said that this private company has indulged in a lot of bungling and that the Department is taking the strongest possible steps in this regard. the Government's policy is also to give priority to the Public Sector so that socialism could be encouraged. However, in regard to the bridge, which is under construction at Ramnagar in Varanasi, a company in the Private Sector was given preference, although Uttar Pradesh Bridge Corporation, a Public Sector enterprise was the lowest bidder and possessed the latest technology. What was the justification in awarding this project to the Private Sector?

MR. SPEAKER: This question does not arise from the subject under discussion.

SHRI RAJ KUMAR RAI: Mr. Speaker, Sir, of course it does. How far is it justified to give preference to the Private Sector and deny the chance to the Public Sector?

MR. SPEAKER: He might not be aware of it as the question is not related to the topic under discussion.

SHRI RAJ KUMAR RAI: Sir, he knows it, for he is a very learned person.

MR. SPEAKER: This does not mean that he might be aware of it.

SHRI RAJESH PILOT: Mr. Speaker, Sir, the design of that project was furnished by U.P. Corporation. That design was not found suitable. It was a project of the World Bank. The design failed to meet the conditions set by the World Bank for this project But when the hon. Member had written to us about it, we had approached the World Bank to retender the bid and give priority to the Public Sector Undertaking. It was possible to take only this step and we have already taken it

SHRI RAJ KUMAR RAI: Sir, its re-tender was not done

SHRI RAJESH PILOT: I have already told that it will be done They will call the tender again

SHRI BHAGWAT JHA AZAD: Mr Speaker, Sir, for the contractors the best method of making money is to delay the completion of the projects so that costs get escalated The Hon Prime Minister has stated that this must not happen The company got the full benefits of the cost escalation from Rs 2 crores to Rs 4 crores and only 7 per cent penalty was paid I want to know as to what was the penalty amount which the Government has received? Regarding this matter the hon. Minister has given two replies Firstly that all the ports will be told to be vigilant about the efficiency of this company and secondly he said that the company will be blacklisted which of the two replies is true? Will the company which is responsible for increasing the cost from Rs 2 crores to Rs 4 crores be blacklisted or will they get contracts again if they are efficient enough?

SHRI RAJESH PILOT: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I want to repeat my answer again. Regarding the contracts which they have already undertaken, we want to inform the ports about their efficiency level and instructed the port authorities to monitor their work. We cannot do anything illegal. The contracts which have already been entered into cannot be cancelled, but their work can be monitored. The ports can be directed to be vigilant about their efficiency. For the present contracts, the solution is to monitor their work. As regards future, we have given assurance that companies will be blacklisted on the basis of reports, which may be obtained about their work.

SHRI V TULSIRAM: Mr. Speaker, Sir, hon. Shri Jha was saying that there were no shortcomings. But in his question he has stated that a lot of wrong things are being done there. What is right, we do not know...*(Interruptions)*.

SHRI BHAGWAT JHA AZAD: He will not understand it.

MR. SPEAKER: When you start speaking, only then he will understand.

[English]

Central Guidelines for Rehabilitation of Evictees of Irrigation Projects

*870 SHRI BALASAHEB VIKHE PATIL: Will the Minister of WATER RESOURCES be pleased to state:

(a) whether there is any proposal to enact a Central Law or issue guidelines for the rehabilitation of the families affected due to submergence of their land in reservoirs of irrigation projects;

(b) if so, the details thereof; and

(c) if not, the reasons therefor?

THE MINISTER OF STATE OF THE MINISTRY OF TEXTILES (SHRI RAM NIWAS MIRDHA): (a) to (c) Irrigation projects are planned and implemented by State Governments and the rehabilitation

measures form part of their project implementation programmes. The adequacy of rehabilitation measures is examined while clearing the project.

[Translation]

SHRI BALASAHEB VIKHE PATIL: Mr. Speaker, Sir, the hon. Minister has not replied to my question. My question was:

[English]

"Whether there is any proposal to enact a Central Law or issue guidelines for the rehabilitation of the families affected due to submergence of their land in reservoirs of irrigation projects?"

[Translation]

He has stated that the Centre only clears the projects. The implementation of the projects is the responsibility of the State Governments. Many farmers are dependent on their pieces of land for their living and when the Government acquires their land, they become helpless and they are rendered jobless. The Government should sympathise with them. Many projects have been stalled because of them. Thousands of farmers are rendered landless and they should get land elsewhere as a part of the project. But the reality is that the Government acquires their land at very low prices. When irrigation facilities are provided in these areas, the price of the same land increase sharply and these farmers are unable to buy any piece of land with that meagre amount of compensation. The Government should issue directives to the State Governments in this regard. Such projects should include rehabilitation programmes as well. Some portion of land should be allotted to the farmers and they should also be given some money as compensation. However, otherwise it is alright, because it increases their income. I want to know as to how you will demonstrate your sympathy in this regard?

SHRI RAM NIWAS MIRDHA: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I have stated in my reply that