

(b) whether no counter provision was kept in the accounts deviating from accounting standards;

(c) whether in subsequent years NCCF had paid huge income tax without any actual income due to this misleading entry; if so, how much;

(d) whether these misleading accounts ultimately resulted in losses of crores of rupees to NCCF and were placed in the Board meeting at Patna on 19-3-1983 and even then the said officiating Controller of Accounts and Finance was promoted to the regular post of CAF; and

(e) the remedial measures taken and proposed to be taken ?

THE MINISTER OF STATE OF THE MINISTRY OF FOOD AND CIVIL SUPPLIES (SHRI SUKH RAM) : (a) NCCF have reported that the amount of Rs. 164.93 lakhs was accounted for in its Trading Account for the year 1981-82 after filing a recovery suit against the Insurance Company in the High Court of Delhi.

(b) As per the accounting procedure followed by the NCCF, no counter provision on account of such claims was required to be made. The Insurance Company is liable to pay the amount.

(c) No, Sir.

(d) The accounting entry was passed in accordance with the accounting policy of NCCF which did not suffer any loss thereby. The audited accounts of NCCF for the year 1981-82, were approved by the Board of Directors in its meeting held on 19-3-83.

(e) Does not arise in view of reply to (d) above.

1197. [Transferred to the 4th May, 1989].

Officers Involved in Irregularities In Distribution of Sugar by NCCF, Lucknow

1198. SHRI SHANKER SINH VAGHEIA : Will the Minister of FOOD AND CIVIL SUPPLIES be pleased to refer to replies given to Starred Question No. 249, Unstarred Question No. 736 and Unstarred Question 267 given in Rajya Sabha on 2nd December, 1988 and state:

(a) what is the outcome of the investigations by the Police at Delhi and Lucknow against the cases registered against NCCF employees involved into the bungling in the distribution and causing shortage in the stocks etc.; and

(b) what disciplinary/departmental action Government have taken against the concerned NCCF employees giving the names of the employees and the action taken against each one of them ?

THE MINISTER OF STATE OF THE MINISTRY OF FOOD AND CIVIL SUPPLIES (SHRI SUKH RAM) : (a) NCCF have reported that the UP Police has since completed investigation into the case of distribution of sugar at Lucknow and are to file a criminal case against one Field Officer who was incharge of Lucknow depot. The Delhi Police did not register any criminal case against the employees of NCCF involved in the distribution of sugar in Delhi on the grounds that since the loss had been recovered from the employees, no criminal action could be taken.

(b) NCCF have reported that the full amount of loss in the distribution of sugar by the Delhi branch had been recovered from the employees concerned, besides imposition of minor penalties on them. The names of the employees concerned and the action taken against them are at Annexure [See Appendix CL, Annexure No. 59].

In the case of distribution of sugar at Lucknow recoveries of the losses from one clerk are in progress. NCCF have also initiated action for imposition of minor penalties on him.

Extension of Retaining Wall in Vasant Vihar

1199. SHRI ANAND PRAKASH GAUTAM : Will the Minister of URBAN DEVELOPMENT be pleased to refer to the answer to Unstarred Question 1144 given in the Rajya Sabha on the 3rd March, 1989 and state :

(a) whether Government are aware that the ground level difference also exists between the retaining wall near Block No. 66 and the boundary wall towards East side and that the technical reasons/necessity call for extension of this retaining wall upto the boundary wall towards East side;

(b) whether it is a fact that the residents of Colony have been demanding extension thereof since long and the CPWD has been evading action in the matter on frivolous grounds:

(c) whether it is also a fact that the extension of the retaining wall will not violate any local bye-laws; and

(d) if so, what are the reasons for not extending the said retaining wall so far and what steps Government propose to take to expedite action in the matter ?

THE MINISTER OF URBAN DEVELOPMENT (SHRIMATI MOHSINA KIDWAI) : (a) to (c) There is some difference in the ground level between the retaining wall near block No. 66 and the road towards the east side. There is no boundary wall towards the east side but only an extension of another wall from the adjoining

359 RS—4

block. Whether construction of retaining wall is technically necessary depends not only on the difference in the ground level, but also on the distance between the two surfaces. The retaining wall is, therefore, not technically necessary as the distance between the quarters and the road is 27 meters. The request of the allottees has, therefore, not been acceded to, all though construction of such a retaining wall will not violate any local bye-laws.

(d) Does not arise in view of reply to parts (a), (b) and (c) above.

Intensive Agriculture District Programme and Areas

1200. SHRI ANAND PRAKASH GAUTAM : Will the Minister of AGRICULTURE be pleased to state :

(a) what are the details of the Intensive Agriculture District Programme and the Intensive Agricultural Areas; and

(b) what are Government's priorities in this regard ?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE AND COOPERATION IN THE MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE (SHRI SHYAM LAL YADAV) : (a) Intensive Agricultural District Programme (IADP) Popularly known as "Package Programme" was launched in seven selected districts in the country in 1960-61 as a pilot project and later extended to nine more districts. This programme embodied a multi disciplined concentrated and coordinated approach to agricultural development, involving the use of package of practices in the selected districts and full utilisation of irrigated potential.

This was followed by the Intensive Agricultural Areas Programme (IAAP) in 1964-65. This program-