

**COMMITTEE  
ON  
GOVERNMENT ASSURANCES  
(1987-88)**

**(EIGHTH LOK SABHA)**

**TENTH REPORT**

*Presented on.....* 23 MAR 1988



**LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT  
NEW DELHI**

*January 7, 1988/Pausa 17, 1909 (Saka)*

*Price : Rs. 1.00*

172.17

# LOK SABHA

## CORRIGENDA

TO

The Tenth Report of the Committee on  
Government Assurances (1987-88)

## EIGHTH LOK SABHA

---

Page No.

Correction

---

Contents	Line 5: <u>For</u> 'give in' read 'given in'
	Line 9: <u>For</u> 'Minuts' read 'Minutes'
Introduction	Line 14: <u>For</u> 'sitting' read 'sittings'
7	Line 8: <u>For</u> 'prorogative' read 'prerogative'
8	Line 2: <u>For</u> 'Second Sittings' read 'Second Sitting'
12	Line 33: <u>For</u> 'Low' read 'Law'

## CONTENTS

	PAGES
COMPOSITION OF THE COMMITTEE (1987-88) . . . . .	(ii)
INTRODUCTION . . . . .	(v)
REPORT . . . . .	i
Implementation of assurance given in reply to Unstarred Question No. 2430 on 4 December, 1985	
RECOMMENDATIONS	

## MINUTES

Minutes of the Second Sitting held on 19 June, 1986 . . . . .	8
Minutes of the Twelfth Sitting held on 28 January, 1987 . . . . .	11
Minutes of the Ninth Sitting held on 7 January, 1988 . . . . .	17

344  
207  
1987  
1988

**COMPOSITION OF THE COMMITTEE\* ON GOVERNMENT  
ASSURANCES  
(1987-88)**

**Prof. Narain Chand Parashar—*Chairman***

2. Shri L. Balaraman
3. Shri Sitaram J. Gavali
4. Shri Abdul Rashid Kabuli
5. Shri Bapulal Malviya
6. Shri Sanat Kumar Mandal
7. Shri Murlidhar Mane
8. Shri P. Namgyal.
9. Shri V. Krishna Rao
10. Shri Bholu Raut
11. Shri Prabhu Lal Rawat
12. Shrimati Shanti Devi
13. Shri Kamla Prasad Singh
14. Shrimati Usha Thakkar
15. Shri Mahabir Prasad Yadav

**SECRETARIAT**

Shri C. K. Jain—*Chief (Questions)*

Shri Raghbir Singh—*Senior Examiner of Questions*

---

\*The Committee was nominated by the Speaker w.e.f. June 12, 1987 vide para No. 1686 of Lok Sabha Bulletin Part—II dated 12 June, 1987.

## INTRODUCTION

I, the Chairman of the Committee on Government Assurances as authorised by the Committee, do present on their behalf this Report of the Committee on Government Assurances.

2. The Committee (1987-88) were constituted on 12 June, 1987.

3. At their sitting held on 28 January, 1987, the Committee (1986-87) took the evidence of the representatives of the Ministries of Home Affairs (Department of Official Language) and Law and Justice in connection with non-implementation of the assurance given on 4 December, 1985, during the Second Session of Eighth Lok Sabha in reply to Unstarred Question No. 2430 regarding Hindi version of the Constitution of India. At their sitting held on 7 January, 1988, the Committee considered and adopted the draft Report.

4. The Minutes of the aforesaid sitting form part of this Report.

5. The conclusions/observations of the Committee are contained in the succeeding chapter.

6. The Committee wish to express their thanks to the officials of the Ministries of Home Affairs (Department of Official Language) and Law and Justice who appeared before the Committee.

NEW DELHI;

7 January, 1988

17 Pausa, 1909 (Saka)

PROF. NARAIN CHAND PARASHAR,

Chairman,

Committee on Government Assurances.

## REPORT

On 4 December, 1985, the following Unstarred Question (No. 2430) given notice of by Shri Ramashray Prasad Singh, M.P. was addressed to the Minister of Home Affairs:—

- “(a) whether Government have approved a Hindi Text of Constitution of India;
- (b) if so, the details thereof; and
- (c) if not, the reasons therefor?”

2. The then Minister of Home Affairs (Shri S. B. Chavan) gave the following reply:—

“(a), (b) & (c): The modalities for preparing an authoritative text of the Constitution in Hindi are under active consideration of the Government.”

3. The above reply to the question was treated as an assurance by the Committee which was to be fulfilled within three months of the reply i.e. by 3 March, 1986.

4. On 7 March, 1986, the Ministry of Home Affairs approached the Committee on Government Assurances through the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs to drop the assurance on the grounds indicated below:—

“...It was not the intention of this Department that Information conveyed to the Honourable Member of Parliament may be treated as an assurance. The issue for providing Hindi text of the Constitution of India has been hanging for the last several years.

The background of this case is given below:—

In accordance with the resolution adopted by the Constituent Assembly on 17th September, 1949, the Hindi translation of the Constitution of India was published. A controversy had arisen some years back whether or not to treat Hindi translation as authoritative text of the Constitution. The Ministry of Law and Justice consulted renowned legal experts such as late Shri M. C. Setalvad.

Shri Niren De and Shri K. L. Misra in 1973. In spite of this, that translation in 1949 was prepared under the authority of the President of the Constituent Assembly and was signed by the President and members of the Constituent Assembly, the text of the advice of learned Counsels was that it was not possible to treat Hindi translation as the authoritative text. After the opinion of the learned counsels, it was considered necessary that a Bill may be got passed in Parliament which may authorise President to provide for the authorised translations of the Constitution in Hindi and other Indian languages specified in the Eighth Schedule of the Constitution. Accordingly a Bill entitled "The Constitution (Authorised Translations) Bill, 1978" was prepared and introduced on 7th August, 1978 in the Rajya Sabha, although the Rajya Sabha passed this Bill on 27th November, 1978, before it could be taken for consideration by the Lok Sabha, the Lok Sabha was dissolved in 1979 and the Bill lapsed.

When the matter for bringing a new Bill in Parliament for the above purpose was under consideration of the Department of Official Language, there was a demand in and outside Parliament to provide for authoritative text in Hindi of the Constitution instead of Hindi translation. In 1984 during the discussion on a question asked by an M.P. in Lok Sabha, the then Law and Justice Minister gave an assurance that the matter would be re-examined.

Accordingly, this matter was again referred to the Attorney General of India for his advice by the Ministry of Law and Justice. According to the advice tendered by the Attorney General of India, it would be necessary to have an authoritative text of the Constitution in Hindi, when a Parliamentary law in terms of article 348(1) of the Constitution for dispensing with the use of English language is enacted and brought into force. In his view, the Constitution can be amended for making a provision for an authorised text of the Constitution in Hindi. On the advice tendered by the Attorney General of India, a Bill has been prepared with the consultation of the Ministry of Law and Justice. Approval of the Cabinet has been sought in this matter.

The matter is under consideration of the Cabinet. If Cabinet approves this matter, it will take time in getting the Bill

passed by both the Houses of Parliament as language issue is a sensitive one. There is a possibility of arising controversy in and outside Parliament on this language issue. Considerable time will, therefore, be taken in disposal of this case. If Cabinet does not approve this matter, then it will not be possible to take further action in this matter. In the circumstances, it will be appropriate not to treat the answer of the question as an assurance."

5. The Committee considered the request of the Ministry of Home Affairs (Department of Official Language) for dropping the assurance at their sitting held on 19th June, 1986. The Committee noted that the matter of producing an authentic text of Hindi version of the Constitution had been pending for a long time. The Committee further noted that Government had at one stage taken a decisive step by introducing the Constitution (Authorised Translation) Bill, 1978 in the Parliament, which was even passed by the Rajya Sabha on 27 November, 1978, but could not be considered by Lok Sabha because of its dissolution and consequently the Bill lapsed. The Committee felt that it was high time to take a conclusive action in the matter. The Committee decided to hear the views of the representatives of Ministries of Home Affairs and Law at their sitting to be fixed for the purpose.

6. On 28 January, 1987, the representatives of the Ministry of Home Affairs (Department of Official Language) and the Ministry of Law and Justice appeared before the Committee for oral evidence.

7. The representative of the Ministry of Home Affairs while explaining the reasons for delay in implementation of the assurance stated that the Official Language Department and Law Department had sent the proposal to the Cabinet in October, 1985 and expected that the proposal would be approved by the Cabinet and thereafter a Bill would be introduced in Parliament. That was why the assurance was given in December, 1985 that the matter was under consideration of Government and an early action would be taken. But when the Cabinet considered this matter they felt that the matter being important, it should be entrusted to a Sub-Committee of the Cabinet. The Sub-Committee was to go through this matter in detail and then the matter was to be placed before the Cabinet again. The Cabinet Sub-Committee was of the opinion that it required amendment. They proposed an amendment and therefore it had to be again forwarded to Law Ministry. Law Department had returned it after making the amendment as per the decision of



Cabinet Sub-Committee. The Cabinet had then asked the Sub-Committee to reconsider the modified form or to reconsider it once again. Therefore, it was reviewed by Department of Official Language again and had again been submitted to Cabinet.

8. In the last meeting, the Ministry had been informed, that the Cabinet had considered the matter and it was informally understood that it had been cleared by the Cabinet. The minutes of the Cabinet meeting were yet to be received by the Ministry. However, if it had been cleared, the concerned Bill would be introduced in the next session of the Parliament. Since it was a legal matter and the action was being taken, the Department of Official Language requested for the dropping of the assurance.

9. The position was further supplemented by the representative of Ministry of Law (Legislative Department) as follows:—

“Sir, she has mentioned the factual position. We are awaiting the Minutes of the Cabinet meeting before we introduce the Bill. We have already given the draft of the Bill along with the note to the Cabinet. That would also be approved, we hope, without much changes. Then, we will introduce it in the next session.”

10. The Committee desired to know the reasons for which the Ministry sought for the dropping of the assurance. In reply, the representative of Ministry of Home Affairs explained that the matter had gone to Cabinet and the Ministry did not know how much time it would take and there was nothing for taking action on their side. Therefore, they had requested for the dropping of the assurance.

11. The Committee pointed out that so long the bill was not introduced in the Parliament, assurance could not be dropped. The witness stated that the Committee would be kept informed of the progress made in fulfilling the assurance and if necessary they would request for extension of time for fulfilling the assurance.

12. Regarding the contention of the Ministry that the reply given to the Unstarred Question was not meant by them to be an assurance and might not have been treated as such by the Committee, it was pointed out to the representative of the Ministry of Home Affairs that it was for the Committee to decide whether a reply was an assurance or not. The representative of the Ministry concurred with Committee's exposition.

13. When asked whether the Hindi text of the Constitution was ready, the representative of the Home Ministry stated that when the Constitution was drafted it was drafted both in English and Hindi. Both the versions were placed in the Constituent Assembly and signatures of the Members were appended on both the versions. But a technical flaw cropped up afterwards that when voting was done it was done para-wise on English version and not on Hindi text. Therefore, legal opinion was that only English version would be taken as authentic although both the versions had signatures. When this lacuna came to light, action to remove this anomaly was initiated. According to Constitution, Hindi is our Official language and therefore the authorised text also should be in Hindi. In view of this, it was considered as to how this lacuna could be removed. Consequently, luminaries in this field were consulted and only then this action was taken.

14. The Committee enquired whether the proposed Bill included the provision that the Hindi text which was signed by the Members would be recognised, the representative of the Ministry of Law and Justice (Legislative Department) stated as under:—

“Under the provisions of the Central Acts (Authorised Text) Act, the authorised texts in other languages the legislative part—are published. The regional versions of Central Acts get authorised by the President and we publish them as authorised texts in the State Languages. We have, in almost all the languages, published about 500 pages and in some other languages, we have published 1000 pages or so. This process is continuous and we are publishing the translation of Central Acts in all the States.”

15. The Committee pointed out that Hindi text and texts in other languages of Central Acts were not authorised and desired to know how the Hindi text of the Constitution would be recognised as authorised and whether those would be included in the bill. The representative of Ministry of Law replied as under:

“As I mentioned earlier, so far as the translation of Central Acts in other languages are concerned, we have a separate Act of Parliament under which we translate all other laws. In respect of the translation of the Constitution into other languages we have made no provision in this field. We are publishing only the Constitution in the various lan-

guages as regional language version of the Constitution. It is not an authenticated one in that way."

16. When asked whether Government proposed to give authentication to Hindi version and also to other languages versions, the representative of the Law Ministry replied as under:

"We will consider it. We will examine this matter, and try to answer. So far as Article 348 is concerned, we have already enacted an Act—the Official Language Act of 1963 as amended in 1967 and provided for any contingencies. Some other provisions are yet to be brought out i.e. language used in the Supreme Court and in other matters."

17. The Committee are happy to note that at length on 27 February, 1987, Government introduced in Lok Sabha 'The Constitution (Fifty Sixth Amendment) Bill, 1987', to empower the President of India to publish under his authority the translation of the Constitution in Hindi signed by the Members of the Constituent Assembly and also to publish the translation in Hindi with such modifications as made in English. The bill was passed by Lok Sabha on the 24th November, 1987, and by the Rajya Sabha on the 26th November, 1987, and assented to by the President on the 9th December, 1987. Now it is on the statute book as the Constitution (Fifty Eighth Amendment) Act, 1987 having been published in the Gazette of India on the 10th December, 1987.

18. The Committee are, however, constrained to observe that Government took unduly long time in implementing a decision taken as far back as on the 17th September, 1949 when Members of the Constituent Assembly signed the Hindi translation which indicated the real intention of the founding fathers of the Constitution to give due status to Hindi recognised as the Official Language for the Union. It is indeed regrettable that Government did not consider the matter urgent and important enough even in the Seventh Lok Sabha when they could reintroduce the Constitution (Authorized Translation) Bill, 1978 which was passed by the Rajya Sabha on the 27th November, 1978 but it could not be passed in the Sixth Lok Sabha because of its dissolution. Obviously, the Government felt the urgency and the importance of the matter and expedited their decision only when this Committee did not agree to their request for the dropping of the assurance and desired that the assurance must be implemented without further delay. The Committee do

hope and trust that Government would avoid such lax attitude in future in such matters of national importance.

19. Incidentally, the Committee also wish to express their unhappiness on the attempt of the Ministry of Home Affairs to sit in judgement on the decision of the Committee to treat the aforesaid reply of the Minister as an assurance. The Committee need hardly observe, as also done in a number of earlier cases, that it is exclusively prerogative of the Committee alone to decide whether or not a particular reply of the Minister should be considered as an assurance and once it has been treated as assurance, Government are obliged to implement it.

NEW DELHI;  
*January 7, 1938*  


---

*Pausa 17, 1909 (Saka)*

PROF. NARAIN CHAND PARASHAR,  
*Chairman,*  
*Committee on Government Assurances.*

## MINUTES

### Second Sitting

Minutes of the Committee on Government Assurances held on 19 June, 1986, in Committee Room No. 50 First Floor, Parliament House, New Delhi.

The Committee met on Thursday, 19 June, 1986, from 11.30 hours to 12.30 hours.

### PRESENT

Prof. Narain Chand Parashar—*Chairman*

### MEMBERS

2. Shri Virdhi Chander Jain
3. Shri Rahim Khan
4. Shri Purna Chandra Malik
5. Shri Channaiah Odeyar
6. Shri Keshorao Pardhi
7. Shri K. N. Pradhan
8. Dr. G. Vijaya Rama Rao
9. Shri Muhiram Saikia

### SECRETARIAT

1. Shri D. C. Pande—*Joint Secretary*
2. Shri C. K. Jain—*Chief Examiner of Questions*
3. Shri D. M. Chanan—*Senior Examiner of Questions*

2. The Committee took up for consideration Memoranda Nos. 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49 and 50.

\* \* \* \*

*Memorandum No. 43: Request for dropping of assurance given on 4 December, 1985, in reply to Unstarred Question No. 2430 regarding Hindi version of the Constitution of India.*

4. The Committee considered the following request of the Ministry of Home Affairs received through the Department of Parliamentary Affairs *vide* their U.O. Note No. F IV/HA (II) USQ, 2430-LS/85 dated 7 March, 1986, for dropping of the assurance on the following grounds:—

“It was not the intention of this Department that information conveyed to the Honourable Member of Parliament may be treated as an assurance. The issue for providing Hindi text of the Constitution of India has been hanging for the last several years.

The background of this case is given below:—

In accordance with the resolution adopted by the Constituent Assembly on 17th September, 1949, the Hindi translation of the Constitution of India was published. A controversy had arisen some years back whether or not to treat Hindi translation as authoritative text of the Constitution. The Ministry of Law and Justice consulted renowned legal experts such as Late Shri M. C. Setalvad, Shri Niren De and Shri K. L. Misra in 1973. In spite of this that translation in 1949 was prepared under the authority of the President of the Constituent Assembly and was signed by the President and members of the Constituent Assembly, the text of the advice of learned Counsels was that it was not possible to treat Hindi translation as the authoritative text. After the opinion of the learned counsels, it was considered necessary that a Bill may be got passed in Parliament which may authorise President to provide for the authorised translations of the Constitution in Hindi and other Indian languages specified in the Eighth Schedule of the Constitution. Accordingly a Bill entitled “The Constitution (Authorised Translations) Bill, 1978” was prepared and introduced on 7th August, 1978 in the Rajya Sabha, although the Rajya Sabha passed this Bill on 27th November, 1978, before it could be taken for consideration by the Lok Sabha, the Lok Sabha was dissolved in 1979 and the Bill lapsed.

When the matter for bringing a new Bill in Parliament for the above purpose was under consideration of the Department of Official Language, there was a demand in and outside Parliament to provide for authoritative text in Hindi of the Constitution instead of Hindi translation. In 1984 during the discussion on a question

asked by an M.P. in Lok Sabha, the then Law and Justice Minister gave an assurance that the matter would be re-examined.

Accordingly this matter was again referred to the Attorney General of India for his advice by the Ministry of Law and Justice. According to the advice tendered by the Attorney General of India, it would be necessary to have an authoritative text of the Constitution in Hindi, when a parliamentary law in terms of article 348(1) of the Constitution for dispensing with the use of English language is enacted and brought into force. In his view the Constitution can be amended for making a provision for an authorised text of the Constitution in Hindi. On the advice tendered by the Attorney General of India, a Bill has been prepared with the consultation of the Ministry of Law and Justice. Approval of the Cabinet has been sought in this matter.

The matter is under consideration of the Cabinet. If Cabinet approves this matter, it will take time in getting the Bill passed by both the houses of Parliament as language issue is a sensitive one. There is a possibility of arising controversy in and outside Parliament on this language issue. Considerable time will, therefore, be taken in disposal of this case. If Cabinet does not approve this matter, then it will not be possible to take further action in this matter. In the circumstances, it will be appropriate not to treat the answer of the question as an assurance."

4.1 The Committee noted that the matter of producing an authentic text of Hindi version of the Constitution had been pending for a long time. The Committee further noted that Government had at one stage taken a decisive step by introducing the Constitution (Authorised Translation) Bill, 1978 in the Parliament, which was even passed by the Rajya Sabha on 27 November, 1978, but could not be considered by Lok Sabha because of its dissolution and consequently the Bill lapsed. The Committee felt that it was high time to take a conclusive action in the matter. The Committee decided to hear the views of the representatives of Ministries of Home Affairs and Law at their sitting to be fixed for the purpose.

\* \* \* \*

The Committee then adjourned.

## MINUTES

### TWELFTH SITTING

*Minutes of the Committee on Government Assurances held on 28 January, 1987 in Room No. 53, Parliament House, New Delhi.*

The Committee met on Wednesday, 28 January, 1987 from 11.30 to 12-20 hours.

### PRESENT

Prof. Narain Chand Parashar—*Chairman*

### MEMBERS

2. Shri Tadur Bala Goud
3. Shri Virdhi Chander Jain
4. Shri Jitendra Prasada
5. Ch. Rahim Khan
6. Shri Purna Chandra Malik
7. Shri Channaiah Odeyar
8. Shri Keshorao Pardhi
9. Shri Ram Pujan Patel
10. Shri K. N. Pradhan
11. Shri Jagannath Prasad
12. Dr. G. Vijaya Rama Rao

### SECRETARIAT

1. Shri D. C. Pande—*Joint Secretary*
2. Shri C. K. Jain—*Chief Examiner of Questions*
3. Shri D. M. Chanan—*Senior Examiner of Questions.*

### WITNESSES EXAMINED

*Ministry of Home Affairs (Deptt. of Official Language)*

Km. Kusum Lata Mittal—*Secretary*

Shri Shambhu Dayal—*Joint Secretary.*



*Ministry of Law and Justice*

Shri P. K. Kartha—*Law Secretary*

Shri S. Ramiah—*Secretary, Legislative Department.*

2. The Committee took the evidence of the representatives of the Ministries of Home Affairs (Deptt. of Official Language) and Law and Justice regarding non-implementation of the assurance given in Lok Sabha on 4 December, 1985 in reply to Unstarred Question No. 2430 relating to Hindi version of the Constitution of India.

3. At the outset, the Chairman drew the attention of the witness to Direction 58 of the Directions by the Speaker and explained that their evidence was to be treated as public and was liable to be published unless the witnesses specifically desired that all or any part of the evidence given by them was to be treated as confidential. It was further explained to the witnesses that even though the evidence was desired to be treated as confidential, such evidence was liable to be made available to Members of Parliament.

4. The Secretary, Ministry of Home Affairs (Department of Official Language) was thereafter asked to explain the reasons why the implementation of the assurance was delayed so long. In reply, the witness submitted that the Official Language Department and Law Department had sent the proposal to the Cabinet in October, 1985 and expected that the proposal would be approved by the Cabinet and thereafter a bill would be introduced in Parliament. That was why the assurance was given in December, 1985 that the matter was under consideration of Government and an early action would be taken. But when the Cabinet considered this matter they felt that the matter being important, it should be entrusted to a Sub-Committee of the Cabinet. The Sub-Committee was to go through this matter in detail and then the matter was to be placed before the Cabinet again.

The Cabinet Sub-Committee was of the opinion that it required amendment. They proposed an amendment and therefore it had to be again forwarded to Law Ministry. Law Department had returned it after making the amendment as per the decision of Cabinet Sub-Committee. The Cabinet had then asked the Sub-Committee to reconsider the modified form or to reconsider it once again. Therefore, it was received by Department of Official Language again and had again been submitted to Cabinet.

In the last meeting the Ministry had been informed that the Cabinet had considered the matter and it was informally understood

that it had been cleared by the Cabinet. The minutes of the Cabinet meeting were yet to be received by the Ministry. However, if it had been cleared, the concerned Bill would be introduced in the next session of the Parliament. Since it was a legal matter and the action was being taken, the Department of Official Language requested for the dropping of the assurance.

5. The position was further supplemented by the representative of Ministry of Law (Legislative Department) as follows:—

“Sir, she has mentioned the factual position. We are awaiting the Minutes of the Cabinet meeting before we introduce the Bill. We have already given the draft of the Bill along with the note to the Cabinet. That would also be approved, we hope, without much changes. Then, we will introduce it in the next session.”

6. Explaining the reasons why the Ministry sought for the dropping of the assurance, the representative of Ministry of Home Affairs stated that the matter had gone to Cabinet and the Ministry did not know how much time it would take and there was nothing for taking action on their side. Therefore, they had requested for the dropping of the assurance. The witness added, Assurances will be fulfilled by the Parliament. We will hardly be in a position to fulfil the assurance because once the matter is placed before the Parliament in the form of the Bill, then it will be for the Parliament to consider and clear the Bill. As soon as they pass the Bill, it will be enacted.

7. The Committee pointed out that so long the bill was not introduced in the Parliament, assurance could not be dropped. The witness stated that the Committee would be kept informed of the progress made in fulfilling the assurance and if necessary they would request for extension of time for fulfilling the assurance.

8. Regarding the contention of the Ministry that the reply given to the Unstarred Question was not meant by them to be an assurance and might not have been treated as such by the Committee, it was pointed out to the representative of the Ministry of Home Affairs that it was for the Committee to decide whether a reply was an assurance or not. In reply, the representative of the Ministry concurred with Committee's exposition.

9. When asked whether the Hindi text of the Constitution was ready, the representative of the Home Ministry stated that when

the Constitution was drafted it was drafted both in English and Hindi. Both the versions were placed in the Assembly and signatures of the Members were appended on both the versions. But a technical flaw cropped up afterwards that when voting was done it was done para-wise on English version and not on Hindi text. Therefore, legal opinion was that only English version would be taken as authentic although both the versions had the signatures. When this lacuna came to light, action to remove this anomaly was initiated. According to Constitution, Hindi is our Official language and therefore the authorised text also should be in Hindi. In view of this, it was considered as to how this lacuna could be removed. Consequently, luminaries in this field were consulted and only when this action was taken.

10. The Committee enquired whether the proposed Bill included the provision that the Hindi text which was signed by the Members would be recognised, the representative of the Ministry of Law and Justice (Legislative Department) stated as under:

“Under the provisions of the Central Acts (Authorised Text) Act, the authorised texts in other languages—the legislative part—are published. The regional versions of Central Acts get authorised by the President and we publish them as authorised texts in the State languages. We have, in almost all the languages, published about 500 pages and in some other languages, we have published 1000 pages or so. This process is continuous and we are publishing the translation of Central Acts in all the States.”

11. The Committee pointed out that Hindi text and texts in other languages of Central Acts were not authorised and desired to know how the Hindi text of the Constitution would be recognised as authorised and whether those would be included in the bill. The representative of Ministry of Law replied as under:

“As I mentioned earlier, so far as the translation of Central Acts in other languages are concerned, we have a separate Act of Parliament under which we translate all other laws. In respect of the translation of the Constitution into other languages we have made no provision in this field. We are publishing only the Constitution in the various languages as regional language version of the Constitution. It is not an authenticated one in that way.”

12. When asked whether Government proposed to give authentication to Hindi version and also to other languages versions, the representative of the Law Ministry replied as under:

“We will consider it. We will examine this matter, and try to answer. So far as Article 348 is concerned, we have already enacted an Act—the Official Language Act of 1963 as amended in 1967 and provided for any contingencies. Some other provisions are yet to be brought out i.e. language used in the Supreme Court and in other matters.”

13. The witness further added that the Constitution of India had been translated in all the languages except Sindhi, Tamil and Kashmiri. Tamil Constitution was also ready. Same was the case of Sindhi Constitution. They were doing the translation of the Constitution in Kashmiri. As soon as it was completed, they would publish that also. Government had brought out three or four editions in some of the languages. In Malayalam and in Marathi, they had brought out three editions. In some of the languages, they had brought out two editions. They were going to bring out the second edition of Bengali translation very soon. It was being sold in the country in large numbers. There was a great demand for these editions.

14. When asked what they did with the amendments to various Acts, the representative of the Ministry of Law replied as under:—

“We have to bring out the amended version also. Each individual amended act is also being published under the authority.”

15. The Committee desired to know the reasons for the delay in issuing the translated version of the Constitution in Tamil language, the representative of Ministry of Law replied as under:

“As far as this question is concerned, I will have to give a brief history of the scheme of publication of Central Acts or the Constitution in the regional languages. We have a system by which the Central Government translates all the Central Acts and the Constitution and give them to the State Governments. Take the case of Tamil translation. The State Government has to go through the Tamil version. They also get them printed in their own press. We are also giving them grants to do this work. In respect of Tamil Constitution, we had completed the pre-

paration of Tamil Version of the Constitution and given it to the State Government as early as 1978, if I am correct. It was also approved by the State Government. The State Cabinet had also approved it. We had set a date for releasing this publication. Somehow, in the year 1981 at the last minute, the State Government had said that the Tamil version is not correctly reproduced. It did not take into account the recent developments and changes in the Tamil language after 1980. So, they wanted to have a second look at the translation. They had also appointed a Committee to go into it. The earlier Official Language Commission presided over by Justice Maharajan had approved it. Then the State Government—may be due to some political reasons—referred it to the Committee. The Committee took a very long time. They are going through each and every article. We have even sent reminders at the Ministerial level to the State Government. Last time also, I sent a letter to the Chief Secretary to the Government of Tamil Nadu. I have also asked for a discussion with him. I hope by the middle of this year we should be able to bring out this Tamil version. So far as the Sindhi edition is concerned, the work is going on. We are able to get a District Judge from Gujarat who was also a former Law Secretary. The translation is, more or less, complete now. As soon as it is ready we will also fix an occasion for releasing it. Translation in Kashmiri language is still going on. We found a little difficulty in locating the person. So, from these I could say that the Sindhi version is complete; Tamil version is complete.”

16. The Committee wanted to know the script used for translation in Sindhi version. In reply, the representative of Ministry of Law stated that they were using the Urdu script.

17. The Committee then adjourned.

## MINUTES

### Ninth Sitting

*Minutes of the Committee on Government Assurances held on 7 January, 1988 in Committee Room No. 50 Parliament House, New Delhi.*

The Committee met on Thursday, 7 January, 1988 from 11.00 hrs. to 12.10 hours.

### PRESENT

Prof. Narain Chand Parashar—*Chairman*

### MEMBERS

2. Shri L. Balaraman
3. Shri Abdul Rashid Kabuli
4. Shri Bapulal Malviya
5. Shri Sanat Kumar Mandal
6. Shri P. Namgyal
7. Shri Bhola Raut
8. Shri Kamla Prasad Singh
9. Shrimati Usha Thakkar

### SECRETARIAT

Shri Raghbir Singh—*Senior Examiner of Questions.*

2. The Committee took up for consideration the draft Tenth Report and adopted the same. The Committee authorised the Chairman to present the report in the Budget Session.

\* \* \* \* \*

The Committee then adjourned.

---

© 1988 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,  
MINTO ROAD, NEW DELHI.

an exercise is of a continuing nature and no commitment about the time-frame should be read into this as it would lead to a situation implying that Government do not propose to reduce the costs below a specified level."

8.1 The Committee did not find the reasons adduced by the Ministry as cogent and convincing for dropping the assurance and hence did not agree to the plea of the Ministry. They urged the Ministry to seek extension of time considered minimum to implement the assurance.

The Committee then adjourned.



**MINUTES**  
**Eighth Sitting**

Minutes of the Committee on Government Assurances held on 8  
December, 1987 in Committee Room No. 53, Parliament  
House, New Delhi

---

The Committee met on Tuesday, 8 December, 1987, from 15.30  
hours to 16.20 hours.

**PRESENT**

Prof. Narain Chand Parashar—*Chairman*

**MEMBERS**

2. Shri L. Balaraman
3. Shri Bapulal Malviya
4. Shri Sanat Kumar Mandal
5. Shri P. Namgyal
6. Shri V. Krishna Rao
7. Shri Bhola Raut
8. Shri Kamla Prasad Singh
9. Shrimati Usha Thakkar

**SECRETARIAT**

1. Shri C. K. Jain—*Chief (Questions)*
2. Shri Raghbir Singh—*Senior Examiner of Questions.*

\* \* \* \*

The Committee took up for consideration their draft Ninth Report and adopted the same. The Committee authorised the Chairman to present the Report before the end of the current Session.

The Committee then adjourned.

## APPENDIX-I

(Vide Para No. 43 of the Report)

*Statement showing the position of the assurances of Seventh Lok Sabha pending implementation as on 12 November, 1987*

Session	No. of assurances culled out	No. of assurances implemented/dropped	No. of assurances outstanding
First Session, 1980	26	26	..
Second Session, 1980	196	196	
Third Session, 1980	548	548	
Fourth Session, 1980	333	333	
Fifth Session, 1981	793	793	..
Sixth Session, 1981	373	372	1
Seventh Session, 1981	418	418	
Eighth Session, 1982	798	798	..
Ninth Session, 1982	429	429	..
Tenth Session, 1982	315	315	..
Eleventh Session, 1983	861	860	1
Twelfth Session, 1983	433	433	
Thirteenth Session, 1983	424	424	..
Fourteenth Session, 1984	956	949	7
Fifteenth Session, 1984	328	326	2
Total assurances outstanding	7231	7220	11

## APPENDIX-II

(*Para No. 43 of the Report*)

*Statement showing the position of assurances of Eighth Lok Sabha pending implementation as on 12 November, 1987.*

Session	No. of assurances culled out	No. of assurances implemented/dropped	No. of assurances outstanding
First Session, 1985 . . . . .	19	19	..
Second Session, 1985 . . . . .	426	418	8
Third Session, 1985 . . . . .	323	318	5
Fourth Session, 1985 . . . . .	355	334	21
Fifth Session, 1986 . . . . .	777	693	84
Sixth Session, 1986 . . . . .	475	406	69
Seventh Session, 1986 . . . . .	428	348	80
Eighth Session, 1987 . . . . .	777	487	290
Eighth Session (Second Part), 1987 . . . . .	578	64	514
<b>Total assurances outstanding . . . . .</b>			<b>1071</b>

© 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,  
MINTO ROAD, NEW DELHI-110002.