

**COMMITTEE ON  
GOVERNMENT ASSURANCES  
(1985-86)**

**(EIGHTH LOK SABHA)**

**FIFTH REPORT**

*Presented on 7 May, 1986*



**LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT  
NEW DELHI**

*May 6, 1986/Valsakha 16, 1908 (Saka)*

*Price : Rs. 2.35*

32P.372 R  
MS; 3

LOK SABHA

C O R R I G E N D A

Fifth Report of the Committee on  
Government Assurances (Eighth Lok Sabha)

Page No.	Corrections
3.	Line 11 : <u>for</u> 'works' <u>read</u> 'Works'
	Line 12 : <u>for</u> 'housebuilding' <u>read</u> 'housebuilding'
4.	Line 4 : <u>for</u> 'request' <u>read</u> 'requests'
4.	Line 12 : <u>for</u> 'considered' <u>read</u> 'was considered'
9.	Line 3 : <u>for</u> 'buantum' <u>read</u> 'quantum'
13.	Lines 12 to 14: : <u>for</u> 'through the vide their U.O. Note No. F.XIV/I & D (34)/SQ-548-LS/84 date 4 July, 1985 Department of Parliamentary Affairs/to drop'  <u>read</u> 'through the Department of Parliamentary Affairs vide their U.O. Note No. F.XIV/I&B (34)/SQ-548-LS/84 dated 4 July, 1985 to drop'
14.	Last line : <u>for</u> 'Department, of' <u>read</u> 'Department of'
15.	Line 32 : <u>for</u> 'taht' <u>read</u> 'that'
22.	Line 19 : <u>for</u> 'Committee' <u>read</u> 'Committees'
23.	Line 23 & 24 : <u>for</u> (Janardhan Poojari) <u>read</u> '(Janardhan Poojary)'
23.	Col.No.3 of Statement : i) <u>for</u> 'amunto', <u>read</u> 'amount of' ii) <u>for</u> 'amunto, T.D.S.Rs.' <u>read</u> 'amount of T.D.S. Rs.'
24.	Line 11. : <u>for</u> 'authorities,' <u>read</u> 'authorities'.
30.	Line 32 : <u>for</u> 'amcnment' <u>read</u> 'amendment'
32.	Line 22 : <u>for</u> 'droppin' <u>read</u> 'dropping'
47.	Line 10 : <u>for</u> 'siliar' <u>read</u> 'similar'

## CONTENTS

	PAGE
COMPOSITION OF THE COMMITTEE . . . . .	(iii)
INTRODUCTION . . . . .	(v)
<b>CHAPTER I</b>	
Review of pending assurances of Seventh and Eighth Lok Sabha . . . . .	1
<b>CHAPTER II</b>	
Requests from Government for extension of time for implementation of Assurances . . . . .	2
<b>CHAPTER III</b>	
Requests from Government for dropping of assurances . . . . .	12
<b>CHAPTER IV</b>	
Position of pending assurances pertaining to Seventh and Eighth Lok Sabha . . . . .	27
<b>MINUTES</b>	
Minutes of Sixth and Seventh Sittings held on 30 October and 31 October, 1985 . . . . .	28—43
Minutes of Twelfth Sitting held on 6 May, 1986 . . . . .	48
<b>APPENDICES</b>	
Statement showing the position of assurances pertaining to Seventh and Eighth Lok Sabha pending implementation by the Government as on 3 April, 1986 . . . . .	49

COMPOSITION OF THE COMMITTEE\* ON GOVERNMENT  
ASSURANCES  
(1985-86)

CHAIRMAN

Shri B.K. Gadhvi

MEMBERS

2. Shri T. Bala Goud
3. Shri V. Kishore Chandra S. Deo
4. Shri Jagannath Prasad
5. Shri Virdhi Chander Jain
6. Shri Rahim Khan
7. Shri Channaiah Odeyar
8. Shri S.S. Ramasamy Padayachi
9. Shri Keshorao Pardhi
10. Shri Ram Pujan Patel
11. Shri K. Pradhani
12. Shri Ram Bahadur Singh
13. Shri Sode Ramaiah
- \*\*14. Shri Jitendra Prasada
- \*\*15. Shri K.N. Pradhan

SECRETARIAT

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

---

\*The Committee was nominated by the Speaker w.e.f. 20 May, 1985 vide para 420 of Lok Sabha Bulletin Part-II dated 21.5.1985.

\*\*Nominated by the Speaker w.e.f. 23 September, 1985 vide Sarvashri Martand Singh and Bhagwat Jha Azad resigned vide para 632 of Lok Sabha Bulletin Part-II dated 23.9.85

## INTRODUCTION

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

2. The Committee (1985-86) was constituted on 20 May, 1985.

3. The Committee at their sittings held on 30 and 31 October, 1985 reviewed pending assurances pertaining to various sessions of the Seventh Lok Sabha and considered the requests from Government for dropping of eight pending assurances.

4. At their sitting held on 6 May, 1986 the Committee considered and adopted this Fifth Report.

5. The Minutes of the aforesaid sittings of the Committee are also included in this Report.

6. Conclusions/observations of the Committee are contained in succeeding chapters of this Report.

NEW DELHI  
May 6, 1986  
Vaisakha 16, 1988 (Saka)

B. K. Gadhvi,  
Chairman,  
Committee on Government Assurances.

## **CHAPTER I**

### **REVIEW OF PENDING ASSURANCES OF SEVENTH AND EIGHTH LOK SABHA**

During the Seventh Lok Sabha, 7,231 assurances were culled out from Lok Sabha Debates (Part I and II) to be implemented by the Government. Out of these, 7,192 assurances have since been implemented, leaving a balance of 39 assurances to be implemented.

2. During the First, Second, Third and Fourth Sessions of Eighth Lok Sabha in all 19, 426, 331 and 355 assurances respectively were culled out. Out of these 17, 381, 265 and 177 assurances have since been implemented, thus leaving a balance of 2, 45, 66 and 178 assurances respectively to be implemented.

3. The above figures take into account the latest statements of implemented assurances laid on the Table of Lok Sabha by the Minister of Parliamentary Affairs and Tourism (Department of Parliamentary Affairs), on 3 April, 1986.

## CHAPTER II

### REQUESTS FROM GOVERNMENT FOR EXTENSION OF TIME FOR IMPLEMENTATION OF ASSURANCES

(i)

On 27 July, 1984, Shri B.D. Singh, M.P. asked the following Starred Question (No. 954) regarding shortfall in utilization of funds for specific projects :

- “(a) whether it is a fact that there has been huge short fall in the utilisation of funds for specific projects during the last several years; and
- (b) the comparative shortfall in the utilisation of funds for specific projects during the last five years stating the reasons therefor ?”

5. The Minister of Tourism and Civil Aviation (Shri Khurshed Alam Khan) gave the following reply to the above question :

- (a) and (b) “The information is being collected and will be placed on the Table of Lok Sabha in due course.”

6. The above reply of the Minister was treated as an assurance and was required to be fulfilled by 26 October, 1984. As the Ministry was not in a position to fulfil the assurance within the stipulated time, the Ministry submitted a request for extension of time on 27 October, 1984 to the Committee through the Department of Parliamentary Affairs. Subsequent requests from the Ministry for further extension of time were received on 31 January, 22 April, 17 July and 10 September, 1985. The last request of the Ministry for extension of time was upto 15 November, 1985. The reason advanced by the Ministry was that the required information being voluminous might take some more time for its compilation. Accepting the plea of the Ministry, the Committee agreed to grant extension of time upto the period indicated by the Ministry.

7. After the said five extensions had been granted, the Ministry again approached the Committee to allow three more extensions first upto 15 February, 1986, then upto 15 April, 1986 and the latest in the series upto 15 June, 1986.

8. The Committee regret that even after lapse of more than one and a half year period, the assurance has not been implemented. The fact that as many as eight extensions of time were sought to implement the assurance amply reflects on the working of the Ministry. There is little evidence to show either adequate concern for the speed with which the assurance to the House is required to be implemented or any planned approach on the part of the Ministry in collecting the required information. The Committee hope that the Ministry will make a serious endeavour to collect the required information and implement the assurance at the earliest.

(ii)

On 24 August, 1981, Shri S.M. Krishna, M.P. addressed to the Minister of works and Housing the following Unstarred Question (No. 1105) regarding Conversion of leasehold land in the Capital for housebuilding purposes to freehold :

- “(a) whether any decision has since been taken to convert the leasehold land allotted by the DDA in the capital for house-building through the various co-operative house building societies to freehold ;
- (b) if so, when ; and
- (c) if not, the stage at which the matter stands at present?”

10. The Minister of Works and Housing (Shri Bhisma Narain Singh) replied to the above question as follows :

- (a) “No such proposal specifically in respect of land allotted by the DDA to the co-operative house building societies is under consideration. However, the general question whether the leasehold system in Delhi should continue or it can be converted into freehold in respect of residential plots generally has been under the consideration of the Government.
- (b) The proposal referred to above is still under the consideration of the Government.
- (d) The views of certain State Governments/Union Territories, which have experience in the administration of leasehold as well as freehold systems of land tenure are being collected. Thereafter, all aspects of the matter will be carefully examined before a final decision is taken.”



11. The above reply in part (c) was treated as an assurance and was required to be implemented by 23 November, 1981. As the desired information could not be collected within the stipulated period, the Ministry requested the Committee to allow extensions of time. These request were received through the Department of Parliamentary Affairs on 9 December, 1981; 2 February, 17 May, 13 July and 7 October, 1982; 16 March, 10 June 16 September and 2 December, 1983; 7 April, 19 July and 15 October, 1984; 17 January, 4 April and 9 October, 1985. Pleading for extension of time, the Ministry stated that the matter was still under consideration and decision in the matter was likely to take some more time. The request received on 9 October, 1985, for extension of time upto 31 December, 1985, considered by the Committee at their sitting held on 30 October, 1985. The Committee did not feel convinced with the Ministry's repeated plea that the matter was under consideration or active consideration and asked the Ministry to expedite the implementation of the assurance and if any further extension of time was required Cogent and convincing reasons be given therefor. After this direction of the Committee, the Ministry made two more requests for extension of time, first upto 31 March, and then upto 30 June, 1986. In their last request for extension of time, the Ministry stated :

“The proposal regarding conversion of residential leasehold system in Delhi into freehold is in the final stage of examination and a decision is likely to be taken very shortly”.

12. This assurance was given as back as 24 August, 1981. The Committee are extremely unhappy to note that Government should have delayed their decision so long on an important issue like this and kept a large number of affected people in a state of continued suspense. It is indeed regrettable to note that although the Committee were approached seventeen times for extensions of time, yet at no stage the actual difficulties causing delay were explained and so many repeated requests for extension of time in bits lead to irresistible conclusion that the system and the methods pursued in regard to decision making have been faulty and requires close scrutiny and suitable reforms so as to make them speedy and result-oriented. The Committee would like to be apprised of the steps taken on their observations.

(iii)

On 16 April, 1984, Shri Bheekhabhai. M.P. asked the following Unstarred Question (No. 7688) regarding SC/ST Employees in the Ministry of Works and Housing :

“(a) the total number of Government servants (excluding SC/ST) and belonging to SC/ST in Grade ‘A’ to ‘C’ category-wise) as on

1 January, 1982 in each department (Ministerial and non-Ministerial staff) separately ; and

- (b) the total number of Government servants (excluding SC/ST) and belonging to SC/ST recruited and promoted (category-wise) as in (a) above from 1 January, 1982 to 31 December, 1982 and January, 1983 to 31 December, 1983 ?”

14. The Deputy Minister in the Ministry of Works & Housing (Shri Mohammad Usman Arif) gave the following reply to the aforesaid question :—

- (a) and (b). “The information is being collected and will be laid on the Table of the House.”

15. The above reply was treated as an assurance and it was required to be implemented by 15 July, 1984.

As the Ministry was not in a position to fulfil the assurance within the stipulated time, the Committee were requested five times to allow extension of time. These requests were received through the Department of Parliamentary Affairs on 18 August and 23 October 1984, 23 January, 22 April and 29 July, 1985. The last request was for extension of time upto 16 October, 1985. The reason advanced by the Ministry was that the requisite information was still awaited from Directorate of Printing and attached offices of the Ministry which in turn had to collect the information from the subordinated units situated all over the country. The requests for extension of time were accordingly granted.

16. On 22 November, 1985, a statement containing the required information was laid on the Table of Lok Sabha and thus the assurance was implemented.

17. The Committee note that the assurance under reference has since been implemented. However, they would like the Ministry to consider to introduce a regular system to maintain centrally the basic statistics about the Government servants particularly of the kind desired in the aforesaid question so as to obviate the need of giving an assurance and then collecting the data on *ad hoc* basis.

18. Incidentally, the Committee would like to point out that when the Ministry was aware that the statement implementing the aforesaid assurance could be laid on the Table of the House only during the winter session, the

last request for extension of time should have been for the period upto 22 November, 1985 and not 16 October, 1985. This sort of lapse should not repeat and due care taken before hand.

(iv)

On 7 May, 1984, Shri Satyasadhan Chakraborty, M.P. asked the following Unstarred Question (No. 10169) regarding transfer of properties :

- “(a) whether it is a fact that the scheme of allowing transfer of houses built on plots allotted by DDA and built up flats allotted by DDA introduced in 1979/1980 has evoked no response still large scale transfers of such properties are taking place in Delhi on the basis of registration of agreements to sell, irrevocable power of attorneys, irrevocable wills and collusive decrees; and
- (b) whether Government have studied the schemes of Haryana Urban Development Authority and the Ghaziabad Development Authority in relation to such transfers and have plan to further liberalise the DDA scheme with a view to encourage the people not to resort to under-hand methods of transfers ?

20. The Deputy Minister of Works and Housing (Shri Mallikarjun) replied to the above question as follows :

- “(a) DDA have reported that so far as the flats are concerned only 25 requests for sale permission have been received for MIG and LIG flats. As regards plots no such scheme was introduced in the year 1979-1980. The transfer of built up plots was being allowed in accordance with the scheme of Large Scale Acquisition, Development and Disposal of land in Delhi 1961 with the approval of Lessor. Government has no precise knowledge of the scale of transfer of properties in Delhi on the basis of the registration agreements/power of attorney etc.
- (b) The question of abolition of the leasehold system of land tenure in Delhi is under consideration of the Government.”

21. The above reply of the Deputy Minister to part (b) of the question was treated as an assurance and was required to be implemented by 6 August, 1984. As the assurance could not be implemented within the stipulated period, the Ministry requested the Committee to allow extension of time.

These requests were received through the Department of Parliamentary Affairs on 19 July, 12 October, 1984; and 17 January, 4 April and 9 October, 1985. Pleading for extension, the Ministry stated that the matter was still under active consideration and decision in the matter was likely to take some more time.

22. Later the Ministry requested the Committee for two more extensions, first upto 31 March and then upto 30 June, 1986. Explaining the request for extension the Ministry had stated that, "the proposal regarding conversion of residential lease-hold system in Delhi into freehold is in the final stage of examination and a decision is likely to be taken very shortly."

23. The Committee are constrained to observe that the assurance given by the Minister has been kept pending implementation for too long although there appears to be no justifiable reason for holding it up. The Committee urge upon the Government to expedite their decision in the matter so that the assurance given in aforesaid reply of the Minister is fulfilled without further delay. The Committee also wish to stress on the need of realisation on the part of all concerned in the Ministry that giving an assurance does not mean unnecessarily delaying the finalisation of a matter. As a matter of fact, a Minister is to give an assurance only when it is not possible to furnish the information immediately because of time and other constraints in its collection and hence the assurance, if and when given, is required to be fulfilled at the earliest possible time. This should be noted for future guidance.

(v)

On 23 July, 1984, Shri Mohd. Asrar Ahmed, M.P. asked the following Unstarred Question (No. 64) regarding ownership rights to allottees of DDA flats :

- “(a) whether DDA (Delhi Development Authority) flat allottees do not possess ownership rights over their flats even after they have paid the full cost of the flats;
- (b) whether the allottees have to pay ground rent to DDA in perpetuity;
- (c) whether the allottees of flats and Residents Welfare Associations have made several representations to confer full ownership rights to the allottees and do away with the ground rent system; and
- (d) if so, the reaction of Government in this regard ?”

25. The Deputy Minister of Works & Housing (Shri Mallikarjun) replied to the above question as follows :

- “(a) In accordance with the present policy of the Government, flats are allotted by DDA on lease-hold basis.
- (b) yes.
- (c) DDA has reported that some representations from the Resident Welfare Associations have been received for the full ownership rights to allottees.
- (d) The matter is under consideration of the Government.”

26. The above reply of the Minister to part (d) of the question was treated as an assurance and was required to be implemented by 22 October, 1984. As the assurance could not be implemented within the stipulated period, the Ministry requested the Committee to allow extensions of time. These requests were received through the Department of Parliamentary Affairs on 29 October, 1984, 7 January, 1 April, 10 July and 10 October, 1985. Pleading for extension, the Ministry stated that the question of ownership rights to allottees was still under consideration of this Ministry. The Committee agreed to grant extension of time upto the period requested by the Ministry.

27. After the said five extensions granted, the Ministry again approached the Committee to allow two more extensions, first upto 23 March, 1986 and then upto 23 June, 1986.

28. The Committee note that a Bill\* in this regard has recently been passed by Lok Sabha and is likely to be enacted shortly after its passing by the Rajya Sabha. A formal statement replying to the House the implementation of the assurance may be laid on the Table of the House at the earliest possible opportunity.

(vi)

On 19 March, 1984, Shri Satyanarayan Jatiya, M.P. asked the following Unstarred Question (No. 3582) regarding construction of flats State-wise :

“The position State-wise regarding number of houses/flats constructed by various Government Corporation or Corporations

---

\*The Delhi Apartment Ownership Bill, 1986, was passed by Lok Sabha on 30 April, 1986.

and institutions constituted by Government for different income groups the reservation therein for Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes, the quantum of grants given for the purpose and the houses/flats actually allotted."

30. The Deputy Minister of Works & Housing (Shri Mallikarjun) replied to the above question as follows :

"Information is being collected and will be laid on the Table of the House."

31. The above reply of the Deputy Minister was treated as an assurance and was required to be implemented by 18 June, 1984. As the assurance could not be implemented within the stipulated time, the Ministry requested the Committee to allow extensions of time. These requests were received through the Department of Parliamentary Affairs on 28 June, 25 September and 27 December 1984 and 26 March, 9 July and 10 October, 1985. The Ministry had stated that it was not possible to fulfill the assurance completely for want of complete information from all the State Governments/Union Territories as also some of the Ministries/Departments. Accepting the plea of the Ministry, the Committee agreed to grant extensions of time upto the period indicated by the Ministry.

32. After the said six extensions had been granted, the Ministry again approached the Committee to allow further extension upto 18 March, 1986.

33. The Committee note that the Ministry have fulfilled the assurance partly by laying statements on the Table of the House on 19 April, 24 July and 22 November, 1985 and a final statement has been laid on 3 April, 1986. Since the extension of time was sought and granted only upto 18 December, 1985, the Ministry ought to have made a request to the Committee for further extension of time upto the date when the assurance was desired to be implemented finally. This lapse should not recur.

(vii)

On 13 August, 1984, Shri Suraj Bhan, M.P. asked the following Unstarred Question (No. 3200) regarding construction of flats :

- (a) "the State-wise number of houses/flats/tenements for different income groups constructed by various Government Corporations and Government organised/ aided agencies ;
- (b) the number actually allotted ;

- (c) the number out of them reserved for Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes and also for the disabled ; and
- (d) the amount of aid given for this purpose ?”

35. The Deputy Minister for Works and Housing (Shri Mallikarjun) replied to the above question as follows :

- (a) to (d). “The information is being collected and will be laid on the Table of the Sabha.”

36. The above reply of the Deputy Minister was treated as an assurance and was required to be implemented by 12 November, 1984. As the assurance could not be implemented within the stipulated period, the Ministry requested the Committee to allow extensions of time. These requests were received through the Department of Parliamentary Affairs on 16 November, 1984; 18 February, 17 May and 19 August, 1985. Pleading for extensions of time, the Ministry stated that information in respect of Government of Maharashtra and some more institutions/corporation under the administrative control of the Central Government had since been received and the Assurance was proposed to be fulfilled partially again. However, complete information was still awaited from a number of State Governments and Union Government Ministries/Departments. Accepting the plea of the Ministry, the Committee agreed to grant extensions of time upto the period desired by the Ministry.

37. On 24 July, 22 November and 19 December, 1985, the Ministry laid three statements on the Table of the House giving required information in parts towards the fulfilment of the assurance. The full implementation of the assurance is still due.

38. The Committee regret that the assurance has not been fulfilled in full by the Ministry so far and urge the Ministry that this may be done expeditiously.

39. The Committee find that the Ministry have not cared to approach them for any extension of time beyond 12 November, 1985 for implementing the assurance. The Committee take a serious view of the negligence of the Ministry in this regard which is absolutely incompatible with the requisite regard to be shown to a Parliamentary Committee. It need not be emphasised that it is the duty of the Ministry to approach the Committee for extension of time for implementing an assurance if they face any insurmountable difficulty beyond their control.

On 30 July, 1984, Shri Mool Chand Daga, M.P. asked the following Unstarred Question (No. 1125) regarding sports teams sent abroad during 1982-83 and 1983-84 :

“the details of Indian teams who went abroad to play during 1982-83 and 1983-84 in different games/events showing yearwise :

- (i) name of the game,
- (ii) name of the countries visited,
- (iii) number of matches played with results,
- (iv) total expenditure for each events and
- (v) advantage gained?”

41. The Deputy Minister of Sports (Shri Ashok Gehlot) replied to the above question as follows :

“Required information is being collected and will be laid on the Table of the Lok Sabha.”

42. The above reply of the Deputy Minister was treated as an assurance and was required to be implemented by 29 October, 1984. As the assurance could not be implemented within the stipulated period, the Ministry requested the Committee to allow extensions of time. Their requests were received through the Department of Parliamentary Affairs on 22 November, 1984; 8 February, 14 May, 19 July, 1985. Requesting extension of time, the Ministry stated that the requisite information was still awaited from some Sports Federations/Association. The Committee agreed to grant extensions of time upto the periods indicated by the Ministry. A statement towards implementation of the assurance in part was laid on the Table of the House on 14 March, 1985. The assurance has since been implemented in full through a statement having been laid on the Table of the House on 26 February, 1986.

43. The Committee while noting the implementation of the assurance in early part of the current budget session, cannot appreciate the casual approach of the Ministry in not seeking the permission of the Committee for further extension of time after 30 October 1985 upto which the last extension was granted. The Committee trust that the Ministry would be careful in future.



### CHAPTER III

#### REQUESTS FROM GOVERNMENT FOR DROPPING OF ASSURANCES

(i)

44. On 3 April, 1984, the following Starred Question (No. 548) given notice of by Shri A. Neelalohithadasan Nadar, M.P., was addressed to the Minister of Law, Justice and Company Affairs :

- (a) "the main recommendations of the Justice Sachar Committee as regards the Company Law ;
- (b) the reason for the delay on the part of Government to bring amendments of the Company Law on the basis of those recommendations ;
- (c) whether Government propose to bring those amendments now; and
- (d) if so, the details thereon ?"

45. The Minister of Law, Justice and Company Affairs (Shri Jagan Nath Kaushal) gave the following reply :

- (a) to (d). The Sachar Committee, in its Report submitted to Government in August, 1978, had made various recommendations for amendments to the Companies Act, 1956. Copies of the Report containing these recommendations, were laid on the Table of both the Houses of Parliament on 30.8.1978. The Government are in the process of finalising their views on the recommendations of the Committee in regard to the more important amendments to the Companies Act and steps are being initiated to introduce the requisite legislation in this regard in the very near future.

The delay in processing is mainly attributable to the necessity of an in-depth re-examination of nearly 460 recommendations made by the Committee in respect of the Companies Act from the point of view of assessing the feasibility of an overall simplification of the statute as a whole. Some delay is also attributable

to the fact that these recommendations had to be considered in the light of changes in the Government policy in the wake of the change in Government in January, 1980 and in the light of the changed economic situation both in India and abroad and further keeping in view several new suggestions received from various Chambers of Commerce etc. on this subject."

46. The above reply to the question was treated by the Committee as an assurance and was to be fulfilled within three months of the date of reply i.e. by 2 July, 1984.

47. On 4 July, 1985, the Ministry of Industry (Department of Company Affairs) to whom this subject was transferred approached the Committee on Government Assurances through the *vide* their U.O. Note No. F.XIV/I&D(34)/SQ-548-LS/84 date 4 July, 1985 Department of Parliamentary Affairs/to drop the assurance on the grounds indicated below :

"The proposals for amendment of the Companies Act, 1956 in the light of the recommendations of Sachar Committee and other suggestions were examined by this Department in consultation with the Ministry of Law, and other Economic Ministries. Thereafter, it was proposed to introduce a short legislation in Parliament to amend the Companies Act, 1956 in regard to certain urgent proposals so as to plug loopholes and also to make them more relevant in the light of the socio-economic scenario, pending the introduction of a comprehensive Bill at a later stage. Necessary legislative proposals were finalised in consultation with the Law Ministry but in the meanwhile, the Elections for Lok Sabha were announced in November, 1984. With the coming into office of the new Government, after the General Elections, it was decided to review afresh these proposals in consultation with the Ministry of Law. As all these proposals are being reviewed afresh it is not possible to indicate precisely the period within which action would be finalised. This would no doubt take considerable time."

48. The Committee considered the request of the Ministry of Industry (Department of Company Affairs) for dropping the assurance at their sitting held on 30 October, 1985.

49. After considering all aspects of the matter the Committee decided not to accede to the request of the Ministry for dropping the assurance. On the contrary, the Committee desired that the Ministry should implement the assurance at their earliest and might seek extension of time, if necessary, for its early implementation.

50. The decision of the Committee was accordingly communicated to the Ministry of Industry (Department of Company Affairs).

51. The Ministry then approached the Committee through the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs and Tourism to grant extension of time upto 30 June, 1986 on the plea that "a short Bill containing urgent amendments based on some recommendations of Sachar Committee and other suggestions, had already been formulated and is presently under finalisation in the Legislative Department of the Law Ministry. Bill is proposed to be introduced in the Budget Session, 1986 of the Parliament. Thereafter, it is proposed to take up action on the remaining recommendations of Sachar Committee and to prepare comprehensive Bill for the purpose."

52. While granting the extension of time for implementing the assurance by 30 June, 1986, the Committee hope that the Ministry will adhere to the time schedule and introduce the Bill to amend the Companies Act, 1956 during the autumn session of Lok Sabha. In their opinion, had the Ministry shown due alacrity, the assurance could have been implemented much earlier. The Committee hope that in future—the Ministry would show due care and attention in such important matters.

(ii)

53. On 7 May, 1985, the following Unstarred Question (No. 5469) given notice of by Shri Prakash Chandra, M.P., was addressed to the Minister of Defence :

"(a) the number complaints received by his Ministry/Defence Head Quarters about the illegal possession of M.E.S. barracks by the civilians; and

(b) the details of each complaint and the action taken thereon ?

54. The Minister of Defence (Shri P.V. Narasimhan Rao) gave the following reply :

"Information is being collected."

55. The above reply to the question was treated as an assurance by the Committee and was required to be fulfilled within three months of the date of reply i.e. by 6 August, 1985.

56. On 16 September, 1985, the Ministry of Defence requested the Committee on Government Assurances through the Department, of Parlia-

mentary Affairs *Vide* their UO No. F. II/D(6) USQ. 5469-LS/85 dated 16 September, 1985 to drop the assurance on the grounds mentioned below :

“.....that the requisite information in respect of MES barracks is to be collected from all the units spread throughout the country which will involve a lot of time, efforts and expenditure. Further, such information may not be of much public interest. In view of this it has been decided with the approval of Raksha Mantri to request for the deletion of the Assurance.”

57. The Committee considered the request of the Ministry of Defence for dropping the assurance at their sitting held on 30 October, 1985. The Committee were not convinced with the reasons advanced by the Ministry of Defence to drop the assurance nor did they appreciate as to how the Ministry of Defence reached the conclusion that the requisite information was not of much public interest. In their opinion whether or not the information required in implementation of an assurance was of public importance was to be decided by them and not the Ministry. The assurance given by the Ministry of Defence on 7.5.1985 was to be fulfilled within three months i.e. by 6.8.1985. However, neither the Ministry fulfilled the assurance within the prescribed time nor did any extension of time was sought. Keeping this in view, the Committee observed that while making a request for dropping of an assurance, the Ministry concerned should not take them for granted to accede to such a request. They advised that requests for dropping the assurances should always be accompanied by requests for extension of time for implementing the assurances. After considering the matter, the Committee decided not to agree to the dropping of the assurance and desired the Ministry to implement it immediately and also make formal request for extension of time. The decision of the Committee was accordingly communicated to the Ministry of Defence.

58. In pursuance of the said direction of the Committee, the Ministry of Defence approached them through the Department of Parliamentary Affairs to grant extension of time upto 26 February 1986 *vide* their U.O. No. F. II/D (6) USQ 5469-LS/85 dated 13 February, 1986 on the plea, that 'information is to be collected from the three services Headquarters'.

59. On 3 April, 1986 the Ministry implemented the assurance by laying a statement on the Table of Lok Sabha.

60. The Committee note that at last the Ministry of Defence has implemented the assurance. Nevertheless, the Committee have to express their unhappiness on the manner in which the Ministry first approached the

Committee to drop the assurance and when that request was not acceded to the Ministry decided to implement the assurance. The facts mentioned in preceding paragraphs speak for themselves. While the Ministries are entitled to approach the Committee to consider dropping of an assurance if some genuine unforeseen difficulties crop up in implementing the assurance, this process is certainly not to be used as a means in the first instance to evade the reply by giving an assurance and then seeking its dropping by the Committee. The Committee are of the considered opinion that this kind of approach is nothing short of an abuse of the process which not only denies to an individual member of his right to have information on a matter of public importance but also materially affects the right of the House as a whole to have the information. The Committee therefore, would like to impress on the Ministry that in future requests for dropping of an assurance should be processed with utmost care and caution and at an appropriately higher level. Also, before submitting such requests to the Committee, specific approval of the Minister should be taken.

61. This observation of the Committee may also be noted by other Ministries/Departments of Government of India for future guidance.

(iii)

62. On 8 May, 1985, the following Unstarred Question (No. 5725) given notice of by Shri Somnath Rath, M.P., was addressed to the Minister of Tourism and Civil Aviation :

- “(a) whether Government propose to set up a National Civil Aviation Authority to look after the civil airports in the country ;
- (b) if so, when ;
- (c) whether Government have appointed any Committee in this connection; and
- (d) if so, the recommendations thereof ?”

63. The Minister of State in the Ministry of Tourism and Civil Aviation (Shri Ashok Gehlot) gave the following reply :

- “(a) and (b). A proposal to set up a Civil Aviation Authority which will be responsible *inter alia* for the development, management and maintenance of domestic airports is under consideration.
- (c) and (d). Yes, Sir. The Committee has recommended the creation of a statutory Civil Aviation Authority.”

64. Reply to parts (a) and (b) of the Question was treated as an assurance by the Committee which was to be fulfilled within three months of the date of reply *i.e.* by 7 August, 1985.

65. On 13 August, 1985, the Ministry of Transport (Department of Civil Aviation), approached the Committee on Government Assurances through the Department of Parliamentary Affairs, *vide* their U.O. No. FII/TCA(10) USQ 5725-LS/85 dated 13 August, 1985, to drop the assurance on the grounds indicated below :

“Although the proposal to set up a Civil Aviation Authority for domestic airports in India is under active consideration, it is likely to take about a year for the Authority to come into existence. The matter is required to be thoroughly examined as to the functions etc. to be performed by the proposed Authority, etc. A draft legislation will also have to be introduced in Parliament for this purpose. It is, thus, not likely that the assurance can be fulfilled within the stipulated period of three months or in the near future.”

66. The Committee considered the request of the Ministry of Transport (Department of Civil Aviation) for dropping the assurance at their sitting held on 30 October, 1985, and decided not to accede to the request of the Ministry of Tourism and Civil Aviation for dropping the assurance. They desired that the Ministry should implement the assurance early and in the meantime make a request for extension of time. The decision of the Committee was communicated to the Ministry accordingly.

67. The Committee note that the assurance has since been implemented by laying a statement on the Table of Lok Sabha on 26 February, 1986. In this connection, the Ministry should note the observations of the Committee made in respect of preceding assurance.

(iv)

68. On 24 July, 1985, the following Unstarred Question (No.278) given notice of by Shri Chintamani Panigrahi, M.P. was addressed to the Minister of Tourism and Civil Aviation :

- “(a) whether there is any proposal before Government for giving subsidy to the State Governments for the construction of low cost and clean hotels for both domestic and foreign tourists ;
- (b) if so, whether Centre has taken up the matter with State Government and initiated action in this direction ; and

(c) the number of hotels and their locations in Orissa under this programme ?”

The Minister of State in the Ministry of Tourism and Civil Aviation (Shri Ashok Gehlot) gave the following reply :

“(a) and (b). Yes Sir. A scheme framed in this regard has been forwarded to the State Governments.

(c) Specific proposals from the Government of Orissa are awaited.”

69. Reply to part (c) of the question was treated as an assurance by the Committee which was to be fulfilled within three months of the reply i.e. by 23 October, 1985.

70. On 30 September, 1985, the (Department of Tourism) approached the Committee to drop the assurance through the Department of Parliamentary Affairs *vide* their UO No. F. III/TCA(2) UQ-278-LS/85 dated 30 September, 1985 on the grounds mentioned below :

“The present position in this regard is that detailed criteria for the low cost and clean hotels (to be known as economy hotels) are being finalised by this department and the proposals received from the State Governments for the grant of Central subsidy for the construction of such hotels will be examined with reference to the prescribed criteria. As these proposals will involve financial assistance by the Central Government, each proposal will be examined in detail in consultation with the Ministry of Finance. The process of examination of a hotel project is a time-consuming process which requires prolonged correspondence between the concerned State Government and this Department before the proposal is finally accepted and the subsidy released.”

71. The Committee considered the request of the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs and Tourism (Department of Tourism) to drop the assurance at their sitting held on 30 October, 1985.

The Committee, keeping in view the difficulty expressed by the Ministry to implement the assurance, agree to drop the assurance.”

(v)

72. On 3 April, 1984, the following Unstarred Question (No. 6171) given notice of by Shri Neelalohithadasan Nadar, M.P. was addressed to the Minister of Law, Justice and Company Affairs :

- “(a) whether Government are aware that the wives, sons and daughters of some of the Judges of High Courts and Supreme Court are practising in the same courts where the Judges themselves are serving;
- (b) if so, the details thereof and whether Government have gone into the propriety of the present state of affairs; and
- (c) if not, whether Government propose to take steps to bar the practice by the relatives of the judicial officers in the same courts where they are serving and details thereof ?”

73. The Minister of Law, Justice and Company Affairs Shri Jagan Nath Kaushal gave the following reply :

- “(a) and (b) Information in respect of part (a) including the details thereof is being collected and would be laid on the Table of the House. The Government have not yet gone into the propriety of the matter.
- (c) The issue regarding Judges' relatives practising in the same High Court is *sub-judice* in the Supreme Court. The Government would consider the matter after the decision of the Court.”

74. Reply to parts (a) and (b) of the question was treated as an assurance by the Committee which was to be fulfilled within three months of date of the reply i.e. by 2 July, 1984.

75. After seeking 5 extensions *viz.* upto 3.10.1984, 3.1.1985, 3.4.1985 and 3.7.1985 and 3.10.1985 respectively to implement the assurance, on 16 September, 1985, the Ministry of Law and Justice approached the Committee on Government Assurances through the Department of Parliamentary Affairs *vide* their U.O. No. XIV/L & J (21)/USQ. 6171-LS/84 dated 16 September, 1985 to drop the assurance on the grounds indicated below :

“We had addressed the Bar Council of India (B.C.I.) and the Déptt. of Justice for obtaining the necessary information to fulfil the assurance. The Bar Council of India have replied *vide*



their letter dated 14.7.1984 stating that they do not have the information and that the same might be obtained by this Ministry from the High Courts and Supreme Court. The Deptt. of Justice in their D.O. letter dated 21.6.85 have replied stating that the Department are aware of the close relations of some Judges of High Courts who are practising as advocates in the High Courts where the Judges are functioning. However, they are of the view that it is considered not advisable together detailed information in that regard from the High Courts and the Supreme Court, as it would be embarrassing to enquire from the Judges/Justices about their relatives and that might even raise sensitive issues."

76. The Committee considered the request of the Ministry of Law and Justice for dropping the assurance at their sitting held on 31 October, 1985.

77. Finding that the Department of Justice was aware that close relations of some of the Judges of the High Courts were practising as advocates in the High Courts where the Judges were functioning, and the matter being already *sub-judice*, the Committee did not concur with the opinion of the Department that collection of information from High Courts and Supreme Court would not be advisable as it would be embarrassing to enquire from Judges/Justices about their relatives and that might even raise sensitive issues.

78. They desired the Ministry to expedite to implementation of the assurance at the earliest and if circumstances so warranted to request for extension of time as would be needed by them for this purpose.

The decision of the Committee was communicated to the Ministry accordingly.

79. The Ministry of Law and Justice then requested the Committee through the Department of Parliamentary Affairs *vide* their U.O. No. F. XIV/LJ(21) USQ. 6171-LS/84 dated 14 February, 1986, to grant extension of time upto 30 June, 1986 for implementing the assurance. The Ministry *inter alia* stated "the Department of Justice, has been requested to collect the information about the close relatives of the Judges of the High Courts and the Supreme Court practising in the same courts where they are serving. On receipt of the said information from the Department of Justice the question of the propriety of the said situation and the steps to be taken to remedy the same will be considered by the Government in its proper perspective."

80. The Committee regret that despite their clear direction for expeditious implementation of the assurance, the approach of the Ministry is lackadaisical as is reflected in their note regarding further extension of time for implementation of the assurance. While not being averse to grant time to the Ministry to implement the assurance by 30 June, 1986, the Committee desire that the whole matter be placed before the Minister to expedite the implementation of the assurance. The Committee would await the reaction of the Minister in the matter at the earliest.

(vi)

81. On 14 March, 1985, the following Unstarred Question (No. 196) given notice of by Shri Anand Singh, M.P., was addressed to the Minister of Education :

- “(a) whether Government have been thinking of opening a large number of public schools which would serve as pace setters and besides promoting education will also promote national integration; and  
(b) if so, the salient features of the scheme ?”

The Minister of Education (Shri K.C. Pant) gave the following reply :

- “(a) & (b) There is no proposal under consideration of Government to open a large number of public Schools. However, the Government is considering the setting up of model schools at the district level during the 7th Plan period. The details of the scheme are being worked out.”

82. 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 13 June, 1985.

83. On 9 May, 1985, the Ministry of Human Resource Development (Department of Education) approached the Committee on Government Assurances through the Department of Parliamentary Affairs *vide* their U.O. No. E. II/Edu. (1)USQ. 196-LS/85, dated 9 May, 1985, to drop the assurance on the grounds indicated below :

“The question related primarily to opening of public schools to which a categorical negative reply has been given.

Information regarding the proposal to set up model schools was given as an additionality on the assumption that the question may be referring to them.

The scheme for setting up model schools is still to be finalised and may take considerable time as several sub-committees are being set up to consider different aspects of the proposal."

84. In reply to a query as to whether (i) any time-frame had been laid down for finalising the proposal in regard to setting up of model schools at the district level during the Seventh Plan and (ii) if so, the time-frame so decided and if not, the reasons therefor, the Ministry informed the Committee :

"Approval of Cabinet and the Expenditure Finance Committee was originally expected to be obtained by the end of July, 1985. However the draft note for the Cabinet is presently with the Ministry of Finance for comments. As soon as they are available the matter will be placed before the Cabinet for approval. After Cabinet's approval the proposal will be placed before the EFC.

The expert Committees set up to work out details of different aspects of the scheme, have started their work in anticipation of approvals so that there is no delay once approval of Cabinet and EFC are available. The Committees will submit their reports during August to October 1985."

85. The Committee considered the request of the Ministry of Human Resource Development (Department of Education) for dropping the assurance at their sitting held on 31 October, 1985.

86. After considering all aspects the Committee found no justification to drop the assurance as the assurance was obviously given in regard to model schools. They desired that Government should make earnest efforts to implement the assurance at the earliest and might request for suitable extension of time. The Ministry was accordingly informed of the decision of the Committee.

87. The Ministry of Human Resource Development (Department of Education) then approached the Committee to grant extension of time upto 27 April, 1986 for implementing the assurance on the ground "the scheme for setting up of Model Schools in each district of the country is still under consideration."

88. April 27, 1986 also being over now, the implementation of the assurance is not in sight. Conceiving new ideas and schemes is of course

important, equally, if not more, important is producing the results by implementing those ideas or schemes. The Committee do believe that the setting up of model schools at the district level during the Seventh Plan period must be receiving Governments consideration much earlier than it was disclosed in reply to the aforesaid question. That being so, the Committee fail to understand the reasons for which Government are not able to come out with the details of the scheme as yet. With the new education policy on the anvil, which envisages the setting up of pace setting schools all over the country, it is all the more essential to expedite the drawing up of the necessary blue print of the scheme contemplated in the aforesaid reply. The Committee recommend that the matter should be attended to on priority and with the required urgency which would automatically ensure implementation of the assurance.

(vii)

89. On 15 March, 1985, the following Unstarred Question No. 246 given notice by Shri A.P. Sethi, M.P. was addressed to the Minister of Finance :

“(a) whether any criminal cases have been initiated against some private companies by Income Tax Authorities during 1983-84 and 1984-85 for not depositing income tax of more than Rs. 90,000 deducted at source within the stipulated period with the Union Government; and

(b) if so, the details in this regard ?”

90. The Minister of State in the Ministry of Finance (Shri Janardhan Poojari) gave the following reply :

“(a) Yes, Sir.

(b) The cases where some private companies, have not deposited Income Tax of more than Rs. 90,000/- deducted at source within one year, within the stipulated period with the Union Government are as under :

	<i>Assessment Year</i>	<i>Amount to T.D.S. Rs.</i>
<b>M/s. R. Tulsidas &amp; Co., Bombay</b>	1977-78	1,36,672
	1978-79	2,59,171
	1979-80	2,69,790
	1980-81	3,55,630
<b>M/s. Hind Shipping Agencies, Bombay</b>	1977-78	94,976
	1978-79	1,29,778

The latest position is being ascertained from the field authorities.”

91. Reply to part (b) of the question was treated as an assurance by the Committee which was to be fulfilled within three months of the date of reply *i.e.* by 14 June, 1985.

92. On 18 July, 1985, the Ministry of Finance approached the Committee on Government Assurances through the Department of Parliamentary Affairs *vide* their UO No. F. II/F (1) USQ. 246.LS/85 dated 18 July, 1985 to drop the assurance on the grounds indicated below :

“The information available with the Ministry was given in reply to the question and it was stated that latest information was being as-from the field authorities. This portion of reply was treated as an assurance. The information has since been received from the field formation and it is found that there is no change. The information given in the original reply may, therefore, be treated as final, and no further reply may be expected from this Ministry. The assurance may kindly be treated as fulfilled.”

93. The Committee considered the request of the Ministry of Finance for dropping the assurance at this sitting held on 31 October, 1985. As there is no further change in the information given earlier by the Minister in reply to the question, the Committee agree to dropping of the assurance.

(viii)

94. On 23 April, 1985, the following Unstarred Question (No. 4046) given notice of by Shrimati Jayanti Patnaik, M.P. was addressed to the Minister of Petroleum :

- “(a) whether Government are aware that the present storage capacity of the public sector oil companies in Orissa for storing diesel, petrol, kerosene, furnace oil etc. is most inadequate;
- (b) whether Government of Orissa had requested his Ministry to consider the issue of immediate augmentation of storage capacity of various public sector oil companies in that State; and
- (c) if so, the steps taken by Union Government to implement the request made by Government of Orissa ?”

95. The Minister of State in the Ministry of Petroleum (Shri Naval Kishore Sharma) gave the following reply :

“(a) No Sir, The product tankage capacity already available in Orissa is considered sufficient to meet the current demand for POL products in that State.

(b) Yes, Sir.

(c) With a view to augmenting the product storage capacity in the country in accordance with the existing policy of the Government, tankages to the extent of 6357 Kls. are being set up in Orissa under Phase-I of the Additional Product Tankage Programme and these are expected to be completed by the end of 1985. Tankages to the extent of 10532 Kls. have been sanctioned under Phase-IIA and these are expected to be completed by 1986-87. A proposal to set up a terminal at Paradeep is also under consideration of Government”.

96. Reply to part (c) of the Question was treated as an assurance by the Committee which was to be fulfilled within three months of the date of reply *i.e.* by 22 July, 1985.

97. On 13 September, 1985, the Ministry of Petroleum and Natural Gas approached the Committee on Government Assurances through the Department of Parliamentary Affairs *vide* their U.O. No. F. II Pet (18)USQ. 4046-LS/85 dated 13 September, 1985 to drop these assurances on the grounds indicated below :

“A proposal to set up an oil terminal at Paradeep has been under consideration of the Government alongwith similar other proposals. However, owing to constraint of resources and consequent inability of the oil industry to take up any tankage scheme other than those of operational necessity during the Seventh Plan, there has been no further progress on the proposal for setting up an oil terminal at Paradeep. At this stage, it is not possible to say as to when the Paradeep Terminal proposal will be approved and taken up for implementation. In view of this, it is requested that the reply given to the above question may not be treated as assurance.”

98. The Committee considered the request of the Ministry of Petroleum and Natural Gas for dropping the assurance at their sitting held on 31 October, 1985 and agreed to it.

99. While the Committee have agreed to drop the assurance in the present case, they would like to point out that whenever in a reply it is stated by the Minister that such and such proposal is under consideration, the Committee would normally take it that the Minister would come forward within a reasonable time to inform the House about the final decision on that proposal or the progress about its implementation. In the opinion of the Committee, an assurance is normally implicit in the expression the proposal is under consideration or the matter is under consideration and the House expects to be informed further. In fact the reply raises same kind of hope in the people likely to be attached by the decision. The Committee reiterate the above observation in order to clarify the misconception that the said expressions indicate a self contained and a final reply and are not be treated as an assurance.

100. In the present case while the assurance was given on 23, April, 1985 the Ministry approached the Committee with the request that the reply might not be treated as an assurance after an expiry of five Months. The circumstances or difficulties pointed out by the Ministry did not crop up suddenly and in fact existed from the beginning itself. This indicates a peculiar care-free attitude on the part of Ministry which has to be disapproved by the Committee. It is hoped that such kind of lapse will not be repeated by the Ministry in future.

## CHAPTER IV

### POSITION OF PENDING ASSURANCES PERTAINING TO SEVENTH AND EIGHTH LOK SABHA

101. A statement showing the position of assurances pertaining to Seventh and Eighth Lok Sabha pending implementation by the Government as on 3 April, 1986 is given in Appendices.

102. The Committee would like the Ministries/Departments concerned to make a critical analysis of these assurances so as to implement them without further loss of time.

B. K. GADHVI,  
*Chairman,*  
*Committee on Government Assurances*

NEW DELHI;  
May 6, 1986  
Vaisakha 16, 1908 (Saka)



## MINUTES

### Sixth Sitting

*Minutes of the Committee on Government Assurances (1985-86)  
held on 30 October, 1985, in Committee Room No. 53, Parli-  
ament House, New Delhi.*

The Committee met on Wednesday, 30 October, 1985 from 15.00 hrs. to 15.40 hrs.

### PRESENT

Shri B.K. Gadhvi—*Chairman*

### MEMBERS

2. Shri T. Bala Goud
3. Shri V. Kishore Chandra S. Deo
4. Shri Jaganath Prasad
5. Shri Virdhi Chander Jain
6. Shri Rahim Khan
7. Shri Channah Odeyar
8. Shri Keshorao Pardhi
9. Shri Ram Pujan Patel
10. Shri K. Pradhani
11. Shri Jitendra Prasada
12. Shri K.N. Pradhan

### SECRETARIAT

Shri M.G. Agrawal —*Senior Examiner of Questions*

2. The Committee took up for consideration Memoranda Nos. 24, 16, 17, 18 and 19. Observations/recommendations of the Committee on the said Memorada were as under :—

*Memorandum Nos. 24* :—Review of assurances pertaining to various sessions of Seventh Lok Sabha.

3. The Committee considered eight pending assurances of various sessions of Seventh Lok Sabha pertaining to the Ministries of Parliamentary

Affairs and Tourism (Department of Tourism), Urban Development and Human Resources Development (Department of Youth Affairs and Sports), details of which are given in the annexure.

3.1 The Committee made the following observations/recommendations :—

*Sl. Nos. 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7 and 8* : The Committee noted that the Ministries of Parliamentary Affairs and Tourism (Department of Tourism), Urban Development and Human Resources Development (Department of Youth Affairs and Sports) had already availed of more than 3 extensions for fulfilling the relevant assurances. The purpose of seeking the informations through the question was defeated if the requisites information was furnished after inordinate delay.

3.2 The Committee were unhappy to note that in many cases the extensions had been sought after the expiry of period of the previous extensions. This gave the impression to the Committee that the concerned Ministries/Departments were not serious enough to observe the time schedule for fulfilling the assurances. The Committee desired that whenever any Ministry was not in a position to implement an assurance within the specified time, they should apply for extension of time well before the expiry of the date of the previous extension.

3.3. After considering all aspects of the matter, the Committee agreed to the requests made by the Ministries for extension of time and desired that the assurances be fulfilled as early as possible in any case not later than the expiry of time.

3.4. *Sl. No. 2* : The Committee noted that the assurance was given as far back as 24 August, 1981. Since then the Ministry of Urban Development had made 15 requests to the Committee for extension of time for fulfilling the assurance. The last request was made on 9 October, 1985 seeking extension of time upto 31 December, 1985 on the ground that matter was still under active consideration of the Ministry and a decision in the matter was likely to take more time. The Committee were surprised to observe that the Ministry had taken 4 years to take a decision on an important issue like conversion of lease hold land into free-hold. The Committee were not satisfied with the reasons advanced by the Ministry for seeking the extension of time and desired that the Ministry should implement the assurance expeditiously and for any further extension of time, cogent and convincing reasons should be given therefor.

*Memorandum No. 16* :—Request from Government for dropping of an assurance given on 3.4.1984 in reply to Starred Question No. 548 regarding amendment of Company Law on the basis of recommendations of Sachar Committee.

4. The Committee noted that the Ministry of Industry and Company Affairs (Department of Company Affairs), to whom this subject was transferred, had requested through the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs that the assurance might be dropped on the grounds mentioned in their note dated 4 July, 1985, relevant extracts therefrom are reproduced below :—

“The proposals for amendment of the Companies Act, 1956 in the light of the recommendation of Sachar Committee and other suggestions were examined by this Department in consultation with the Ministry of Law, and other Economic Ministries. Thereafter, it was proposed to introduce a short legislation in Parliament to amend the Companies Act, 1956 in regard to certain urgent proposals so as to plug loopholes and also to make them more relevant in the light of the socio-economic scenario, pending the introduction of a comprehensive Bill at a later stage. Necessary legislative-proposals were finalised in consultation with the Law Ministry but in the meanwhile, the Elections for Lok Sabha were announced in November, 1984. With the coming into office of the new Government, after the General Elections, it was decided to review afresh these proposals in consultation with the Ministry of Law. As all these proposals are being reviewed afresh it is not possible to indicate precisely the period within which action would be finalised. This would no doubt take considerable time.”

4.1. The Committee also noted that the Ministry of Industry and Company Affairs, prior to the making of request to the Committee for dropping the assurance, had requested the Department of Parliamentary Affairs to move the Committee to drop the assurance on the ground that “passage of an amendment to a statutory enactment is a time consuming process and not entirely within the control of the Department to implement the assurance within the prescribed time.” The Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs had then advised the Ministry that the Committee on Government Assurance did not normally agree to deletion of an assurance on such grounds.

4.2. After considering all aspects of matter the Committee decided not to accede to the request of the Ministry for dropping the assurance. The

Committee desired that the Ministry should implement the assurance at their earliest and may seek extension of time, if necessary, for its implementation.

*Memorandum No. 17* :—Request from the Government for dropping of an assurance given on 7-5-1985 in reply to USQ No. 5469 regarding illegal possession of M.E.S. barracks by civilians.

5. The Committee took note of the following request of the Ministry of Defence received through the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs in their note dated 16 September, 1985.

“.....that the requisite information in respect of M.E.S. barracks is to be collected from all the units spread throughout the country which will involve a lot of time, efforts and expenditure. Further, such information may not be of much public interest. In view of this it has been decided with the approval of Raksha Mantri to request for the deletion of the Assurance.”

5.1 The Committee were not convinced with the reasons advanced by the Ministry of Defence to drop the assurance, the Committee did not appreciate as to how the Ministry of Defence had reached to the conclusion that the requisite information was not of much public interest. Whether or not the information required in implementation of an assurance was of public importance was to be decided by the Committee and not the Ministry. It was noted that the assurance was given by the Ministry of Defence on 7-5-85 to be fulfilled within three months i.e. upto 6-8-85. However, neither the Ministry fulfilled the assurance within the prescribed time nor did any extension of time was sought.

5.2 The Committee observed that while making a request for dropping of an assurance, the Ministry concerned should not presume that it would be dropped and should invariably apply for extension of time where necessary.

5.3 After carefully considering the matter, the Committee decided not to drop the assurance and desired the Ministry to implement the assurance immediately and also make formal request for extension of time.

*Memorandum No. 18*—Request from the Government for dropping of an assurance given on 8.5.85 in reply to USQ No. 5725 regarding setting up of National Civil Aviation Authority.

6. The Committee noted the request of the Ministry of Tourism and Civil Aviation forwarded through the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs note dated 13 August, 1985, relevant extracts therefrom are reproduced below :

“Although the proposal to set up a Civil Aviation Authority for domestic airports in India is under active consideration, it is likely to take about a year for the Authority to come into existence. The matter is required to be thoroughly examined as to the functions etc. to be performed by the proposed Authority etc. A draft-legislation will also have to be introduced in Parliament for this purpose. It is thus, not likely that the assurance can be fulfilled within the stipulated period of three months or in the near future.”

6.1 The Committee decided not accede to the request of the Ministry of Tourism and Civil Aviation for dropping the Assurance. The Committee desired that the Ministry should implement the assurance and in the meantime made a request for extension of time.

*Memorandum No. 19*—Request from Government for dropping of an assurance given on 24.7.1985 in reply to USQ No. 278 regarding subsidy to State Government for construction of low cost and clean hotels.

7. The Committee noted the request of the Ministry of Tourism and Civil Aviation for dropping the assurance, made through the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs note dated 30 September, 1985, relevant extracts therefrom are reproduced below :

“The present position in this regard is that criteria for the low cost and clean hotels (to be known as economy hotels) are being finalised by this department and the proposals received from the State Governments for the grant of Central subsidy for the construction of such hotels will be examined with reference to the prescribed criteria. As these proposals will involve financial assistance by the Central Government, each proposal will be examined in detail in consultation with the Ministry of Finance. The process of examination of a hotel project is a time-consuming pro-

cess which requires prolonged correspondence between the concerned State Government and this Department before the proposal is finally accepted and the subsidy released."

7.1 The Committee, keeping in view the difficulty expressed by the Ministry to implement the assurance, agreed to drop the assurance,

The Committee then adjourned to meet again on 31 October, 1985.

Question No. and date	Text of the Question	Assurance given	Extension Sought		Reasons	Remarks
			On	Upto		
1 2	3	4	5	6	7	8

**MINISTRY OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS AND TOURISM  
(DEPARTMENT OF TOURISM)**

Fifteenth Session of Seventh Lok Sabha

**Category 'A'**

1. Starred Question No. 954 dt. the 27th July, 1984 by Shri B.D. Singh: and
- (a) whether it is a fact that there has been huge shortfall in the utilisation of funds for specific projects during the last several years ; and
- (b) the comparative shortfall in the utilisation of
- (a) and (b):
- |  |          |          |  |
|--|----------|----------|--|
| The information is being collected and will be placed on the Table of Lok Sabha in the due course. | 27.10.84 | 27.1.85  | The Completion of the information for the past several years which is voluminous, may take some more time. |
|  | 31.1.85  | 27.3.85  |  |
|  | 22.4.85  | 27.6.85  |  |
|  | 17.7.85  | 15.8.85  |  |
|  | 10.9.85  | 15.11.85 |  |
- Assurance was required to be implemented within three months.

funds for specific projects during the last five years stating the reasons therefor ?

## MINISTRY OF URBAN DEVELOPMENT

*VI to XIV Sessions of Seventh Lok Sabha*

### Category 'A'

2. Unstarred Question No. 1105 Dated the 24th August, 1981 by Shri S.M. Krishna :	The views of certain State Governments/ Union Territories, which have experience in the administration of lease-hold as well as free hold systems of land tenure, are being collected,	9.12.81 2.2.82 17.5.82 13.7.82 7.10.82 16.8.83 10.6.83 16.9.83 2.12.83 7.4.84 19.7.84 15.10.84 17.1.85 4.4.85 9.10.85	31.1.82 31.4.82 30.6.82 30.9.82 31.3.83 31.5.83 31.8.83 30.11.83 28.2.84 30.6.84 30.9.84 31.12.84 31.3.85 30.9.85 31.12.85	The matter is still under active consideration of the Ministry. A decision in the matter is likely to take some more time.	Assurance was required to be implemented within three months.
3. Unstarred Question	(a) the total number of Government servants (b) if so, when ; and (c) if not, the stage at which the matter stands at present ?	18.8.84 23.10.84	16.10.84 16.1.85	The requirement is site information	Assurance was required



<p>No. 7688 date the 16th April, 1984 by Shri Bhee- khabhai :</p>	<p>(excluding SC/ST) and belonging to SC/ST in Grade A to C (category- wise) as on 1 January, 1982 in each department (Ministerial and non- Ministerial staff) separa- tely ; and (b) the total number of Government servants (excluding SC/ST) and belonging to SC/ST re- cruited and promoted (category-wise) as in (a) above from 1 January, 1982 to 31 December, 1982 and 1 January, 1983 to 31 December, 1983.</p>	<p>23.1.85 22.4.85 29.7.85</p>	<p>16.4.85 16.8.85 16.10.85</p>	<p>tion is being collected and will be laid on the Table of the House.</p>	<p>mation is still await- ed from Directorate of Printing an attach- ed office of this Minis- try, who have to col- lect the in- formation from their subordinate units situ- ated all over the Country.</p>	<p>to be imple- mented with- in three months.</p>
<p>4. Unstarred Question No. 10169 dated 7.5.84 by Shri</p>	<p>(a) whether it is a fact that the scheme of allo- wing transfer of houses built on plots allotted by DDA and built up</p>	<p>19.7.84 12.10.84 17.1.85 4.4.85 9.10.85</p>	<p>30.9.84 31.12.84 31.3.85 30.9.85 31.12.85</p>	<p>(b) the ques- tion of aboli- tion of the leasehold sys- tem of land</p>	<p>The matter . Assurance is still under active consi- deration of the Ministry.</p>	<p>was required to be imple- mented with- in three months.</p>

months.

A decision in the matter is likely to take some more time.

tenure in Delhi is under consideration of the Government.

Satyasadhan flats allotted by DDA in 1979/80 had evoked no response and still large scale transfers of such properties are taking place in Delhi on the basis of registration of agreements to sell, irrevocable power of attorneys, irrevocable wills and collusive decrees; and (b) whether Government have studied the schemes of Haryana Urban Development Authority and the Ghaziabad Development Authority in relation to such transfers and have plan to further liberalise the DDA scheme with a view to encourage the people not to resort to underhand methods of transfer?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
5.	Unstarred Question No. 64 dated the 23rd July, 1984 by Shri Mohd. Asrar Ahmad.	(a) whether DDA (Delhi Development Authority) flat allottees do not possess ownership rights over their flats even after they have paid the full cost of the flats;	(d) The matter is under consideration of the Government.	29.10.84 7.1.85 1.4.85 10.7.85 10.10.85	23.12.84 23.3.85 23.6.85 23.9.85 23.12.85	The question of ownership rights to allottees is still under consideration of this Ministry.	The assurance was required to be implemented with-in three months.
		(b) whether the Allottees have to pay ground rent to DDA in perpetuity;					
		(c) whether the allottees of flats and Residents Welfare Associations have made several representations to confer full ownership rights to the allottees and do away with the Ground rent system; and					
		(d) if so, the reaction of Government in this regard ?					

## CATEGORY 'C'

6. Unstarred Question No. 3582 dated the 19th March, 1985 by Shri Satyanarayan Jatiya.	(a) the position wise regarding number of houses/flats constructed by various Government corporation or corporations and institutions and constituted by Government for different income groups the reservation their in for Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes; the quantum of grants given for the purpose and the houses/flats actually allotted.	Information is being collected and will be laid on the Table of the House.	28-6-84 25-9-84 27-12-84 26-3-85 9-7-85 8-10-85	18-9-84 18-12-84 18-3-85 18-6-85 18-9-85 18-12-85	For want of complete information from all the State Government/U.T.s as also some of the Ministries/Departments, it is not yet possible to fulfil the assurance completely. However, an Implementation Report giving information in respect of some more States/U.Ts. etc. is being sent separately.	Partly implemented <i>vide</i> statement laid on 19.4.85 and 24.7.85
--	---	--	--	--	--	--

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8

CATEGORY 'C'

7.	Unstarred Question No. 3200 dated the 13th August, 1984 by Shri Suraj Bhan.	Referring to the reply given to USQ. No. 3582 on 19 March, 1984 regarding construction of flats and asking for : (a) the State-wise number of houses/flats/tenements for different income groups constructed by various Government Corporations and Government organised/aided agencies;	(a) to (d) The information is being collected and will be laid on the Table of the Sabha.	16.11.84 18.2.85 17.5.85 19.8.85	12.2.85 12.5.85 12.8.85 12.11.85	Information in respect of Government of Maharashtra and some more institutions/corporation under the administrative control of the Central Government has since been received and the Assuranc is proposed to be fulfilled	Partly implemented <i>vide</i> statement laid on 24.7.1985.
		(b) the number actually been allotted ;					
		(c) the number out of them reserved for Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes also for the disabled; and					

(d) the amount of aid given for this purpose.

partially again. However, complete information is still awaited from a number of State Government and Union Governments/Ministries/Departments.

**MINISTRY OF HUMAN RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT (DEPARTMENT OF YOUTH AFFAIRS AND SPORTS)**

*XV Session of Seventh Lok Sabha*

**CATEGORY 'A'**

3.	Unstarred Question No. 1125 dated the 30th July, 1984 by	The details of Indian teams who went abroad to play during 1982-83 and 1983-84 different games/event showing year-wise:	Required Information is being collected and will be laid on the Table of the	22.11.84	30.1.85	The requisite information is still awaited from some sports Federations/	Assurance has been partially fulfilled and statement laid on the Table of the
				8.2.85	30.4.85		
				14.5.85	30.7.85		
				19.7.85	30.10.85		

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
	Shri Mool Chand Daga.	(i) name of the game; (ii) name of the countries visited; (iii) number of matches played with results; (iv) total expenditure for each event; and (v) advantage gained.	Sabha.			Associations.	House 14,3.85

## MINUTES

### Seventh Sitting

*Minutes of the Committee on Government Assurances  
(1985-86) held on 31 October, 1985 in Committee  
Room No. 53, Parliament House, New Delhi.*

The Committee met on Thursday, 31 October, 1985 from 16.30 hrs. to 17.25 hrs.

#### PRESENT

Shri B.K. Gadhvi—*Chairman*

#### MEMBERS

2. Shri T. Bala Goud
3. Shri V. Kishore Chandra S. Deo
4. Shri Virdhi Chander Jain
5. Shri Rahim Khan
6. Shri Channaiah Odeyar
7. Shri Keshorao Pardhi
8. Shri Ram Pujan Patel
9. Shri K. Pradhani
10. Shri Ram Bahadur Singh
11. Shri K.N. Pradhan

#### SECRETARIAT

Shri M.G. Agrawal—*Senior Examiner of Questions*

2. The Committee took up for consideration Memoranda Nos. 20, 21, 22 and 23. Observations/recommendations of the Committee on the said memoranda were as under :

*Memorandum No. 20* : Request from the Government for dropping of an assurance given on 3.4.1984 in reply to USQ No. 6171 regarding proposal to bar the practice by relatives of judicial officers in the same Court where they are serving.



3. The Committee noted that the Ministry of Law, Justice had requested through the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs that the Assurance be dropped on the grounds mentioned in their note dated 16.9.1985 relevant extracts therefrom are reproduced below :

“We had addressed the Bar Council of India (B.C.I.) and the Deptt. of Justice for obtaining the necessary information to fulfil assurance. The Bar Council of India have replied vide their letter dated 14.7.1985 stating that they do not have the information and that the same might be obtained by this Ministry from the High Courts and Supreme Court. The Deptt. of Justice in their D.O. letter dated 21.6.1985 have replied stating that the Department are aware of the close relations of some Judges of High Courts who are practising as advocates in the High Courts where the Judges are functioning. However, they are of the view that it is considered not advisable to gather detailed information in that regard from the High Courts and the Supreme Court, as it would be embarrassing to enquire from the Judges/Justices about their relatives and that might even raise sensitive issue.”

3.1. The Committee noted that while the Department of Justice were aware that close relations of some of the Judges of the High Courts were practising as advocates in the High Courts where the Judges were functioning, it was of the view that the collection of information from the Judges/Justices of High Courts and Supreme Court about their relatives would be embarrassing and might even raise sensitive issues.

3.2. In this connection, the Committee went through the reply given to part (c) of the same question where the Minister had said that “the issue regarding the Judges relations practising in the same High Court is sub-judice in the Supreme Court. The Government would consider the matter after decision of the Court.”

3.3. The Committee failed to understand the plea taken by the Ministry to drop the assurance as on one hand, the Minister stated that the issue was *sub judice* and on the other it was being pleaded that collection of information would be embarrassing and might raise sensitive issues. When the matter was already in court and known to the public, how could the process of collection of information on the same issue could be embarrassing and or raising sensitive issues. Moreover, in a democratic set-up people had the right to know about the functioning of the judiciary.

3.4. It was also noted that the Ministry did not seek extension of time beyond 3.10.1985 alongwith the request for dropping the assurance. The Committee were unhappy that the Ministry should have anticipated that their request for dropping would be accede to by the Committee and that they were not required to seek extension of time.

3.5. The Committee did not agree to drop the assurance. The Committee desired that the Ministry should expedite the implementation of the assurance and in the meantime request for extension of time as would be needed by them for this purpose.

*Memorandum No. 21* : Request from the Government for dropping of an assurance given on 14.3.1985 in reply to USQ No. 196 regarding opening of public schools.

4. The Committee considered the following request of the Ministry of Education forwarded through the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs that the Assurance be dropped on the following grounds mentioned in their note dated 9 May, 1985 :

“The question related primarily to opening of public schools to which a categorical negative reply has been given.

Information regarding the proposal to set-up model schools was given as an additionality on the assumption that the question may be referring to them.

The scheme for setting up model schools is still to be finalised and may take considerable time as several sub-committees are being set-up to consider different aspects of the proposal.”

4.1. The Committee took note of the following reply of the Ministry of Education furnished vide their O.M. dated 15 July, 1985 in response to this Secretariat letter dated 25 June, 1985 regarding (i) whether any time frame has been laid down for finalising the proposal in regard to setting up of model schools at the district level during Seventh Plan and (ii) if so, the time-frame so decided and if not, the reasons therefor :

“Approval of Cabinet and the Expenditure Finance Committee was originally expected to be obtained by the end of July, 1985. However, the draft note for the Cabinet is presently with the Ministry of Finance for comments. As soon as they are available the matter will be placed before the Cabinet for approval. After Cabinet’s approval, the proposal will be placed before the EFC.

The expert Committees set up to work out details of different aspects of the scheme, have started their work in anticipation of approvals so that there is no delay once approval of Cabinet and EFC are available. The Committees will submit their reports during August to October, 1985."

4.2 After discussing at length the ground taken by the Ministry of Education that the information regarding the proposal to set up model schools at district level during Seventh Plan was given in reply to the question as an additional information on the assumption that the question relating to Public School might be referring to model schools. The Committee observed that in view of the reply of the Minister it self, there was no justification to drop the assurance as the assurance was obviously given in regard to model schools. The Committee desired that Government should make earnest efforts to liquidate the assurance at the earliest and might request for suitable extension of time

*Memorandum No 22* :—Request from the Government for dropping of the Assurance given on 15.3.1985 in reply to USQ. No. 246 regarding cases against private firms by Income Tax authorities.

5. The Committee noted that the Ministry of Finance had requested through the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs that the assurance might be dropped on the grounds mentioned in their note dated 18 July, 1985 relevant extracts there from are reproduced below :

"The information available with the Ministry was given in reply to the question and it was stated that latest information was being ascertained from the field authorities. This portion of the reply was treated as an assurance, The information has since been received from the field formation and it is found that there is no change. The information given in the original reply may, therefore, be treated as final, and no further reply may be expected from this Ministry. The assurance may kindly be treated as fulfilled."

5.1 The Committee noted that Ministry were not having any additional information to be given against the assurance. The Committee observed that since there was no further change in the information already given by the Minister in reply to the question, the Committee decided to drop the assurance.

*Memorandum No. 23* :—Request from the Government for dropping of an Assurance given on 23.4.1985 in reply to USQ. 4046 regarding augmentation of storage capacity of various public sector oil companies in Orissa.

6. The Committee took note of the following request of the Ministry of Petroleum forwarded through the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs that the assurance might be dropped on the following ground mentioned in their note dated 13 September, 1985 :

“A proposal to set up an oil terminal at Paradeep has been under consideration of the Government alongwith similar other proposals. However, owing to constraint of resources and consequent in ability of the oil industry to take up any tankage scheme other than those of operational necessity during the Seventh Plan, there has been no further progress on the proposal for setting up an oil terminal at Paradeep. At this stage, it is not possible to say as to when the Paradeep Terminal proposal will be approved and taken up for implementation. In view of this, it is requested that the reply given to the above question may not be treated as an assurance.”

6.1 The Committee considered the above request and decided to drop the assurance.

*The Committee then adjourned*

---

## MINUTES

### Twelfth Sitting

*Minutes of the Twelfth Sitting of the Committee on Government Assurances held on 6 May, 1986 in Room No. 50, First Floor, Parliament House, New Delhi*

The Committee met on Tuesday, 6 May, 1986 from 15.30 hours to 16.00 hours.

#### PRESENT

Shri B.K. Gadhvi—*Chairman*

#### MEMBERS

2. Shri. T. Bala Goud
3. Shri V. Kishore Chandra S. Deo
4. Shri Jagannath Prasad
5. Shri Virdhi Chander Jain
6. Shri Channaiah Odeyar
7. Shai Keshoraø Pardhi
8. Shri K.N. Pradhan

#### SECRETARIAT

Shri C.K. Jain—*Chief Examiner of Questions*

Shri D.M. Chanan—*Senior Examiner of Questions*

2. The Committee considered their draft Fifth Report and adopted the same.

3. The Committee authorised the Chairman to present the Report on Wednesday, the 7th May, 1986.

*The Committee then adjourned*

## APPENDIX

(Vide para No. 101 of the Report)

(i) Statement showing the position of the assurances  
of Seventh Lok Sabha pending implementation as on  
3 April, 1986

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	547	1
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	428	1
Tenth Session, 1982	315	315	—
Eleventh Session, 1983	861	857	4
Twelfth Session, 1983	433	433	—
Thirteenth Session, 1983	424	422	2
Fourteenth Session, 1984	956	937	19
Fifteenth Session, 1984	328	317	11
<b>Total Assurances out-standing</b>			<b>39</b>

(ii) Statement showing the position of assurances of  
Eighth Lok Sabha pending implementation as on  
3 April, 1986

Session	No. of assurances culled out	No. of assurances implemented/dropped	No. of assurances out-standing
First Session, 1985	19	17	2
Second Session, 1985	426	381	45
Third Session, 1985	331	265	66
Fourth Session, 1985	355	177	178
<b>Total Assurances outstanding</b>			<b>291</b>

(iii) Ministry-wise details of outstanding assurances of Seventh Lok Sabha

Ministry/Department	SESSION OF SEVENTH LOK SABHA																TOTAL
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	
Agriculture													1	1		2	
Atomic Energy															1	1	
Commerce											1					2	
Communications													1			1	
Defence																	
Electronics																	
Energy																	
Environment and Forests																	
External Affairs													3	2		5	
Finance								1		1		2				4	
Food and Civil Supplies																	
Health and Family Welfare													1			1	
Home Affairs													2	1		3	
Human Resource Development																	
Industry										1			4			5	
Information and Broadcasting														2		2	

Labour					1	1	2
Law and Justice							5
Ocean Development					1		
Parliamentary Affairs and Tourism	1					3	
Personnel and Training, Administrative Reforms and Public Grievances and Pension							1
Petroleum and Natural Gas Planning						1	1
Prime Minister Programme Implementation							
Science and Technology Space							
Steel and Mines Textiles							
Transport							
Urban Development		1				1	3
Water Resources							5
Welfare						1	1
Total	1	1	1	4	2	19	39



## (iv) Ministry-wise details of outstanding Assurances of Eighth Lok Sabha

Ministry/Department	Ist Session	2nd Session	3rd Session	4th Session	Total
Agriculture	—	—	1	9	10
Atomic Energy	—	—	—	2	2
Commerce	—	2	1	5	8
Communications	—	—	—	5	5
Defence	—	—	1	2	3
Electronics	—	—	1	—	1
Energy	—	—	1	4	5
Environment and Forests	—	2	1	4	7
External Affairs	—	—	1	—	1
Finance	—	—	12	25	37
Food and Civil Supplies	—	3	4	6	13
Health and Family Welfare	—	5	1	2	8
Home Affairs	—	2	6	10	18
Human Resource Development	—	5	9	10	24
Industry	1	4	2	28	35
Information and Broadcasting	—	3	—	5	8
Labour	—	3	7	9	19
Law and Justice	1	5	—	4	10
Ocean Development	—	—	—	—	—
Parliamentary Affairs and Tourism	—	—	1	3	4
Personnel and Training, Administrative Reforms and Public Grievances and Pension	—	—	1	—	1
Petroleum and Natural Gas	—	2	2	3	7
Planning	—	—	—	3	3
Prime Minister Programme Implementation	—	—	—	—	—
Science and Technology	—	—	1	—	1
Space	—	—	—	—	—
Steel and Mines	—	5	3	6	14
Textiles	—	—	—	—	—
Transport	—	1	3	25	29
Urban Development	—	3	6	2	11
Water Resources	—	—	1	1	2
Welfare	—	—	—	3	3
	2	45	66	178	291

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

Sl. No.	Name of Agent	Sl. No.	Name of Agent
<b>ANDHRA PRADESH</b>		<b>UTTAR PRADESH</b>	
1.	M/s. Vijay Book Agency, 11-1-477, Mylargadda, Secunderabad-500 361.	12.	Law Publishers, Sardar Patel Marg, P.B. No. 77 Allahabad, U. P.
<b>BIHAR</b>		<b>WEST BENGAL</b>	
2.	M/s. Crown Book Depot, Upper Bazar, Ranchi (Bihar).	13.	Mrs. Manimala, Buys & Sells, 123, Bow Bazar Street, Calcutta-1
<b>GUJARAT</b>		<b>DELHI</b>	
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)
<b>MADHYA PRADESH</b>		15.	M/s. J.M. Jaina & Brothers, P. Box 1020, Mori Gate, Delhi- 110006(T.No. 2915064 Off. 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).
<b>MAHARASHTRA</b>		17.	M/s. Bookwell, 2/77, Sant Niran- kari Colony, Kingsway Camp, Delhi-110009 (T. No. 7112309)
5.	M/s. Sunderdas Gian Chand, 601, Girguam Road, Near Princess Street, Bombay-400 002	18.	M/s. Rajendra Book Agency, IV-D/50, 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-400 001.	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-400 062.	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, Repre- sentative Accounts & Law Book Sellers, Mohan Kuni, Ground Floor 68, Jyotiba Puele 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-400 001.	23.	M/s. Book India Corporation Publishers, Importers Exporters L-27, Shastri Nagar, Delhi-110052 (T. No. 269631 & 714465)
<b>TAMIL NADU</b>		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, Nungam- bakkam, Madras-600 034 (T. No. 476558).		

©1986 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 Sunlight Printers, Delhi.**