

**COMMITTEE  
ON  
GOVERNMENT ASSURANCES  
(1992-93)**

(TENTH LOK SABHA)

**FIFTEENTH REPORT  
on  
Dropping of Assurances**

*(Presented on 10 December, 1993)*



सत्यमेव जयते

L  
3658R  
NR. 15/4

LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT  
NEW DELHI

*November 8, 1993 / Kartika 17, 1915 (Saka)*

Price : Rs.10.00

**CORRIGENDA  
TO THE**

**FIFTEENTH REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON  
GOVERNMENT ASSURANCES (1992-93)**

**(TENTH LOK SABHA)**

<b>Page</b>	<b>Para No.</b>	<b>Line</b>	<b>For</b>	<b>Read</b>
3	1.13	18	from	form
22	7	6	steps for	step
26	4	5	regalia	regalia
27	5.1	3	IVHFW(11)SQ; 387-LS/92	IV/HFW(11)SQ 387-LS/92

## CONTENTS

	PAGE
COMPOSITION OF THE COMMITTEE (1992-93) .....	(iii)
INTRODUCTION .....	(v)
<b>CHAPTER I</b>	
Request for dropping of assurances (Not accepted and pending)	
(i) Request for dropping of assurance given on May 4, 1992 in reply to Unstarred Question No. 8926 regarding investment in power sector .....	1
(ii) Request for dropping of assurance given on July 20, 1992 in reply to Starred Question No. 1714 regarding steel plant in Orissa .....	3
(iii) Request for dropping of assurance given on July 29, 1992 in reply to Unstarred Question No. 3236 regarding International Sub-contracting Exchange .....	5
<b>CHAPTER II</b>	
Request for dropping of assurances (Not accepted and implemented)	
(i) Request for dropping of assurance given on July 15, 1992 in reply to Unstarred Question No. 1103 regarding speedy disposal of cases in Tribunals .....	7
(ii) Request for dropping of assurance given on July 20, 1992 in reply to Starred Question No. 182 regarding World Bank loan to N.T.P.C. Power Projects .....	9
(iii) Request for dropping of assurance given on August 12, 1992 in reply to Unstarred Question No. 5540 regarding search of residences of officials .....	10
<b>CHAPTER III</b>	
Request for dropping of assurances (Accepted)	
(i) Request for dropping of assurance given on July 8, 1992 in reply to Unstarred Question No. 126 regarding Industrial development of Parbhani and Nanded districts of Maharashtra .....	13
(ii) Request for dropping of assurance given on April 3, 1992 in reply to Starred Question No. 532 regarding Government Expenditure .....	14

(ii)

- (iii) Request for dropping of assurance given on December 9, 1991 in reply to Unstarred Question No. 2965 regarding missing of necklace of ex-maharaja of Baroda ..... 15
- (iv) Request for dropping of assurance given on August 4, 1992 in reply to Starred Question No. 387 regarding Cobalt Therapy Units ..... 17

APPENDICES

Minutes

	PAGE
Minutes of First Sitting held on December 28, 1992 .....	20
Minutes of Second Sitting held on January 21, 1993 .....	25
Minutes of Twelfth Sitting held on November 8, 1993 .....	28

LC  
328.3658 K  
N2.15.4

PARLIAMENT LIBRARY  
Central Govt. Publications  
Acc. No. PC... 7029752  
Date ... 26/8/94

**COMPOSITION OF THE COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT  
ASSURANCES\***  
(1992-93)

**CHAIRMAN**

**Dr. Laxminarain Pandey**

**MEMBERS**

2. Dr. Krupasindhu Bhoi
3. Shri B. Devarajan
4. Smt. Saroj Dubey
5. Shri B.K. Gudadinni
6. Shri Prabhu Dayal Katheria
7. Shri Balin Kuli
8. Shri Manphool Singh
9. Shri Ajoy Mukhopadhyay
10. Shri Surendra Pal Pathak
11. Shrimati Pratibha Devisingh Patil
12. Shri Naval Kishore Rai
13. Dr. D. Venkateshwara Rao
14. Shri A. Prathap Sai
15. Shri Chinmaya Nand Swami

**SECRETARIAT**

Dr. R.C. Bhardwaj	—	<i>Additional Secretary</i>
Shri Murari Lal	—	<i>Joint Secretary</i>
Shri Joginder Singh	—	<i>Deputy Secretary</i>
Shri Ram Autar Ram	—	<i>Under Secretary</i>

---

\* The Committee was nominated by the Speaker w.e.f. 13 December, 1992 vide Para 1596 of Lok Sabha Bulletin — Part-II dated 14.12.992.

## INTRODUCTION

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

2. The Committee (1992-93) were constituted on December 13, 1992.

3. The Committee at their sittings held on December 28, 1992 and January 21, 1993 considered requests (*vide* Memoranda Nos. 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53 and 54) received from the Ministries/ Departments of the Government of India for dropping of pending assurances and their decisions are contained in this Report. The Committee took oral evidence of the Ministry of Planning and Programme Implementation at their sitting held on May 24, 1993 (Memorandum No. 50) regarding educated and uneducated unemployed persons as per 1991 census and adopted a separate Report (Thirteenth Report) on it. At their sitting held on November 8, 1993 the Committee considered and adopted the Draft Fifteenth Report on the rest of the Memoranda.

4. The Minutes of the aforesaid sittings of the Committee form part of the Report (Appendices).

5. The conclusions/observations of the Committee are contained in this Report.

NEW DELHI;  
November 8, 1993  

---

Kartika 17, 1915 (Saka)

DR. LAXMINARAIN PANDEY,  
Chairman,  
Committee on Government Assurances.

## CHAPTER I

(i)

### INVESTMENT IN POWER SECTOR

On May 4, 1992, the following Unstarred Question No. 8926 given notice of by Shri Sriballav Panigrahi, M.P. was addressed to the Minister of Power and Non-Conventional Energy Sources:—

- (a) The application pending with the Government both of Indians and non-Indians for investment in the power sector;
- (b) the time by which a decision is likely to be taken on these applications; and
- (c) the break-up of projects covering thermal, hydel and gas based power projects."

1.1 The Minister of State in the Ministry of Power and Non-Conventional Energy Sources (Shri Kalp Nath Rai) gave the following reply:—

"(a) to (c): While 17 proposals have been received from private entrepreneurs, both Indian and non-Indian, the Central Electricity Authority is presently examining feasibility reports submitted by private entrepreneurs for setting up 2 thermal power projects. A third proposal with regard to the setting up of a lignite based thermal power station is under consideration. The time taken for the decision would depend upon the tying up of various inputs. Break-up of projects is as follows:

Thermal	—	11
Hydel	—	3
Gas	—	3"

1.2 Reply to parts (a) to (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 August 3, 1992.

1.3 The Ministry of Power and Non-Conventional Energy Sources approached the Committee on Government Assurances through the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs *vide* U.O. Note No. III/PNES(35)USQ 8926-LS/92 dated November 18, 1992, to drop the assurance on the grounds indicated below:—

"In reply to part (b) of the question relating to the time by which a decision is likely to be taken on these applications, it has been

indicated that the time taken for the decision would depend upon the tying up of various inputs. The position is as follows:—

1. The tying up of inputs is the responsibility of the project authorities.
2. The submission of applications of proposals is a continuous process. These are examined by CEA as and when received, and project authorities advised from time to time about the action to expedite project clearances and approvals.
3. The Central Electricity Authority appraises the technical and economic feasibility of the project as soon as the requisite inputs/clearances have been tied up.
4. On this account, such a reply if treated as an assurance may continue to be fulfilled in parts at different intervals, thus leaving the assurance always pending fulfilment.”

1.4 The Committee considered the request of the Ministry of Power & Non-Conventional Energy Sources for dropping of the assurance at their sitting held on December 28, 1992.

1.5 The Committee did not agree to the request of the Ministry to drop the assurance. The decision of the Committee was conveyed and it was requested to initiate action to fulfil the assurance.

1.6 The Ministry had sought extension of time up to March 31, 1993.

1.7 The Committee could not visualise the statement made by the Ministry of Power and Non-Conventional Energy Sources that the time taken for arriving at a decision on the 17 proposals would depend upon the tying up of various inputs. The Committee do not appreciate the tendency of the Ministry to get the assurance dropped on the plea that the tying up of inputs is the responsibility of the Project Authorities and the role of the Central Electricity Authority is only to appraise the technical and economic feasibility of the project as soon as the requisite inputs/clearance had been tied up. Instead the Ministry should have diverted their earnest efforts in the right direction to fulfil the assurance.

1.8 The Committee observe that the delay in taking a decision on the 17 proposals is uncalled for. The Committee desire that the extraordinary procedural delays should be avoided and the Government should take immediate steps to arrive at a final decision instead of keeping these proposals pending for years together.

1.9 The Committee note that CEA is examining feasibility reports submitted by the private entrepreneurs, both Indian and non-Indian, for setting up of two Thermal Power Projects. In addition a third proposal for setting up of a lignite based thermal power station is under consideration.

1.10 The Committee deprecate the tendency of not seeking the extension of time before the expiry of time despite their reiteration time and again



about it. The Committee take a serious view of the unduly long delay caused in implementation of the assurance given on the floor of the House.

1.11 The Committee recommend that the matter should be processed with all seriousness and project clearance and approvals might be expedited and disposed of finally and the assurance implemented without any further delay.

(ii)

### STEEL PLANT IN ORISSA

1.12 On July 20, 1992, the following Unstarred Question No. 1714 given notice of by Dr. Kartikeshwar Patra, M.P., was addressed to the Minister of Steel:-

“(a) the total outlay for the establishment of steel plant at Daitari in Orissa;

(b) the shares of the State Government and Dr. Swaraj Paul of the Caparo Group of U.K. and its potential employment generation capacity; and

(c) other relevant details of agreement reached between the State Government and Dr. Swaraj paul?”

1.13 The Minister of State in the Ministry of Steel (Shri Santosh Mohan Dev) gave the following reply:-

“(a) According to the information received from the State Government, the capital cost of the Steel Plant is projected at Rs. 4250/-crores for production of one million tonnes of finished goods per year.

(b) The State Government's participation in equity will be to the extent of Rs. 100 crores which will be provided by way of infra-structure support. The responsibility for raising the remaining portion of the equity as well as the loan rests with the Caparo Group. Details about employment generation are yet to be evaluated.

(c) A Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) was signed on 01.11.1991 between the State Government and Dr. Swaraj Paul of the Caparo Group of the United Kingdom to set up an integrated Steel Plant near Daitari in Orissa. As per the MOU:—

- (i) Kalinga Steels Ltd. is expected to be in the Private Sector with full support from the Government of Orissa.
- (ii) The Caparo Group with its associates, in consultation with the Government of Orissa, will form the Board of Management of Kalinga Steels.
- (iii) Caparo will arrange to evaluate the different technology options.
- (iv) Caparo will arrange a financing package including foreign currency and rupee components.

- (v) Both parties agree to start work on this project immediately. The MOU will be appropriately expanded, modified and detailed into an agreement in due course."

1.14 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 October 19, 1992.

1.15 The Ministry of Steel approached the Committee on Government Assurances through the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs *vide* U.O. Note No. IV/S(2)SQ-1714-LS/92 dated November 16, 1992, to drop the assurance on the grounds indicated below:-

"Except for certain locational restrictions the iron and steel industry has been delicensed under the New Industrial Policy announced in July, 1991. This steel project in Orissa is being set up in pursuance of a Memorandum of Understanding signed between Government of Orissa and Dr. Swaraj Paul of the Caparo Group. The Government of India is, therefore, not directly involved in the implementation of this project, and the response given by this Ministry to the above Unstarred Question was based on information furnished by the State Government."

1.16 The Committee considered the request of the Ministry of Steel for the dropping of the assurance at their sitting held on December 28, 1992.

1.17 The Committee did not agree to drop the assurance and the decision of the Committee was accordingly conveyed to the Ministry for compliance.

1.18 The Ministry had sought extension of time upto July 20, 1993 and thereafter sought further extension of time upto January 20, 1994 on the following grounds:

"This Steel Plant project is being set up in pursuance of a Memorandum of Understanding signed between Government of Orissa and Dr. Swaraj Paul of the Caparo Group. The required details regarding employment generation were, therefore, sought from the Government of Orissa, which has informed that these are yet to be worked out, and will be available only after finalisation of the detailed project Report."

1.19 The Committee note that a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) was signed as back as on November 1, 1991 between the State Government of Orissa and Dr. Swaraj Paul of the Caparo Group of United Kingdom to set up an integrated Steel Plant near Daitari Orissa. State Government's participation in equity will be to the extent of Rs. 100 crores by providing infrastructural support.

1.20 The Committee desire that the Ministry of Steel might take up the matter with the State Government of Orissa sufficiently at higher level and get the project report finalised during the extended period of time and implement the assurance at the earliest by collecting the information from the State Government.

(iii)

#### INTERNATIONAL SUB-CONTRACTING EXCHANGE

1.21 On July 29, 1992, the following Unstarred Question No. 3236 given notice of by Shri K.P. Singh Deo, M.P., was addressed to the Prime Minister:—

- “(a) whether the Government propose to set up an international sub-contracting exchange;
- (b) whether this international sub-contracting exchange is proposed to be set up in collaboration with the United Nations Industrial Development Organisation (UNIDO);
- (c) if so, the main purpose of setting up of this exchange; and
- (d) the time by which it is likely to be set up?”

1.22 The Minister of State in the Ministry of Industry (Shrimati Krishna Sahi) gave the following reply:—

- “(a)&(b) The United Nations Industrial Development Organisation (UNIDO) has proposed to establish a sub-regional Network of Industrial Sub-contracting Exchanges in Asia.
- (c) the main purpose of setting up of this exchange is to enable participating countries to exchange technical and economic information on industrial sub-contracting capabilities and opportunities through a sub-regional sub-contracting system and network.
- (d) A final decision in this regard is still to be taken.”

1.23 Reply to part (d) 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 October 28, 1992.

1.24 The Ministry of Industry approached the Committee on Government Assurances through the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs *vide* U.O. Note No. IV/Ind.(16)USQ-3236-LS/92 dated December 8, 1992, to drop the assurance on the grounds indicated below:—

“that the project related to the establishment of a sub-regional network of industrial sub-contracting exchanges in Asia is presently under revision and is pending with UNIDO authorities. This was also discussed with the UNIDO authorities recently when one of their officers visited India. He has indicated that the revised proposal would be sent to us shortly. However, it would be appreciated that

apart from requesting the UNIDO authorities to expedite the revision of the proposal, we cannot insist on a particular time frame—UNIDO being an independent international organisation. Further, action on this project can be taken only as and when the revised project proposal is received from UNIDO. Thus, it would be a little difficult to ensure that the said assurance is fulfilled within a certain time frame.”

1.25 The Committee considered the request of the Ministry of Industry for the dropping of the assurance at their sitting held on December 28, 1992.

1.26 The Committee did not agree to drop the assurance and the decision of the Committee was accordingly conveyed to the Ministry for compliance.

1.27 The Ministry of Industry sought extension of time upto June 24, 1993 and thereafter upto September 30, 1993. The grounds on which the extensions have been sought are given below:—

“.....as we have yet to get certain clarifications from United Nations Industrial Development Organisation (UNIDO) authorities.”

1.28. The Committee are happy to note that the United Nations Industrial Development Organisation (UNIDO) has proposed to establish a sub-regional Network of Industrial Sub-Contracting exchanges in Asia to enable participating countries to exchange technical and economic information on Industrial Sub-contracting capabilities and opportunities. The Committee further notice that the Ministry have sought certain clarification on the revised project proposal from the UNIDO which is yet to be received from UNIDO. Latter being an independent international organisation, no time frame can be forced upon it to expedite the clarification. The Committee do not find any cogent reasons to drop the assurance. However, the Committee are pleased to grant further extension of minimum time as would be required to implement the assurance. The Committee further hope that the Ministry of Industry will take immediate action for expediting the clarification from the UNIDO and finalising the matter to fulfil the assurance.

## CHAPTER II

(i)

### SPEEDY DISPOSAL OF CASES IN TRIBUNALS

2.0 On July 15, 1992 the following Unstarred Question No. 1103 given notice of by Shri Pawan Kumar Bansal, M.P. was addressed to the Prime Minister:—

- “(a) whether the Government propose to consider the desirability of conducting the appraisal of working of various specialised Tribunals set up in the country particularly those where the writ jurisdiction of the High Court has been excluded;
- (b) if so, the Government’s perspective thereon;
- (c) whether a number of cases have started piling up in such Tribunals; and
- (d) the steps proposed to ensure speedy disposal of cases in the Tribunals?”

2.1 The Minister of State in the Ministry of Personnel, Public Grievances and Pensions (Shrimati Margaret Alva) gave the following reply:—

- (a) & (b) There is no proposal to conduct any joint appraisal of working of the various Tribunals as these Tribunals are working under various Ministries of Government of India and the State Governments.
- (c) No centralised figures of arrears for the various Tribunals are available in this Ministry. However, the position of institution, disposal and pendency of cases during the last three years in the Central Administrative Tribunal which is monitored by this Ministry is as under:—

	Instituted	Disposed of	Pending
Upto 31-12-1989	83170	51586	31584
Upto 31-12-90	101120	65663	35457
Upto 31-12-91	122971	83241	39730

(d) Various measures to speed up the disposal of cases, are *under consideration* of the Central Government including increasing the number of benches the Tribunal monitoring pendency of cases and filling up the vacant posts of Vice-Chairman and Members at the earliest."

2.2 Reply to part (d) 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 October 14, 1992.

2.3 The Ministry of Personnel, Public Grievances and Pensions approached the Committee on Government Assurances through the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs *vide* U.O. Note No. IV/PPGP(1) U.Q.1103-LS/92 dated September 21, 1992, to drop the assurance on the grounds indicated below:—

"While replying to part (d) of the question, the factual position was indicated and it was not the intention of the Department to give an assurance to the House. It may also be stated that since CAT is an autonomous judicial body, the Department does not have actual control over their disposal of cases except monitoring pendency of cases from time to time. In view of the above, it is requested that the reply to part (d) of the question may not be treated as an assurance and dropped out from the list of assurance."

2.4 The Committee considered the request of the Ministry of Personnel, Public Grievances and Pensions for the dropping of the assurance at their sitting held on December 28, 1992.

2.5 The Committee did not agree to drop the assurance.

2.6 The decision of the Committee was accordingly conveyed to the Ministry for compliance.

2.7 Subsequently, the Ministry fulfilled the assurance by laying an implementation report on the Table of the Lok Sabha on February 26, 1993 *vide* SS IV, Item No. 72. The implementation report furnished reads as follows:—

"Government has considered the issue of setting up of three Additional Benches at Chandigarh, Jabalpur and Calcutta and a new Bench at Nagpur and taken a view that in view of the present financial constraints, it will not be possible to set up any Additional Benches. Steps have been taken to fill up the posts of Vice-Chairman/Members taking into account the existing vacancies as well as the vacancies likely to arise upto 31.5.1993."

2.8 The Committee have taken notice of the implementation report. The Committee however do not appreciate the undesirable steps to get the

assurance dropped from the Committee. The Committee feel that the Ministry have preferred to adopt an easy approach rather than making sincere efforts to fulfil the assurance.

2.9 The Committee need not to reiterate that the Ministry should make all possible efforts first to fulfil the assurance and they should approach the Committee with the dropping request when there is any genuine difficulty in implementation of the assurance given on the floor of the House.

(ii)

#### WORLD BANK LOAN TO N.T.P.C. POWER PROJECTS

2.10 On July 20, 1992, the following starred Question No. 182 given notice of by Shri Rabi Ray, M.P., was addressed to the Minister of Power:—

“(a) whether a high level World Bank team visited India in June, 1992 to negotiate a World Bank loan to be disbursed to finance NTPC power projects in India; and

(b) if so, the details of the projects identified by the World Bank team for financing?”

2.11 The Minister of State in the Ministry of Power (Shri Kalp Nath Rai) gave the following reply:—

“(a)&(b) Discussions are being held with the World Bank regarding the funding of new power projects of NTPC and in this connection World Bank officials had visited India in June, 1992. *The projects to be funded are yet to be decided.*”

2.12. Reply to 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 October 19, 1992.

2.13 The Ministry of Power approached the Committee on Government Assurances through the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs *vide* their U.O. Note No. IV/PNES (3) SQ 182-LS/92 dated September 25, 1992, to drop the assurance on the grounds indicated below:—

“That before tying up a project with the World Bank for funding, certain predefined steps like pre-appraisal, appraisal of the project, etc., are usually done and until the project is cleared by the Board of the Bank, it is not presumed that the same has been tied up for funding with the World Bank. The World Bank is currently discussing with the Government of India certain structural and financial improvements in the power sector and the future funding of the Bank in this sector depends upon adherence to various conditions and line of action stipulated by the Bank. Therefore, power projects that would receive World Bank assistance cannot be identified till all the issues with the Bank are settled. Secondly, it would be difficult

at this stage to hazard a guess as to the time that would be taken to identify a project for Bank's funding, since the entire procedure depends upon the Bank being satisfied with the response/commitment of the Government of India."

2.14 The Committee considered the request of the Ministry of Power for the dropping of the assurance at their sitting held on December 28, 1992.

2.15 The Committee did not agree to drop the assurance and the decision of the Committee was accordingly conveyed to the Ministry for compliance.

2.16 Subsequently, the Ministry fulfilled the assurance by laying an implementation report on the Table of the Lok Sabha on April 28, 1993 *vide* SS No.V/Item No. 56. The implementation report furnished reads as followed:—

"(a) & (b): Discussions are being held with the World Bank for seeking financial assistance for NTPC under a 'Time Slice' arrangement for its various projects and for the Powergrid Cooperation of India for certain transmission lines. Since under the time slice arrangement, there is flexibility in the list of projects, for which financing could be utilised, project selections would, *inter-alia*, depend on readiness in terms of clearances etc. available."

2.17 The Committee take notice of the Implementation Report and are satisfied with the Progress made in the matter. The Committee, however, do not appreciate the easy approach adopted by the Ministry of Power for getting the assurance dropped. The Committee observe that such issue in which International Organisations are involved, the matter should not be taken lightly and the Parliament should be kept well informed by stating the progress made in the matter in the form of Implementation Report as has been done in the present case.

(iii)

#### SEARCH OF RESIDENCE OF OFFICIALS

2.18 On August 12, 1992, the following Unstarred Question No. 5540 given notice of by Dr. Laxminarain Pandey, M.P., was addressed to the Prime Minister:—

- "(a) The number of All India Services Officials whose residence/offices were searched during 1991-92 till date by the CBI, year-wise,
- (b) the number of officials who were prosecuted, year-wise; and
- (c) the action taken against the erring officials?"



2.19 The Minister of State in the Ministry of Personnel, Public Grievances and Pensions (Shrimati Margaret Alva) gave the following reply:—

“(a) The number of All India Services Officials whose residence/offices were searched during 1991-92 till date by the CBI is as follows:-  
1991 - 4  
1992 - 1

“(b)&(c) CBI has registered cases against erring officials and law will take its own course.”

2.20 Reply to parts (b) & (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 November 11, 1992.

2.21 The Ministry of Personnel, Public Grievances and Pensions approached the Committee on Government Assurances through the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs *vide* their U.O. Note No. IV/PPGP/(13)USQ 5540-LS/92 dated December 9, 1992, to drop the assurance on the grounds indicated below:—

“It may be pertinent to mention that the last part of above reply *i.e.* “The law will take its own course” is a mere statement of factual position with regard to the further processing of the matter involved in the cases under reference. Moreover, once an FIR as to the Commission of a cognizable offences (RC) has been registered by CBI or by the Station House Officer incharge of any Police Station for that matter, in accordance with the provisions of Section 154 of the Criminal Procedure Code, further processing of entire case pertaining to the subject matter/offence in question, has to be dealt with only in accordance with the procedures as laid down in the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973. After investigations are complete and the truth of the matter has been found out a report on completion of investigation will have to be filed by the officer incharge of the police station in the Court of the Magistrate of Competent jurisdiction, as prescribed under section 173 Cr.P.C. and thereafter is for that Court to take further action in the matter, again in accordance with the procedures pertaining to the trial of the cases/offences, as laid down in the Cr.P.C. as may be seen from the position as explained above, there is no other alternative for any investigation agency except to act in accordance with the established procedures as laid down in the Code of Criminal Procedures, 1973.”

2.22 The Committee considered the request of the Ministry of Personnel, Public Grievances and Pensions for the dropping of the assurance at their sitting held on December 28, 1992.

2.23 The Committee did not agree to drop the assurance and the decision of the Committee was accordingly conveyed to the Ministry for compliance.

2.24 Subsequently, the Ministry fulfilled the assurance by laying an implementation report on the Table of the Lok Sabha on August 26, 1993 SS No. VIII/Item No. 15. The implementation report reads as follows:—

“As Government have already informed the Lok Sabha *Vide* their reply to the Unstarred Question under reference, we do not have any further information to be shared, except that in one case the CBI has completed the investigation and recommended to Government sanction of prosecution of the officer concerned and in another case field investigations have just been completed by the CBI.”

2.25 The Committee note that the Ministry has taken full one year to implement a pending assurance regarding search of residences of All India Services Officials during 1991-92. The Committee cannot but deprecate the tendency of the Ministry of Personnel and Public Grievances for approaching the Committee to drop the assurance on account of procedural delays. The Government should not make it a general practice first to give an assurance and then try to get it dropped. The request for dropping of assurance should be made to the Committee only in such cases where no other alternative is left with the Government and that the Government is not in a position to have the drill completed.

2.26 The Committee hope that Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs will guide the Ministries/Department of the Government of India in the matter and advise them not to make requests too frequently for dropping the assurance. Such requests should be made only when it is absolutely necessary.

## CHAPTER III

### (I)

#### INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT OF PARBHANI AND NANDED DISTRICTS OF MAHARASHTRA

3.0 On July 8, 1992 the following Unstarred Question No. 126 given notice of by Shri Vilasrao Nagnathrao Gundewar, M.P. was addressed to the Prime Minister:—

“(a) the steps taken for the industrial development of Parbhani and Nanded districts of Maharashtra;

(b) whether the Union Government have set up any industry at Parbhani and Nanded districts of Maharashtra so far;

(c) whether the proposals for the setting up of industries in Maharashtra specially in the surrounding districts of Parbhani and Nanded are pending with the Union Government; and

(d) if so, the details thereof and action taken by the Government on these proposals?”

3.1 The Minister of State in the Ministry of Industry (Shrimati Krishna Sahi) gave the following reply:—

(a) to (d): “Industrialisation of a district/area is primarily the responsibility of the State Governments concerned. The Central Government supplement their efforts wherever possible. In order to bring about dispersal of industries, the Central Government have sanctioned a growth centre in Nanded under the Growth Centre Scheme, the project report of which is under appraisal. The growth centre would be provided with all basic infrastructural facilities.

During the period January, 1989 to May, 1992, 8 letters of intent were issued for Parbhani district and 11 for Nanded. As on 31.5.1992, 10 applications for industrial licence in respect of Parbhani district and 14 applications in respect of Nanded were pending consideration by the Central Government.”

3.2 Reply to 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 October 7, 1992.

3.3 On September 21, 1992, the Ministry of Industry approached the Committee on Government Assurances through the Ministry of

Parliamentary Affairs *vide* their U.O. Note No.IV/Ind. (3) USQ 126-LS/92 dated September 21, 1992, to drop the assurance on the grounds indicated below:—

“In reply, it was *inter-alia* stated that during this period 10 applications for Industrial Licences for Parbhani District and 14 applications for Nanded District were pending consideration.....

..It is clear from the above that the Hon'ble M.P. had desired to know the pendency position for these districts which have been stated in the reply. No further clarification/supplementary in respect of the question asked for by the M.P. is required to be given. In view of this, the reply to the question may be treated as complete and the assurance may kindly be deleted from the list of assurances pending with the Department of Industrial Development.”

3.4 The Committee considered the request of the Ministry of Industry for dropping of the assurance at their sitting held on December 28, 1992.

3.5 The Committee have decided to drop the assurance.

(II)

#### GOVERNMENT EXPENDITURE ON VINTAGE CAR RALLIES

3.6 On April 3, 1992, the following Starred Question No. 532 given notice of by Shri Mrutyunjaya Nayak, M.P., was addressed to the Minister of Finance:—

“(a) whether all the Ministries have been asked to review their expenditure control system;

(b) if so, whether all the Ministries have done so and submitted their reports;

(c) if so, the broad details thereof; and

(d) the steps being taken by the Government on the basis of these reports to further curtail the Government expenditure?

3.7 The Minister of State in the Ministry of Finance (Shri Shantaram Potdukhe) gave the following reply:—

(a) to (d): “There is a well established system for expenditure control in Government of India. Under this, the expenditure of each Ministry is controlled and reviewed by the concerned Financial Adviser on a regular basis. The overall budgetary position is reviewed by the Ministry of Finance on the basis of data received from Reserve Bank and the monthly accounts rendered by the Controller General of Accounts. Apart from close monitoring of expenditure by the financial Advisers, Government have issued a number of economy instructions to curtail expenditure. Ministries have also been advised to review all their schemes and prioritise them so that schemes of low priority can be eliminated. This will be continuous process.”

3.8 During the course of supplementaries of the Question, Shri Indrajit Gupta, M.P. drew attention of the Government to the oil crisis and the need for conservation of energy, etc. by stopping vintage car rallies being held every year.

3.9 In the reply, the Minister of State in the Ministry of Finance (Shri Shantaram Potdukhe) stated as follows:—

“I agree with the suggestion given by a very senior Member of this House. I may mention here that this rally is being conducted as a sports event and private organisations are involved in it. The suggestion of the Hon'ble Member is very well taken.”

3.10 Reply to the point raised during supplementaries on 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 July 2, 1992.

3.11 On September 28, 1992, the Ministry of Finance approached the Committee on Government Assurances through the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs *vide* their U.O. Note No.III/Fin. (59) SQ 532-LS/92 dated September 28, 1992, to drop the assurance on the grounds indicated below:—

“that this rally is being conducted as a sports event and private organisations are involved in it.”

3.12 The Committee considered the request of the Ministry of Finance for dropping of the assurance at their sitting held on January 21, 1993.

**3.13 The Committee have decided to drop the assurance.**

(iii)

#### MISSING OF NECKLACE OF EX-MAHARAJA OF BARODA

3.14 On December 9, 1991, the following Unstarred Question No.2965 given notice of by Shri Mohan Singh, M.P. was addressed to the Minister of Home Affairs:—

(a) whether the seven-strand pearl necklace of the Ex-Maharaja of Baroda is included in the list of regalia items;

(b) whether the historical necklace with all its seven strands is now within the country; and

(c) if not, when the missing strands were sold and other detail regarding its disposal?”

3.15 The Minister of State in the Ministry of Home Affairs (Shri M.M. Jacob) gave the following reply:—

“(a) The Government of India in the White Paper published in 1950 had stated *inter-alia* that in a large number of cases ancestral jewellery has been treated as heirloom to be preserved for the

ruling family. In the case of states having valuable ragalia, such articles are to remain in the custody of the Ruler for use on ceremonial occasions and they will be subject to periodical inspection by the Government concerned.

(b) & (c): Information is being collected and will be laid on the Table of the House."

3.16 Reply to parts (b) & (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 March 8, 1992.

3.17 On January 8, 1993, the Ministry of Home Affairs approached the Committee on Government Assurances through the Department of Parliamentary Affairs *vide* their U.O. Note No. II/HA(39)USQ-3965-LS/91 dated January 8, 1993 to drop the assurance on the grounds indicated below:—

".....At the time of merger of the erstwhile princely States with the Union of India, the property of the ex-rulers were divided into (i) Private property, and (ii) State Property. The Private property went to the ruler concerned and the state property to the State Government concerned. In so far as heirloom and regalia items were concerned, they were allowed to remain in the custody of ex-rulers for use on ceremonial occasions and these were subject to periodical inspection by the State Government concerned. The Constitution (26th Amendment) Act, 1971 came into force on 28.12.1971. As a consequence, the persons who had been recognised as rulers by the President ceased to be so recognised with effect from that date. This Ministry issued letter on 28.10.1972 to the Chief Secretaries of the State Governments wherein the following instructions were conveyed regarding regalia/heirloom items:—

"As regards items of regalia which were declared as state properties but were allowed to be retained by the Rulers for use on ceremonial occasions subject to inspection by the authorities concerned, the position is that after the commencement of the Constitution (Twenty-Sixth Amendment) Act, 1971, official recognition of the rulership has been withdrawn and there appears no need for the display of these regalia. The State Government may, therefore, consider asking the former Rulers concerned to return the items of regalia which are State properties but are with the former Rulers."

It would thus be clear that only the State Governments were to take necessary action with regard to regalia items.

Immediately after giving the Assurance, we have taken up the matter with the State Government of Gujarat who have informed us on 18.5.1992 that "efforts have been made to obtain required

information through Collector, Baroda. The Collector has informed that Shri Ranjitsingh Gaikwad who was approached to obtain information in this respect has informed that he is corresponding directly with the Government of India and as the matter is confidential he will not be able to give details of the correspondence to the Collector's Office." Shri Gaikwad had never written any letter to the Central Govt. nor did the Central Government write any letter to him in this respect directly. The State Government were again advised to investigate the matter and forward facts to us. It was impressed upon the State Government that they were to periodically inspect the regalia items and also advised to consider asking the former rulers concerned to return the items of regalia in our letter dated 28.10.1972. Several reminders were issued to the State Govt. for obtaining the information but to no avail. The State Govt. were reminded on 22.7.1992, 28.8.1992, 4.9.1992, 14.9.1992, 15.10.1992 and 19.11.1992.

It would thus be observed from the foregoing that the descendant of the ex-ruler of Baroda is now an ordinary citizen of this country who is responsible for his acts of omissions and commission under the laws of the Land. The subject matter of the question primarily concern the State Govt. of Gujarat. We have made the best effort to obtain the information from the State Government of Gujarat but met with no results."

3.18 The Committee considered request of the Ministry of Home Affairs for dropping of the assurance at their sitting held on January 21, 1993.

3.19 The Committee have decided to drop the assurance not to pursue the matter.

(iv)

#### COBALT THERAPY UNITS

3.20 On August 4, 1992, the following Starred Question No. 387 given notice of by Shrimati Geeta Mukherjee, M.P., was addressed to the Minister of Health and Family Welfare:—

“(a) whether the hospitals and the Regional Cancer Centres having Cobalt Therapy Units have adequate facilities and trained/qualified medical and para-medical personnel to handle such units;

(b) if not, the remedial steps proposed to be taken in this regard;

(c) whether there is a dearth of such units and shortage of technical staff to man the radio-therapy department in Lok Nayak Jayaprakash Narain Hospital, Delhi, affecting the cancer treatment; and

(d) if so, the steps taken in this regard?”

3.21 The Minister of Health and Family Welfare (Shri M.L. Fotedar) gave the following reply:—

“(a) & (b) : Department of Atomic Energy ensures that there are adequate facilities and enough qualified medical and para-medical personnel to handle cobalt therapy units in hospitals and Regional Cancer Centres.

(c) & (d) : Lok Nayak Jai Prakash Narain Hospital, Delhi has two tele-cobalt units with adequate trained medical and para-medical personnel to man those units. However, as the number of patients are on the increase, some times shortage of tele-therapy units is felt. Delhi Administration have intimated that the situation would improve to a large extent when the radio-therapy Department in Guru Tegh Bahadur Hospital, Shahdara becomes functional.”

3.22 During the course of supplementaries on the question, Shri Chottey Singh Yadav, M.P. raised a point to know as to which part/area of India have the largest number of cancer patients and whether any Cobalt Therapy Unit/Cancer Cell is there?

3.23 In the reply to the above question, the Minister of Health and Family Welfare promised him to furnish the information and also gave the following information in reply:—

“XXX I will give him the information. I may tell the hon'ble Member that there are about 1.5 million to 2 million cancer patients in the country. Every year, there is an addition of about five lakh cancer patients in the country.....There are, I think, about 182 Cobalt Units in the country. In the developed countries, for about one million population, they have one Cobalt Unit. Here, if we have to have the same thing, then it must be 800 or 900 units that we should have. But so far as India is concerned, we have calculated that we must have one Cobalt Unit per three-million population. So, we require minimum of 300 Cobalt Units. I have told you that due to constraints of funds, we will not be able to do that in the foreseeable future.

3.24 Reply to supplementary points raised on 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 November 3, 1992.

3.25 On December 22, 1992, the Ministry of Health and Family Welfare approached the Committee on Government Assurances through the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs *vide* their U.O. Note No. IV/HFW (11)SQ-387-LS/92 dated December 22, 1992 to drop the assurance on the grounds indicated below:—

“that it appears from the copy of the record of discussions received in this respect that the assurance does not appear to have been given by the Minister.”



3.26 The Committee considered the request of the Ministry of Health and Family Welfare for dropping of the assurance at their sitting held on January 21, 1993.

3.27 In view of the reply of the Minister the Committee have decided to drop the assurance.

NEW DELHI;  
*November 8, 1993*  

---

*Kartika 17, 1915 (Saka)*

DR. LAXMINARAIN PANDEY  
*Chairman,*  
*Committee on Government Assurances.*

## APPENDICES

(Vide para No. 4 of the Introduction)

### MINUTES

#### First Sitting

*The Minutes of the sitting of the Committee on Government Assurance held on December 28, 1992 in Committee Room 'C', Parliament House Annexe, New Delhi.*

The Committee met on Monday, December 28, 1992 from 12.00 hours to 13.00 hours.

### PRESENT

Dr. Laxminarain Pandey — *Chairman*

### MEMBERS

2. Dr. Krupasindhu Bhoi
3. Shri B. Devarajan
4. Smt. Saroj Dubey
5. Shri B.K. Gudadinni
6. Shri Prabhu Dayal Katheria
7. Shri Balin Kuli
8. Shri Surendra Pal Pathak
9. Shri Nawal Kishore Rai
10. Shri Chinmaya Nand Swami

### SECRETARIAT

Shri Joginder Singh — *Deputy Secretary*

2. At the outset, the Chairman welcomed the Members, especially those who had been nominated to the Committee for the first time. Thereafter, he gave a brief account of the working of the Committee and the work done by the Committee in the last year (Annexure).

3. The Committee then took up for consideration of the following Memoranda Nos. 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50 and 51.

Memorandum No. 44 : *Request for dropping of the assurance given on May 4, 1992 in reply to Unstarred Question No. 8926 regarding investment in Power Sector.*

4. The Committee considered the request of the Ministry of Power and Non-Conventional Energy Sources received through the Ministry of

Parliamentary Affairs *vide* their U.O. Note No. III/PNES (35) USQ 8926-LS/92 dated 18.11.92 for the dropping of the assurance on the following grounds:

“In reply to part (b) of the question relating to the time by which a decision is likely to be taken on these applications, it has been indicated that the *time taken for the decision would depend upon the tying up of various inputs*. The position is as follows:

1. The tying up of inputs is the responsibility of the project authorities.
2. The submission of applications or proposals is a continuous process. These are examined by CEA as and when received, and project authorities advised from time to time about the action to expedite project clearance and approvals.
3. The Central Electricity Authority appraises the technical and economic feasibility of the project as soon as the requisite inputs/clearances have been tied up.
4. On this account, such a reply if treated as an assurance may continue to be fulfilled in parts at different intervals, thus leaving the assurance always pending fulfilment.”

4.1 The Committee decided not to accede to the request of the Ministry of Power and Non-Conventional Energy Sources.

**MEMORANDUM NO. 45 :** *Request for dropping of the assurance given on July 8, 1992 in reply to Unstarred Question No. 126 regarding Industrial Development of Parbhani and Nanded Districts of Maharashtra.*

5. The Committee considered the request of the Ministry of Industry received through the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs *vide* their U.O. No. IV/Ind.(3) USQ 126-LS/92 dated September 21, 1992 for the dropping of the assurance on the following grounds:

“In reply, it was *inter-alia* stated that during this period 10 applications for industrial licences for Parbhani District and 14 Applications for Nanded District were pending consideration.....

It is clear from the above that the Hon'ble M.P. had desired to know the pendency position for these districts which have been stated in the reply. No further clarification/supplementary in respect of the question asked for by the M.P. is required to be given. In view of this, the reply to the question may be treated as complete and the assurance may kindly

be deleted from the list of assurance pending with the Department of Industrial Development.”

5.1 The Committee decided to drop the assurance.

**MEMORANDUM NO. 46 :** *Request for dropping of the assurance given on July 15, 1992 in reply to Unstarred Question No. 1103 regarding speedy disposal of cases in Tribunals.*

6. The Committee considered the request of the Ministry of Personnel, Public Grievances and Pensions received through the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs *vide* their U.O. Note No. IV/PPGP(5) USQ. 1103-LS/92 dated 21.9.92 for the dropping of the assurance on the following grounds:

“While replying to part (d) of the question, the factual position was indicated and it was not the intention of the Department to give an Assurance to the House. It may be stated that since CAT is an autonomous judicial body, the Department does not have actual control over their disposal of cases except monitoring pendency of cases from time to time. In view of the above, it is requested that the reply to part (d) of the question may not be treated as an assurance and dropped out from the list of assurances.”

6.1 The Committee did not agree to drop the assurance.

**MEMORANDUM NO. 47:** *Request for dropping of the assurance given on July 20, 1992 in reply to Starred Question No. 182 regarding World Bank Loan to N.T.P.C. Power Projects.*

7. The Committee considered the request of the Ministry of Power received through the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs *vide* their U.O. Note No. IV/PNES (3) SQ 182-LS/92 dated September 25, 1992 for the dropping of the assurance on the following grounds:

“that before tying up a project with the World Bank for funding, certain predefined steps for like-pre-appraisal, appraisal of the project etc., are usually done and until the project is cleared by the Board of the Bank, it is not presumed that the same has been tied up for funding with the World Bank. The World Bank is currently discussing with the Government of India certain structural and financial improvements in the owner sector and the future funding of the Bank in this sector depends upon adherence to various conditions and line of action stipulated by the Bank. Therefore, power projects that would receive World Bank assistance can not be identified till all the issues with the bank are settled. Secondly, it would be difficult at this stage to hazard a guess as to the time that would be taken to identify a project for Bank's funding, since the entire procedure/depends upon the bank being satisfied with the response/commitment of the Government of India.”

7.1 Considering the importance of the issue the Committee decided not to drop the assurance.

**MEMORANDUM NO. 48:** *Request for dropping of the assurance given on July 20, 1992 in reply to Unstarred Question No. 1714 regarding Steel Plant in Orissa.*

8. The Committee considered the request of the Ministry of Steel received through the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs *vide* their U.O. Note No. IV/S(2) USQ 1714-LS/92 dated November 16, 1992 for the dropping of the assurance on the following grounds:

“Except for certain locational restrictions the iron and steel industry has been delicensed under the New Industrial Policy announced in July, 1991. This steel project in Orissa is being set up in pursuance of a Memorandum of Understanding signed between Government of Orissa and Dr. Swraj Paul of the Caparo Group. The Government of India is, therefore, not directly involved in the implementation of this project, and the response given by this Ministry to the above Unstarred Question was based on information furnished by the State Government”.

8.1 The Committee did not agree to the request for dropping the assurance and decided to grant extension of time up to January 20, 1993 to implement the assurance.

**MEMORANDUM NO. 49:** *Request for dropping of the assurance given on July 29, 1992, in reply to Unstarred Question No. 3236 regarding International Sub-contracting Exchange.*

9. The Committee considered the request of the Ministry of Industry received through the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs *vide* their U.O. Note No. IV/Ind. (16) USQ 3236-LS/92 dated December 8, 1992 for the dropping of the assurance on the following grounds:

“that the project related to the establishment of a sub-regional network of industrial sub-contracting exchanges in Asia is presently under revision and is pending with UNIDO authorities. This was also discussed with the UNIDO authorities recently when one of their officers visited India. He has indicated that the revised proposal would be sent to us shortly. However, it would be appreciated that apart from requesting the UNIDO authorities to expedite the revision of the proposal, we can not insist on a particular time frame—UNIDO being an independent international organisation. Further, action on this project can be taken only as and when the revised project proposal is received from UNIDO. Thus, it would be a little difficult to ensure that the said assurance is fulfilled within a certain time frame.”

9.1 In view of the categorical reply given to part (d) of the Question, The Committee decided not to drop the assurance and decided to pursue the same.

**MEMORANDUM NO. 51:** *Request for dropping of assurance given on August 12, 1992, in reply to Unstarred Question No. 5540 regarding search of Residence of Officials.*

11. The Committee considered the request of the Ministry of Personnel, Public Grievances and Pensions receive through the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs vide their U.O. Note No. IV/PPGP (13) USQ 5540-LS/92 dated December 9, 1992 for the dropping of the assurance on the following grounds:

"It may be pertinent to mention that the last part of above reply i.e. "the law will take its own course" is a mere statement of factual position with regard to the further processing of the matter involved in the cases under processing. Moreover, once an FIR as to the Commission of the cognizable offences (RC) has been registered by CBI or by the Station House Officer incharge of any Police Station for that matter, in accordance with the provisions of Section 154 of the Criminal Procedure Code, further processing of entire case pertaining to the subject matter/offence in question, has to be dealt with only in accordance with the procedures as laid down in the Code of Criminal Procedure 1973. After investigations are complete and the truth of the matter has been found out a report on completion of investigation will have to be filed by the officer incharge of the police station in the Court of Magistrate of Competent jurisdiction, as prescribed under Section 173 Cr. P.C. and thereafter it is for that court to take further action in the matter, again in accordance with the procedures pertaining to the trial of the cases/offences, as laid down in the Cr. P.C. As may be seen from the position as explained above, there is no other alternative for any investigation agency except to act in accordance with the established procedures as laid down in the Code of Criminal Procedures, 1973."

11.1 The Committee decided not to drop the assurance straight away and desired that the Ministry of Personnel, Public Grievances and Pensions should obtain more details, on the subject.

12. The Committee decided to undertake an on-the-spot visit to Hyderabad, Visakhapatnam/Bhubaneshwar (either of the two places), Raipur and Nagpur during the first-second week of February, 1993.

13. The Committee then adjourned to meet again on January 21, 1993.

## MINUTES

### Second Sitting

*Minutes of the Committee on Government Assurances held on Thursday, January 21, 1993 in Committee Room 'D' Parliament House Annexe, New Delhi.*

The Committee met on Thursday, January 21, 1993 from 14.00 hours to 14.45 hours.

### PRESENT

Dr. Laxminarain Pandey — *Chairman*

#### MEMBERS

2. Dr. Krupasindhu Bhoi
3. Shri B. Devarajan
4. Smt. Saroj Dubey
5. Shri B.K. Gudadinni
6. Shri Prabhu Dayal Katheria
7. Shri Manphool Singh
8. Shri Ajoy Mukhopadhyay
9. Shri Surendra Pal Pathak
10. Shri Chinmaya Nand Swami

#### SECRETARIAT

1. Shri Murari Lal — *Director*
2. Shri Joginder Singh — *Deputy Secretary*
3. Shri K.K. Ganguly — *Under Secretary*

2. The Committee considered and adopted their Ninth Report with the following modification:—

In para 1.25 at the end of line 6, *add* "The displeasure of the Committee should also be conveyed to the Ministry of Finance for delay in forwarding their comments in this regard."

3. Thereafter, the Committee took up for consideration Memoranda Nos. 52, 53 and 54 for dropping of assurances.

**MEMORANDUM NO. 52:** *Request for dropping of the assurance given on April 3, 1992, in reply to Starred Question No. 532 regarding Government expenditure.*

3.1 The Committee considered the request of the Ministry of Finance received through the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs *vide* their U.O. Note No. III/Fin(59) SQ. 532-LS/92 dated 28.9.92 for the dropping of the assurance on the following grounds:-

“That this rally is being conducted as a sports even and private organisations are involved in it.”

3.2 The Committee decided to drop the assurance.

**MEMORANDUM NO. 53:** *Request for dropping of the assurance given on December, 9, 1991, in reply to Unstarred Question No. 2965 regarding missing of necklace of Ex-Maharaja of Baroda.*

4. The Committee considered the request of the Ministry of Home Affairs received through the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs *vide* their U.O. Note No. II/HA(39) USQ. 2965-LS/91 dated 8.1.93 for the dropping of the assurance on the following grounds:

“At the time of merger of the erstwhile princely States with the Union of India, the property of the ex-rulers were divided into (i) Private property, and (ii) State Property. The Private property went to the ruler concerned and the State property to the State Government concerned. In so far as heirloom and regalia items were concerned, they were allowed to remain in the custody of ex-ruler for use on ceremonial occasions and these were subject to periodical inspection by the State Government concerned. The Constitution (26th Amendment) Act, 1971 came into force on 28.12.1971. As a consequence, the persons who had been recognised as rulers by the President ceased to be so recognised with effect from that date. This Ministry issued a letter on 28.10.1972 to the Chief Secretaries of the State Governments wherein the following instructions were conveyed regarding regalia/heirloom items:—

‘As regards items of regalia which were declared as State properties but were allowed to be retained by the Rulers for use on ceremonial occasions subject to inspection by authorities concerned, the position is that after the commencement of the constitution (Twenty-Sixth) Amendment Act, 1971, official recognition of the rulership has been withdrawn and there appears no need for the display of these regalia. The State Government may, therefore, consider asking the former Rulers concerned to return the items of regalia which are State properties but are with the former rulers.’

It would thus be clear that only the State Governments were to take necessary action with regard to regalia items.

Immediately after giving the Assurance, we have taken up the matter with the State Government of Gujarat who have informed us on 18.5.1992



that "efforts have been made to obtain required information through Collector, Baroda. The Collector has informed that Shri Ranjit Singh Gaikwad who was approached to obtain information in this respect has informed that he is corresponding directly with the Government of India and as the matter is confidential he will not be able to give details of the correspondence to the collector's Office. "Shri Gaikwad had never written any letter to the Central Government nor did the Central Govt. write any letter to him in this respect directly. The State Government were again advised to investigate the matter and forward facts to us. It was impressed upon the State Government that they were to periodically inspect the regalia items and also advised to consider asking the former rulers concerned to return the items of regalia in our letter dated 28.10.1972. Several reminders were issued to the State Govt. for obtaining the information but to no avail. The State Govt. were reminded on 22.7.1992, 25.8.1992, 4.9.1992, 14.10.1992, 15.10.92 and 19.11.1992.

It would thus be observed from the foregoing that the descendant of the ex-ruler of Baroda is now an ordinary citizen of this country who is responsible for his acts of omissions and commission under the laws of land. The subject matter of the Question primarily concern the State Govt. of Gujarat. We have made the best effort to obtain the information from the State Government of Gujarat but met with no results."

4.2 The Committee decided to drop the assurance as it is primarily the concern of State Government.

*MEMORANDUM NO. 54: Request for dropping of the assurance given on August 4, 1992 - in reply to Starred Question No. 387 regarding Cobalt therapy units.*

5.1 The Committee considered the request of the Ministry of Health and Family Welfare received through the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs vide their U.O. Note No. IVHFW(II)SQ. 387-LS/92 dated 22.12.92 for the dropping of the assurance on the following grounds:

"that it appears from the copy of the record of discussions received in this respect that the assurance does not appear to have been given by the Minister."

5.2 The Committee decided not to pursue and dropped the assurance in view of the statement of the Minister.

6. The Committee approved their revised tour programme finally to visit only 3 places, namely Hyderabad, Visakhapatnam and Bubhaneshwar and decided to visit Nagpur and Raipur later on.

*The Committee then adjourned.*

## MINUTES

### Twelfth Sitting

*Minutes of the sitting of the Committee on Government Assurances held on November 8, 1993 in Committee Room No, 62, Parliament House, New Delhi.*

The Committee met on Monday, November 8, 1993 from 15.00 hours to 16.00 hours.

#### PRESENT

Dr. Laxminarain Pandey — *Chairman*

#### MEMBERS

2. Shri B.Devarajan
3. Shri B.K. Gudadinni
4. Shri Balin Kuli
5. Shri Ajoy Mukhopadhyay
6. Shri Surendra Pal Pathak
7. Smt. Pratibha Devi Singh Patil
8. Shri Naval Kishore Rai

#### SECRETARIAT

Shri Joginder Singh — *Deputy Secretary*

Shri Ram Autar Ram — *Under Secretary*

\*\*\*

\*\*\*

\*\*\*

11. the Committee took up for consideration their draft Fifteenth Report and adopted the same for being presented to the House.

12. The Committee decided to hold the next sitting on November 30, 1993 at 11.00 A.M. or any day during the first week of December, 1993 as may be decided by the Chairman.

*The Committee then adjourned.*

---

---

© 1993 BY LOK SABHA SECRETARIET

Published Under Rule 382 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in Lok Sabha (Seventh Session) and printed by Manager P.L. Unit, Government of India Press, Minto Road, New Delhi.

---

---