

**COMMITTEE  
ON  
GOVERNMENT ASSURANCES  
(1988-89)**

**( EIGHTH LOK SABHA )**

**FOURTEENTH REPORT**

*(Presented on*      **30 NOV 1988**



सत्यमेव जयते

**LOK      SABHA      SECRETARIAT  
NEW DELHI**

*11 October, 1988/19 Asvina, 1910 (Saka)*

*Price : ks. 2.00*

LOK SABHA

C O R R I G E N D A

to

The Fourteenth Report of the Committee  
on Government Assurances (1988-89)

Eighth Lok Sabha

---

Page No.

Correction

---

- 2 para 4 : For letter's read latter's  
5 para 12, line 3 : For letter's read latter's  
5 para 13, line 1 : For consider read considered  
8 para 26, line 8 : For clearly read closely  
9 para 35 : delete first sentence  
11. para 39, line 3 : for there read these.

## CONTENTS

	<b>PAGE</b>
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 for dropping of assurances . . . . .	2
<b>CHAPTER - III</b>	
Position of pending assurances pertaining to Seventh and Eighth Lok Sabha . . . . .	13
<b>MINUTES</b>	
Minutes of Sitting held on 14 July, 1987 . . . . .	14
Minutes of Sitting held on 11 October, 1988 . . . . .	20
<b>APPENDICES</b>	
Statements showing the position of assurances pertaining to Seventh and Eighth Lok Sabha pending implementation by the Government as on 5 September, 1988. . . . .	22

COMPOSITION OF THE COMMITTEE\* ON GOVERNMENT  
ASSURANCES (1988-89).

Prof. Narain Chand Parashar—*Chairman*

2. Shri L. Balaraman
3. Dr. S. Jagathrakshakan
4. Shri Bapulal Malviya
5. Shri Murlidhar Mane
6. Dr. A. K. Patel
7. Shri V. Krishna Rao
8. Shri Bhola Raut
9. Shri Prabhu Lal Rawat
10. Shri Manik Reddy
11. Shrimati Shanti Devi
12. Shri Kamla Prasad Singh
13. Shri Ramashray Prasad Singh
14. Shrimati Usha Thakkar
15. Shri Mahabir Prasad Yadav

SECRETARIAT

1. Shri C. K. Jain—*Director-IC (A)*
2. Shri S. C. Gupta—*Deputy Secretary*
3. Shri Raghbir Singh—*Senior Examiner of Questions.*

---

\* The Committee was nominated by the Speaker w. e. f. June 20, 1988 vide para No 2318 of Lok Sabha Bulletin Part-II dated 22 June, 1988.

## I N T R O D U C T I O N

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

2. The Committee (1988-89) were constituted on June 20, 1988.

3. The Committee (1987-88) at their sitting held on 14 July, 1987, considered requests from the Ministries for dropping of assurances and their decisions are contained in this Report. At their Fourth sitting held on 11 October, 1988, the Committee (1988-89) considered and adopted this draft Fourteenth Report.

4. The minutes of the aforesaid sittings of the Committee form part of the Report.

5. The conclusion/observations of the Committee are contained in the succeeding chapters.

NEW DELHI;  
October 11, 1988  
Asvina 19, 1910 (Saka)

PROF. NARAIN CHAND PARASHAR  
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 for implementation by Government. Of these 7,222 assurances have since been implemented, leaving a balance of 9 assurances to be implemented.

2. During the First to Tenth Sessions of Eighth Lok Sabha, 6,154 assurances were culled out. Out of them 4,361 have since been implemented, thus leaving a balance of 1,793 assurances pending implementation.

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 on 5 September, 1988.

## CHAPTER II

### REQUESTS FOR DROPPING OF ASSURANCES

(i)

On 27 February, 1987, the following Starred Question (No. 44) given notice of by Sarvashri Narayan Choubey and Mukul Wasnik, MPs was addressed to the Minister of Home Affairs:

- “(a) whether the GNLF leader Shri Subhas Ghising submitted a memorandum to Prime Minister during his recent visit to Darjeeling;
- (b) whether he also had talks earlier in Delhi with the Union Home Minister;
- (c) if so, the demands of the Front;
- (d) the outcome of the talks; and
- (e) the reaction of Union Government on the demands of the Front?”

2. In reply to the above question, the Minister of Home Affairs (Shri Buta Singh) laid a statement which *inter-alia*, stated as follows:

“The Government is in the process of examining this Memorandum.”

3. The above remarks of the Minister were treated as an assurance by the Committee which was required to be fulfilled within three months from the date of reply i.e. by 26 May, 1987.

4. On 27 April, 1987, the Minister of Home Affairs requested through the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs *vide* letters' U.O. Note No. VIII/HA(1)SQ 44-LS|86, dated 27 April, 1987 for dropping of the assurance on the grounds indicated below:—

“When this Ministry answered that the Government is in the process of examining this memorandum the intention of the Government was not to give an assurance as such.

While saying so, this Ministry had only meant to indicate that as on the date of answering the said question, the memorandum was under examination. It would be appreciated that the issues raised in the said memorandum are very delicate in nature, and it may take a long time before any decision is taken on it. It would not, therefore, be appropriate to treat this as an assurance."

5. The Committee at their sitting held on 14 July, 1987 considered the request of the Ministry of Home Affairs for the dropping of the assurance. The Committee did not agree with the view point of the Ministry that the statement of the Minister, 'The Government is in the process of examining this Memorandum' should not be treated as an assurance. After careful perusal of the statement of the Minister of Home Affairs as also the note submitted by the Ministry of Home Affairs pleading for the dropping of the assurance, the Committee felt that the reply of the Minister was correctly treated as an assurance and the issues raised in the Memorandum being very delicate in nature needed early decision of the Government. The request for extension of time upto 27 August, 1987, was granted.

6. The above decision of the Committee was conveyed to the Ministry on 20 August, 1987.

7. The Ministry has implemented the assurance by laying an implementation statement on the Table of the House on 21 April, 1988. In the statement, the Ministry have stated:

"The memorandum has since been examined by the Government. The Government have firmly ruled out the creation of a separate State of Gorkhaland. On the other demands, the Government have reached an understanding with the GNLFF leadership that these should be resolved through negotiations."

8. The Committee note the implementation of the assurance. However, they express their unhappiness about the request of the Ministry made earlier for the dropping of the assurance, even questioning the decision of the Committee in treating the reply of the Minister as an assurance. The fact that after the Committee did not agree to drop the assurance, the Ministry reported the implementation indicates that the request for dropping was made without proper thought. The Committee deplore this attitude of the Ministry and trust that the Ministry would show the requisite



esteem as well as timely responsiveness towards the implementation of the commitments made by the Minister in the House.

## (ii)

9. On 26 November, 1986, the following Unstarred Question (No. 3470) given notice of by Prof. Narain Chand Parashar, M.P. was addressed to the Prime Minister:

- “(a) whether the Working Group on Digital TV set up by the Department of Electronics to study and analyse the techno-economical aspects of a Digital TV set has since submitted its report to the Government;
- (b) if so, a brief outline of the report including its recommendations and also the action taken on them;
- (c) if not, the likely date by which the report would be submitted to Government;
- (d) whether any collaboration with Japan would be established in making multifunctional Digital TV sets which has facilities for Teletext and Video Text applications and multi-channel viewing and which is specially suited to the fringe areas in view of its high reliability and improved resolution; and
- (e) if so, the details thereof”

10. The Minister of State in the Ministry of Science and Technology (Shri K. R. Narayan) gave the following reply:

“(a) No, Sir.

(b) Does not arise.

(c) As mentioned in response to Lok Sabha Unstarred question No. 9229 on May 7, 1986 Digital TV is an emerging technology and as such the foreign manufacturers have been reluctant to share information on its various techno-economic aspects. The Department of Electronics (DOE) under its Standardisation, Testing and Quality Control (STQC) Programme has been able to procure a 61 cm. (24”) digital TV receiver and some limited tests have been made on the receiver. So far, it has not been possible to procure, 51cm.(20”) models—a size which has been standardised for the CTV receivers.

The Working Group on Digital TV would only be in a position to make its recommendations after comprehensive technology becomes clearer.

(d) & (e) As the demand for analogue CTV receivers has just built-up and efforts are now being made to make the necessary components available, it is too early to promote Digital Colour TV receivers in the country."

11. The above reply to parts (d) and (e) of the question was treated as an assurance by the Committee which was required to be fulfilled by the Ministry of Science & Technology (Department of Electronics) within three months from the date of reply i.e. by 25 February, 1987.

12. On 23 April, 1987, Ministry of Science & Technology (Deptt. of Electronics) requested the Committee through the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs *vide* letter's U.O. Note No. VII/Elac.(3)USQ. 3470-LS/86 dated 23 April, 1987 for the dropping of the assurance on the grounds indicated below:

"The case was referred to Minister of State (S & T) for approving the extension of time to fulfil this Assurance upto May 26, 1987. While approving the extension, Minister of State (S & T) has observed that this reply is not an assurance but a statement, that stage for it has not yet arrived. In fact, it has been stated in the reply that it is too early to promote Digital Colour TV in the country."

13. The Committee at their sitting held on 14 July, 1987 consider the request of the Ministry of Science & Technology for dropping of the assurance. After considering the submission of the Ministry of Science and Technology and perusing the reply of the Minister given on 26 November, 1986 to Unstarred Question No. 3470 as well as the reply given on 7 May, 1986 to Unstarred Question No. 9229, the Committee were convinced that the relevant reply of the Minister had been correctly treated as an assurance and the Ministry should implement it early. It should be noted that the reply of the Minister to Unstarred Question No. 9229 clearly, *inter-alia* indicated that 'the working Group would prepare its report. This exercise is expected to be completed in about a year's time'. The Committee granted extension of time upto 26 May, 1987 as requested by the Ministry and since this date having already expired, the Ministry should seek further extension of time as might be considered minimum to implement the assurance.

14. The above decision of the Committee was conveyed to the Ministry on 20 August, 1987.

15. In a statement laid on the Table of the House on 12 November, 1987 in pursuance of the assurance, the Ministry have stated *inter-alia* that in view of the factors as mentioned in the statement it is not considered desirable to bring digital technology in the country for the next few years at least.

16. The Committee note the decision taken by Government in the matter. It clearly indicates that the request made by the Ministry on 23 April, 1987 for the dropping of the assurance was not necessary. The Ministry should, therefore, bear in mind that in future when an assurance is capable of implementation, they should take steps to implement it expeditiously instead of making request for its dropping.

(iii)

17. On 6 March, 1987, the following Unstarred Question (No. 1566) given notice of by Shri Sanat Kumar Mandal, M.P. was addressed to the Minister of Tourism.

“(a) whether any investigation has been made into the theft of Rs. two lacs from the Ashok Yatri Niwas, New Delhi on 9 February, 1987; and

(b) if so, its outcome and the steps taken to prevent such thefts occurring in future?”

18. The then Minister of Tourism (Shri Mufti Mohammad Sayeed) gave the following reply:

(a) and (b): “This case relates to embezzlement of money and not theft. A police case was registered by I.T.D.C. on 9 February, 1987 for embezzlement of money. The police is investigating into the matter.”

19. The above reply to the question was treated as an assurance by the Committee which was required to be fulfilled by the Ministry of Tourism within three months from the date of reply i.e. by 5 June, 1987.

20. On 18 June, 1987, the Director General of Tourism requested the Committee *vide* his D.O. letter No. 8/13/87-PSU(T) dated 18 June, 1987 for dropping of the assurance on the following grounds:

"Reply to this question has been given by the Minister of Tourism that the police is investigating into the matter. While we are pursuing the matter with the Director General of Police, Delhi, to expedite the case, you will kindly agree that the whole process of investigation will take considerable time resulting in the assurance remaining unfulfilled, for an indefinite period. Since a final decision in this case will be taken in accordance with the due process of law, I shall be thankful if the assurance to the Question is dropped."

21. On 26 June, 1987, Lok Sabha Secretariat requested the Ministry of Tourism to submit the latest position of the case and seek extension of time.

22. On 6 July, 1987, the Ministry of Tourism clarified the position and once again requested the Committee on Government Assurance for dropping of the assurance on the grounds indicated below:—

"The matter is still under investigation with the Director General of Police, Delhi. It was in this context as the time to be taken in investigation of the case etc. is likely to be indefinite that a request has been made in this Ministry's letter No. 8/13/87-PSU(T) dated 18-6-87 for dropping the assurance. After investigation of the case has been completed, the case will be placed before a court of law. The outcome of the case in the court will take further time.

It is, therefore, requested to please reconsider the matter and agree to drop the assurance as it may take considerable time to fulfil the assurance.

In the meantime an extension upto 5-9-87 may in any case please be granted as in fact more time will be required to fulfil the assurance in question."

23. The Committee at their sitting held on 14 July, 1987 considered the request of the Ministry of Tourism to drop the assurance. The Committee not agreeing with the request of the Ministry to drop the assurance observed that the assurance be implemented expeditiously. They however, granted extension of time upto 5 September, 1987.

24. The above decision of the Committee was conveyed to the Ministry on 20 August, 1987;

25. The Ministry have implemented the assurance by laying implementation statement on the Table of the House on 5 August, 1988. In the implementation statement, the Ministry have stated:—

“The investigation has been completed by the Delhi Police and a challan has been sent to the court, against the accused person involved in the case.”

26. The Committee note the implementation of the assurance by the Ministry. They are, however, constrained to observe that the Ministry earlier approached the Committee for dropping of the assurance on the plea that the whole process of investigation would take considerable time. The Ministries would do well to avoid making references to the Committee for dropping of the assurances on frivolous grounds. The Committee also desire that the case be clearly pursued in the court for its early finalisation.

(iv)

27. On 21 November, 1986 the following Unstarred Question (No. 2863) given notice of by Shri Narain Chand Parashar, M.P. was addressed to the Minister of Tourism:

- “(a) whether the India Tourism Development Corporation propose to take over the existing building housing the Indian Institute of Advance Study at Shimla and convert it into a 4-Star/3-Star Hotel;
- (b) if so, the likely date by which the building would be taken over and all the members of Class III and Class IV staff of the Institute absorbed; and
- (c) if not, the arrangements under contemplation for rehabilitating the existing staff in the event of delay in take-over?”

28. The then Minister of Tourism (Shri Mufti Mohammad Sayeed) gave the following reply:

- (a) to (c) : “The proposal regarding the takeover of the building of Indian Institute of Advance Studies at Shimla by ITDC is still under consideration.”

29. The above reply to the question was treated as an assurance by the Committee which was required to be fulfilled by the Ministry of Tourism within three months of the date of reply i.e. by 20 February, 1987.

30. On 18 June, 1987, the Director General of Tourism requested the Committee *vide* his D.O. letter No. 8 (119)86-PSU(T) dated 18 June, 1987 for the dropping of the assurance on the following grounds:

"In reply to this question the Minister of Tourism stated that the proposal regarding the take over of the building of Indian Institute of Advance Studies at Shimla by I.T.D.C. is still under consideration. The Ministry of Human Resource Development have informed this Ministry that they are still exploring the possibility of obtaining alternative accommodation for the location of the Institute and that it would take time before a final decision is taken.

You will kindly appreciate that the conversion of the building into a Hotel by I.T.D.C. will depend on the shifting of the Institute from Rashtrapati Nivas Complex, Shimla. In the circumstances I shall be thankful if the Assurance to the question is treated as liquidated."

31. On 26 June, 1987, the Lok Sabha Secretariat requested the Ministry of Tourism to submit the latest position of the assurance.

32. On 2 July, 1987, the Ministry of Tourism clarified as under:

"The matter is still under consideration with other Ministries etc. and may take quite some more time before it is finalised. It is, therefore, requested that in order to fulfil this assurance extension for a further period of three months from 22-8-87 to 21-11-87 may kindly be granted."

33. The Committee at their sitting held on 14 July, 1987 considered the request of the Ministry of Tourism to drop the assurance. The Committee did not accede to the request of the Ministry of Tourism for the dropping of the assurance. However, the Ministry was granted extension of time for implementation of the assurance before 21 November, 1987.

34. The above decision of the Committee was conveyed to the Ministry on 20 August, 1987.

35. The Committee note the implementation of the assurance. The Ministry have implemented the assurance by laying implementation statement on the Table of the House on 5 August, 1988. In the implementation statement the Ministry have stated:

"ITDC has dropped the proposal for putting up a hotel in vice-regal lodge at Shimla. In case the State Govern-

ment is able to allow suitable land at concessional rate and feasibility study permits, then a fresh proposal can be processed by the ITDC for putting up a hotel in Shimla either, as its own project or in joint venture in collaboration with the State Government."

36. The Committee regret to note that the assurance which was given as far back as November, 1986 has been fulfilled only in August, 1988 i.e. after more than 20 months and that too after the Committee did not agree to the request of the Ministry for its dropping. They expect the Government to take expeditious decisions in respect of pending assurances so that these do not remain unfulfilled for long.

(V)

37. On 30 July, 1986, the following Starred Question (No. 182-A) given notice by Shri Indrajit Gupta and Shrimati Geeta Mukherjee was addressed to the Minister of Home Affairs:—

- “(a) whether the German Airline “Lufthansa” has been bringing in some security personnel in the guise of tourists to the Sahar International Airport at Bombay and deploying them in maximum security areas;
- (b) if so, whether such action is permissible under the law or it amounts to violation of Indian sovereignty; and
- (c) the action taken by Government in the matter?”

38. The Minister of Home Affairs (Shri Buta Singh) gave the following reply:—

- (a) (b) & (c): “Normal security checking is done by the Indian Security Personnel. However, on a request from “Lufthansa” they were allowed to post three security supervisors at Bombay airport in January, 1985 subject to the condition that they would not interfere with the working of the normal security staff. This did not amount to violation of Indian sovereignty.

Some officers of “Lufthansa” were recently noticed in the ‘sterils’ area. It was clarified to the Airlines that this was not in conformity with international practice.”

39. During the course of supplementaries on the question, Shri Madhu Dandavate, M.P. pointed out that since 1971 more than hundred persons came to Bombay international airport on tourist

visas and worked in the airport for Lufthansa which tantamounted to violation of several laws of the land and sought to know whether Government had taken care of all these violations.

40. The Minister of State in the Ministry of Home Affairs (Shri Arun Nehru) gave the following reply:—

“We will certainly take up with relevant Ministries and if the Honourable Member can help us, we would not mind if he gives his file to us”.

41. The above reply to the Supplementary raised on the question was treated as an assurance by the Committee which was required to be fulfilled by the Ministry of Home Affairs within three months from the date of reply i.e. by 29 October, 1986.

42. On 11 May, 1987, the Ministry of Home Affairs requested the Committee through the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs vide U.O. note No. VI/HA (ii) SQ. 182-A-LS/86 dated 11 May, 1987 for dropping of the assurance on the grounds indicated as under:—

“.....the Member of Parliament concerned was requested on 23-1-1987 to let this Ministry have information about 100 persons about whom reference had been made by him during the course of Supplementaries to the Question to enable this Ministry to have necessary enquiries conducted. The requisite information, has, however, not been furnished by the Member of Parliament concerned. It is not possible to make enquiries in regard to the cases mentioned by the Member unless and until the details are furnished by the Member concerned. In the absence of the above information, it is not possible to fulfil the assurance.”

43. The Committee at their sitting held on 14 July, 1987 considered the request of the Ministry of Home Affairs to drop the assurance. The Committee observed that the statement of the Minister of State for Home Affairs “We will certainly take up with relevant Ministries” was a categorical assurance independent of any information whether or not furnished by the Member and desired that the assurance may be implemented expeditiously.

44. The above decision of the Committee was conveyed to the Ministry on 20 August, 1987.

45. The Committee find that it was in July, 1986 that the assurance was given in the House. Instead of fulfilling it expedi-



tiously, the Ministry requested the Committee in May, 1987 i.e. after 10 months for the dropping, which was not agreed to by the Committee and the decision conveyed to the Ministry in August, 1987. Although more than one year has passed since then, the Ministry have neither fulfilled the assurance nor sought any extension of time for fulfilling it. The Committee take a serious view of the laxity on the part of the Ministry in dealing with the assurance and showing scant respect to the Parliamentary Procedure. The Committee expect that Government, irrespective of the Member supplying the information to them or not, would promptly find out the relevant information and also exercise necessary check on the entry of foreign airline officials so as not to violate the sovereignty of the country and report to the House about the steps taken in this regard.

### CHAPTER III

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

46. A statement showing the position of assurances pertaining to Seventh and Eighth Lok Sabha pending implementation by the Government as on 5 September, 1988 is given in *Appendix*.

47. 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.

NEW DELHI;

October 11, 1988

Asvina 19, 1910 (Saka)

PROF. NARAIN CHAND PARASHAR

*Chairman,*

*Committee on Government Assurances.*

## MINUTES

*Minutes of the Third Sitting of the Committee (1987-88) of Government Assurances held on Tuesday, 14 July, 1987 in Committee Room No. 'B', Parliament House Annexe, New Delhi.*

The Committee met on Tuesday, 14 July, 1987 from 11.30 hours to 12.40 hours.

### P R E S E N T

**Prof. Narain Chand Parashar—Chairman**

#### MEMBERS

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

#### SECRETARIAT

1. Shri C. K. Jain—*Chief Questions*
2. Shri J. D. Bhalla—*Senior Examiner of Questions*
3. Shri Raghbir Singh—*Senior Examiner of Questions.*

2. The Committee took up for consideration Memoranda Nos. 88 to 97.

\* \* \* \*

*Memorandum No. 89:*

Request for dropping of assurance given on 27 February, 1987, in reply to Starred Question No. 44 regarding memorandum to Union Government by GNLf leader.

4. The Committee considered the following request of the Ministry of Home Affairs received through the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs vide their U.O. Note No. VIII|HA(1) SQ. 44-LS|86 dated 27 April, 1987 for dropping the assurance on the following grounds:

“When this Ministry answered that the Government is in the process of examining this memorandum the intention of the Government was not to give an assurance as such. While saying so, this Ministry had only meant to indicate that as on the date of answering the said question, the memorandum was under examination. It would be appreciated that the issues raised in the said memorandum are very delicate in nature, and it may take a long time before any decision is taken on it. It would not therefore be appropriate to treat this as assurance.”

4.1 The Committee did not agree with the view point of the Ministry that the statement of the Minister, ‘The Government is in the process of examining this Memorandum’ should not be treated as an assurance. After careful perusal of the statement of the Minister of Home Affairs as also the note submitted by the Ministry of Home Affairs pleading for the dropping of the assurance, the Committee felt that the reply of the Minister was correctly treated as an assurance and the issues raised in the Memorandum being very delicate in nature needed early decision of the Government. The request for extension of time upto 27 August, 1987, was granted.

\* \* \* \*

*Memorandum No. 92:* Request for dropping of assurance given on 26 November, 1986 in reply to Unstarred Question No. 3470 regarding report by Working Group on Digital T.V.

7. The Committee considered the following request of the Ministry of Science and Technology received through the Ministry of Parliamen-

tary Affairs *vide* their U.O. Note No. VII/Elec.(3)USQ. 3470-LS/86 dated 23 April, 1987 for dropping the assurance on the following grounds:—

“The case was referred to Minister of State (S&T) for approving the extension of time to fulfil this Assurance upto May 26, 1987. While approving the extension, Minister of State (S&T) has observed that this reply is not an assurance but a statement, that stage for it has not yet arrived, in fact, it has been stated in the reply that it is too early to promote Digital Colour TV in the country.”

7.1 After considering the submission of the Ministry of Science and Technology and perusing the reply of the Minister given on 26 November, 1986 to Unstarred Question No. 3470 as well as the reply given on 7 May, 1986 to Unstarred Question No. 9229, the Committee were convinced that the relevant reply of the Minister had been correctly treated as an assurance and the Ministry should implement it early. It should be noted that the reply of the Minister to Unstarred Question No. 9229 clearly *inter alia* indicated that the Working Group would prepare its report. This exercise is expected to be completed in about a year's time'. The Committee granted extension of time upto 26 May, 1987 as requested by the Ministry and since this date having already expired, the Ministry should seek further extension of time as might be considered minimum to implement the assurance.

\* \* \* \*

*Memorandum No. 95:* Request for dropping of assurance given on 6 March, 1987 in reply to Unstarred Question No. 1566 regarding theft of money from Ashok Yatri Niwas.

10. The Director General of Tourism and Ex-officio Additional Secretary in the Ministry of Tourism *vide* his D.O. letter No. 8/13/87-PSU(T) dated 18 June, 1987 had made a request for the dropping of the assurance on the following grounds:

“Reply to this question has been given by the Minister of Tourism that the police is investigating into the matter. While we are pursuing the matter with the Director General of Police, Delhi, to expedite the case, you will kindly agree that the whole process of investigation will take considerable time resulting in the assurance remaining unfulfilled, for an indefinite period. Since a final decision in this case will be taken in accordance with the due process of law, I shall be thankful if the assurance to the Question is dropped.”

10.1 Subsequently, the Ministry of Tourism were asked *vide* this Secretariat U.O. Note dated 26 June, 1987 to submit the latest position in the matter alongwith a request for extension of time. In reply the Ministry of Tourism *vide* their U.O. dated 6 July, 1987 have stated as follows:—

“The matter is still under investigation with the Director General of Police, Delhi. It was in this context as the time to be taken in investigation of the case etc. is likely to be indefinite that a request has been made in this Ministry’s letter No. 8/13/87-PSU(T), dated 18-6-87 for dropping the assurance. After investigation of the case has been completed, the case will be placed before a court of law. The outcome of the case in the court will take further time.

It is, therefore, requested to please reconsider the matter and agree to drop the assurance as it may take considerable time to fulfil assurance.

In the meantime an extension upto 5-9-87 may in any case please be granted as in fact more time will be required to fulfil the assurance in question.”

10.2 The Committee did not agree to the dropping of the assurance as requested by the Ministry of Tourism. Extension of time upto 5 September, 1987 for implementation of the assurance was, however, granted.

*Memorandum No. 96:* Request for dropping of assurance given on 21 November, 1986, in reply to Unstarred Question No. 2863 regarding conversion of building of Indian Institute of Advance Studies in Shimla into a Hotel.

11. The Director General of Tourism and Ex-officio Additional Secretary in the Ministry of Tourism *vide* his D.O. letter No. 8(119)/86-PSU(T), dated 18 June, 1987 has made a request for the dropping of the assurance on the following grounds:—

“In reply to this question the Minister of Tourism stated that the proposal regarding the take over of the building of Indian Institute of Advance Studies at Shimla by I.T.D.C. is still under consideration. The Ministry of Human Resource Development have informed this Ministry that they are still exploring the possibility of obtaining alternative accommodation for the location of the Institute and that it would take time before a final decision is taken.

You will kindly appreciate that the conversion of the building into a Hotel by I.T.D.C. will depend on the shifting of the Institute from Rashtrapati Nivas Complex, Shimla. In the circumstances I shall be thankful if the Assurance to the question is treated as liquidated."

11.1 Subsequently, the Ministry of Tourism were asked *vide* this Secretariat U.O. Note dated 26 June, 1987, to submit the latest position in the matter alongwith a request for extension of time. In reply, the Ministry of Tourism *vide* their O.M. dated 2 July, 1987, have stated as follows:

"The matter is still under consideration with other Ministries etc. and may take quite some more time before it is finalised. It is, therefore, requested that in order to fulfil this assurance extension for a further period of three months from 22.8.87 to 21.11.87 may kindly be granted."

11.2 The Committee did not accede to the request of the Ministry of Tourism for the dropping of this assurance. However, the Ministry was granted extension of time for implementation of the assurance before 21 November, 1987.

*Memorandum No. 97:* Request for dropping of assurance given on 30 July, 1986, in reply to Starred Question No. 182-A regarding reported deployment of German Security Personnel by Lufthansa.

12. The Committee considered the following request of the Ministry of Home Affairs received through the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs *vide* their U.O. Note No. VI|HA(II)SQ 182-A-LS|86 dated 11 May, 1987, for dropping the assurance on the following grounds:—

".....the Member of Parliament concerned was requested on 23.1.1987 to let this Ministry have information about 100 persons about whom reference had been made by him during the course of supplementaries to the Question, to enable this Ministry to have necessary enquiries conducted. The requisite information, has, however, not been furnished by the Member of Parliament concerned. It is not possible to make enquiries in regard to the cases mentioned by the Member unless and until the details are furnished by the Member concerned. In the absence of the above information, it is not possible to fulfil the assurance."

12.1 The Committee noted that the statement of the Minister of State for Home Affairs, 'we will certainly take up with relevant Ministries . . . . . ' in reply to a supplementary by Prof. Madhu Dandavate was a categorical assurance, independent of any information whether or not furnished by the Member. In view of this position, the Committee desired that the assurance should be implemented early and a request for extension of time as might be considered minimum for implementation of the assurance be submitted by the Ministry of Home Affairs.

The Committee then adjourned.

---



## MINUTES

### FOURTH SITTING

*Minutes of the sitting of the Committee on Government Assurances held on 11 October, 1988 in Committee Room 'B', Parliament House Annexe, New Delhi.*

The Committee met on Tuesday, 11 October, 1988 from 15.30 hrs. to 16.30 hrs.

#### PRESENT

Prof. Narain Chand Parashar—*Chairman*

#### MEMBERS

2. Shri L. Balaraman
3. Shri Bapulal Malviya
4. Shri Murlidhar Mane
5. Dr. A. K. Patel
6. Shri V. Krishna Rao
7. Shri Bhola Raut
8. Shri Prabhu Lal Rawat
9. Shri Manik Reddy
10. Shri Kamla Prasad Singh
11. Shri Ramashray Prasad Singh
12. Shrimati Usha Thakkar
13. Shri Mahabir Prasad Yadav

#### SECRETARIAT

1. Shri C. K. Jain—*Director-IC(A)*
2. Shri S. C. Gupta—*Deputy Secretary (Q)*
3. Shri Raghbir Singh—*Senior Examiner of Questions.*

2. The Committee considered the draft Fourteenth Report and adopted the same with the following modifications:

- (i) Page 4, Para 8, line 8: add 'The Committee deplore this attitude of the Ministry and,

(ii) Page 20, para 45, line 10: after the word assurance read 'and showing scant respect to the Parliamentary Procedure. The Committee expect that Government, irrespective of the Member supplying the information to them or not, would promptly find out the relevant information and also exercise necessary check on the entry of foreign airline officials so as not to violate the sovereignty of the country and report to the House about the steps taken in this regard.'

3. The Committee authorised the Chairman to present the Report to the House during ensuing Session of the Lok Sabha.

\* \* \* \* \*

4. The Committee then adjourned to meet again on 12 October, 1988.

---

## APPENDIX I

(Vide Para No. 46 of the Report)

(i) Statement showing the position of the assurances of Seventh Lok Sabha pending implementation as on 5 September, 1988.

Session	No. of Assurances culled Out	No. of Assurances implemented/dropped	No. of Assurances outstanding
First Session, 1980	26	26	..
Second Session, 1980	196	196	
Third Session, 1980	548	548	
Fourth Session, 1980	333	333	
Fifth Session, 1981	793	793	..
Sixth Session, 1981	373	372	1
Seventh Session, 1981	418	418	..
Eighth Session, 1982	798	798	
Ninth Session, 1982	429	429	..
Tenth Session, 1982	315	315	
Eleventh Session, 1983	861	860	1
Twelfth Session, 1983	433	433	
Thirteenth Session, 1983	424	424	..
Fourteenth Session, 1984	956	951	5
Fifteenth Session, 1984	328	326	2
<b>Total Assurances Outstanding</b>	<b>7231</b>	<b>7222</b>	<b>9</b>

## APPENDIX D

(Vide Para No. 46 of the Report)

(ii) Statement showing the position of assurances of Eighth Lok Sabha pending implementation as on 5 September, 1988.

Session	No. of Assurances culled out	No. of Assurances implemented/dropped	No. of Assurances outstanding
First Session, 1985	19	19	..
Second Session, 1985	426	421	5
Third Session, 1985	323	321	2
Fourth Session, 1985	355	338	17
Fifth Session, 1986	777	721	56
Sixth Session, 1986	475	431	44
Seventh Session, 1986	428	371	57
Eighth Session, 1987	777	594	183
Eighth Session, 1987 (Second Part)	578	275	303
Ninth Session, 1987	772	437	335
Tenth Session, 1988	1224	433	791
<b>Total Assurances Outstanding</b>	<b>6,154</b>	<b>4,361</b>	<b>1793</b>