

COMMITTEE
ON
GOVERNMENT ASSURANCES
(1988-89)

(EIGHTH LOK SABHA)

SIXTEENTH REPORT



Presented on 9 May, 1989

C
P.3725
16

LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT
NEW DELHI

8 May, 1989/18 Vaisakha, 1911 (Saka)

Price 1 Rs. 1.00

CONTENTS

	PAGE
COMPOSITION OF THE COMMITTEE	... (iii)
INTRODUCTION	... (v)
RECOMMENDATIONS/OBSERVATIONS	... (1)
MINUTES	
Minutes of the Sitting held on 16 January, 1987	... 8
Minutes of the Sitting held on 12 October, 1988	... 11
Minutes of the Sitting held on 3 May, 1989	... 17

**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 —Joint Secretary**
2. **Shri S.C. Gupta —Deputy Secretary**
3. **Shri Jyoti Prasad—Officer on Special Duty**

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

INTRODUCTION

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

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

3. At their Eleventh sitting held on 16 January, 1987, the Committee (1986-87) took the evidence of the representatives of the Ministry of Water Resources in connection with the non-implementation of assurance given on 1 August, 1985 in reply to Unstarred Question No. 1456 regarding dam safety legislation. As the assurance remained unimplemented, the Committee (1988-89) at their fifth sitting held on 12 October, 1988 again took evidence of the representatives of the Ministry of Water Resources on this subject. The Committee considered and adopted this draft Sixteenth Report at their sitting held on 3 May, 1989.

4. The Minutes of the aforesaid sittings of the Committee form part of this Report.

5. The conclusions/observations of the Committee are contained in para 22 of the Report.

6. The Committee wish to express their thanks to the officials of the Ministry of Water Resources who appeared before the Committee.

NEW DELHI ;

May 8, 1989

Vaisakha 18, 1911 (Saka)

PROF. NARAIN CHAND PARASHAR

Chairman,
Committee on Government Assurances

REPORT

Dam Safety Legislation

On 1 August, 1985, Dr. G. Vijaya Rama Rao, M.P. addressed the following Unstarred Question No. 1456 to the Minister of Irrigation and Power :-

- (a) whether Government have received any representation from Consumer Protection Organisation concerning the urgent need for dam safety legislation;
- (b) if so, details thereof and action taken thereon; and
- (c) whether Government will ensure that Dam Safety Authority is created at the earliest?"

2. In reply to the Question, the then Minister of Irrigation and Power (Shri B. Shankaranand) stated as follows :-

"(a) to (c) Government of India have received a representation from Consumer Education and Research Centre, Ahmedabad, concerning the need for legislation on the creation of dam safety authority for the supervision of dams and reservoirs. The matter is under consideration."

3. The above reply to the question was treated as an assurance by the Lok Sabha Secretariat and the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs. The assurance was to be implemented by the Ministry of Water Resources by 31 October, 1985.

4. The Ministry of Water Resources requested through the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs that the above assurance be dropped. The plea advanced by the Ministry in their O.M. No. 20/23/85 -IT dated 24 October, 1985, to the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs for the dropping of the assurance was as follows :-

"...the subject is not one on which consideration by the Government of India can lead forth with to action. As water is a State subject, most of the reservoirs and dams are owned, operated and maintained by the State Governments and therefore, the matter has to be discussed with the states to

prepare the ground for further action. Even if Government of India takes a view in favour of enactment of legislation on dam safety, the States have to agree to its implementation. This could be a prolonged and protracted process, and the result cannot be predicted. The matter is thus not one on which the Government of India by itself can either give an assurance or fulfil it."

5. The Committee on Government Assurances (1985-86) considered the request of the Ministry of Water Resources for dropping of the assurance at their sitting held on 27 January, 1986, and took the following decision :-

"The Committee did not agree with the plea taken by the Ministry that 'the subject is not one on which consideration by Government can lead forth-with to action'. They were of the opinion that even conceding that 'water' was State subject and the dams and reservoirs were primarily the concern of States, it would not mitigate the importance of the safety in dams which involved national interests. The Committee felt that Government after consulting State Governments should take appropriate initiatives in the matter including a model legislation for the States. Accordingly, while not agreeing to the dropping of the assurance, the Committee urged the Ministry to implement the assurance at the earliest and if necessary, seek extension of time as might be required to implement the assurance."

6. The decision of the Committee was communicated to the Ministry of Water Resources *vide* this Secretariat O.M. No. 12/4/USQ/1456/85-Q (CGA) dated 15 February, 1986.

7. The Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs *vide* their U.O. Note No. XIV/Ind. (17) USQ. 7164-LS/84 dated 24 March, 1986 renewed the request of the Ministry of Water Resources for dropping the assurance.

8. The Committee on Government Assurances (1986-87) considered the request of the Ministry of Water Resources at their sitting held on 19 June, 1986 and decided to call the representatives of the Ministry of Water Resources for oral evidence before taking a final decision on the request of the Ministry to drop the assurance.

9. The Committee took the oral evidence of the representatives of the Ministry of Water Resources at their sitting held on 16 January,

1987. During evidence, the representative of the Ministry of Water Resources stated that the National Water Resources Council was expected to meet on the 5th February, 1987 to consider the draft National Water Policy. The draft contained *inter-alia* certain directions regarding dam safety procedures. Thus, there would be an occasion for discussing the matter in detail when the National Water Policy is considered by the National Water Resources Council. The Committee, therefore, decided to examine further the representatives of the Ministry of Water Resources after the meeting of the National Water Resources Council.

10. While seeking extension of time upto 15 November, 1987, for fulfilling the assurance the Ministry of Water Resources took the following plea in October, 1987 for granting them extension :-

“The NWRC met on 9 September, 1987 and considered the draft National Water Policy Document (NWPD) and approved it with some modifications. The approved document is expected to be ready by 15.11.1987.”

11. The Minister of State of the Ministry of Textiles and Water Resources laid a copy of the National Water Policy on 18 November, 1987.

12. The Ministry again requested *vide* their O.M. No. 20 (23) 85-IT dated 3 November, 1987 for dropping of the assurance. The Committee took evidence of the representatives of the Ministry of Water Resources in this connection on 12 October, 1988.

13. When asked to mention the circumstances leading to the request for dropping of the assurance, the representative of the Ministry stated that after the Minister replied to this question they examined the statutory provisions governing this subject as per entry 56 of the Central List. This is a subject which figures at *Entry 17* of the State List. So they made a reference to the Law Ministry to advise whether they could introduce a legislation and have it enacted into law by the Parliament on this subject. They said that on this subject the Central Government could not introduce any legislation and therefore, they had to follow other measures. They made a further reference to the Law Ministry whether under the scope of regulating the things on inter-state rivers under Article 262 of the Constitution something could be introduced. The Law Ministry again advised that Article 262 permits legal provisions to be enacted only with respect to adjudication of disputes and dam safety.

would not come in the category of a dispute. So the scope of Article 262 would not cover the proposed legislation.

14. The witness also stated that the Ministry made an exercise towards the drafting and finalisation of the national water resources policy and in this connection also this subject was considered. It was first considered by a group of Chief Ministers in a Committee which was presided over by the Minister of Water Resources and thereafter the draft policy was put before the National Water Resources Council in September 1987. Para 6 of the policy mentions about the safety of the structures in the following words :-

“There should be proper organisational arrangements at the national and State levels for ensuring the safety of storage dams and other water related structures. The Central guidelines on the subject should be kept under constant review and periodically updated and reformulated. There should be a system of continuous surveillance and regular visits by experts.”

15. The Ministry had set up a National Committee on Dam Safety by an order dated 19 October, 1987 under the Chairmanship of Chairman, Central Water Commission. It included representatives from the Ministry like Director General of Geological Survey of India, the Director General of Indian Meteorological Department, representatives of State Governments, Member of Irrigation of Bhakra Beas Management Board etc. There was a stipulation that the Committee would meet at least twice a year and keep the dam safety guidelines under constant review and also see to it that dam safety cells also come up and function properly in various States. They were thus taking various administrative steps to ensure better dam safety. At the same time the constitutional provisions were such that they were not in a position to have a central law on the subject.

16. The Chairman pointed out that many important dams were of inter-state nature like Bhakra Dam. Asked as to which state would initiate a dam safety legislation in such cases, the Secretary of the Ministry stated that the situation in respect of Bhakra and Pong Dams was somewhat unique. In the case of Bhakra Dam, the Bhakra Beas Management Board had representatives of all the State Governments concerned. The Board functioned under the rules and was as much subject to the guidelines and dam safety procedures as any other dam owned by the other State Government. He further added.

'The policy of the Government of India as a whole is that so far as possible in the water resources we try to move through consensus and with the agreement of the States. There are occasions where the Central Government has the power but we do not use it. We try first to have an amicable settlement. We first try to discuss it with the States and then proceed with everybody as partners otherwise the issue may degenerate into protracted legal proceedings.'

17. Asked whether they have felt the necessity of intervention in inter-State dams, the witness stated :—

"At the moment we have not reached the conclusion whether in respect of Bhakra and Pong dams we require any law because the existing law and the rules framed thereunder are quite sufficient to secure the purpose in which we are interested. Law has to be introduced on the basis of a strong need. Secondly, the administrative Ministry concerned is Ministry of Energy, Department of Power. As an administrative Ministry they can give direction. Two of the officers of the Government of India sit as Directors on the Bhakra Beas Management Board. The Chairman of the Board is appointed by the Central Government, Ministry of Energy. Department of Power has affective control on operation and maintenance of the project."

18. When pointed out that the directions by the Centre did not have the force of law, the witness stated that there was not a single case where a State Government has not accepted their guideline or the changes in the design of the dam suggested by them

19. In reply to another question; about the safety of dams, the witness stated—

"Safety of dams, especially the large dams, is accorded the highest importance both at the State Government level in the Central Water Commission and the Ministry of Water Resources. We go into depth in every case where any problem occurs. If the problem is there in a State where we find that a State is not capable, we set up an expert panel. And we send that expert panel from spot to spot to make on-the-spot study and suggest remedial action. It is some thing that we don't shelve. It is dealt with very promptly and adequately."

20. When asked about the final view taken by the Government about the assurance, the representative of the Ministry stated.

"as far as the Ministry of Water Resources or CWC is concerned, whenever we apprise our projects, or our people go for monitoring the constructions, make field visits, receive reports, the dam safety is number one on the list. In any case, whenever we go for a project inspection, or approval of a project, there is no question that the first item which is seen is dam safety. At the same time, we submit that in the context of the amount of work that has been done by CWC, the institutional mechanism that has been put in place in the shape of a National Committee of which the Chairman CWC is the presiding officer, the biennial review of all these things for larger dams wherever problems are there putting experts on the job, getting their report and getting them modified all this work done, should lead us to the conclusion that at the administrative level, arrangements we had introduced might be characterized as adequate.

On the legal side, the position is that given the state of Centre-State relations, the present situation and the cooperation which exists between CWC and the irrigation departments, the Ministry of Water Resources of the State Governments it is not perhaps the time for Government of India to consider extraordinary measures like amendments to the Constitution, or going in for a legislation in the teeth of opposition from the State Governments when they are cooperating with us because we may have a law, but we may thereby have a bad situation. I think the situation on the ground is more important, viz. cooperation between state Governments and the Central Government."

21. Referring to the request made by the Ministry in the note to accept the Ministry's plea that it was not a case of assurance, the Committee pointed out that it was for the Committee to decide whether the reply constituted an assurance or not and the observations of the Ministry in this regard were uncalled for. Explaining the position, the representative of the Ministry stated :

"The spirit of the Communication is that it is difficult to live with this assurance, because sometimes there is a certain time-bound programme, and an assurance is given, and it is

amenable to implementation within a fixed period of time. Here, we meant that in view of what has been done, perhaps to carry this assurance on the books of the Committee and to pursue it as a periodical review, might not be necessary now, in the context of the detailed report submitted by us. But I admit that this might have been more happily worded."

22. The Lok Sabha was informed as early as August, 1985 that the question of enactment of legislation on dam safety was under consideration of Government. Apparently, the need for having such a legislation must have been realised before giving an assurance in the House. The Ministry have now come forward with the plea that the State Legislatures alone are competent to legislate on the subject. This however, does not take into account the problem of inter-State Dams like Bhakra Dam and Pong Dam, where the enactment of legislation by any one State cannot serve the purpose and any directions by the Centre to the project authorities in such cases would not have the force of law. The Ministry have also failed to take any action on the suggestion of the Committee to have a model legislation on the subject for the guidance of the States keeping in view the importance of the safety in dams which involved national interest. The Committee regret to note that although more than three years have passed since the assurance was given in Lok Sabha it still remains unfulfilled. They would urge the Ministry to take a final decision in the matter at the earliest and to implement the assurance by laying in Lok Sabha the required statement in fulfilment of the assurance.

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

NEW DELHI
 May 8, 1989

Vaisakha 18, 1911 (Saka)

MINUTES

Minutes of the Eleventh Sitting of the Committee on Government Assurances held on 16 January, 1987, in Committee Room No. 52, Parliament House, New Delhi

The Committee met on Friday, 16 January, 1987 from 11.00 hours to 1.50 hours.

PRESENT

Prof. Narsin Chand Parsa — *Chairman*,

MEMBERS

2. Shri Tadur Bata Goud
3. Shri Jitendra Prasad
4. Shri Rahim Khan
5. Shri Purna Chandra Malik
6. Shri Channiah Odeyar
7. Shri Ram Pujan Patel
8. Shri K. N. Pradhan
9. Shri K. Pradhani
10. Dr. G. Vijaya Rama Rao
11. Shri Mubiram Saikia

SECRETARIAT

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

WITNESSES EXAMINED

Ministry of Water Resources

1. Shri D.W. Telang — *Additional Secretary, Ministry of Water Resources*
2. Shri M.S. Rao — *Commissioner (I&F), Ministry of Water Resources*
3. Shri G.S. Narayana — *Chief Engineer, Central Water Commission.*
4. Shri A. Sekhar — *Deputy Secretary, Ministry of Water Resources.*
5. Shri K.D. Thite — *Director, Central Water Commission.*

The Committee took the evidence of the representatives of the Ministry of Water Resources in connection with the non-implementation of the assurance given in Lok Sabha on 1 August, 1985, in reply to Unstarred Question No. 1456 regarding Dam Safety Legislation.

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

4. The representative of the Ministry while giving the reasons for making the request for dropping the assurance stated that a National Water Resource Council had been set up under the Chairmanship of the Prime Minister; and under the auspices of this Council a sub-group had been constituted consisting of Ministers of the Central Government as well as Chief Ministers of seven States to formulate National Water Policy. This Group had considered the question of dam safety but there had not been any consensus in regard to Central Legislation for this purpose and this was the main reason for making request for dropping of the assurance. The representative of the Ministry stated that the National Water Resource

Council was expected to meet next month on the 5 February, 1987. The policy which had been framed by group of Ministers would be coming for a discussion and the draft contained *inter alia* certain directions regarding dam safety procedures. Thus there would be an occasion for discussing the matter in detail when the National Water Policy is considered next month.

5. The Chairman observed that since a meeting of the National Water Council was due to be held during the next month, to consider the draft National Water Policy and the question of dam safety was also likely to be discussed at the meeting, the Committee would like to hear the views of the representatives of the Ministry thereafter. Members agreed with Chairman.

* * * * *

MINUTES

Fifth Sitting

Minutes of the sitting of the Committee on Government Assurances held on 12 October, 1988 in Committee Room 'B', Parliament House Annexure, New Delhi

The Committee met on Wednesday, 12 October, 1988 from 11.00 hours to 13.35 hours.

PRESENT

Prof. Narain Chand Parashar ... *Chairman*

MEMBERS

2. Shri L. Balaraman
3. Shri Bapulal Malviya
4. Dr. A.K. Patel
5. Shri V. Krishna Rao
6. Shri Bholu Raut
7. Shri Prabhu Lal Rawat
8. Shri Kamla Prasad Singh
9. Shrimati Usha Thakkar
10. 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*

Witnesses Examined

1. **Shri Naresh Chandra**, *Secretary, Ministry of Water Resources*
2. **Shri J.P. Singh**, *Additional Secretary, Ministry of Water Resources*
3. **Shri M.A. Chitale**, *Chairman, Central Water Commission*

2. The Committee took evidence of the representatives of the Ministry of Water Resources regarding non-implementation of the assurance in reply to Unstarred Question No. 1456 dated 1 August, 1985 regarding dam safety legislation.

3. At the outset the Chairman drew the attention of the witnesses to Direction 58 of the Directions by the Speaker whereunder their evidence could be treated as public and was liable to be published unless the witnesses specifically desired that all or any part of the evidence given by them was to be treated as confidential.

4. When asked to mention the circumstances leading to the request for dropping of the assurance, the representatives of the Ministry stated that after the Minister replied to this question they examined the statutory provisions governing this subject as per entry 56 of the Central List. This is a subject which figures at Entry 17 of the State List. So they made a reference to the Law Ministry to advise whether they could introduce a legislation and had it enacted into law by the Parliament on this subject. They said that on this subject the Central Government could not introduce any legislation and therefore they had to follow other measures. They made a further reference to the Law Ministry whether under the scope of regulating the things on inter-State rivers under Article 262 something could be introduced. The Law Ministry again advised that Article 262 permits legal provisions to be enacted only with respect to adjudication of disputes and dam safety would not come in the category of a dispute. So the scope of Article 262 would not cover the proposal legislation.

They made an exercise towards the drafting and finalisation of the national water resources policy for India and in this connection also this subject was considered. It was first considered by a group of Chief Ministers in a Committee which was presided over by the Minister of Water Resources and thereafter the draft policy was put before the National Water Resources Council in September, 1987.

Para 6 of the policy mentions about the safety of the structures in the following words :

“There should be proper organisational arrangements at the national and State levels for ensuring the safety of storage dams and other water related structures. The Central guidelines on the subject should be kept under constant review and periodically updated and reformulated. There should be a system of continuous surveillance and regular visits by experts.”

The Ministry had set up a National Committee on Dam Safety by an order dated 19.10.1987 under the Chairmanship of Chairman C.W.C. It included representatives from the Ministry like D G of G S.I. the D.G. of I.H.D, the representatives of State Government, Member of Irrigation of B.B.M.B. etc. There was a stipulation that the Committee would meet at least twice a year and keep the dam safety guidelines under constant review and also see to it that dam safety cells also come up and function properly in various States.

They were thus taking various administrative steps to ensure better dam safety. At the same time the constitutional provisions were such that they were not in a position to have a central law on the subject.

5. When pointed out that as per the reply of Minister, the question of legislation on the creation of a dam safety authority was under consideration, the representative of the Ministry replied :

“The fact that the matter is under consideration does not mean that the Government will decide in favour of the proposal. When it came to the Minister, he felt that it had to be examined or reviewed in depth and so he gave an interim reply. After that, we had examined and taken a number of steps. We consulted the States. We have gone to the National Water Resource Council through the Group of Chief Ministers. We have seen that they are in no mood for any central legislation.

We can submit the proceedings of the National Water Resource Council for the perusal of the Hon. Members of the Committee. You will see that repeatedly the Chief Ministers wanted to know whether there would be a Central Legislation and they made it very plain that it should not be a door through which the Central Government might start tinkering

with the position of water as a State subject. It was clarified that the Government of India has no such intention. It is in the proceedings of the Council. We have to see the whole thing in total perspective. From our low level, that is the administrative level, we could sense that the mood of the National Water Resource Council is not in favour of any kind of constitutional amendment."

6. When asked whether the Government had taken any decision or the matter was still in the stage of consideration, the representative of the Ministry stated that unless they went to the Cabinet to over rule the advice of Law Ministry, the advice was binding on administrative Ministry.

7. The Chairman pointed out that many important dams were of inter-state nature like Bhakra Dam. Asked as to which state would initiate a dam safety legislation in such cases, the Secretary of the Ministry stated that the situation was somewhat unique. In the case of Bhakra Dam, the Bhakra Beas Management Board had representatives of all the State Governments concerned. The Board functioned under the rules and was as much subject to the guidelines and dam safety procedures as any other dam owned by the other State Government. He further added :

"the policy of the Government of India as a whole is that so far as possible in the water resources sector we try to move through consensus and with the agreement of the States. There are occasions where the Central Government has the power but we do not use it. We try first to have an amicable settlement. We first try to discuss it with the States and then proceed with everybody as partners otherwise the issue may degenerate into protracted legal proceedings."

8. Asked whether they have felt the necessity of intervention in inter-State dams, the witness stated :

"At the moment we have not reached the conclusion whether in respect of Bhakra and Pong dams we require any law because the existing law and the rules framed thereunder are quite sufficient to secure the purpose in which we are interested. Law has to be introduced on the basis of a strong need. Secondly, the administrative Ministry concerned is Ministry of Energy Department of Power. As an Administrative Ministry they can give direction. Two of the officers of the Government of India sit as Directors on the Bhakra Beas

Management Board. The Chairman of the Board is appointed by the Central Government, Ministry of Energy Department of Power has effective control on operation and maintenance of the project."

9. When pointed out that the directions by the Centre did not have the force of law, the witness stated that there was not a single case where a State Government has not accepted their guideline or the changes in the design of the dam suggested by them.

10. In reply to another question, about the safety of dams, the witness stated :

"safety of dams, especially the large dams, is accorded the highest importance both at the State Government level in the Central Water Commission and the Ministry of Water Resources. We go into depth in every case where any problem occurs. If the problem is there in a State where we find that a State is not capable, we set up an expert panel. And we send that expert panel from spot to spot to make on the spot study and suggest remedial action. It is something that we don't shelve. It is dealt with very promptly and adequately."

11. When asked about the final view taken by the Government about the assurance, the representative of the Ministry stated.

"as far as the Ministry of Water Resources or CVC, CWC is concerned, whenever we apprise our projects, or our people go for monitoring the constructions, make field visits receive reports, the dam safety is number one on the list. In any case, whenever we go for a project inspection, or approval of a project, there is no question that the first item which is seen is dam safety. At the same time, we submit that in the context of the amount of work that has been done by CWC, the institutional mechanism that has been put in place in the shape of a National Committee of which the Chairman CWC is the presiding officer; the biennial review of all these things for larger dams wherever problems are there; putting experts on the job getting their report and getting them modified all this work done, should lead us to the conclusion that at the administrative level, arrangements we had introduced might be characterized as adequate.

On the legal side, the position is that given the state of Centre-State relations, the present situation and the cooperation which exists between CWC and the irrigation departments, the Ministry of Water Resources of the State Governments, it is not perhaps the time for Government of India to consider extraordinary measures like amendments to the Constitution, or going in for a legislation in the teeth of opposition from the State Governments when they are co-operating with us, because we may have a law, but we may thereby have a bad situation. I think the situation on the ground is more important, viz. cooperation between State Governments and the Central Government."

12. Referring to the request made by the Ministry in their note to accept the Ministry's plea that it was not a case of assurance, the Committee pointed out that it was for the Committee to decide whether the reply constituted an assurance or not and the observations of the Ministry in this regard were uncalled for. Explaining the position the representative of the Ministry stated :

"The spirit of the communication is that it is difficult to live with this assurance, because sometimes there is a certain time-bound programme, and an assurance is given, and it is amenable to implementation within a fixed period of time. Here, we meant that in view of what has been done, perhaps to carry this assurance on the books of the Committee and to pursue it as a periodical review, might not be necessary now in the context of the detailed report submitted by us. But I admit that this might have been more happily worded".

* * *

MINUTES

Fourteenth Sitting

The Minutes of the Sitting of the Committee on Government Assurances held on 3 May, 1989 in Committee Room 53, Parliament House, New Delhi.

The Committee met on Wednesday, 3 May, 1989 from 15.50 hours to 17.20 hours.

PRESENT

Prof. Narain Chand Parashar — *Chairman*

MEMBERS

2. Shri Bapulal Malviya
3. Shri Murlidhar Mane
4. Shri V. Krishna Rao
5. Shri Bhola Rau
6. Shri Kamla Prasad Singh
7. Shrimati Usha Thakkar

SECRETARIAT

1. Shri C.K. Jain—*Joint Secretary*
2. Shri S.C. Gupta—*Deputy Secretary*
3. Shri Jyoti Prasad Jain—*Officer on Special Duty*

* * *

2. The Committee considered the draft Sixteenth Report and adopted the same and authorised the Chairman to present the same in the current Session of Lok Sabha.

3. The Committee then adjourned.