

**COMMITTEE  
ON  
GOVERNMENT ASSURANCES  
(1989-90)**

(EIGHTH LOK SABHA)

**TWENTIETH REPORT**

(Presented on

4 AUG 1989



**LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT  
NEW DELHI**

*July 1989/Asa dha 1911(Saka)  
Price Rs. 4.00*

372R  
20

## CONTENTS

	PAGE
COMPOSITION OF THE COMMITTEE . . . . .	(iii)
INTRODUCTION . . . . .	(v)
CHAPTER-I Requests for dropping of assurances . . . . .	1
CHAPTER-II Position of pending assurances pertaining to Seventh and Eighth Lok Sabha . . . . .	4
APPENDIX-I Requests for dropping of assurances—not accepted and pending implementation . . . . .	5
APPENDIX-II Requests for dropping of assurances not accepted and subsequently implemented . . . . .	33
APPENDIX-III Statements showing the position of assurances pertaining to Seventh and Eighth Lok Sabha pending implementation by the Government as on 10 May, 1989 . . . . .	52
<b>MINUTES</b>	
Minutes of the sitting held on 20 October, 1987 . . . . .	54
Minutes of sitting held on 5 December, 1988 . . . . .	57
Minutes of sitting held on 28 December, 1988 . . . . .	64
Minutes of sitting held on 16 January, 1989 . . . . .	71
Minutes of sitting held on 30 May, 1989 . . . . .	79
Meetings of sitting held on 6 July, 1989 . . . . .	81

COMPOSITION OF THE COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT  
ASSURANCES\*

(1989-90)

Prof. Narain Chand Parashar—*Chairman*

2. Shri L. Balaraman
3. Shri Bhadreswar Tanti
4. Shri Kadambur M. R. Janarthanan
5. Shri Bapulal Malaviya
6. Shri Sanat Kumar Mandal
7. Shri Murlidhar Mane
8. Shri V. Krishna Rao
9. Shri Bhola Raut
10. Shri Prabhu Lal Rawat
11. Shri Bajju Ban Riyan
12. Shrimati Shanti Devi
13. Shri Kamla Prasad Singh
14. Shrimati Usha Thakkar
15. Shri Mahabir Prasad Yadav

SECRETARIAT

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

---

\*The Committee was nominated by the Speaker w.e.f. June 20, 1989 vide Para No. 2982 of Lok Sabha Bulletin Part-II dated 20 June, 1989,

COMPOSITION OF THE COMMITTEE\* ON GOVERNMENT  
ASSURANCES

(1988-89)

---

- Prof. Narain Chand Parashar—*Chairman*
2. Shri Balaraman
  3. Dr. S. Jagathraksnakan
  4. Shri Bapulal Malviya
  5. Shri Murlidhar Mane
  6. Dr. A. K. Patel
  7. Shri V. Krishna Rao
  8. Shri Bholu 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 Jain—*Officer on Special Duty*

---

\*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.

## INTRODUCTION

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

2. The Committee (1989-90) were constituted on June 20, 1989.

3. The Committee (1987-88) at their sittings held on 20 October, 1987, 5 December, 28 December, 1988 and 16 January, 1989 considered requests from the Ministries for dropping of assurances. At their Seventeenth Sitting held on 30 May, 1989, the Committee (1988-89) considered and adopted the draft Twentieth Report.

4. The Report, however, could not be presented to Lok Sabha due to the expiry of the term of the Committee on 31 May, 1989.

5. The Report was again considered and adopted by the Committee (1989-90) at their sitting held on 6 July, 1989.

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

7. The conclusions/observations of the Committee are contained in the succeeding chapters.

NEW DELHI;

6 July, 1989

15 Asadha, 1911 (Saka)

PROF. NARAIN CHAND PARASHAR,

*Chairman,*

*Committee on Govt. Assurances*

## CHAPTER I

### REQUEST FOR DROPPING OF ASSURANCES

1.1 The Committee at their sitting held on 20 October, 1987, 5 and 28 December, 1988, and 16 January, 1989, considered 29 requests from various Ministries|Departments for dropping of pending assurances given during the Fifth, Seventh, Eighth, Ninth and Tenth Sessions of Eighth Lok Sabha. The Committee were not convinced of the reasons advanced by the Ministries|Departments for dropping of these assurances and decided to pursue them for their expeditious implementation. Out of these 29 assurances, 12 of them as detailed in Appendix II have since been implemented. However, the following 17 assurances still remain unfulfilled:—

<i>Sl. No.</i>	<i>SQ/USQ. Nos. &amp; Date</i>	<i>Subject</i>
1	2	3
1	USQ. No. 7442/23-4-86 .	Portuguese laws and decrees in force in Goa Daman and Diu.
2	USQ. No. 520/6-11-86 .	Proposal to introduce new common syllabus for medical education.
3	USQ. No. 763/2-3-87 .	Housing mortgage Insurance Scheme.
4	USQ. No. 4881/26-8-87 .	Three-wheelers for handicapped.
5	USQ. No. 3372/30-11-87	Report of Committee on minimum wages for agricultural labour.
6	USQ. No. 2569/11-3-88 .	Abid Hussain Committee Report on capital market.
7	USQ. No. 6048/7-4-88 .	Tata Committee recommendations.
8	USQ. No. 6282/8-4-88 .	Mahananda left bank scheme of West Bengal.
9	USQ. No. 6285/8-4-88 .	Sunderban Delta Project.
10	USQ. No. 6842/12-4-88 .	Power Generation in Eighth Plan Period.
11	USQ. No. 7571/20-4-88	Restructuring of Central Secretariat Services.
12	USQ. No. 8061/22-4-88	Kandi area integrated Flood Control Scheme.

1	2	3
13	USQ. No. 8344/25-4-88.	On-going projects.
14	USQ. No. 9275/2-5-88 ..	Computer managed maintenance system of steel plants.
15	USQ. No. 9936/6-5-88 ..	Group Insurance Scheme for landless labourers.
16	SQ. No. 1036/10-5-88 ..	Target of reserve accretion of O.N.G.C.
17	SQ. No. 39/28-7-88	Modernisation of Durgapur Steel Plant.

The details in regard to these cases are given in Appendix I.

1.2 The Committee are extremely unhappy to note the inordinate delay in the implementation of the assurances. As would be seen from the above statement, some of the assurances are pending implementation for over two years and a large number of them have remained unfulfilled for over a year as against the prescribed period of three months. The Assurances pending implementation include matters of immense public importance like Mortgage Insurance Scheme for Housing, restructuring of the Central Secretariat Services and Group Insurance Scheme for Landless labourers. In the case of assurance relating to Mortgage Insurance Scheme, inspite of the fact that a draft scheme had been prepared by a special Committee consisting of the representatives of GIC, HDFC and the Ministry of Urban Development, the Ministry has not been able to finalise the draft bill in this regard, even after the lapse of two years since the assurance was given in the House. Similarly, the questions of restructuring of Central Secretariat Services and introduction of Group Insurance Scheme for Landless Labourers in all the States are still pending although more than one year has passed since the assurances were given in Lok Sabha. The Committee cannot help concluding that the implementation of the assurances has not been accorded attention it deserves. They hope that the Ministries/Departments concerned would atleast now make sincere and consistent efforts to implement the pending assurances at the earliest.

1.3 The Committee also deplore the tendency on the part of the Ministries/Departments to wriggle out of the assurances by approaching them with the request for dropping of the assurances on frivolous grounds. In many of the cases mentioned in para 1.1 above the request for dropping the assurance was made on the ground

that the implementation of the assurance was likely to take a long time. The Committee would reiterate that in such cases the proper course was to seek extension of time considered to be absolutely minimum necessary to implement the assurance instead of resorting to the easy course of making a request to the Committee for dropping of the assurance.

1.4. The Committee are constrained to observe that in several cases, the Ministries came forward with plea to drop the assurance on the ground that their reply merely presented the factual position and as such should not have been treated as an assurance. The Committee have repeatedly pointed out that it is the exclusive prerogative of the Committee to decide whether a reply of the Minister constituted an assurance or not and it is not for the Ministry to question the decision of the Committee. The Ministries would, therefore, do well to take concerted measures to implement the assurances instead of trying to sit over the judgement of the Committee.

1.5. The Committee also take a serious view of the laxity on the part of the Ministries in seeking extensions of time for fulfilling of assurances. Out of 17 cases mentioned in paragraph 1 above, in as many as 7 cases, the period upto which extensions were sought for fulfilment of assurances has expired but neither the assurances have been implemented nor further extensions sought for their implementation. The Committee emphasise that the pending assurances need to be reviewed periodically at the highest level in the Ministry to ensure their expeditious implementation and in cases of delays, extensions of time should be sought well in advance, wherever necessary.

1.6. Even in respect of 12 assurances which have been implemented, the Committee are unhappy to note that there have been delays of more than one year in implementing them and the Ministries concerned took steps to implement them only when their requests for dropping the assurances were not agreed to by the Committee. Considering the fact that the Ministries have been able to implement these assurances, although belatedly, clearly shows that the requests of the Ministries for dropping these assurances were untenable. The Committee stress that in future the request for dropping of an assurance should be made only in rare cases where the Ministry/ Department concerned are fully convinced that the assurance could not be implemented under any circumstance and there was no option left with them but to approach the Committee for its dropping. . .



## CHAPTER II

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

2.1 A statement showing the position of assurances pertaining to Seventh and Eighth Lok Sabha (upto Twelfth Session pending implementation by the Government as on 10 May, 1989 is given in Appendix-III.

2.2 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 them.

PROF. NARAIN CHAND PARASHAR

*Chairman,*

*Committee on Government Assurances.*

NEW DELHI;

6 July, 1989

15 Asadha, 1911 (Saka)

## APPENDIX I

### *Requests for dropping of assurances not accepted and pending implementation*

(i)

#### *Portuguese laws and decrees in force in Goa, Daman and Diu*

1. On 23 April, 1986 the following Unstarred Question (No. 7442) given notice of by Shri Shantaram Naik M.P. was addressed to the Minister of Home Affairs:

"(a) whether there are a number of Portuguese laws and decrees in force in the Union Territory of Goa, Daman and Diu;

(b) if so, the details and titles thereof. and

(c) reasons for not replacing these by Indian statutes so far?"

2. The then Minister of State in the Ministry of Home Affairs (Shri Ram Niwas Mirdha) gave the following reply:

"(a) Yea, Sir.

(b) As per the statement attached.

(c) The matter relating to the review of Portuguese laws in force in the Union Territory of Goa, Daman and Diu and extension of corresponding Indian laws is under consideration of the Committee set up by the Union Territory Administration. The recommendations of the Committee for retention of the existing Portuguese laws or otherwise are still awaited."

3. The reply to para (c) of the question was treated as an assurance by the Committee which was to be fulfilled within three months of the date of reply i.e. by 22 July, 1986.

4. On 2 December, 1987, the Ministry of Home Affairs approached the Committee through the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs vide their U.O. Note No. V/HA (33) USQ 7442-LS/87 for the dropping of the assurance on the grounds indicated below:

"The Goa region of the erstwhile Union Territory of Goa, Daman and Diu was conferred Statehood and they are fully independent to take their own view in the matter

relating to the applicability of laws in that territory. The matter is at present pending before the Committee of Legislative Assembly of Goa."

5. The Committee considered the request of the Ministry of Home Affairs for the dropping of these assurance at their sitting held on 28 December, 1988.

They noted that Daman and Diu were still a Union Territory. They therefore, did not agree to drop the assurance. The extension of time upto 23 January 1989 was, however, granted for fulfilling the assurance.

6. The decision of the Committee was accordingly conveyed to the Ministry. Subsequently, the Ministry sought extension of time upto 23 July, 1989 for fulfilling the assurance on the grounds indicated below:

"The Central Government has to go by the suggestions by the State Government of Goa in the matter of retention or repeal of Portuguese laws in the Union territory of Daman and Diu. The erstwhile Union territory of Goa, Daman and Diu was having uniformity in the matter of application of laws including the Portuguese laws. The information with regard to the various laws still in force in Daman and Diu, including the authentic English version of such laws, has been called for from the State Government of Goa and a final decision with regard to their retention or otherwise will be taken in due course of time in accordance with the recommendations of the Committee set up by the State Government to review such laws.

In view of the peculiar circumstances stated above and having regard to the fact that the UT Administration of Daman & Diu, being small in size, does not have a Law Officer of its own, it will be difficult to take quick decision in the matter."

7. The assurance is yet to be fulfilled.

## (ii)

*Proposal to introduce new common syllabus for Medical education*

8. On 6 November, 1986, the following Unstarred Question (No. 520) given notice of by Shri Vijay Kumar Mishra, M.P., was addressed to the Minister of Health and Family Welfare:

- “(a) whether the Central Council of Health and Family Welfare has recommended restructuring of medical education;
- (b) if so, what are the suggestions of the Central Council of Health and Family Welfare in this regard;
- (c) whether Government have considered these suggestions; and
- (d) whether Government propose to introduce new scheme and new common syllabus for medical education in the country?”

9. The Minister of State in the Department of Health in the Ministry of Health and Family Welfare (Kumari Saroj Khaparde) gave the following reply:—

“(a) to (d): the 12th Joint Conference of Central Council of Health and Central Family Welfare Council in its meeting held on September 22—24, 1986 has, *inter-alia*, recommended that:—

- (i) the Medical Council of India may be requested to review the curriculum and syllabus of under-graduate and post-graduate courses with a view to incorporating the essential elements of Primary Health Care;
- (ii) the Central and State Governments may establish Universities of Health Sciences in order to bring about coordination between various educational and training institutions of the modern and various Indian Systems of Medicine, Dentistry, Nursing, Pharmacy, etc. and promote research;
- (iii) the Central and State Governments should evolve uniform procedures for admission to medical colleges keeping in view the recommendations of the Medical Education Review Committee and the recent decision of the Supreme Court.

The above recommendations would be processed in consultation with the Medical Council of India, State Governments and other concerned authorities."

10. 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 6 February, 1987.

11. On 16 September, 1987, 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. VII/HFW (14) USQ. 520 to drop the assurance on the grounds indicated below:—

"It may be pointed out that the recommendations of the 12th Jt. Conference of the Central Council of Health and the Central Family Welfare Council held from 22nd to 24th September, 1986 regarding Medical & Health Education were forwarded to the State Governments/Union Territories on the 10th December, 1986 requesting them to take action on the recommendations. The Medical Council of India was also requested on the 9th February, 1987 to send their comments on the recommendations. While the Medical Council have given comments *vide* their letter of the 23rd June, 1987, the State Govts. have not yet replied and they have been reminded on the 23rd June, 1987. The question (USQ. No. 520 answered on 6-11-86) related to the recommendations made by the Central Council of Health regarding restructuring of medical education and introduction of common syllabus for medical education in the country. The Medical Council of India has stated that as a matter of policy the Council reviews and revises the under-graduate and post-graduate curriculum periodically keeping in view the developments taking place all over the world and also the needs of the country. The post-graduate Committee of the Council has already initiated action to review and revise its recommendations. The restructuring of medical education and review of curriculum and syllabus of under-graduate and post-graduate courses is a long drawn process and it will not be possible to fix any time limit within which such reviews could be given effect to."

12. The Committee considered the request of the Ministry of Health and Family Welfare for dropping the assurance at their sitting held on 20 October, 1987. The Committee did not agree to drop the assurance and desired that the assurance be implemented expeditiously.

13. The decision of the Committee was conveyed to the Ministry. The Ministry subsequently sought further extension of time upto 15 May, 1989 on the following ground:—

“The Ministry have already taken up the matter at the level of Union Health Secretary with the Health Secretaries of all State Governments/UTs on the 18th August, 1988, and inspite of the facts that replies were requested by 6th September, 1989, so far only three State Governments have replied. The remaining State Governments will be reminded to furnish replies immediately.”

14. The assurance is yet to be implemented.

(iii)

#### *Housing Mortgage Insurance Scheme*

15. On 2 March, 1987, the following Unstarred Question (No. 763) given notice of by Chaudhary Ram Parkash, M.P. was addressed to the Minister of Urban Development:—

- “(a) whether Union Government propose to introduce housing loan mortgage insurance scheme with a view to give boost to housing finance activity in the country; and  
(b) if so, the main features of the proposal?”

16. The Minister of State for Urban Development (Shri Dalbir Singh) gave the following reply:—

- “(a) & (b) Government have received a Report containing a draft scheme of mortgage insurance prepared by the special Committee consisting of representatives of the General Insurance Corporation of India, Housing Development Finance Corporation and the Ministry of Urban Development. The recommendations made would require detailed examination”.

17. The 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 2 June, 1987.

18. On 6 September, 1988 the Ministry of Urban Development approached the Committee through the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs *vide* their U.O. Note No. VIII/UD(65) USQ. 763-LS/87 to drop the assurance on the grounds indicated above:

“Introduction of a Mortgage Insurance Scheme in the country requires promulgation of an enabling Act. Though a draft Bill for the purpose had been prepared some-time back, it is yet to be finalised and some amendments thereto are presently under consideration in consultation with the Ministry of Finance and the Ministry of Law. Finalisation of the draft legislation is, therefore, likely to take some more time. Even after the legislation has been finalised, the Ministry of Finance will require some more time to obtain the approval of the Cabinet and complete other formalities. This Ministry will, therefore, not be in a position to fulfil the assurance in the near future. The Ministry of Finance has also expressed the view that since it is too early to say when the scheme/legislation will be enacted, it appears to be of no use to obtain extension of time again and again. In the circumstances, this Ministry suggests that the Committee on Government Assurances, Lok Sabha may kindly be moved to delete this assurance from the list of assurance in the name of this Ministry. All efforts will, however, be made by this Ministry to finalise the legislation on the subject as early as possible.”

19. The Committee considered the request of the Ministry of Urban Development for dropping of the assurance at their sitting held on 5 December, 1988 and decided not to agree to the request of the Ministry for dropping the assurance.

20. The decision of the Committee was conveyed to the Ministry. The Ministry subsequently sought further extension of time upto 30 April, 1989 for fulfilling the assurance on the grounds indicated below:

“The proposal for introduction of Mortgage Insurance Scheme is still under consideration; the draft bill in this regard is under preparation and it will require some more time before it can be introduced in the Parliament.”

21. However, the assurance is yet to be fulfilled.

(iv)

*Three wheelers for handicapped*

22. On 26 August, 1987 the following Unstarred Question (No. 4881) given notice of by Shrimati Usha Choudhary, M.P. was addressed to the Minister of Welfare.

“(a) whether Government are aware of difficulties experienced by the physically handicapped persons in getting hand driver three wheelers; and

(b) if so, the yearly production of three wheelers, the price and method for making them available to the handicapped?”

The Deputy Minister in the Ministry of Welfare (Shri Giridhar Gomango) gave the following reply:

“(a) & (b): Three wheelers are manufactured by the Artificial Limb Manufacturing Corporation, Kanpur, a Public Sector Undertaking under the Ministry of Welfare, and a number of small scale manufacturing units in different parts of the country. Hand driven three wheelers are given on the basis of certain criteria which include certification that applicant cannot use any other form of mobility aid, the disability being so severe that he can only move in three wheeler. The Ministry has a scheme of assistance for distribution of aids and appliances upto Rs. 3000/- in value to the disabled out of which in exceptional cases hand driven three wheelers can be given. If the handicapped person has an income less than Rs. 1500 he is given the three wheeler free of cost and if his income is between Rs. 1600/- and 3000/- at 50 per cent of the cost. The distribution is done through approved centres throughout the country which include a large number of voluntary organisations.

The yearly production of three wheelers produced by ALIMCO during the last three years is as follows:—

1985-86	.....	185
1986-87	.....	425
1987-88	.....	215

(from April to July)



The present price of three wheelers supplied by ALIMCO is Rs. 2,900/- each F.O.R. destination plus Sales Tax. Any individual, voluntary organisation, State or Central Government Departments, institutions, private industries ALIMCO dealers can book orders for three wheelers. The demand on ALIMCO for this item is adequately met.

Information regarding the quantity of production of three wheelers by small scale manufacturing units and the price being charged by them is not readily available."

23. The 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 26 November, 1987.

24. On 6 October, 1988, the Ministry of Welfare approached the Committee through the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs *vide* their U.O. Note No. VIII-2/Wel(15) USQ. 4881-LS/87 for the dropping of the assurance on the grounds indicated below:

"The small scale manufacturers in the Private Sector are spread across the whole country and the number of such manufacturers is not known. The prices these manufacturers charge of three wheelers vary from place to place depending on the local market conditions. The efforts to collect such information from the whole country apart from taking a very long time, may not be complete and as such will not be commensurate with the results. A large number of small-scale sector manufacturers may not respond at all with the result that the information is not likely to reflect the correct position. The office of Development Commissioner, small Scale Industry has also given this Ministry to understand that the addresses of small scale manufacturers are not known to their office and hence it may not be possible to collect complete information regarding the production of tricycles in the country."

25. The Committee considered the request of the Ministry of Welfare for the dropping of the assurance at their sitting held on 28 December, 1988 and decided not to accede to the request of the Ministry for dropping the assurance.

26. The decision of the Committee was accordingly conveyed to the Ministry. The Ministry subsequently sought extension upto 30 June, 1989 on the grounds indicated below:

"Efforts are being made by this Ministry to collect informa-

tion from various sources involved in the manufacturing of three wheelers for the handicapped. The requisite information will be placed on the table of the House as soon as the same is received by this Ministry."

27. The assurance is yet to be fulfilled.

(v)

*Report of Committee on minimum wages for agricultural labour*

28. On 30 November, 1987, the following Unstarred Question (No. 3372) given notice of by Shri P. Kamran, M.P. was addressed to the Minister of Labour:

"(a) whether the Committee set up under the Chairmanship of Shri Jinabhai Darjee for determining the minimum wages of rural labour has submitted any interim report;

(b) if so, whether Government are considering any enactment of fixing a minimum wage for agricultural labour; and

(c) if so, the details thereof?"

29. The then Minister of State in the Ministry of Labour (Shri P. A. Sangma) gave the following reply:—

"(a) The National Commission on Rural Labour has been set up under the Chairmanship of Shri Jinabhai Darji to, *inter-alia*, study and report on fixation of a minimum wage for rural labour as also the enforcement mechanism. The Commission has not yet submitted any report.

(b) & (c) Do not arise."

30. The above reply to part (a) 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 29 February, 1988.

31. On 23 June, 1988, the Ministry of Labour approached the Committee through the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs *vide* their U.O. Note No. IX/L(19)USQ. 337-LS/87 for the dropping of the assurance on the grounds indicated below:

"In case the statement 'The Commission has not yet submitted any report' has been considered as an Assurance, it may be stated that it is not known as to when the Com-

mission would submit its Report(s) and it is still more than two years before the term of the Commission will expire. It will, therefore, be clear that even if the reply is considered to be an Assurance, it will serve no purpose by keeping it pending for a long time, which may exceed even two years."

32. The Committee considered the request of the Ministry of Labour for the dropping of the assurance at their sitting held on 5 December, 1989 and decided not to accede to the request of the Ministry for dropping the assurance. However, the request for extension of time upto 31 March, 1989 was granted to fulfil it, as desired by the Ministry.

33. The decision of the Committee was conveyed to the Ministry. The assurance is yet to be fulfilled.

(vi)

*Abid Hussain Committee Report on Capital Market*

34. On 11 March, 1988 the following Unstarred Question (No. 2569) given notice of by Shri H. B. Patil, M.P. was addressed to the Minister of Finance:—

"(a) whether the Abid Hussain Committee on Development Capital Market has submitted its interim report to Government; and

(b) if so, the details thereof regarding its recommendations?"

35. The Minister of State in the Ministry of Finance (Shri Eduardo Fileiro) stated following reply:—

"(a) Yes Sir.

(b) Details regarding the recommendations cannot be disclosed until a decision is taken by Government on the final Report which is yet to be submitted by the Committee."

36. The 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 11 June, 1988.

37. On 19 May, 1988, the Ministry of Finance approached the Committee through the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs *vide* their

U.O. Note No. X/F in (12) USQ 2569-LS/88 for the dropping of the assurance on the grounds indicated below:—

“The reply given to the above mentioned question does not contain any Assurance but *only a statement of facts*. Hence it is requested that the reply may not be considered as an Assurance.”

38. The Committee considered the request of the Ministry of Finance for the dropping of the Assurance at their sitting held on 5 December, 1988 and decided not to accede to the request of the Ministry for dropping the assurance. However, the extension of time upto 31 December, 1988 was granted as desired by the Ministry.

39. The decision of the Committee was conveyed to the Ministry. Thereafter, the Ministry sought extension of time upto 30 June 1989 for fulfilment the assurance on the ground indicated below:—

“The Committee on capital market has not yet submitted its final report to the Government.”

40. The Assurance is yet to be fulfilled.

(vii)

*Tata Committee recommendations*

41. On 7 April, 1988, the following Unstarred Question No. (6048) given notice of by S|Shri Dharam Pal Singh Malik, Sita Ram J. Gavali, Manikrao Hodlya Gavit, Prakash Chandra, Subhash Yadav and Prof. K. V. Thomas, M.Ps was addressed to the Minister of Civil Aviation:

“(a) whether Government have considered the Tata Committee’s recommendations to privatise Air India and Indian Airlines to improve their operational efficiency and international competitiveness and propose to reconsider the entire transport policy of the country; and

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

42. The then Minister of Health and Family Welfare and Civil Aviation (Shri Moti Lal Vora) gave the following reply:

“(a) and (b): To develop a well integrated longterm perspective plan for the transport sector, the Planning Commission has set up a Steering Committee, for Transport

Planning. For providing inputs to the Steering Committee, a Planning Group on Civil Aviation headed by Shri J. R. D. Tata was also set up. The findings and recommendations of this Group, including those relating to equity participation by staff and others are under consideration of the Steering Committee for Transport Planning.

The report of the Steering Committee for Transport Planning has not been received by the Government."

43. The 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 7 July, 1988.

44. On 31 October, 1988, the Ministry of Civil Aviation approached the Committee through the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs vide their U.O. Note No. X/CA(12) USQ. 6048-LS/88 for the dropping of the assurance on the grounds indicated below:

"The report of the Planning Group on Civil Aviation headed by Shri J. R. D. Tata would be an input for the Steering Committee of the Planning Commission for formulation a long term plan on Transport sector, Government would not take any formal view or decisions on the recommendations of the Tata Group on Civil Aviation. It may not, therefore, be possible for this Ministry to fulfil the assurance in the foreseeable future."

45. The Committee considered the request of the Ministry of Civil Aviation for the dropping of the assurance at their sitting held on 16 January, 1989 and decided not to accede to the request of the Ministry for dropping the assurance.

46. The decision of the Committee was accordingly conveyed to the Ministry. Subsequently, the Ministry sought extension of time upto 6 April, 1989 for fulfilling the assurance on the grounds indicated below:

"The report of the Planning Group on Civil Aviation headed by Shri J. R. D. Tata would be an input for the Steering Committee of the Planning Commission for formulating a long term plan on Transport sector. The finalisation of long term plan for Transport sector (including Civil Aviation sector) would be a time consuming process."

However, the assurance is yet to be fulfilled.

(viii)

*Mahananda left bank scheme of West Bengal*

47. On 8 April, 1988 the following Unstarred Question (No. 6282) given notice of by Shri Purna Chandra Malik, M.P. was addressed to the Minister of Water Resources:—

- “(a) whether the Mahananda left bank scheme of West Bengal is still pending with Union Government;  
 (b) if so, the details thereof;  
 (c) the reasons therefor; and  
 (d) the time by which it is likely to be cleared?”

48. The Minister of State in the Ministry of Water Resources (Shrimati Krishna Sahi) gave the following reply:

“(a) No, Sir.

- (b) to (d). The scheme for construction of embankment on the left bank of river Mahananda (Barsoi Branch) costing Rs. 495 lakhs was examined in the Ganga Flood Control Commission and comments communicated to the State Government in January, 1977. Modified report prepared in the light of these comments is still awaited from the State Government.”

49. The 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 8 July, 1988.

50. On 12 September, 1988, the Ministry of Water Resources approached the Committee through the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs vide their U.O. Note No. X/WR(6) USQ 6282-LS/88 for the dropping of the assurance on the grounds indicated below:

“In the reply furnished to the Parliament Question the words “The scheme for construction of embankment on the left bank of river Mahananda (Barsoi Branch) costing Rs. 495 lakhs was examined in the Ganga Flood Control Commission and Comments communicated to the State Government in January, 1977. Modified report prepared in the light of these comments is still awaited from the State Government” are not used in the sense of intimating at a later date, the likely date by which time the project will be cleared.

The drill involved in clearing the project is that the scheme after receipt from the State Government has to be examined by Ganga Flood Control Commission. Any subsequent clarifications have to be furnished by State Government before it is cleared by the Advisory Committee of the Ministry of Water Resources. Ultimately, the Planning Commission has to approve the scheme.

The time taken for clearance of a scheme depends mainly upon the initiative of the concerned State Government as also time taken by various Central Government Agencies."

51. The Committee considered the request of the Ministry of Water Resources for the dropping of the assurance at their sitting held on 28 December, 1988 and decided not to accede to the request of the Ministry for dropping the assurance. Taking a serious view of the fact that the Ministry had not sought any extension of time for fulfilling the assurance, the Committee decided that the Ministry should seek extension of time considered to be minimum necessary to fulfil the assurance.

52. The decision of the Committee was accordingly conveyed to the Ministry. The Ministry, later, sought extension of time upto 8 July, 1989 for fulfilling the assurance.

53. The assurance is yet to be fulfilled.

(ix)

*Sunderban delta project*

54. On 8 April, 1988 the following Unstarred Question (No. 6285) given notice of by Shri Mati Lal Hansda, M.P. was addressed to the Minister of Water Resources:—

"(a) whether the Sunderbans Delta Project in West Bengal is still pending for clearance by Union Government;

(b) if so, the reasons therefor; and

(c) the time by which it will be cleared?"

55. The then Minister of State in the Ministry of Water Resources (Shrimati Krishna Sahi) gave the following reply:

"(a) No, Sir.

(b) & (c): The original Scheme costing Rs. 47.30 crores was received in the Ganga Flood Control Commission for examination in October, 1978. The Ganga Flood Control Commission have asked the Government of West Bengal to get a model study done for a dependable quantification of the likely siltation in the post-project condition. This study is awaited."

56. The reply to parts (b) & (c) of the question was treated as an assurance by the Committee and was to be fulfilled within three months of the date of reply i.e. by 8 July, 1988.

57. On 12 August, 1988, the Ministry of Water Resources approached the Committee through the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs *vide* their U.O. Note No. X/WR(7) USQ. 6285-LS/88 for the dropping of the assurance on the grounds indicated below:—

"In the reply furnished to the Parliament Question the words 'it was *inter-alia* stated, "The Ganga Flood Control Commission have asked the Government of West Bengal to get a model study done for a dependable quantification of the likely siltation in the Post-project conditions. This study is awaited", are not used in the sense of intimation at a later date, the likely date by which time the project will be cleared.

The drill involved in clearing the project is that the scheme after receipt from the State Government has to be examined by GFCC. Any subsequent clarifications have to be furnished by State Government before it is cleared by the Advisory Committee of the Ministry of Water Resources. Ultimately, the Planning Commission has to approve the scheme.

The time taken for clearance of a scheme depends mainly upon the initiative of the concerned State Govt. as also time taken by various Central Govt. Agencies."

58. The Committee considered the request of the Ministry of Water Resources for the dropping of the assurance at their sitting held on 5 December, 1988 and decided not to accede to the request of the Ministry for dropping the assurance. However, the extension of time upto 8 January, 1989 was granted to implement the assurance.



59. The decision of the Committee was conveyed to the Ministry. Thereafter, the Ministry sought extension upto 8 July, 1988 for fulfilling the assurance on the ground indicated below:

"The implementation report is under process of submission."

60. The assurance is yet to be implemented.

(x)

*Power generation in Eighth Plan period*

61. On 12 April, 1988, the following Unstarred Question (No. 6842) given notice of by Shrimati Basavarajeswari, M.P. was addressed to the Minister of Energy:—

- "(a) whether the programme of Government to add 38,000 MW of power generation during the Eighth Five Year Plan has gone away;
- (b) if so, the main reasons therefor; and
- (c) how far the power schemes programmed for the Seventh Plan period have been implemented?"

62. The then Minister of State in the Department of Power (Shrimati Sushila Rohatgi) gave the following reply:

- "(a) & (b): The Eighth Plan proposals relating to the Power Sector are yet to be finalised.
- (c) As against a target of commissioning 22245 MW during the Seventh Plan period, upto 31-3-1988 a capacity of about 11829 MW has been commissioned."

63. The reply to parts (a) & (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. 12 July, 1988.

64. On 8 July, 1988 the Ministry of Energy approached the Committee through the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs vide their U.O. Note No. X/Engy. (35) USQ. 6842-LS/88 for the dropping of the assurance on the grounds indicated below:

"It will take quite sometime for the Planning Commission to finalise the Eighth Plan proposals which is to cover the period 1990-91 to 1994-95."

65. The Committee considered the request of the Ministry of Energy for the dropping of the assurance at their sitting held on

5 December, 1988 and decided not to accede to the request of the Ministry for dropping the assurance. Ministry should furnish a note by 31-12-1988 giving the latest position.

66. The decision of the Committee was accordingly conveyed to the Ministry. The Ministry, subsequently sought extension of time upto 12 January, 1990 for fulfilling the assurance on the grounds indicated below:

“The Planning Commission have constituted a Working Group on Power and seven sub-groups in connection with the formulation of Eighth Plan power sector programme. The Working Group is expected to submit its report to the Planning Commission by 31st March, 1989. After receipt of reports of similar Working Groups|Committee set up by the Planning Commission for formulation of Programme in respect of other sectors, the Eighth Plan would be finalised by Government. It would take a long time to finalise the Eighth Five Year Plan (including power programme).”

67. The assurance is yet to be implemented.

(xi)

#### *Restructuring of Central Secretariat Services*

68. On 20 April, 1988, the following Unstarred Question (No. 7571) given notice of by Shri Hussain Dalwai, M.P. was addressed to the Prime Minister.

- “(a) whether Government have any proposal to restructure the Central Secretariat Services or to change its basic character/constitution;
- (b) if so, the details thereof;
- (c) whether the decision has been taken in consultation with the respective service associations; and
- (d) if not, the reasons therefor?”

69. The Minister of State in the Ministry of Personnel, Public Grievances and Pension (Shri P. Chidambaram) gave the following reply:—

- “(a) The Government is considering restructuring of the Central Secretariat Services.

(b) The proposals are yet to be finalised.

(c) and (d). Does not arise."

70. The reply to parts (a) and (b) of the question was treated as an assurance by the Committee which was to be fulfilled within three months of the date of reply i.e. by 20 July, 1988.

71. On 12 August, 1988 the Ministry of Personnel Public Grievances and Pension approached the Committee through the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs *vide* their U.O. Note No. X/PAPP(8) USQ 7571—LS/88 for the dropping of the assurance on the grounds indicated below:

"In this connection it may be stated that no doubt the Government is contemplating to restructure the Central Secretariat Service. At present it is only in the embryo stage where the proposals are yet to be formulated, leave alone processing of the proposals in consultation with the concerned Ministries and Cadre Controlling Authorities, including a dialogue with the staff side under JCM Scheme. It is a time consuming process and calls for considerable thought and care, specially when restructuring is contemplated after more than two decades, further, restructuring the service with a view to bring about both qualitative and quantitative improvements in its functioning, is a continuous ongoing exercise, not only for this cadre but for all other cadres/services as well, and this cannot be completed in short spells. Accordingly, in reply to the unstarred Parliament Question against Part A it was merely stated that "The Government is considering restructuring of the Central Secretariat Service." The position was further clarified in reply to part B of the question stating that "the proposals are yet to be finalised."

In view of the above it may not be correct to treat it as an assurance. Neither it was intended by the Honourable MOS (PP) to give any assurance in reply to this Question."

72. 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 28, December, 1988 and decided not to accede to the request of the Ministry for dropping the assurance.

73. The decision of the Committee was conveyed to the Ministry.

74. Thereafter, the Ministry sought extension of time upto 20 April, 1989 for fulfilling the assurance on the grounds indicated below:

"The matter is still under the consideration of the Government."

75. The assurance is yet to be implemented.

(xii)

*Kandi area Integrated Flood Control Scheme*

76. On 22 April, 1988, the following Unstarred Question (No. 8061) given notice of by Shri Syed Masudal Hossain, M.P. was addressed to the Minister of Water Resources:—

"(a) What is the fate of Kandi Area Integrated Flood Control Scheme; and

(b) When it is likely to be cleared?"

77. The Minister of State in the Ministry of Water Resources (Shrimati Krishna Sahi) gave the following Reply:—

"(a) & (b): The Kandi Area Integrated Flood Control Scheme prepared by the Government of West Bengal at an estimated cost of Rs. 51.5 crores was received in the Ganga Flood Control Commission in 1979 for appraisal. The comments of the Ganga Flood Control Commission were communicated to the State Government; their compliance is awaited."

78. The above 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 22 July, 1988.

79. On 12 August, 1988, the Ministry of Water Resources approached the Committee through the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs vide their U.O. Note No. X/WR (9) USQ 8061-LS/88 for the dropping of the assurance on the grounds indicated below:—

"In the reply furnished to the Parliament Question the words "The Kandi Area Integrated Flood Control Scheme prepared by the Government of West Bengal at an estimated cost of Rs. 51.5 crores was received in the Ganga Flood Control Commission in 1979 for appraisal. The comments of the GFCC were communicated to the State Government their compliance is awaited", are not used in the

sense of intimating at a later date, the likely date by which time the project will be cleared.

The drill involved in clearing the project is that the scheme after receipt from the State Government has to be examined by GFCC. Any subsequent clarifications have to be furnished by State Government before it is cleared by the Advisory Committee of the Ministry of Water Resources. Ultimately, the Planning Commission has to approve the scheme.

The time taken for clearance of a scheme depends mainly upon the initiative of the concerned State Government as also time taken by various Central Government Agencies.

80. The Committee considered the request of the Ministry of Water Resources for the dropping of the assurance at their sitting held on 28 December, 1988 and decided to accede to the request of the Ministry for dropping the assurance. The extension of time upto 22 January, 1989 was granted for fulfilling the assurance.

81. The decision of the Committee was accordingly conveyed to the Ministry. The Ministry, later, sought extension of time upto 22 July, 1989 for fulfilling the assurance on the grounds indicated below:

“The implementation report for fulfilment of the assurance is under process of submission”.

82. The assurance is yet to be implemented.

(xiii)

#### *On-going projects*

83. On 25 April, 1988, the following Unstarred Question (No. 8344) given notice of by Shri Y. S. Mahajan, M.P. was addressed to the Minister of Steel and Mines:

“(a) the number of on-going projects, when were these launched, the original completion schedule and the present completion schedule;

- (b) what was the original cost of each project and what will be the estimated cost when each project is finally completed;
- (c) what are the precise reasons for delays in the case of each project; and
- (d) the effect of these on time and cost over-run?"

84. The then Minister of State in the Department of Steel (Shri Yogendra Makwana) gave the following reply:—

- '(a) to (c). Details of on-going major projects in Steel and Mines Sectors are given in the Annexure attached.
- (d) Effect on the time and cost over-run will be known after the projects are completed.

85. The 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 25 July, 1988.

86. On 22 August, 1988, the Ministry of Steel and Mines approached the Committee through the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs *vide* their U.O. Note No. IX/SM(21)USQ. 8344-LS/88 for the dropping of the assurance on the grounds indicated below:

"It may be seen from the Annexure to the reply given by the Department of Steel to the above mentioned Lok Sabha USQ. That some of the on-going projects are likely to be completed only by September, 1992. If the reply given at Part (d) is construed as an assurance then the Department will have to wait atleast till after September 1992 to fulfil the assurance.

In view of the very long time required for the completion of the now on-going projects it is requested that part (d) of the reply may not be treated as assurance."

87. The Committee considered the request of the Ministry of Steel and Mines for the dropping of the assurance at their sitting held on 28 December, 1988 and decided not to accede to the request of the Ministry.

88. The decision of the Committee was accordingly conveyed to the Ministry. However, the assurance is yet to be fulfilled. The Ministry have also not sought extension beyond 24 January, 1989 for fulfilling the assurance.

*Computer managed maintenance system of steel plants*

89. On 2 May, 1988 the following Unstarred Question (No. 9275) given notice of by Prof. Ramkrishna More and Shri H. N. Nanje Gowda, M.Ps. was addressed to the Minister of Steel and Mines:

- “(a) whether the Steel Authority of India Limited is implementing, with the assistance of UNDP, a project for integrated computer managed maintenance system in its units starting with the Rourkela Steel Plant;
- (b) whether Government propose to provide the same equipments to other steel plants also; and
- (c) if so, the details thereof and the time by which the work will be started and completed?”

90. The Minister of Steel and Mines (Shri M. L. Fotedar) gave the following reply:

“(a) Yes, Sir.

(b) & (c): Under its second phase of the Project, it is proposed to be extended to Bhilai, Bokaro, and Durgapur Steel Plants. Details of Phase-II have not yet been finalised.”

91. The reply to parts (b) and (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 2 August, 1988.

92. On 12 September, 1988, the Ministry of Steel and Mines approached the Committee through the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs *vide* their U.O. Note No. X|SM(24) USQ. 9275-LS|88 for the dropping of the assurance on the grounds indicated below:

“Discussions are currently being held with UNDP and various other agencies for extension of Computer Managed Maintenance System to Bhilai, Bokaro and Durgapur Steel Plants under Phase-II of the Project. Phase-I will be completed by the end of 1989 and therefore any decision regarding Phase-II would not be taken before 1989. This too is subject to approval of Govt. of India and UNDP. Therefore, the matter being in a most nebulous and preliminary stage, no time limit can be indicated during which positive decision will be taken.”

93. The Committee considered the request of the Ministry of Steel and Mines for the dropping of the assurance at their sitting held

on 5 December, 1988 and decided not to accede to the request of the Ministry for dropping the assurance and decided that the Ministry should seek further extension of time considered necessary to fulfil the assurance.

94. The decision of the Committee was conveyed to the Ministry. The Ministry subsequently sought extension of time upto 2 May, 1989 for fulfilling the assurance on the ground indicated below:

The finalisation of information is likely to take some more time."

95. The assurance is yet to be fulfilled.

(xv)

*Group Insurance Scheme for landless labourers*

96. On 6 May, 1988, the following Unstarred Question (No. 9936) given notice of by Shrimati Vyjayanthimala Bali and Shri Amar Sinh Rathawa, M.Ps was addressed to the Minister of Finance:

- "(a) the number of landless labourers covered so far under the Group Insurance Scheme introduced by Union Government on 15 August, 1987;
- (b) whether the cooperation of the State Governments and the Union Territories has been sought for the implementation of this scheme; and
- (c) if so, with what results, State-wise?"

97. The Minister of State in the Ministry of Finance (Shri Eduardo Faleiro) gave the following reply:

- "(a) About 3 crores landless agricultural labourers are estimated to be covered under the Group Insurance Scheme introduced by Union Government with effect from 15th August, 1987.
- (b) Yes, Sir.
- (c) The States of Uttar Pradesh, Rajasthan, Jammu and Kashmir, Orissa, Bihar, Karnataka, Madhya Pradesh, Tamil Nadu, Kerala, Goa and Andhra Pradesh and the Union Territories of Delhi and Pondicherry have already issued administrative instructions for implementation of the Scheme. Follow-up action for issue of similar administrative instructions by the remaining States/UTs has been taken."



98. The reply to part (c) of the question was treated as an assurance by the Committee which was to be fulfilled within three months of the date of reply i.e. by 6 August, 1988.

99. On 31 October, 1988, the Ministry of Finance approached the Committee through the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs *vide* their U.O. Note No. X/Fin(102)USQ. 9936-LS/88 for the dropping of the assurance on the grounds indicated below:

“The reply to part (c) of the Question was the factual position as on the date of the question and may not be treated as an assurance. It may be stated that the Scheme which came into force w.e.f. 15th August, 1987 throughout the country was announced in the Lok Sabha on 12-8-1987 and the Finance Minister in his letter dated 14-8-87 requested all the Chief Ministers for assistance in the implementation of the scheme in their respective States/UTs. Immediately thereafter details of the scheme were also made available to the State/UT Governments by Life Insurance Corporation of India. Thereafter the follow-up action being taken by the Central Government as well as the Life Insurance Corporation of India is merely a continuing course of action. Since the implementation of the scheme in the States/UTs is being continuously pursued through the LIC, the follow-up action on the part of the Central Government may not be treated as assurance.”

100. The Committee considered the request of the Ministry of Finance for the dropping of the assurance at their sitting held on 16 January, 1989 and decided not to accede to the request of the Ministry for dropping the assurance. The extension of time upto 6 February, 1989 was, however, granted for fulfilling the assurance, as requested by the Ministry.

101. The decision of the Committee was accordingly conveyed to the Ministry. Later, the Ministry sought extension of time upto 6 August, 1989 for fulfilling the assurance on the grounds indicated below:

“While every effort for implementing the Group Insurance Scheme for Landless Agricultural Labourers all over the country in collaboration with Life Insurance Corporation of India is being taken up, there are still a few State/UT Governments namely, Assam, Maharashtra, West Bengal, Sikkim, Daman & Diu & Lakshadweep who have not yet issued necessary instructions to implement the Scheme to their field staff. The State Government

Union Territories were required to issue Government orders for implementing the Scheme in their respective States and nominating specific authorities at State/District and Village levels who will be responsible for implementation and for overseeing the administration of the Scheme. The LIC officers are in constant touch with the concerned officers of the State/Union Territory Governments for assistance and co-operation in the working of the Scheme."

102. The assurance is yet to be implemented.

(xvi)

103. Target of reserve accretion of ONGC.

On 10 May, 1988 the following Starred Question (No. 1036) given notice of by Shrimati Kishori Sinha, M.P. was addressed to the Minister of Petroleum and Natural Gas:—

- "(a) whether the Oil and Natural Gas Commission is well on the way to achieve the Seventh Plan target of adding 970 million tonnes of oil reserve accretion;
- (b) if so, the details thereof;
- (c) the quantity of oil and gas added by the Oil and Natural Gas Commission during 1987-88 towards its target of reserve accretion;
- (d) whether larger accretion would enable crude production to be raised substantially; and
- (e) if so, the details thereof?"

104. The Minister of State in the Ministry of Petroleum and Natural Gas (Shri Braham Dutt) gave the following reply:

- "(a) and (b): ONGC have added geological reserves of about 820 million tonnes of oil and oil equivalent of gas during the first three years of the Seventh Plan as against a target of 970 million tonnes;
- (c) the addition of geological reserves by ONGC during 1987 has been provisionally estimated as about 300 million tonnes of oil and 112 million tonnes of oil equivalent of gas.
- (d) Accretion of recoverable reserves of crude oil would enable increases in the crude production.

- (e) the exact details of crude production during the Eighth Plan period would be available only after the finalisation of the Eighth Five Year Plan."

105. The reply to part (e) 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 10 August, 1988.

106. On 3 October, 1988, the Ministry of Petroleum and Natural Gas approached the Committee through the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs vide their U.O. Note No. X/PNG(15) SQ. 1036-LS/88 for the dropping of the assurance on the grounds indicated below:

"The assurance related to the 8th Five Year Plan. It is not possible in the near future, to fulfil this assurance since the correct reply can be given only when the 8th Plan is finalised sometimes in 1989 or 1990."

107. The Committee considered the request of the Ministry of Petroleum and Natural Gas for the dropping of the assurance at their sitting held on 16 January, 1989 and decided not to accede to the request of the Ministry for dropping the assurance. The Committee also decided that the Ministry should seek further extension of time considered to be minimum necessary for fulfilling the assurance.

108. The decision of the Committee was accordingly conveyed to the Ministry. Subsequently, the Ministry sought extension of time upto 31 December, 1989 on the grounds indicated below:

"The assurance in this case can be fulfilled only when the 8th Five Year Plan is finalised and the finalisation of the 8th Plan is likely to take about an year."

109. The assurance is yet to be implemented.

(xvii)

#### *Modernisation of Durgapur Steel Plant*

110. On 28 July, 1988 the following Starred Question (No. 39) given notice of by Shri H. N. Nanje Gowda, M.P. was addressed to the Minister of Steel and Mines:

- "(a) whether there has been increase in the cost of modernisation programme of Durgapur Steel Plant;
- (b) if so, the details thereof;

- (c) whether the tenders on global basis have been floated for implementation of the project; and
- (d) if so, when the total value of such tenders and the last dates fixed for the submission of tenders?"

111. The Minister of Steel and Mines (Shri M. L. Fotedar) gave the following reply:

- (a) & (b): "The sanctioned estimates for the modernisation of Durgapur Steel Plant are Rs. 1357 crores based on IIIrd Quarter 1986 prices. The final estimates based on present prices will be known only after the tenders have been evaluated.
- (c) and (d): Yes, Sir. For six packages of work, tenders have been floated on global basis. Tenders in respect of five packages were asked on July 9, 1988 to submit their final bids by 25th July, 1988. For the sixth package, no complete offers have been received. The total value of these packages will be known only after the finalisation of tenders."

112. The 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 28 October, 1988.

113. On 17 November, 1988, the Ministry of Steel and Mines approached the Committee through the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs *vide* their U.O. Note No. XI/SM (I) SQ. 39-LS/88 for the dropping of the assurance on the grounds indicated below:

"A reply to the question, based on the available information was given to the Lok Sabha on 28-7-88. This Department is of the view that the reply was complete in itself and no assurance as such was held out. In this connection, it may please be appreciated that the evaluation and finalisation of tenders for the modernisation scheme involving hundreds of crores of rupees will, of necessity, take considerable time. The understanding of this Department is that Parliament Questions of the nature referred to above can at best be answered with reference to the information available at the relevant time and are not to be put off until new or revised facts emerge over a period of time."

114. The Committee considered the request of the Ministry of Steel and Mines for the dropping of the assurance at their sitting

held on 16 January, 1989 and decided not to accede to the request of the Ministry for dropping of the assurance. They observed that the reply to the question was rightly treated as an assurance. Extension of time upto 31 March, 1989 was, however, granted for fulfilling the assurance.

115. The decision of the Committee was accordingly conveyed to the Ministry. Later, the Ministry sought extension of time upto 31 March, 1989 for fulfilling the assurance.

116. The assurance is yet to be fulfilled.

## APPENDIX II

### *Request for dropping of assurances—not accepted and assurances subsequently implemented*

(i)

#### *Proposal of Orissa to place a land reform act in Ninth Schedule*

117. On 24 March, 1986 the following Unstarred Question (No. 3970) given notice of by Shri K. Pradhani, M.P. was addressed to the Minister of Agriculture.

“(a) whether Government of Orissa submitted a proposal for placing Regulation 2 of 1956 in the Ninth Schedule of the Constitution of India with a view to checking and regulating illegal alienation of lands of persons belonging to Scheduled Tribes; and

(b) if so, the stage at which the matter stands at present?”

118. The then Minister of Agriculture (Shri Buta Singh) gave the following reply:

“(a) Yes, Sir.

(b) Proposal received from Orissa Government is under scrutiny.”

119. The 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 24 June, 1986.

120. On 21 October, 1988, the Ministry of Agriculture approached the Committee through the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs vide their U.O. Note No. V/Agri (52) USQ. 3970-LS/86, dated 21 October, 1988 for the dropping of the assurance on the grounds indicated below:—

“The proposal of Government of Orissa for inclusion of the Act in the Ninth Schedule of the Constitution is being processed alongwith similar proposals received from various other States and as it involves amendment to the Constitution after following due procedures which require detailed examination of the laws in consultation with various Ministries, approval of Cabinet, drafting of the Amendment Bill, introduction in Parliament and its

final enactment, and all these steps take considerable time. Further, it would not be expedient to process the Orissa Law only in isolation as it would mean that similar procedures would have to be followed for every State law."

121. The Ministry of Agriculture sought extension of time upto 24 December, 1988 for fulfilling the assurance.

122. The Committee considered the request of the Ministry of Agriculture for dropping of the assurance at their sitting held on 16 January, 1989 but did not accede to it and desired that the Ministry should seek further extension of time considered necessary to fulfil the assurance.

123. The decision of the Committee was accordingly conveyed to the Ministry.

124. The Ministry, however, implemented the assurance only on 28 February, 1989, by laying on the Table of the House Statement No. XXI (Item No. 1).

(ii)

*Bauxite mines in Krishnadeopeta in A.P.*

125. On 6 April, 1987, the following Unstarred Question (No. 5864) given notice by Shri Bhattam Sriramamurthy, M.P., was addressed to the Minister of Steel and Mines:

- "(a) whether Government have signed a contract with USSR in January, 1986 for preparation of feasibility report for bauxite mines in Krishnadeopeta in Andhra Pradesh;
- (b) whether the report has since been made available and decision taken for appropriate investment on the project;
- (c) whether Government had undertaken feasibility study of the Alumina Plant in Visakhapatnam district of Andhra Pradesh;
- (d) the estimated capital cost at 1980 price level for 6 lac-tonne plant; and
- (e) the stage at which the matter stands?"

126. The Minister of State in the Department of Mines (Shrimati Ram Dulari Sinha) gave the following reply:—

- "(a) National Aluminium Company Limited signed a contract with Tsvetmetpromexport of USSR.

(b) No Sir.

(c) and (d): In 1980, the Soviets prepared a feasibility report. The estimated capital cost for a six lac tonne per annum alumina-plant was Rs. 426 crores at first quarter of 1980 price level.

(e) At present the Government is examining the export oriented Bauxite project."

127. Reply to part (e) 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 6 July, 1987.

128. On 29 September, 1987 the Ministry of Steel and Mines approached the Committee on Government Assurances through the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs *vide* their U.O. Note No. VIII/SM(25) USQ. 5864—LS/87 to drop the assurance on the grounds indicated below:—

"The Andhra Bauxite Project has been featuring in the Indo-Soviet Joint Commission as well as various meetings of the Working Group on Non-Ferrous Metallurgy of the above Joint Commission from 1982 onwards. In accordance with the protocol of the IXth Session of the Inter-Governmental Soviet-Indian Commission on Economic, Scientific and Technical Cooperation pertaining to non-Ferrous metallurgy, an agreement was signed between M/s. Tsvetmetpromexport-USSR and the National Aluminium Company Limited (NALCO) on 24th January, 1986 for preparation of a feasibility report for establishing a 2.3 MTPY Export-oriented Bauxite Mine in Andhra Pradesh. The feasibility report has been received in February, 1987.

Before the Feasibility Report is taken up for appraisal for investment decision, discussion/negotiations will have to be held between Indian and the Soviet sides on various aspects. Only after these matters are sorted out to the satisfaction of both sides, the feasibility report can be appraised by various agencies before it can be posed for investment decision by Government. This likely to take quite sometime. In the case of such proposals, it will be difficult to indicate a definite time schedule."

129. The Committee considered the request of the Ministry of Steel and Mines for dropping the assurance at their sitting held on 20 October, 1987 and decided not to accede to the request of the Ministry.



130. The Ministry implemented the assurance only on 5 September, 1988 by laying on the Table of the House Statement No. XI (Item No. 10).

(iif)

*Intensive Monitoring system for 20 Point Programme*

131. On 6 August, 1987 the following Starred Question (No. 144) given notice of by Shri N. Tombi Singh, M.P. was addressed to the Minister of Programme Implementation:

- (a) whether Union Government propose to have a more intensive monitoring system at the State and lower levels to ensure that targets under 20 Point Programme are fully achieved;
- (b) whether a system of physical inspection would also be evolved; and
- (c) if so, the details thereof?"

132. The Minister of State in the Ministry of Programme Implementation (Shri Sukh Ram) gave the following reply:—

"(a) Yes, Sir.

(b) It has been suggested to the concerned Central Ministries to introduce the scheme of Concurrent Evaluation of the implementation of various items under the 20-Point Programme. The Department of Rural Development have already introduced this scheme in respect of Integrated Rural Development Programme and Rural Water Supply.

(c) A Monitoring Manual for monitoring the 20-Point Programme from village/block to the State level has been prepared for guidance of State Governments and Union Territory Administration."

133. During the course of supplementaries on the question, Kamari Mamta Banerjee complained that the State Government of West Bengal was misusing/defalcating crores of rupees out of funds given by the centre for implementation of the 20-Point Programme and pointed out that it had happened in Alipore Nazirkhana and other treasuries in West Bengal. She wanted to know the steps Government proposed to take to probe the matter and whether some high power committee would be set up to enquire into the matter.

134. In reply to the above supplementary, the Minister of State in the Ministry of Programme Implementation (Shri Sukh Ram) stated as follows:

"I did not receive any complaint from the official sources regarding misuse of funds by the West Bengal Government. But since the Honourable Member has made a complaint about the misuse of funds in West Bengal I will definitely look into the matter. If necessary a High Power Committee will be set up because the centre contributes 37 per cent of the resources for this programme."

135. The above reply to supplementary 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 6 November, 1987.

136. On 31 October, 1988, the Ministry of Programme Implementation approached the Committee through the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs *vide* their O.M. No. VIII-2/PI (3)-SQ. 144-LS/87 dated 31 October, 1988 for the dropping of the assurance on the grounds indicated below:

"The Minister of State for Programme Implementation had requested Kumari Mamta Banerjee, M.P., to give complete details regarding misuse/defalcation of funds given for implementation of the 20-Point Programme and other instances in Alipur Nazirkhana and other treasuries. These details were considered necessary to pursue the matter with the authorities concerned. Despite repeated requests, the requisite information has not been forthcoming. Presumably, the Honourable Member is no longer interested in pursuing the matter further. The Committee on Government Assurances may, therefore, be approached for deleting the above mentioned assurance. In any case, it will not be possible for this Ministry to fulfil the assurance unless the Honourable Member furnishes the full information."

137. The Committee considered the request of the Ministry at their sitting held on 16 January, 1989 and decided not to accede to the request of the Ministry for dropping of the assurance. The decision of the Committee was accordingly conveyed to the Ministry.

138. The Ministry, however, implemented the assurance only on 9 May, 1989 by laying on the Table of the House Statement No. XII (Item No. 11).

(iv)

*Fresh initiative to solve Punjab problem*

139. On 28 August, 1987, the following Unstarred Question (No. 5391) given notice of by Shrimati N. P. Jhansi Lakshmi, Dr. (Mrs.) T. Kalpana Devi and Shri Balram Singh Yadav, M.Ps. was addressed to the Minister of Home Affairs:—

“(a) whether Government have any proposal to take a fresh initiative to solve the Punjab problem; and

(b) if so, the details thereof?”

140. The Minister of State in the Ministry of Home Affairs (Shri P. Chidambaram) gave the following reply:—

“(a) and (b): The Government has made sincere efforts to implement the Punjab Accord and further efforts in this direction are continuing.”

141. The 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 28 November, 1987.

142. On 24 June, 1988, the Ministry of Home Affairs approached the Committee through the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs *vide* their U.O. Note No. VIII-2/HA (40)USQ.5391-LS/87, dated 24 June, 1988 for the dropping of the assurance on the grounds indicated below:—

“The answer to the above mentioned question was not intended to be an Assurance to be fulfilled at a later date. The reply was only a factual one and it will be observed that it did not constitute any assurance as no time limit/period can be fixed, for obvious reasons, for solving the Punjab problem.”

143. The Committee at their sitting held on 11 October, 1988 considered the above request of the Ministry of Home Affairs and took the following decision:—

“The Committee desired that the Ministry be asked to furnish a note indicating the steps taken to date by Government including the recent initiative taken by the Prime Minister, to solve the Punjab problem. It was decided to postpone the consideration of the request for the dropping of the assurance till then.”

144. The above decision of the Committee was conveyed to the Ministry on 25 October, 1988.

The Ministry later furnished a detailed note indicating the steps taken by Government to solve the Punjab problem.

145. The Committee took note of the steps taken by Government to solve Punjab problem and considered the request of the Ministry of Home Affairs for the dropping of the assurance at their sitting held on 16 January, 1989 and decided not to accede to the request of the Ministry for dropping of the assurance. The Committee also decided that the Ministry should seek further extension of time considered to be necessary for fulfilling the assurance.

146. The decision of the Committee was accordingly conveyed to the Ministry. Thereafter, the Ministry sought an extension of time upto 28 March, 1989 for fulfilling the assurance.

147. The Ministry, however, implemented the assurance only on 9 May, 1989 by laying on the Table of the House Statement No. XII (Item No. 8).

(v)

*Declaration of Port Blair as free port*

148. On 13 November, 1987 the following Unstarred Question (No. 1034) given notice of by Shri Murlidhar Mane, M.P. was addressed to the Minister of Commerce:

- “(a) whether Government propose to declare Port Blair as a free port;
- (b) if so, the details thereof; and
- (c) if not, the reasons therefor?”

149. The Minister of State in the Ministry of Commerce (Shri Priya Ranjan Das Munshi) gave the following reply:

“(a) to (c). Some suggestions have been received for the development of a free port in the Andaman and Nicobar Islands. No decision has been taken on the proposal which requires to be evaluated in depth having regard to various issues.”

150. The reply to the question was treated as an assurance by the Committee which was fulfilled within three months of the date of reply i.e. by 12 February, 1988.

151. On 25 October, 1988 the Ministry of Commerce approached the Committee through the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs vide their U.O. Note No. IX/Com(20) USQ 1034-LS/87 dated 25 October, 1988 for the dropping of the assurance on the following grounds:—

“The concept of a free port is totally new which has not precedent in the country and a detailed feasibility study has to be carried out besides ecological impact assessment which could run over years. Moreover, while replying to this question, the idea of the Minister of State for Commerce was only to inform the Hon'ble Members of the Parliament of the present position in the matter.

It may not be possible and practicable to fulfil the same in the near future because of administrative and other implications which necessitate detailed feasibility study and interactions with other departments and agencies before the Government takes a final decision in the matter.”

152. The Ministry of Commerce sought extension of time upto 13 February, 1989 for fulfilling the assurance.

155. The Committee considered the request of the Ministry of Commerce for dropping of the assurance at their sitting held on 16 January, 1989 but did not accede to it and decided that the Ministry should seek further extension of time considered necessary for fulfilling the assurance.

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

The Ministry, however, implemented the assurance only on 28 February, 1989 by laying on the Table of the House Statement No. X (Item No. 5)

(vi)

*Soviet Offer in new power projects*

156. On 17 November, 1987 the following Unstarred Question (No. 1481) given notice of by Shrimati Kishori Sinha, M.P. was addressed to the Minister of Energy:—

“(a) whether Soviet Union has offered to assist in new power projects with a total capacity of 3000 MW;

- (b) if so, the details of these projects; and
- (c) whether placing of orders for such power projects abroad would affect utilisation of capacity of Indian power equipment manufacturers?"

157. The then Minister of State in the Department of Power (Shrimati Sushila Rohatgi) gave the following reply:—

"(a) to (c): In the Eighth Meeting of the Indo-Soviet Working Group on Power held in Moscow in October, 1987, both sides recognised that prospects exist in respect of enlarging cooperation in the construction of new thermal/hydro power stations and transmission and distribution systems. The Soviet side indicated their interest in extending assistance, on mutually acceptable terms and conditions, for new projects of an aggregate capacity of about 3000 MW on which work could start before March, 1990.

The Indian side agreed to examine this offer expeditiously, in the light of new capacity induction plans."

158. The 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 17 February, 1988.

159. On 23 August, 1988 the Ministry of Energy approached the Committee through the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs *vide* their U.O. No. IX/Engy(40) USQ-1481-LS/87 dated 23 August, 1988 for the dropping of the assurance on the grounds indicated below:—

"The power projects for Indo-Soviet assistance are largely those which would yield benefits in the Eighth Plan period. The Eighth Plan is yet to be formulated. It would be appreciated that the process of tying up of specific projects for foreign assistance, keeping in view various relevant factors and priorities, also requires some time to be completed. The reply given to the Question under reference was complete and reflected the position fully. It does not appear feasible to fulfil the assurance within the prescribed time limit."

The Ministry of Energy requested for extension of time upto 17 November, 1988.

160. The Committee considered the request of the Ministry of Energy for dropping of the assurance at their sitting held on 5 December, 1988 but did not accede to it and desired that the Ministry should seek further extension of time considered necessary to fulfil it.

161. The decision of the Committee was accordingly conveyed to the Ministry.

162. The Ministry, however, implemented the assurance only on 28 February, 1989 by laying on 28 February, 1989 by laying on the Table of the House Statement No. X (Item No. 10).

(vii)

*Training of Senior Officers under National Management Programme*

163. On 18 November, 1987 the following Starred Question (No. 176) given notice of by Shri Manik Reddy, M.P. was addressed to the Prime Minister:—

- “(a) whether the Implementation of the National Management Programme for training of senior Government Officers at the Management Development Institute, Gurgaon has been undertaken;
- (b) if so, the details thereof; and
- (c) the number of officers trained in the institute in the last three years?”

164. The Minister of State in the Ministry of Personnel, Public Grievances and Pensions (Shri P. Chidambaram) gave the following reply:

- “(a) The Management Development Institute (MDI), Gurgaon have offered to run such a programme. The four Indian Institutes of Management at Ahmedabad, Bangalore, Calcutta and Lucknow and the Xavier Labour Relations Institute, Jamshedpur have agreed to collaborate with MDI in running the programme. The course content and curriculum are under preparation.
- (b) Details are enclosed (Annexure ‘A’).
- (c) Does not arise as the First Programme has not yet started.”

165. The reply to part (a) 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 17 February, 1988.

166. On 24 June, 1988 the Ministry of Personnel, Public Grievances and Pensions approached the Committee through the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs *vide* their U.O. Note No. IX|PAPA(10) SQ. 176-LS|87 dated 24 June, 1988 for the dropping of the assurance on the grounds indicated below:—

“The Management Development Institute had offered to run a National Management Programme for a mix of officers belonging to All India and Group ‘A’ General Services as well as Senior Executives of Public and Private Organisations to promote a Joint developmental programme through management education. This is being done as a cooperative venture of the 4 Institutes of Management at Ahmedabad, Bangalore, Calcutta and Lucknow and the Xavier Labour Relations Institute Jamshedpur. The Ministry is supporting the programme, but otherwise the programme enjoys autonomy. There is a programme Chairman who is a renowned management consultant. There is a course Committee comprising 2 faculty from each of the six cooperating institutions to examine the academic content and related matters. In addition, there is a Coordination Committee consisting of the Directors of the 6 cooperating institutions to oversee the academic and coordination work. There is also an Advisory Committee consisting of eminent public men to ensure that the programme conforms to our socio-economic priorities and political perspectives and the concepts are suitable for our socio-political milieu.

The first programme is slated to commence on 1.7.88. The course content and curriculum are determined by the Programme Chairman in consultation with the -|U Course Committee and endorsed by the Coordination Committee and the Advisory Committee.

In these circumstances, the reply may not be construed as an assurance as the course content and curriculum for the National Management Programme have been left to the Management Development Institute and the Cooperating institutions and this Ministry has no role in the same.”



167. The Ministry of Personnel, Public Grievances and Pensions requested for extension of time for fulfilling the assurance till the decision is taken on their request for dropping by the Committee.

168. The Committee considered the request of the Ministry of Personnel, Public Grievances and Pensions for dropping of the assurance at their sitting held on 5 December, 1988 but did not accede to it. However, the extension of time upto 31 December, 1988 was granted to the Ministry to Implement the assurance.

169. The decision of the Committee was accordingly conveyed to the Ministry.

170. The Ministry, however, implemented the assurance only on 5 September, 1988 by laying on the Table of the House Statement No. VI (Item No. 26).

(viii)

*Plan to set up vocational centre for women in Delhi.*

171. On 19 November, 1987, the following Unstarred Question (No. 1896) given notice of by Shri P. M. Sayeed, M.P. was addressed to the Minister of Human Resource Development:

- “(a) whether the Delhi State Council of Women has formulated a plan to set up a vocational centre for women;
- (b) if so, the details of the plan and the salient features which the proposed centre is likely to bring forth;
- (c) the estimated initial cost for setting up the centre and the financial resources; and
- (d) the site of the centre and the time by which it is likely to Start functioning?”

172. The Minister of State in the Departments of Youth Affairs and Sports and Women and Child Development (Shrimati Margaret Alva) gave the following reply:

“(a) Yes, Sir.

- (b), (c) & (d): The Delhi State Council of Women, New Delhi has been allotted 1.05 acre of land by the Delhi Development Authority for Rs. 1,53,750/- at New Friends Colony, New Delhi. The organisation has started construction of a building there, which is likely to be completed by the middle of 1988. One of the proposed objectives

is to organize vocational training for young girls and women in stitching and tailoring, typing and shorthand, office management, computer etc. The building is being financed by the voluntary organisation from its own resources. Details of the financial estimates have not yet been finalised by the agency."

173. The 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 19 February, 1988.

174. On 25 August, 1988, the Ministry of Human Resource Development approached to the Committee through the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs *vide* their U.O. Note No. IX|RD(37) USQ. 1896-LS|87 dated 25 August, 1988 for the dropping of the assurance on the grounds indicated below:—

"Delhi State Council of Women is a voluntary organisation. They are constructing building from their own resources. It has not obtained funds either from the Central Government or Directorate of Social Welfare, Delhi Administration. The organisation is not primarily responsible to Government of India."

175. The Committee considered the request of the Ministry of Human Resouce Development for dropping of the assurance at their sitting held on 5 December, 1988 but did not accede to it. However, the extension of time upto 31 December, 1988 was granted to the Ministry to fulfil the assurance.

176. The decision of the Committee conveyed to the Ministry accordingly.

177. The Ministry, however, implemented the assurance only on 4 November, 1988 by laying on the Table of the House Statement No. VII (Item No. 40).

(ix)

*Japanese assistance for Raichur Thermal Power Project in  
Karnataka*

178. On 1 March, 1988, the following Unstarred Question (No. 1254) given notice of by Shri V. S. Krishna Iyer, M.P. was addressed to the Minister of Energy:

"(a) whether Government have approached Japan for financial assistance for the proposed Raichur Thermal Project's fourth Unit in Karnataka;

- (b) if so, the total amount of assistance sought; and  
 (c) the time by which the assistance is expected to be forthcoming?"

179. The then Minister of State in the Department of Power (Shrimati Sushila Rohatgi) gave the following reply:

"(a) to (c): The Raichur Unit-IV (210 MW) is under consideration for OECF loan assistance from Japan for the year 1988-89. The exact amount of assistance would be known only after the Japanese side formally agree to finance the project, at the Aid India Consortium meeting which usually takes place in June each year."

180. The 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 1 June, 1988.

181. On 17 June, 1988 the Ministry of Energy approached the Committee through the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs vide their U.O. Note No. X|Engy|(7) USQ. 1254-LS|88 dated 17 June, 1988 for the dropping of the assurance on the ground indicated below:—

"The Department of Power had not intended to extend an assurance in this case since foreign Governments and financial institutions have their own priorities and procedures in taking a decision on extending aid to the project posed to them. It would not be practicable, therefore, to ensure fulfilment of the assurance within the applicable limits of time. Further, the reply given to question No. 1254 was factually full and complete at the time of the answer."

182. The Ministry of Energy sought question of time upto 30 November, 1988, for fulfilling the assurance.

183. The Committee consider the request of the Ministry of Energy for dropping of the assurance at their sitting held on 28 December, 1988 but did not accede to it. Taking a serious view of the failure of the Ministry to seek further extension of time beyond 30 November, 1988, the Committee desired that the Ministry should seek immediately further extension of time considered to be minimum necessary for fulfilling the assurance.

184. The decision of the Committee was accordingly conveyed to the Ministry.

185. The Ministry, however, implemented the assurance only on 28 February, 1989 by laying on the Table of the House Statement No. VIII (Item No. 76.)

(x)

*Proposal for construction of sub-surface dams in Kerala*

186. On 11 March, 1988, the following Starred Question (No. 250) given notice of by Shri Mullappally Ramachandran, M.P. addressed to the Minister of Water Resources:

- “(a) whether Government of Kerala has submitted a proposal for construction of sub-surface dams across the river systems in Kerala for conservation of Water;
- (b) if so, the details thereof;
- (c) the other measures proposed by the State Government with regard to water conservation measures in the rivers of Kerala; and
- (d) the details thereof and the decision taken by Union Government thereon?”

187. The Minister of Water Resources (Shri Dinesh Singh) gave the following reply:

- “(a) to (d). A proposal envisaging construction of 257 sub-surface dams and check dams has been received from Government of Kerala. Clarifications on certain aspects of the scheme have been sought from the State Government.”

188. During the course of supplementaries on the question, Shri Mullappally Ramachandran wanted to know whether Mr. Sam Pitroda visited Kerala recently and whether he made any study for conservation of rain water in the State?

189. In reply to the above supplementary, the Minister of State in the Ministry of Water Resources (Shrimati Krishna Sahi) replied as under:

“We do not have any information about it as yet.”

190. The reply to the supplementary question was treated as an assurance by the Committee. The assurance was required to be implemented by the Ministry of Water Resources by 11 June, 1988.

191. On 10 May, 1988, the Ministry of Water Resources approached the Committee through the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs vide their U.O. Note No. X/WR (I) SQ 250-LS/88 dated 10 May, 1988 for the dropping of the assurance on the grounds indicated below:

"The matter deals with the reported visit to Kerala of the Technology Adviser to the Prime Minister in connection with the study on conservation of rain water in the State. This Ministry had not suggested any such study and this is not in the picture in so far as the reported visit to Kerala of the Technology Adviser to the Prime Minister. The Ministry is also not expecting any report from the Adviser to the Prime Minister, nor did the Minister of Water Resources promise in course of his reply to apprise the House of the results.

The reply by the Minister of Water Resources in response to the Supplementaries put by the Hon. Member, does not also constitute an Assurance, as illustrated in the standard list of expressions constituting assurance in Lok Sabha/Rajya Sabha as given in the Annual Report 1985-86 of the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs."

192. The Ministry of Water Resources also sought extension of time upto 11 December, 1988 for fulfilling the assurance.

193. The Committee considered the request of the Ministry of Water Resources for the dropping of the assurance at their sitting held on 28 December, 1988 and decided not to accede to the request of the Ministry for dropping the assurance. They saw no reasons why the factual information required by Parliament could not be obtained and furnished by the Ministry. Taking of the fact that the Ministry had sought extension of time only upto 11 December, 1988, the Committee observed that the Ministry should seek further extension of time considered to be minimum necessary for fulfilling the assurance.

194. The Ministry, however, implemented the assurance only on 9 May, 1989 by laying on the Table of the House Statement No. IX (item No. 84).

(xi) .

*Profit by public sector manufacturing units ..*

195. On 29 March, 1988 the following Unstarred Question (No. 5341) given notice of by Dr. Krupasindhu Bhoi and Shrimati Jayanti Patnaik, M.Ps was addressed to the Ministry of Industry:

- “(a) whether some public sector manufacturing units have shown profit during 1987-88;
- (b) if so, the details thereof; and
- (c) the amount of net profit earned by these public sector units in 1987-88?”

196. The Ministry of Industry (Shri J. Vengala Rao) gave the following reply:

- “(a), (b) & (c): Details of profitability of public sector undertakings during 1987-88 will be available only after the year ends on 31st March, 1988 and the accounts are finalised thereafter.”

197. The 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 29 June, 1988.

198. On 10 August, 1988, the Ministry of Industry approached the Committee through the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs *vide* their U.O. Note No. X/Ind(42) USQ-5341-S/88 dated 10 August, 1988 for the dropping of the assurance on the grounds indicated below:

“Details of profitability of public sector undertakings during 1987-88 will be available only after the year ends on 31st March, 1988 and the accounts are finalised thereafter. It will be observed from the above that the Industry Minister had no intention to give an assurance and hence he had given the factual position in the House on 29th March, 1988 in reply to Lok Sabha USQ No. 5341. The financial year ends on 31st March and the accounts of the public sector undertakings are closed on that date every year. After the closing of the accounts the accounts are subjected to audit by Statutory Auditors and by the Comptroller and Auditor General of India. After the accounts are audited the Annual General Body of the public sector

undertakings adopts the accounts and then undertaking sends the final accounts to the Government. This process is completed by the end of every year. Bureau of Public Enterprises bring out a Public Enterprises Survey indicating the profit and loss of all public sector undertakings and this Survey is presented to both the Houses during every Budget Session."

199. The Committee considered the request of the Ministry of Industry for the dropping of the assurance at their sitting held on 28 December, 1988 and decided not to accede to the request of the Ministry for dropping the assurance. Extension of time upto 28 February 1989 was, however, granted for fulfilling the assurance.

200. The decision of the Committee was accordingly conveyed to the Ministry. Subsequently, the Ministry requested for extension of time upto 31 March, 1989 for fulfilment of the assurance.

201. The Ministry, however, implemented the assurance only on 9 May, 1989 by laying on the Table of the House Statement No. IX (item No. 62).

(xii)

*Public sector units running in losses*

202. On 10 May, 1988 the following Unstarred Question (No. 10409) given notice of by Dr. V. Venkatesh, M.P. was addressed to the Ministry of Industry:—

- "(a) the names of the public sector units, the performance of which was not satisfactory and were running in losses during 1986-87 and 1987-88; and
- (b) whether any measures have been taken to check this trend?"

203. The Ministry of Industry (Shri J. Vengala Rao) gave the following reply:

- "(a) Names of the public sector units which have suffered losses during 1986-87 are given at page 58 of Volume-I of Public Enterprises Survey 1986-87 laid on the Table of the House on 25th February, 1988. Annual Accounts for the financial year 1987-88 of the public enterprises are yet to be finalised.
- (b) The details of the steps taken by the Government to improve the working of the public sector undertakings are

given at page 179 of Volume-I of the Public Enterprises Survey 1986-87 placed on the Table of the House on 25th February, 1988."

204. The reply to part (a) 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 10 August, 1988.

205. On 17 August, 1988, the Ministry of Industry approached the Committee through the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs vide their U.O. Note No. X/Ind(88)USQ. 10409-LS/88 dated 17 August, 1988 for the dropping of the assurance on the grounds indicated below:—

"While replying to Lok Sabha USQ No. 10409 in the House, the Minister for Industry gave factual information with regard to public sector units which have suffered loss during 1986-87 but with regard to the year 1987-88 the Minister informed the House that annual accounts for the financial year 1987-88 are yet to be finalised. The financial year end on 31st March every year and after the accounts are closed, the same are subjected to audit before these are adopted at the Annual General Meeting. This has to be done by 30th September following the end of the financial year for the company. Based on the finalised accounts the Bureau of Public Enterprises brings out of Public Enterprises Survey every year containing summarised version of these accounts among other items. The Public Enterprises Survey is thereafter presented to Parliament every year during the Budget Session."

206. The Ministry of Industry also sought extension of time till 1 March, 1989.

207. The Committee considered the request of the Ministry of Industry for the dropping of the assurance at their sitting held on 5 December, 1988 and decided not to accede to the request of the Ministry for dropping the assurance. However, the extension of time upto 1 March, 1989 was granted to fulfil the assurance.

208. The decision for the Committee was accordingly conveyed to the Ministry. Thereafter, the Ministry sought further extension upto 31 March, 1989 for implementation of assurance.

209. The Ministry, however, implement the assurance only on 9 May, 1989 by laying on the Table of the House Statement No. IX (Item No. 66).



### APPENDIX III

(Vide Para No. 2.1 of the Report)

(i) *Statement showing the position of the assurances of Seventh Lok Sabha pending implementation as on 9 May, 1989.*

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	861	..
Twelfth Session, 1983	433	433	..
Thirteenth Session, 1983	424	424	..
Fourteenth Session, 1984	956	952	4
Fifteenth Session, 1984	328	326	2
<b>Total Assurances Outstanding</b>	<b>7231</b>	<b>7224</b>	<b>7</b>

A P P E N D I X—III—Contd.

(Vide Para No. 2.1 of the Report)

(ii) *Statement showing the position of pending assurances of Eighth Lok Sabha pending implementation as on 9 May, 1989.*

Session	No. of ass- urances culled out	No. of ass- urances im- plemented/ dropped	No. of ass- urances out- standing
1st Session	19	19	..
2nd Session	430	430	..
3rd Session	323	321	2
4th Session	358	353	5
5th Session	783	760	23
6th Session	479	461	18
7th Session	431	410	21
8th Session	783	739	44
8th (Part-II) Session	586	492	94
9th Session	781	580	201
10th Session	1197	843	354
11th Session	560	341	239
12th Session	533	199	334
	7283	5948	1335

## MINUTES

*Minutes of the Seventh Sitting of the Committee on Government Assurances held on 20 October, 1987 in Committee Room 'D', Ground Floor, Parliament House Annexe, New Delhi.*

The Committee met on Tuesday, 20 October, 1987 from 11.00 hours to 13.20 hours.

### PRESENT

**Prof. Narain Chand Parashar—Chairman**

### MEMBERS

2. Shri L. Balaraman
3. Shri Bapulal Malviya
4. Shri Sanat Kumar Mandal
5. Shri Murlidhar Mane
6. Shri V. Krishna Rao
7. Shri Bhola Raut
8. Shri Prabhu Lal Rawat
9. Shri Kamla Prasad Singh
10. Shrimati Usha Thakkar
11. Shri Mahabir Prasad Yadav

### SECRETARIAT

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

2. The Committee took up for consideration Memoranda Nos. 104, 105, 106 and 107.

*Memorandum No. 104:—Request for dropping of the assurance given on 6 November, 1986 in reply to Unstarred Question No. 520 regarding proposal to introduce new common syllabus for medical education.*

3. The Committee considered the request of the Ministry of Health and Family Welfare received through Ministry of Parliament Affairs

vide their U.O. Note No. VH/HFW(14) USQ-520 dated 16 September, 1987, for dropping of the assurance on the following grounds:—

“The Medical Council of India has stated that as a matter of policy the Council reviews and revises the under-graduate and post-graduate curriculum periodically keeping in view the developments taking place all over the World and also the needs of the country. The Post-graduate Committee of the Council has already initiated action to review and revise its recommendations. The restructuring of medical education and review of curriculum and syllabus of under-graduate and post-graduate courses is a long drawn process and it will not be possible to fix any time limit within which such reviews could be given effect to.”

It may be pointed out that the recommendations of the 12th Jt. Conference of the Central Council of Health and Central Family Welfare Council held from 22nd to 24th September, 1986 regarding Medical & Health Education were forwarded to the State Governments|Union Territories on the 10th December, 1986 requesting them to take action on the recommendations. The Medical Council of India was also requested on the 9th February, 1987 to send their comments on the recommendations. While the Medical Council have given comments vide their letter of the 23rd June, 1987, the State Governments have not yet replied and they have been reminded on the 23rd June, 1987. The question (USQ No. 520 answered on 6-11-86) related to the recommendations made by the Central Council of Health regarding restructuring of medical education and introduction of common syllabus for medical education in the country.”

3.1 The Committee after through the reasons advanced by the Ministry of Health and Family Welfare decided not to drop the assurance and desired that the assurance be implemented expeditiously. The Committee desired that the Ministry should obtain the requisite information from the States after taking up the matter of higher level and assurance should be fulfilled during the ensuing session.

*Memorandum No. 105:—Request for dropping of assurance given on 6 April, 1987 in reply to Unstarred Question No. 5864 regarding Bauxite mines in Krishnadeopeta in Andhra Pradesh.*

4. The Committee considered the request of the Ministry of Steel and Mines received through the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs vide their U. O. Note No. VIII/SM(25) USQ 5864—LS|87 dated 29 September, 1987 for dropping of the assurance on the following grounds:—

“The Andhra Bauxite Project has been featuring in the Indo-Soviet Joint Commission as well as various meetings of the

Working Group on Non-Ferrous Metallurgy of the above Joint Commission from 1982 onwards. In accordance with the protocol of the IXth Session of the Inter-Governmental Soviet-Indian Commission on Economic, Scientific and Technical Cooperation 'pertaining to non-ferrous metallurgy, an agreement was signed between M/s. Tsvetmetpromexport-USSR and the National Aluminium Company Limited (NALCO) on 24th January, 1986 for preparation of a feasibility report for establishing a 2.3 MTPY Export-oriented Bauxite Mines in Andhra Pradesh. The feasibility report has been received in February, 1987.

Before the Feasibility Report is taken up for appraisal for investment decision, discussion/negotiations will have to be held between Indian and the Soviet sides on various aspects. Only after these matters are sorted out to the satisfaction of both sides, the feasibility report can be appraised by various agencies before it can be posed for investment decision by Government. This likely to take quite sometime. In the case of such proposal, it will be difficult to indicate a definite time schedule".

4.1 The Committee after going through the pros and cons of the reasons advanced by the Ministry of Steel and Mines did not agree to drop the assurance and desired that the assurance may be implemented without delay. Ministry should also seek extension of time minimum required to implement the assurance.

\* \* \* \*

6. The Committee then adjourned.

**MINUTES**

**Sixth Sitting**

Minutes of the sitting of the Committee on Government Assurances held on 5 December, 1988 in Committee Room No. 50, Parliament House, New Delhi.

The Committee met on Monday, 5 December, 1988 from 16.00 hours to 16.40 hours.

**PRESENT**

Prof. Narain Chand Parashar—*Chairman*

**MEMBERS**

2. Shri Bapulal Malviya
3. Shri Murlidhar Mane
4. Shri V. Krishna Rao
5. Shri Bhola Raut
6. Shri Prabhu Lal Rawat
7. Shri Manik Reddy
8. Shrimati Shanti Devi
9. Shri Ramashray Prasad Singh
10. Shrimati Usha Thakkar
11. 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 took up for consideration the following Memoranda

*Memorandum No. 162:—Request for dropping of assurance given on 2 March, 1987, in reply to Unstarred Question No. 763 regarding boost to housing finance activity.*

3. The Committee considered the request of the Ministry of Urban Development received through the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs *vide*

their U. O. Note No. VIII/UD(65) USQ 763-LS|87, dated 6 September, 1988 for the dropping of the assurance on the following grounds:—

“Introduction of a Mortgage Insurance Scheme in the country requires promulgation of an enabling Act. Though a draft Bill for the purpose had been prepared sometime back, it is yet to be finalised and some amendments thereto are presently under consideration in consultation with the Ministry of Finance and the Ministry of Law. Finalisation of the draft legislation is, therefore, likely to take some more time. Even after the legislation has been finalised, the Ministry of Finance will require some more time to obtain the approval of the Cabinet and complete other formalities. This Ministry will, therefore, not be in a position to fulfil the assurance in the near future. The Ministry of Finance has also expressed the view that since it is too early to say when the scheme/legislation will be enacted, it appears to be of no use to obtain extension of time again and again. In the circumstances, this Ministry suggests that the Committee on Government Assurances, Lok Sabha, may kindly be moved to delete this assurance from the list of assurance in the name of this Ministry. All efforts will, however, be made by this Ministry to finalise the legislation on the subject as early as possible.”

The Committee did not agree to the request of the Ministry for the dropping of the assurance. Taking serious note of the fact that the Ministry had not sought any extension of time beyond 30th July, 1988, they also desired the Ministry to explain the lapse and seek further extension of time for fulfilling the assurance.

*Memorandum No. 163:—Request for dropping of assurance given on 10 May, 1988, in reply to Unstarred Question No. 10409 regarding Public Sector units running in losses.*

4. The Committee considered the request of the Ministry of Industry received through the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs vide their U. O. Note No. X/Ind(88) USQ 10409-LS|88 17 August, 1988 for the dropping of the assurance on the following grounds:—

“While replying to Lok Sabha USQ No. 10409 in the House, the Minister for Industry gave factual information with regard to public sector units which have suffered loss during 1986-87 but with regard to the year 1987-88 the Minister informed the House that annual accounts for the financial year 1987-88 are yet to be finalised. The financial year ends on 31st March every year and after the accounts are closed, the same

are subjected to audit before these are adopted at the Annual General Meeting. This has to be done by 30th September, following the end of the financial year for the company. Based on the finalised accounts the Bureau of Public Enterprises brings out a public Enterprises Survey every year containing summarised version of these accounts among other items. The Public Enterprises Survey is thereafter presented to Parliament every year during the Budget Session."

4.1 The Committee did not agree to the request of the Ministry for the dropping of the assurance. However, extension of time upto 1 March, 1989 was granted to fulfil the assurance.

*Memorandum No. 164:—Request for dropping of assurance given on 8 April, 1988, in reply to Unstarred Question No. 6285 regarding Sunderban Delta Project.*

5. The Committee considered the request of the Ministry of Water Resources received through the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs *vide* their U.O. Note No. X|WR(7) USQ 6285-LS|88 dated 12 August, 1988 for the dropping of the assurance on the following grounds:—

"In the reply furnished to the Parliament Question the words 'it was *inter-alia* stated. "The Ganga Flood Control Commission have asked the Government of West Bengal to get a model study done for a dependable quantification of the likely siltation in the post-project conditions. This study is awaited." are not used in the sense of intimation at a later date, the likely date by which time the project will be cleared.

The drill involved in clearing the project is that the scheme after receipt from the State Government has to be examined by GFCC. Any subsequent clarifications have to be furnished by State Government before it is cleared by the Advisory Committee of the Ministry of Water Resources. Ultimately, the Planning Commission has to approve the scheme.

The time taken for clearance of a scheme depends mainly upon the initiative of the concerned State Government as also time taken by various Central Government Agencies."

5.1 The Committee did not agree to the request of the Ministry to drop the assurance. The extension of time upto 8 January, 1989, was, however, granted to implement the assurance.



*Memorandum No. 165.—Request for dropping of assurance given on 12 April, 1988, in reply to Unstarred Question No. 6842 regarding power generation in Eighth Plan Period.*

6. The Committee considered the request of the Ministry of Energy received through the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs *vide* their U.O. Note No. X/Engy. (35) USQ. 6842-LS|88 dated 8 July, 1988 for the dropping of the assurance on the following grounds:—

“It will take quite sometime for the Planning Commission to finalise the Eighth Plan proposals which is to cover the period 1990-91 to 1994-95.”

6.1 The Committee did not agree to the request of the Ministry for the dropping of the assurance. They decided that the Ministry should furnish a note by 31.12.88 giving the latest position in regard to the finalisation of Eighth Plan proposals and to seek further extension of time to fulfil the assurance.

*Memorandum No. 166.—Request for dropping of assurance given on 19 November, 1987, in reply to Unstarred Question No. 1896 regarding plan to set up vocational centre for women in Delhi.*

7. The Committee considered the request of the Ministry of Human Resource Development received through the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs *vide* their U.O. Note No. IX|HRD(37)USQ-1896-LS|87 dated 25 August, 1988 for the dropping of the assurance on the following grounds:—

“Delhi State Council of Women is a voluntary organisation. They are constructing building from their own resources. It has not obtained funds either from the Central Government or Directorate of Social Welfare, Delhi Administration. The organisation is not primarily responsible to Government of India.”

7.1 The Committee did not agree to the request of the Ministry to drop the assurance. However, extension of time upto 31 December, 1988 was granted to fulfil the assurance.

*Memorandum No. 167.—Request for dropping of assurance given on 18 November, 1987 in reply to Unstarred Question No. 176 regarding training of Senior Officers under National Management Programme.*

8. 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. IX|PAPA(10)SQ. 176-LS|87

dated 24 June, 1988 for the dropping of the assurance on the following grounds:

"The Management Development Institute had offered to run a National Management Programme for a mix of officers belonging to All India and Group A Central Services as well as Senior Executives of Public and Private Organisations to promote a joint developmental programme through management education. This is being done as a cooperative venture of the 4 Institutes of Management at Ahmedabad, Bangalore, Calcutta and Lucknow and the Xavier Labour Relations Institute Jamshedpur. The Ministry is supporting the programme, but otherwise the programme enjoys autonomy. There is a programme Chairman who is a renowned management consultant. There is a Course Committee comprising two faculty from each of the six cooperating institutions to examine the academic content and related matters. In addition, there is a Coordination Committee consisting of the Directors of the 6 cooperating institutions to oversee the academic and coordination work. There is also an Advisory Committee consisting of eminent public men to ensure that the programme conforms to our socio-economic priorities and political perspectives and the concepts are suitable for our socio-political milieu.

The first programme is slated to commence on 1st July, 1988. The course content and curriculum are determined by the Programme Chairman in consultation with the Course Committee and endorsed by the Coordination Committee and the Advisory Committee.

In these circumstances, the reply may not be construed as an assurance as the course content and curriculum for the National Management Programme have been left to the Management Development Institute and the Cooperating Institutions and this Ministry has no role in the same."

8.1. The Committee did not agree to the request of the Ministry to drop the assurance. Extension of time was, however, granted upto 31st December, 1988 to implement it.

*Memorandum No. 168:—Request for dropping of assurance given on 2 May, 1988, in reply to Unstarred Question No. 9275 regarding computer managed maintenance system of steel plants*

9. The Committee considered the request of the Ministry of Steel and Mines received through the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs vide

their U.O. Note No. X/SM(24)USQ.9275-LS/88 dated 12 September, 1988 for the dropping of the assurance on the following grounds:—

“Discussions are currently being held with UNDP and various other agencies for extension of Computer Managed Maintenance System to Bhilai, Bokaro and Durgapur Steel Plants under Phase-II of the Project. Phase-I will be completed by end of 1989 and therefore any decision regarding Phase-II would not be taken before 1989. This too is subject to approval of Government of India and UNDP. Therefore, the matter being in a most nebulous and preliminary stage, no time limit can be indicated during which positive decision will be taken.”

9.1. The Committee did not agree to the request of the Ministry for dropping of the assurance and decided that the Ministry should seek further extension of time considered necessary to fulfil the assurance.

*Memorandum No. 169:—Request for dropping of assurance given on 17 November, 1987, in reply to Unstarred Question No. 1481 regarding Soviet offer in new power projects.*

10. The Committee considered the request of the Ministry of Energy received through the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs, vide their U.O. Note No. IX/Energy (40)USQ. 1481-LS/87 dated 23 August, 1988 for the dropping of the assurance on the following grounds:—

“The power projects for Indo-Soviet assistance are largely those which would yield benefits in the Eighth Plan period. The Eighth Plan is yet to be formulated. It would be appreciated that the process of tying up of specific projects for foreign assistance, keeping in view various relevant factors and priorities, also requires some time to be completed. The reply given to the Question under reference was complete and reflected the position fully. It does not appear feasible to fulfil the assurance within the prescribed time limit.”

*Memorandum No. 170:—Request for dropping of assurance given on 30 November, 1987, in reply to Unstarred Question No. 3372 regarding report of Committee on minimum wages for agricultural labour.*

11. The Committee considered the request of the Ministry of Labour received through the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs vide their U.O. Note No. IX/L(19)USQ.3372-LS/87 dated 23rd June, 1988 for the dropping of the assurance on the following grounds:—

“In case the statement ‘The Commission has not yet submitted any report’ has been considered as an assurance, it may be

stated that it is not known as to when the Commission would submit its Report(s) and it is still more than two years before the term of the Commission will expire. It will, therefore, be clear that even if the reply is considered to be an assurance, it will serve no purpose by keeping it pending for a long time, which may exceed even two years."

10.1 The Committee did not agree with the request of the Ministry for dropping of the assurance and desired that the Ministry should seek further extension of time considered necessary to fulfil it.

*Memorandum No. 171:—Request for dropping of assurance given on 11 March, 1988 in reply to Unstarred Question No. 2569 regarding Abid Hussain Committee Report on capital market.*

12. The Committee considered the request of the Ministry of Finance received through the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs *vide* their U.O. Note No. X/Fin.(12)USQ. 2569-LS/88 dated 19 May, 1988 for the dropping of the assurance on the following grounds:—

"The reply given to the above mentioned question does not contain any Assurance but *only a statement of facts*. Hence it is requested that the reply may not be considered as an Assurance."

11.1. The Committee while not agreeing with the request of the Ministry for the dropping of the assurance, granted extension of time upto 31 March, 1989 to fulfil it, as desired by the Ministry.

12.1 The Committee did not agree to drop the assurance as requested by the Ministry. However, extension of time upto 31 December, 1988, was granted as desired by the Ministry.

13. The Committee decided to hold their next sitting on 22 December, 1988.

14. The Committee then adjourned.

**MINUTES**

**Seventh Sitting**

*The Minutes of the sitting of the Committee on Government Assurances held on 28 December, 1988 in Committee Room 'B', Parliament House Annexe, New Delhi.*

The Committee met on Wednesday, 28 December, 1988 from 15.00 hours to 16.10 hours.

**PRESENT**

Prof. Narain Chand Parashar—*Chairman*

**MEMBERS**

2. Shri Bapulal Malviya
3. Shri Murlidhar Mane
4. Dr. A. K. Patel
5. Shri Bhola Raut
6. Shri Prabhu Lal Rawat
7. Shrimati Shanti Devi
8. Shri Kamla Prasad Singh
9. Shri Ramashray Prasad Singh
10. Shrimati Usha Thakkar
11. Shri Mahabir Prasad Yadav

**SECRETARIAT**

1. Shri S. C. Gupta—*Deputy Secretary (Q)*
2. Shri Raghbir Singh—*Senior Examiner of Questions*

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

- (i) Page 8, Para 10, after line 9: *add* 'The Committee take a serious view of this lapse on the part of the Ministry and hope that such instances would be avoided in future.'
- (ii) Page 11, Para 17, line 10: *for* 'Used' *read* 'resorted to'

(iii) Page 26, Para 50, line 12: for 'planned' read 'systematic'.

3. The Committee authorised the Chairman to present the Report in the next Session of Lok Sabha .

4. The Committee then took up the following memoranda for consideration:

*Memorandum No. 172: Request for dropping of the assurance given on 23 April, 1986, in reply to Unstarred Question No. 7442 regarding Portuguese laws and decrees in force in Goa, Daman and Diu.*

5. The Committee considered the request of the Ministry of Home Affairs received through the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs *vide* their U.O. Note No. V/HA(33)USQ. 7442-LS|86 dated 2 December, 1987 for the dropping of the assurance on the following grounds:—

"The Goa region of the erstwhile Union Territory of Goa, Daman and Diu was conferred statehood and they are fully independent to take their own view in the matter relating to the applicability of laws in that territory. The matter is at present pending before the Committee of Legislative Assembly of Goa."

5.1. The Committee noted that Daman and Diu were still a Union Territory. They, therefore, did not agree to drop the assurance. The extension of time upto 23 January, 1989 was, however, granted for fulfilling the assurance.

*Memorandum No. 173: Request for dropping of the assurance given on 1 March, 1988, in reply to Unstarred Question No. 1254 regarding Japanese assistance for Raichur Thermal Project in Karnataka.*

6. The Committee considered the request of the Ministry of Energy received through the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs *vide* their U.O. Note No. X|Engy(7)USQ-1254-LS|88 dated 17 June, 1988 for the dropping of the assurance on the following grounds:—

"The Department of Power had not intended to extend an assurance in this case since foreign Governments and financial institutions have their own priorities and procedures in taking a decision on extending aid to the project posed to them. It would not be practicable, therefore, to ensure fulfilment of the assurance within the applicable limits of time. Further,

the reply given to question No. 1254 was factually full and complete at the time of the answer."

6.1 The Committee did not agree to the request of the Ministry to drop the assurance. Taking a serious view of the failure of the Ministry to seek further extension of time beyond 30 November, 1988, the Committee desired that the Ministry should seek immediately further extension of time considered to be minimum necessary for fulfilling the assurance.

*Memorandum No. 174: Request for dropping of the Assurance given on 11 March, 1988 in reply to Starred Question No. 250 regarding proposal for construction of sub surface dams in Kerala.*

7. The Committee considered the request of the Ministry of Water Resources received through the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs vide their U.O. Note No. X/WR(1)SQ-250-LS/88 dated 10 May, 1988 for the dropping of the assurance on the following grounds:

"The matter deals with the reported visit to Kerala of the Technology Adviser to the Prime Minister in connection with the study on conservation of rain water in the State. This Ministry had not suggested any such study and thus is not in a picture in so far as the reported visit to Kerala of the Technology Adviser to the Prime Minister. The Ministry is also not expecting any report from the Adviser to the Prime Minister, nor did the Minister of Water Resources promise in course of his reply to apprise the House of the results.

The reply by the Minister of Water Resources in response to the Supplementaries put by the Hon. Member, does not also constitute an Assurance, as illustrated in the standard list of expressions constituting assurances in Lok Sabha/Rajya Sabha as given in the Annual Report 1985-86 of the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs."

7.1. The Committee did not agree to the request of the Ministry to drop the assurance. They saw no reasons why the factual information required by Parliament could not be obtained and furnished by the Ministry. Taking note of the fact that the Ministry had sought extension of time only upto 11 December, 1988, the Committee observed that the Ministry should seek further extension of time considered to be minimum necessary for fulfilling the assurance.

*Memorandum No. 175: Request for dropping of the assurance given on 29 March, 1988 in reply to Unstarred Question No. 5341 regarding profit by public sector manufacturing units.*

8. The Committee considered the request of the Ministry of Industry received through the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs vide their U.O. Note

No. X|Ind(42) USQ-5341-LS|88 dated 10 August, 1988 for the dropping of the assurance on the following grounds:

“Details of profitability of public sector undertakings during 1987-88 will be available only after the year ends on 31st March, 1988 and the accounts are finalised thereafter.

It will be observed from the above that the Industry Minister had no intention to give an assurance and hence he had given the factual position in the House on 29th March, 1988 in reply to Lok Sabha USQ. No. 5341. The financial year ends on 31st March and the accounts of the public sector undertakings are closed on that date every year. After the closing of the accounts the accounts are subjected to audit by Statutory Auditors and by the Comptroller and Auditor General of India. After the accounts are audited the Annual General Body of the Public Sector Undertakings adopts the accounts and then undertaking sends the final accounts to the Government. This process is completed by the end of every year. Bureau of Public Enterprises bring out a Public Enterprises Survey indicating the profit and loss of all public sector undertakings and this Survey is presented to both the Houses during every Budget Session.”

8.1 The Committee did not agree to the request of the Ministry to drop the assurance. Extension of time upto 28 February, 1989 was, however, granted for fulfilling the assurance.

*Memorandum No. 176: Request for dropping of the assurance given on 20 April, 1988, in reply to Unstarred Question No. 7571 regarding restructuring of Central Secretariat Services.*

9. 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.X|PAPP(8)-USQ.7571-LS|88 dated 12 August, 1988 for the dropping of the assurance on the following grounds:

“In this connection it may be stated that no doubt the Government is contemplating to restructure the Central Secretariat Service. at present it is only in the embryo stage where the proposals are yet to be formulated, leave alone processing of the proposals in consultation with the concerned Ministries and Cadre Controlling Authorities, including a dialogue with the staff side under JCM Scheme. It is a time consuming process and calls for considerable thought and care, specially when restructuring



is contemplated after more than two decades. Further, restructuring the service with a view to bring about both qualitative and quantitative improvements in its functioning, is a continuous ongoing exercise, not only for this cadre but for all other cadres/services as well, and this cannot be completed in short spells. Accordingly, in reply to the unstarred Parliament Question against Part A it was merely stated that "The Government is considering restructuring of the Central Secretariat Service." The position was further clarified in reply to part B of the question stating that "the proposals are yet to be finalised."

In view of the above it may not be correct to treat it as an Assurance. Neither it was intended by the Honourable MCS(PP) to give any assurance in reply to this question."

9.1 The Committee did not agree to the request of the Ministry to drop the assurance. The Committee also took a serious view of the statement of the Ministry that 'it may not be correct to treat it as an assurance' and observed that it was no part of the business of the Ministry to question the decision of the Committee about treating any reply as an assurance. They hoped that the Ministry would note it for future. Extension of time upto 20-1-1989 for fulfilling the assurance was granted.

*Memorandum No. 177: Request for dropping of the assurance given on 22 April, 1988, in reply to Unstarred Question No. 8061 regarding Kandi Area Integrated Flood Control Scheme.*

10. The Committee considered the request of the Ministry of Water Resources received through the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs *vide* their U.O. Note No. X|WR(9) USQ-8061-LS|88 dated 12 August, 1988 for the dropping of the assurance on the following grounds:

"In the reply furnished to the Parliament Question the words "The Kandi Area Integrated Flood Control Scheme prepared by the Government of West Bengal at an estimated cost of Rs. 51.5 crores was received in the Ganga Flood Control Commission in 1979 for appraisal. The comments of the GFCC were communicated to the State Government, their compliance is awaiting", are not used in the sense of intimating at a later date the likely date by which time the project will be cleared.

The drill involved in clearing the project is that the scheme after receipt from the State Government has to be examined by GFCC. Any subsequent clarifications have to be furnished by State Government before it is cleared by the Advisory

Committee of the Ministry of Water Resources. Ultimately, Planning Commission has to approve the scheme.

The time taken for clearance of a scheme depends mainly upon the initiative of the concerned State Government as also time taken by various Central Government Agencies."

10.1 The Committee did not agree to the request of the Ministry to drop the assurance and desired that the Ministry should furnish a note stating the latest position about the receipt of the scheme from the State Government and its examination by the Government. The extension of time upto 22 January, 1989 was granted for fulfilling the assurance.

*Memorandum No. 178:—Request for dropping of the assurance given on 25 April, 1988 in reply to Unstarred Question No. 8344 regarding on-going projects.*

11. The Committee considered the request of the Ministry of Steel and Mines received through the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs vide their U.O. Note No. IX/SM(21)USQ-8344-LS/88 dated 22 August, 1988 for the dropping of the assurance on the following grounds :

"It may be seen from the Annexure to the reply given by the Department of Steel to the above mentioned Lok Sabha USQ. that some of the on-going projects are likely to be completed only by September, 1992. If the reply given at part (d) is construed as an assurance, then the Department will have to wait atleast till after September, 1992 to fulfil the assurance.

In view of the very long time required for the completion of the now on-going projects, it is requested that part (d) of the reply may not be treated as assurance."

11.1 The Committee did not agree to the request of the Ministry to drop the assurance and decided to examine the matter further during their on the spot study visit in January, 1989. The Committee also desired that the Ministry should furnish a note giving the latest position about the time and cost overruns of the on-going projects and seek further extension of time for fulfilling the assurance.

*Memorandum No. 179:—Request for dropping of the assurance given on 8 April, 1988, in reply to Unstarred Question No. 6282 regarding Mahananda left bank scheme of West Bengal.*

12. The Committee considered the request of the Ministry of Water Resources received through the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs vide

their U.O. Note No. X/WR(6)USQ-6282-LS/88 dated 12 September, 1988 for the dropping of the assurance on the following grounds :—

In the reply furnished to the Parliament Question the words "The scheme for construction of embankment on the left bank of river Mahananda was examined in the Ganga Flood Control Commission and Comments communicated to the State Government in January, 77. Modified report prepared in the light of these comments is still awaited from the State Government" are not used in the sense of intimating at a later date, the likely date by which time the project will be cleared.

The drill involved in clearing the project is that the scheme after receipt from the State Government has to be examined by Ganga Flood Control Commission. Any subsequent clarifications have to be furnished by State Government before it is cleared by the Advisory Committee of the Ministry of Water Resources. Ultimately, the Planning Commission has to approve the scheme.

The time taken for clearance of a scheme depends mainly upon the initiative of the concerned State Government as also time taken by various Central Government Agencies."

12.1 The Committee did not agree to the request of the Ministry to drop the assurance and desired that the Ministry should furnish a note giving the latest position about the receipt of the modified report from the State Government and its examination by Government. Taking a serious view of the fact that the Ministry had not sought any extension of time for fulfilling the assurance, the Committee decided that the Ministry should seek extension of time considered to be minimum necessary to fulfil the assurance.

*Memorandum No. 180:—Request for dropping of the assurance given on 26 August, 1987, in reply to Unstarred Question No. 4881 regarding three wheelers for handicapped.*

13. The Committee considered the request of the Ministry of Welfare received through the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs *vide* their U.O. Note No. VIII-2/Wel(15)USQ-4881-LS/88 dated 26 November, 1987 for the dropping of the assurance on the following grounds :

"The small scale manufacturers in the Private Sector are spread across the whole country and the number of such manufac-

turers is not known. The prices these manufacturers charge of three wheelers vary from place to place depending on the local market conditions. The efforts to collect such information from the whole country apart from taking a very long time, may not be complete and as such will not be commensurate with the results. A large number of small scale sector manufacturers may not respond at all with the result that the information is not likely to reflect the correct position. The office of Development Commissioner, Small Scale Industry has also given this Ministry to understand that the addresses of small scale manufacturers are not known to their office and hence it may not be possible to collect complete information regarding the production of tricycles in the country."

13.1 The Committee did not agree to the request of the Ministry to drop the assurance and desired that the Ministry ought to furnish the required information to the extent possible. The Ministry should also seek extension of time considered to be minimum necessary for fulfilling the assurance.

14. The Committee decided to undertake a review of pending assurances of selected Ministries taking into consideration factors like number of pending assurances, the period for which they were pending and the action taken by Government to fulfil them.

15. The Committee approved their on the spot study tour programme from 30th January to 8th February, 1989.

16. The Committee also decided to hold their next sitting at 15.00 hrs. on 16th January, 1989.

17. The Committee then adjourned.

## MINUTES

### **Eighth Sitting**

*Minutes of the Committee on Government Assurances held on 16 January, 1982 in Committee Room No. 'B', Parliament House Annexe, New Delhi.*

---

The Committee met on Monday, 16 January, 1989 from 15.00 hours to 15.30 hours.

## PRESENT

Prof. Narain Chand Parashar—*Chairman*

## MEMBERS

2. Shri Bapulal Malviya
3. Dr. A. K. Patel
4. Shri V. Krishna Rao
5. Shri Bholu Raut
6. Shri Prabhu Lal Rawat
7. Shri Manik Reddy
8. Shri Ramashray 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*

2. The Committee took up for consideration the following memoranda :

*Memorandum No. 181:—Request for dropping of the assurance given on 24 March, 1986, in reply to Unstarred Question No. 3970 regarding proposal of Orissa to place a land reform act in Ninth Schedule.*

3. The Committee considered the request of the Ministry of Agriculture received through the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs vide their U.O. Note No. V/Agri(52)-USQ 3970-LS/86 dated 21 October, 1988 for the dropping of the assurance on the following grounds :

“The proposal of Government of Orissa for inclusion of the Act in the Ninth Schedule of the Constitution is being processed

along with similar proposals received from various other States and as it involves amendment to the Constitution after following due procedures which require detailed examination of the laws in consultation with various Ministries, approval of Cabinet, drafting of the Amendment Bill, introduction in Parliament and its final enactment, all these steps take considerable time. Further, it would not be expedient to process the Orissa law only in isolation as it would mean that similar procedures would have to be followed for every State law."

3.1 The Committee did not accede to the request of the Ministry to drop the assurance and desired that the Ministry should seek further extension of time considered necessary to fulfil the assurance.

*Memorandum No. 182:—Request for dropping of the assurance given on 13 November, 1987 in reply to Unstarred Question No. 1034 regarding declaration of Port Blair as free port.*

4. The Committee considered the request of the Ministry of Commerce received through the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs *vide* their U.O. Note No. IX/Com(20)USQ 1034-LS/87 dated 25 October, 1988 for the dropping of the assurance on the following grounds :

"The Concept of a free port is totally new which has no precedent in the country and a detailed feasibility study has to be carried out besides ecological impact assessment which could run over years. Moreover, while replying to this question, the idea of the Minister of State for Commerce was only to inform the Hon'ble Members of the Parliament of the present position in the matter.

It may not be possible and practicable to fulfil the same in the near future because of administrative and other implications which necessitate detailed feasibility study and interactions with other departments and agencies before the Government takes a final decision in the matter."

4.1 The Committee did not agree to drop the assurance and decided that the Ministry should seek extension of time considered to be minimum necessary for fulfilling the assurance.

*Memorandum No. 183:—Request for dropping of the assurance given on 7 April, 1988, in reply to Unstarred Question No. 6048 regarding Tata Committee recommendations.*

5. The Committee considered the request of the Ministry of Civil Aviation received through the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs *vide*

their U.O. Note No. X/CA(12)USQ-6048-LS/88 dated 31 October, 1988 for the dropping of the assurance on the following grounds :

"The report of the Planning Group on Civil Aviation headed by Shri J.R.D. Tata would be an input for the Steering Committee of the Planning Commission for formulating a long term plan on Transport sector, Government would not take any formal view or decisions on the recommendations of the Tata Group on Civil Aviation. It may not, therefore, be possible for this Ministry to fulfil the assurance in the foreseeable future."

5.1 The Committee did not accept the plea of the Ministry to drop the assurance and decided that the Ministry should seek further extension of time considered to be minimum necessary for fulfilling the assurance.

*Memorandum No. 184:—Request for dropping of the assurance given on 6 May, 1988 in reply to Unstarred Question No. 9936 regarding group insurance scheme for landless labourers.*

6. The Committee considered the request of the Ministry of Finance received through the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs *vide their* U.O. Note No. X/Fin (102)-USQ.9936-LS/88 dated 31 October, 1988 for the dropping of the assurance on the following grounds:

"The reply to part (c) of the Question was the factual position as on the date of the question and may not be treated as an assurance. It may be stated that the Scheme which came into force w.e.f. 15th August, 1987 throughout the country was announced in the Lok Sabha on 12-8-1987 and the Finance Minister in his letter dated 14-8-87 requested all the Chief Ministers for assistance in the implementation of the scheme in their respective States|UTs. Immediately thereafter details of the scheme were also made available to the State|UT Govts. by Life Insurance Corporation of India. Thereafter the follow-up action being taken by the Central Govt. as well as the Life Insurance Corporation of India is merely a continuing course of action. Since the implementation of the Scheme in the States|UTs is being continuously pursued through the LIC, the follow-up action on the part of the Central Govt. may not be treated as assurance."

6.1. The committee did not agree to drop the assurance. Extension of time upto 6 February, 1989 was, however, granted for fulfilling the assurance, as requested by the Ministry.

*Memorandum No. 185:—Request for dropping of the assurance given on 6 August, 1987, in reply to Starred Question No. 144 regarding intensive monitoring system for 20 point programme.*

7. The Committee considered the request of the Ministry of Programme Implementation received through the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs *vide* their U.O. Note No. VIII-2|PI(3) SQ-144-LS|87 dated 31 October, 1988 for the dropping of the assurance on the following grounds:—

“The Minister of State for Programme Implementation had requested Kumari Mamta Banerjee, M.P. to give complete details regarding misuse/defalcation of funds given for implementation of the 20-Point Programme and other instances in Alipur Vazirkhana and other treasuries. These details were considered necessary to pursue the matter with the authorities concerned. Despite repeated requests, however, the requisite information has not been forthcoming. Presumably, the Hon. Member is no longer interested in pursuing the matter further. The Committee on Govt. Assurance may therefore be approached for deleting the above mentioned assurance. In any case, it will not be possible for this Ministry to fulfil the assurance unless the Hon’ble Member furnishes the full information.”

7.1. The Committee did not agree to drop the assurance. They observed that irrespective of furnishing of required information by Kumari Mamta Banerjee, M.P., the Ministry should have collected from its own sources the necessary information regarding misuse/defalcation of funds given for implementation of the 20 Point Programme. The Committee, however agreed to grant extension of time upto 5 February, 1980, as requested by the Ministry.

*Memorandum No. 186: Request for dropping of assurance given on 28 July, 1988, in reply to Starred Question No. 39 regarding modernisation of Durgapur Steel Plant.*

8. The Committee considered the request of the Ministry of Steel and Mines received through the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs *vide* their U.O. Note No. XI|SM(1)-SQ.39-LS|88 dated 17 November, 1988 for the dropping of the assurance on the following grounds:

“A reply to the question, based on the available information was given to the Lok Sabha on 28-7-88. This Deptt. is of the view that the reply was complete in itself and no assurance as such was held out. In this connection, it may please be appreciated that the evaluation and finalisation of tenders for the modernisation scheme involving hundreds of crores of rupees will, of necessity, take considerable time. The understanding of this Department is that Parliament Questions of the nature referred



to above can at best be answered with reference to the information available at the relevant time and are not to be put off until new or revised facts emerge over a period of time."

8.1 The Committee observed that the reply to the Question was rightly treated as an assurance and did not agree to drop the assurance, Extension of time upto 31 March, 1989 was, however, granted for fulfilling the assurance.

*Memorandum No. 187:—Request for dropping of the assurance given on 28 August, 1987, in reply to Unstarred Question No. 5391 regarding fresh initiative to solve Punjab problem.*

9. The Committee considered the request of the Ministry of Home Affairs received through the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs vide their U.O. Note No. VIII-2|HA(40)-USQ. 5391-LS|87 dated 24 June, 1988 for the dropping of the assurance on the following grounds:

"The answer to the above mentioned question was not intended to be an Assurance to be fulfilled at a later date. The reply was only a factual one and it will be observed that it did not constitute any assurance as no time limit period can be fixed, for obvious reasons, for solving the Punjab problem."

9.1 The Committee at their sitting held on 11 October, 1988 considered the above request of the Ministry of Home Affairs and took the following decision:—

"The Committee desired that the Ministry be asked to furnish a note indicating the steps taken to date by Government including the recent initiative taken by the Prime Minister, to solve the Punjab problem. It was decided to postpone the consideration of the request for the dropping of the assurance till then."

9.2 The above decision of the Committee was conveyed to the Ministry on 25 October, 1988.

9.3 The Ministry have now furnished a detailed note indicating the steps taken by Government to solve the Punjab problem (Annexure).

9.4 The Committee took note of the steps taken by Government to solve the Punjab problem. They however did not agree to drop the assurance and decided that the Ministry should seek further extension of time considered to be necessary for fulfilling the assurance.

*Memorandum No. 188:—Request for dropping of the assurance given on 10 May, 1988, in reply to Starred Question No. 1036 regarding target of reserve accretion of ONGC.*

10. The Committee considered the request of the Ministry of Petroleum and Natural Gas received through the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs *vide* their U.O. Note No. X/PNG(15)-SQ. 1036-LS/88 dated 3 October, 1988 for the dropping of the assurance on the following grounds:—

“The assurance related to the 8th Five Year Plan. It is not possible in the near future, to fulfil this assurance since the correct reply can be given only when the 8th plan is finalised sometimes in 1989 or 1990.”

10.1 The Committee did not agree to drop the assurance and decided that the Ministry should seek further extension of time considered to be minimum necessary for fulfilling the assurance.

11. The Chairman informed the Members about the change in the discussions with the Ministry of Finance during tour of the Committee from 30 January to 8 February, 1989.

12. The Committee then adjourned.

**NOTE INDICATING THE STEPS TAKEN BY THE GOVERNMENT TO SOLVE THE PUNJAB PROBLEM**

*I. Initiative for restoring peace and normalcy in Punjab.*

- (1) The Government of Punjab had undertaken a campaign to involve people in the fight against terrorism and restoration of peace and law and order in the State.
- (2) Village Peace and Development Committees have been formed to enlist the co-operation of people to combat terrorism and to accelerate the pace of development in the State.
- (3) A State level monitoring committee representing all the major political parties and shades of opinion in the State was constituted under the Chairmanship of the Governor of Punjab to review the setting up and functioning of these committees.
- (4) Raids on the hideouts of terrorists and their harbourers/associates have been made from time to time.
- (5) There has been intensification of patrolling and prompt follow-up action on the information received about activities of terrorists and their harbourers/associates.
- (6) After reviewing the situation in Punjab, an action plan was drawn up for implementation in the State to curb terrorist activities, to prevent infiltration and smuggling of arms, etc. into the country. The Plan includes the erection of fence for a stretch of about 118 k.m. along the most vulnerable sector of the Indo-Pak border in the Punjab. More O.P. towers have been constructed and improving/laying of border traps has been taken up. Selected stretches of the border are also being got flood-lit.

With a view to curbing smuggling activities and border crossing and IGP (Border) has been appointed and deterrent action against smugglers and their principal lieutenants under the NSA and COFEPOSA is being taken.

The police administration in three border districts of Amritsar, Gurdaspur and Ferozepur has been streamlined by creating additional police districts.

The Intelligence gathering machinery has been strengthened.

Arrangements for checking passengers and their luggages, coming into the country through Attari and Wagha check-posts, have been strengthened.

- (7) Apart from the action at the border, several steps like joint raids to flush out arms and ammunition, setting up of village protection force pickets, training of the PAP to work as "strike-force" and involvement of ex-servicemen and villagers in village protection groups have been taken. The grievances redressal machinery has been activated and a plan for co-ordinate media campaign to explain the policies and decisions of the Government to the people, has been drawn up.

## II. *Implementation of Punjab Accord*

The Government has made sincere efforts to solve the Punjab problem and implement the Punjab accord. Out of 11 items in the Memorandum of settlement, 8 items have been fully implemented.

## III. *Recent initiative by the Prime Minister to solve the Punjab problem.*

- (1) The Prime Minister visited Punjab on 21-9-1988 and addressed Public functions at Jalandhar, Goidwal and Jaito. The Prime Minister announced that an all-party meeting to discuss the Punjab problem would be held. Later he announced the formation of a Cabinet Sub-Committee to work out details of the agenda for the meeting. The Cabinet Sub-Committee has since been constituted under the Chairmanship of Shri P. V. Narsimha Rao, Minister of External Affairs with the composition as under:—

1. Shri P. V. Narsimha Rao, Minister of External Affairs.
2. Shri S. B. Chavan, Minister of Finance.
3. Shri Buta Singh, Minister of Home Affairs.
4. Shri K. C. Pant, Minister of Defence.
5. Shri J. Vengal Rao, Minister of Industry.
6. Shri Ram Niwas Mirdha, Minister of Textiles.
7. Dr. Rajendra Kumari Bajpai, Minister of State (Independent Charge) of the Ministry of Welfare.
8. Shri P. Chidambaram, Minister of State in the Ministry of Personnel, Public Grievances and Pensions and Minister of State in the Ministry of Home Affairs.

- (2) The Cabinet Sub-Committee has held three meetings on 12th and 25th October, 1988 and 8th November, 1988.

## MINUTES

*Minutes of the Seventeenth Sitting of the Committee on Government Assurances held on 30 May, 1989 in Committee Room 'D' Parliament House Annexe, New Delhi.*

-----

The Committee met on Tuesday, 30 May, 1989 from 11.00 hours to 11.40 hours.

### PRESENT

Prof. Narain Chand Parashar—*Chairman*

### MEMBERS

2. Shri L. Balaraman
3. Shri Bapulal Malviya
4. Shri Murlidhar Mane
5. Shri V. Krishna Rao
6. Shri Bhola Raut
7. Shri Prabhu Lal Rawat
8. Shri Manik Reddy
9. Shrimati Shanti Devi
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—*Joint Secretary*
2. Shri S. C. Gupta—*Deputy Secretary*
3. Shri Jyoti Prasad—*Officer on Special Duty*

\* \* \* \* \*

*Consideration of Draft Report*

9. The Committee considered and adopted draft Twentieth Report.

10. As the term of the Committee was to end on 31 May, 1989 and this was their last sitting, the Chairman gave an account of the work done by the Committee during the year. He thanked the Members for their whole-hearted cooperation and valuable contribution to the work of the Committee. He also expressed his thanks to the Honourable Speaker for his guidance and to the officers of the Secretariat for their hard work and assistance to the Committee. Shri Mahabir Prasad Yadav, Member of the Committee speaking on behalf of all Members of the Committee thanked the Chairman for his leadership and to the Secretariat for the assistance rendered to the Committee.

11. The Committee then adjourned.

---

## MINUTES

*Minutes of the Second Sitting of the Committee on Government Assurances held on 6 July, 1989 in Committee Room No. 'C', Parliament House Annexe, New Delhi.*

The Committee met on Thursday, 6 July, 1989 from 11.00 hrs. to 11.55 hrs.

### PRESENT

Prof. Narain Chand Parashar—*Chairman*

### MEMBERS

2. Shri L. Balaraman
3. Shri Kadambur M. R. Janarthanan
4. Shri Bapulal Malviya
5. Shri Sanat Kumar Mandal
6. Shri Murlidhar Mane
7. Shri V. Krishna Rao
8. Shri Bhola Raut
9. Shri Prabhu Lal Rawat
10. Shri Bajju Ban Riyan
11. Shri Kamla Prasad Singh
12. Shrimati Usha Thakkar
13. 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*
2. The Committee adopted the draft 19th and 20th Reports which were considered by their predecessor Committee.
- \* \* \* \* \*
3. The Committee then adjourned.