

**COMMITTEE
ON
GOVERNMENT ASSURANCES
(1987-88)**

(EIGHTH LOK SABHA)

NINTH REPORT

Presented on 10-12-87



**LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT
NEW DELHI**

December 8, 1987/Agrahayana 17, 1909 (Saka)

372 R

Price Rs: 1.20

•

C O N T E N T S

	PAGE
COMPOSITION OF THE COMMITTEE	(iii)
INTRODUCTION	(v)
CHAPTER—I Review of pending assurances of Seventh and Eighth Lok Sabha	1
CHAPTER—II Requests for dropping of assurances not acceded to	2
CHAPTER—III Position of pending assurances pertaining to Seventh and Eighth Lok Sabha	13

M I N U T E S

Minutes of sittings held on 15 and 16 January, 1987	14
Minutes of Eighth sitting held on 8-12-87	21

A P P E N D I C E S

Statements showing the position of assurances pertaining to Seventh and Eighth Lok Sabha pending implementation by the Government as on 12 November, 1987.

APPENDIX I	22
APPENDIX II	23

COMPOSITION OF THE COMMITTEE* ON GOVERNMENT
ASSURANCES

(1987-88)

Prof. Narain Chand Parashar—*Chairman*

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

SECRETARIAT

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

Shri Raghbir Singh—*Senior Examiner of Questions*

*The Committee was nominated by the Speaker w.e.f. June 12, 1987
vide para No. 1686 of Lok Sabha Bulletin, Part-II dated 12 June,
1987.

INTRODUCTION

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

2. The Committee (1987-88) were constituted on June 12, 1987.

3. The Committee (1986-87) at their sittings held on 15 and 16 January, 1987, considered six requests from the Ministries for dropping of pending assurances and their decisions are contained in this Report. At their eighth sitting held on 8-12-87 the Committee (1987-88) considered and adopted the draft Ninth Report.

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

5. The conclusions|observations of the Committee are contained in the succeeding chapters.

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

NEW DELHI:

Dated, December 8, 1987.

CHAPTER I

REVIEW OF PENDING ASSURANCES OF SEVENTH AND EIGHTH LOK SABHA

During the Seventh Lok Sabha, 7,231 assurances were culled out from Lok Sabha Debates for implementation by Government. Of these 7,220 assurances have since been implemented (leaving a balance of 11 assurances to be implemented.

2. During the First to Eighth Sessions of Eighth Lok Sabha, 4158 assurances were culled out. Out of them 3087 assurances have since been implemented, thus leaving a balance of 1071 assurances, pending implementation.

3. The above figures take into account the latest statements of implemented assurances laid on the Table of Lok Sabha by the Minister of Parliamentary Affairs on 12 November, 1987.

CHAPTER II

(i)

REQUESTS FOR DROPPING OF ASSURANCES NOT ACCEPTED TO

4. On 17 March, 1986, the following Unstarred Question (No. 3130) given notice of by Dr. D. N. Reddy, M.P., was addressed to the Minister of Urban Development:—

“(a) whether Government are aware that housing in western countries has vastly developed with prefabricated material, and

(b) whether Government propose to import know-how and introduce the systems in our country so as to save expenses and time in construction of houses.”

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

“(a) & (b): Various suggestions made with regard to the adoption of pre-fab. technology in use in western countries are already engaging the attention of the Government.”

6. The above reply was treated as an assurance by the Committee which was to be fulfilled within three months of the date of reply i.e. by 16 June, 1986.

7. On 29 October, 1986, the Ministry of Urban Development approached the Committee on Government Assurances through the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs *vide* their U.O. Note No. V/UD (36)USQ-3130-LS|86 dated 29 October, 1986 to drop the assurance on the grounds indicated below:—

“A decision with regard to the adoption of pre-fabricated technology in the construction of houses can be taken only after examining the various aspects of the matter. The examination of various technologies is a continuing effort and no decision can be arrived at in a short time. Incidentally, housing being a State subject, it is for the State Government/Union Territory Administrations to adopt methods of construction of houses considered suitable for their local requirements.”

8. The Committee considered the request of the Ministry of Urban Development for dropping the assurance at their sitting held on 15 January, 1987.

9. The decision of the Committee was conveyed to the Ministry on 11 March, 1987.

10. The assurance was subsequently implemented by the Ministry on 7 May, 1987.

11. The Committee wish to express their displeasure over the casualness with which this matter received the attention of the Ministry and the consequent delay in implementation of the assurance. Looking to the importance and urgency of the matter, certainly a year and a quarter period ought not to have been taken by Government to take a decision. Obviously the Ministry took a lax attitude from the very beginning. It took seven months for them to decide to approach the Committee to drop the assurance on the plea that the matter involved a continuing effort and the housing was a State subject. And when the Committee did not accede to their request for dropping the assurance, Government reported the implementation. The Committee hope that due importance and promptness in implementing the assurances to the House would be shown in future.

(ii)

12. On 10 April, 1986, the following Unstarred Question (No. 6086) given notice of by Shri Dileep Singh Bhuria, M.P. was addressed to the Minister of Human Resource Development:—

“(a) whether Union Government have received any proposal from the Madhya Pradesh Government regarding raising of the present income limit for the purpose of awarding post-matric scholarships; and

(b) if so, the action taken thereon?”

13. The Minister of Human Resource Development (Shri P. V. Narasimha Rao) gave the following reply:—

“(a) Yes, Sir.

(b) The proposal is under consideration.”

14. Reply to part (b) of the question was treated as an assurance by the Committee which was to be fulfilled within three months of the date of reply i.e. by 9 July, 1986.

15. On 28 October, 1986, the Ministry of Human Resource Development approached the Committee on Government Assurances through the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs vide their U.O. Note No. V/HRD(18) USQ-6086-LS/86 dated 28 October, 1986, to drop the assurance on the grounds indicated below:—

“In view of the submission of the Fourth Pay Commission’s report, it has been decided to await final decision about raising of income limit after the Commission’s recommendations have been processed in the Government and it would lead to re-processing the issue once again involving time factor.”

16. The Committee considered the request of the Ministry of Human Resource Development for dropping the assurance at their sitting held on 15 January, 1987 and did not accede to it. The Committee’s decision was conveyed to the Ministry on 11 March, 1987.

17. This is a simple but typical example of sheer ad hocism in the decision making process of Government. In April, 1986, the Minister’s reply indicated that the proposal of Madhya Pradesh Government about the raising of the income limit for the purpose of awarding post-matric scholarship was under consideration. Since the reply was treated as an assurance, it was incumbent on Government to expedite their decision and in any case to report its implementation within three months time and in case it was not possible for some reason to report the implementation within the prescribed time limit, a request for extension of time was to be submitted to the Committee. The Ministry of Human Resource Development did neither. It was only after six months, the Ministry woke up and approached the Committee to drop the assurance as the decision in the matter would have to await Government’s decision on the recommendations of the Fourth Pay Commission. The Report of the Fourth Pay Commission was awaited at the time of the Minister’s reply in Lok Sabha on 10 April, 1986 and this being not a new development could have been mentioned by the Minister. The only conclusion to be drawn is that the matter should remain pending on one or the other pretext. The Committee would like to urge upon the Government to take suitable steps to eliminate avoidable delays in their decision making process so that at least such matters as affect

a large number of students are decided early. The assurance under reference already hanging fire for more than a year and a half should be implemented without further loss of time.

(iii)

18. On 5 May, 1986, the following Unstarred Question (No. 8866) given notice of by Shri Basudeb Acharia, M.P., was addressed to the Minister of Labour:—

- “(a) whether it is a fact that the Government has set up a sub-committee to draft amendments to the present Contract Labour (Regulation and Abolition) Act, 1970;
- (b) if so, how far the work has progressed; and
- (c) the time by which the report of the Committee is likely to be submitted to Government?”

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

- (a), (b) and (c): “The Ministry of Labour had formed a Working Group to look into various proposals for amendments to the Contract Labour (Regulation and Abolition) Act, 1970. The Group submitted its report in July, 1982 suggesting certain amendments to the Act. These recommendations were placed before the Labour Ministers’ Conference held in September, 1982. The batch of amendments is still to be finalised.”

20. Reply to the above 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 4 August, 1986.

21. On 21 October, 1986, the Ministry of Labour approached the Committee on Government Assurances through the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs vide their U.O. Note No. V/L (35)USQ-8866-LS/86 dated 21 October, 1986 to drop the assurance on the grounds indicated below:—

“The reply given to the question was not intended to constitute an assurance. In this connection, it may be stated that a batch of amendments to the Contract Labour (Regulation and Abolition) Act, 1970 is under active consideration in consultation with the Ministry of Law

and Justice and other concerned interests. It will take considerable time to make finalisation of amendments to the Contract Labour (Regulation and Abolition) Act, 1970. Moreover, details of amendments could not be intimated to the House in public interest at present. An amendment to the Act relating to the definition of "appropriate Government" has been made by the promulgation of an ordinance on 28-1-86 which has been subsequently replaced by an Amendment to the Act (No. 14 of 1986) in the interest of healthy industrial relations and harmony in the implementation of the Act, 1970. This is an important amendment in the batch of amendments under consideration."

22. The Committee considered the request of the Ministry of Labour for dropping the assurance at their sitting held on 15 January, 1987 and did not accede to it. The decision of the Committee was conveyed to the Ministry on 12 March 1987. Subsequently the Ministry sought extension of time upto 30 November, 1987 for implementing the assurance.

23. The Committee note that the working Group formed to look into various proposals for amendments to the Contract Labour (Regulation and Abolition) Act, 1970, submitted its report in July, 1982 and the recommendations of the Group were placed before the Labour Ministers Conference held in September, 1982. The Minister in his aforesaid reply stated that the amendments were still to be finalised. Although this reply was treated as an assurance and was required to be implemented before 4 August, 1986, Government did not consider it necessary to finalise the matter and introduce the amending bill before Parliament. Instead the Ministry of Labour thought it appropriate to request the Committee to drop the assurance with the plea that the reply given to the question was not intended to constitute an assurance. Evidently even after lapse of more than five years the Ministry is not prepared to finalise the amendments. The Committee can only deprecate this inordinate delay as well as lackadaisical approach of the Ministry which is charged with the responsibility of providing labour welfare. The Committee would like the Government not to waste any further time in fruitless exercise and take steps to see that necessary amending bill is brought before Parliament at the earliest. Incidentally statement of the Ministry that the reply of the Minister was not intended to be

an assurance evinces complete ignorance of the Parliamentary practice and procedures. It should be clearly understood, as has been observed earlier on several occasions, it is the prerogative of the Committee alone to treat a reply as an assurance and once it is so treated Government is bound to implement the assurance.

(iv)

24. On 5 May, 1986, the following Unstarred Question (No. 8789) given notice of by Shri K. Pradhani and Dr. B. L. Shailesh, M.Ps, was addressed to the Minister of Agriculture:—

- “(a) whether Union Government plan to undertake the third phase of National Seeds Projects (NSP) to expand and strengthen facilities for production and processing of seeds;
- (b) if so, the broad features of the plan and the anticipated capital outlay of the project planned; and
- (c) the source of finance and the schedule for implementation of this scheme?”

25. The Minister of State in the Ministry of Agriculture, (Shri Yogendra Makwana) gave the following reply:—

- (a), (b) and (c) “The matter is still under consideration of the Government.”

26. The above reply to the question was treated as an assurance by the Committee which was to be implemented within three months of the date of reply i.e. by 4 August, 1986.

27. On 25 November, 1986, the Ministry of Agriculture approached the Committee on Government Assurances through the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs *vide* their U.O. Note No. V/Agri(57)USQ-8789-LS/86 dated NIL, to drop the assurance on the grounds indicated below:—

- “...because National Seeds Project Phase-III has not been materialised. It is true that this Department has been formulating proposals for phase-III of the project in consultation with the Project States but the final picture of the project would become available only after the project is appraised by the World Bank which may take quite a long time. We have been in the formulation process for the last 11-12 years but the World Bank has

been deferring its consideration as perhaps they were not ready to accept the project. Even if the World Bank agrees to consider our proposal, the dates for the appraisal of the project have not yet been finalised. Before the project becomes affective and its broad features become available, the project has to undergo the drill of pre-appraisal, appraisal and negotiations. None of these activities have yet been completed. We are not sure whether the World Bank would finally approve the project as also because the precise details of the project would become available only after the completion of the drill."

28. The Committee considered the request of the Ministry of Agriculture for dropping the assurance at their sitting held on 15 January, 1987 and did not accede to it. The decision of the Committee was communicated to the Ministry on 12 March, 1987. The assurance was subsequently implemented by the Ministry *vide* the Statement laid on the Table of the House by the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs on 7 May, 1987.

29. The Committee note that the Ministry have since fulfilled the assurance by laying a statement on the Table of the House on 7 May, 1987. However, it is regrettable that the Ministry should in the first instance have thought of requesting for dropping of the assurance. It need hardly be emphasised that Ministries should always sincerely endeavour to implement the assurance within the least possible time and when it is found not at all possible to implement it, a request for dropping should be made.

(v)

30. On 23 July, 1986, the following Unstarred Question (No. 817) given notice of by Sarvashri C. Madhav Reddy and Banwari Lal Purohit, M.Ps., was addressed to the Minister of Home Affairs:—

- (a) "Whether it is a fact that 12 persons including some foreigners who were masquerading as Sri Lankan militants were arrested in Madras on 7th June, 1986 on charge of spying;
- (b) if so, the nature of the spying activities indulged in by the arrested persons; and
- (c) whether a number of local people are also involved in the spying activities?"

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

(a), (b) and (c): "According to the information available at present, five persons were arrested under the provisions of the Official Secrets Act read with the provisions of the Foreigners Act and of the Passport Act on June 7, 1986 at Madras. The case is still under investigation."

32. The above reply to 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 October, 1986.

33. On 13 November, 1986, the Ministry of Home Affairs approached the Committee on Government Assurances through the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs *vide* their U.O. Note No. VI/HA(6) USQ-817-LS/86 dated 13 November, 1986, to drop the assurance on the grounds indicated below:—

"According to the information available on the date of the answer to the Question, the case registered against the arrested persons was under investigation. This information which reflected the correct position obtaining on the date of the answer to the Question was furnished in the answer. There was no intention to give any assurance. It may also be added that no assurance was intended to be given stating that the facts were being ascertained. As the Lok Sabha Secretariat are aware such cases registered by the State Police are investigated by the State Police. The Central Government cannot interfere in the investigation of such cases except to request the State authorities to expedite the investigation. It is likely that the State Police may take considerable time, say, some months even years to complete the investigation and file charge-sheet against the accused where considered necessary. If under investigation, is treated as an assurance, the fulfilment thereof would depend on the progress made by the State Police in the investigation of the case and as the Central Government cannot really exercise any control in such matters, fulfilment of the assurances will depend only on the action taken by the State Police."

34. The Committee considered the request of the Ministry of Home Affairs for dropping the assurance at their sitting held on 16 January, 1987 for dropping the assurance. The Committee being of the view that in spying cases, the State Governments were not competent to negotiate with foreign Governments, did not accede to the request of the Ministry. They rather urged the Ministry to implement the assurance at an early date. The decision of the Committee was communicated to the Ministry on 12 March, 1987.

35. The assurance was subsequently implemented *vide* implementation statement laid by the Minister of Parliamentary Affairs on the Table of the House on 20 April, 1987.

36. The Committee note that the assurance has since been fulfilled. However, the Committee must express their displeasure over the initial evasive attempt of the Ministry in making a request for the dropping of the assurance, rather in trying to sit in judgement over the decision to treat the reply as an assurance.

(vi)

37. On 28 July, 1986, the following Unstarred Question (No. 1332) given notice of by Shri V. Tulsiram, M.P., was addressed to the Minister of Steel and Mines:—

- “(a) whether Government propose to reduce the output cost of non-ferrous metals in the country to bring it at par with the international price;
- (b) if so, the details of the proposal and when it is expected to be implemented;
- (c) the extent to which it will help in increasing the production in the country and in competing with the world market; and
- (d) the extent to which it will reduce import of such materials?”

38. The Minister of State in the Ministry of Steel and Mines (Shrimati Ram Dulari Sinha) gave the following reply:—

“(a) & (b): Government are looking into the possibilities of reduction in the output cost of non-ferrous metals for which consultations are being held with the public sector enterprises producing the metals.

(c) & (d): Do not arise as yet.”

39. 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 27 October, 1986.

40. On 28 October, 1986, the Ministry of Steel and Mines approached the Committee on Government Assurances through the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs vide their U.O. Note No. VI|SM (3)USQ-1332-LS|86 dated 28 October, 1986, to drop the assurance on the grounds indicated below:—

“In reply to the above mentioned question, this Department has only said that the Government are looking into the possibilities of reduction of output of cost of non-ferrous metals for which the consultations are being held with the public sector enterprises producing the metals. Such an exercise is of a continuing nature and no commitment about the time-frame should be read into this as it would lead to a situation implying that Government do not propose to reduce the costs below a specified level.”

41. The Committee considered the request of the Ministry of Steel and Mines for dropping the assurance at their sitting held on 16 January, 1987, and did not accede to it. The decision was communicated to the Ministry on 11 March, 1987.

42. The Committee consider the terms of the request for the dropping of the assurance self contradictory. If Government is engaged in a continuing exercise of exploring the possibilities of reduction of output of cost of non-ferrous metals, the House would be interested in knowing the results of this exercise. Should Government be able to furnish this information, it would automatically lead to implementation of the assurance. The Committee trust that in future the Ministry would adopt a positive approach as the national interest is better served by sharing information with Parliament than denying it on some or the other pretext.

CHAPTER III

POSITION OF PENDING ASSURANCES PERTAINING TO SEVENTH AND EIGHTH LOK SABHA

43. A statement showing the position of assurances pertaining to Seventh and Eighth Lok Sabha pending implementation by the Government as on 12 November, 1987, is given in Appendix.

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

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

NEW DELHI;
December 8, 1987

Agrahayana 17, 1909 (Saka).

10
MINUTES

TENTH SITTING

Minutes of the Committee on Government Assurances held on 15 January, 1987 in Committee Room No. 62, Parliament House, New Delhi.

The Committee met on Thursday, 15 January, 1987, from 15.00 hours to 15.30 hours.

PRESENT

Prof. Narain Chand Parashar—*Chairman*

MEMBERS

2. Shri Tador Bala Goud
3. Shri Viridhi Chander Jain
4. Shri Jitendra Prasada
5. Shri Rahim Khan
6. Shri Purna Chandra Malik
7. Shri Channaiah Odeyar
8. Shri Ram Pujan Patel
9. Shri K. N. Pradhan
10. Shri Jagannath Prasad
11. Shri Muhiram Saikia

SECRETARIAT

1. Shri D. C. Pande—*Joint Secretary*
2. Shri D. M. Chanan—*Senior Examiner of Questions*

2. At the outset, Chairman extended to the Members his greeting and good wishes for the New Year.

3. The Committee took up for consideration their draft Eighth Report and adopted the same. The Committee authorised the Chairman to present the Report during the ensuing session of Lok Sabha.

4. Thereafter, the Committee took up for consideration Memoranda Nos. 62, 63, 64, 65 and 66.

Memorandum No. 62: Request for dropping of assurance given on 17 March, 1986, in reply to Unstarred Question No. 8130 regarding prefabrication know-how for development of housing.

5. The Committee considered the following request of the Ministry of Urban Development received through the Ministry of Parliament Affairs *vide* their U.O. Note No. V/UD(36) USQ 3130-LS/86 dated 29 October, 1986, for dropping of the assurance on the following grounds:—

“A decision with regard to the adoption of pre-fab. technology in the construction of houses can be taken only after examining the various aspects of the matter. The examination of various technologies is a continuing effort and no decision can be arrived at in a short time. Incidentally, housing being a State subject, it is for the State Government/Union Territory Administration to adopt methods of construction of houses considered suitable for their local requirements.”

5.1 The Committee did not find the plea taken by the Government that the housing being a State subject, it was for the State Governments/Union Territory Administrations to adopt methods of construction of houses considered suitable for their local requirements as convincing. In their opinion the issue involved consultation with foreign countries with whom State could not negotiate directly and hence the Centre should own the responsibility of moving in the matter. The Committee decided not to drop the assurance and desired its implementation at an early date.

Memorandum No. 63: Request for dropping of assurance given on 10 April, 1986 in reply to Unstarred Question No. 6086 regarding income limit for award of postmatric scholarships.

6. The Committee considered the following request of the Ministry of Human Resource Development received through the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs *vide* their U.O. Note No. V/HRD(18) USQ. 6086-LS/86 dated 28 October, 1986, for dropping of the assurance on the following grounds:—

“In view of the submission of the Fourth Pay Commission's report, it has been decided to await final decision about

raising of income limit after the Commission's recommendations have been processed in the Government and it would lead to re-processing the issue once again involving time factor."

6.1 Nothing that the Fourth Pay Commission's Report had already been submitted, the Committee felt that there should be no delay in taking a decision regarding the raising of the present income limit for the purpose of awarding postmatric scholarships. The Committee did not agree to drop the assurance and desired its implementation at an early date. Meanwhile, Ministry were advised to seek extension of time for implementation of the assurance.

* * * *

Memorandum No. 65: Request for dropping of assurance given on 5 May, 1986 in reply to Unstarred Question No. 8866 regarding amendment to Contract Labour (Regulation and Abolition) Act, 1970.

8. The Committee considered the following request of the Ministry of Labour received through the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs *vide* their U.O. Note No. V/L(35)USQ, 8866-LS/86 dated 21 October, 1986, for dropping of the assurance on the following grounds:—

"The reply given to the question was not intended to constitute an assurance. In this connection, it may be stated that a batch of amendments to the Contract Labour (Regulation and Abolition) Act, 1970 is under active consideration in consultation with the Ministry of Law and Justice and other concerned interests. It will take considerable time to make finalisation of amendments to the Contract Labour (Regulation and Abolition) Act, 1970. Moreover, details of amendments could not be intimated to the House in public interest at present. An amendment to the Act relating to the definition of "appropriate Government" has been made by promulgation of an ordinance on 28-1-86 which has been subsequently replaced by an Amendment to the Act (No. 14 of 1986) in the interest of healthy industrial relations and harmony in the implementation of the Act, 1970. This is an important amendment in the batch of amendments under consideration."

8.1 The Committee did not agree to the request of the Ministry to drop the assurance. They were of the opinion that the Ministry

should finalise the amendments to the Contract Labour (Regulation and Abolition) Act, 1970, early so that the assurance was implemented expeditiously. Meanwhile, the Ministry should seek extension of time considered minimum for implementation of the assurance.

Memorandum No. 66: Request for dropping of assurance given on 5 May, 1986, in reply to Unstarred Question No. 8789 regarding third phase of National Seeds Project.

9. The Committee considered the following request of the Ministry of Agriculture received through the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs *vide* their U.O. Note No. V/Agri.(57)USQ-8789-LS/86 dated Nil for dropping of the assurance on the following grounds:—

“Because National Seeds Project Phase-III has not been materialised. It is true that this Department has been formulating proposals for Phase-III of the project in consultation with the Project States but the final picture of the project would become available only after the project is appraised by the World Bank which may take quite a long time. We have been in the formulation process for the last 11-12 years but the World Bank has been deferring its consideration as perhaps they were not ready to accept the project. Even if the World Bank agrees to consider our proposal, the dates for the appraisal of project have not yet been finalised. Before the project becomes effective and its broad features become available, the project has to undergo the drill of pre-appraisal, appraisal and negotiations. None of these activities have yet been completed. We are not sure whether the World Bank would finally approve the project as also because the precise details of the project would become available only after the completion of the drill.”

9.1 The Committee found the request of the Ministry for the dropping of the assurance unconvincing and desired that they should take vigorous steps to implement the assurance at an early date. They desired that the Ministry should at the earliest seek extension of minimum time required to implement the assurance.

10. The Committee then adjourned to meet again on 16 January, 1987 at 11.00 hours.

MINUTES
Eleventh Sitting

**Minutes of the Committee on Government Assurances held on 16
January, 1987 in Committee Room No. 62, Parliamentary
House, New Delhi.**

The Committee met on Friday, 16 January, 1987 from 11.00 hours to 11.50 hours.

PRESENT

Prof. Narain Chand Parashar—*Chairman*

MEMBERS

2. Shri Tador Bala Goud
3. Shri Jitendra Prasada
4. Shri Rahim Khan
5. Shri Purna Chandra Malik
6. Shri Channaiah Odeyar
7. Shri Ram Pujan Patel
8. Shri K. N. Pradhan
9. Shri K. Pradhani
10. Dr. G. Vijaya Rama Rao
11. Shri Muhiram Saikia

SECRETARIAT

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

6. The Committee then considered the following memoranda:—

Memorandum No. 67: Request for dropping of assurance given on 23 July, 1986 in reply to USQ. No. 817 regarding persons arrested for spying in Tamil Nadu.

7. The Committee considered the following request of the Ministry of Home Affairs received through the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs *vide* their U.O. Note No. VI/HA(6)USQ-817-LS/86 dated 13 November, 1986, for dropping of the assurance on the following grounds:—

“According to the information available on the date of the answer to the Question, the case registered against the

arrested persons was under investigation. This information which reflected the correct position obtaining on the date of the answer to the Question was furnished in the answer. There was no intention to give any assurance. It may also be added that no assurance was intended to be given stating that the facts were being ascertained. As the Lok Sabha Secretariat are aware such cases registered by the State Police are investigated by the State Police. The Central Government cannot interfere in the investigation of such cases except to request the State authorities to expedite the investigation. It is likely that the State Police may take considerable time, say, some months even years to complete the investigation and file charge-sheet against the accused where considered necessary. If under investigation, is treated as an assurance, the fulfilment thereof would depend on the progress made by the State Police in the investigation of the case and as the Central Government cannot really exercise any control in such matters, fulfilment of the assurances will depend only on the action taken by the State Police."

7.1 Being of the view that in matters of spying State Governments were not competent to negotiate with foreign countries, the Committee did not agree to the dropping of the assurance. On the contrary they desired the Ministry to implement it at the earliest.

Memorandum No. 68: Request for dropping of assurance given on 28 July, 1986 in reply to Unstarred Question No. 1332 regarding scheme to reduce cost of production of non-ferrous metals.

8. The Committee considered the following request of the Ministry of Steel and Mines received through the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs *vide* their U.O. Note No. VI/SM (3)USQ. 1332-LS/86 dated 28 October, 1986, for dropping of the assurance on the following grounds:—

"In reply to the above mentioned question, this Department has only said that the Government are looking into the possibilities of reduction of output of cost of non-ferrous metals for which the consultations are being held with the public sector enterprises producing the metals. Such

an exercise is of a continuing nature and no commitment about the time-frame should be read into this as it would lead to a situation implying that Government do not propose to reduce the costs below a specified level."

8.1 The Committee did not find the reasons adduced by the Ministry as cogent and convincing for dropping the assurance and hence did not agree to the plea of the Ministry. They urged the Ministry to seek extension of time considered minimum to implement the assurance.

The Committee then adjourned.

MINUTES
Eighth Sitting

Minutes of the Committee on Government Assurances held on 8
December, 1987 in Committee Room No. 53, Parliament
House, New Delhi

The Committee met on Tuesday, 8 December, 1987, from 15.30
hours to 16.20 hours.

PRESENT

Prof. Narain Chand Parashar—*Chairman*

MEMBERS

2. Shri L. Balaraman
3. Shri Bapulal Malviya
4. Shri Sanat Kumar Mandal
5. Shri P. Namgyal
6. Shri V. Krishna Rao
7. Shri Bhola Raut
8. Shri Kamla Prasad Singh
9. Shrimati Usha Thakkar

SECRETARIAT

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

* * * *

The Committee took up for consideration their draft Ninth Report and adopted the same. The Committee authorised the Chairman to present the Report before the end of the current Session.

The Committee then adjourned.

APPENDIX-I

(Vide Para No. 43 of the Report)

Statement showing the position of the assurances of Seventh Lok Sabha pending implementation as on 12 November, 1987

Session	No. of assurances culled out	No. of assurances implemented/dropped	No. of assurances outstanding
First Session, 1980	26	26	..
Second Session, 1980	196	196	..
Third Session, 1980	548	548	..
Fourth Session, 1980	333	333	..
Fifth Session, 1981	793	793	..
Sixth Session, 1981	373	372	1
Seventh Session, 1981	418	418	
Eighth Session, 1982	798	798	
Ninth Session, 1982	429	429	..
Tenth Session, 1982	315	315	..
Eleventh Session, 1983	861	860	1
Twelfth Session, 1983	433	433	
Thirteenth Session, 1983	424	424	..
Fourteenth Session, 1984	956	949	7
Fifteenth Session, 1984	328	326	2
Total assurances outstanding	7231	7220	11

APPENDIX-II

(Vide Para No. 43 of the Report)

Statement showing the position of assurances of Eighth Lok Sabha pending implementation as on 12 November, 1987.

Session	No. of assurances culled out	No. of assurances implemented/dropped	No. of assurances outstanding
First, Session, 1985.	19	19	..
Second Session, 1985	426	418	8
Third Session, 1985	323	318	5
Fourth Session, 1985	355	334	21
Fifth Session, 1986	777	693	84
Sixth Session, 1986	475	406	69
Seventh Session, 1986	428	348	80
Eighth Session, 1987	777	487	290
Eighth Session (Second Part), 1987.	578	64	514
Total assurances outstanding			1071

© 1987 BY LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT

PUBLISHED UNDER RULE 382 OF THE RULES OF PROCEDURE AND CONDUCT
OF BUSINESS IN LOK SABHA (SIXTH EDITION) AND PRINTED BY THE
MANAGER, GOVERNMENT OF INDIA PRESS,
MINTO ROAD, NEW DELHI-110002.