

**COMMITTEE  
ON  
GOVERNMENT ASSURANCES  
(1986-87)**

(EIGHTH LOK SABHA)

**EIGHTH REPORT**

(Presented on 1861 11W 8')



**LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT  
NEW DELHI**

*15 January, 1987/Pausa 25, 1908 (Saka)*

*Price : Rs. 2.20*

8372R  
n6;2

LOK SABHA

C O R R I G E N D A  
to

The Eighth Report of the Committee  
on Government Assurances (1986-87)

Eighth Lok Sabha

Page No.	Correction
3	Line 11 : For 'processess' <u>read</u> 'processes'
4	Line 19 : For 'mangeto' <u>read</u> 'magneto'
9	Last Line : For 'harldy' <u>read</u> 'hardly'
13	Line 23 : For 'September, 1986' <u>read</u> '3 September, 1986'
14	Line 25 : For 'thr' <u>read</u> 'the'
15	Line 4 : For 'receipt o1' <u>read</u> 'receipt of'
16	Line 1 : For 'willingnese as well as' <u>read</u> 'willingness as well as'
	Line 22 : For '(ngot-steel)' <u>read</u> '(ingot-steel)'
25	Line 18 : For 'reclved' <u>read</u> 'received'
	Line 30 : For 'inforation' <u>read</u> 'information'
30	Line 7 : For 'Governmenth' <u>read</u> 'Government'
38	Line 2 : For 'magnete' <u>read</u> 'magneto'
41	Line 19-20 : For 'compatiable' <u>read</u> 'compatible'
44	Statement Column No.3 line No. 9 : For '229' <u>read</u> '429'
47	Statement, under : 13 Session line <u>read</u> Total '1'

# CONTENTS

	PAGE
COMPOSITION OF THE COMMITTEE.....	(iii)
INTRODUCTION .....	(v)
<b>CHAPTER I</b>	
Review of pending assurances of Seventh and Eighth Lok Sabha. ....	1
<b>CHAPTER II</b>	
Requests for dropping of assurances not acceded to.....	2
<b>CHAPTER III</b>	
Position of pending assurances pertaining to Seventh and Eighth Lok Sabha.....	22
<b>MINUTES</b>	
Minutes of Sixth, Eighth and Ninth sittings held on 8 September 20 and 21 October, 1986 .....	23
Minutes of Tenth Sitting held on 15 January, 1987 .....	35
<b>A P P E N D I C E S</b>	
I. Debates portion regarding supplementary raised to SQ No. 853 dated 29.4.1986. (Annexure—I) .....	37
II. Statement laid on the Table of the House in reply to part (e) of SQ No. 271 dated 13.3.1986. (Annexure—II).....	39
III. Copy of Planning Commission's Memorandum No. T&C3(27)/85 dated 18.12.1985. (Annexure—III) .....	40
IV. Statement showing the position of assurances pertaining to Seventh and Eighth Lok Sabha pending implementation by the Government as on 4 December, 1986. (Appendix) .....	44

**\*COMPOSITION OF THE COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT**

**ASSURANCES (1986-87)**

- 
1. Prof. Narain Chand Parashar—*Chairman*
  2. Shri Tadur Bala Goud
  3. Shri Virldhi Chander Jain
  4. Shri Jitendra Prasada
  5. Shri Rahim Khan
  6. Shri Purna Chandra Malik
  7. Shri Channaiah Odeyar
  8. Shri S.S. Ramasamy Padayachi
  9. Shri Keshorao Pardhi
  10. Shri Ram Pujan Patel
  11. Shri K. N. Pradhan
  12. Shri K. Pradhani
  13. Shri Jagannath Prasad
  14. Dr. G. Vijaya Rama Rao
  15. Shri Muhiram Saikia

**SECRETARIAT**

Shri D. C. Pande—*Joint Secretary*

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

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

---

\*The Committee was nominated by the Speaker w.e.f. June 2, 1986 vide para No. 1071 of Lok Sabha Bulletin, Part II, dated 19 May, 1986.

## INTRODUCTION

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

2. The Committee at their sittings held on 8 September and 21 October, 1986 considered eleven requests from Government for dropping of pending assurances and their decisions are contained in this Report.

3. The minutes of the aforesaid sittings of the Committee are also included in this Report.

4. At their sitting held on 15 January, 1987, the Committee considered and adopted this Eighth Report.

5. Conclusion/Observations of the Committee are contained in succeeding chapters of this Report.

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

NEW DELHI;  
15 January, 1987  

---

25, Pausa, 1908 (SAKA)

## **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 7,212 assurances have since been implemented, leaving a balance of 19 assurances to be implemented.

2. During the First to Seventh Sessions of Eighth Lok Sabha 2746 assurances were culled out. Out of them 1715 assurances have since been implemented, thus leaving a balance of 1031 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 4 December, 1986.

## CHAPTER II

### REQUESTS FOR DROPPING OF ASSURANCES—NOT ACCEDED TO

4. On 11 March, 1986, the following Unstarred Question (No. 2185) given notice of by Prof. Narain Chand Parashar, M.P., was addressed to the Minister of Industry :—

- (a) the latest position with regard to sanction and opening of branches of Small Industries Services Institute at Hamirpur and Mehatpur in Una district of Himachal Pradesh ;
- (b) since when the matter has been under consideration of Government and the reasons for delay; and
- (c) the likely date of sanction and opening of the branches ?”

5. The Minister of State for industrial Development in the Ministry of Industry (Shri M. Arunachalam) gave the following reply :—

- (a) to (c) : Proposals have been received for opening of a Branch Small Industries Service Institute at Hamirpur and an Extension Centre at Mehatpur in Una district of Himachal Pradesh from Small Industries Service Institute, Solan, Himachal Pradesh during August, 1984. These are still under examination.”

6. 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 10 June, 1986.

7. On 2 June, 1986, the Ministry of Industry approached the Committee on Government Assurances through the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs *vide* their U.O. Note No. F.V/Ind.(16)USQ. 2185-LS/86 dated 2 June, 1986 to drop the assurance on the grounds indicated below :—

“The Hon'ble Member had sought the latest position with regard to sanction and opening of Branches of Small Industries Service Institute at Hamirpur and Mehatpur in Una district of Himachal Pradesh and also likely date of sanction and opening of the Branches. In reply to the Question, it was stated that proposals have been received for open-

ing of a Branch Small Industries Service Institute at Hamirpur and Extension Centre at Mehatpur in Una district of Himachal Pradesh from Small Industries Service Institute, Solan, Himachal Pradesh during August, 1984 and that these were under examination.

In this connection, it may be stated that opening of new Branch Institutes and Extension Centres in backward areas was considered based on the requests received from State Government or Small Industry Associations, etc. In pursuance of this, an exercise was undertaken by this organisation to identify suitable locations for establishment of Branch, SISIS and Extension Centres in the country during Seventh Plan period. In fact, these are on-going processes and there is no target date fixed for establishing any Branch Institute or Extension Centre. The reply given in the case of Lok Sabha Unstarred Question No. 2185 on 11th March, 1986 may kindly be viewed in this context. In fact, no assurance was meant to be given in the case of question under reference.

Opening of Branch Institutes or Extension Centres during the Five Year Plan period is an on going process, involving consultations with various Ministries including the Ministry of Finance and Planning Commission.

There is no finality about the number of locations of such Institutes/ Extension Centres. They may be or may not be opened at all or at particular locations which might have been suggested and are considered by the Government. As has been submitted above, no assurance was meant to be given."

The Committee at their sitting held on 8 September, 1986 considered the request of the Ministry for dropping the assurance."

9. Finding the reasons advanced by the Ministry for the dropping of the assurance not cogent and convincing, the committee are unable to accede to their request and urge upon the Government to expedite their decision in the matter which would lead to the implementation of the assurance.

10. The Committee do not appreciate the argument advanced by the Ministry that no assurance was meant to be given'. The argument is clearly untenable. The reply of the Minister unambiguously discloses that the Ministry had received proposals for opening of a Branch Small Industries Service Institute at Hamirpur and an Extension Centre at Mehatpur during August 1984 and were under their examination. It implied that Government would inform the House of their final decision on these proposals. To say that it is an on going process does not mean a licence to sit over the proposals indefinitely and take no decision. Being a responsible administration,



the Committee trust that Government would ensure its functioning with speed and efficiency and is also result-oriented.

(ii)

11. On 29 April, 1986, the following Starred question (No. 853) given notice of by Shri Chintamani Jena, M.P., was addressed to the Minister of Energy :—

- “(a) whether some foreign countries have offered modern technology for production of non-conventional energy in our country;
- (b) if so, the reaction of Government on this issue;
- (c) which countries have offered such modern technology; and
- (d) which are the systems for each such technology offered and the conditions attached therewith?”

12. The Minister of Energy (Shri Vasant Sathe) gave the following reply :—

- “(a) No, Sir.
- (b), (c) & (d): Does not arise.”

13. During the course of supplementaries, a Member (Shri G.G. Swell) enquired whether any experiment had been conducted with magnets to hydro dynamics and if so, where and with what results and what were the calculated economics.

14. In reply, the Minister of Energy (Shri Vasant Sathe) stated as follows :—

“I do not know where. I will try to get the details and pass them on to the hon. Member.”

15. The above reply of the Minister to the supplementary 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 July, 1986.

16. On 29 July, 1986, the Ministry of Energy approached the Committee on Government Assurances through the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs *vide* their U.O. Note No. V/Ergy. (36)SQ-853-LS/86

dated 29 July, 1986, to drop the assurance on the grounds indicated below:—

“the Minister of Energy had furnished the promised information on the same page of the debate [Page No. 25153 line No. 14 (Annexure-I)]

17. The Committee considered the request of the Ministry of Energy for dropping the assurance at their sitting held on 8 September, 1986.

18. A plain reading of the reply of the Minister to supplementaries asked by Shri G.G. Swell indicates that the Minister promised to furnish the information sought by the Member later. It is a clear assurance. In view of the communication received from the Ministry requesting for the dropping of the assurance, the Committee perused the debates but did not find any reply of the Minister which could be construed as giving the information sought by the Member. The Ministry was apprised of this position. However, the Ministry have not yet furnished any explanation in this respect. In the absence of any satisfactory explanation, the Committee are constrained to conclude that the approach of the Ministry in this respect has been singularly casual and has to be viewed with concern. The Committee would like to be apprised of the circumstances in which this kind of request for the dropping of the assurance was made and the responsibility fixed.

(iii)

19. On 23 April, 1986, the following Unstarred Question (No. 7402) given notice of by Sarvashri Banwari Lal Purohit, N. Dennis and Jai Prakash Agarwal, M.Ps, was addressed to the Minister of Welfare:—

- “(a) whether his Ministry has drawn up a new scheme for the welfare of prisoners in consonance with the objective that jails should really be correctional homes to reform and rehabilitate the offenders;
- (b) if so, the proposed new scheme; and
- (c) to what extent the proposed new scheme will help in the economic rehabilitation of prisoners?”

20. On 30 April, 1986, the following Unstarred Question (No. 8419) given notice of by Shri K V. Shankara Gowda, M.P. was also addressed to the Minister of Welfare :

- “(a) whether the Union Ministry has drawn a new scheme for the welfare of prisoners in consonance with the objective that jail should really be correctional home to reform and rehabilitate offenders;

- (b) whether State Governments are being provided sufficient funds in implementing schemes for the welfare of prisoners;
- (c) if so, the total amount proposed for each State in implementing the proposed scheme; and
- (d) the details of the schemes being undertaken during 1986-87 in this regard?"

21. The Deputy Minister of Welfare (Shri Giridhar Gomango) gave the following reply to both the Questions:—

*Reply to USQ No. 7402 dated 23 April, 1986*

- “(a) Yes Sir, A proposal for introducing a new scheme for the welfare of prisoners under the Seventh Five Year Plan has been accepted by the Planning Commission.
- (b) & (c). The details of the proposed new scheme are being worked out.”

*Reply to USQ No. 8419 dated 30 April, 1986*

- “(a) Yes, Sir. A proposal for introducing a new scheme for the Welfare of prisoners under the Seventh Five Year Plan has been accepted by the Planning Commission.
- (b), (c) & (d) The details of the proposed new scheme are being worked out.”

22. The above replies to parts (b) and (c) of Question No. 7402 and parts (a), (b) and (c) of Question No. 8419 were treated as assurances by the Committee which were to be fulfilled within three months of the dates of replies *i.e.* by 22 and 29 July, 1986 respectively.

23. On 22 July, 1986, the Ministry of Welfare have approached the Committee on Government Assurances through the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs *vide* their U.O. Note No. F.V/W (9) USQ-7402-LS/86 dated 22 July, 1986, to drop both the assurances on the grounds indicated below: —

“.....the scheme for the welfare of prisoners under the Seventh Five Year Plan has been accepted by the Planning Commission. The views/comments of the State Governments and Union Territory Administrations were called for besides the Ministry of Home Affairs. In reply, the Ministry of Home Affairs pointed out that the report of the Expert Group set up by that Ministry for preparing schemes in respect of 'prison administration' under the 7th Five Year Plan contains elaborate proposals for the development of organisational

structure, medical and psychiatric services; staff training; buildings; staff quarters; minimum requirements of planning, coordination and monitoring in the Central Government; and establishment of a national academy of correctional administration.

The ingredients of the scheme for the welfare of prisoners as formulated by this Ministry and proposals of the group set up by the Ministry of Home Affairs overlapped each other. In this regard a meeting is being convened to discuss and sort out issues with the representatives of Ministry of Home Affairs, this Ministry and the Planning Commission.

Keeping in view the above position of this case, it would perhaps not be possible for this Ministry to adhere the time limit which is generally given to an assurance of a Parliament question. Further more as this case relates to sorting out overlappings in the scheme of Ministry of Home Affairs and this Ministry, the time which would be required cannot be determined at this stage."

24. The Committee considered the request of the Ministry of Welfare for dropping of both the assurances at their sitting held on 8 September, 1986.

25. No valid reason has been adduced by the Ministry for dropping the assurance. What stands in the way of the Ministry to hold meetings with the representatives of the Ministries of Home Affairs and Planning to sort out the problem of overlapping of responsibilities is an enigma to the Committee. In the view of the Committee, the Ministry should have made earnest and sustained efforts to ensure an early implementation of the assurance. The Committee now urge the Ministry to review the whole matter and prepare a time schedule so that the assurance does not remain unimplemented for long.

26. As the time for implementation is already over, the Ministry should submit to the Committee a request for extension of time which may be required as minimum for liquidating the assurance.

(iv)

27. On 13 March, 1986, the following Starred Question (No. 271) given notice of by Shri H.M. Patel M.P., was addressed to the Minister of Transport:—

- “(a) whether Government have taken decision to implement the shipping code laid down by UNCTAD;
- (b) whether Government propose to enforce cargo reservation for Indian Shipping Companies;

- (c) whether Government have enforced containerisation;
- (d) whether a Planning Group has been appointed for formulating a perspective plan for shipping; and
- (e) if so, the particulars of the Group Members?"

28. The Minister of Transport (Shri Bansi Lal) gave the following reply: -

- “(a) & (b). Government have in principle taken a decision to bring in legislation to implement the UN Convention on Code of Conduct for Liner Conferences. The main objective of the legislation will be to ensure that upto a level of 40% of foreign trade of India carried by liner ships is carried on Indian flag vessels.
- (c) Government have extended full support to containerisation including setting up of port facilities for container handling, development of Inland Container Depots and acquisition of cellular container ships.
- (d) & (e). The composition of Planning Group set up by the Planning Commission on 18.12.1985 to prepare a perspective plan for shipping is placed on the table of the House (Annexure-II).

29. During the course of supplementaries on the question, a Member (Shri Somnath Chatterjee) pointing out that the Shipping Industry had been going through a recession for a number of years and that some of the shipping companies had closed their operations, also rendering the employees jobless, sought to know whether the Planning Group which had been set up for formulating a perspective plan for shipping had been asked to go into this matter and whether any support was likely to be given to the shipping industry.

30. In reply to the above supplementary the Minister of State in the Ministry of Surface Transport (Shri Rajesh Pilot) stated as follows:—

“..... We are trying to categorise the companies which are really viable, which can regain their health with the help .... There are some companies which are not at all viable. There may be some companies which have not paid their instalments or their dues for some period when the recession was on, but there are some other companies which have not paid their dues even when there was no recession. Other companies have paid their dues in time but there

are some companies which have really misused this opportunity and this privilege which has been given by the Government in the form of subsidy and other things. So, the whole study is on. The moment we come out with the correct information, we can inform the hon. Member."

31. The above reply of the Minister was treated as an assurance by the Committee which was to be fulfilled within three months from the date of reply *i.e.* by 12 June, 1986.

32. On 5 June, 1986, the Ministry of Surface Transport approached the Committee on Government Assurances through the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs *vide* their U.O. Note No. F/V/T/S(7)SQ-271-LS/86 dated 5 June, 1986, to drop the assurance on the grounds indicated below:—

The Ministry of Transport have constituted the Planning Group on Shipping *vide* Planning Commission's Memo, No. T&C/3/(27)/85 dated 18.12.85 (Annexure-III). A perusal of the terms of reference of this O.M. shows that this Group is not considering any measures of financial assistance to the shipping industry. In view of this the Planning Group is perhaps not likely to make any recommendation about the financial assistance to the shipping industry."

33. The Committee reconsidered the request of the Ministry of Surface Transport for dropping the assurance at their sitting held on 8 September, 1986.

34. The aforesaid reply of the Minister to the supplementary asked by Shri Somnath Chatterjee constituting this assurance is positive and straight indicating a definite line of action contemplated by Government. It seems presumptuous on the part of the Ministry to put a different construction on the statement of the Minister. The Committee have no reason to believe that the Minister wants to change his earlier stand in having given an undertaking to the House for a study of all the aspects of the matter and come back to the House with its results. The Committee are not aware if the request of the Ministry for the dropping of the assurance has had the approval of the Minister.

35. In the view of the Committee, the request of the Ministry for dropping of the assurance on the ground that the terms of reference of the Planning Group set up by the Planning Commission do not include the matters referred to by the Minister of State for Transport in his aforesaid reply to the supplementary and as such, the Planning Group is not likely to make any recommendation about the financial assistance to the shipping industry, smacks of a typical evasive approach as well as disregard for the Parliamentary obligation of the Minister to the House. It need hardly be added that

whereas the Planning Group was constituted on 18.12.1985, the Minister replied to the question on 13.3.1986. Naturally as a follow up of the assurance by the Minister, the terms of reference of the Planning Group ought to have been enlarged and other suitable steps taken for its early implementation. Instead of following this natural course, the Ministry chose an inappropriate though convenient course—seeking the dropping of the assurance, which has to be deprecated. The Committee would like the whole matter to be reviewed without further delay at the level of the Minister himself and suitable steps taken to implement the assurance. In the meantime, the Ministry should submit to the Committee a request for extension of time which should be minimum.

(v)

36. On 7 March, 1986 the following Unstarred Question (No. 1737) given notice of by Sarvashri K. Pradhani, P.M. Sayeed, Kamal Nath and Sanat Kumar Mandal M.P. was addressed to the Minister of Finance :—

- “(a) whether a high-level tribunal is likely to be set up by Government early in the next financial year to settle excise and customs classification and valuation cases ;
- (b) if so, the modalities of the proposed Tribunal and how far it will be an improvement over the existing Central Excise and Customs Tribunals ;
- (c) whether Government will in the interest of timely collection of revenue and to prevent the trade in dodging payment of duties by resorting to courts for stay of the proceedings, consider the desirability of debarring the jurisdiction of the courts to entertain such pleas ; and
- (d) if not, the reasons therefor ?”

37. The Minister of State in the Ministry of Finance (Shri Janardhana Poojary) gave the following reply :—

- “(a) A proposal to set up a high powered Customs and Excise Revenue (Appellate) Tribunal under Article 323B of the Constitution for settlement of customs and central excise matters including classification and valuation cases, is under consideration.
- (b) Detailed proposals are being worked out in consultation with the Ministry of Law.
- (c) Yes.
- (d) Question does not arise in view of reply to part (c).”

38. The above reply to part (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.* by 6 June, 1986.

39. On 3 September, 1986 the Ministry of Finance approached the Committee on Government Assurances through the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs *vide* their U.O. Note No. V/Fin. (79) USQ-1737 LS/86 dated 3 September, 1986. to drop the assurance on the grounds indicated below :—

“The matter has been examined by the Department of Revenue. It may be mentioned that in the long term fiscal policy announced by the Government in December, 1985, the Government has proposed to establish an Appellate Tribunal under Article 323B of the Constitution to deal with all matters concerned with payment of customs and excise duties. Accordingly the proposal to set up the Appellate Tribunal is under consideration. However, no final decision in the matter has yet been taken.”

40. The Committee considered the request of the Ministry of Finance for dropping the assurance at their sitting held on 21 October, 1986.

41. The Committee find no sufficient justification for dropping the assurance. When Government have taken a decision in principle to establish an Appellate Tribunal under Article 323B of the Constitution to deal with all matters concerned with payment of customs and excise duties, it should be given effect to expeditiously. The Committee feel that Government should take a final decision without further delay and thereby implement the assurance. Meanwhile, the Ministry should seek extension of time for implementing the assurance as the prescribed period of three months for implementing assurance expired in June, 1986 itself.

(vi)

42. On 11 April, 1986, the following Unstarred Question (No. 6484) given notice of by Shri B.K. Gadhvi, M.P., was addressed to the Minister of Finance :—

- “(a) the number of raids conducted on diamond merchants in Bombay during 1984-85 and 1985-86 ;
- (b) whether any prosecution has been launched against any of the diamond merchants ; and
- (c) if so, the results thereof ?”

43. The Minister of State in the Ministry of Finance (Shri Janardhana Poojary) gave the following reply :—

“(a), (b) & (c) : During the financial years 1984-85 and 1985-86,



**Income-tax Department conducted 42 and 95 searches respectively in Bombay in the cases of the diamond merchants.**

**No. prosecution has been launched so far in these cases as the investigation is in progress."**

44. The above reply was treated as an assurance by the Committee which was to be fulfilled within three months of its being given i.e. by 10 July, 1986.

45. On 3 September, 1986, the Ministry of Finance approached the Committee on Government Assurances through the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs *vide* their U.O. Note No. F.V/Fin. (77) USQ-6484-LS/86 dated 3 September, 1986, to drop the assurance on the grounds indicated below :—

**".....under the income Tax Act the time limit for completion of assessment proceeding is normally upto the end of two years after the relevant assessment year and the prosecution proceedings are also not necessarily an automatic concomitant of all search cases. Therefore the deemed assurance may be treated as fulfilled."**

46. The Committee considered the request of the Ministry of Finance for dropping the assurance at their sitting held on 21 October, 1986.

47. **No valid reason has been given by the Ministry for dropping the assurance and hence the Committee are not agreeable to drop the assurance. They feel that so far as the forty two cases of 1984-85 are concerned, the period of two years as stipulated in the Income-tax Act is virtually over and the Ministry should be able to furnish the information in the ensuing session. The remaining cases might also be expedited and implementation reported to the House before the end of March, 1987.**

(vii)

48. On 7 May, 1986, the following Starred Question (No. 952) given notice of by Shri Anadi Charan Das M.P., was addressed to the Minister of External Affairs :

**"(a) whether Government have accepted and ratified the 1951 U.N. Convention on the Status of Refugees and the 1967 Protocol of the same import relating to the U.N. High Commissioner for Refugees;**

**(b) if so, the details thereof; if not the reasons therefor;**

**(c) whether this organisation is recognized as an important institution in the U.N. system; and**

(d) whether there is any proposal to have a regular office of this organisation in India in near future ?”

49. The Minister of External Affairs (Shri B.R. Bhagat) gave the following reply:—

“(a) No, Sir.

(b) The implications of the Convention and the Protocol remain under study.

(c) & (d) The Office of the UNHCR came into being on 1st Jan. 1951, as a result of a decision taken by the UN General Assembly by resolution 319 (IV) of 1949 and reports annually to the Assembly through ECOSOC.

A branch office of the UNHCR was established in New Delhi in 1969 but UNHCR closed it down in 1975. In 1979, the UNHCR requested us to allow them to open an office in India. We have permitted a representative of the UNHCR to function as the “UNHCR Component of the UNDP” in New Delhi.”

50. The above 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 6 August, 1986.

51. On 3 September, 1986, the Ministry of External Affairs approached the Committee on Government Assurances through the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs *vide* their U.O. Note No. F.V/EA (16) SQ-952/LS/86 dated 1 September, 1986, to drop the assurance on the grounds indicated below :—

“India has not acceded to the 1951 UN Convention on the status of refugees and the 1967 protocol on the same subject. The question of India’s acceding to the above as well as other similar international instruments relating to refugees has been engaging the attention of the Government of India but no decision has been taken so far. The political and security implications of these conventions require to be examined very thoroughly and carefully by various Ministries/Departments of the Government of India before accession. There are difficulties in the way of acceding to the 1951 convention on account of a large number of refugees/illegal entrants in India from across the border. However, the mere fact of India’s not acceding to this convention has not in any way prevented the Government of India from giving humanitarian relief to refugees in Asia, Africa or elsewhere.

The answer given by the Minister of External Affairs to the above starred question stating the “implications of the convention and

protocol remain under study" was not intended to be an assurance. In any case, it is not feasible to complete the study in a definite time frame due to the reasons given above."

52 The Committee considered the request of the Ministry of External Affairs for dropping the assurance at their sitting held on 21 October, 1986.

53. The Committee regret to note that the Ministry of External Affairs have not given any precise and clear reasons for the inability of the Government to take a final decision in regard to India's acceding to the 1951 UN Convention and 1967 protocol on the status of refugees even though these have been under study all these years. If, as stated by the Ministry, the matter requires examination thoroughly and carefully by the various Ministries/Departments of the Government, the process should have been completed long ago. In case that alone not be the reason, the position ought to have been suitably explained to the Committee. In the circumstances, the Committee do not see any valid reason for the Government keeping their decision pending so long and also not indicating any definite time-frame for it. The Committee trust that Government would take a final decision in the matter without further delay.

54. The Committee also wish to express their displeasure over the manner in which the Ministry have tried to sit in judgement over their decision to treat the reply of the Minister as an assurance, which is the exclusive prerogative of the Committee on Government Assurances and once it has been treated as an assurance, Government are obliged to implement it or come forward with a plausible explanation for delay or for dropping of the assurance.

(viii)

55. On 2 May, 1986, the following Unstarred Question (No. 8489) given notice of by Shri Simon Tigga, M.P., was addressed to the Minister of Commerce :

- (a) whether his attention has been drawn to the news item captioned "Enemy property Ex-Gratia Rs. 30 crores disbursed without verification" appearing in the Telegraph, Calcutta of 6th March, 1986;
- (b) if so, the details of the amount disbursed without verification, if any;
- (c) the action being taken against the officials found guilty; and
- (d) the number of cases pending before the Custodian of Enemy Property ?

56. The Minister of External Affairs (Shri B.R. Bhagat) gave the following reply :—

- (a) Yes, Sir.
- (b) All payments of ex-gratia are to be authorised after receipt of verification of reports.
- (c) Some cases of alleged irregularities regarding impersonation and forged documents are under investigation.
- (d) About 14,600 cases are pending.

57. The above 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 1 August, 1986.

58. On 15 September, 1986, the Ministry of Commerce approached the Committee on Government Assurances through the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs *vide* their U.O. Note No. F.V./Com. (19) USQ-8489-LS/86 dated 15 September, 1986, to drop the assurance on the grounds indicated below :—

“CBI has registered some cases against some officials of office of Officer on-Special Duty, Calcutta regarding alleged irregularities of impersonation and forged documents. In some cases CBI has charge-sheeted the officials and filed the cases in the court which are under Court's jurisdiction. The matter is *sub-judice* in the court and it is not certain when these cases will be settled. As court cases take a long time, it will not be possible to fulfil the assurance within the stipulated period. At the time of giving reply, this Ministry did not take it as assurance. So far no official has been found guilty.”

59. The Committee considered the request of the Ministry of Commerce for dropping the assurance at their sitting held on 21 October, 1986.

60. The Committee consider the grounds submitted by the Ministry for the dropping of the assurance as inadequate and are of the view that the Ministry should immediately furnish a statement indicating an upto date factual position. It need hardly be pointed out that the reply of the Minister gave the position obtaining on that date and as such the House is entitled to know further developments and cannot be denied this sort of information in the garb of *sub-judice* plea which is to be applied only to withhold such information as may be prejudicial to the proceedings in the court. The Ministry should note this point and take early and effective steps to implement the assurance. It is indeed regrettable that the Ministry has allowed the matter to remain hanging for about nine months and they

~~should now advise with~~ **should now advise with** ~~firmness~~ **firmness** ~~as well as~~ **as well as** ~~promptness~~ **promptness** ~~to be responsive to the~~ **to be responsive to the** ~~Parliamentary duty.~~ **Parliamentary duty.**

(ix)

61. On 7 April, 1986, the following Unstarred Question (No. 5616) given notice of by Shri Bala Saheb Vikhe Patil, M.P., was addressed to the Minister of Steel and Mines:

- (a) whether a scheme for modernisation of steel mills/plants has been drawn up;
- ~~(b) the funds required for the purpose;~~
- (c) how much of it will be earmarked for import of machinery and ~~know-how~~; and
- (d) the extent to which the indigenous industries will be associated to make the supplies so as to reduce the necessity of import?

62. The Minister of Steel and Mines (Shri K.C. Pant) gave the following reply:—

- (a) & (b): There is a proposal to modernise Durgapur Steel Plant at an estimated cost of about Rs. 990/- crores which will enable the plant to attain its rated capacity of 1.6 Million Tonnes per annum (ingot steel).

A scheme to modernise the Rourkela Steel Plant at an estimated cost of Rs. 861 crores was formulated to enable the plant to attain its rated capacity of 1.8 million tonnes per annum (ingot steel). Steel Authority of India Limited (SAIL) is, however, reviewing the scope of this proposal and evaluating various alternatives.

A proposal to modernise IISCO (Burnpur) at an estimated cost of Rs. 93½ crores has also been formulated. That would enable the plant to attain its rated capacity of 1.00 million tonnes per annum (ingot steel). However, in view of the overall resource constraint, no funds have been provided for this scheme in the Seventh Plan.

SAIL is also formulating specific schemes for debottlenecking and technological upgradation of Bokaro and Bhilai Steel Plants.

- (c) & (d): The extent to which funds would be required for import of equipment/know-how as also association of indigenous industries for these schemes would be known after investment decisions are taken.

63. The above reply to parts (c) and (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 6 July, 1986.

64. On 24 September, 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. V/SM(24) USQ-5615-LS/86 dated 24 September, 1986, to drop the assurance on the grounds indicated below:—

“As already stated in the answer, investment decisions on the schemes are yet to be taken by the Government. These schemes are at various stages of consideration and it may take quite some time before investment decisions are taken in these cases. At this stage it is not possible to furnish exact information about the import content and value of know-how and extent of indigenous involvement in the modernisation proposals within a reasonable period. This is an ongoing process and even estimates are difficult to formulate.”

65. The Committee considered the request of the Ministry of Steel and Mines for dropping the assurance at their sitting held on 21 October, 1986.

66. In the opinion of the Committee, the request of the Ministry for the dropping of the assurance has no justification and the phrase ‘ongoing process’ has rather been abused to cover up its slow moving machinery. Such important decisions with far reaching consequences mainly in terms of productivity and investment return have to be taken speedily within a specified time frame. The Committee cannot allow any other approach to result in further delays and as such while expressing their deep concern would like Government to expedite their decision in the matter and report implementation of the assurance

67. The Committee take note of the request of the Ministry for extension of time upto 31 January, 1987 for implementation of this assurance. They trust that the Ministry would apprise the Committee before that date about the implementation of the assurance and have it formally laid on the Table of the House at the earliest opportunity during the next session.

(x)

68. On 23 August, 1985, the following Unstarred Question (No. 4799) given notice of by Shri Hafiz Mohd. Siddiq, M.P., was addressed to the Minister for Finance :

“(a) whether safety matches are exported from Delhi to the neighbouring States in huge quantity daily defrauding the Govern-

ment of its revenues like sales and income-taxes of crores of rupees as there is no sales tax on matches in Delhi;

- (b) if so, the steps proposed to be taken to check this evasion of revenue ;
- (c) whether there is any proposal to levy sales tax on matches in Delhi; and
- (d) if not, the reasons thereof?"

69. The Minister of State in the Ministry of Finance (Shri Janardhana Poojary) gave the following reply:—

- “(a) Sales Tax authorities in Delhi are not aware of any large scale export of hand-made safety matches from Delhi to the neighbouring States, on which there is no local sales tax. The Income Tax authorities have also no information in this regard;
- (b) the question does not arise.
- (c) & (d) The Delhi Administration have informed that representations in this regard have recently been received by the Administration which are under their examination.”

70. The above reply to parts (c) and (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 22 November, 1985. The Ministry of Finance had approached the Committee for extension of time for implementation of the assurance five times. Their latest request for extension was upto 31 May, 1986.

71. On 23 September, 1986, the Ministry approached the Committee through the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs *vide* their U.O. Note No. F.III/Fin(42)USQ-4799-LS/86 dated 23 September, 1986, to drop the assurance on the grounds indicated below:—

“We had taken up this matter with the Delhi Administration who have intimated that sometime back, the WIMCO Ltd. have sent them a copy of the advice given by their Legal Adviser, who is of the opinion that the exemption from levy of sales tax on hand-made matches given by the Delhi Administration is not valid and that the notification issued in this regard is ultra-vires of Section 7(3) of the Delhi Sales Tax Act, 1975. The opinion given by the Legal Adviser of WIMCO Ltd. is being examined in consultation with the Law Department of the Delhi Administration. Only after knowing the

opinion of Law and Judicial Department a memorandum containing the complete history of the case is being prepared for being placed before the executive council for its consideration and taking a final decision in the matter. The proposal, if rejected straight away by the Executive Council would hardly involve any further delay. In case of its acceptance by the Executive Council, the decision can be finally implemented only by amending the second schedule of the Delhi Sale Tax Act, 1975 after obtaining the prior approval of Central Government. Completion of these formalities is likely to take a long time.

Considering that the action on the assurance is to be taken primarily by the Delhi Administration which has elected bodies like the Metropolitan Council and Executive Council of their own, and there is no direct action to be taken by the Central Government in this regard, the Chairman, Committee on Government Assurance may kindly be requested to drop this assurance as the Delhi Administration is already seized of the matter and is taking appropriate action to law."

72. The Committee considered the request of the Ministry of Finance for dropping the assurance at their sitting held on 21 October, 1986.

73. Considering that a period of one year and four months is enough to come to a decision in the matter, the Committee would like the Ministry to take up the matter with the Delhi Administration vigorously at an appropriate high level so that a final decision is taken early and the assurance is liquidated in the ensuing session. The Ministry should also make a request for extension of time as considered minimum to fulfil the assurance.

(xi)

74. On 12 March, 1986, the following Unstarred Question (No. 2479) given notice of by Sarvashri B.V. Desai and Indrajit Gupta, M.Ps. was addressed to the Minister of external Affairs:—

- "(a) whether 43,000 persons of Indian origin in Sri Lanka have been granted Sri Lankan citizenship during the months of December, 1985 and January, 1986;
- (b) whether the citizenship was given under the 1964 agreement between Sri Lanka and India;
- (c) whether nearly 84,000 people of Indian origin have been given Indian citizenship;



- (d) whether the question of 93,000 others who were categorised as stateless have not been considered for granting citizenship at all so far by the Sri Lanka Government; and
- (e) if so, how many items are still pending for implementation under the 1964 agreement and when it is likely to be fully implemented?"

75. The Minister of External Affairs (Shri B.R. Bhagat) gave the following reply :—

- “(a) No-sir, during the months of December, 1985 and January 1986, 663 persons of Indian origin have been granted Sri Lanka citizenship;
- (b) No Sir. The 663 persons referred to in para (a) above have been granted Sri Lanka citizenship under the Indo-Sri Lanka Agreement of 1964.
- (c) No Sir. In terms of the Accord reached between India and Sri Lanka on 15.1.86, about 85000 stateless persons of Indian origin, who had applied for Indian citizenship before 30 October, 1981 under the Indo-Sri Lanka Agreement of 1964 and whose applications are pending, are to be granted Indian citizenship. These applications are under consideration and being processed.
- (d) As per the Accord reached between India and Sri Lanka on 15.1.86, 94,000 persons, who had not applied for Indian citizenship under the 1964 Agreement before 30.10.1981, are to be granted Sri Lanka citizenship. Legislation to this effect was passed by the Sri Lanka Parliament on 31.1.86.
- (e) The question of repatriation of persons who have been granted Indian citizenship is to be taken up later.”

76. 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 11 June, 1986:

77. On 24 September, 1986, the Ministry of External Affairs approached the Committee on Government Assurances through the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs *vide* their U.O Note No. V/EA(14) USQ-2479-LS/86 dated 24 September, 1986, to drop the assurance on the grounds indicated below :—

“In terms of the Indian Sri Lanka agreement of January, 1986 about

84,000 stateless persons were proposed to be granted Indian citizenship, if they had applied for this before 30th October, 1981 (under the India-Sri Lanka agreement of 1964). It was envisaged in January, 1986 that this process would be completed within six to eight months, after the signing of the agreement. These applications have been under consideration for grant of Indian citizenship and this depends upon persons concerned, voluntarily coming forward to claim citizenship and related documents. Therefore, it is not in our hands to speed up this process. As and when these persons have approached the High Commission of India, Colombo they have been granted citizenship papers. In the light of these part, (c) of the answer *cannot be termed* as an assurance, because it relates to on going process and Government of India's responsibility comes into play only if the affected persons voluntarily come forward to get their documents."

78. The Committee considered the request of the Ministry of External Affairs for dropping the assurance at their sitting held on 21 October, 1986.

79. The Committee find the request of the Ministry vague as well as contradicting the original reply of the Minister to part (c) of the question. It may be noted that the Minister had *inter alia* stated, "these applications of about 85,000 stateless persons of Indian origin in Sri Lanka are under consideration and being processed." Now the Ministry have stated, "It relates to an *on going process* and Government of India's responsibility comes into play *only* if the affected persons voluntarily come forward to get their documents". This position obviously is not in accord with what Minister stated in his reply. If the Ministry's version is to be given credence, the whole process would seem to be unending whereas the same note of the Ministry stated earlier, "It was envisaged in January, 1986 that this process would be completed within six to eight months, after the signing of the agreement". Therefore, the Committee are constrained to decline to accept the plea of the Ministry for dropping the assurance and would like that the assurance be implemented early. In the meantime, the Ministry should make a request for extension of time as may be considered necessary.

## CHAPTER III

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

80. A statement showing the position of assurances pertaining to Seventh and Eighth Lok Sabha pending implementation by the Government as on 11 November, 1986, is given in *Appendix*.

81. 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;  
15 January, 1987.  
25 Pausa, 1908 (Saka)

## MINUTES

### Sixth Sitting

*Minutes of the Committee on Government Assurances held on  
8 September, 1986, in Committee Room No. 'B', Parliament  
House Annexe, New Delhi.*

---

The Committee met on Monday, 8 September, 1986 from 15.30 hours to 16.15 hours.

### PRESENT

Prof. Narain Chand Parashar—*Chairman*

### MEMBERS

2. Shri Virdhi Chander Jain
3. Shri Jitendra Prasada
4. Shri Purna Chandra Malik
5. Shri Keshorao Pardhi
6. Shri Ram Pujan Patel
7. Shri K. Pradhani
8. Shri Jagannath Prasad
9. Shri Muhiram Saikia

### SECRETARIAT

1. Shri C.K. Jain—*Chief Examiner of Questions*
2. Shri D.M. Chanan—*Senior Examiner of Questions*

\* \* \* \* \*

3. The Committee then took up for consideration Memoranda Nos. 51, 52, 53 and 54.

**MEMORANDUM NO. 51:** *Request for dropping of assurance given on 11 March, 1986 in reply to Unstarred Question No. 2185 regarding opening of branches of Small Industries Service Institute in Himachal Pradesh.*

4. The Committee considered the following request of the Ministry of Industry received through the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs vide their U.O. No. F.V/Ind.(16)USQ2185-LS/86 dated 2 June, 1986 for dropping of the assurance on the following grounds:—

"The Hon'ble Member had sought the latest position with regard to sanction and opening of Branches of Small Industries Service Institute at Hamirpur and Mehatpur in Una district of Himachal Pradesh and also likely date of sanction and opening of the Branches. In reply to the Question, it was stated that proposals have been received for opening of a Branch of Small Industries Service Institute at Hamirpur and Extension Centre at Mehatpur in Una District of Himachal Pradesh from Small Industries Service Institute, Solan, Himachal Pradesh during August, 1984 and that these were under examination.

In this connection, it may be stated that opening of new Branch Institutes and Extension Centres in backward areas was considered based on the requests received from State Governments or Small Industry Associations, etc. In pursuance of this, an exercise was undertaken by this organisation to identify suitable locations for establishment of Branch SISIS and Extension Centres in the country during Seventh Plan period. In fact, these are on-going processes and there is no target date fixed for establishing any Branch Institute or Extension Centre. The reply given in the case of Lok Sabha Unstarred Question No. 2185 on 11th March, 1986 may kindly be viewed in this context. In fact, no assurance was meant to be given in the case of Question Under reference.

Opening of Branch Institutes or Extension Centres during the Five Year Plan period is an on going process, involving consultations with various Ministries including the Ministry of Finance and the Planning Commission.

There is no finality about the number of locations of such Institutes/ Extension Centres. They may be or may not be opened at all or at particular locations which might have been suggested and are considered

by the Government. As has been submitted above, no assurance was meant to be given."

5. Finding the reasons advanced by the Ministry for the dropping of the assurance not cogent and convincing, the Committee decided not to accede to their request for dropping the assurance. They expressed their displeasure at the attempt made by the Ministry to sit in judgement on the decision of the Committee to treat the reply as an assurance which is the exclusive prerogative of the Committee. They expected that in future Ministries should refrain from doing so. The Committee desired that the Ministry should make a request for extension of time as may be minimum in order to implement the assurance and keep the Committee informed of the progress made towards the implementation of the assurance.

**MEMORANDUM No. 52 :** *Request for dropping of assurance given on 29 April, 1986 in reply to a supplementary to Starred Question No. 853 regarding modern technology for non-conventional energy.*

6. The Committee considered the following request of the Ministry of Energy received through the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs *vide* their U.O. Note No. F.V/Engy. (36) SQ-853-LS/86 dated 29 July, 1986 for the dropping of the assurance given in reply to supplementary raised by Shri G.G. Swell, M.P. on the following grounds :—

".....the Minister of Energy had furnished the promised information on the same page of the debate (Page No. 25153 line No. 14)....."

7. They decided that the replies of the Minister clearly constituted an assurance and Government should implement it early as is normally expected in similar cases.

The Committee did not appreciate as to why the Ministry did not clearly spell out what precise information given by the Minister in his reply on that page was considered enough to meet the points on which Prof. Swell sought information in his supplementaries.

**MEMORANDUM No. 53 :** *Request for dropping of assurances given on 23 April, and 30 April, 1986 in reply to Unstarred Question Nos. 7402 and 8419 respectively regarding scheme for welfare of prisoners.*

8. The Committee considered the following request of the Ministry of Welfare received through the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs *vide* their O.M. No. F.V/W (9) USQ-7402-LS/86 dated 22 July, 1986 for the dropping of both the assurances on the following grounds :—

"that the scheme for the welfare of prisoners under the Seventh Five Year Plan has been accepted by the Planning Commission. The views/

2. comments of the State Governments and Union Territory Administrations were called for besides the Ministry of Home Affairs. In reply, the Ministry of Home Affairs pointed out that the report of the Expert Group set up by that Ministry for preparing schemes in respect of 'prison administration' under the Seventh Five Year Plan contains elaborate proposals for the development of organisational structure, medical and psychiatric services; staff training; building; staff quarters; minimum requirements of Planning, coordination and monitoring in the Central Government; and establishment of a national academy of correctional administration.

The ingredients of the scheme for the welfare of prisoners as formulated by this Ministry and proposals of the group set up by the Ministry of Home Affairs overlapped each other. In this regard a meeting is being convened to discuss and sort out issues with the representatives of Ministry of Home Affairs, this Ministry and the Planning Commission.

Keeping in view the above position of this case, it would perhaps not be possible for this Ministry to adhere to the time limit which is generally given to an assurance of a Parliament question. Furthermore as this case relates to sorting out overlappings in the scheme of Ministry of Home Affairs and this Ministry, the time which would be required cannot be determined at this stage".

9. The Committee found no valid reason to drop the assurances given by the Ministry of Welfare and decided not to accede to their request particularly keeping in view the importance of the subject matter of the question, the Committee desired that the Ministry might make a request to them for the extension upto minimum time required to implement both the assurances.

MEMORANDUM No. 54 : *Request for dropping of assurance given on 13 March, 1986 in reply to supplementaries raised on Starred Question No. 271 regarding planning group for formulating a perspective plan for shipping.*

10. The Committee considered the following request of the Ministry of Transport received through the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs vide their U.O. Note No. F.V/T/S (7) SQ 271-LS/86 dated 5 June, 1986 for the dropping of the assurance on the following grounds :—

"The Ministry of Transport have constituted the Planning Group on Shipping vide Planning Commissions Memo. No. T & C/3/(27)/85 dated 18.12.85. A perusal of the terms of reference of this O.M. shows that this Group is not considering any measures of financial assistance to the shipping industry. In view of this the Planning Group is perhaps

not likely to make any recommendation about the financial assistance to the shipping industry."

11. The Committee were informed that on an informal enquiry from the Ministry, it was understood that the date for submission of report by the said Planning Group had been extended upto November, 1986 instead of June, 1986.

12. Finding that the supplementary was specific about the Special Group going into the matter of providing financial assistance to shipping industry and the categorical assurance given by the Minister in regard thereto, the Committee felt that the terms of reference of the Group should have been enlarged by Government, if so needed, to include the giving of financial assistance to shipping companies. They desired that needful might now be done and let the Government report implementation of the assurance soon after the Planning Group submitted the report. Meanwhile the Ministry should approach the Committee for extension of time.

The Committee then adjourned to meet again on 9 September, 1986 at 11.30 hours.

---



## MINUTES

### **Eighth Sitting**

*Minutes of the Committee on Government Assurances held on Monday,  
20 October, 1986 in Committee Room No. 'D' Parliament House  
Annexe, New Delhi.*

---

The Committee met on Monday, 20 October, 1986 from 11.00 hours to 11.05 hours.

#### PRESENT

Prof. Narain Chand Parashar—*Chairman*

#### MEMBER

2. Shri Virdhi Chander Jain
3. Shri Jitendra Prasada
4. Shri Rahim Khan
5. Shri Purna Chandra Malik
6. Shri Keshorao Pardhi
7. Shri Ram Pujan Patel
8. Shri K.N. Pradhan
9. Shri Muhiram Saikia

#### SECRETARIAT

1. Shri C.K. Jain—*Chief (Questions)*
2. Shri D.M. Chanan—*Senior Examiner of Questions*
2. At the requests of the Members, it was decided to postpone the consideration of Memoranda Nos. 55 to 57 to the next sitting scheduled to be held on Tuesday, 21 October, 1986.

The meeting then adjourned.

---

# MINUTES

## Ninth Sitting

*Minutes of the Committee on Government Assurances held on Tuesday  
21 October, 1986 in Committee Room No. 'D', Parliament  
House Annexe, New Delhi*

The Committee met on Tuesday, 21 October, 1986 from 15.00 hours to 15.45 hours.

### PRESENT

Prof. Narain Chand Parashar—*Chairman*

### MEMBER

2. Shri Tadur Bala Goud
3. Shri Virdhi Chander Jain
4. Shri Purna Chandra Malik
5. Shri Channajab Odeyar
6. Shri K.N. Pradhani
7. Shri K. Pradhan
8. Shri Jagannath Prasad
9. Shri Muhiram Saikia

### SECRETARIAT

1. Shri C.K. Jain—*Chief (Questions)*
2. Shri D.M. Chanan—*Senior Examiner of Questions*
2. The Committee took up for consideration Memoranda Nos. 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60 and 61.

MEMORANDUM No. 55 : *Request for dropping of assurance given on 7 March, 1986 in reply to Unstarred Question No. 1737 regarding setting up of high level tribunal to settle excise cases.*

3. The Committee considered the following request of the Ministry of Finance received through the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs *vide* their U.O. Note No. V/Fin. (79) USQ-1737-LS/86 dated 3 September, 1986, for dropping the assurance on the following grounds :—

“The matter has been examined by the Department of Revenue. It may be mentioned that in the long term fiscal policy announced by the Government in December, 1985 the Government has proposed to establish an Appellate Tribunal under Article 323B of the Constitution to deal with all matters concerned with payment of Customs and Excise duties. Accordingly the proposal to set up the Appellate Tribunal is under consideration. However, no final decision in the matter has yet been taken.”

4. The Committee was not convinced with the reasons advanced by the Ministry for dropping the assurance. They decided that Ministry should expedite the decision in the matter and report implementation of the assurance early. In the mean-time Ministry should make a request for extension of time.

**MEMORANDUM NO. 56 :** *Request for dropping of assurance given on 11 April, 1986 in reply to Unstarred Question No. 6484 regarding raids on diamond merchants in Bombay.*

5. The Committee considered the following request of the Ministry of Finance received through the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs *vide* their U.O. Note No. F.V/Fin. (77) USQ-6484-LS/86 dated 3 September, 1986, for dropping of the assurance on the following grounds :—

“.....under the Income Tax Act the time—limit for completion of assessment proceedings is normally upto the end of two years after the relevant assessment year and the prosecution proceedings are also not necessarily an automatic concomitant of all search cases. Therefore the deemed assurance may be treated as fulfilled.”

6. The Committee decided not to accede to the request of the Ministry. They were of the view that in 42 cases relating to period 1984-85, mentioned in reply to question, some progress must have been made. At least that part of information could have been laid before Lok Sabha. They were of the opinion that the Ministry should lay during the ensuing session whatever information was with them. For the remaining cases, extension of time might be sought.

**MEMORANDUM NO. 57 :** *Request for dropping of assurance given on 7 May, 1986 in reply to Starred Question No. 952 regarding UN Convention on Status of Refugees.*

7. The Committee considered the following request of the Ministry of

External Affairs received through the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs *vide* their U.O. Note No. F.V/EA (16) SQ-952-LS/86 dated 3 September, 1986, for dropping the assurance on the grounds stated as under :—

“India has not acceded to the 1951 UN Convention on the status of refugees and the 1967 protocol on the same subject. The question of India’s acceding to the above as well as other similar international instruments relating to refugees has been engaging the attention of the Government of India but no decision has been taken so far. The political and security implications of these conventions require to be examined very thoroughly and carefully by various Ministries/Depts. of the Government of India before accession. There are difficulties in the way of acceding to the 1951 convention on account of a large number of refugees/illegal entrants in India from across the border. However, the mere fact of India’s not acceding to this convention has not in any way prevented the Government of India from giving humanitarian relief to refugees in Asia, Africa or elsewhere.

The answer given by the Minister of External Affairs to the above starred question stating the “implications of the convention and protocol remain under study” was not intended to be an assurance. In any case, it is not feasible to complete the study in a definite time frame due to the reasons given above.”

8. Considering wide importance of the matter, pertaining to UN Convention adopted in 1951 and the protocol of 1967, the Committee decided not to agree to the request of the Ministry to drop the assurance.

If the question of India’s acceding to the Convention is held up for want of opinion to be furnished by other Ministries, the Ministry of External Affairs should have got it expedited, otherwise their note should have been explicit to the extent possible specifying the precise reasons for their inability.

The Committee expressed their displeasure at the Ministry’s attitude to sit in judgement on their decision to treat a reply as an assurance on a matter which was solely the preserve of the Committee.

MEMORANDUM NO. 58 : *Request for dropping of assurance given on 2 May, 1986 in reply to Unstarred Question No. 8489 by Ministry of Commerce regarding disbursement of enemy property claims.*

9. The Committee considered the following request of the Ministry of Commerce received through the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs *vide*

their U.O. Note No. F.V/Com. (19) USQ-8489-LS/86 dated 3/15 September, 1986, for dropping the assurance on the following grounds :—

“CBI has registered some cases against some officials of office of Officer-on-Special Duty, Calcutta regarding alleged irregularities of impersonation and forged documents. In some cases CBI has charge-sheeted the officials and filed the cases in the court which are under Court's jurisdiction. The matter is subjudice in the court and it is not certain when these cases will be settled. As court cases take a long time, it will not be possible to fulfil the assurance within the stipulated period. At the time of giving reply, this Ministry did not take it as assurance. So far no official has been found guilty.”

10. The Committee found no justification for the dropping of the assurance and desired that the Ministry should have come forward at least with the latest factual position of cases with charge-sheets and other pending cases. They desired that the Ministry should send a note stating in detail the factual position obtaining at present and also make a request for extension of time as necessary for implementing the assurance.

MEMORANDUM No. 59 : *Request for dropping of assurance given on 7 April, 1986 in reply to Unstarred Question No. 5616 regarding scheme for modernisation of steel mills/plants.*

11. 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. F.V/SM (24) USQ-5616-LS/86 dated 24 September, 1986, for dropping the assurance on the following grounds :—

“As already stated in the answer, investment decisions on the schemes are yet to be taken by the Government. These schemes are at various stages of consideration and it may take quite some time before investment decisions are taken in these cases. At this stage it is not possible to furnish exact information about the import content and value of know-how and extent of indigenous involvement in the modernisation proposals within a reasonable period. This is an on going process and even estimates are difficult to formulate.”

12. The Committee decided not to drop the assurance. They desired that Ministry should expedite the implementation of assurance and seek extension of time.

MEMORANDUM No. 60 : *Request for dropping of assurance given on 23 August, 1985 in reply to Unstarred Question No. 4799 regarding evasion of revenue in exporting safety matches out of Delhi.*

13. The Committee considered the following request of the Ministry

of Finance received through the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs *vide* their U.O. Note No. III/Fin. (42) USQ-4799-LS/86 dated 23 September, 1986, for dropping of the assurance on the following grounds :—

“We had taken up this matter with the Delhi Administration who have intimated that sometime back, the WIMCO Ltd. have sent them a copy of the advice given by their Legal Adviser, who is of the opinion that the exemption from levy of sales tax on hand-made matches given by the Delhi Administration is not valid and that the notification issued in this regard is ultra-vires of Section 17 (3) of the Delhi Sales Tax Act, 1975. The opinion given by the Legal Adviser of WIMCO Ltd. is being examined in consultation with the Law Department of the Delhi Administration. Only after knowing the opinion of Law and Judicial Department a memorandum containing the complete history of the case is being prepared for being placed before the Executive Council for its consideration and taking a final decision in the matter. The proposal, if rejected straight away by the Executive Council would hardly involve any further delay. In case of its acceptance by the Executive Council, the decision can be finally implemented only by amending the second scheduled of the Delhi Sale Tax Act, 1975 after obtaining the prior approval of Central Government. Completion of these formalities is likely to make a long time.

Considering that the action on the assurance is to be taken primarily by the Delhi Administration which has elected bodies like the Metropolitan Council and Executive Council of their own, and there is no direct action to be taken by the Central Government in this regard, the Chairman, Committee on Government Assurances may kindly be requested to drop this assurance as the Delhi Administration is already seized of the matter and is taking appropriate action to law.”

14. The Committee decided not to agree to the request for dropping the assurance. The Ministry should expedite the decision and implement the assurance at the earliest. It was noted that the assurance was required to be implemented by 22 November, 1985 but the Ministry did not make any request for extension of time. This casual attitude of the Ministry was adversely commented upon by the Committee.

MEMORANDUM No. 61 : *Request for dropping of assurance given on 12 March, 1986 in reply to Unstarred Question No. 2479 regarding citizenship to Sri Lankan Stateless persons.*

15. The Committee considered the following requests of the Ministry of External Affairs forwarded through the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs

vide their U.O. note No. V/EA (14) USQ 2479-LS/86 dated 24 September, 1986 for dropping the assurance given on the following grounds :—

“In terms of the Indian Sri Lanka agreement of January, 1986 about 84,000 stateless persons were proposed to be granted Indian citizenship, if they had applied for this before 30th October, 1981 (under the India-Sri Lanka agreement of 1964). It was envisaged in January, 1986 that this process would be completed within six to eight months, after the signing of the agreement. These applications have been under consideration for grant of Indian citizenship and this depends upon persons concerned, voluntarily coming forward to claim citizenship and related documents. Therefore, it is not in our hands to speed up this process. As and when these persons have approached the High Commission of India, Colombo they have been granted citizenship papers. In the light of these facts part (c) of the answer *cannot be termed* as an assurance because it relates to *on going process* and Government of India's responsibility comes into play *only* if the affected persons voluntarily come forward to get their documents.”

16. The Committee found the request of the Ministry vague and not sufficient for the dropping of the assurance and desired that they should implement the assurance early. In the meantime they should request for extension of time.

The meeting then adjourned.

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 Virdhi 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.*

At the out set, Chairman wished Happy New Year to the Members.

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,

\*\*\*

\*\*\*

\*\*\*

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

ANNEXURE-I

(Vide Para No. 16 of Report)

Shri Chintamani Jena : Sir, may I know whether it is a fact that countries like USSR, USA, USA, UK and Denmark are the pioneers in the production of non-conventional energy ; if so, may I know whether the USSR has developed a very economical and cheaper model of wind-mill i.e. Eagle which is very easily operated and also very economical? Such type of model-wind-mills can be installed in our country specially when our country fully depends on the agricultural sector. 75 per cent of our population is engaged in agricultural operation and these wind-mills, if installed in rural areas, the farmers can easily operate and it will be very economical. May I know whether the Government will think in that line to set up such type of model wind-mills in our country?

The Minister of Energy (Shri Vasant Sathe) : We are already setting up wind-mill farms on the coastal side of our country. Two wind-mill farms-one at Tuticorin and one in Gujarat—have already been successfully working. Three more wind-mills are proposed and any technology that can help us to put improved or better wind-mills will always be welcome. We are, ourselves, developing these wind-mills. This suggestion would be most welcome. But we do not have offer from any country mentioned by the Hon. Member of any new technology in this regard. But we are, ourselves, on the look out and developing technology not only in the field of wind-mill but all non-conventional sources of energy. We know this is very important for the country.

Shri Chintamani Jena : Sir, my second supplementary is whether it is a fact that a survey was conducted by the U.N. who had opined that whatever the energy we are getting now-a-days from wind-mills, it can be 10 times more than that. So, in that context, may I know from the Hon. Minister whether any programme has been made to speed up the setting up of such wind-mills in the rural areas. Why I am saying this is, in all, 400 wind-mills have been set up in our country. So, will the Minister have any programme to expedite it?

Shri Vasant Sathe : We know the great potential of wind in the country and we would like to expedite it fully. But it depends upon the force, velocity of the wind available and what can be best used for generating energy ; we will definitely keep this in mind. We have a big programme of using wind-mill energy in the country.

**Shri G.G. Swell :** I would like to know whether anywhere in the country we have experimented with magnete hydro-dynamics and if so, where, with what results and what are the calculated economics.

**Shri Vasant Sathe :** On MHD, a pilot plant is being experimented in our country. That technology is modern and it helps direct conversion from coal to energy.....

**Shri G.G. Swell :** Where ?

**Shri Vasant Sathe :** I do not know where. I will try to get the details and pass them on to the Hon. Member. Is it in Meghalaya ?

**Shri G.G. Swell :** You are the Minister for Energy.

**Shri Vasant Sathe :** I will find out and get the information. The pilot plant has been set up in Tiruchirappalli, Tamil Nadu.

**Shri Eduardo Faleiro :** Development of non-conventional sources of energy is a national priority. We have agreements for exchange of science and technology with many countries in the world—a very large number of countries. In furtherance of these Agreements we have Joint Commissions on science and technology. Now the procedure in these Joint Commissions is that the country, India or the other country, each one of them, submits those matters on which they would like to have cooperation. I would like to know, in view of the large number of these Joint Commissions, in view of the fact that it is open to this country to submit the item on which they would like to have cooperation and in view of the fact that non-conventional sources of energy are a national priority, why this question of cooperation in non-conventional sources of energy has not been taken up by any of the Joint Commissions on science and technology.

**Shri Vasant Sathe :** As far as science and technology is concerned, as I said, the Department of Non-conventional Energy Sources is developing on all fields of non-conventional sources of energy the technology indigenously and wherever we find that technology is available, we take action. It is a question of country-to-country when you say that discussions in Joint Commissions are held. Uptill now, no country has come forward or has shown any interest, but we have gone to various countries to find out technologies like Denmark for windmill and to other countries, and we take the best wherever it is available.

**Shri Vasant Sathe :** That is also under consideration.

## ANNEXURE II

(Read with para No. 28 of the Report)

*Statement Laid on the Table of the House in Reply to Part E of the Starred Question No. 271 Answered on 13.3.1986.*

The composition of the Planning Group on Shipping is as follows :—

1. Shri L.M.S. Rajwar, .....Chairman  
Chairman, Shipping Corporation of India.
2. Shri Vasant Sheth, .....Member  
Chairman, Great Eastern Shipping Company  
of India.
3. Dr. H.B. Desai .....Member  
Indian Institute of Foreign Trade, Delhi.
4. Dr. A.K. Malhotra, .....Member  
Member of Oil & Natural Gas Commission.
5. Dr. D.P. Ghosh, .....Member  
Department of Naval Architecture, I.I.T.  
Kharagpur.
6. Rear Admiral Kishan Dev Ex-Chairman, .....Member  
Shipping Corporation of India.
7. Shri M.R. Shroff, .....Member  
Economist, Bombay
8. Shri V.D. Chowgule, .....Member  
Chairman, Ghowgule Shipping Company.
9. Mrs. Ishar Judge Ahluwalia .....Member  
C-II/83, Motibagh, New Delhi.
10. Director General (Shipping), .....Member  
Bombay.

**ANNEXURE III**

(Read with para No. 32 of the Report)

*Copy of Planning Commission's Memorandum No. T&C/3(27)/85 dated the 18th December, 1985.*

In connection with the formulation of a long-term perspective plan for Transport Sector on an integrated basis, it has been decided to set up a planning group on shipping with the following composition :—

1. Shri L.M.S. Rajwar, .....Chairman  
Chairman, Shipping Corporation of India.
2. Shri Vasant Sheth, Chairman, .....Member  
Great Eastern Shipping Company of India.
3. Dr. H.B. Desai, .....Member  
Indian Institute of Foreign Trade, Delhi.
4. Dr. A.K. Malhotra, .....Member  
Member of Oil & Natural Gas Commission.
5. Dr. J.P. Ghosh, ... ..Member  
Deptt. of Naval Architecture, T, Kharagpur.
6. Rear Admiral Kishan Dev, ... ..Member  
Ex-Chairman, Shipping Corporation of India.
7. Shri M.R. Shroff, .....Member  
Economist, Bombay.
8. Shri V.D. Chowgule, .....Member  
Chairman, Chowgule Shipping Company.
9. Mrs. Ishar Judge Ahluwalia, .....Member  
C-II/83, Motibagh, New Delhi.
10. Director General .....Member  
(Shipping Bombay).

2. The Planning Group may co-opt any other expert in shipping or related fields.

3. The Planning Group's main task will be to prepare a long-term plan for shipping for overseas as well as coastal trade, based upon sound technical and economic considerations in the time perspective of year 2000 A.D. The specific Terms of Reference will be as follows :—

- (i) To study the past trends in development of shipping both overseas and coastal for passenger traffic and freight cargo over the last two decades having regard to the trends in the country's export and import trade and coastal traffic in the context of development of transport services in the country;
- (ii) To project future developments in export and import trade of the country for the period ending 2000 A.D., based upon anticipated developments in the international trade environments and in so far as coastal traffic is concerned, on inter-modal allocation of traffic in the country, phased over 5 years periods ending 1990, 1995 & 2000 A.D.;
- (iii) To review liner route developments and liner code evaluation and recommend necessary reorientation to enable improvements in the country's share in liner services in future;
- (iv) To determine the optimum size and type of Indian fleet compatible with cargo mix, feasible technological improvements and anticipated trends in international and coastal trade ;
- (v) To study the factors influencing productivity and efficiency of Indian shipping and to consider any structural changes needed in the shipping industry in future with a view particularly to improve the productivity and efficiency of the industry as a whole ;
- (vi) To study measures to improve resource availability for shipping including foreign exchange resources with due regard to the anticipated foreign exchange outgo and inflow and particularly to consider non-conventional sources of financing for the industry including *inter-alla* borrowings by shipping companies from commercial sources;
- (vii) In relation to coastal shipping, to examine projected developments in the principal industries in coastal areas and project requirements of shipping with due consideration being given to feasible integrated transport services;
- (viii) To review measures to integrate shipping development with development of infra-structure facilities including port development and specifically to recommend ~~moderation~~ of the

facilities at the ports through adoption of a system approach to ensure co-ordinated development of major, intermediate and minor ports. (This will be particularly necessary in planning development of facilities to handle container ships in future); and

- (ix) To recommend such other measures including policy measures on financial, institutional and operational aspects of shipping such as may be conducive to development of industry on a sound commercial basis in future.

4. The Group will have the studies on various aspects of shipping carried out by expert bodies or through engagement of consultants to the extent necessary.

5. The Group will maintain close inter-action with the Steering Committee on Transport Planning and will report to the Planning Commission from time to time on the progress of the work undertaken.

6. The Group will submit its report by 15th June, 1986.

7. The Group will be serviced by the Deptt. of surface Transport and shipping Corporation of India. The official Members will be paid TA & DA by their respective Departments/Corporations. The non-official Members will be paid TA & DA as admissible to Grade 'A' Central Government officers.

Sd/-  
(K.C. Agarwal)  
Director (Admn.).

- To
1. Shri L.M.S. Rajwar, Chairman, SCI
  2. Shri Vasant Sheth
  3. Dr. H. B. Dcsai
  4. Dr. A K Malhotra
  5. Dr. J. P. Ghosh
  6. Rear Admiral Kishan Dev
  7. Shri M. R. Saroff

8. Shri V.D. Chowgule

9. Mrs. Ishar Judge Ahluwalia.

Copy to :—

All concerned Deptt./Ministries.



## APPENDIX

(Vide Para No. 80 of the Report)

(i) *Statement showing the position of the assurances of Seventh Lok Sabha pending implementation as on 4 December, 1986.*

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	547	1
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	229	—
Tenth Session, 1982	315	315	—
Eleventh Session, 1983	861	859	2
Twelfth Session, 1983	433	433	—
Thirteenth Session, 1983	424	423	1
Fourteenth Session, 1984	956	945	11
Fifteenth Session, 1984	328	325	3
Total Assurances out-standing			19

*(ii) Statement showing the position of assurances of  
Eighth Lok Sabha pending implementation  
as on 4 December, 1986.*

Session	No. of assurances culled out	No. of assurances implemented/dropped	No. of assurances out-standing
First Session, 1985	19	19	—
Second Session, 1985	426	403	23
Third Session, 1985	331	312	19
Fourth Session, 1985	355	300	55
Fifth Session, 1986	767	499	268
Sixth Session, 1986	459	182	277
Seventh Session, 1986	389	NIL	389
<b>Total Assurances outstanding :</b>			<b>1031.</b>

(iii) *Ministry-wise details of outstanding assurances of Seventh Lok Sabha*

Ministry/Department	Session of Seventh Lok Sabha																Total
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	
Agriculture . . . . .																	
Atomic Energy . . . . .																	
Commerce . . . . .														1			1
Communications . . . . .																	
Defence . . . . .										1							
Electronics . . . . .																	
Energy . . . . .																	
Environment and Forests																	
External Affairs . . . . .														1			1
Finance . . . . .											1						2
Food and Civil Supplies .																	
Health and Family Welfare .																	
Home Affairs . . . . .																	
Human Resource Development .																	
Industry . . . . .														3			3
Information and Broadcasting .																	
											2		1	5			8

Ministry/Department	Session of Seventh Lok Sabha															Total
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	
Labour . . . . .														1		1
Law and Justice . . . . .				1										3		4
Ocean Development . . . . .																
Parliamentary Affairs and Tourism . . . . .																
Personnel and Trainings Administrative Reforms and Public Grievances and Pension . . . . .																
Petroleum and Natural Gas Planning . . . . .																
Prime Minister . . . . .																
Programme Implementation Science and Technology . . . . .																
Space . . . . .																
Steel and Mines . . . . .																
Textiles . . . . .																
Transport . . . . .																
Urban Development . . . . .																
Water Resources . . . . .						1								1	2	4
Welfare . . . . .														1	1	2
			1			1								11	3	19

(iv) Ministry-wise details of outstanding Assurances of Eighth Lok Sabha

Ministry/Department	2nd Session	3rd Session	4th Session	5th Session	6th Session	7th Session
Agriculture . . . . .	..	..	2	17	19	25
Atomic Energy . . . . .	..	..	2	7	..	4
Commerce . . . . .	1	..	3	7	9	8
Communications . . . . .	..	..	..	1	10	16
Defence . . . . .	..	..	1	6	4	2
Electronics . . . . .	..	..	..	..	2	2
Energy . . . . .	..	1	3	9	13	14
Environment and Forests	..	..	1	12	8	7
External Affairs . . . . .	..	..	1	12	5	9
Finance . . . . .	..	3	6	23	33	59
Food and Civil Supplies	2	1	1	6	6	6
Health and Family . . . . .						
Welfare . . . . .	4	..	..	18	15	13
Home Affairs . . . . .	1	2	3	19	22	23
Human Resource . . . . .						
Development . . . . .	2	2	6	24	14	25
Industry . . . . .	1	1	6	34	24	46
Information and . . . . .						
Broadcasting . . . . .	2	..	..	6	2	2
Labour . . . . .	1	1	3	19	14	7
Law and Justice . . . . .	3	..	..	6	10	10
Ocean Development . . . . .	..	..	..	..	..	1
Parliamentary Affairs . . . . .	..	..	..	1	..	..
Personnel and Training, . . . . .						
Administrative Reforms . . . . .						
and Public Grievances . . . . .						
and Pension . . . . .	..	..	..	5	2	5

Ministry/Department	2nd Session	3rd Session	4th Session	5th Session	6th Session	7th Session
<b>Petroleum and Natural Gas . . . . .</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Planning . . . . .</b>	<b>..</b>	<b>..</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>..</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>Prime Minister . . . . .</b>	<b>..</b>	<b>..</b>	<b>..</b>	<b>..</b>	<b>..</b>	<b>..</b>
<b>Programme Implemen- tation . . . . .</b>	<b>..</b>	<b>..</b>	<b>..</b>	<b>..</b>	<b>..</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>Science and Technology . . . . .</b>	<b>..</b>	<b>..</b>	<b>..</b>	<b>..</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Space . . . . .</b>	<b>..</b>	<b>..</b>	<b>..</b>	<b>..</b>	<b>..</b>	<b>..</b>
<b>Steel and Mines . . . . .</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>..</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>Textiles . . . . .</b>	<b>..</b>	<b>..</b>	<b>..</b>	<b>..</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>Tourism . . . . .</b>	<b>..</b>	<b>..</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>Transport . . . . .</b>	<b>..</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>35</b>
<b>Urban Development . . . . .</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>22</b>
<b>Water Resources . . . . .</b>	<b>..</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>..</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Welfare . . . . .</b>	<b>..</b>	<b>..</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>5</b>
	<b>23</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>55</b>	<b>268</b>	<b>277</b>	<b>389</b>

**LIST OF AUTHORISED AGENTS FOR THE SALE OF LOK SABHA  
SECRETARIAT PUBLICATIONS—1986**

Sl. No.	Name of Agent	Sl. No.	Name of Agent
<b>ANDHRA PRADESH</b>		<b>UTTAR PRADESH</b>	
1.	M/s Vijay Book Agency, 11-1-477, Mylargadda, Secunderabad-500361.	12.	Law Publishers, Sardar Patel Marg, P. B. No. 77, Allahabad, U.P.
<b>BIHAR</b>		<b>WEST BENGAL</b>	
2.	M/s. Crown Book Depot, Upper Bazar, Ranchi (Bihar).	13.	M/s. Manimala, Buys & Sells, 123, Bow Bazar Street, Calcutta-1
<b>GUJARAT</b>		<b>DELHI</b>	
3.	The New Order Book Company, Ellis Bridge, Ahmedabad-380006. (T. No. 79065)	14.	M/s. Jain Book Agency, C-9, Connaught Place, New Delhi (T. No. 351663 & 350806)
<b>MADHYA PRADESH</b>		15.	M/s. J. M. Jaina & Brothers, P. Box 1020, Mori Gate, Delhi- 110006 (T. No. 2915064 & 230936)
4.	Modern Book House, Shiv Vilas Palace, Indore City. (T. No. 35289)	16.	M/s. Oxford Book & Stationery Co., Scindia House, Connaught Place, New Delhi-110001 (T. No. 3315308 & 45896).
<b>MAHARASHTRA</b>		17.	M/s. Bookwell, 2/72, Sant Niran- kari Colony, Kingsway Camp, Delhi-110009 (T. No. 7112309).
5.	M/s. Sunderdas Gian Chand, 601, Girgaum Road, Near Princess Street, Bombay-400002	18.	M/s. Rajendra Book Agency, IV-DR 59, Lajpat Nagar, Old Double Storey, New Delhi-110024 (T. No. 6412362 & 6412131).
6.	The International Book Service, Deccan Gymkhana, Poona-4	19.	M/s. Ashok Book Agency, BH-82, Poorvi Shalimar Bagh, Delhi-110033.
7.	The Current Book House, Maruti Lane, Raghunath Dadaji Street, Bombay-400001	20.	M/s. Venus Enterprises, B-2/85, Phase-II, Ashok Vihar, Delhi.
8.	M/s. Usha Book Depot, 'Law Book Seller and Publishers', Agents Govt. Publications, 585, Chira Bazar, Khan House, Bombay- 400002.	21.	M/s. Central News Agency Pvt. Ltd., 23/90, Connaught Circus, New Delhi-110001 (T. No. 344448, 322705, 344478 & 344508)
9.	M&J Services, Publishers, Repre- sentative Accounts & Law Book Sellers, Mohan Kunj, Ground Floor 68, Jyotiba Fuele Road, Nalgaum-Dadar Bombay-400014	22.	M/s. Amrit Book Co, N-21, Connaught Circus, New Delhi.
10.	Subscribers Subscription Services India, 21, Raghunath Dadaji Street, 2nd Floor, Bombay-400001	23.	M/s. Books India Corporation Publishers, Importers & Exporters L-27, Shastri Nagar, Delhi-110052 (T. No. 269631 & 714465)
<b>TAMIL NADU</b>		24.	M/s. Sangam Book Depot, 4378/4B, Murari Lal Street; Ansari Road, Darya Ganj, New Delhi-110002.
11.	M/s. M. M. Subscription Agencies, 14th Murali Street, (1st floor) Mahalingapuram, Nungam- bakkam, Madras-600034 (T. No. 476558)		

© 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  
SHRI DURGHA PRINTING PRESS, DELHI