

COMMITTEE
ON
GOVERNMENT ASSURANCES
(1988-89)

(EIGHTH LOK SABHA)

SEVENTEENTH REPORT



(Presented on 10 May, 1989)

LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT
NEW DELHI

3728
9 May, 1989/19 Vaisakha, 1911 (Saka)

17.1

Price Rs. 2.00

CONTENTS

	Pages
COMPOSITION OF THE COMMITTEE	(iii)
INTRODUCTION	(v)
CHAPTER-I	
Review of pending assurances of Seventh and Eighth Lok Sabha. 	1
CHAPTER II	
Pending assurances pertaining to Fourth and Fifth Sessions of Eighth Lok Sabha 	3
CHAPTER III	
Position of pending assurances pertaining to Seventh and Eighth Lok Sabha. 	7
APPENDIX I : Selected assurances pertaining to Fourth and Fifth Sessions of Eighth Lok Sabha not yet implemented. 	9
APPENDIX II : Selected assurances pertaining to Fourth and Fifth Sessions of Eighth Lok Sabha implemented by the Ministries 	21
APPENDIX III : Statements showing the position of assurances pertaining to Seventh and Eighth Lok Sabha pending implementation by the Government as on 28 February, 1989. ...	46

MINUTES

Minutes of Sitting held on 20 October, 1987. ...	48
Minutes of Sitting held on 8 May, 1989. ...	52

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

Prof. Narain Chand Parashar—*Chairman*

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

SECRETARIAT

1. Shri C. K. Jain — *Joint Secretary*
2. Shri S. C. Gupta — *Deputy Secretary*

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

INTRODUCTION

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

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

3. The Committee (1987-88) at their sitting held on 20 October, 1987, considered requests from the Ministries and reviewed pending assurances pertaining to Fourth and Fifth Sessions of the Eighth Lok Sabha. At their sitting held on 8 May, 1989, the Committee (1988-89) considered and adopted this draft Seventeenth 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 ;

9 May, 1989

19 Valsakha, 1911 (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 7,223 assurances have since been implemented, leaving a balance of 8 assurances to be implemented.

2. During the First to Eleventh Sessions of Eighth Lok Sabha, 7,275 assurances were culled out. Out of them 5,569 have since been implemented, thus leaving a balance of 1,706 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 28 February, 1989.

CHAPTER II

PENDING ASSURANCES PERTAINING TO FOURTH AND FIFTH SESSIONS OF EIGHTH LOK SABHA

At their sitting held on 20 October, 1987, the Committee reviewed 29 selected pending assurances given during the Fourth and Fifth Sessions of Eighth Lok Sabha and decided to pursue them with the Ministries/Departments concerned for their expeditious implementation. Out of these 29 assurances, 21 of them as detailed in Appendix II, have since been implemented. However, the following 8 assurances still remain unfulfilled:-

<u>Sl. No.</u>	<u>SQ/USQ.No. & date</u>	<u>Subject</u>
1.	USQ. No. 262/19.11.85	Suggestion from State Governments for revision of royalty rates on account of increase in coal prices.
2.	General Discussion on 29.11.85 on Third and Fourth Reports of the Commission for SC/ST	Post matric scholarships.
3.	USQ.No. 2464/4.12.85	Implementation of recommendations of Minorities Commission.
4.	USQ. No. 4325/17.12.85	Modernisation of car industry and creation of fresh capacity.
5.	USQ. No. 4336/17.12.85	Foreign collaboration for manufacture of medium size passenger cars.
6.	USQ.No. 282/25.2.86	Citreon car versus Maruti.
7.	USQ. No. 444/26.2.86	Report of high power panel on minorities.
8.	USQ.No.2445/12 3.86	Felling of trees for electricity production.

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

2. It will be seen from the above statement that the pending assurances include assurances even on important matters like post-matric scholarships to Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes students and implementation of Reports on minorities. In the case of assurance relating to upward revision of rates for post-matric scholarships for SC/ST students (S.No.1), according to Ministry's own admission, the review of the scheme is generally taken up at the end of every Five Year Plan. The last review having been made in July, 1981, the second review should have been completed at the latest by 1986. However, despite the assurance given in Lok Sabha as early as November, 1985 the review has not been completed so far causing great hardship to deserving students. There have also been inordinate delay in making public the report of high power panel on minorities which was submitted in 1983 (S. No. 7) and the Sixth Report of Minorities Commission in 1985 (S. No. 3) on the ground that the reports were still under examination. Similarly there has been unjustifiable long delay in taking a decision about the revision of the rates of royalty on coal which is of vital importance to a number of States because of its financial implications and the matter was stated to be still under consideration of the Government.

3. The Committee deprecate the inordinate delay in fulfilling these assurances. They see no justification for the delay of over three years in their implementation. In many of these cases, the Ministries have not cared even to seek further extensions of time for implementing the assurances after the expiry of the period for which the extensions were granted earlier. The Committee wish to re-emphasise that the assurances given by the Ministers are undertakings given solemnly on the floor of the House and the concerned Ministry/Department must put in sincere and sustained endeavours to implement them at the earliest. There should be a periodical review of the pending assurances at the highest level in the Ministry to ensure that the implementation of any assurance is not delayed unless there are very strong justifiable grounds for it.

4. Even in respect of 21 assurances which have been implemented, the Committee are unhappy to note that in some cases there have been delays of even more than two years in implementing them. Repeated extensions had been sought by the Ministries concerned to implement them. In some cases the Ministries did not care even to give detailed and adequate reasons for seeking extensions and extensions were sought on such sketchy grounds as 'the collection of the required information was likely to take some time.' The Committee were also approached in some cases for dropping the assurances and only when this was not agreed

to, the Ministries concerned implemented the assurance. The Committee are of the view that in many cases the assurances could have been implemented much earlier had the concerned Ministries taken follow-up action well in time at a suitable level and proper vigil kept on the progress of collection of the information, etc. The Committee hope that in future the Ministries would show the required urgency to ensure the implementation of the assurances at the earliest.

CHAPTER III

POSITION OF PENDING ASSURANCES PERTAINING TO SEVENTH AND EIGHTH LOK SABHA

5. A statement showing the position of assurances pertaining to Seventh and Eighth Lok Sabha pending implementation by the Government as on 28 February, 1989 is given in *Appendix III*.

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

NEW DELHI,
9 May, 1989

19 Vaisakha, 1911 (Saka)

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

APPENDIX-I

REFERENCE : PARA 1 OF THE REPORT SELECTED ASSURANCES PERTAINING TO FOURTH AND FIFTH SESSIONS OF EIGHTH LOK SABHA NOT YET IMPLEMENTED

Suggestion from State Governments for revision of royalty rate on account of increase in coal prices

1. On 19 November, 1985, Shri Mohd. Mahfooz Ali Khan, M.P. asked the following Unstarred Question (No. 262) regarding suggestion from State Governments for revision of royalty rate on account of increase in coal prices:

- “(a) whether Government are aware of the demand of some of the States for enhancement in the rate of royalty on account of increase in coal prices;
- (b) if so, the names of those States;
- (c) whether Government have accepted the suggestions of State Governments because the coal supplying States incur losses in the absence of upward revision of the royalty rate; and
- (d) if not, the reasons therefor?”

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

“(a) & (b) : Yes, Sir. Some of the States like Assam, Bihar, Madhya Pradesh, Maharashtra, Meghalaya, Orissa, West Bengal etc. have represented for enhancement of the rate of royalty on coal.

(c) & (d) : The rate of royalty on coal was last revised with effect from 13.2.81. To consider the question of further revision of royalty rate on coal, a Study Group was constituted in November, 1984. The Study Group has submitted its report which is under consideration by the Government of India.”

3. The above reply of the Minister was treated as an assurance and was required to be fulfilled by 19 February, 1986. The

Ministry did not fulfil the assurance within the stipulated period and sought repeated extensions of time. The Ministry sought extension of time on 6 October, 1987 upto 19 November, 1987 on the following ground:

“The question in regard to revision of rates of royalty on coal is still under consideration.”

4. The Committee at their sitting held on 20 October, 1987 considered the request of the Ministry and granted extension of time upto 19 November, 1987.

5. The assurance is however yet to be implemented. The Ministry have sought extension of time upto 19 August, 1989, on the ground that the question of revision of rates of royalty on coal is still under consideration of the Government. It will take some more time to arrive at a decision in this regard.

6. On 29 November, 1985, during the discussion on a Motion regarding the Third and Fourth Reports of the Commissioner for Scheduled Castes/Scheduled Tribes, a member (Shri Ram Swarup Ram) made a point that the amount of post matric stipend be raised to Rs. 150/-.

7. The Minister of State, in the Ministry of Welfare (Dr. Rajendra Kumari Bajpai) gave the following reply :

“So far as the post matric scholarship is concerned, we have already revised the rates. The rates were last revised in July, 1981 and the proposal to further revise the amount is under consideration.”

8. This reply of the Minister of State in the Ministry of Welfare was treated as an assurance by this Committee which was to be fulfilled within three months of the date of reply i.e. by 28 February, 1986.

9. On 29 January, 1986, the Ministry of Welfare approached this Committee through the Department of Parliamentary Affairs *vide* their U.O. Note No. IV/W (1) Genl, Dis-LS/85 dated 29 January, 1986, to drop the assurance on the grounds indicated below:

“Post Matric Scholarships a Centrally sponsored Scheme is being implemented through the States/UTs. Expenditure on the Scheme is shared by the Centre as well as by the State Governments. The review of the scheme, which also includes upward revision of rates, is generally taken up at the end of every five year plan. For this purpose necessary data and other relevant

information are to be collected from the States and Union Territory Administrations. So far, 17 States/UTs. have furnished their comments on the revision of rates. Necessary action will be taken to revise the post matric scholarship rates after receiving the necessary information from the remaining States/UTs. After their comments are received a detailed exercise has to be carried out in consultation with the Finance Ministry and Planning Commission for determining the rates, income ceiling etc. It will be appreciated that the whole process is a time consuming one. The Processing of last review started in 1979-80 could be finalised only in July, 1981.

In view of the above it is requested that the statement of Hon'ble Minister may kindly be treated as general statement instead of an Assurance and the Committee on Government Assurances (Lok Sabha) may be moved for the deletion of the Assurance."

10 The Committee at their sitting held on 10 April, 1986, considered the request of the Ministry of Welfare for dropping the assurance and did not accede to it.

11. The Committee *vide* their Sixth Report observed:

"The Statement of the Minister of State in the Ministry of Welfare on 29 November, 1985 in the Lok Sabha was rightly treated as an assurance. The Post-Matric Scholarships is a centrally sponsored scheme and naturally its implementation by the States/Union Territories is required to be constantly watched and reviewed by the Union Government. As the Minister's reply indicates the review of rates of scholarships was made last in July, 1981, the process for which started in 1979-80. The Committee are unable to appreciate that instead of utilizing the benefit of experience gained out of the first review by making an effort to reduce the time to be taken for the current second review and expedite the decision. the Ministry chose to make a request for the dropping of the assurance. The Committee would like that the Ministry should make concerted efforts to expedite the implementation of the assurance. If necessary, the Ministry might make a request for extension of time which should be kept to the minimum to enable them to collect the desired information and take a final decision."

12. The assurance however remained unimplemented and repeated extensions were sought by the Ministry for fulfilling it. The last request for extension of time upto 30.6.89 was on the ground that the matter was being placed before the Cabinet.

(iii)

Implementation of recommendations of Minority Commission.

13. On 4 December, 1985, Shri G. Bhoopathy, M.P. asked the following Unstarred Question (No.2464) regarding implementation of recommendation made by President of Minority Commission:-

“(a) whether President of Minority Commission has recommended for establishment of additional educational and technical institutes in the areas inhabited mainly by backward classes; and

(b) if so, when recommendations of the Commission is proposed to be implemented?”

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

“(a) & (b) : Minorities Commission in their Sixth Annual Report for the period 1.4.83 to 31.3.84 has made the following recommendation :

‘Government should open more educational institutions in areas predominantly inhabited by minorities and, side by side, start such technical institutions as may be beneficial to backward sections according to the availability of natural resources and their aptitudes and acceptability for certain professions in particular areas’.

The aforesaid report has been submitted by the Commission in October, 1985 and is under examination in consultation with the concerned Departments and will be laid on the Table of the House together with the Action-Taken-Memorandum at the earliest.”

15. The above reply of the Minister was treated as an assurance and was required to be fulfilled by 4 March, 1986. As the Ministry was not in a position to fulfil the assurance within the stipulated period, the Ministry sought repeated extension of time for fulfilling it.

16. The Committee at their sitting held on 20 October, 1987 considered the request of the Ministry for extension of time fulfilling the assurance and granted extension of time upto 31 December, 1987. The Ministry was also requested to submit a detailed note stating the latest position alongwith the reasons for not fulfilling the assurance within the extended time.

17. The Ministry submitted the note giving the latest position and stated that in terms of para 7 of the Government Resolution dated 12th January, 1978 constituting the Minorities Commission,

the Commission's Report containing *inter-alia* the reasons for non acceptance is required to be placed before each House of Parliament. The Sixth Report of the Minorities Commission which is the main subject matter of the Assurance contains recommendations which pertain to a large number of Ministries/Departments. These recommendations were referred to them for their comments. It took time before the comments were received. Based on the comments received 'Action Taken Memorandum' has been drafted and sent to the concerned Ministries for their comments. The Ministries are being reminded to expedite their replies. As soon as the replies are received further action will be taken to finalise the Action Taken Memorandum and to lay it before each House of the Parliament, the Ministry also requested for extension of time upto 31 March, 1989 on the ground that the examination was likely to take some more time. The assurance, however, is yet to be fulfilled.

(iv)

Modernisation of Car Industry and Creation of fresh capacity.

18. On 17 December, 1985, S/Shri P.M. Sayeed, Murlidhar Mane and Prakash V. Patil, M.Ps asked the following Unstarred Question (No. 4325) regarding modernisation of car industry and creation of fresh capacity.

“(a) whether it is a fact that a number of proposals for the modernisation of car industry and creation of fresh capacity thereof are pending with Government;

(b) the details and number of those proposals which have already been cleared by Government during the last one year both with foreign collaboration and entirely indigenous; and

(c) the reasons for which the other proposals have been held up and, the approximate time that is likely to be taken for coming to a decision ?”

19. The Minister of State for Industrial Development in the Ministry of Industry (Shri M. Arunachalam) gave the following reply;

“(a) & (c) : Four proposals for industrial licence and/or foreign collaboration for the manufacture of passenger cars received during the current financial year and under consideration of the Government.

(b) : The proposal of Standard Motor Products of India Ltd. for expansion of car manufacturing capacity was approved during the last one year.”

20. The above reply of the Minister was treated as an assurance and was required to be fulfilled by 17 March, 1986. As the Ministry was not in a position to fulfil the assurance within the stipulated period, the Ministry sought repeated extensions of time. The Ministry made a request on 17 July, 1987 for extension of time upto 31 December, 1987 on the following grounds:-

“The question relates to a policy matter a decision on which is likely to take some more time.”

21. The Committee at their sitting held on 20 October, 1987 considered the request of the Ministry and granted extension of time upto 31 December, 1987 and desired to have a note stating the latest position together with the reasons for not fulfilling the assurance within the extended time. In their note the Ministry stated that this Department had prepared a comprehensive paper on the automobile policy which had been discussed in a series of meetings of the Committee of Secretaries in the Cabinet Secretariat. In the light of the directions given by the COS, this Department has prepared a note for the Cabinet Committee on Economic Affairs in regard to the policy for the passenger car sector. The note was one of the agenda items in the CCEA meeting scheduled for 22nd November, 1988, but the meeting of the CCEA was postponed. Therefore, the note is still to be considered by the CCEA.

The Ministry also stated that the formulation of any policy in the automobile sector has to reckon with heavy commitments of foreign exchange that Government will have to undertake. Considering the widespread and acute drought situation of 1987, it was felt by this Department that it would not be advisable to consider a policy that might involve heavy foreign exchange commitments in a drought year. Therefore, this matter was kept under low priority last year. It has now been taken up, and as stated above the Department's note on the passenger car sector is under the consideration of the CCEA.

Considering the complexity of the issues involved it is difficult to give a precise time periods for announcement of the policy or for fulfilment of the assurances based on it. We are therefore left with no alternative but to review the situation from time to time, and if necessary, to seek further extensions of time for fulfilment of the assurances.

Subsequently the Ministry sought extension of time upto 31 March, 1989 on the ground that the question related to a policy matter, a decision on which was likely to take some more time, it would not be possible to fulfil the assurance within the stipulated period.

22. The assurance is, however yet to be fulfilled.

Foreign Collaboration for manufacture of medium size Passenger cars :

23. On 17 December, 1985, Shri Mukul Wasnik, M.P. asked the following Unstarred Question (No. 4336) regarding foreign collaboration for manufacture of medium size passenger cars:

“(a) whether it is a fact that some prominent industrial group of South India has entered into a collaboration agreement with a foreign car company for manufacture of medium size passenger cars and has submitted application to the Government for necessary approval;

(b) if so, the details thereof;

(c) the total number of applications for industrial licences with or without foreign collaborations pending before Government for approval alongwith the names of applicants; and

(d) when the final decision will be taken thereon?”

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

“(a) No Sir.

(b) Does not arise.

(c) & (d) : Two composite applications from M/s Escorts Ltd. and Gujarat Industrial Investment Corporation Limited for Industrial licence and foreign collaboration for manufacture of cars are under consideration of the Government.”

25. The above reply of the Minister was treated as an assurance and was required to be fulfilled by 1 / March, 1986. As the Ministry was not in a position to fulfil the assurance, the Ministry sought repeated extensions of time. The Ministry made a request, dated 20 August, 1987, for extension of time upto 31 December, 1987 on the following grounds :-

“The question relates to a policy matter, a decisions on which is likely to take some more time.”

26. The Committee at their sitting held on 20 October, 1987 considered the request of the Ministry and granted extension of time upto 31 December, 1987. Subsequently the Ministry on 29 December, 1988 made a request for extension of time upto 31 March, 1989 on the following ground :

"As the question relates to a policy matter a decision on which is likely to take more time, it would not be possible to fulfil the assurance within the stipulated period."

27. The assurance is, however, yet to be fulfilled.

Citroen Car Versus Maruti :

28. On 25 February, 1986, Dr. Chinta Mohan, M.P. asked the following Unstarred Question (No. 282) regarding Citroen car versus Maruti :

"(a) whether it is a fact that Citroen car offers several advantages over Maruti and other small cars in the market, especially in final customer price, running costs, spares etc.; and

(b) whether Government will ensure that indigenisation of Citroen is a part of the project in reasonable time frame unlike Maruti which seems no where in sight?"

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

"(a) & (b) : The application received from M/s. Escorts Limited for the manufacture of Citroen car is under consideration."

30. The above reply of the Minister was treated as an assurance and was required to be fulfilled by 25 May, 1986. As the Ministry was not in a position to fulfil the assurance within the stipulated period, the Ministry sought repeated extensions of time. On 24.11.87 the Ministry made a request for extension of time upto 24 November, 1987 on the following grounds:-

"The question relates to a policy matter, a decision on which is likely to take some more time."

31. The Committee at their sitting held on 20 October, 1987 considered the request of the Ministry and granted extension of time upto 24 November, 1987.

32. The Ministry have even thereafter sought repeated extension of time the last being upto 31 March, 1989 on the following grounds:

"As the question relates to a policy matter, a decision on which is likely to take some more time, it would not be possible to fulfil the assurance within the stipulated period."

The assurance is yet to be implemented.

Report on High Power Panel on Minorities :

33. On 26 February, 1986, Shri Syed Shahabuddin, M.P. asked the following Unstarred Question (No. 444) regarding Report of high power panel on minorities ;

“(a) whether Report of the High Power Panel on Minorities etc. under Dr. Gopal Singh which was submitted in 1983 has not yet been released ;

(b) if so, the reasons for the delay; and

(c) whether it has been circulated to the State Government and various departments of Union Government for their comments ?

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

“(a) & (b) : The report is under consideration of the Government.

(c) No, Sir.”

35. The above reply of the Minister was treated as an assurance and was required to be fulfilled by 26 May, 1986. As the Ministry was not in a position to fulfil the assurance within the stipulated period, the Ministry sought repeated extensions of time. The Ministry made a request for extension of time upto 25 November, 1987 on the following grounds :-

“The report of High Power panel on minorities is still under examination of the Government and completion of its examination is likely to take some more time.”

36. The Committee at their sitting held on 20 October, 1987 considered the request of the Ministry and granted extension of time upto 25 November, 1987. The decision of the Committee was conveyed to the Ministry on 30 July, 1988.

37. Subsequently the Ministry has sought further extensions of time upto 27 May, 1989 on the ground that the Report of High Power Panel on minorities was still under examination of the Government and the completion of its examination is likely to take some more time.

Felling of trees for electricity production.

38. On 12 March, 1986, Shri Sarfraz Ahmad, M.P. asked the following Unstarred Question (No. 2445) regarding felling of trees for electricity production :

“(a) Whether Government’s attention has been drawn to the news item appearing in the *Jansatta* dated 4 February, 1986 wherein it has been stated that 50 lakhs tree are to be cut for 107 Megawatt electricity production in various States; and

(b) if so, the action Government propose to take to save those trees which are likely to be cut?”

39. The Minister of State in the Ministry of Environment and Forests (Shri Z.R. Ansari) gave the following reply:

“(a) Yes, Sir. However the news item in *Jansatta* dated February 4, 1986 pertains to only one hydro-electrical project. viz. Indira Sarovar (Bodhghat) in the Bastar district of Madhya Pradesh;

(b) The proposal for the diversion of forest lands for the Indira Sarovar (Bodhghat) Project is, still under the consideration of the Central Government.”

40. The above reply of the Minister was treated as an assurance and was required to be fulfilled by 12 June, 1986. As the Ministry was not in a position to fulfil the assurance within the stipulated period they sought repeated extension of time. On 23 September, 1987, the Ministry sought extension of time up to 11.12.87 on the following grounds:

“a final decision on the Indira Sarovar (Bodhghat) Hydro Electric project have not yet been taken.”

41. The Committee at their sitting held on 20 October, 1987 considered the request of the Ministry and granted extension upto 11 December, 1987 and desired to have a note stating the latest position together with the reasons for not fulfilling the assurance within the extended time.

42. The Ministry after explaining the position of the assurance sought further extension of time upto 11 December, 1988, on the following grounds:

“The question of clearance of the project from environmental as well as rehabilitation angles can be considered only after the indepth study report on the displacement of tribals due to Bodhghat project has been submitted by the Ministry of Welfare and Government decision thereon is taken. The study report on the displacement of tribals due to Bodhghat Project has not yet been submitted. Hence no final decision on the diversion of forest land for Indira Sarovar (Bodhghat) Project has been taken so far.”

43. The assurance is however, yet to be fulfilled.

APPENDIX II

Vide Para No. I of Chapter-II of the Report

SELECTED ASSURANCES PERTAINING TO FOURTH AND FIFTH SESSIONS OF EIGHTH LOK SABHA IMPLEMENTED BY THE MINISTRIES

(i)

Synthetic Filament Yarn :

44. On 19 November, 1985, Shri V. Tulsi Ram, M.P. asked the following Unstarred Question (No. 428) regarding Synthetic filament yarn :

“(a) whether a delegation from the Synthetic filament yarn industry recently met him and requested for concession in the excise duty for the benefit of the consumers;

(b) if so, the details of the concession desired by the industry and the extent to which the same has been agreed to by Government;

(c) the extent to which such a concession will be utilised by the industry for their own benefits; and

(d) the extent to which it will be helpful in creating employment in the industry?”

45. The then Minister of State for Chemicals and Petro-Chemicals in the Ministry of Industry (Shri R.K. Jaichandra Singh) gave the following reply :

“(a) Yes, Sir.

(b), (c) & (d) : The delegation suggested that excise duty on synthetic filament yarns should be reduced by Rs. 20 to Rs. 25 per kg. A decision on the proposal is yet to be taken.”

46. The above reply of the Minister was treated as an assurance and was required to be fulfilled by 19 February, 1986. As the Ministry was not in a position to fulfil the assurance within the stipulated period, the Ministry sought repeated extensions of time. The last

request for extension of time upto 19.5.1987 was on the following grounds :

“The matter is still under consideration and a final decision has yet to be taken.”

47. The Committee at their sitting held on 20 October, 1987 considered the request of the Ministry to grant extension of time upto 19 May, 1987. The Committee took the following decision :-

“The Committee were not satisfied with the reasons for seeking extension. A detailed note giving the progress made since the assurance was given and thereafter the Committee would like to hear the views of the representative of the Ministry.”

48. The Ministry implemented the assurance only on 2 March, 1988 by laying the following statement on the Table of the House:

“The proposal for reduction in excise duty on synthetic filament yarns has not been found acceptable for the present.”

Atomic Power Plants during Seventh Plan

49. On 20 November, 1985, Shri V.S. Vijayaraghavan, M.P. asked the following Unstarred Question No.499 regarding atomic power plants during Seventh Plan:

“(a) whether any final decision has been taken with regard to the number of atomic power plants to be set up in the country in the Seventh Plan;

(b) whether Government of Kerala have requested that an atomic power plant be set up in that state; and

(c) if so, the reaction of Government thereto?;

50. The Minister of State for Science and Technology, Atomic Energy, Space, Electronics and Ocean Development (Shri Shiv Raj V. Patil) gave the following reply:-

“(a) No, Sir.

(b) Yes, Sir.

(c) Site Selection Committee has examined sites in the Southern Electricity Region of which Kerala is a constituent state. The report of the Committee is under consideration of Government.”

51. The above reply of the Minister was treated as an assurance and was required to be fulfilled by 20 February, 1986. As the Ministry was not in a position to fulfil the assurance within the stipulated time, the Ministry sought repeated extensions of time for fulfilling it. On 7 January, 1986, the Department of Atomic Energy approached the Committee through the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs *vide* their U.O.No. IV/AE (1) USQ. 499-2562-LS/85 dated 7 January, 1986 to drop the assurance on the following grounds:

“Site Selection Committee has examined sites in the Southern Electricity Region of which Kerala is a Constituent State. The report of the Committee is under consideration of the Government.”

52. The Committee at their sitting held on 27 January, 1986 considered the request of the Ministry for the dropping of the assurance and took the following decision:-

“The Committee found no cogent reason in the Ministry’s plea to drop the assurance. They were of the view that once an assurance had been given, it became incumbent on the Ministry to implement it as it raised a hope in the minds of not only Members of Parliament but also in the minds of general public that the reply to assurance would be forthcoming.”

53. On 6.10.1987, the Ministry requested for extension of time upto 20.10.1987 on the following grounds:

“The collection of the required information is likely to take some more time.”

54. The Committee at their sitting held on 20 October, 1987 considered the request of the Ministry and granted extension upto 20 October, 1987.

55. The Ministry implemented the assurance only on 7.12.88 by laying the following statement on the Table of the House:-

“There is no proposal to set up an atomic power plant in Kerala during the Seventh Plan. However, irrespective of the physical location of the future atomic power stations in a particular region, it is the intention of the Government to ensure that power from such central power stations will be made available to all the States in the region on an equitable basis.”

Nuclear Power Plant in Andhra Pradesh.

56. On 20 November, 1985, Shri V. Sobhanadreeswara Rao, M.P. asked the following Unstarred Question (No.562) regarding Nuclear Power Plant in Andhra Pradesh :

“(a) whether Andhra Pradesh had demanded the setting up of a nuclear power plant in the State;

(b) whether any expert team had visited certain sites in Andhra Pradesh in this connection; and

(c) if so, the findings of the team and the final decision taken by Government in this regard?”

57. The Minister of State for Science and Technology, Atomic Energy, Space, Electronics and Ocean Development (Shri Shivraj V. Patil) gave the following reply:

“(a) Yes, Sir.

(b) Yes, Sir.

(c) The Site Selection Committee has examined the sites in Southern Electricity Region of which Andhra Pradesh is a constituent state. The report of the Committee is under consideration of Government.”

58. The above reply of the Minister was treated as an assurance and was required to be fulfilled by 20 February, 1986. As the Ministry was not in a position to fulfil the assurance within the stipulated period, the Ministry sought repeated extensions of time.

59. On 7 January, 1986, the Department of Atomic Energy approached the Committee through the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs *vide* U.O. No. IV/AE (i) USQ.499&562 LS/85 dated 7 January, 1986 for the dropping of the assurance on the following grounds:

“Site Selection Committee has examined sites in the Southern Electricity Region of which Andhra Pradesh is a constituent State. The report of the Committee is under consideration of the Government.”

60. The Committee at their sitting held on 27 January, 1986

considered the request of the Ministry for the dropping of the assurance and took the following decision:

“The Committee found no cogent reason in the Ministry’s plea to drop the assurance. They were of the view that once an assurance had been given, it became incumbent on the Ministry to implement it as it raised a hope in the minds of not only Members of Parliament but also in the minds of general public that the reply to assurance would be forthcoming.”

61. The above decision of the Committee was conveyed to the Ministry on 15 February, 1986. The assurance, however, remained unfulfilled. On 6.10.1987, the Ministry again requested for extension of time upto 20.12.1987 on the following grounds:

“The collection of the required information is likely to take some more time.”

62. The Committee at their sitting held on 20 October, 1987 considered the request of the Ministry for extension of time and granted extension of time up to 20 December, 1987.

63. The Ministry implemented the assurance only on 7 December, 1988 by laying the following statement on the Table of Lok Sabha:

“There is no proposal to set up an atomic power plant in Andhra Pradesh in near future. However, irrespective of the physical location of the future Atomic power stations in a particular region, it is the intention of the Government to ensure that power from such central power stations will be made available to all the States in the region on an equitable basis.”

Supply of spurious and sub-standard goods to Delhi Transport Corporation

64. On 21 November, 1985, Dr. G. S. Rajhans, M.P. asked the following Starred Question (No. 67) regarding supply of spurious and sub-standard goods to Delhi Transport Corporation:

- “(a) whether the Minister of State in the Department of Surface Transport recently paid surprise visits to the different Delhi Transport Corporation depots in Delhi and found spurious and sub-standard goods;
- (b) if so, what are the spurious and sub-standard goods recovered;

- (c) the names of the companies which supplied these inferior goods to the Delhi Transport Corporation; and
- (d) whether any responsibility has been fixed and the action contemplated by Government against the involved Delhi Transport Corporation officials and companies for such deals ?”

65. The then Minister of Transport (Shri Bansi Lal) gave the following reply :

“(a) & (b) : Yes, Sir. The surprise visit was made to the DTC's Patpar Ganj Depot on 28.10.1985. During the course of inspection cartons containing the soap were opened in the Stores Department and random samples were seen which appeared to be superior. Some spare parts were also seized which were suspected to be sub-standard or spurious.

(c) & (d) : 11 officials of DTC have been suspended. The investigation has been entrusted to CBI and CVO of the Surface Transport Department has been entrusted with detailed enquiries into purchase procedures. Their reports are awaited. Pending investigation and enquiries it will not be in public interest to give any further information.”

66. During the course of supplementaries on the question, Dr. G.S. Rajhans referring to the reply of the Minister that a C.B.I. enquiry had been instituted into certain malpractices noticed in D.T.C. wanted to know by when the C.B.I. enquiry would be completed and whether the House would be informed about it.

67. In reply to the above supplementary, the Minister of Transport (Shri Bansi Lal) gave the following reply :

“We can certainly inform the House if the House wants this information.”

68. The above reply of the Minister was treated as an assurance and was required to be fulfilled by 21 February, 1986. As the Ministry was not in a position to fulfil the assurance within the stipulated period, the Ministry sought repeated extensions of time. On 2.9.1987, the Ministry requested for extension of time upto 20.10.1987 on the following grounds :

“It has not yet been possible to take a final decision in the matter.”

69. The Committee at their sitting held on 20 October, 1987 considered the request of the Ministry for extension of time upto 20 October, 1987 and took the following decision :

“The Committee are not convinced with the reasons advanced by the Ministry to seek extension of time to implement the assurance. The Committee decided to call the representative of the Ministry to explain the position of the assurance.”

70. The Ministry implemented the assurance on 11 December, 1987 by laying the following statement on the Table of Lok Sabha :

"The C.B.I. to whom the matter was referred for investigation have exonerated all the involved officers. Therefore the action taken against them has been revoked."

Supply of spurious and sub-standard goods to Delhi Transport Corporation :

71. On 21 November, 1985, Dr. G.S. Rajhans asked the supply of spurious and sub-standard goods to following Starred Question (No. 67) regarding Delhi Transport Corporation :

- (a) whether the Minister of State in the Department of Surface Transport recently paid surprise visits to the different Delhi Transport Corporation depots in Delhi and found spurious and sub-standard goods;
- (b) if so, what are the spurious and sub-standard goods recovered;
- (c) the names of the companies which supplied these inferior goods to the Delhi Transport Corporation; and
- (d) whether any responsibility has been fixed and the action contemplated by Government against the involved Delhi Transport Corporation officials and companies for such deals ?"

72. The then Minister of Transport (Shri Bansi Lal) gave the following reply :

"(a)&(b) : Yes Sir. The surprise visit was made to the DTC's Patpar Ganj Depot on 28.10.1985. During the course of inspection, cartons containing the soap were opened in the Stores Department and random samples were seen which appeared to be spurious. Some spare parts were also seized which were suspected to be sub-standard or spurious.

(c) & (d) : 11 officials of DTC have been suspended. The investigation has been entrusted to CBI and CVO of the Surface Transport Department has been entrusted with detailed enquiries into purchase procedures. Their reports are awaited. Pending investigation and enquiries, it will not be in public interest to give any further information."

73. During the course of supplementaries on the question Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad referring to the deep rooted corruption in D.T.C. causing hundreds and crores of loss to the country wanted to know how the Government proposed to make up for this loss and what were the measures proposed to be taken apart from the suspension of the officers ?

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

“We have ordered one C.B.I. enquiry, some other measures, which will be recommended after the departmental enquiry will be taken and if necessary he will inform the House about it at a later date.”

75. The above reply of the Minister was treated as an assurance and was required to be fulfilled by 21 February, 1986. As the Ministry was not in a position to fulfil the assurance within the stipulated period, the Ministry sought repeated extensions of time. The last request for extension of time upto 20.10.1987 was on the following grounds :

“It has not yet been possible to take a final decision in the matter.”

76. The Committee at their sitting held on 20 October, 1987 considered the request of the Ministry for extension of time upto 20 October, 1987 and took the following decision :

“The Committee are not convinced with the reasons advanced by the Ministry to seek extension of time to implement the assurance. The Committee decided to call for the representative of the Ministry to explain the position of the case.”

77. The Ministry implemented the assurance on 11 December 1987 by laying the following statement on the Table of the House:

“The CBI to whom the matter was referred for investigation, after completion of the Departmental enquiry, have exonerated the involved officers. As regards the DTC losses it is mentioned that these losses are not due to any alleged corruption but are mainly due to its comparative low fare structure coupled with higher cost of various inputs and grant of concessional/ free travel passes to different categories of commuters like students, freedom fighters, war widows, residents of resettlement colonies. The Corporation have, however, initiated a number of measures like reduction in the staff ratio per bus, reduction in the payment of overtime allowance, improvement in fuel consumption, etc. Besides, the Government have approved on 28.9.87 the capital restructuring of DTC which when implemented is expected to reduce its overall accumulated losses.”

Setting up of Steel Plant at Goa by Indian-born Industrialists

78. On 22 November, 1985, S/Shri H.N. Nanje Gowda and G.S. Basavaraju, M.Ps asked the following Unstarred Question (No. 875) regarding setting up of steel plant at Goa by Indian-born Industrialist :

- “(a) whether any Indian-born industrialist and presently settled in a foreign country, has offered Government to set up a Steel Plant at Goa;
- (b) if so, the details thereof;
- (c) whether government have taken any decision in the matter;
- (d) whether setting up of a steel plant at Goa would adversely affect the steel plants operating in the private sector and public sector in the country; and

(e) if so, the reaction of Government thereto ?”

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

“(a) & (b) : Yes, Sir. An Indian born industrialist based in London has offered to set up a one million tonne capacity steel plant at Goa, based on direct reduction of iron together with electrical steel melting;

(c) to (e) : The proposal received on the subject is under examination.”

80. The above reply of the Minister was treated as an assurance and was required to be fulfilled by 22 February, 1986. As the Ministry was not in a position to fulfil the assurance within the stipulated period, the Ministry sought repeated extensions of time. The last request for extension of time was on the following grounds :

“Fulfilment of this assurance involves a policy matter. It will take some more time to fulfil the assurance.”

81. The Committee at their sitting held on 20 October, 1987 considered the request of the Ministry and granted extension of time up to 22 November, 1987.

82. The Ministry implemented the assurance only on 21 April, 1988 by laying the following statement on the Table of the House :

“(c) The proposal of an Indian-born industrialist, presently settled in a foreign country, does not fall within the parameters of the current guide-lines for licencing for the Steel Industry and has not, therefore, been agreed to.

(d) & (e) : Do not arise.”

Steel Plants at Goa

83. On 22 November, 1985, Shri V.S. Krishna Iyer, M.P. asked the following Unstarred Question (No. 1036) regarding steel plants at Goa :

“(a) whether it is a fact that an Indian born Industrialist based in London has come forward to set up a steel plant at Goa using latest technology ;

(b) if so, the action taken to set up the above steel plant at Goa; and

(c) since Goa is having iron ore which is at present being exported, whether the steel plant would be set up immediately to save foreign exchange by using the available iron at Goa?”

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

“(a) Yes, Sir.

(b) & (c) : The proposal is under examination.”

85. The above reply of the Minister was treated as an assurance and was required to be fulfilled by 22 February, 1986. As the Ministry was not in a position to fulfil the assurance within the stipulated period, the Ministry sought repeated extensions of time. The last request for extension of time was on the following grounds :

“The required policy decisions have not been taken by the Government so far. It will take some more time.”

86. The Committee at their sitting held on 20 October, 1987 considered the request of the Ministry and granted extension of time upto 22 November, 1987.

87. The Ministry implemented the assurance only on 21 April, 1988 by laying the following statement on the Table of the House :

“The proposal of Indian-born industrialist based in London does not fall within the parameters of the current guidelines for licencing for the steel Industry and has not, therefore, been agreed to.”

(VIII)

Setting up of Energy Development Council

88. On 3 December, 1985, Sarvashri B.V. Desai and P.M. Sayeed, M.Ps. asked the following Unstarred Question (No. 2293) regarding setting up of Energy Development Council :

- “(a) whether Government have decided to set up an Energy Development Council to advice the administration about generation and distribution of power;
- (b) if so, the main functions of the Council;
- (c) the names of its members and whether any representation has been given to the State Governments in this Council;
- (d) if so, the details thereof;
- (e) the extent to which formation of the Council would help in better administration between the States and the Centre in regard to power distribution ?”

89. The then Minister of State for Power (Shri Arif Mohammad Khan) gave the following reply :

“(a) to (e) : The composition and functions etc. of the proposed Energy Development Council are under consideration.”

90. The above reply of the Minister was treated as an assurance and was required to be fulfilled by 3 March, 1986. As the Ministry was not in a position to fulfil the assurance within the stipulated period, the Ministry sought repeated extensions of time. The last request for extension of time was on the following grounds :

“The procedural formalities for constituting the proposed Energy Development Council have not yet been completed.”

91. The Committee at their sitting held on 20 October, 1987 considered the request of the Ministry and granted extension of time up to 3 December, 1987. The Ministry sought further extension of time up to 3 March, 1988.

92. The Ministry implemented the assurance on 2 March, 1988 by laying the following statement on the Table of Lok Sabha :

“The Government has decided not to set up the proposed Energy Development Council.”

(IX)

Proposal for engine project by B.E.M.L.

93. On 4 December, 1985, Kumari Pushpa Devi, M.P. asked the following Unstarred Question (No. 2404) regarding proposal for engine project by B.E.M.L.

- “(a) whether Government have received a proposal from Bharat Earth Movers Ltd. for starting manufacture of internal combustion engines ;
- (b) if so, whether Government have approved such project;
- (c) if not, the reasons therefor;
- (d) the proposed location and expenditure to be incurred on that project; and
- (e) the time by which basic infrastructure will be made available for the proposed project ?”

94. The Minister of State in the Ministry of Defence (Shri Sukh Ram) gave the following reply :

- “(a) Yes, Sir.
- (b) & (c) : The matter is in an advanced stage of consideration in Government.
- (d) the estimated investment for the project is Rs. 30.06 crores and location is yet to be finalised:
- (e) Basic infrastructure is already available with BEML.”

95. The above reply of the Minister was treated as an assurance and was required to be implemented by 4 March, 1986. As the Ministry was not in a position to fulfil the assurance within the stipulated period, the Ministry sought repeated extensions of time to fulfil it. The last request for extension of time was on the following grounds :-

“Bharat Earth Movers Limited’s proposal to manufacture diesel engines for their earth moving equipment is still under consideration of the Government. In this connection, Raksha Mantri desires to discuss certain issues with the Minister of Industry and Member (A), Planning Commission, before putting up the case for decision of the Cabinet Committee on Economic Affairs. The whole process, as such, is likely to take some more time.”

96. The Committee at their sitting held on 20 October, 1987 considered the request of the Ministry and granted extension of time up to 4 November, 1987.

97. The Ministry implemented the assurance only on 5 August, 1988 by laying the following statement on the Table of the Lok Sabha :

“The Government has approved the proposal from BEML for investment of Rs. 30.06 crores for the setting up of engine manufacturing facilities at the company’s land in Mysore.”

(X)

Letters of credit for import of TPA by Reliance Textile Industries

98. On 6 December, 1985, Shri S. Jaipal Reddy, M.P. asked the following Unstarred Question (No. 2989) regarding letters of credit for import of TPA by Reliance Textile Industries :

“(a) whether it is a fact that various banks in India had opened letters of credit totalling Rs. 110 crores for import of TPA by Reliance Textile Industries in the last week of May, 1985; and

(b) if so, whether some banks have been found guilty of violating lancing norms and banking practices ?”

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

“(a) In accordance with the provisions of the statutes governing the nationalised banks and in accordance with the practices and usages customary among bankers, the information relating to or the affairs of individual constituents of the banks cannot be divulged.

(b) the Reserve Bank of India and the CBI are seized of the matter.”

100. The above reply of the Minister was treated as an assurance and was required to be fulfilled by 6 March, 1986. As the Ministry was not in a position to fulfil the assurance within the stipulated period, the Ministry sought repeated extensions of time. The last request for extension of time was on the following grounds :

“Since CBI is still to take action as requested under Section 173 Cr. P.C., the assurance cannot be fulfilled by 31.8.1987.”

101. The Commission at their sitting hold on 20 October, 1987 considered the request of the Ministry and granted extension of time upto 30.11.1987 as asked for by the Ministry. But they were not satisfied with the as sketchy grounds of seeking extension of time..... Even the names of the books involved in the matter had not been mentioned. The Committee desired that a detailed note be submitted for the information of the Committee.

102. The Ministry implemented the assurance on 4 November, 1988 by laying the following statement on the Table of the House :

“The allegation regarding leakage of contemplated change in the import policy was not substantiated during investigation by CBI. As regards the alleged irregularities in the opening of letters of credit by some banks in Bombay, the investigation report of the CBI has been examined in consultation with the Reserve Bank of India and it has not been found to be a fit case for action under the Foreign Exchange Regulation Act.”

(XI)

High prices of KLOX, Lyramycin and Erythocin

103. On 10 December, 1985, Shri Vilas Muttemwar, M.P. asked the following Unstarred Question (No. 3339) regarding high prices of KLOX, Lyramycin, and Erythocin :

- “(a) whether it is fact that the prices of Klox capsules, Lyramycin capsules, Etracin tablets and Erthocin capsules and grannules are very high;
- (b) what are the prices fixed by his Ministry and at what price each is being sold;
- (c) whether it is a fact that certain companies have not got price approval and are overcharging the consumers for the last so many years; and
- (d) if so, what steps have been taken by his Ministry in this regard ?”

104. The then Minister of State for Chemicals and Petro-chemicals in the Ministry of Industry (Shri R.K. Jaichandra Singh) gave the following reply :

“(a) to (d) : Government have not come across products under the name of Lyramycin Capsules and Erythocin Capsules and Grannules. In regard to the remaining products information is being collected and would be laid on the Table of the Lok Sabha.”

105. The above reply of the Minister was treated as an assurance and was required to be fulfilled by 10 March, 1986. As the Ministry was not in a position to fulfill the assurance within the stipulated period, the Ministry sought repeated extensions of time.

106. The last request for extension of time was on the following grounds :

“Implementation Report fulfilling the assurance is being sent separately. Hindi Translation etc. thereof is likely to take some more time.”

107. The Committee at their sitting held on 20 October, 1987 considered the request of the Ministry and granted extension of time upto 10 October, 1987 and desired that the Ministry should lay the implementation Report as early as possible.

108. The Ministry implemented the assurance on 12 November, 1987 by laying the following statement on the Table of Lok Sabha :-

“The new drugs (prices control) Order, 1987 has since been announced by the Government on 26.8.1987 and prices of all the products covered by the provisions thereof will be fixed in due course.”

(XII)

Setting up of manpower corporations for employment opportunities abroad

109. On 16 December, 1985, S/Shri Yashwantrao Gadakh Patil and T. Basheer, M.Ps. asked the following Starred Question (No. 391) regarding setting up of manpower corporations for employment opportunities abroad :

- “(a) whether Union Government have advised the State Governments to set up Manpower Corporations to utilise the employment opportunities abroad and to protect the interests of workers;
- (b) whether necessary action has been taken by all the States; and
- (c) the steps taken to minimise cases of frauds and cheating by unscrupulous recruiting agents and delays in clearance of workers going abroad ?”

110. The then Minister of State in the Ministry of Labour (Shri T. Anjiah) laid the following statement on the Table of Lok Sabha :

“The Central Government had advised the State Governments of Karnataka, Gujarat, West Bengal, Bihar, Madhya Pradesh, Uttar Pradesh, Punjab and Union Territories of Delhi and Goa, Daman and Diu to establish manpower Corporations for protecting the interests of workers and utilisation of employment opportunities abroad. Replies have been received from the Union Territories of Delhi and Goa, Daman and Diu and the State Governments of Gujarat and Uttar Pradesh. The Uttar Pradesh Government have now set up a manpower corporation. Delhi Administration has decided to set up a corporation for this purpose while Gujarat, Punjab and Goa, Daman and Diu are examining the feasibility of setting up manpower corporations. Replies from other State Governments are still awaited. Overseas Manpower corporation are already in existence in Maharashtra, Andhra Pradesh, Orissa, Kerala and Tamil Nadu.

In order to minimise cases of cheating and fraud by unscrupulous recruiting agents, prosecution is launched against such recruiting agents

against whom charges of committing fraud/cheating are established. Registration Certificates of agents are also suspended/cancelled whenever necessary, where prime facie cases of irregularities committed by them are reported and substantiated. A number of steps have been initiated to simplify the procedures of granting clearance of workers going abroad by combining permission for recruitment and registration of their passports into one file. The staff for processing documents for emigration clearance has been augmented. Emigration clearance is now given in a short span of 3 days."

111. During the course of supplementaries on the question, Shri Indrajit Gupta wanted to know the role assigned to our embassies and consulates in protecting the Indians working abroad.

112. In reply to the above supplementary, the Minister of State in the Ministry of Labour (Shri T. Anjiah) gave the following reply :

"After examining the whole question whatever more action or rules are needed for future, I will bring before the House ?

113. The above reply of the Minister was treated as an assurance and was required to be fulfilled by 16 March, 1986. As the Ministry was not in a position to fulfil the assurance within the stipulated period the Ministry sought repeated extensions of time. The last request for extension of time was on the following grounds :

"The fulfilment of the assurance is likely to take some more time."

114. The Committee at their sitting held on 20 October, 1987 considered the request of the Ministry and granted extension of time upto 16 October, 1987.

115. The Ministry implemented the assurance only on 21 April, 1988 by laying the following statement on the Table of the House :

"In order to prevent exploitation of emigrant workers and to protect their interests following measures have been taken :-

- (i) Emigration Rules, 1983 have been amended and laid on the Table of the House on 9.3.1987. The emigration procedures have been simplified so that emigration clearance is granted across the country.
- (ii) A bilateral Labour Agreement has been signed with the State of Qatar and initialled with Jordan.
- (iii) State-owned Manpower Corporations have been set up in Maharashtra, Kerala, Tamil Nadu, Andhra Pradesh, U.P., Delhi, Punjab and Orissa and emigrant workers generally originate from these States and go out for employment.
- (iv) First Secretaries/Counsellors have been appointed in India Missions in major labour-importing countries to look into the problems of Indian workers.

- (v) Adhesive stamps have been introduced to prevent forgery and illegal emigration.
- (vi) A revised accounting procedure has been introduced from 14.9.1987 to facilitate quick refund of security deposit.
- (vii) Computerised services have been introduced in the office of Projectors of Emigrants in Delhi and Bombay."

(XIII)

Merger of Engineering projects (India) Ltd. with some other Public Undertaking

116. On 17 December, 1985, Shri Anadi Charan Das, M.P. asked the following Unstarred Question (No. 4288) regarding merger of engineering projects (India) Ltd. with some other public undertaking :

- "(a) whether Government are considering any proposal for merging the Engineering Projects India Ltd. with some other public undertaking ; and
- (b) if so, the details thereof ?"

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

"(a) & (b) : Details of certain proposals for restructuring of Engineering Projects India Ltd., are being worked out."

118. The above reply of the Minister was treated as an assurance and was required to be fulfilled by 17 March, 1986.

119. On 9 April, 1986, the Ministry of Industry approached the Committee through the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs *vide* their U.O. Note No. IV/Ind (29)-USQ-4288-LS/85 dated 9 April, 1985 for the dropping of the assurance on the following grounds :-

"In the answer to the question referred to above, this Department had given the factual position in the matter. However the various implications of restructuring of Engineering Projects (India) Ltd. are being worked out and it is difficult to indicate either the nature of restructuring that may be finally come about nor the time frame by which a decision will be taken in the matter of restructuring. EPI has large contracts and dealings with banks both in India and abroad. Any premature disclosure of the proposed restructuring of the company may jeopardise the interests of the Government company vis-a-vis the clients, banks and collaborators.

In view of the above, the Department of Public Enterprises requests that the reply given in respect of the above question may please be not treated as an assurance."

120. The Committee at their sitting held on 19 June, 1986 considered the request of the Ministry for dropping of the assurance and made the following recommendations in their Seventh report presented on 26 March, 1987.

"In the opinion of the Committee, the request of the Ministry for dropping of the assurance is supported by a vague and omnibus argument of secretiveness. The Committee feel that after having given an indication that some scheme of restructuring of the Company was under consideration, Government could have shared at least some more information about the lines on which the proposal was being worked out, if not the minute details of the scheme. Sharing of information with the Parliament on such a vital matter is bound to serve national interest better as it would provide opportunities to the Members to offer their views and comments for consideration of Government. In case the Ministry wanted a little more time to come out with the requisite information they could request for extension of time, a suggestion made by the Committee on several occasions in the past. The assurance should be implemented expeditiously and the Ministry should seek permission of the Committee for extension of time as may be considered minimum for the purpose."

121. The Committee at their sitting held on 20 October, 1987 considered the request of the Ministry and granted extension of time upto 31 December, 1987.

122. The Ministry implemented the assurance only on 5 August, 1988 by laying the following statement on the Table of the House :

"The question of future of Engineering projects (India) has been under consideration of the Government. After considering various alternatives for restructuring, has been decided not to merge it with any other public sector undertaking. It has also since been decided that EPI would be allowed to continue its operations till March, 1989 after which the position would be reviewed."

(XIV)

Constitution of development board in Maharashtra

123. On 26 February, 1986, Shri Banwari Lal Purohit, M.P. asked the following Starred Question (No. 49) regarding constitution of development board in Maharashtra :

- “(a) whether the Union Government have taken any decision on the constitution of Development Boards in Maharashtra State as already agreed under article 371 (2) of the Constitution and Nagpur Agreement;
- (b) if so, the details thereof; and
- (c) if not, the reasons for delay in taking final decision by the Union Government ?”

124. The Minister of Home Affairs (Shri S.B. Chavan) gave the following reply :

- “(a) Not Yet, Sir.
- (b) Does not arise.

- (c) The draft scheme received from the Government of Maharashtra for establishment of regional Development Boards in the State under article 371 (2) of the Constitution is under consideration."

125. The above reply of the Minister was treated as an assurance and was required to be fulfilled by 26 May, 1986. As the Ministry was not in a position to fulfil the assurance within the stipulated period, the Ministry sought repeated extensions of time. The last request for extension of time was on the following grounds :

"The matter relating to the establishment of Development Boards in Maharashtra under Article 371 (2) of the Constitution is still under consideration in consultation with Government of Maharashtra."

126. The Committee at their sitting held on 20 October, 1987 considered the request of the Ministry and granted extension of time upto 26 November, 1987.

127. The Ministry implemented the assurance on 11 December, 1987 by laying the following statement on the Table of Lok Sabha.

"The draft scheme received from the Government of Maharashtra for establishment of a Development Board each for Vidharbha, Marathwada and the rest of Maharashtra through a Presidential Order under article 371 (2) of the Constitution was not found to conform to the requirements of the Constitutional provision and therefore, the matter has been taken up with the State Government. Keeping in view the legal position that any scheme for operating the provisions of article 371 (2) will inevitably involve the discharge of special responsibility of the Governor of the State in his discretion and to that extent will militate against the democratic set-up, the State Government are reconsidering the whole matter. In this situation, the question of issuing a Presidential Order at present under the said Constitutional provision does not arise."

(XV)

Social forestry programmes

128. On 26 February, 1986, Shrimati Jayanti Patnaik, M.P. asked the following Unstarred Question (No. 518) regarding social forestry programmes :

- "(a) whether Government have prepared a massive programme and included it in the Seventh Five Year Plan to increase areas under Social forestry;
- (b) if so, the additional areas in Orissa and other States to be covered under social forestry in the above plan period; and
- (c) the amount earmarked to implement such social forestry programmes in different States during that plan period ?"

129. The Minister of State in the Ministry of Environment and Forests (Shri Z.R. Ansari) gave the following reply :

“(a) Yes, Sir.

(b) & (c) : A statement indicating the afforestation targets for various States/Union Territories for 1985-86 is annexed, the details of amount earmarked in different States to implement the social forestry programme during the 7th Five Year Plan period are being collected and would be laid on the Table of the House, along with the area targets for the remaining years of the Plan period.”

130. The above reply of the Minister was treated as an assurance was required to be fulfilled by 26 May, 1986. As the Ministry was not in a position to fulfil the assurance within the stipulated period, the Ministry sought repeated extensions of time. The last request for extension of time was on the following grounds :

“The information required for fulfilment of the assurance is still awaited from the Government of Tamil Nadu, West Bengal and Sikkim. Efforts to collect the information are continuing.”

131. The Committee at their sitting held on 20 October, 1987 considered the request of the Ministry and took the following decision :—

“The Committee desired that the Ministry should implement the assurance in batches and submit request for extension of time in respect of unimplemented portion.”

132. The Ministry implemented the assurance on 11 December, 1987 by laying the statement giving the required information on the Table of Lok Sabha.

(XVI)

Royalty on minerals outstanding against Government of India undertakings in Madhya Pradesh :

133. On 10 March, 1986, Shri Pratap Bhanu Sharma, M.P. asked the following Unstarred Question (No. 2070) regarding royalty on minerals outstanding against Government of India undertakings in Madhya Pradesh :

“(a) the amount of royalty on minerals outstanding against Government of India undertakings in Madhya Pradesh; and

(b) the action being taken by Union Government to ensure the payment of the outstanding amount ?”

134. The Minister of State for Mines (Shrimati Ram Dulari Sinha) gave the following reply :

“(a) & (b) : The information is being collected and will be laid on the Table of the House.”

135. The above reply of the Minister was treated as an assurance and was required to be fulfilled by 10 June, 1986. As the Ministry was not in a

position to fulfil the assurance within the stipulated period, the Ministry sought repeated extensions of time. The last request for extension of time was on the following grounds :

“The information is still awaited from the State Government of Madhya Pradesh. It is likely to take some more time.”

136. The Committee at their sitting held on 20 October, 1987 considered the request of the Ministry and granted extension of time upto 10 November, 1987.

137. The Ministry implemented the assurance only on 2 March, 1980 by laying the following statement on the Table of Lok Sabha :

“According to the Government of Madhya Pradesh an amount of Rs. 2062.60 remains outstanding against M/s Central Coal fields Limited in the district of Sarguja in Madhya Pradesh, the Deputy mining Engineer of Bhatgawan, district Sarguja has informed the State Government that the outstanding amount will be paid shortly.”

(XVII)

Price fixed for Gold produced by Kolar Gold field Mines

138. On 10 March, 1986, Shri V.S. Krishna Iyer, M.P. asked the following Unstarred Question (No. 2140) regarding price fixed for gold produced by Kolar Gold field mines :

- “(a) the price formula fixed for gold produced by Kolar Gold Field Mines Karnataka; and
- (b) whether Government propose to fix the KGF gold price at open market price ?”

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

- “(a) The entire gold produced by the Company is made over to the Government at the International Monetary Fund rate at Rs. 84.40 per 10 gms. In addition the Government is reimbursing by way of Price Differential the difference between the IMF price and the price equivalent to average LME price of the preceding month plus 35% of that price or the average Indian Market price of the preceding month, whichever is less.
- (b) this is under consideration.”

140. The above reply of the Minister was treated as an assurance and was required to be fulfilled by 10 June, 1986. As the Ministry was not in a position to fulfill the assurance within the stipulated period, the Ministry sought repeated extensions of time. The last request for extension of time was on the following grounds :

“The matter relating to the sale of Gold by Bharat Gold Mines Limited is still under examination in consultation with other departments/ Ministries. This being a policy issue, it would inevitably take some more time to be finalised.”

141. The Committee at their sitting held on 20 October, 1987 considered the request of the Ministry to grant extension of time upto 10 March, 1988 and took the following decision.

“The Committee had granted extension of time upto 10 March, 1988 as asked for by the Ministry. The Committee desired that the Ministry should furnish a note giving details of progress made since the assurance was given.”

142. The decision of the Committee was conveyed to the Ministry on 30 July, 1988.

143. The Ministry implemented the assurance only on 5 September, 1988 by laying the following statement on the Table of House :

“The Kolar Gold field mines are being operated by Bharat Gold Mines Ltd. The Government have since decided to permit BGML to sell its Gold in the open domestic market observing the procedure prescribed by the Gold Control Administrator. Necessary notification to this effect has been issued by the Gold Control Administrator *vide* Ministry of Finance (Department of Revenue) Notification No. S.O. 550 (E) dated 8th June, 1988.”

(XVIII)

Accidents in Collieries/Mines and compensation paid to the victims

144. On 10 March, 1986, Shri Kali Prasad Pandey, M.P. asked the following Unstarred Question (No. 2168) regarding accidents in collieries/mines and compensation paid to the victims :

- “(a) the number of minor/major accidents in various collieries in the country during 1984-85 and 1985-86 in which inquiries were conducted and completed/still pending, State-wise and mines-wise, and the number of the injured and the deceased persons whose dependents have been provided financial assistance and social security; and
- (b) the number of the cases of major accidents occurred inside the collieries in which inquiries have been completed as also the number of those cases still pending ?”

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

“(a) & (b) : Information is being collected and will be laid on the Table of the House.”

146. The above reply of the Minister was treated as an assurance and was required to be fulfilled by 10 June, 1986. As the Ministry was not in a position to fulfil the assurance within the stipulated period, the Ministry sought repeated extensions of time. The last request for extension of time was on the following grounds :

“The requisite information is being collected from the Director General of Mines safety; Dhanbad. The matter is being pursued with them.”

147. The Committee at their sitting held on 20 October, 1987 considered the request of the Ministry and granted extension of time upto 10 November, 1987.

148. The Ministry have implemented the assurance on 21 April, 1988 by laying the desired information on the Table of the House.

(XIX)

Setting up of Environmental Courts

149. On 12 March, 1986, S/Shri Sarfaraz Ahmed and M. Raghuma Reddy, M.Ps. asked the following Starred Question (No. 260) regarding setting up of Environmental Courts :—

- (a) whether there is any proposal under the consideration of Government for setting up of environmental courts on regional basis in view of growing litigation over environmental pollution;
- (b) if so, the details thereof; and
- (c) the time by which such courts are likely to be set up ?”

150. The Prime Minister (Shri Rajiv Gandhi) gave the following reply :—

- (a), (b) & (c) : In a recent judgement, Supreme Court suggested that since cases involving issues of environmental pollution, ecological destruction and conflicts over natural resources are increasingly coming up for adjudication and as these cases involve assessment and evaluation of scientific and technical data, it might be desirable to set up Environmental Courts on regional basis with one professional judge and two experts drawn from the Ecological Sciences Research Group keeping in view the nature of the cases and the expertise required for its adjudication. This suggestion is under examination.”

151. The above reply of Prime Minister was treated as an assurance and was required to be fulfilled by 12 June, 1986. As the Ministry was not in a position to fulfil the assurance within the stipulated period, the Ministry sought repeated extensions of time. The last request for extension of time was on the following grounds :

“The question of setting up of Environmental Courts in the country is under the consideration of the Government and it is likely to take more time to fulfil the assurance.”

152. The Committee at their sitting held on 20 October, 1987 considered the request of the Ministry and granted extension of time upto 11 December, 1987.

153. The Ministry implemented the assurance only on 2 March, 1988 by laying the following statement on the Table of Lok Sabha :—

"The suggestion has been examined by the Government in consultation with concerned Central Departments including the Ministry of Law and Justice and the State Departments of Environment, the Central Pollution Control Board and the State Pollution.

Keeping in view the quantum of environmental litigation presently before the courts in the country, the existing legal provisions in the Code of Criminal Procedure which enable setting up of special courts by a State Government to try cases under the environmental Acts and other factors related to the issue, Government has come to the conclusion that there is no need to establish environment court at present."

(XX)

Import of TV Components

154. On 19 March, 1986, Shri Amar Singh Rathawa, M.P. addressed the following Unstarred Question (No. 3383) regarding import of TV components:-

- “(a) whether it is a fact that high quality components for the TV are being imported;
- (b) if so, whether any foreign company has offered its services to establish its unit in India to manufacture such components in India; if so, the details thereof and the action taken by the Government; and
- (c) what is the Government policy in regard to establish such units in India which manufacture high quality components ?”

155. The Minister of State in the Ministry of Science and Technology and Departments of Atomic Energy, Electronics, Ocean Development and Space (Shri Shivraj V. Patil) gave the following reply :—

- “(a) In the area of consumer electronics the import of components is taking place, primarily, for the manufacture of colour TV sets.
- (b) A foreign collaboration proposal has been received from M/s. Andhra Pradesh Electronics Development Corporation Limited for the setting up of a colour picture tube plant with M/s. Philips, Holland. The proposal involves majority foreign equity participation and is under consideration of the Government.
- (c) The Integrated Policy statement laid on the Table of the House on March 21, 1985 allows foreign equity companies to establish projects in the area of electronic components where the technology is closely held.”

156. The above reply of the Minister was treated as an assurance and was required to be fulfilled by 19 June, 1986. As the Ministry was not in a position to fulfil the assurance within the stipulated period, the Ministry

sought repeated extensions of time. On 24 September, 1987, the Ministry made a request for extension of time upto 30 November, 1987 was on the following grounds :—

“The proposal referred to in reply to part (b) of the question is still under the consideration of the Government”.

157. The Committee at their sitting held on 20 October, 1987 considered the request of the Ministry and granted extension of time upto 30 November, 1987. The decision of the Committee was conveyed to the Ministry on 30 July, 1988.

158. The Ministry has implemented the assurance only on 28 February, 1989 by laying the following statement on the Table of Lok Sabha :

“Foreign collaboration application of M/s. APEDC with M/s. Philips, Holland for manufacture of colour TV picture Tubes has not been accepted”.

(XXI)

Proposal of Orissa to place a land reform Act in Ninth Schedule

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

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

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

160. The Minister of Agriculture (Shri Buta Singh) gave the following reply :—

“(a) Yes, Sir.

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

161. 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 it by 24 June, 1986. As the assurance remained unfulfilled and Ministry sought extensions of time to fulfil it. The last request for extension of time upto 24 June, 1988 was on the following grounds :

“Orissa Government’s proposal alongwith proposals from other States were referred to Law Ministry for their advice. That Ministry agreed

to include the Orissa's proposal in the Ninth Schedule to the Constitution. Regarding some of the proposals from other states, certain objections were raised by law Ministry. Concerned States were requested to furnish clarification on the observations of Law Ministry along with justification and materials. The requisite information is still awaited from some States. It has also been proposed to hold a meeting with the officials of the States concerned to finalise the laws to be included in the Ninth Schedule of the Constitution. When it is finally decided as to which of the laws are to be included, the matter will be submitted to the Cabinet. After its approval, the matter will again be referred to Law Ministry for drafting the Bill. Thereafter, this Constitutional amendment Bill will be presented in the Parliament by the Minister of Law."

162. The Committee at their sitting held on 20 October, 1987 considered the request of the Ministry and took the following decision :

"Committee are not satisfied with the reasons seeking extension of time. The Ministry should submit a detailed note showing the progress made so far to implement the assurance. They hope that the Ministry should be able to fulfil the assurance by the second week of February, 1988".

163. Subsequently, the Ministry sought extension of time upto 24 December, 1988. The Ministry of Agriculture instead of fulfilling it requested on 21 October, 1988, through the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs *vide* their U.O. Note No. V/Agri. (52) USQ. 3970-LS/86 dated 21 October, 1988 for the dropping of the assurance on the following grounds :

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

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

165. The Ministry implemented the assurance on 28 February, 1989 by laying the following statement on the Table of the Lok Sabha :

"The State Government have since withdrawn the proposal and therefore, no further action to be taken in the matter."

APPENDIX III

(Vide Para No. 5 of the Report)

(i) Statement showing the position of the assurances of Seventh Lok Sabha pending implementation as on 28 February, 1989

Session	No. of Assurances culled out	No. of Assurances Implemented/ dropped	No. of Assurance 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	373	1
Seventh Session, 1981	418	418	—
Eight Session, 1982	798	798	—
Ninth Session, 1982	429	429	—
Tenth Session, 1982	315	315	—
Eleventh Session, 1983	861	861	—
Twelfth Session, 1983	433	433	—
Thirteenth Session, 1983	424	424	—
Fourteenth Session, 1984	956	956	5
Fifteenth Session, 1984	328	328	2
Total Assurances Outstanding	7231	7223	8

(ii) Statement showing the position of pending assurances of Eight Lok Sabha pending implementation as on 28.2.1989.

Session	No. of assurances culled out	No. of assurances implemented/dropped	No. of assurances outstanding
1st Session, 1985	19	19	—
2nd Session, 1985	430	429	1
3rd Session, 1985	323	321	2
4th Session, 1985	358	351	7
5th Session, 1986	783	758	25
6th Session, 1986	479	455	24
7th Session, 1986	431	406	25
8th Session, 1987	783	730	53
8th (Part-II) Session, 1987	586	476	110
9th Session, 1987	781	559	222
10th Session, 1988	1196	761	435
11th Session, 1988	576	249	327
12th Session, 1988	530	55	475
	7275	5569	1706

MINUTES

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

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

PRESENT

Prof. Narain Chand Prashar—Chairman

MEMBERS

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

SECRETARIAT

1. **Shri C.K. Jain—Chief (Questions)**
2. **Shri Raghubir Singh—Senior Examiner of Questions**
2. **The Committee took up for consideration Memoranda Nos. 104, 105, 106 and 107.**

Memoranda Nos. 106 & 107 : Review of pending assurances pertaining to Fourth and Fifth Sessions of Eighth Lok Sabha.

5. The Committee considered 29 pending assurances given during the Fourth and Fifth Sessions of Eighth Lok Sabha by various Ministries in reply to questions as given in the Annexures I and II.

5.1 The observations of the Committee in respect of the above mentioned assurances are given below :

<i>Question No. & Date</i>	<i>Observation</i>
(i) USQ. No. 499 and 562 dated 20.11.85	Extension upto 20.10.1987 and 20.12.1987 respectively granted by the Committee. The Committee noted that the Department of Atomic Energy had sought four extensions to implement these two assurances only on one single ground that the collection of the required information was likely to take some time. The Department had not given the detailed reasons for seeking extension to enable the Committee to assess the progress made so far. The Committee were not happy to know the reasons for seeking the extension. The Committee took the serious view on the manner the assurances were being dealt with. A detailed note giving the reasons for not implementing the assurance might be submitted for the consideration of the Committee.
(ii) USQ. No. 2404 dt. 4.12.1985	The Committee had granted extension of time upto the period asked for each assurances by the various Ministries. But they desired that the assurances should be implemented by that period.
USQ. No. 2263 dated 19.11.1985	
USQ. No. 2293 dated 3.12.1985	
USQ. No. 4288 dated 17.12.1985	
USQ. No. 4325 dated 17.12.1985	
USQ. No. 4336 dated 17.12.1985	
USQ. No. 875 dated 22.11.1985	
General Discussion on 29.11.1985 regarding Third and Fourth Reports of Commission for SC/ST	

USQ. No. 2464
dated 4.12.1985

USQ. No. 3383
dated 19.3.1986

SQ. No. 260
dated 12.3.1986

USQ. No. 2445
dated 12.3.1986

SQ. No. 49
dated 26.2.1986

USQ. No. 282
dated 25.2.1986

USQ. No. 2168
dated 10.3.1986

USQ. No. 2070
dated 10.3.1986

USQ. No. 444
dated 26.2.1986

- (iii) USQ. No. 2989
dated 6.12.1985
- The Committee had granted extension of time upto 30.11.1987 as asked for by the Ministry. But they were not satisfied with sketchy ground of seeking extension of time... Even the names of the banks involved in the matter had not been mentioned. The Committee desired a detailed note be submitted for the information of the Committee.
- (iv) USQ. 428
dated 19.11.1985
- The Committee were not satisfied with reasons for seeking extension. A detailed note giving the progress made since the assurance was given and thereafter the Committee would like to hear the views of the representative of the Ministry.
- (v) USQ. No. 3339
dated 10.12.1985
- The Committee had granted extension upto 10.10.1987 and the Ministry should lay the implementation report as early as possible.
- (vi) SQ. No. 391
dated 16.12.1985
(Supplementary
by Shri Indrajit
Gupta)
- The Committee had noted that the assurance was given as long back as 16.12.1985 but the Ministry had not been able to fulfil the assurance far. The Ministry had not even cared to give detailed reasons for seeking the extension. The Committee were not convinced with the reasons for seeking the extension and decided to call the representative of the Ministry before them to explain the reasons for non-implementation of the assurance.

- (vii) SQ. No. 67 dated 21.11.1985 supplementary by Dr. G. S. Rajhans. The Committee are not convinced with the reasons advanced by the Ministry to seek extension of time to implement the assurance.
- ... SQ. No. 67 dated 21.11.85 supplementary by Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad The Committee decided to call for the representative of the Ministry to explain the assurance.
- (viii) USQ. No. 3970 dated 24.3.1986 Committee are not satisfied with the reasons seeking extension of time. The Ministry should submit a detailed note showing the progress made so far to implement the assurance. They hope that the Ministry should be able to fulfil the assurance by the second week of February, 1988.
- (ix) USQ. No. 518 dated 26.2.1986 The Committee desired that the Ministry should implement the assurance in batches and submit request for extension of time in respect of unimplemented portion.
- (x) USQ. No. 2140 dated 10.3.1986 The Committee had granted extension of time upto 10.3.1988 as asked for by the Ministry. The Committee desired that the Ministry should furnish a note giving details of progress made since the assurance was given.

6. The Committee then adjourned.

MINUTES

(FIFTEENTH SITTING)

The Minutes of the Sitting of the Committee on Government Assurances held on 8 May, 1989 in Committee Room No. 53, Parliament House, New Delhi.

The Committee met on Monday, 8 May, 1989 from 16.00 hours to 17.00 hours.

PRESENT

Prof. Narain Chand Parashar—*Chairman*

MEMBERS

2. **Shri L. Balaraman**
3. **Dr. A.K. Patel**
4. **Shri Bhola Raut**
5. **Shri Manik Reddy**

SECRETARIAT

1. **Shri C.K. Jain—*Joint Secretary***
2. **Shri S.C. Gupta—*Deputy Secretary***

2. The Committee considered and adopted the draft Seventeenth and Eighteenth Reports. They authorised the Chairman to present them in the current session of Lok Sabha.

3. The Committee then adjourned.
