

**COMMITTEE
ON
GOVERNMENT ASSURANCES
(1988-89)**

(EIGHTH LOK SABHA)

THIRTEENTH REPORT

(Presented on 31 August, 1988)



**LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT
NEW DELHI**

30 August, 1988/8 Bhadra, 1910 (Saka)

Price : Rs. 2.00

272A

CORRIGENDA

THIRTEENTH REPORT

- Page 1, para 2, line 3: after 'assurances' delete ','
- Page 4, line 17: after 'association' delete 'and
association'
- Page 5, para 14, line 14: after 'and the' insert 'House'
- Page 9, para 26, lines 1-2: for 'assurances'
read 'assurance'
- Page 9, para 26, line 8: after 'passed on' insert 'to'
- Page 10, line 24; for 'final' read 'final'
- Page 12, para 35, line 4: for 'assurances' read 'assurance'
- Page 19, para 53(b), line 2: after 'bring' insert 'to'
- Page 19, para 54, line 1: for 'I.A.' read 'P.A.'
- Page 19, para 56, for "letter's" read "latter's"
- Page 21, para 63, line 3: for 'VII/J' read 'VII/LJ'
- Page 23, para 70, line 29: after 'Shipping' insert ','

CONTENTS

	PAGE
COMPOSITION OF THE COMMITTEE	(iii)
INTRODUCTION	(v)
CHAPTER I	
Review of pending assurances of Seventh and Eighth Lok Sabha	1
CHAPTER II	
Requests for dropping of assurances	2
CHAPTER III	
Position of pending assurances pertaining to Seventh and Eighth Lok Sabha	25

MINUTES

Minutes of First sitting of the Committee (1987-88) held on 24 June, 1987	26
Minutes of Second sitting of the Committee (1987-88) held on 25 June, 1987	34
Minutes of Second sitting of the Committee (1988-89) held on 29 August, 1988	40

APPENDICES

Statements showing the position of assurances pertaining to Seventh and Eighth Lok Sabha pending implementation by the Government as on 5 August, 1988.	42
---	----

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—*Director-in-charge*
2. Shri S. C. Gupta—*Deputy Secretary*
3. Shri Raghubir Singh—*Senior Examiner of Questions*

*The Committee was nominated by the Speaker w.o.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 Thirteenth Report of the Committee on Government Assurances.

2. The Committee (1988-89) were constituted w.e.f. 20 June, 1988 vide para No. 2318 of Lok Sabha Bulletin Part-II dated 22 June, 1988.

3. The Committee (1987-88) at their sittings held on 24 and 25 June, 1987 considered requests from Government for dropping of pending assurances and decisions thereon are contained in this Report.

4. The Minutes of the aforesaid sittings of the Committee are also included in this Report.

5. At their sitting held on 29 August, 1988, the Committee (1988-89) considered and adopted this Thirteenth Report.

6. Conclusions/observations of the Committee are contained in succeeding chapters.

NEW DELHI;

30 August, 1988

8 Bhadra, 1910 (Saka)

PROF. NARAIN CHAND PARASHAR

Chairman,

Committee on Government Assurances.

CHAPTER I

REVIEW OF PENDING ASSURANCES OF SEVENTH AND EIGHTH LOK SABHA

During the Seventh Lok Sabha, 7231 assurances were culled out from Lok Sabha Debates for implementation by Government. Of these 7,222 assurances have since been implemented, leaving a balance of 9 assurances to be implemented.

2. During the First to Tenth Sessions of Eighth Lok Sabha, 6,154 assurances were culled out. Out of them 4,171 have since been implemented, thus leaving a balance of 1,983 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 5 August, 1988.

CHAPTER II

REQUESTS FOR DROPPING OF ASSURANCES

(i)

4. On 13 March, 1986, the following Unstarred Question (No. 2597) given notice of by Shri P. Kolandaivelu, M.P. was addressed to the Minister of Human Resource Development:

- (a) whether there is any proposal to start a university for cultural studies;
- (b) number of States which have applied for starting universities for cultural studies;
- (c) number of cultural organisations which have applied for "deemed university" status; and
- (d) whether any of them has been granted the status of deemed university by University Grants Commission?"

5. The Minister of State in the Department of Education and Culture (Shrimati Sushila Rohatgi) gave the following reply:

- (a) No such proposal is under consideration at present.
- (b) None.
- (c) and (d) Proposals for declaring Kalakshetra, Madras; Central Institute of Higher Tibetan Studies, Varanasi; Indological Research Institute and Shri Sharadapeeth Arts and College of Education, Dwarka; and the Asiatic Society, Calcutta; as institutions deemed-to-be universities under Section 3 of the University Grants Commission Act; 1956 are in the process of examination."

6. The above reply to parts (c) and (d) of the question was treated as an assurance by the Committee which was to be fulfilled within three months of the date of reply i.e. by 12 June, 1986.

7. On 24 November, 1986 the Ministry of Human Resource Development requested through the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs vide their N.O. Note No. V/HRD/E(31)USQ 2597-LS/86 dated 24

November, 1986 for the dropping of the aforesaid assurance on the grounds indicated below:

"The proposal from Kalakshetra, Madras, Central Institute of Higher Tibetan Studies, Varanasi; Indological Research Institute and Shri Shardapeeth Arts and College of Education, Dwarka; and the Asiatic Society, Calcutta for declaring them as institutions deemed to be universities under Section 3 of the UGC Act, 1956, are at various stages of consideration in consultation with the UGC, the State Governments and the institutions concerned. It may be stated that before an institution is declared a deemed university it has to be ensured that the institution is engaged in teaching and research in chosen fields of specialisation and has maintained the highest academic standards; that the institution has the necessary financial resources and viability and management capable of contributing to university ideals and traditions; that granting the institution deemed to be a university status would further enhance the development of the area of specialisation, teaching and research activities in that institution; and that by bringing it under the UGC Act the university system would be enriched. The process of examination of such proposals in consultation with the UGC and other agencies concerned therefore, invariably takes time since so many factors have to be taken into account before a final decision can be taken to declare the institution as a deemed university. In the circumstances, it is not possible to fulfil the assurance cited above."

8. The Committee at their sitting held on 24 June, 1987 considered the request of the Ministry of Human Resource Development for dropping of the assurance.

9. The Committee did not agree to the request of the Ministry of Human Resource Development.

10. The decision of the Committee was conveyed to the Ministry on 17 August, 1987.

11. The Ministry of Human Resource Development have partly fulfilled the assurance by laying implementation statement on the Table of the House on 12 November, 1987 indicating the decision

taken or the present position in regard to the proposals for grant of deemed university status to the concerned institutions which is as follows:—

Kalakshetra, Madras

It was brought to the notice of the Department of Education that there is a legal dispute between the Trust and the Society which is running the educational activities of Kalakshetra. It was, therefore, considered that before processing the proposal further the legal position of the institution should be settled to ensure that the deemed to be university status is not conferred on an institution whose management is in a state of turmoil. The proposal would be processed further only after the court case is settled and the final judgement of the Honourable Court of Madras is made available.

Central Institute of Higher Tibetan studies, Varanasi

The Institute has been advised to make suitable amendments in its Memorandum of Association and Association and Rules in consultation with the UGC. The proposal would be processed further by the Department of Education after the modified M.O.A. and Rules duly approved by the competent authorities are furnished to the Department of Education.

Indological Research Institute, Shri Sharda Peeth Arts and College of Education, Dwarka

The proposal of the institute was referred to the Government of Gujarat in 1984 for accepting the present level of maintenance expenditure and matching share for the development schemes of the institute. In spite of reminders, the Government of Gujarat did not convey their decision/reply. It has, therefore, been decided not to proceed with the proposal.

Asiatic Society, Calcutta

The proposal for grant of deemed university status to the Asiatic Society, Calcutta, was considered by the Department of Culture and it was decided not to proceed with the proposal further.

12. The Committee are unhappy to note that even after more than two years the Ministry have fulfilled the assurance only partly and that too after the Committee did not agree to the frivolous request of the Ministry for the dropping of the assurance. They desire that the Ministry should pursue the matter and implement the assurance in full expeditiously.

(ii)

13. On 16 April, 1986, during the course of General Discussion on 'Demands for Grants' for the Ministry of Home Affairs, some Members raised a point about the implementation of the recommendations of the National Police Commission (extracts from Lok Sabha debates at Annexure).

14. The then Minister of Home Affairs (Shri P. V. Narsimha Rao) gave the following reply:

"Now there are about 500 recommendations, most of them are concerned with the States. Out of 500, 85 pertain to the Central Government. Out of these 85, 82 have been disposed of and final decisions have been taken. Only three remain to be decided. These three matters are under examination in consultation with the States again, because one of them, is about the service conditions. Now, service conditions naturally would need financial outlays and a deeper examination of the matter from all points of view would be needed. Therefore, this may take a little time. But even so, I would like to assure the Members who have raised it and the in general that we are not really delaying matters and we are taking expeditious decisions and action."

15. The above reply of the Minister was treated as an assurance by the Committee which was to be fulfilled within three months of the date of reply i.e. by 15 July, 1986.

16. On 14 November, 1986, the Ministry of Home Affairs requested through the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs *vide* U.O. Note No. VI/WR(2)GD-LS/86 dated 14 November, 1986 for dropping of the aforesaid assurance on the grounds indicated below:

"While replying to the debate on the Demands for Grants relating to the Ministry of Home Affairs, the Home

Minister referred to the present stage of implementation of the recommendations of the National Police Commission. What he has said is only a statement of bare facts, without any "Promise" or holding out of an "Assurance". While stating the facts he has simply mentioned that out of 85 recommendations which were to be examined by the Central Government 82 have been disposed and final decisions taken. The remaining 3 are in the course of examination in consultation with the State Governments. This statement of the Minister should be seen in its correct perspective. The fact of the matter is that "Police" is a State subject and, therefore, action in all recommendations of the Commission has invariably and undoubtedly to be taken by the State Governments/Union Territories. The Central Government can formulate some views on certain matters but ultimately the implementation of that particular recommendations would devolve on the State Governments. There are more than five hundred recommendations on which the State Governments have to take a view and see to their implementation. From the reports gathered from the States so far, it is understood that all these recommendations are under active examination/consideration of the State Governments. The implementation of the recommendations being far reaching, obviously no time frame can be established for their implementation. In short, what this Ministry would like to emphasise is that there is very little that can be done by the Central Government without involving/consulting the State Governments. It is, therefore, requested that the Statement of Home Minister should be read in the context of the position as it stands today."

17. The Committee at their sitting held on 24 June, 1987 considered the request of the Ministry of Home Affairs for dropping the assurance. The Committee desired that the Ministry of Home Affairs be asked to specify the three recommendations of the National Police Commission which pertained to the Union Government and the reasons for which Government's decision on each of them was delayed. The Committee further desired that the Ministry of Home Affairs should submit a request for further extension of time for implementation of assurance. The decision of the Committee was conveyed to the Ministry on 17 August, 1987.

18. The Ministry has implemented the assurance by laying a statement in Lok Sabha on 12 November, 1987. In the statement the Ministry have stated:

"Final decisions/views have already been taken on all the 85 recommendations which pertained to Central Government."

19. The Committee note the implementation of the assurance in so far as the recommendations of the Police Commission pertained to the Union Government. They are however, constrained to observe that even this part of the assurance, was fulfilled only when the Committee did not agree to the request of the Ministry for the dropping of the assurance on the lame plea that 'Police' is a State subject and, therefore, action on all the recommendations of the Commission has invariably and undoubtedly to be taken by the State Government/Union Territories. The Ministry would do better in future to make quick and sincere efforts to implement the assurance instead of questioning the decisions of the Committee.

(iii)

20. On 23 July, 1986, the following unstarred question (No. 808) given notice of by Dr. V Venkatesh, M.P. was addressed to the Minister of Home Affairs:

- "(a) whether nine people suspected to be the contacts of the seven terrorists arrested by the Canadian Police on June 14, 1986, have been taken into custody by the CBI in Jullandhar;
- (b) if so, whether Canadian Police had informed CBI that the case of the conspiracy was at Jullandhar;
- (c) if so, the facts thereof; and
- (d) whether investigations in this regard have been completed?"

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

- "(a) to (c): On the basis of information received from the Canadian authorities about a conspiracy being hatched in Canada for the creation of Khalistan by force and to indulge in terrorist and disruptive activities in India for the

purpose and the contacts of the conspirators with their counterparts in Jullandhar, a case under the Terrorist and Disruptive Activities (Prevention) Act 1985 has been registered and 12 persons from Jullandhar and one from Amritsar have been arrested.

(d) The investigation is in progress."

22. Reply to part (d) of the above question was treated as an assurance by the Committee which was to be fulfilled within three months of the date of reply i.e. by 22 October, 1986.

23. On 27 January, 1987, the Ministry of Home Affairs approached the Committee on Government Assurances through the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs vide their U.O. Note No. VI/HA(33)USQ 808-LS/86 dated 27 January, 1987 to drop the assurance on the grounds indicated below :

"It may be mentioned that according to information available on the date of answer of the question the investigation into the case registered in connection with the alleged conspiracy was in progress. This fact, which reflected the position on the date of the answer of the question, was mentioned in reply to the question which wanted information whether the investigation has been completed. There was, therefore, no intention to give any assurance in reply to the question.

.....Such cases are investigated by the field agencies and the Central Government will not be in a position to interfere in their investigation. Moreover, in this particular case the investigation will have to be in cooperation with the Canadian Police and it is likely that the investigating agencies of the two countries may take considerable time to complete the investigations and file charge sheet against the accused wherever necessary. In the circumstances, if the statement "the investigation is in progress" is be treated as an assurance, the fulfilment thereof which would entirely depend on the progress made by the investigating agencies, both in India and Canada, would be considerably delayed and the Central Government cannot really exercise any control in such matters."

24. The Committee at their sitting held on 24 June, 1987 considered the request of the Ministry of Home Affairs for dropping of the assurance.

25. The Committee desired that the Ministry of Home Affairs should give the latest position about the implementation of the assurance. The decision of the Committee was conveyed to the Ministry on 17 August, 1987.

26. The Committee note that the Ministry has fulfilled the assurances by laying a statement in the Lok Sabha on 21 April, 1988. In the statement, the Ministry have stated:

"According to information available, the investigation of the case was taken up on the basis of information received from the Canadian authorities about a conspiracy being hatched in their country. Evidence collected during investigation has been passed on the Canadian authorities for correlation. Any further action in the case would depend upon the developments/outcome of the case started by the Canadian authorities including the decisions of the Canadian court for permitting the use of evidence collected by them in the case."

(iv)

27. On 3 December, 1986, the following Unstarred Question (No. 4555) given notice of by Shri Bhadrashwar Tanti, M.P. was addressed to the Minister of Home Affairs:

- "(a) whether any survey works have been done in connection with the setting up of permanent capital for Assam; and
(b) if so, the name and place of the proposed capital?"

28. The Minister of State in the Ministry of Home Affairs (Shri Chintamani Panigrahi) gave the following reply:

- "(a) Yes, Sir.
(b) In 1983, it was decided to finalise the site of the capital at Chandrapur near Guwahati. The decision is at present under review of the State Government."

29. The above reply to part (b) of the question was treated as an assurance by the Committee which was to be fulfilled within three months of the date of reply i.e. by 2 March, 1987.

30. On 19 March, 1987, Ministry of Home Affairs requested through the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs *vide* their U.O. note No. VII/

HA(24)USQ. 4555-LS/86 dated 19 March, 1987, for dropping of the assurance on the grounds indicated below:

"Selection of a suitable site for the permanent capital of Assam has been under consideration of the State Government of Assam Since 10th November, 1970 when the late Prime Minister Smt. Indira Gandhi announced in the Lok Sabha the decision to confer fullfledged statehood to Meghalaya as a result of which the old capital at Shillong of the composite State of Assam went away to Meghalaya. The matter squarely lies within the province of the State Government and the Central Government have no role in it except providing the assistance of the experts as and when requested by the State Government, to help them to come to a decision. In 1983, the previous Government in Assam had decided to select Chandrapur near Guwahati as the permanent site for the capital of Assam. However, the present Government appear to be having second thought about the site selected by the outgoing Government and have decided to constitute a committee to finalise the site selection for the capital. The reply given, therefore, was based entirely upon the information furnished by the State Government.

As the matter entirely concerns the State Government who have not been able to come to a final decision in the respect since 1970 and the Central Government have no role to play and it is not known as to how long the State Government will take to come to a final decision in view of the variety and complexity of the issues involved..... this assurance against this Ministry may be dropped."

31. The Committee at their sitting held on 24 June, 1987 considered the request of the Ministry of Home Affairs for dropping of the assurance. The Committee find that although the matter has been under consideration of the State Government since 1970, no final decision has been taken in the matter so far. Keeping in view the variety and complexity of the issues involved and as the matter is the concern of the State Government the Committee accede to the request of the Ministry of Home Affairs to drop the assurance.

(v)

32. On 16 April, 1986, the following Unstarred Question (No. 6785) given notice of by Dr. (Mrs.) T. Kalpana Devi, M.P. was addressed to the Prime Minister:—

“(a) whether any subjects from Medical Sciences are proposed to be introduced as optional subjects in Civil Services Examinations conducted by the Union Public Service Commission;

(b) if not, the reasons thereof; and

(c) how many doctors have been selected for IAS and IPS in each year in the past three years?”

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

“The present scheme of Civil Services Examinations was introduced in 1979 on the recommendations of the Committee on Recruitment Policy and Selection Methods, commonly known as Kothari Committee. With regard to the list of optional subjects, the Committee *inter-alia* recommend that the list for both the Preliminary and the Main Examinations should not be so restrictive in its coverage of subjects as would tend to deter promising candidates from offering themselves for selection. Also, with a very large list of optional subjects, the number of candidates in several subjects would be too small. The examination in that case would split, as it were, into a large number of separate examinations. Therefore, subjects in which the number of competing candidates is relatively small should be avoided unless there are strong reasons to the contrary. The Committee also recommended that subjects which are of a highly specialised character or which are likely to be offered by only a very limited number of candidates should not be included in the list. However, on the recommendations of the Estimates Committee of 7th Lok Sabha, the Scheme of the Civil Services Examination is being reviewed in consultation with the Union Public Service Commission and the inclusion of various subjects among the optionals of the examination will also be part of the review

As regards the number of Doctors selected in the IAS and IPS during the last three years, the information is given below:—

Year	1982	1983	1984
I.A.S.	2	4	2
I.P.S.	1	—	3

34. The above reply to the question was treated as an assurance by the Committee which was required to be fulfilled within three months of the reply i.e. by 15 July, 1986.

35. On 27 January, 1987, the Ministry of Personnel, Public Grievances and Pensions requested through the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs *vide* their U.O. Note No. V/PAPP(9) USQ. 6785/LS/86 dated 27 January, 1987 for dropping of the assurances on the grounds indicated below:—

“It may be stated that in their 77th report the Estimates Committee (1983-84) of the 7th Lok Sabha *inter-alia* made the following recommendations:—

The new pattern of Civil Services Examination was introduced in 1979. As by now 5 examinations have been held under the revised pattern, it is time to review and evaluate the new system of Civil Services Examination to find out whether it is really an improvement over the previous system and in the light of the study to make such changes in the system of examination as may be necessary and desirable.

In pursuance of the above recommendation of Estimates Committee of Lok Sabha, this Department took up the matter with the Union Public Service Commission and a working Group was set up by the Commission. The working Group has recently submitted its report proposing setting up of a Review Committee. The Commission had mentioned that question of inclusion of medical subjects in the list of optional subjects for the Civil Services Examination should be considered when the existing scheme of Civil Services Examination is reviewed. The Lok Sabha Secretariat may appreciate that examination of report of working Group and taking a decision about constituting a Review Committee, to go into the details and making suitable recommendations, is likely to take considerable

time. It would, therefore, not be possible to fulfil this assurance in near future. The Government is already seized of the matter on the recommendations of Estimates Committee of Lok Sabha itself."

36. The Committee at their sitting held on 24 June, 1987 considered the request of the Ministry of Personnel, Public Grievances and Pensions to drop the assurance. The Committee noted that the Ministry of Personnel, Public Grievances and Pensions had not indicated whether the Review Committee had been set up or not. The Committee desired to know the details of the Review Committee if already set up and in case it had not been constituted, the reasons for the delay and the likely date by which it was proposed to be constituted. The Committee took a serious view for not submitting the request for extension of time and desired that the Ministry should submit a request for extension of time. The decision of the Committee was conveyed to the Ministry on 19 August, 1987.

37. Subsequently, the Ministry of Personnel, Public Grievances and Pensions through Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs again renewed their request for the dropping of the assurance. In his O.M. No. 28016/12/86-AIS(I), dated 24 September, 1987, the Ministry stated *inter-alia* as follows:

"The matter was considered in detail by the Government. It was felt that there may not be sufficient justification for constitution of a Review Committee at this particular stage when the Government has already taken decision on important issues like upper age limit restriction on number of chances for competing the Civil Services Examinations etc. and that the decisions have been taken recently after a very careful consideration. In view of this, it was not considered necessary to refer the areas suggested by Working Group to the Review Committee at all. However, the Government felt that the following points deserve consideration by a Committee in the light of the constraints pointed out by the Working Group:—

- (a) Examination of the feasibility of grouping various services into 4 or 5 groups on the basis of qualifications, traits and special aptitudes and to examine whether there should be a single examination common for recruitment to all the services as at present or different examinations.

- (b) Inclusion of certain subjects particularly medical subjects in the scheme of the examination and also exclusion of any subject, if considered necessary.
- (c) Introduction of lecture, group discussion, psychological and aptitude tests in the recruitment procedure.
- (d) Feasibility of introducing a one year Foundational Course leading to Master's degree in Management in Government as part of the selection process.
- (e) Physical/medical requirements for the services like Indian Police Service, Indian Railway Traffic Service, Railway Protection Force and Group 'B' Central/U.T.s Police Services.

The views of the Government were communicated to the Union Public Service Commission with the observations/comments of this Department for their consideration. It was intimated that the physical/medical requirements is primarily a matter to be decided by the cadre controlling authorities and the Ministry of Health. It might have to be considered by a separate Committee with which the Commission can be associated, if they so desire. With regard to other terms of the reference suggested by the Working Group, this Department communicated its comments. The matter is under consideration of the Union Public Service Commission. As regards the other Committee to consider the physical/medical requirements, it was decided to constitute a Committee of the representatives of the following Ministries/Departments for this purpose.

1. Ministry of Home Affairs,
2. Department of Forests and Wildlife,
3. Ministry of Railways,
4. Department of Personnel and Training,
5. Department of Health and Family Welfare,
6. Directorate of General Health Services.

The first meeting of the Committee was held on 3rd July, '87.

In view of the position explained above, the Lok Sabha Secretariat may appreciate that to constitute a Committee to

consider the items other than physical/Medical requirements, in consultation with the Union Public Service Commission and to go into the details and making suitable recommendations, is likely to take considerable time. It would therefore, not be possible to fulfil this assurance in near future. Since the Government is already seized of the matter on the basis of the recommendations of the Estimates Committee of the Lok Sabha itself, it is requested that the facts of the case may kindly be brought to the notice of the Hon'ble Chairman of the Committee on Government Assurances with the request that this assurance may be dropped."

38. The Committee cannot but deprecate the inordinate delay in the implementation of the assurance. Instead of fulfilling the assurance which is now pending for more than two years, the Ministry have repeatedly come forward with the request for dropping the assurance. As a matter of fact the proposal to review the scheme of the Civil Services Examination has been pending before the Government much earlier in pursuance of the recommendation of the Estimates Committee of Lok Sabha made in their 77th Report (1983-84). They see no justification for dropping the assurance and would urge upon the Government to implement it without any further loss of time.

(vi)

39. On 13 August, 1986, the following Unstarred Question (No. 3948) given notice of by Shri Digvijay Sinh, M.P. was addressed to Prime Minister:—

- "(a) whether Government have taken a final decision to shelve the Bhopalpatnam and Inchampally dam projects on the Indravati and Godavari Rivers respectively;
- (b) if not, the reasons therefor; and
- (c) whether these proposed dams are likely to inundate the national park in Madhya Pradesh and untapped coal fields in Maharashtra."

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

- "(a) and (b). The project reports for the Bhopalpatnam and Inchampally river valley projects are still being detailed by the State authorities.

(c) In the absence of the proposals, assessment of the areas going under submergence is not available."

41. The above reply to parts (a) and (b) of the question was treated as an assurance by the Committee which was required to be fulfilled within three months from the date of reply i.e. by 12 November, 1986.

42. On 5 March, 1987, the Ministry of Environment and Forests approached the Committee on Government Assurances through the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs vide their U.O. Note No. VI/EF (8) USQ 3948-LS/86 dated 5 March, 1987 for dropping of the assurance on the grounds indicated below:

"The Bhopalpatnam and Inchampally Projects are Inter-State Hydro-electric and Irrigation Projects—the former involving MP and Maharashtra and the latter involving Maharashtra, MP and Andhra Pradesh.

The state authorities are reportedly still carrying out field surveys to collect necessary data for preparation of the detailed project report for Inchampally Multi-purpose Project which is to be operated by a joint control Board to be set up subsequently. A preliminary report has been prepared on the Bhopalpatnam Project and submitted to the Ministry of Water Resources. The Central Water Commission has advised the Project authorities to revise the project report. No data is yet available on the Environmental aspects.

Since the Project reports are still under formulation by the State authorities and it is not known to us as to when the Project report would be submitted for consideration, it is not possible for the Ministry of Environment and Forests to state as to when the Project(s) would be submitted and the time that will be needed for its consideration. Under the circumstances, it is difficult for the Ministry of Environment and Forests to give an assurance for undertaking and completing the Environmental analysis of the projects within a specified date."

43. The Committee at their sitting held on 25 June, 1987 considered the request of the Ministry of Environment and Forests to drop the assurance. Not agreeing with the plea advanced by the Ministry to drop the assurance, the Committee desired that the Ministry should submit a request for extension of time as might be considered minimum to fulfil the assurance.

44. The above decision of the Committee was conveyed to the Ministry on 19 August, 1987. Thereafter, the Ministry sought an extension of time upto 30 June, 1988 on the ground "the project reports for the Bhopalpatnam and Inchampally river valley projects are still being detailed by the State authorities."

45. The Committee desire that the Ministry should pursue the matter with the State Governments and take a final decision on the projects expeditiously so as to implement the assurance.

(vii)

46. On 22 July, 1986, the following Unstarred Question (No. 650) given notice of by Shri Balasaheb Vikhe Patil, M.P. was addressed to the Minister of Energy:

- "(a) whether it is proposed to set up a corporation to finance and promote the development of non-conventional energy sources;
- (b) if so, the details thereof including its organisational set up, functions and activities;
- (c) the initial capital allotted for the project and the mode of its disposal utility;
- (d) the time by which the said corporation is likely to start functioning and provide grants for research and loans for the commercial exploitation of non-conventional energy sources; and
- (e) the terms and conditions for providing loans and grants to private organisations/institutions in this regard?"

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

- (a), (b), (c), (d) and (e): "With a view to promoting projects in the area of new and renewable sources of energy on a wider scale, it is proposed to set up a Renewable Energy Development Agency. A provision of Rs. 10 crores has been made for this project during the Seventh Five Year Plan. The details and modalities of the Agency are under examination of the Government."

48. The reply to the above question was treated as an assurance by the Committee which was required to be fulfilled by the Ministry within three months from the date of reply i.e. by 21 October, 1986.

49. On 12 February, 1987, the Ministry of Energy requested through the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs vide latter's U.O. Note No. VI/Energy (3) USQ-650-LS/86 dated 12 February, 1987 for the dropping of the assurance on the grounds indicated below:

"This Department has already submitted to the Cabinet Secretariat a note for the Cabinet for its approval to the Department's proposal regarding the establishment of Renewable Energy Development Agency (REDA).

The Note contains proposals regarding the functions of the REDA, composition of the Board, financing of the Agency etc. The other issues like framing the Memorandum of Association, rules and regulations, laying down the modalities for resource mobilisation, procedure for advancing loans, rates of interest as well as modes of recovery and specification of projects, are proposed to be left to the Board of the Agency. It would, therefore, be appreciated that even after Cabinet's approval and establishing the Agency, it will take time to make the Agency operational."

50. The Committee at their sitting held on 25 June, 1987 considered the request of the Ministry of Energy to drop the assurance. The Committee desired that the assurance be fulfilled expeditiously and for the time being request for extension of time be submitted by the Ministry of Energy.

51. The Committee note that the Ministry has implemented the assurance by laying a statement on the Table of the House on 29 July, 1987. In the statement, the Ministry has stated:

"The Indian Renewable Energy Development Agency has been registered as a Government Company under the Companies Act on 11th March, 1987 with an authorised capital of Rs. 10 crores with a view to promoting projects in the area of new and renewable sources of energy on a wider scale. The company will be governed by a Board of Directors under the Chairmanship of Secretary, Department of Non-Conventional Energy Sources. Some of the major functions of the Agency would include provision for partial financial support on soft loan basis for specific projects and schemes for generating/conserving energy through non-conventional and renewable materials and sources; also manufacturers of such systems and devices, promotion of schemes for leasing out New and Renewable

Sources of Energy equipment to individuals and institutions on soft loans, functioning as a financial institutions on behalf of New and Renewable Sources of Energy industry etc. The Agency will grant loans on soft term basis for appropriate projects to industries as well as users in the field of New and Renewable Source of Energy with repayment terms extending upto 7 years."

52. The Committee note the implementation of the assurance. It clearly indicates that the request made by the Ministry on 12 February, 1987 for dropping the assurance was not necessary. The Ministry should, therefore, bear in mind that in future when an assurance is capable of implementation instead of making request for its dropping, they should implement it expeditiously.

(viii)

53. On 17 November, 1986, the following Unstarred Question (No. 2074) given notice of by Sarvashri Banwari Lal Purohit, R. M. Bhoje and Kali Prasad Pandey, M.Ps. was addressed to the Minister of Labour:—

"(a) whether Union Government propose to amend the Contract Labour (Regulation and Abolition) Act to provide for stiffer penalties for defaulters;

(b) if so, the details of amendments Government propose to bring the existing Act; and

(c) to what extent the contract labour would be benefited?"

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

"(a) Yes, Sir.

(b) and (c). Necessary amendments under the Contract Labour (Regulation and Abolition) Act, 1970 are being finalised."

55. The above reply to parts (b) and (c) of the question was treated as an assurance by the Committee which was required to be fulfilled within three months from the date of reply i.e. by 16 February, 1987.

56. On 11 February, 1987, the Ministry of Labour requested through the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs vide letter's U.O. Note

No. VII/L(4) USQ-2074-LS/86, dated 11 February, 1987 for dropping of the assurance on the grounds indicated below:—

“In this connection it may be stated that a batch of amendments to the Contract Labour (Regulation and Abolition) Act, 1970 is under active consideration in consultation with the Ministry of Law and Justice and other concerned interests. It will take considerable time to make finalisation of amendments to the Contract Labour (Regulation and Abolition) Act, 1970. Moreover, details of amendments could not be intimated to the House in public interest at present.

In view of this, it may not be possible for this Ministry to fulfil the assurance within the stipulated period as finalisation of Amendments to the Contract Labour (Regulation and Abolition) Act, is time consuming process.”

57. The Committee at their sitting held on 25 June, 1987 considered the request of the Ministry of Labour to drop the assurance. The Committee were not convinced with the reasons advanced by the Ministry of Labour for dropping the assurance and desired that the Ministry should make serious and concerted efforts to implement the assurance. The Committee granted extension of time upto 30 June, 1987 and directed that the Ministry should submit a request for extension of time as may be considered minimum to implement the assurance. The decision of the Committee was conveyed to the Ministry on 19 August, 1987.

58. Subsequent to the conveying of the decision of the Committee, the Ministry sought four extensions of time more or less on the same ground. ‘A batch of amendments to the Contract Labour (Regulation and Abolition) Act, 1970 is under active consideration of the Government. Finalisation of the amendments to the Act will take some time more.’ In the last request, the Ministry sought an extension of time upto 31 August, 1988 to implement the assurance.

59. The Committee regret to note that an important matter like this concerning the welfare of the labourers has been allowed to hang fire for more than 21 months. It is strange that instead of implementing the assurance expeditiously, the Ministry came forward with the request for dropping the assurance. They expect the Ministry to show a sense of urgency and finalise, without any further loss of time, the necessary amendments to the Contract Labour (Regulation and Abolition) Act which are stated to be ‘under active consideration of the Government’.

(ix)

60. On 18 November, 1986, the following Unstarred Question (No. 2161) given notice of by Shri Baju Ban Riyon, M.P. was addressed to the Minister of Law and Justice:

“(a) whether Government have any proposal to set up a separate High Court in the State of Tripura during the Seventh Five Year Plan;

(b) if so, the details thereof; and

(c) if not, the reasons therefor?”

61. The Minister of State in the Ministry of Law and Justice (Shri H. R. Bhardwaj) gave the following reply:—

“(a), (b) & (c): Setting up of High Courts is not a plan scheme and hence is not connected with Seventh Plan.

Government of Tripura have been pressing for formation of a separate High Court and, till separate High Court is formed, for establishment of a Permanent Bench of the Gauhati High Court in the State Capital.

The matter is engaging the attention of the Central Government.”

62. The above reply to the question was treated as an assurance by the Committee which was required to be fulfilled within three months from the date of reply, i.e., by 17 February, 1987.

63. On 19 March, 1987, the Ministry of Law and Justice requested through the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs *vide* latter's U.O. Note No. VII/J(6) USQ-2161-LS/86, dated 19 March, 1987 for dropping of the assurance on the grounds indicated below:—

“The matter of establishing a separate High Court for the State of Tripura is linked with the larger issue as to whether separate High Courts should be established for each of the States of the north-eastern region. This main issue is engaging the attention of the Government of India having regard to various relevant aspects.”

64. The Committee at their sitting held on 25 June, 1987 considered the request of the Ministry of Law and Justice for dropping

of the assurance. The Committee did not agree to the request of the Ministry for dropping of the assurance and desired that the Government should take a final decision in the matter early. In the meantime, the Ministry should submit a request for extension of time. This decision of the Committee was conveyed to the Ministry on 17 August, 1987. Subsequently, the Ministry implemented the assurance on 29 July, 1987, stating as follows:—

“It has been decided to establish a separate High Court for the State of Tripura by undertaking Parliamentary legislation.”

65. The Committee note the implementation of the assurance. They would, however, like to add that this is yet another instance where the Ministry chose initially to approach the Committee for dropping the assurance. The Ministry would do better in future to make quick and sincere efforts to implement the assurance instead of making request for dropping the assurance.

(x)

66. On 1 April, 1985, the following Unstarred Question (No. 1703) given notice of by Shri Yashwantrao Gadakh Patil, M.P. was addressed to the Minister of Works and Housing :—

- “(a) how many hectares of land belongs to the Central Government in Greater Bombay;
- (b) how many hectares of land have been built upon, lying vacant and encroached upon by slum dwellers; and
- (c) whether Government propose to evict the slum dwellers from such vacant land and rehabilitate them elsewhere?”

67. The then Minister of Works and Housing (Shri Abdul Ghafoor) gave the following reply:—

“(a) to (c): The information is being collected and will be laid on the Table of the Lok Sabha.”

68. The above reply to the question was treated as an assurance by the Committee which was required to be implemented within three months from the date of reply, i.e., by 30 June, 1985.

69. The Ministry have partly fulfilled the assurance twice by laying two statements on 24 July, 1986 and 11 November, 1986 on the Table of Lok Sabha (Appendices I & II).

70. On 12 February, 1987, the Ministry of Urban Development requested through the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs vide latter's U.O. Note No. V/UD(II) USQ-1703-LS/86, dated 12 February, 1987 for dropping of the assurance on the grounds indicated below:—

“As each Central Government Ministry/Department controls its own lands and the role of this Ministry is limited to providing basic policy guidelines without direct involvement in control of such lands, this Ministry had taken up the issue with all Central Ministries/Departments requesting for complete information in respect of the attached/subordinate formations under them in order to fulfil the assurance. The various Ministries, in their turn, have a number of attached/subordinate formations, including public sector undertakings and they have to collect information from such formations who may be in actual control of the lands in Bombay. Because of this long drawn procedure and also the fact that the organisational set up of the Ministries/Departments is also reviewed from time to time, it is found difficult to compile a meticulously complete list of land in possession of various subordinate/attached formations under all Ministries/Departments of the Central Government, in Bombay. However, this Ministry has succeeded in eliciting information from about 100 organisations out of which 44 own land in Bombay. The information has already been laid before the Lok Sabha. It may be seen that this compilation includes almost all the bulk land owning organisations like, Director-General, Shipping Ministry of Civil Aviation, Ministry of Defence, Ministry of Railways, Ministry of Industry, Department of Posts, Department of Telecommunications, Bombay Port Trust, Estate Management, CPWD, Ministry of Agriculture etc. This Ministry has, however, further pursued the matter for compilation of complete information but because of the difficulties explained above it is being found that the process may be too time consuming without a reasonable assurance of much additional information forthcoming.

This Ministry feels that the thrust of the question was to elicit information regarding the extent of Central Government lands in Bombay and the extent of unauthorised occupation thereon at present. The information compiled

having included most of the bulk land owning departments, it is felt that picture regarding unauthorised occupation of the Central Government lands in Bombay has already clearly emerged. Under the circumstances this Ministry feels that the process of pursuing the matter with the various Ministries/Departments who in turn have to chase their lower formations, may not perhaps be continued further."

71. The Committee at their sitting held on 25 June, 1987 considered the request of the Ministry of Urban Development to drop the assurance. Not agreeing with the plea taken by the Ministry to drop the assurance the Committee observed that they had noted that the statement of the Ministry that bulk of the information sought in the question had since been laid on the Table of the House in part implementation of the assurance. The Committee desired that the Ministry be asked to expedite the collection of the remaining information and thereby implement the assurance in full without further delay. The Committee granted extension of time for implementation of the assurance upto 30 September, 1987. The decision of the Committee was conveyed to the Ministry on 20 August, 1987.

72. The Committee note that the Ministry has since laid the remaining information on the Table of Lok Sabha on 21 April, 1988.

CHAPTER III

POSITION OF PENDING ASSURANCES PERTAINING TO SEVENTH AND EIGHTH LOK SABHA

73. A statement showing the position of assurances pertaining to Seventh and Eighth Lok Sabha pending implementation by the Government as on 5 August, 1988 is given in *Appendix*.

74. 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;
30 August, 1988
8 Bhadra, 1910 (Saka).

PROF. NARAIN CHAND PARASHAR,

Chairman,
Committee on Government Assurances.

MINUTES

Minutes of the first sitting of the Committee on Government Assurances held on 24 June, 1987 in Committee Room 'C', Parliament House Annexe, New Delhi

The Committee met on Wednesday, 24 June, 1987 from 15.00 hours to 16.40 hours.

PRESENT

Prof. Narain Chand Parashar—*Chairman*

MEMBERS

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

SECRETARIAT

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

2. At the outset, the Chairman congratulated the Members on their nomination to the Committee and extends them a warm welcome. He also dwelt on the procedure followed by the Committee in regard to their working and examination of matters undertaken by them. The text of the Chairman's observations is given in Appendix.

3. The Committee then took up the following memoranda for consideration.

Memorandum No. 77: Request for dropping of assurance given on 13 March, 1986, in reply to USQ No. 2597 regarding University for cultural studies.

4. The Committee considered the following request of the Ministry of Human Resource Development received through the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs vide their U.O. Note No. V/HRD/E(31) USQ-2597-LS/86 dated 24 November, 1986, for dropping of the assurance on the following grounds:—

“The proposal from Kalakshetra, Madras, Central Institute of Higher Tibetan Studies, Varanasi, Indological Research Institute and Shri Shardapeeth Arts and College of Education, Dwarka; and the Asiatic Society, Calcutta for declaring them as institutions deemed to be universities under Section 3 of the UGC Act, 1956, are at various stages of consideration in consultation with the UGC, the States Governments and the institutions concerned. It may be stated that before an institution is declared a deemed university it has to be ensured that the institution is engaged in teaching and research in chosen fields of specialisation and has maintained the highest academic standards that the institution has the necessary financial resources and viability and management capable of contributing to university ideals and traditions; that granting the institution deemed to be a university status would further enhance the development of the area of specialisation, teaching and research activities in that institution; and that by bringing it under the UGC Act the university system would be enriched. The process of examination of such proposals in consultation with the UGC and other agencies concerned therefore, invariably takes time since so many factors have to be taken into account before a final decision can be taken to declare the institution as a

deemed university. In the circumstances, it is not possible to fulfil the assurance cited above."

4.1 The Committee did not agree to the request of the Ministry of Human Resource Development for the dropping of the assurance. They desired that the assurance be implemented and granted extension of time upto 30 September, 1987 for this purpose.

Memorandum No. 78: Request for dropping of assurance given on 16 April, 1986, in reply to point raised during General Discussion on the Demands for Grants of the Ministry of Home Affairs regarding implementation of the recommendations of the National Police Commission

5. The Committee considered the following request of the Ministry of Home Affairs received through the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs vide their U.O. Note No. VI/WR(2)-GD-LS.86 dated 14 November, 1986, for dropping of the assurance on the following grounds:-

"While replying to the debate on the Demands for Grants relating to the Ministry of Home Affairs, the Home Minister referred to the present stage of implementation of the recommendations of the National Police Commission. What he has said is only a statement of bare facts, without any 'promise' or holding out of an 'Assurance'. While stating the facts he has simply mentioned that out of 85 recommendations which were to be examined by the Central Government 82 have been disposed and final decision taken. The remaining 3 are in the course of examination in consultation with the State Governments. This statement of the Minister should be seen in its correct perspective. The fact of the matter is that "Police" is a State subject and, therefor, action on all recommendations of the Commission has invariably and undoubtedly to be taken by the State Governments/Union Territories. The Central Government can formulate some views on certain matters but ultimately the implementation of that particular recommendation would devolve on the State Governments. There are more than five hundred recommendations on which the State Governments have to take a view and see to their implementation. From the reports gathered from the States so far, it is understood that all these recommendations are under active examination/consideration

of the State Governments. The implication of the recommendations being far reaching obviously no time frame can be established for their implementation. In short, what this Ministry would like to emphasise is that there is very little that can be done by the Central Government without involving|consulting the State Governments. It is, therefore, requested that the Statement of Home Minister should be read in the context of the position as it stands today."

5.1 The Committee desired that the Ministry of Home Affairs be asked to specify the three recommendations of the National Police Commission which pertained to the Central Government and the reasons for which Government's decision on each of them was delayed. In the meantime, the Ministry should submit a request for further extension of time for implementation of the assurance.

Memorandum No. 79: Request for dropping of assurance given on 23rd July, 1986, in reply to Unstarred Question No. 808 regarding CBI custody for contacts of terrorists arrested by Canadian Police

6. The Committee considered the following request of the Ministry of Home Affairs received through the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs *vide* their U.O. Note No. VI/HA (33) USQ-808-LS/86 dated 27 January, 1987, for dropping of the assurance on the following grounds:—

"It may be mentioned that according to information available on the date of answer of the question the investigation into the case registered in connection with the alleged conspiracy was in progress. This fact, which reflected the position on the date of the answer of the question, was mentioned in reply to the question which wanted information whether the investigation has been completed. There was, therefore, no intention to give any assurance in reply to the question.

..... Such cases are investigated by the field agencies and the Central Government will not be in a position to interfere in their investigation. Moreover, in this particular case the investigation will have to be in cooperation with the Canadian Police and it is likely that the investigating

agencies of the two countries may take considerable time to complete the investigations and file charge sheet against the accused wherever necessary. In the circumstances, if the statement "the investigation is in progress" is to be treated as an assurance, the fulfilment thereof which would entirely depend on the progress made by the investigating agencies, both in India and Canada, would be considerably delayed and the Central Government cannot really exercise any control in such matters."

6.1 The Committee desired that the Ministry of Home Affairs be asked to indicate the latest position about this case. The Committee further desired that the Ministry be advised to note for future guidance that they should not try to sit in judgement on the decision of the Committee to treat a particular statement of the Minister as an assurance.

Memorandum No. 80: Request for dropping of assurance given on 3 December, 1986 in reply to Unstarred Question No. 4555 regarding construction of Capital of Assam

7. The Committee considered the following request of the Ministry of Home Affairs received through the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs *vide* their U.O. No. VII/HA (24) USQ. 4555-LS/86 dated 19 March, 1987, for dropping of the assurance on the following grounds:—

"Selection of a suitable site for the permanent capital of Assam has been under consideration of the State Government of Assam since 10th November, 1970 when the late Prime Minister Smt. Indira Gandhi announced in the Lok Sabha the decision to confer full-fledged statehood to Meghalaya as a result of which the old capital at Shillong of the composite State of Assam went away to Meghalaya. The matter squarely lies within the province of the State Government and the Central Government have no role in it except providing the assistance of the experts as and when requested by the State Government, to help them to come to a decision. In 1983, the previous Government in Assam had decided to select Chandrapur near Guwahati as the permanent site for the capital of Assam. However, the present Government appear to be having

second thought about the site selected by the outgoing Government and have decided to constitute a committee to finalise the site selection for the capital. The reply given, therefore, was based entirely upon the information furnished by the State Government.

As the matter entirely concerns the State Government who have not been able to come to a final decision in this respect since 1970 and the Central Government have no role to play and it is not known as to how long the State Government will take to come to a final decision in view of the variety and complexity of the issues involved.... this assurance against this Ministry may be dropped.'

7.1 The Committee decided to accede to the request of the Ministry of Home Affairs to drop the assurance.

Memorandum No. 81: Request for dropping of assurance given on 24 April, 1986, in reply to Unstarred Question No. 7602 regarding Institute for Training of Teaching staff of Engineering colleges in Kerala

8. The Committee considered the following request of the Ministry of Human Resource Development (Deptt. of Education and Culture) received through the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs vide their U.O. Note No. V|HRD (35)USQ-7602-LS|86 dated 30 January, 1987, for dropping of the assurance on the following grounds:—

"In this connection it may be mentioned that Ministry of Human Resource Development is concerned with development and expansion of Technical Education in respect of Diploma level Engineering Education and above. So far as expansion of Technical Education facilities is concerned, it may be stated that All India Council for Technical Education and this Ministry gives its technical approval to such of the proposals which are submitted by the State Governments after making necessary provision in their plans.

In accordance with the procedure laid down in this behalf, the project proposals fulfilling the necessary requirements are in the first instance forwarded by the respective State Government to the concerned Regional Offices of this

Ministry. The Regional Offices get the proposals examined by Expert Visiting Committees make of the Regional Committees. The Visiting Committees make an on-the-spot study of the facilities/infrastructure already available, requirement of manpower etc. to examine the justification or otherwise of the proposals. The reports of these Expert Committees are considered by the concerned Regional Committees of All India Council for Technical Education. The recommendations of the Regional Committees are then forwarded to the Ministry alongwith the reports of the Expert Visiting Committees for consideration by the All India Council for Technical Education.

It would be observed from above that process can start only if the State Government is keen about the proposal. The responsibility for furnishing the desired information rests with the concerned State Government. Unless the State Government take initiative who are primarily concerned with the various development proposals, the Central Government cannot proceed with the question of their technical approval. In the present case, it may be seen that the State Government of Kerala are not interested to pursue the proposal."

8.1. The Committee desired that the Ministry of Human Resource Development be asked to indicate the latest position in the matter. Since the assurance was required to be implemented before 23 July, 1986, the Committee further directed that the Ministry should immediately submit a request for extension of time as may be necessary for implementation of the assurance.

Memorandum No. 82: Request for dropping of assurance given on 16 April, 1986, in reply to Unstarred Question No. 6785, regarding Medical Science subjects as optionals for Civil Services Examinations

9. The Committee considered the following request of the Ministry of Personnel, Public Grievances and Pensions received through the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs *vide* their U.O. Note No. V/PAPP(9) USQ-6785/LS/86 dated 27 January, 1987 for dropping of the assurance on the following grounds:—

"It may be stated that in their 77th report the Estimates Committee (1983-84) of the 7th Lok Sabha *inter alia* made the following recommendations:—

"The new pattern of Civil Services Examination was intro-

duced in 1979. As by now 5 examinations have been held under the revised pattern, it is time to review and evaluate the new system of Civil Services Examination to find out whether it is really an improvement over the previous system and in the light of the study to make such changes in the system of examination as may be necessary and desirable.

In pursuance of the above recommendation of Estimates Committee of Lok Sabha this Department took up the matter with the Union Public Service Commission and a working Group was set up by the Commission. The working Group has recently submitted its report proposing setting up of a Review Committee. The Commission had mentioned that question of inclusion of medical subjects in the list of optional subjects for the Civil Services Examination should be considered when the existing scheme of Civil Services Examination is reviewed. The Lok Sabha Secretariat may appreciate that examination of report of working Group and taking a decision about constituting a Review Committee, to go into the details and making suitable recommendations, is likely to take considerable time. It would, therefore, not be possible to fulfil this assurance in near future. The Government is already seized of the matter on the recommendations of Estimates Committee of Lok Sabha itself."

9.1. It was noted that the request of the Ministry of Personnel, Public Grievances and Pensions did not clearly indicate as to whether or not a Review Committee as recommended by the working Group set up by the Union Public Service Commission had been constituted. The Committee desired to know the date, composition, terms of reference and other relevant details about the Review Committee if already set up. And in case the Review Committee had not been constituted, the reasons for the delay and the likely date by which it was proposed to be constituted might be indicated by the Ministry. The Ministry should also submit a request for extension of time as required by them for the implementation of the assurance.

10. The Committee then adjourned to meet again on 25 June, 1987 at 11.00 hrs.

MINUTES

Minutes of the second sitting of the Committee on Government Assurances held on 25 June, 1987 in Committee Room 'C', Parliament House Annexe, New Delhi.

The Committee met on Thursday, 25 June, 1987 from 11.00 hours to 12.50 hours.

PRESENT

Prof. Narain Chand Parashar—*Chairman*

MEMBERS

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

SECRETARIAT

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

2. At the outset, the Committee welcomed the Assurances Committee of Orissa Assembly who was on a visit to Delhi. Both the Committee had an informal discussion on matters of mutual interest.

3. The Committee then took up the following memoranda for consideration.

Memorandum No. 83: Request for dropping of assurance given on 13 August, 1986, in reply to Unstarred Question No. 3948 regarding Bhopalpatnam and Inchampally dam project

4. The Committee considered the following request of the Ministry of Environment and Forests received through the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs *vide* their U.O. Note No. VI/EF(8) USQ-3948-LS/86 dated 5 March, 1987, for dropping of the assurance on the following grounds:—

“The Bhopalpatnam and Inchampally Projects are Inter-State Hydro-electric and Irrigation Projects—the former involving MP and Maharashtra and the later involving Maharashtra, MP and Andhra Pradesh. The State authorities are reportedly still carrying out field surveys to collect necessary data for preparation of the detailed project report for Inchampally Multi-purpose project which is to be operated by a joint control board to be set up subsequently. A preliminary report has been prepared on the Bhopalpatnam Project and submitted to the Ministry of Water Resources. The Central Water Commission has advised the Project authorities to revise the project report. No data is yet available on the Environmental aspects.

Since the Project reports are still under formulation by the State authorities and it is not known to us as to when the Project reports would be submitted for consideration, it is not possible for the Ministry of Environment and Forests to state as to when the Project(s) would be submitted and the time that will be needed for its consideration. Under the circumstances, it is difficult for the Ministry of Environment and Forests to give an assurance for undertaking and completing the Environmental analysis of the projects within a specified date.”

4.1. The Committee did not accede to the request of the Ministry of Environment and Forests for the dropping of the assurance and desired that the Ministry should submit a request for extension of time as might be considered minimum to fulfil the assurance.

Memorandum No. 84: Request for dropping of assurance given on 22 July, 1986, in reply to Unstarred Question No. 650 regarding corporation to boost non-conventional energy sources

5. The Committee considered the following request of the Ministry of Energy received through the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs *vide* their U.O. Note No. VI/Energy (3) USQ-650-LS/86 dated 12 February, 1987, for dropping of the assurance on the following grounds:—

“This Department has already submitted to the Cabinet Secretariat a note for the Cabinet for its approval to the Department’s proposal regarding the establishment of Renewable Energy Development Agency (REDA).

The note contains proposals regarding the functions of the REDA, composition of the Board, financing of the Agency etc. The other issues like framing the Memorandum of Association, rules and regulations, laying down the modalities for resource mobilisation, procedure for advancing loans, rates of interest as well as modes of recovery and specification of projects, are proposed to be left to the Board of the Agency. It would, therefore, be appreciated that even after cabinet’s approval and establishing the Agency, it will take time to make the Agency operational.”

5.1. The Committee did not agree to the request of the Ministry of Energy for the dropping of the assurance. The Ministry should make a request for extension of minimum time required to fulfil the assurance.

Memorandum No. 85: Request for dropping of assurance given on 17 November, 1986, in reply to Unstarred Question No. 2074 regarding amendment to the Contract Labour (Regulation and Abolition) Act, 1970

6. The Committee considered the following request of the Ministry of Labour received through the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs *vide* their U.O. Note No. VIII/L(4) USQ 2074-LS/86 dated 11 February, 1987, for dropping of the assurance on the following grounds:—

“In this connection it may be stated that a batch of amendments to the Contract Labour (Regulation and Abolition) Act, 1970 is under active consideration in consultation with

the Ministry of Law and Justice and other concerned interests. It will take considerable time to make finalisation amendments to the Contract Labour (Regulation and Abolition) Act, 1970. Moreover, details of amendments could not be intimated to the House in public interest at present.

In view of this, it may not be possible for this Ministry to fulfil the assurance within the stipulated period as finalisation of Amendments to the Contract Labour (Regulation and Abolition) Act, is time consuming process."

6.1. The Committee were not at all convinced with the reasons submitted by the Ministry of Labour for the dropping of the assurance. The Committee granted extension of time upto 30 June, 1987 as requested by the Ministry. They desired that the Ministry should make serious and concerted efforts to implement the assurance and submit a request for further extension of time as considered minimum for the purpose.

Memorandum No. 86: Request for dropping of assurance given on 18 November, 1986, in reply to Unstarred Question No. 2161 regarding separate High Court for Tripura.

7. The Committee considered the following request of the Ministry of Law and Justice received through the Ministry of Parliamentary affairs *vide* their U.O. Note No. VII/LJ(6) USQ-2161-LS/86 dated 19 March, 1987, for dropping of the assurance on the following grounds:—

"The matter of establishing a separate High Court for the State of Tripura is linked with the larger issue as to whether separate High Courts should be established for each of the States of the north-eastern region. This main issue is engaging the attention of the Government of India having regard to various relevant aspects."

7.1 The Committee did not agree to the request of the Ministry of Law and Justice for the dropping of the assurance and desired that the Government should take a final decision in the matter early. In the meantime, the Ministry should submit a request for extension of time.

Memorandum No. 87: Request for dropping of assurances given on 1 April, 1985, in reply to Unstarred Question No. 1703 regarding Central Government land in Greater Bombay.

8. The Committee considered the following request of the Ministry, of Urban Development received through the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs *vide* their U.O. Note No. UD|(11) USQ. 1703-LS/86, dated 12 February, 1987 for dropping of the assurance on the following grounds:—

“As each Central Government Ministry/Department controls its own lands and the role of this Ministry is limited to providing basic policy guidelines without direct involvement in control of such lands, this Ministry had taken up the issue with all Central Ministries/Departments requesting for complete information in respect of the attached/subordinate formations under them in order to fulfil the assurance. The various Ministries, in their turn, have a number of attached/subordinate formations including public sector undertakings and they have to collect information from such formations who may be in actual control of the lands in Bombay. Because of this long drawn procedure and also the fact that the organisational set up of the Ministries/Departments is also reviewed from time to time, it is found difficult to compile a meticulously complete list of land in possession of various subordinate/attached formations under all Ministries/Departments of the Central Government in Bombay. However, this Ministry has succeeded in eliciting information from about 100 organisations out of which 44 own land in Bombay. The information has already been laid before the Lok Sabha. It may be seen that this compilation includes almost all the bulk land owning organisations like, Director-General Shipping, Ministry of Civil Aviation, Ministry of Defence, Ministry of Railways, Ministry of Industry, Department of Posts, Department of Telecommunications, Bombay Port Trust, Estate Management, CPWD, Ministry of Agriculture etc. This Ministry has, however, further pursued the matter for compilation of complete information but because of the difficulties explained above it is being found that the process may be too time consuming without a reasonable assurance of much additional information forthcoming.

This Ministry feels that the thrust of the question was to elicit information regarding the extent of Central Government lands in Bombay and the extent of unauthorised occupation thereon at present. The information compiled having included most of the bulk land owning departments, it is felt that picture regarding unauthorised occupation of the Central Government lands in Bombay has already clearly emerged. Under the circumstances this Ministry feels that the process of pursuing the matter with the various Ministries/Departments who in turn have to chase their lower formations, may not perhaps be continued further."

8.1 The Committee noted that the statement of the Ministry that bulk of the information sought in the question had since been laid on the Table of the House in part implementation of the assurance. The Committee desired that the Ministry be asked to expedite the collection of the remaining information and thereby implement the assurance in full without further delay. The Committee granted extension of time for the implementation of the assurance upto 30 September, 1987.

9. The Committee decided to hold their next sitting on Tuesday, 14 July, 1987 at 11.30 hours.

10. The Committee then adjourned.

MINUTES

Second Sitting

Minutes of the Committee on Government Assurances held on 29 August, 1988 in Committee Room No. 62, Parliament House, New Delhi.

The Committee met on Monday, 29 August, 1988, from 15.30 hrs. to 16.45 hrs.

PRESENT

Prof. Narain Chand Parashar—*Chairman*

MEMBERS

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

SECRETARIAT

1. Shri C. K. Jain—*Director-in-charge*
2. Shri S. C. Gupta—*Deputy Secretary*
3. Shri Raghubir Singh—*Senior Examiner of Questions*

2. The Committee considered the draft Thirteenth Report and adopted the same. The Committee authorised the Chairman to present the report to Lok Sabha on 31 August, 1988.

* * * * *

3. The Committee then adjourned.

ANNEXURE

(vide para No. 13 of the Report)

(Shri P. V. Narasimha Rao—Contd.) P. No. 20858

“* * * * *

Then the other question which has been raised is about the implementation of the recommendations of the National Police Commission. Now there are about 500 recommendations, most of them are concerned with the States. Out of 500, 85 pertain to the Central Government. Out of these 85, 82 have been disposed of and final decision have been taken. Only three remain to be decided. These three matters are under examination in consultation with the States again, because one of them, I am told, is about the service conditions. Now, service conditions naturally would need financial outlays and a deeper examination of the matter from all points of view would be needed. Therefore, this may take a little time. But even so, I would like to assure the *Members* who have raised it and the House in general that we are not really delaying matters and we are taking expeditious decisions and action.”

* * * * *

APPENDIX I

(Vide Para No. 73 of the Report)

(i) *Statement showing the position of the assurances of Seventh Lok Sabha pending implementation as on 5 August, 1988.*

Session	No. of Assurances called out	No. of Assurances implemented/dropped	No. of Assurances Outstanding
First Session, 1980	26	26	
Second Session, 1980	196	196	
Third Session, 1980	548	548	
Fourth Session, 1980	333	333	
Fifth Session, 1981	793	793	..
Sixth Session, 1981	373	372	1
Seventh Session, 1981	418	418	
Eighth Session, 1982	798	798	
Ninth Session, 1982	429	429	
Tenth Session, 1982	315	315	..
Eleventh Session, 1983	861	860	1
Twelfth Session, 1983	433	433	
Thirteenth Session, 1983	424	424	..
Fourteenth Session, 1984	956	951	5
Fifteenth Session, 1984	328	326	2
Total Assurances Outstanding	7231	7222	9

APPENDIX II

(Vide Para No. 73 of the Report)

(ii) Statement showing the position of assurances of Eighth Lok Sabha pending implementation as on 5 August, 1988

Session	No. of Assurances called out	No. of Assurances implemented/dropped	No. of Assurances Outstanding
First Session, 1985	19	19	..
Second Session, 1985	426	420	6
Third Session, 1985	323	320	3
Fourth Session, 1985	355	338	17
Fifth Session, 1986	777	716	61
Sixth Session, 1986	475	428	47
Seventh Session, 1986	428	368	60
Eighth Session, 1987	777	584	193
Elighth Session, 1987 (Second Part)	578	265	313
Ninth Session, 1987	772	404	368
Tenth Session, 1988	1224	309	915
Total Assurances Outstanding	6,154	4,171	1,983