

COMMITTEE
ON
GOVERNMENT ASSURANCES
(1988-89)

(EIGHTH LOK SABHA)

EIGHTEENTH REPORT

Presented on 10 May, 1989



P.372A

LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT
NEW DELHI

18/5/89

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

Price 1 Rs. 5.00

CONTENTS

	PAGE	
COMPOSITION OF THE COMMITTEE	(iii)	
INTRODUCTION	(v)	
CHAPTER I	Request for dropping of assurance	
	—Accepted	1
CHAPTER II	Requests for dropping of assurances	5
	—Not accepted	
CHAPTER III	Requests for dropping of assurances	47
	—Not accepted and subsequently implemented	

MINUTES

Minutes of Sitting held on 18 July, 1988	72
Minutes of Sitting held on 29 August, 1988	82
Minutes of Sitting held on 20 September, 1988	89
Minutes of Sitting held on 11 October, 1988	97
Minutes of Sitting held on 8 May, 1989	105

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

Prof. Narain Chand Paraghar —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 Bhole 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 Eighteenth Report of the Committee on Government Assurances.

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

3. The Committee (1988-89) at their sittings held on 18 July, 29 August, 20 September and 11 October, 1988 considered requests from the Ministries for dropping of assurances and extensions of time for implementation of assurances. At their sitting held on 8 May, 1989, the Committee considered and adopted this draft Eighteenth 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.

NEW DELHI :

May 9, 1989

4 Vatsakha, 1911 (S)

PROF. NARAIN CHAND PARASHAR,

Chairman,

Committee on Government Assurances

CHAPTER-I

REQUEST FOR DROPPING OF ASSURANCE—ACCEPTED

Demand of Commercial Vehicles

On 25 Augst, 1987. Sarvashri Chintamani Jena and Mohanbhai Patel, M.Ps addressed the following Starred Question No. 420 to the Minister of Industry :

“(a) the names of the companies which are manufacturing commercial vehicles in the country and their annual production;

(b) whether the demand of commercial vehicles in the country is decreasing year after year;

(c) if so, the reasons therefor;

(d) whether there is a demand of Indian commercial vehicles in foreign countries; and

(e) if so, what steps are being taken in this direction ?”

2. In reply to the above question, the Minister of Industry (Shri J Vengala Rao) laid a statement on the table of the House which stated as follows :

“(a) The names of the major commercial vehicles manufacturers in the country and their production during 1986-87 are indicated below :

<i>Sl. No.</i>	<i>Name of the Manufacturer</i>	<i>Production</i>
1	2	3
1.	M/s TELCO	49242
2.	M/s Ashok Leyland Ltd.	15138
3.	M/s Hindustan Motors Ltd.	2031
4.	M/s Mahindra & Mahindra Ltd.	10423

1	2	3
5.	M/s Bajaj Tempo Ltd.	13249
6.	M/s Standard Motor Product of India Ltd.	2292
7.	M/s DCM-Toyota Ltd.	2714
8.	M/s Swaraj Mazda Ltd.	1602
9.	M/s Eicher Motors Ltd.	1143
10.	M/s Allwyd Nissan Ltd.	1149
11.	M/s Maruti Udoyog Ltd.	21185

(b) & (c) The sale of commercial vehicles is some what less than anticipated on account of their high cost of production resulting in high prices as well as the improved performance of Railways.

(d) & (e) The Indian Commercial Vehicles manufacturers have already entered in to the export market. Government is providing a variety of incentives for encouraging export production including financial and fiscal incentives reduction of input costs and technological upgradation."

3. During the course of supplementaries on the above question Shri P. Namgyal wanted to know :

"whether Government had received any complaint about the higher charges of prices for the chassis of Tata vehicles particularly by a dealer in Jammu & Kashmir valley. He further wanted to know the action tak-n in the matter if the aforesaid was true and whether the Government would look in to it if it was not so."

4. In reply the Minister of State in the Ministry of Industry (Shri M. Arunachalm) stated as follows :

"We have not received any complaint If any complaint is there. we will look in to it."

5. The above reply to the supplementary question was treated as an assurance by the Lok Sabha Secretariat and the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs. The assurance was required to be implemented by the Ministry of Industry by 24 November, 1987.

6. The Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs *vide* their U.O. Note No. VIII-2/Ind. (23) SQ-420-LS/87 dated 17 January, 1988 had thereafter forwarded the request of the Ministry of Industry for the dropping of the assurance on the following grounds :

"In this context, it is stated that the answer "We have not received any complaint" is specific. Similarly, the other part of the answer is subjective in the sense that if such complaint is brought to the notice of the Government that will be looked in to. It is thus felt that this answer may not be considered as an assurance. Further, no such complaint has been received in this Ministry till date."

7. The request of the Ministry of Industry was considered by the Committee at their sitting held on 5 May, 1988. It was decided by the Committee that Shri P. Namgyal (in reply to whose supplementary the assurance was given and who was a member of the Committee) might be requested to indicate the details of the case or case referred to by him in his supplementary question.

8. As Shri Namgyal had since been appointed as Deputy Minister Surface Transport, the Private Secretary to the Deputy Minister was requested to enquire from the Minister the details of the case or cases referred to by him in his supplementary question. He had replied (*vide* his U.O. Note dated 29 June.1988) as follows ;

"I have brought the contents of your U.O. to the notice of my Minister. The position of the case is that in 1986 when there was a temporary shortage of T.M.B. truck and tipper chassis. the Hon' ble Minister had received a number of verbal complaints against the dealer of the company that they were charging full cost of the chassis and the advance of money paid at the time of booking was not being adjusted by the dealer at the time of the delivery. Subsequently, in many cases the advance money had not been refunded to the buyers from the Ladakh region. Probably, some-one took up the case with the manufacturer in 1987 and as a result, the dealer returned the advance money to some of the buyers and there

after no complaint has been received in this regard. As such there is no need to pursue the matter any further."

9. In view of the position explained by Shri Namgyal in his office U.O. Note No. 67/DM/SFT/88 dated 29 June 1988, the Committee decide that the assurance be dropped.

CHAPTER-II

REQUESTS FOR DROPPING OF ASSURANCES-NOT ACCEPTED

(i)

Proposal for additional berth at Paradip Port

10. On 20 August, 1987, Shrimati Jayanti Patnaik, M.P. addressed the following Unstarred Question No. 3963 to the Minister of Surface Transport :

“(a) whether there is any proposal for providing additional berth at Paradip Port of facilitating transport of Coal from Orissa to power stations in South; and

(b) if so, the details thereof ?”

11. In reply to the above question, the Minister for Surface Transport (Shri Rajesh Pilot) stated as follows :

“(a) A proposal is under consideration for setting up a mechanised coal handling facility at Paradip Port for transport of coal to the Super Thermal Power Station at Ennore (North of Madras).

(b) the details will be known after the detailed Project Report is prepared.”

12. The above reply to the question was treated as an assurance by the Lok Sabha Secretariat and the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs. The assurance was required to be implemented by the Ministry of Surface Transport by 19 November, 1987.

13. The Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs vide their U.O. Note No. VIII-2/ST (6) USQ. 3963-LS/87 dated 14 April, 1988 forwarded the request of the Ministry of Surface Transport for the dropping of the assurance on the following grounds :

“Seventh Five Year Plan does not provide for the construction of such an additional berth at Paradip. However, proposal to

this effect have been made but it may not be possible to take a decision on it in the immediate future. The reasons for the same are given below :

Based on the study made by their RITES, it was found that rail-cum-sea mode is the most economical mode for transport of coal from Telchar mines (Orissa) to Ennore, where a new Thermal Power Station is proposed to be put up by Tamil Nadu Electricity Board. This coal transportation between Telchar mines and the Thermal Station would be done first by rail to the loading port of Paradip and thereafter by coastal shipping to a new Satellite Port at Ennore which has been proposed to the North of the existing Madras Port. It has been decided to entrust the preparation of the Detailed Project Report to the Dutch under the Dutch Technical Assistance Programme. The terms of reference for this Detailed Feasibility Report has also been finalised and forwarded to them in the month of November, 1987 for their scrutiny and for initiating preliminary steps. This Ministry has already approached the Committee of the Public Investment Board seeking first stage clearance for formally commissioning the DPR. The investment decision on the project will be taken only after the feasibility report had been received and considered by the Government. There is no provision in the VIth Five Year Plan for this scheme at present. It is anticipated that the project will be ripe for an investment decision only by about June, 1989 presuming that the Project is included in the Seventh Plan by the Planning Commission."

14. The Ministry of Surface Transport also requested for extension of time till the decision by the Committee on their request for dropping.

15. The Committee considered the request of the Ministry of surface Transport for the dropping of the assurance at their sitting held on 18 July, 1988 and decided not to accede to the request of the Ministry for dropping the assurance. The decision of the Committee was accordingly conveyed to the Ministry.

16. The Ministry have now requested for extension of time upto 30 June, 1989 to implement the assurance and the assurance is yet to be fulfilled.

17. The Committee are unhappy that even after a lapse of about two years, no concrete outcome of the proposal for providing additional berth at Paradip Port has emerged. The note submitted to the Committee for dropping of the assurance indicates that the Ministry has not been dealing with the matter with the required zeal and urgency. The whole approach seems to be lackadaisical. The Committee recommended that the Ministry should make sincere and expeditious attempts to implement the assurance without further loss of time.

18. The Committee are also unhappy about the manner in which the Ministry couched their request for extension of time wherein they sought time to fulfil the assurance till a decision was taken by the Committee on their request for the dropping of the assurance. While making the request for extension of time, the Committee feel that the Ministry should have indicated a specific time frame by which they would be able to fulfil the assurance instead of putting it vaguely which gives an impression of a perfunctory approach and casual attitude,

(H)

Approval for medium and major irrigation projects in Orissa

19. On 9 December, 1987, Shri Chintamani Jena, M.P. addressed the following Unstarred Question No. 4877 to the Minister of Water Resources :

- “(a) the total irrigated land in Orissa at present;
- (b) the total area of land which have been brought under irrigation so far;
- (c) whether the State Government of Orissa has sent their proposals to establish more irrigation projects in Orissa; and
- (d) if so, the details thereof and the action taken by Government thereon ?”

20. In reply to the above question, the Minister of State for Textiles and Water Resources (Shri Ram Niwas Mirdha) stated as follows :

- “(a) & (b) the irrigation potential created upto end of 1985-86 is about 267 m ha., the corresponding utilisation being 2 53 m ha

(c) & (d) project reports of 18 major and medium projects have been received for clearance. Clarifications on the observations made by the Central appraising agencies or the Advisory Committee are awaited from the State Government in the case of 13 projects while the other 5 project reports are in different stages of examination."

21. The above reply to parts (c) & (d) of the question was treated as an assurance by the Lok Sabha Secretariat and the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs. The assurance was required to be implemented by the Ministry of Water Resources by 8 March, 1988.

22. The Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs vide their U.O. Note No. IX/WR (7) USQ-4877-LS/87, dated 15 March, 1988 forwarded request of the Ministry of Water Resources for the dropping of the assurance on the following grounds :

"The States are required to prepare project reports in accordance with the guidelines issued for this purpose and the project reports are sent to Central Water Commission for scrutiny from techno-economic angle. It is observed that project reports submitted by the State Governments are not formulated fully according to the guidelines, resulting in protracted correspondence and discussions to obtain clarifications. Settlement of observations made by Centre is dependent upon the priority assigned by the State Government to this work. Projects are also required to be cleared at the Centre by other Ministries like Environment and Forests, Agriculture, etc. and data deficiency impedes this process. While efforts are being made to minimise the time taken in clearance of these projects, it is not practicable to ensure clearance within a pre-determined time-frame in view of the position explained above. It is, therefore, requested that reply given to parts (c) and (d) of the above mentioned question which merely presents the factual position may not be treated as an assurance and be deleted from the list of assurances."

23. The Committee considered the request of the Ministry of Water Resources for the dropping of the assurance at their sitting held on 18 July, 1988 and decided not to accede to the request of the Ministry for dropping the assurance. The decision of the Committee was accordingly conveyed to the Ministry.

24. The Ministry have now requested for extension of time upto 9 March, 1989 to implement the assurance. However, the assurance is yet to be fulfilled.

25. The Committee do not appreciate the reasoning advanced by the Ministry of Water Resources that their reply merely presented the factual position and as such might not be treated as an assurance. The Committee wish to point out that it is the exclusive prerogative of the Committee to decide whether a reply of the Minister constituted an assurance or not and it is not for the Ministry to question the decision of the Committee. In the instant case, the reply to the question constitutes a clear assurance and the Committee desire that the Ministry should implement it at the earliest. The Committee suggest that the matter should be taken up at the highest level with the Government of Orissa to fulfil the assurance without any further delay.

(iii)

National Programme for drug testing

26. On 26 November, 1987, Dr. B.L. Shailesh, M.P. addressed the following Unstarred Question No. 3106 to the Minister of Health and Family Welfare.

“(a) whether Government have mooted a national programme for drug testing to be launched in the Eighth Plan and to provide an infrastructural base for implementing drug control measures;

(b) if so, whether any framework in this behalf has been prepared or is being prepared; the role to be assigned to the State Government and Central Laboratories like the Central Drug Research Institute, Lucknow, Haffkine Institute, Bombay and others in this programme; and

(c) its broad features?”

27. In reply to the above question, the Minister of State in the Ministry of Health and Family Welfare (Kumari Saroj Khaparde) stated as follows :

“(a) to (c) Proposals for the Eighth Five Year Plan have not yet been drawn up.”

28. The above reply to the question was treated as an assurance by the Lok Sabha Secretariat and the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs. The assurance was required to be implemented by the Ministry of Health and Family Welfare by 25 February, 1988.

29. The Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs *vide* their U.O. No. IX/HFW (6) USQ. 3 06-LS/87 dated 13 May, 1988 forwarded the request of the Ministry of Health and Family Welfare for the dropping of the assurance on the following grounds :

“Since the term of the Seventh Five Year Plan will expire in March, 1990 and proposals for Eighth Five Year Plan (1990-95) will be drawn up some time in the next year, it is not possible at this stage to fulfil the assurance.”

30. The Committee considered the request of the Ministry of Health and Family Welfare for the dropping of the assurance at their sitting held on 18 July, 1988 and decided not to accede to the request of the Ministry for dropping the assurance. The decision of the Committee was accordingly conveyed to the Ministry.

31. The Ministry have now requested for extension of time upto 30 March, 1989 to implement the assurance. However, the assurance is yet to be fulfilled.

32. The Committee are not convinced of the grounds on which the Ministry had approached the Committee for the dropping of the assurance. Since the exercise is now on for the formulation of the Eighth Five Year Plan, the Ministry should make efforts to fulfil the assurance at this appropriate hour instead of requesting for the dropping of the assurance. Such a request for dropping the assurance clearly indicates the non-serious attitude adopted by the Ministry in fulfilling the solemn assurance given by the Minister on the floor of the House.

(iv)

High Court bench at Hubli

33. On 9 December, 1987, Shri V. Krishna Rao, M.P. addressed the following Unstarred Question No. 4904 to the Minister of Law and Justice.

“(a) whether there is a demand for setting up of a High Court bench at Hubli; and

(b) if so, the reaction of Government thereto?"

34. In reply to the above question, the Minister of State in the Ministry of Law and Justice (Shri H.R. Bhardwaj) stated as follows :

“(a) & (b): Yes, Sir. The Jaswant Singh Commission was asked to examine the demand but it could not do so. The recommendations of the Jaswant Singh Commission on the general question of having Benches of High Courts away from their principal seats were referred to the State Government in October, 1986 for considering the matter of establishment of a Bench at Hubli Dharwar in the light of these recommendations in consultation with the Karnataka High Court. The reply of the State Government giving their views has not so far been received.”

35. The above reply to the question was treated as an assurance by the Lok Sabha Secretariat and the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs. The assurance was required to be implemented by the Ministry of Law and Justice by 8 March, 1988.

36. The Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs *vide* their U.O. Note No. IX/LJ (10) USQ-4904-LS/87 dated 11 May, 1988 forwarded the request of the Ministry of Law and Justice for the dropping of the assurance on the following grounds :

“The Chief Minister of Karnataka had sent a proposal in August, 1981 for establishment of a Bench of the Karnataka High Court at Hubli-Dharwar. The State Government were requested in September, 1981 for some basic information for further consideration of the proposal. Partial information was received in September, 1983 but full requisite information was awaited from the State Government. The proposal was included in the enlarged terms of reference of the Jaswant Singh Commission in December, 1983.

The Jaswant Singh Commission submitted its Report on 30.4.85. While the Commission examined and reported on the proposals for establishment of Benches of Allahabad, Madhya Pradesh and Madras High Court and also on the general question of having Benches of High Courts away from their principal seats, it could not examine and report on the

specific proposal of the Government of Karnataka for establishment of a Bench of the Karnataka High Court at Hubli-Dharwar.

The recommendations of the Jaswant Singh Commission on the general question of having Benches of High Courts away from their principal seats were referred to the Government of Karnataka in October, 1986 for considering the matter of establishment of a Bench at Hubli-Dharwar in the light of those recommendations in consultation with the Karnataka High Court. Reply of the State Government giving their views has still not been received. No action can be taken by the Government of India in this regard unless a specific and complete proposal is received from the Government of Karnataka.

As mentioned above, the Government of Karnataka have not sent their views and comments on the recommendations of the Jaswant Singh Commission even after about a year and a half. There is no action pending on the part of the Central Government. The reply given to the Lok Sabha Unstarred Question No. 4904 on 9.12.87 was also not intended to constitute an assurance."

37. The Committee considered the request of the Ministry of Law and Justice for the dropping of the assurance at their sitting held on 18 July, 1988 and decided not to accede to the request of the Ministry for dropping the assurance. The decision of the Committee was accordingly conveyed to the Ministry.

38. The Ministry have now requested for extension of time upto 9 June, 1989 to implement the assurance and the assurance is yet to be fulfilled.

39. The Committee note that there is an attempt on the part of the Ministry to wriggle out of the assurance stating that no action is pending on the part of the Central Government thus shifting the onus on the State Government. The Committee are unable to comprehend the logic behind the request of the Ministry that an assurance of immense public importance should be dropped as the views of the State Government are not forthcoming in the matter. The Ministry would do well to seek further extension of time rather than making requests for dropping the assurance. From the wording

of the request of the Ministry for the dropping of the assurance, the Committee are at a loss to know whether or not the matter was taken up at the highest level. They recommend that the matter be taken up at the highest level with the State Government and sincere efforts should be made to implement the assurance.

(v)

New Level crossing device

40. On 3 December, 1987, Sarvashri V. Sreenivasa Prasad and H.N. Nanje Gowda M. Ks addressed the following Starred Question No. 403 to the Minister of Railways.

“(a) whether the Northern Railway has started field trials of a unique device which will help bring down substantially the number of accidents at railway crossings throughout the country;

(b) if so, the details of the new device including its cost;

(c) the outcome of the trials and when it is likely to be introduced; and

(d) whether there is any plan to equip all level crossings with such device ?”

41. In reply to the above question, the Minister of Railways (Shri Madhavrao Scindia) stated as follows :

“(a) Trial of an indigenously developed solar powered train actuated warning device to give audiovisual warning to road users before negotiating level crossing, is under way on the Northern Railway.

(b) A solar-powered radio transmitter located 2-3 Kms., from the level crossing senses the passage of the train and flashes the information to a receiver at the level crossing, actuating audio-visual warning system for the road-users. The approximate cost of the system under trial is about Rs. 2.5 lakhs per level crossing.

(c) & (d) This system is still under trial. Introduction of the system on a permanent basis can only be considered after the results of the trial are evaluated.”

42. The above reply to parts (c) and (d) of the question was treated as an assurance by the Lok Sabha Secretariat and the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs. The assurance was required to be implemented by the Ministry of Railways by 2 March, 1988.

43. The Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs *vide* their U.O. Note No. IX/Rly. (8) SQ-403-LS/87 dated 18 February, 1988, forwarded request of the Ministry of Railways for the dropping of the assurance on the following grounds :

“The reply given to parts (c) and (d) of question does not constitute or intended to be an assurance. The new system is still under trial and there are a lot of teething problems which are to be attended to and remedial measures to be devised. In view of this, a specific schedule cannot be kept for introduction of this system. As already indicated in the reply to the question the introduction of the system on permanent basis can only be considered after the results of the trial are evaluated and found to be acceptable.”

44. The Committee considered the request of the Ministry of Railways for the dropping of the assurance at their sitting held on 18 July, 1988 and decided not to the request of the Ministry for dropping the assurance. The decision of the Committee was accordingly conveyed to the Ministry.

45. The Ministry have requested for extension of time upto 3 December, 1989 to implement the assurance and the assurance is yet to be fulfilled.

46. The Committee are unhappy to note that the Ministry of Railways have sought the dropping of the assurance which involved the question of safety of precious human life and property. The precise date when the device was introduced on the Northern Railway on a trial basis is not known to the Committee but even if the date of reply in which assurance was given is taken as starting point of the trial about one and a half year period has elapsed and still the Ministry are not able to finally evaluate the efficacy of the device. The trial cannot go on indefinitely and analysis and evaluation have to be according to some schedule. In the absence of any clear indication to that effect, the Committee have no alternative except to conclude that the decision making process is not only faulty but also lethargic. In matters of vital importance like this, the Committee expect the Government to act with promptness and report the implementation of the assurance to the House in the first week of the next session.

Tourism development of Golconda Fort

47. On 28 August, 1987, Shri V.S. Krishna Iyer, M.P. addressed the following Unstarred Question No. 5330 to the Minister of Tourism :

“(a) whether there is any proposal before Union Government to develop the world famous Golconda Fort to attract tourists;

(b) if so, the details of the proposals; and

(c) if so, the total amount to be spent during the current year ?”

48. In reply to the above question, the then Minister of State in the Ministry of Tourism (Sh. Jagdish Tytler) stated as follows :

“The Central Ministry of Tourism has received a proposal from the Government of Andhra Pradesh for development of Golconda Fort. The proposal includes land acquisition, development of roads, development of a bird sanctuary, camping ground, tourist cottages, conference centre etc. The Central Ministry of Tourism has assigned to the Town and Country Planning Organisation the job of preparation of a Master Plan. Further action regarding development of tourism infrastructure will be taken according to the recommendations of the Master Plan.”

49. The above reply to the Question was treated as an assurance by the Lok Sabha Secretariat and the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs. The assurance was required to be implemented by the Ministry of Tourism by 27 November, 1987.

50. The Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs *vide* their U.O. Note No. VIII-2 (3) USQ 5330-LS/87 dated 18 February, 1988 forwarded request of the Ministry of Tourism for the dropping of the assurance on the following grounds :

“It is felt that the Assurance cited pertaining to the answer to the Parliament Question does not constitute an assurance since the Tourism Minister has stated that further action for providing Tourism infrastructure will be taken according to the recommendations of the Master Plan. It was also stated that the preparation of Master Plan has been assigned to the Town and Country Planning Organisation and the report is still awaited.”

51. The Ministry of Tourism also requested for extension of time till the decision of the Committee on their request for dropping of the assurance.

52. The Committee considered the request of the Ministry of Tourism for the dropping of the assurance at their sitting held on 18 July, 1988 and decided not to accede to the request of the Ministry for dropping the assurance. The decision of the Committee was accordingly conveyed to the Ministry.

53. The Ministry have now requested for extension of time upto 28 May, 1989 to implement the assurance and the assurance is yet to be fulfilled.

54. The Committee regret to observe that the reasoning of the Ministry of Tourism that the reply does not constitute an assurance since further action for providing tourism infrastructure will be taken according to the recommendations of the master plan and report on the Master Plan is still awaited. In the view of the Committee, the reply is a clear-cut assurance and the Ministry of Tourism cannot sit in judgement over the decision of the Committee and instead should make endeavour to implement the assurance.

55. While agreeing to the request of the Ministry for extension of time upto 28 May, 1989 to implement the assurance, the Committee do hope and trust that Government would report the implementation of the assurance by that date.

(vii)

Seismological studies of Narmada Sagar Project

56. On 1 December, 1987, Shri Mullappally Ramachandran, M.P. addressed the following Unstarred Question No. 3729 to the Minister of Energy :

- “(a) whether seismological studies are made in all cases before finally sanctioning Hydel Power Projects;
- (b) whether the World Bank had insisted upon further seismological studies before they could decide upon financing the Narmada Sagar Project;
- (c) if so the reasons for the same:

- (d) whether the further seismological study was made in the region of the Narmada Sagar Project; if so, by whom and the findings thereof; and
- (e) whether the World Bank aid was made available for the said project; if so, the extent thereof ?”

57. In reply to the above question, the then Minister of State in the Department of Power (Shrimati Sushila Rohatgi) stated as follows :

“(a) Yes, Sir.

(b) No, Sir.

(c) Does not arise.

(d) Further seismological studies were conducted by the Department of Earthquake Engineering, University of Roorkee, at the instance of the Dam Review Panel which was constituted on the advice of the World Bank. Based on these studies, the Dam Review Panel has suggested some design parameters to be adopted, which have been incorporated.

(e) Narmada Sagar Project has been posed for World Bank assistance, but loan negotiations are yet to be held.”

58. The above reply to part (e) of the question was treated as an assurance by the Lok Sabha Secretariat and the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs. The assurance was required to be implemented by the Ministry of Energy by 29 February, 1988.

59. The Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs *vide* their U.O. Note No. IX/Engy (33) USQ. 3729-LS/87 dated 4 April, 1988 forwarded request of the Ministry of Energy for the dropping of the assurance on the following grounds :-

“The Narmada Sagar Project is still in the pipeline for World Bank assistance for which the Bank mission visited the Project during January, 1988 to prepare it for possible reappraisal in March/April, 1988. This would be followed by a humour of discussions to sort out various issues involved in it. Further, the details about the aid would also be known only after the conclusion of negotiations with the Bank, approval by the Board of Directors of the Bank, signing of the Agreement and the loan has been declared to be effective.

In view of this it is not possible to fulfil the assurance within the prescribed limit of three months. Moreover, the various actions culminating in the implementation of the Assurance are beyond the control of this Department and are dependent upon the World Bank taking a view in the matter."

60. The Committee considered the request of the Ministry of Energy for the dropping of the assurance at their sitting held on 29 August, 1988 and decided not to accede to the request of the Ministry for dropping the assurance. The decision of the Committee was accordingly conveyed to the Ministry.

61. The Ministry have now requested for extension of time upto 1 December, 1989 to implement the assurance and the assurance is yet to be fulfilled.

62. The Committee are not convinced of the reasons advanced by the Ministry of Energy for the dropping of the assurance. The Committee appreciate the fact that in the nature of things certain matters involve prolonged negotiations and in such cases the Ministry should request the Committee for more time for the fulfilment of the assurance instead of approaching for its dropping which reveals the lack of perseverance on the part of the Ministry to take things to their logical conclusion. The Committee desire that Government should implement the assurance during the next session of Lok Sabha reporting the upto date progress made in the matter.

Implements of suggestions by National Convention on Water

63. On 2 December, 1987, Shri Chintamani Jena, M.P. addressed the following Unstarred Question No. 8809 to the Minister of Water Resources :

"(a) whether the National Convention on Water was held recently in New Delhi; and

(b) if so, the details of the steps taken to implement the suggestions made in the convention ?"

64. In reply to the above question, the Minister of State for Textiles and Water Resources, (Shri Ram Niwas Mirchha) stated as follows :

"(a) & (b) The first National Water Convention, which was a cooperative effort of Government departments, Public

Sector agencies and professional institutions and associations, was held in November, 1987 at New Delhi, to provide a common forum for specialists in concerned disciplines for exchange of ideas on the development and management of water resources. State Governments and other concerned agencies will consider the suggestions made by this convention for implementation."

65. The above reply to the question was treated as an assurance by the Lok Sabha Secretariat and the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs. The assurance was required to be implemented by the Ministry of Water Resources by 1 March, 1988.

66. The Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs *vide* their U.O. Note No. IX/WR (6) USQ 3809-LS/87, dated 18 March, 1988 forwarded request of the Ministry of Water Resources for the dropping of the assurance on the following grounds :

"The convention was a cooperative effort of Government Departments, public sector agencies, professional institutions and associations in concerned disciplines for exchange of ideas on development and management of Water Resource. The recommendation made at the Convention can be kept in view by State Governments and other concerned organisations for taking such action as deemed appropriate in the light of the National Water Policy which has been laid before the Parliament. The recommendations of the Convention have already been circulated. No further action by way of implementation of assurance is necessary."

67. The Committee considered the request of the Ministry of Water Resources for the dropping of the assurance at their sitting held on 29 August, 1988 and decided not to accede to the request of the Ministry for dropping the assurance. The decision of the Committee was accordingly conveyed to the Ministry.

68. The Ministry have now requested for extension of time upto 2 March, 1989 to implement the assurance. However, the assurance is yet to be fulfilled.

69. The Committee deprecate the manner in which the Ministry of Water Resources submitted their request for the dropping of the assurance. In their view, the appropriate course was to report the implementation to the

House by laying a statement indicating the action taken by the concerned Government departments and other organisations. It is unfortunate that this has not been done as yet although the Ministry sought extension only upto 2 March, 1989. The Committee would urge upon the Ministry to do the needful without further delay and report the implementation of the assurance in the beginning of the next session.

(ix)

Import of gold

70. On 11 December, 1987, Shri Swami Prasad Singh, M.P. addressed the following Unstarred Question No. 5527 to the Minister of Finance :

- “(a) whether requests from some quarters have been received for import of gold;
- (b) if so, the details of these requests;
- (c) in what context these requests have been made;
- (d) the decision taken by Government on these requests;
- (e) whether import of gold will affect present rise in the price of gold;
- (f) if so, the details thereof; and
- (g) if not, the reasons therefor ?”

71. In reply to the above question the Minister of State in the Ministry of Finance (Shri B.K. Gadhvi) stated as follows :

“(a) to (g) Suggestions have been received by Government from time to time regarding import of gold. These suggestions have been referred to the Working Group on Gold Policy set up by the Government whose report is awaited.”

72. The above reply to the question was treated as an assurance by the Lok Sabha Secretariat and the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs. The assurance was required to be implemented by the Ministry of Finance by 10 March, 1988.

73. The Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs *vide* their U.O. Note No. Ix/Fin. (90) USQ. 5527-LS/87, dated 12 May, 1988 forwarded request

of the Ministry of Finance for the dropping of the assurance on the following grounds :-

"The question, suggestions regarding import of gold have been referred to the Working Group on Gold Policy set up by the Government. The terms of the Working Group has been extended upto 31st May, 1988. Processing and finalisation of Government's decisions on the recommendations of the Working Group will take some time after the receipt of the report. The reply has been treated as an assurance by the Lok Sabha. It may be mentioned here that a similar reply given on a similar question on 1.8.86 in Lok Sabha had not been treated as an assurance by the Committee on Government Assurances of Lok Sabha."

74. The Committee considered the request of the Ministry of Finance for the dropping of the assurance at their sitting held on 29 August, 1988 and decided not to accede to the request of the Ministry for dropping the assurance. The decision of the Committee was accordingly conveyed to the Ministry.

75. The Ministry has requested for extension of time upto 10 April, 1989 to implement the assurance. However, the assurance is yet to be fulfilled.

76. The Committee are not convinced with the plea taken by the Government to drop the assurance. The Committee desire that the report of the Working Group on Gold Policy should be got expedited and its recommendations considered as early as possible.

(x)

Inclusion of 'Tanti' community in the List of Scheduled Castes

77. On 19 March, 1986, Shri C.P. Thakur, M.P. addressed the following Starred Question No. 348 to the Minister of Welfare :

"(a) whether Government have received representations to treat 'Tanti' (Tatwa) Community as synonym of 'Pan', which is in the list of Scheduled Castes in Bihar;

(b) whether Union Government have invited the comments of State Government of Bihar in this regard; and

(c) the date by which the decision is likely to be taken by Union Government in this regard ?”

78. In reply to the above question, the Minister of State in the Ministry of Welfare (Dr. Rajendra Kumari Bajpai) stated as follows :

“(a) & (b) Yes, Sir.

(c) The proposal to include ‘Tanti’ (Tatwa) as synonym of ‘Pan’ which is in the list of Scheduled Castes in Bihar is being considered along with similar other proposals in the context of the proposed comprehensive revision of the list of Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes in consultation with the concerned State Government/Union Territory Administration including the Government of Bihar and the Registrar General of India. At this stage, it is not possible to indicate the date by which the proposal for the comprehensive revision of the lists of Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes would be finalised.

Further, amendment in the existing list of Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes can be done only through an Act of Parliament in view of Articles 341(2) and 342(2) of the Constitution.”

79. The above reply to part (c) of the question was treated as an assurance by the Lok Sabha Secretariat and the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs. The assurance was required to be implemented by the Ministry of Welfare by 18 June, 1986

80. The Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs *vide* their U.O. Note No. V/W (19) SQ 348-LS/86 dated 8 April, 1987, forwarded the request of the Ministry of Welfare for the dropping of the assurance on the following grounds :

“In the statement showing the assurance given, the following text of the answer given by the Minister of Welfare has not been included :

Further, amendment in the existing lists of Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes can be done only through an act of Parliament in view of Articles 341 (2) and 342 (2) of the Constitution.

Part (c) of the answer to the Question would be complete only with addition of the aforesaid sub-para. It would thereby imply that any amendment in the existing lists can since be done only through an Act of Parliament, hence no time-limits in context of the Parliament's jurisdiction can, thus, be specified by the Administrative Ministry. Further, the Cabinet Note on the comprehensive revision of the List of Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes has been submitted and is at present under consideration of the Group of Ministers."

81. The Committee considered the above request of the Ministry for the dropping of assurance at their sitting held on 14 July, 1987 and took the following decisions which were communicated to the Ministry.

"The Committee noted that the replies of the Minister of Welfare to the original question as well as in response to a supplementary clearly indicated Government's intention to bring forward a comprehensive bill after taking into account the various representations for revision of the lists of Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes. The Committee also noted that the matter was presently under consideration of the Group of Ministers. In view of this position, the Committee did not see any reason to accede to the request of the Ministry for the dropping of the assurance. Agreeing to the request of the Ministry for extension of time for implementation of assurance by 31 November, 1987, the Committee desired that Government should expedite their decision so as to ensure implementation of the assurance within the extended time granted for the purpose. The Committee further desired that group of Ministers as well as Cabinet be suitably apprised of their said recommendations."

82. The Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs *vide* their U.O. Note No. V/W (19) SQ 348-LS/85 dated 16 December, 1987 forwarded another request of the Ministry of Welfare for the dropping of the assurance. The grounds were as follows :

"The question of comprehensive revision of the lists of Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes was placed before the Cabinet on the 25 July, 1986. The Cabinet referred it to the

Group of Ministers for detailed examination of various proposals included therein. The Group of Ministers has so far held seven meetings and may take a few more meetings to finalise all the proposals. At this stage it is difficult to indicate any time limit by which the Group of Ministers would be able to finalise all the proposals. After the Group of Ministers given their recommendations in respect of all the proposals it will be placed before the Cabinet for a final decision. The Ministry of Law and Justice will then be requested to prepare Bill which will be introduced in Parliament. It would, thus, be seen that it is difficult to anticipate the time limit by which the whole process of finalisation of all the proposals is to be completed. Even after the Bill is introduced in the Parliament, it will be referred to a Joint Select Committee, as happened in the past.

For instance, the Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes Orders (Amendment) Bill, 1967 was referred to a joint Select Committee which took two years in submitting their report. Similarly in 1978, when this Bill was again introduced in the Lok Sabha, it was referred to a Joint Select Committee and that Committee could not finalise its report even after taking one year's time and the Bill eventually lapsed on the dissolution of the Lok Sabha in 1979. The past experience, therefore, shows that it cannot be possible to precisely fix any time limit within which the whole matter would be finalised and the Bill enacted."

83. The Committee considered the request of the Ministry of Welfare for the dropping of the assurance at their sitting held on 29 August, 1988 and decided not to accede to the request of the Ministry for dropping the assurance. The decision of the Committee was accordingly conveyed to the Ministry.

84. The Ministry have now requested for extension of time upto 12 June, 1989 to implement the assurance and the assurance is yet to be fulfilled.

85. The Committee believe that the Government must have received representations not only from Bihar but from other States also for inclusion of some communities in the lists of Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes. The Ministry should, therefore, bring forward urgently a comprehensive legislation for revision of the lists of Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes.

The Committee further observe that it is not necessary for the Ministry to anticipate the manner in which the Parliament would like to consider the Bill and make it a ground for the dropping of the assurance, as once the Bill is before the Parliament, Government can report the implementation of the assurance.

(xi)

Misuse of foreign funds

86. On 25 November, 1987, Shri Jagannath Patnaik, M.P. addressed the following Starred Question No. 272 to the Minister of Home Affairs :—

“(a) whether the events in the last two years have clearly established that the foreign funds flowing into the country ostensibly for the promotion of religious, social and such other programmes of the voluntary agencies are finding their way to finance terrorists and other anti-national activities; and

(b) if so, the steps Government propose to take to effectively control and regulate the flow of such foreign funds.”

87. In reply to the above question, the Minister of Home Affairs (Shri Buta Singh) stated as follows :

“(a) and (b) There is no definite information that foreign contribution received by the voluntary agencies are being used for such purposes. However, some amendments to the Foreign Contribution (Regulation) Act, 1976 are under consideration with a view to making it more effective.”

88. The above reply to the question was treated as an assurance by the Lok Sabha Secretariat and the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs. The assurance was required to be implemented by the Ministry of Home Affairs by 24 February, 1988.

89. The Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs *vide* their U.O. Note No. IX/HA (25) SQ. 272-IS/87, dated 11 March, 1988 forwarded request of the Ministry of Home Affairs for the dropping of the assurance on the following grounds :

“The Ministry had only meant to indicate the intentions, approach and anxiety of the Government to plug certain lacunae in the

Foreign contributions (Regulation) Act, 1976 by amending the same so that chances of its misuse are minimised. The Ministry do not consider that this statement amounts to 'Assurance'. It would be appreciated that as the process of bringing about amendments in such enactments does take time, it is not possible to fulfil the assurance within a particular time frame."

90. **The Committee considered the request of the Ministry of Home Affairs for the dropping of the assurance at their sitting held on 20 September, 1988 and decided not to accede to the request of the Ministry for dropping the assurance.**

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

92. **The Ministry have requested for extension of time upto 24 May, 1989 to implement the assurance and the assurance is yet to be fulfilled.**

93. **The Committee feel unhappy to note that the Ministry tried to sit in judgement on their decision in treating the reply of the Minister of Home Affairs as an assurance. The Committee need hardly over emphasize the importance of the matter requiring the attention of the Government on top priority Government should therefore, bring forward necessary legislation to amend the Foreign Contribution (Regulation) Act, 1976, without any further delay, in fulfilment of the commitment to the House in reply to the aforesaid question.**

(xii)

Teachers' participation in action plan of New Education Policy

94. **On 26 November, 1987, Shri Aziz Qureshi, M.P. addressed the following Unstarred Question No. 2920 to the Minister of Human Resource Development :**

- "(a) the special provisions made in regard to teachers' participation in the act on plan of National Education Policy;**
- (b) whether there is any proposal to give more representation to teachers in NCERT and UGC as per these special provisions;**
- (c) whether there is provision of special participation of school teachers in the National Level Committee of the National**

Teachers Welfare Organisation and the details of proposals;

- (d) whether teachers and instructors will be given more representation in the National Teachers and Instructors Training Council; and
- (e) The action taken to make the Teachers Training Council a statutory body?"

95. In reply to the above question, the Minister of State in the Departments of Education and Culture in the Ministry of Human Resource Development (Shrimati Krishna Sakti) stated as follows :

- "(a) The National Policy of Education, 1986 recognises the Central role of teachers in the educational process and it recognises that the provisions of the Policy can be implemented only with the total involvement and commitment of the teachers. The National Policy envisages higher status to teachers and freedom to them to innovate, it also envisages improvement in pay and service conditions of teachers to be commensurate with their social and professional responsibilities. It postulates improved facilities to teachers to go along with accountability at all stages and in this the involvement of teachers' association is contemplated. The policy has proposed a strengthened and improved programme of teacher education to upgrade their competency.

To improve the competencies of the teachers, to make them fully aware of the thrusts of the National Policy and to increase their motivation the Government has started a programme for mass orientation of 5,00,000 school teachers every year since 1986. This programme is implemented through the NCERT with the assistance of State Governments.

- (b) According to the rules governing the composition of the NCERT and the UGC, four teachers are members of the NCERT Council and similarly four university teachers are members of the UGC.
- (c) The Working Committee of the National Foundation of Teachers Welfare in every State includes six persons to be nominated by the State Education Minister, at least two of whom are eminent educationists.

- (d) The National Council of Teacher Education has 42 members out of which 12 experts in the field of pre-school, school and vocational education are nominated by the President of the Council.
- (e) The National Policy envisages that the National Council of Teacher Education will be provided necessary resources and capability to accredit institutions of teacher education and provide guidance regarding curricula and methods. The programme of Action which has worked out specific strategies to implement the provisions of the Policy, envisages that National Council of Teacher Education will be given autonomous and statutory status. These provisions of the policy and the Programme of Action will be taken up for implementation over a period of time."

96. The above reply to the question was treated as an assurance by the Lok Sabha Secretariat and the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs. The assurance was required to be implemented by the Ministry of Human Resource Development by 25 February, 1988.

97. The Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs *vide* their U.O. Note No. IX/HRD (10) USQ. 2920-LS/87 dated 11 May, 1988 forwarded request of the Ministry of Human Resource Development for the dropping of the assurance on the following grounds :—

"It is clear from the wording of the above sentence that it is not possible to lay down any specific time frame for conferral of statutory status of the National Council of Teacher Education (NCTE), but that this can be taken up for implementation only over a period of time. It is implicit in the above wording that this action is likely to take a considerable length of time.

A National Council of Teacher Education, constituted by a Resolution of this Ministry, is already in existence since 1973. However, conferral of statutory status on it would require prior consultation with all States not merely because Education is in the Concurrent List of the Constitution but also because certain functions envisaged for the NCTE may impinge on the jurisdiction of the universities as it stands today under the various State Universities Acts. Such a process would naturally take a long time to complete.

In the light of above, it would be difficult to set down any deadline or time-limit by which the task of conferring statutory status on the NCTE would be completed. As such, it would not serve much purpose to keep the matter alive as a Parliamentary Assurance.

Conferral of statutory status on the NCTE has already found mention in the National Policy on Education adopted by Parliament and in the Programme of Action. Hence the Central Government already stand committed to it and even without treating the above reply as an assurance, Parliament would always be kept informed of progress in the matter while submitting periodic Implementation Reports on the National Policy on Education."

98. The Committee considered the request of the Ministry of Human Resource Development for the dropping of the assurance at their sitting held on 20 September, 1988 and decided not to accede to the request of the Ministry for dropping of the assurance. The decision of the Committee was accordingly conveyed to the Ministry.

99. The Ministry have requested for extension of time upto 11 December, 1989 to implement the assurance and the assurance is yet to be fulfilled.

100. The Committee are not inclined to agree with the reasons advanced by the Ministry of Human Resource Development for the dropping of the assurance, especially when the Government are conscious of the importance of the matter and have asserted their commitment to the conferment of the statutory status on the National Council of Teachers Education. The Committee desire that the Government should take early steps for the expeditious implementation of the assurance not later than the expiry of the next session of Lok Sabha.

(xlii)

Reopening of Indian Consulate in Lhasa

101. On 11 November, 1987, Shri S. Jaipal Reddy, M.P. addressed the following Unstarred Question No 699 to the Minister of External Affairs.

"(a) whether Government have received any request from China to reopen Indian Consulate in Lhasa; and

(b) whether Government have considered the proposal and if so, the decision thereon ?”

102. In reply to the above question, the Minister of State in the Ministry of External Affairs (Shri K. Natwar Singh) stated as follows :

“(a) The Chinese Government have proposed the re-establishment of Consulates General by India and China in each other's countries.

(b) The proposal is under the consideration of Government.”

103. The above reply to part (b) of the question was treated as an assurance by the Lok Sabha Secretariat and the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs. The assurance was required to be implemented by the Ministry of External Affairs by 10 February, 1988.

104. The Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs *vide* their U.O. Note No. IX/EA (3) USQ. 699-LS/87 dated 14 January, 1988 forwarded request of the Minister of State in the Ministry of External Affairs for the dropping of the assurance on the following grounds :-

“This should not be regarded as an assurance, for the primary reason that it would not be feasible to specify a time-limit within which India and China will reopen Consulates in each other's country. The matter is under discussion with the Chinese Government and a final decision will emerge only when these discussions have been satisfactorily and thoroughly completed. It would therefore not be possible for Government to take the position that the Consulates will be reopened within a specified time limit.

The entire subject of India-China relations is extremely sensitive and every aspect, is being handled with the utmost care and discretion by Government. We are trying to sort out the various issues involved in a positive manner and in keeping with our national interest. The process will take time. It is in this context that we request that the reply to Unstarred Question No. 699 should not be treated as an Assurance but only as an indication of the sincerity with

which we are examining various proposals for the improvement of relations with China ”

105. The Committee considered the request of the Ministry of External Affairs for the dropping of the assurance at their sitting held on 20 September, 1988 and decided not to accede to the request of the Ministry for dropping the assurance. The decision of the Committee was accordingly conveyed to the Ministry.

106. The Ministry requested for extension of time only upto 11 November, 1988 to implement the assurance but the assurance is yet to be fulfilled.

107. The Committee are unable to agree with the reasoning of the Ministry of External Affairs that the reply should not be regarded as an assurance. In this regard, the Committee would like to point out that it is for the Committee and not at all for the Ministry to decide whether or not a particular reply of the Minister is to be treated as an assurance. In the instant case, the reply to the question clearly constitutes an assurance and the Committee desire that it should be implemented at the earliest as the Government have already indicated that they are examining various proposals for the improvement of relations with China.

108. The Committee are unhappy to find that even after hearing about their decision not to drop the assurance, the Ministry did not report its implementation nor submitted a request for extension of time beyond 11 November, 1988. This is unfortunate and the Ministry must note not to repeat it in future.

(xiv)

Scheme to stop water-logging from Bihar

109. On 11 November, 1987, Dr. G.S. Rajhans, M.P. addressed the following Unstarred Question No. 776 to the Minister of Water Resources :

“(a) whether the Government of Bihar recently forwarded to the Union Government a scheme to stop water logging for clearance;

(b) if so, when the scheme was received by Government; and

(c) 'steps taken by Government on the proposed scheme?'

110. In reply to the above question, the Minister of State for Textiles and Water Resources (Shri Ram Niwas Mirdha) stated as follows :

“(a) to (c) Yes, Sir. The Project Report on drainage in the irrigation commands of Gandak and Kosi Projects in North Bihar has been received in July, 1987 only. It is currently under appraisal.”

111. The above reply to the above question was treated as an assurance by the Lok Sabha Secretariat and the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs. The assurance was required to be implemented by the Ministry of Water Resources by 10 February, 1988.

112. The Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs *vide* their U.O. No. IX/WR (2) USQ-776-LS/87 dated 15 February, 1988 forwarded request of the Ministry of Water Resources for the dropping of the assurance on the following grounds :

“In the reply furnished to the Parliament Question the words ‘It is currently under appraisal’ are not used in the sense of intimating at a later date, the likely date by which the appraisal is going to be completed but only to indicate the present position. The appraisal of a Project has to be done by the various Central appraising agencies, and later it has to be cleared by the Advisory Committee of the Ministry of Water Resources. Then, ultimately Planning Commission has to approve the scheme. The time taken for clearance of a Project depends upon the initiative of the concerned State Government furnishing replies to the observations are made from time to time.”

113. The Committee considered the request of the Ministry of Water Resources for the dropping of the assurance at their sitting held on 20 September, 1988 and decided not to accede to the request of the Ministry for dropping the assurance. The decision of the Committee was accordingly conveyed to the Ministry.

114. The Ministry have requested for extension of time upto 11 May, 1989 to implement the assurance and the assurance is yet to be fulfilled.

115. The Committee are unable to appreciate the stand taken by the Ministry of Water Resources that they used the words 'it is currently under appraisal' not in the sense of intimating at a later date as to when the appraisal is going to be completed. The Committee observe that the reply of the Ministry constitutes a clear cut assurance and is required to be implemented at the earliest. The Committee do not feel happy in reminding the Ministry about the established Parliamentary practice that once the reply of the Minister is treated as an assurance, the Ministry should implement it and not try to sit in judgement over the decision of the Committee. This only delays the matter. The Committee do hope that the Government would report the implementation of the assurance by 11 May, 1987 the date upto which extension has been sought.

(xv)

Setting up of Thermal Plant near Suratgarh

116. On 17 November, 1987, Shri Manphool Singh Choudhary, M.P. addressed the following Unstarred Question No. 1494 to the Minister of Energy :

- “(a) whether a scheme has been formulated to set up a thermal plant of 410 megawatt on Indira Gandhi Canal near Suratgarh;
- (b) the progress in regard to the implementation of this scheme;
- (c) the total expenditure likely to be incurred thereon; and
- (d) the time by which this plant will be completed ?”

117. In reply to the above question, the Minister of State in the Department of Power (Shrimati Sushila Rohatgi) stated as follows :

- “(a) to (d) : A feasibility report in respect of installation of a Thermal Power Plant (2 x 210MW) at an estimated cost of Rs. 483.16 crores, near the Indira Gandhi Canal, was received in the Central Electricity Authority (CEA) in May, 1984 from the Rajasthan State Electricity Board (RSEB). The scheme could be considered for techno-economic clearance after the statutory requirements, under Section 29 (2) of the Electricity (Supply) Act, 1948, have been complied with by the RSEB and necessary inputs, including coal linkage, have been tied up.”

118. The above reply to the question was treated as an assurance by the Lok Sabha Secretariat and the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs. The assurance was required to be implemented by the Ministry of Energy by 16 February, 1988.

119. The Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs *vide* their U.O. No. IX/ Energy (15) USQ. 1494-ES/87 dated 16 February, 1988 forwarded request of the Ministry of Energy for the dropping of the assurance of the following grounds :

“The project authorities have to comply with the statutory requirements—under Section 29 (2) of the Electricity (Supply) Act, 1948 regarding publication of the scheme in the Official Gazette/local newspapers for the prescribed period and examination of the representations/objections, if any, received thereon; ~~if~~ this is completed, the proposal is not considered to have been submitted to the CEA for formal clearance. Before according formal clearance, various aspects—like availability of water, adequacy of land for ash disposal system, coal linkage and suitability of the site for a power plant, including its approach from the point of view of means of transportation, including railways need to be satisfactorily tied up. The scheme has also to be examined with reference to the available transmission systems for evacuation of power, its impact on the environment of the surrounding areas and clearance of the Department of Civil Aviation for building high structures. Compliance of all those steps can be a long-drawn process and the tying up of inputs and various clearances involves active cooperation of the State authorities. Quite often, techno-economic appraisal of schemes is held up for want of clarifications/clearances from the project authorities on various aspects; schemes can be accorded techno-economic clearance only after all the inputs have been tied up and necessary clearances have been obtained.”

120. The Committee considered the request of the Ministry of Energy for the dropping of the assurance at their sitting held on 20 September, 1988 and decided not to accede to the request of the Ministry for dropping the assurance. The decision of the Committee was accordingly conveyed to the Ministry.

121. The Ministry requested for extension of time only upto 30 April, 1989 to implement the assurance. However, the assurance is yet to be fulfilled.

122. The Committee note that even after the lapse of one year and a half, the Ministry of Energy has not been able to implement the assurance even after repeated extensions. The Committee recommend that the Ministry should expedite the finalisation of the project and implement the assurance.

(xv)

Clearance to Vijayawada Thermal Power Plant Stage III

123. On 10 November, 1987, Shri V. Sobhanadreeswara Rao, M.P. addressed the following Starred Question No. 43 to the Minister of Energy :

- “(a) whether the clearance to Vijayawada Thermal Power Plant Stage-III, proposed to be set up in Andhra Pradesh, has been further delayed;
- (b) if so, the reasons for delay; and
- (c) the likely time by which the above plant will be cleared ?”

124. In reply to the above question, the then Minister of State in the Department of Power (Shrimati Sushila Rohatgi) laid the following statement on the Table of the House :

- (a) No, Sir.
- “(b) & (c): A feasibility report in regard to Stage-III (15×00 MW of the Vijayawada Thermal Power Station was received in the Central Electricity Authority (CEA) from the Andhra Pradesh State Electricity Board (APSEB) in September, 1986. However, several aspects including clearance of the State pollution Control Board, Availability of land for ash disposal and confirmation of availability of water, had not been tied up. The APSEL have been requested for necessary clarifications, details of transmission system and for information relating to cost of implementation of the environmental safeguards, which are awaited.

The proposed scheme could be considered for techno-economic approval only after the requisite inputs and clearances have been obtained by APSEB, as indicated to them by the CEA.

125. The above reply to parts (b) & (c) of the question was treated as an assurance by the Lok Sabha Secretariat and the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs. The assurance was required to be implemented by the Ministry of Energy by 9 February, 1988.

126. The Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs *vide* their U.O. Note No. IX/Engy (1) SQ. 43-LS/87 dated 15 March, 1988 forwarded request of the Ministry of Energy for the dropping of the assurance on the following grounds :

“The project feasibility report in respect of the proposed Vijayawada Thermal Power Station Stage-III (1×500 MW) was received in the Central Electricity Authority in September, 1986 from the Andhra Pradesh State Electricity Board (APSEB) and is under examination in consultation with the various appraising agencies. Before formal clearance could be accorded to the proposed scheme, various aspects such as availability of land for ash disposal, coal linkages and details of transmission system for evacuation of power need to be satisfactorily tied up. In addition, details of the cost for implementation of the environmental safeguards have yet to be received from the APSEB.

It may be mentioned that tying up of inputs and obtaining the requisite clearances calls for active cooperation of the State authorities. Sometimes the techno-economic appraisal of schemes is held up for want of clarification/clearances from the project authorities on various aspects. In replying to the aforesaid Lok Sabha Question it was not the intention to extend an Assurance in the matter.”

127. The Committee considered the request of the Ministry of Energy for the dropping of the assurance at their sitting held on 20 September, 1988 and decided not to accede to the request of the Ministry for dropping the assurance. The decision of the Committee was accordingly conveyed to the Ministry.

The Ministry requested for extension of time upto 9 March, 1989 to implement the assurance. However, the assurance is yet to be fulfilled.

128. The Committee are deeply concerned to note that no decision has been taken so far on the feasibility report received in September, 1986. The Committee recommend that the matter should be taken up with the State Government of Andhra Pradesh at the highest level and report to the House the implementation of the assurance at the earliest.

129. As has been observed by the Committee earlier in other cases, the Ministry of Energy ought not to have indulged in the frivolous exercise of arguing that it was not the intention to extend an assurance. The Committee would like once again to impress upon the Ministry that it is the exclusive prerogative of the Committee to decide whether or not a reply constituted an assurance and is not for the Ministry to question the decision of the Committee.

(xvii)

(1) Power projects proposed for private sector

130 On 17 November, 1987, Shri Mullappally Ramachandran, M.P. addressed the following Unstarred Question No. 1665 to the Ministry of Energy :

- “(a) whether any power projects have been proposed for the private sector exclusively; and
- (b) the main recommendations of the five member Committee on the setting up of such power projects ?”

131. In reply to the above question, the Minister of State in the Department of Power (Shrimati Sushila Rohatgi) stated as follows :

- “(a) No, Sir.
- (b) Specific proposals received from the private sector are examined on merits. The Report of the Working Group set up to study the modalities of private sector participation in electric power generation is receiving consideration of Government.”

132. The above reply to part (b) of the question was treated as an assurance by the Lok Sabha Secretariat and the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs. The assurance was required to be implemented by the Ministry of Energy by 16 February, 1988.

133. The Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs *vide* their U.O. Note No. IX/Engy (38) USQ. 1665-LS/87 dated 6 April, 1988 have forwarded request of the Ministry of Energy for the dropping of the assurance on the following grounds :

"In this regard, it may be stated that the formulation of the broad principles to be followed in respect of such private sector participation keeping in view, *inter-alia*, the recommendations of the Working Group, has been under consideration; being a matter of policy, various relevant aspects have to be examined in requisite detail which is likely to take some time. After a decision is reached, it would be necessary to consult the State Electricity Boards/State Governments/concerned Ministries/Departments in the event that amendments to the Electricity (Supply) Act, 1948 and the Indian Electricity Act, 1910 are to be effected. As such, implementation of the pending assurance in respect of this matter, in a definite time-frame, would not appear to be feasible."

134. The Ministry of Energy requested for extension of time for fulfilling the assurance till a decision was taken on their request for dropping it by the Committee.

135. The Committee considered the request of the Ministry of Energy for the dropping of the assurance at their sitting held on 11 October, 1988 and decided not to accede to the request of the Ministry for dropping the assurance. The Committee granted extension of time upto 31 December, 1988 to the Ministry to implement the assurance while taking exception to the manner in which the Ministry had couched their request for extension of time for fulfilling the assurance. The decision of the Committee was accordingly conveyed to the Ministry.

136. The Ministry did not request for extension of time even after 31 December, 1988 to implement the assurance and the assurance is yet to be fulfilled.

(2) Working group on private sector participation in power generation

137. On 28 July, 1987, Shrimati Basavarajeswari, Sarvashri Bhadreshwar Tanti, Mohanbhai Patel, P. Kolandaivelu, (Dr.) V. Venkatesh, S.M. Gureddi and H.N. Nanje Gowda, M.Ps addressed the following Unstarred Question No. 349 to the Minister of Energy.

"(a) whether the working group constituted to study various aspects and issues relating to private sector participation in power generations has submitted its report;

(b) if so, the findings thereof; and

(c) the action taken by Government in the matter ?”

138. In reply to the above question, the Minister of State in the Department of Power (Shrimati Sushila Rohangi) stated as follows :

“(a) Yes, Sir.

(b) & (c). The Working Group was set up to study the modalities of private sector participation in electric power generation. The report of the Working Group is presently being examined.”

139. The above reply to parts (b) & (c) of the question was treated as an assurance by the Lok Sabha Secretariat and the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs. The assurance was required to be implemented by the Ministry of Energy by 27 October, 1987.

140. The Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs *vide* their U.O. Note No. VIII-2/ Engy (3) USQ-349-LS/87 dated 23 March, 1988 have forwarded request of the Ministry of Energy for the dropping of the assurance on the following grounds :

“The formulation of the broad principles to be followed in respect of such private sector participation keeping in view, *inter-alia* the recommendations of the Working Group, has been under consideration; being a matter of policy, various relevant aspects have to be examined in requisite detail which is likely to take some time. After a decision is reached, it would be necessary to consult the State Electricity Boards/States Govts./concerned Ministries/Departments in the event that amendments to the Electricity (Supply) Act, 1948 and the Indian Electricity Act, 1910 are to be effected. As such, implementation of the pending Assurances in respect of the matter, in a definite time-frame, would not appear to be feasible.”

141. The Ministry requested for extension of time upto the date the decision of Committee regarding dropping is conveyed to them.

142. The Committee considered the request of the Ministry of Energy for the dropping of the assurance at their sitting held on 11 October, 1988 and decided not to accede to the request of the Ministry for dropping the

assurance. The Committee granted extension of time upto 31 December, 1988 to the Ministry to implement the assurance, while taking exception to the phraseology used in their request for seeking extension of time for implementing the assurance. The decision of the Committee was accordingly conveyed to the Ministry.

143. The Ministry did not request for extension of time after 31 December, 1988 to implement the assurance and the assurance is yet to be fulfilled.

144. Both the aforesaid assurances are on allied matters and pertain to the Ministry of Energy. Taking a serious view of the fact that the Ministry of Energy have not approached for any further extension of time after 31 December, 1988 in respect of both the assurances despite specific observations of the Committee conveyed to them, the Committee deplore the conduct of the Ministry. The Committee would like to observe that the working of the Ministry in dealing with the assurances given by the Minister must receive the attention of the Minister himself so that the assurances are implemented without delay and if it is not possible owing to certain reasons, the Committee are approached in an appropriate manner.

145. The Committee desire that the Ministry should expedite a decision in the matter and fulfil the assurance.

(xviii)

Exploitation of copper in Bihar

146. On 19 November, 1987, Dr. G S. Rajhans and Shri Laliteshwar Prasad Shahi, M.Ps. addressed the following Unstarred Question No. 1902 to the Minister of Steel and Mines :

- “(a) whether Government have signed a contract with a firm of Australia for taking up a feasible study to exploit the immense potential of the copper belt in Bihar State;
- (b) if so, whether the feasible study in this regard has since been conducted; and
- (c) if so, the details thereof ?”

147. In reply to the above question, the Minister of State in the Department of Mines (Shrimati Ram Dulari Sinha) stated as follows :—

“(a) to (c) A contract has been signed by Hindustan Copper Limited (HCL), a Public Sector Undertaking under the Deptt. of Mines, with M/s. Robertson Research Ltd., Australia to undertake a study for the integrated development of the Singhbhum Copper belt in Bihar. The study is aimed at obtaining detailed project reports on deposits already explored in the area and to formulate a long term strategy for exploitation of the potential of the belt. The study, which is under progress, is expected to be completed in two years.”

148. The above reply to the question was treated as an assurance by the Lok Sabha Secretariat and the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs. The assurance was required to be implemented by the Ministry of Steel and Mines by 18 February, 1988.

149. The Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs *vide* their U.O. Note No. IX/SM(13) USQ-1902-LS/87 dated 24 June, 1988, have forwarded request of the Ministry of Steel and Mines for the dropping of the assurance on the following grounds :

“a part of the reply to the above mentioned USQ viz. “the study is aimed at obtaining detailed project reports on deposits already explored in the area and to formulate a long term strategy for exploitation of the potential of the belt. The study, which is under progress, is expected to be completed in two years” has been treated as an assurance at the instance of the Lok Sabha Secretariat.

In this connection, it may be mentioned that the reply given by this Deptt. is a factual one. The feasibility study has commenced on 1.9.87 and is to be completed by August, 1989 as per the contract entered into with M/s. Robertson Research Ltd., Australia by Hindustan Copper Ltd. Hence, it would not be possible to fulfil the Assurance before the completion of the feasibility study and receipt of feasibility study from M/s. Robertson Research Australia. Besides this, the Question itself asks whether the feasibility study has been conducted, the reply given by this Deptt. is a complete one and does not call for any additional information at this juncture.”

150. The Committee considered the request of the Ministry of Steel and Mines for the dropping of the assurance at their sitting held on 11

October, 1988 and decided not to accede to the request of the Ministry for dropping the assurance. The decision of the Committee was accordingly conveyed to the Ministry

151. The Ministry have requested for extension of time upto 31 March, 1989 to implement the assurance. However, the assurance is yet to be fulfilled.

152. The Committee are surprised to note that it is only after seven months from the date the assurance was given the Ministry of Steel and Mines has chosen to take the plea that their reply indicated only the factual position and as such the assurance be dropped. The Committee note that the Ministry have not made any special efforts towards the fulfilment of the assurance and instead sought its dropping on flimsy grounds. The Committee desire that the Ministry of Steel and Mines should now make sincere efforts to implement the assurance at an early date.

(cont.)

Fresh initiative to solve Punjab problem

153. On 26 August, 1987, Srimati N.P. Jhansi Lakshmi, Dr. (Mrs.) T. Kalpana Devi and Shri Balram Singh Yadav, M.P.s addressed the following Unstarred Question No. 5391 to the Minister of Home Affairs.

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

(b) if so, the details thereof?”

154. In reply to the above question, the Minister of state in the Ministry of Home Affairs (Shri P. Chidambaram) stated as follows :

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

155. The above reply to the question was treated as an assurance by the Lok Sabha Secretariat and the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs. The assurance was required to be implemented by the Ministry of Home Affairs by 27 November, 1987.

156. The Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs vide their U.O. Note No. VIII-2/HA (40) USQ-5391-LS (3), dated 24 June, 1988 have forwarded

request of the Ministry of Home Affairs for the dropping of the assurance on the following grounds :

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

157. The Committee considered the request of the Ministry of Home Affairs for the dropping of the assurance at their sitting held on 11 October, 1988 and decided not to accede to the request of the Ministry for dropping the assurance. The decision of the Committee was accordingly conveyed to the Ministry.

158. The Ministry have requested for extension of time upto 28 March, 1989 to implement the assurance. However, the assurance is yet to be fulfilled.

159. The Committee do not appreciate the plea taken by the Ministry of Home Affairs for the dropping of the assurance on the ground that they had stated in the reply only the factual position. The Committee would like the Ministry to make efforts to implement the assurance at the earliest in view of the urgency and the gravity of the subject matter of the assurance.

(xx)

*Gas available at Cauvery Basin for power generation by Tamilnadu
Electricity Board*

160. On 17 November, 1987, Sri P. Kolangaivelu, M.P. addressed the following Starred Question No. 16 to the Minister of Energy :

- “(a) whether gas is used for power generation by the State Electricity Boards;
- (b) the extent of power produced by various State Electricity Boards with gas;
- (c) whether there is any proposal from the Tamil Nadu Electricity Board to use the gas available at Cauvery Basin for power generation; and

(d) if so, how much power is expected to be generated with the use of gas ?”

161. In reply to the above question, the Minister of State in the Department of Power (Shrimati Sushila Rohatgi) stated as follows :

“(a) Yes, Sir

(b) From gas-based power plants 2464 million units were generated during the period April October, 1987.

(c) and (d). A proposal to import a gas turbine unit of 5 MW capacity, based on gas supply from the Cauvery Basin, was received in July, 1987 from the Tamil Nadu Electricity Board (TNEB). The TNEB were advised in September, 1987, to contact M/s BHEL for their requirements.”

162. During the course of supplementaries on the question, Shri P. Kolandaivelu pleading that the Tamil Nadu was having the largest number of pump sets in the country and the largest consumer of power supply was the farmer, wanted to know whether the Government of India would come forward to help Tamil Nadu to extract more power supply by means of Gas, atomic energy or thermal power.

163. In reply to the supplementary, the Minister of State in the Department of Power (Shrimati Sushila Rohatgi), *inter-alia* stated as follows :

“A project report relating to 3 x 210 MW capacity thermal station at Cudallore at an estimated cost of Rs. 759.22 crores was received in the CEA in March, 1987. The scheme is under examination and coal availability as also environmental clearance remains to be tied up. We ourselves are very eager and will try to help the Tamil Nadu people to the maximum extent possible.”

164. The above reply to the supplementary question was treated as an assurance by the Lok Sabha Secretariat and the Minister of Parliamentary Affairs. The assurance was required to be implemented by the Ministry of Energy by 16 February, 1988.

165. The Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs *vide* their U.O. Note No. IX/Engy. (10) SQ146-LS/87 dated 21 March, 1988 forward the request of

the Ministry of Energy for the dropping of the assurance on the following grounds :

“A project report relating to 3 × 210 MW capacity thermal station at Cuddalore at an estimated cost of Rs. 759.22 crores was received in the CEA in March, 1987. The scheme is under examination and coal availability as also environmental clearance remains to be tied up. We ourselves are very eager and will try to help the Tamil Nadu people to the maximum extent possible. The proposal in respect of installation of a thermal power station (3 x 210 MW) at Cuddalore in South Arcot district is under examination in the CEA in consultation with the various appraising agencies, including the State authorities. Before formal clearance could be accorded to the proposed scheme, various aspects such as coal linkage, availability of water and clearance from environmental angle and of the State Pollution Control Board, need to be satisfactorily tied up. The tying up of inputs and obtaining of requisite clearance involves both the Central and the State authorities. On occasion, techno-economic appraisal of a scheme can be held up for want of clarifications/clearances from the project authorities in regard to various aspects. In making the above statement, in reply to Shri P. Kolandaivelu, MP, it was not the intention to extend an assurance in the matter.”

166. The Committee considered the request of the Ministry of Energy for the dropping of the assurance at their sitting held on 11 October, 1988 and decided not to accede to the request of the Ministry for dropping the assurance and granted extension of time upto 31 January, 1989 to implement the assurance. The decision of the Committee was accordingly conveyed to the Ministry.

167. The Ministry did not request for extension of time after 31 January, 1989 to implement the assurance and the assurance is yet to be fulfilled.

168. The Committee are unhappy to note the plea of the Ministry of Energy that their reply was not intended to extend any assurance in the matter. The Committee wish to point out that this is in contradiction with the position taken by the Minister on the floor of House when she stated that the Government themselves were very eager to help the Tamilnadu people to the maximum extent possible. The Committee feel that the

Ministry should not try to wriggle out of the assurance by seeking its dropping especially after the Minister had expressed her eagerness in expediting the matter.

169. The Committee would like to emphasise the fact that an assurance is a solemn commitment on the floor of House and is not a convenient ploy to wriggle out of an inconvenient situation. The Committee urge upon the Ministry of Energy to implement the assurance without further loss of time

CHAPTER III

REQUESTS FOR DROPPING OF ASSURANCES—NOT ACCEPTED AND SUBSEQUENTLY IMPLEMENTED

(4)

Institute for training of teaching staff of engineering colleges in Kerala.

On 24 April, 1986, Shri T. Basbeer, M.P., addressed the following Unstarred Question No. 7602 to the Minister of Human Resource Development :

“(a) whether Kerala Government have requested Union Government to provide financial assistance for starting an institute for training of teaching staff of engineering colleges and technical schools during the Seventh Plan; and

(b) if so, the reaction thereon ?”

2. In reply to the above question, the Minister of State in the Department of Education and Culture (Shrimati Sushila Rohatgi) stated as follows:-

“(a) & (b) A proposal for starting an Institute to train teachers for Engineering colleges, technicians, craftsmen and administrators, was made by the Director of Technical Education, Kerala alongwith many other proposals concerning the Seventh Five Year Plan for Technical Education in the Kerala State. The Southern Regional Committee of the All India Council for Technical Education, *inter alia* considered all these proposals at its meeting held on the 4th January, 1984 and resolved that as and when detailed project report giving justification/need for the proposal and other relevant information alongwith confirmation about the availability of necessary financial provision/under the State Plan is received from the State Government, the matter may be processed by it. In pursuance of these recommendations, the Southern Regional Officer of the Ministry has requested the Director of Technical Education, Kerala in March, 1984 to furnish the desired information, which is awaited.”

3. The reply to the above question was treated as an assurance by the Lok Sabha Secretariat and the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs. The assurance was required to be implemented by the Ministry of Human Resource Development (Department of Education and Culture) by 23 July, 1986.

4. The Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs *vide* their U.O. No. V/HRD (35) USQ-7602-LS/86, dated 30 January, 1987, forwarded the request of the Ministry of Human Resource Development (Department of Education and Culture) for the 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 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."

5. At their sitting held on 24 June, 1987, the Committee considered the above request of the Ministry of Human Resource Development and took the following decision :-

"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 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."

6. The Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs *vide* their U.O. Note No. V/HRD (35)/USQ. 7602-LS/86 dated 11 January, 1988, thereafter forwarded another request of the Ministry for the dropping of the assurance on the following grounds :-

"This Ministry has not received so far any proposal from the Government of Kerala to start an Institute for Training of Teaching Staff of Engineering Colleges in Kerala. The question of any action on the part of the All India Council for Technical Education and the Ministry arises only when the detailed project for the proposal is submitted by the State Government for consideration."

7. The Committee considered the request of the Ministry of Human Resource Development for the dropping of the assurance at their sitting held on 29 August, 1988 and decided not to accede to the request of the Ministry for dropping the assurance. The decision of the Committee was accordingly conveyed to the Ministry.

8. The Ministry of Human Resource Development, however, implemented the assurance by laying the following statement in Lok Sabha on 16 December, 1988, after seeking repeated extensions :

"The Government of Kerala has now submitted a proposal for the establishment of an Institute for Training in Technical Education in Kerala as a Central Sector Scheme to be fully funded by the Central Government. There is no Central Scheme to set up such institutions separately in various States. The Central Government has already set up 4 Technical Teachers' Training Institutes (TTIs) one in each region (Chandigarh, Madras, Bhopal and Calcutta). The TTI at Madras is looking after the technical teacher training requirements of the States in the Southern Region including Kerala. The State Government has been informed accordingly.

(ii)

Damage to crops due to Natural Calamities

9. On 9 November, 1987, Dr. A.K. Patel, M.P. addressed the following Starred Question No. 35 to the Minister of Agriculture :

- "(a) the estimated damage to farmers due to floods, drought and other natural calamities during the Fifth, Sixth and in the Seventh Five Year Plan period so far;
- (b) the names of States where such damages were recently covered by Crop Insurance Schemes and out of the overall damages how much has been paid to the farmers under these schemes, state-wise, during the past three years for which figures are available ?"

10. In reply to the above question, the Minister of State in the Ministry of Agriculture (Shri Yogendra Makwana) laid a statement on the Table of the Sabha which stated as follows :

- "(a) The estimated cropped area damaged due to floods, drought and other natural calamities during the Sixth and the Seventh Five Year Plan periods were 2143.6 and 1623.8 lakh hectares respectively. Information in respect of Fifth Five Year Plan period is not readily available.
- (b) A Statement showing the indemnity claims paid under the Crop Insurance Scheme in different States during the past three years is at Annexure I."

11. The above reply to part (a) of the question was treated as an assurance by the Lok Sabha Secretariat and the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs. The assurance was required to be implemented by the Ministry of Agriculture by 8 February, 1988.

12. The Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs vide their U.O. Note No. IX/Agri (4) SQ35-LS/87 dated 25 February, 1988 forwarded the request of the Ministry of Agriculture for the dropping of the assurance on the following grounds :

“In part ‘a’ of the Question mentioned above, information was sought about the details of the estimated damages to farmers due to floods, drought and other natural calamities during V, VI and VII Five Year Plan periods. Information in respect of damages due to drought prior to the year 1960-81 is not available in this Department. The reports of the various Finance Commissions have also been gone through to obtain this information. As such reply to this part of the Question was confined to the 6th and 7th Five Year Plans and it was mentioned that information in respect of the 5th Five Year Plan period is not readily available. Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs has treated this part of the reply as an assurance. It is mentioned here that information relating to the 5th Five Year Plan on damages due to drought is neither available in the Department of Agriculture and Cooperation nor in other concerned Departments and such the State Governments have been requested to furnish the same.

In this connection, it is mentioned that the statistics relating to 5th Five Year Plan on damages due to drought may not be readily available in the State Headquarters. They in turn will have to collect the same from their Divisional/District/Taluk levels and as such, this process may take a very long time for getting the complete information. Further substantial amount of time and energy is involved in collecting this historical data which relates to about 10-13 years back. It is feared that even after spending so much of time and Labour, the net result may not match with these efforts.”

13. The Committee considered the request of the Ministry of Agriculture for dropping of the assurance at their sitting held on 29 August, 1988 and decided not to accede to it. The decision of the Committee was accordingly conveyed to the Ministry.

14. After seeking repeated extensions of time, the Ministry of Agriculture later implemented the assurance by laying the following statement on the Table of the House on 7 December, 1988 :

“The estimated damage to cropped area by natural calamities other than drought during the Fifth Five Year Plan period is 300.2 lakh ha. The information in respect of damage due to drought during the Fifth Five Year Plan is not available.”

Enquiry Into Meerut Riots

15. On 11 November, 1987, Shri G.M. Banatwalla, M.P. addressed the following Unstarred Question No. 791 to the Minister of Home Affairs :

- “(a) whether Government have received the report of enquiry into riots at Meerut;
- (b) if so, main findings of the enquiry and recommendations; and
- (c) the Union Government’s reaction thereon ?”

In reply to the above question, the Minister of State in the Ministry of Home Affairs (Shri P. Chidambaram) stated as follows :

“(a), (b) & (c) Since the Committee was appointed by the Government of Uttar Pradesh, it has submitted its report to that Government. The report is under consideration of the State Government. The Government of Uttar Pradesh have to take a view on the Report.”

16. The above reply to the above question was treated as an assurance by the Lok Sabha Secretariat and the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs. The assurance was required to be implemented by the Ministry of Home Affairs by 10 February, 1988.

The Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs *vide* their U.O Note No. IX/HA (14) USQ 791-LS/87, dated 12 February, 1988 forwarded request of the Ministry of Home Affairs for the dropping of the assurance on the following grounds :

“The Committee in question was appointed by the Government of Uttar Pradesh *vide* their O.M. No. 3480 P/ VIII-3-87 dated

the 2nd June, 1987 and further action, if any, on the report of the Committee is also to be taken by that Government. As such no action is pending on the part of the Central Government."

17. The Committee considered the request of the Ministry of Home Affairs for the dropping of the assurance at their sitting held on 20 September, 1988 and decided not to accede to the request of the Ministry for dropping the assurance. The decision of the Committee was accordingly conveyed to the Ministry.

18. The Ministry of Home Affairs, however, implemented the assurance by laying the following statement in Lok Sabha on 7 December, 1988, after seeking repeated extensions :

"The Government of Uttar Pradesh have now informed that appropriate action has been taken by the State Government on the various recommendations contained in the Report of Gyan Prakash Committee. However the report of the Committee has been treated as a 'classified' document by the State Government and has not been laid before the State Legislature."

(iv)

US Aid for Drought

19. On 25 November, 1987, Shri Swami Prasad Singh, M.P. addressed the following Unstarred Question No. 2891 to the Minister of External Affairs :

- "(a) Whether during recent visit of Prime Minister to U.S.A., India has been assured of substantial sum as grant/aid to fight the drought; and
- (b) if so, the details of such aid and areas where this aid is to be utilised ?"

20. In reply to the above question, the Minister of State in the Ministry of External Affairs (Shri K. Natwar Singh) stated as follows :

- "(a) the US Government offered a package of assistance for drought relief.
- (b) the details of the offer are being discussed between the two Governments and may include advance drawal of committed funds, supplies under their Export Enhancement Programme

and grants under the US Agricultural Adjustment Act. The areas where the aid is to be utilised, when actually availed of, is yet to be finalised."

21. The above reply to part (b) of the question was treated as an assurance by the Lok Sabha Secretariat and the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs. The assurance was required to be implemented by the Ministry of External Affairs by 24 February, 1988.

22. The Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs vide their U.O. Note No. IX/EA(8) USQ. 2801-LS/87 dated 16 February, 1988 forwarded the request of the Ministry of External Affairs for the dropping of the assurance on the following grounds :

"It is felt that the answer given to this Unstarred Question did not constitute an assurance. There was an offer from USA to help mitigate the consequences of the drought. The details which are being worked out between the two countries are part of a continuous process in the overall context of Indo-US relations."

23. The Committee considered the request of the Ministry of External Affairs for dropping of the assurance at their sitting held on 20 September, 1988 and decided not to accede to it. The decision of the Committee was accordingly conveyed to the Ministry.

24. After seeking repeated extensions of time, the Ministry of External Affairs later implemented the assurance by laying the following statement on the Table of the House on 7 December, 1988 :

"U.S. Government have offered assistance towards drought relief. The present position in regard to the offers is indicated below.

- (1) 5200 MT of butter oil to Indian Dairy Corporation as grant (agreement has been signed on 29.9.1987).
- (2) 5 lakh tonnes of edible oils under the Export Enhancement Programme, S.T.C. has already finalised contracts for the import of 1 lakh MT worth US \$45.69 million.
- (3) 4 lakh tonnes of Cora for import by NAFEL and NDDB under Section 416 of the US Agricultural Adjustment Act

grant. The entire quantity is now to be handled by NAFED. Against this, agreements for 1 lakh tonnes each were signed on 10.2.88 and 6.5.88 respectively.

- (iv) The U.S. have also sanctioned \$ 50 million by way of advance for the projects being funded under the U.S. aid bilateral assistance programme."

(v)

Outstanding Income Tax Against Film Stars

25. On 20 November, 1987, Shri Kali Prasad Pandey, M.P. addressed the following Starred Question No. 220 to the Minister of Finance :

- (a) the names of the super-cine stars who have paid more than one lakh rupees as income tax for the years 1986-87 and 1987-88 and the names of film stars against whom this amount or above is still outstanding;
- (b) the action taken for the recovery of income tax from the film stars/super stars in Delhi, Bombay, Madras and other parts of the country; and
- (c) the amount of income tax collected during 1985, 1986 and 1987 from this category of assesses ?"

26. In reply to the above question, the Minister of State in the Ministry of Finance (Shri B.K. Gadhwani) stated as follows :

- (a) The names of the film stars who have paid more than a lakh of rupees as income-tax during 1986-87 and 1987-88 are given in Statement-A. The names of film stars in whose cases income-tax arrears of over Rs. 1 lakh are outstanding, are given in Statement-B. (Annexure II of the Report).
- (b) All possible actions, both legal and administrative, are being taken to recover the arrears.
- (c) The income-tax collected from the above category of assesses during 1985-86, 1986-87 and 1987-88 (part of the year) are Rs. 156.83 lakhs, Rs. 295.90 lakhs and Rs. 179.56 lakhs respectively."

27. The above reply to part (b) of the question was treated as an assurance by the Lok Sabha Secretariat and the Ministry of Parliamentary

Affairs. The assurance was required to be implemented by the Ministry of Finance by 19 February, 1988.

28. The Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs *vide* their U.O. Note No. IX/F in (36) SQ-220-LS/87 dated 5 February 1988 forwarded request of the Ministry of Finance for the dropping of the assurance on the following grounds :

“The answer given by this Ministry on the above Lok Sabha Question on 20.11.1987 is the final reply on all the parts of the Question. This Ministry has nothing to add further to the answer given by it on 20.11.1987.”

29. The Committee considered the request of the Minister of Finance for the dropping of assurance at the sitting held on 20 September, 1988 and decided not to accede to the request of the Ministry for dropping the assurance. The decision of the Committee was accordingly conveyed to the Ministry.

30. The Ministry of Finance, however, implemented the assurance by laying the required information in Lok Sabha on 28 February, 1989, after seeking repeated extensions.

(vii)

Import of pressurised water reactors from Soviet Union

31. On 11 November, 1987, Shri C. Janga Reddy, M.P. addressed the following Unstarred Question No. 675 to the Prime Minister :-

“(a) whether Government propose to import from Soviet Union Pressurised Water Reactors of 440 MW;

(b) if so, the main features of the proposal;

(c) whether this import will be detrimental to India's plans indigenisation and self-sufficiency; and

(d) Government's reaction in the matter ?”

32. In reply to the above question, the Minister of State for Science and Technology, Atomic Energy, Space, Electronics and Ocean Development (Shri K.R. Narayana) stated as follows :

“(a) & (b) Discussions are continuing on the technical, economic and other aspects of the Soviet offer to assist in the setting

up of pressurised light water reactors. Government have taken no decision in the matter.

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

33. The above reply to parts (a) & (b) of the question was treated as an assurance by the Lok Sabha Secretariat and the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs. The assurance was required to be implemented by the Department of Atomic Energy by 10 February 1988.

34. The Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs *vide* their U.O. Note No. IX/AE (2) USQ. 675-LS/87 dated 27 April, 1988 forwarded request of the Department of Atomic Energy for the dropping of the assurance on the following grounds :

"As regards Lok Sabha USQ. No. 675 on Soviet offer of Atomic Power Reactors, various aspects of the offer received from USSR viz. technical, economic safeguards etc. are still under consideration of the Government. The question specifically asked whether Govt. proposes to import reactors from USSR and main features of the proposal. In answer it was stated that discussions were continuing and Government have taken no decision in the matter. The matter is still under consideration of the Government and no final decision has yet been taken on the subject. Answer given to the question on the floor of the House contains adequate information for the query raised. The phrase used in the reply viz no decision in the matter has been taken may not be considered as an assurance.

It would, therefore be difficult to liquidate the assurance within the stipulated period of time. Since the Committee on Govt. Assurances have always been responsive to the difficulties of the Govt. and have been giving due relief in terms of the inherent power to dispense with the fulfilment of such assurances, it is requested that the matter may kindly be placed before the Committee on Govt. Assurance for their consideration to delete the 'Assurance' referred to above."

35. The Committee considered the request of the Department of Atomic Energy for the dropping of the assurance at their sitting held on 20 September, 1988 and decided not to accede to the request of the Ministry

for dropping the assurance. The decision of the Committee was accordingly conveyed to the Ministry.

36. The Department of Atomic Energy, however, implemented the assurance by laying the following statement in Lok Sabha on 7 December, 1988, after seeking repeated extensions :

“Government proposes to set up 2 VVER Reactors of 1000 MW each with the assistance of Soviet Union at Kudankulam distt., Tamilnadu.”

(vii)

Scheme for Exservicemen in Karnataka

37. On 13 November, 1987 Shrimati Basavarajeswari, M.P. addressed the following Unstarred Question No. 1140 to the Minister of Defence :

- ‘(a) Whether a scheme for ex-servicemen was launched in Karnataka State on 1 September, 1987;
- (b) if so, how many ex-servicemen have been provided self-employment in Karnataka during 1987-88; and
- (c) the main schemes that will be implemented in 1987-88?’

38. In reply to the above question, the Minister of state in the Ministry of Defence (Shri Shivraj V. Patil) stated as follows :

- “(a) SEMFEX Scheme (Self-Employment for Ex-servicemen) formulated by the Centre with the assistance of industrial Development Bank of India (IDBI) was launched in Karnataka State on 1 September, 1987.
- (b) The position regarding number of ex-servicemen who have been provided self-employment in Karnataka State during 1987-88 is not available. However, two persons have been sanctioned loans under the SEMFEX Scheme and 38 applications are being processed.
- (c) Besides the SEMFEX scheme launched in 1987-88, several on-going schemes for rehabilitation and welfare of ex-servicemen are being implemented in Karnataka. Some of the main on-going schemes are :

- (i) 10% reservation for employment in Government
- (ii) 10% reservation in industrial sheds, permits shops and shopping complexes built in Bangalore by local bodies.
- (iii) Jai Jawan stalls for disabled ex-servicemen.
- (iv) Preferential allotment of milk booths, fair price shops, Kiosks, transport permits for autorikshaws, taxis etc.
- (v) Promotion of small scale ventures like transportation, machine tools, electronic fabrication, garment exports etc. through assistance from State Financial Corporation and Nationalised Banks.
- (vi) Vocational Training and training in industrial Training Institutes.
- (vii) Interest subsidy on loans for small scale ventures.
- (viii) 9% reservation of house sites by Bangalore Development Authority and 9% of ready built houses by the Karnataka Housing Board. Free houses for families of war casualties.
- (ix) Reservation of seats in professional colleges, polytechnics etc for children of ex-servicemen and scholarships.
- (x) Free medical treatment in Government Hospitals for ex-servicemen and their dependents.

39. The above reply to part (b) of the question was treated as an assurance by the Lok Sabha Secretariat and the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs. The assurance was required to be implemented by the Ministry of Defence by 12 February, 1988.

40. The Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs *vide* their U.O. Note No. IX/D (2) USQ. 1140-LS/87 dated 22 April, 1988 forwarded the request of the Ministry of Defence for the dropping of the assurance on the following grounds :

“The observations/information given by the Hon’ble Minister in reply to Part (b) of the subject/question have been examined and it is felt that the same do not appear to constitute an Assurance. Therein no such promise was made by the

Minister to furnish any information in future to the House for the reason that it is not feasible to collect this information as explained in the subsequent sub-paras.

- (i) There are a number of self-employment ventures like allotment of industrial plots/sheds, shops/Jai Jawan stalls, fair price shops, route permits, transportation small scale industries, etc. which are implemented by different agencies. For many of these ventures, the ex-Servicemen may seek financial assistance from different sources like banks, State Financial Corporations, etc. In view of this, the relevant data is neither available at any single point with the concerned State Government nor can it be collected by the Centre.
- (ii) A number of Ex-Servicemen take to self employment on their own. Some of them may seek loans, others may not do so. The Zila/Rajya Sainik Boards recommend or reject the cases for grant of loans, to the financial agencies. Many ex-servicemen may not follow this channel and approach the financial institutions direct. In view of the multiplicity of institutions involved, the information cannot be collected.

Further, it may be mentioned that as the intention of the Hon'ble MP was to elicit information as to how many ex-servicemen have been provided self-employment in Karnataka during 1987-88 through the SEMFEX Scheme which appears to be the case from the wording of this part of the question following on part (a) of the subject Question which refers to SEMFEX Scheme which has been launched in Karnataka on 1.9.1987, keeping this in view, information available relating to this aspect had already been furnished in the reply as follows :

"However, two persons have been sanctioned loans under the SEMFEX Scheme and 38 applications are being processed."

Since SEMFEX Scheme is controlled at one point it was possible to obtain data/information relating to this aspect and furnish the same. Data regarding number of ex-servicemen who had been provided self-employment or who had secured self-employment through the on-going schemes (other than the SEMFEX Scheme) in Karnataka is neither collected by the Centre nor by any State Government nor it is feasible to collect the same on the grounds mentioned in sub-para above. It was, therefore, mentioned in the reply that this information is not available. The intention of the Minister while replying as such was not that such information

would be collected and furnished later on. Information which could be collected relating to this aspect of the question had been furnished.

41. The Committee considered the request of the Ministry of Defence for the dropping of the assurance at their sitting held on 11 October, 1988 and decided not to accede to the request of the Ministry for dropping the assurance. The decision of the Committee was accordingly conveyed to the Ministry.

42. The Ministry of Defence, however, implemented the assurance by laying the following statement in Lok Sabha on 16 December, 1988 after seeking repeated extensions :

Number of ex-servicemen who have been provided assistance for self-employment under SEMFEX-I Scheme in Karnataka State during 1987-88.

Since the introduction of SAMFEX-I Scheme in Karnataka State on 1st September, 1987, a total number of 244 applications had been received in the Rajya Sainik Board as on 30th June 1988.

Out of these, 46 applications had been approved for sanction of loans under the scheme on that date. The amount sanctioned and disbursed on 30th June, 1988 is as under :-

(Rs. in lakhs)

	<i>Term loan</i>	<i>Seed Capital</i>	<i>Total</i>
(i) Amount sanctioned	92.79	18.65	11.44
(ii) Amount disbursed	29.51	5.23	34.74

(viii)

Trunk telephone services in Andaman and Nicobar Islands

43. On 17 November, 1987, Shri Manoranjan Bhakta, M.P. addressed the following Unstarred Question No. 1621 to the Minister of Communications :

“(a) whether Government propose to connect 21 Islands with Port Blair, the capital of Andaman and Nicobar Islands and main land by introducing Trunk Telephone Services;

- (b) if so, the details thereof; and
- (c) if not, the alternative telecommunication programme contemplated by Government for the Union Territory of Andaman and Nicobar Islands ?”

44. In reply to the above question, the Minister of State (Communications) (Shri Santosh Mohan Dev) stated as follows :

“(a) Yes Sir. The Government is having plans to connect 21 locations in 17 islands in the Andaman & Nicobar Group of Islands. In addition 10 LDPTs (Long Distance Public Telephones) are also proposed to be provided.

(b) There are already 2 earth stations at Port Blair and Car Nicobar providing trunk facilities to the main land and between themselves. Besides this, 3 earth stations at Mayabunder, Diglipore and Campbellbay for providing reliable trunk communication facilities are under installation and are expected to be completed by March, 1988.

The following schemes are also sanctioned and are under execution by December 1988 :—

- (i) Installation of Satellite Earth Stations at Rangat, Hutbay, Kamorta and Katchal.
- (ii) Installation of small capacity UHF/VHF Systems between :

—Port Blair—Wimberlyganj
 —Wimberlyganj—Ferraraganj
 —Port Blair—Neil Island
 —Port Blair— Bathubasti
 —Kamorta-- Champai
 —Port Blair— Havelock
 —Port Blair— Baratang
 —Baratang—Kadamtala
 —Rangat—Katamtala

(iii) **Installation of NARR System connecting 10 LDPTs to the base station at Port Blair.**

The schemes at (i) & (ii) above will provide trunk telephone facilities to the following locations :

- 1. Port Blair (Municipal Board)**
- 2. Port Blair (Tehsil)**
- 3. Havelock Island**
- 4. Ferrarganj**
- 5. South Andaman**
- 6. Wimberlyganj**
- 7. Middle Andaman (Part)**
- 8. Middle Andaman (Part)**
- 9. Rangat**
- 10. Baratang Islands**
- 11. Maya Bunder**
- 12. North Andaman (Tehsil)**
- 13. Diglipore**
- 14. Car Nicobar (Tehsil)**
- 15. Car Nicobar (Island)**
- 16. Nicobar (District)**
- 17. Nan Cowry (Tehsil)**
- 18. Kamorta**
- 19. Katchal**
- 20. Campbell Bay**
- 21. Hut Bay**

(c) Other island communities will also be considered for provision of trunk telephone facilities progressively."

45. The above reply to part (c) of the question was treated as an assurance by the Lok Sabha Secretariat and the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs. The assurance was required to be implemented by the Ministry of Communications by 16 February, 1988.

46 The Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs *vide* their U.O. Note No. IX/C (46) USQ. 1621-LS/87 dated 7 July, 1988 have forwarded the request of the Ministry of Communications for the dropping of the assurance on the following grounds :

“In this connection, it is stated that development of telecommunication facilities in the country of which extension of trunk telephone facilities is a part, is a continuous process. The Development Plans are formulated and executed by the department progressively taking into consideration various factors like demand, technical solutions, economic viability, social/strategic needs and resources available to meet the broad objectives laid down for the various Five Year Plans. The general statement, ‘Other island communities will also be considered for provision of trunk telephone facilities progressively’ cannot, therefore, be construed as an assurance especially when no time limit can be given for its fulfilment.”

47. The Committee considered the request of the Ministry of Communications for the dropping of the assurance at their sitting held on 11 October, 1988 and decided not to accede to the request of the Ministry for dropping the assurance. The decision of the Committee was accordingly conveyed to the Ministry.

48. The Ministry of Communications, however, implemented the assurance by laying the following statement in Lok Sabha on 7 December, 1988, after seeking repeated extensions :

The process of identifying additional island communities having some potential of the requirement of telecommunication facilities has been gone through. These locations are :

1. Kakana
2. Little Nicobar
3. Subhasgram (Diglipur)
4. Ramkrishnagram (Diglipur)
5. Swarajgram (Diglipur)
6. Arial Bay Madhupur (Digliaur)
7. Paranshala (Rangat)

8. Kaushalyanagar (Rangat)
9. Panshavati (Rangat)
10. Sabari (Rangat)
11. Slards (Rangat)
12. Horninagar (Pinakinagar)
13. Tugpura (Mayabundar)
14. Ramnagar (Mayabundar)
15. Navagram (Mayabundar)
16. Kishorinagar (Muyabundar)
17. Kalighat (Mayabundar)

Before initiating any action on the preparation of concrete proposals, the technical requirements of map engineering, map survey, detailed site survey and detailed engineering based on the topography and the terrain are required to be done. The data made available from the detailed studies mentioned above makes it possible to prepare concrete proposals and estimate the equipment and other requirements. The initial works as mentioned above have been initiated for the above locations and the feasibility studies are under way. After the details are available concrete proposals will be made for the implementation. The period of implementation may extend upto the end of 8th Five Year Plan because of the remoteness of locations and lack of other infrastructural facilities.

The Committee note that in most of the foregoing instances, where the Committee were approached for the dropping of the assurances, it took more than two years to implement the assurances. In most of the cases, it is only when the Committee did not agree to the request for the dropping of the assurance, the Government initiated the process of implementing the assurances, which is a sad commentary on the lethargic manner in which the Ministries are functioning. The Committee recommend that a methodology should be evolved in order to commence the process of implementing the assurance right from the day the reply proposing the assurance is conceived in the Ministry. The Committee recommend that each Ministry should review the process of implementation of all the assurances once in every three months at the highest level in order to minimise the delay in implementing the assurances. The Committee do hope that all the Ministries would

hereafter endeavour to implement seriously the assurances taking only the minimum time required for the purpose.

NEW DELHI ;
9 May, 1989

19 Vaisakha, 1911 (Saka)

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

ANNEXURE—I

(Vide Para 10 of the Report)

Statement showing the Statewise Details of Indemnity Claims paid under
Comprehensive Drop Insurance Scheme since kharif 1985 season

(Amt. in lakhs)

Sl. No.	State/U.T.	Kharif 1985	Rabi 1985-86	Kharif 1986
1	2	3	4	5
1.	Andhra Pradesh	385.48	68.67	1125.18
2.	Assam	Note implemented	—	Data not received
3.	Bihar	1.23	0.59	No claim
4.	Gujarat	5571.25	26.48	1147.44
5.	J & K	—Not implemented the scheme—		
6.	Himachal Pradesh	— Not implemented—		5.08
7.	Karnataka	303.58	29.78	212.91
8.	Kerala	37.95	1.24	113.42
9.	Madhya Pradesh	21.59	14.27	—
10.	Maharashtra	1978.85	88.60	3887.72
11.	Manipur	—Note implemented—		
12.	Meghalaya	—Not implemented—		
13.	Orissa	8.05	4.14	8.79
14.	Rajasthan	Not implemented	13.15	—
15.	Tripura	-do-	3.93	8.28

1	2	3	4	5
16.	Uttar Pradesh	9.96	7.48	63.05
17.	Tamil Nadu	56.40	24.62	—
18.	West Bengal	23.31	13.04	196.38
19.	Goa	Not implemented	No Claim	2.80
20.	A & N	No claim	Not implemented	No claim
21.	Delhi	Not implemented	No claim	No claim
22.	Pondicherry	2.94	No claim	0.69
	TOTAL	8300.50	295.99	6764.74

ANNEXURE-II

(Vide Para 26 of the Report)

STATEMENT-A

Statement Referred to in reply to part (a) of the Lok Sabha Starred Question No. 220 for 20.11.1987

Sl. No. Names of film stars who have paid more than a lakh of rupees as income tax during 1986-87 and 1987-88		Sl. No. Names of film stars who have paid more than a lakh of rupees as income-tax during 1986-87 and 1987-88	
1	2	1	2
1. Amitabh Bachchan		23. Mithun Chakravarty	
2. Dharmendra Deol		24. Amaresh Puri	
3. Hema Malini		25. Padmini Kolhapuri	
4. Ajay Singh Deol		26. Sadhana Nayar	
5. Shammi Kapoor		27. Dada Kondka	
6. Rishi Kapoor		28. Dara Singh	
7. Ranbir Raj Kapoor		29. Raj Kumar Pandit	
8. Anantnag		30. Ashok Kumar Ganguli	
9. Mehmood Ali Mumtaz Ali		31. Dilip Kumar	
10. N. Balakrishnan		32. Sanjay Dutt	
11. M.R. Radhika		33. Lina Chandravarkar	
12. Bhanu Priya		34. Ranjita Kaur	
13. U. Krishnam Raju		35. Mandakini	
14. G.S.R. Krishnamurthi		36. Meenaxi Seshadri	
15. C. Subasini Hasan		37. Jackie Shroff	
16. K. Bhagyaraj		38. Pankaj Parashar	
17. Kamal Hasan		39. Dr. Sriram Lagoo	
18. Rajnikanth		40. Poonam Dillon	
19. A. Sridevi		41. Danny Dengzongpa	
20. Jayaprada		42. Tina Munim	
21. Sarita		43. Rakhee Gulzar	
22. S. Ambika		44. Dipti Naval	

1	2	1	2
45. Nirupa Roy		57. Vinod Khanna	
46. Satyen Kappoo		58. Rathi Agnihotri	
47. Smita Patil		59. Feroz Khan	
48. Shatrughan Sinha		60. Shakti Kapoor	
49. Sanjay alias Abbas Khan		61. Parveen Babi	
50. Sushma Shiromani		62. Rekha Ganesan	
51. Shabana Azmi		63. Kishore Kumar	
52. Sharmila Tagore		64. Jitendra Kapoor	
53. Sunil Dutt		65. Amjad Khan	
54. Waheeda Rahman		66. Rajesh Khanna	
55. Prem Chopra		67. Kadar Khan	
56. Vidhya Sinha		68. Anil Kapoor	

STATEMENT—B

*Statement referred to in reply to part (a) of the Lok Sabha Starred
Question No. 220 for 20.11.1987.*

Sl No. Names of film stars in whose cases income-tax arrears over Rs. 1 lakh are outstanding	Sl. No. Names of film stars in whose cases income-tax asrears over Rs. 1 lakh are outstanding.
1. Ranjlta Kaur	21. Prema Narayan
2. Sriram Lagoo	22. Padmini Kapila
3. Tina Munim	23. Helan Richardson
4. Dipti Naval	24. Reena Roy
5. Satyen Kapoor	25. Sujit Kumar
6. Sanjay alias Abbas Khan	26. Dimple Kapadia
7. Sushma Shiromani	27. Mushmi Chatterjee
8. Shabana Azmi	28. Mehmood Ali Mumtaz Ali
9. Vidya Sinha	29. Anantnag
10. Vinod Khanna	30. M.R. Radhika
11. Rati Agnihotri	31. U. Krishnam Raju
12. Feroz Khan	32. G.S.R. Krishnamurthi
13. Shakti Kapoor	33. K. Bhagyaraj
14. Rekha Ganeshan	34. C. Suhasini Hasan
15. Kishore Kumar	35. Kamal Hasan
16. Jitendra Kapoor	36. Rajnikant
17. Amjad Khan	37. A. Sridevi
18. Rajesh Khanna	38. Jayaprada
19. Kader Khan	39. Vinod Mehra
20. Sarika Thakor	

MINUTES

Minutes of the first sitting of the Committee on Government Assurances held on 18 July 1988 at 11.30 hours in Room 'D', Parliament House Annex, New Delhi

The Committee met on Monday, 18 July, 1988 from 11.30 hours to 12.40 hours.

PRESENT

Prof. Narain Chand Parashar ...Chairman

MEMBERS

2. Shri L. Balasaman
3. Shri Bapupal Malviya
4. Shri Murlidhar Mane
5. Dr. A.K. Patel
6. Shri Bholu Bant
7. Shri Manik Reddy
8. Shrimati Shanti Devi
9. Shri Kamla Prasad Singh
10. Shri Ramashray Prasad Singh
11. Shri Mahabir Prasad Yadav

SECRETARIAT

1. Shri C.K. Jain—*Joint Secretary*
2. Shri S.C. Gupta—*Deputy Secretary (Q)*
3. Shri Raghbir Singh—*Under Secretary*

2. At the outset, the Chairman welcomed the Members, especially those who had been nominated to the Committee for the first time. Thereafter, he gave a brief account of the working of the Committee and the work done by the Committee in the last year. One of the Members of the Committee, Shri Mahabir Prasad Yadav, speaking on behalf of the members of the Committee, congratulated and Chairman on his re-election and assured him of full cooperation of the Members of the working of the Committee.

3. The Committee then took up for consideration the following Memoranda Nos. 124, 132, 133, 134, 135, 136 and 137.

Memorandum No. 124 : Request for dropping of assurance given on 25 August 1987, in reply to Starred Question No. 420 regarding demand of commercial vehicles.

4. The Committee considered the request of the Ministry of Industry received through the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs vide their U.O. No. VIII-2/Ind. (23) SQ-420-LS/87 dated 17 January, 1988, for the dropping of the assurance on the following grounds :

"In this context, it is stated that the answer "we have not received any complaint" is specific. Similarly, the other part of the answer is subjective in the sense that if such complaint is brought to the notice of the Government that will be looked into. It is thus felt that this answer may not be considered as an assurance. Further, no such complaint has been received in this Ministry till date."

4.1 In view of the position explained by Shri Namgyal in his office U. O. Note No. 67/DM/SFT/88 dated 29 June, 1988, the Committee decided that the assurance be dropped.

Memorandum No. 132. Request for dropping of assurance given on 20 August, 1987, in reply to Unstarred Question No. 3963 regarding proposal for additional berth at Paradip port

5. The Committee considered the request of the Ministry of Surface Transport received through the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs vide their

U O. No. VIII-2/ST(6) USQ. 3963-LS/87 dated 14 April, 1988 for the dropping of the assurance on the following grounds :—

“Seventh Five Year Plan does not provide for the construction of such an additional berth at Paradip. However, proposals to this effect have been made but it may not be possible to take a decision on it in the immediate future. The reasons for the same are given below :—

Based on the study made by the RITES, it was found that rail-cum-sea mode is the most economical mode for transport of coal from Telchar mines (Orissa) to Ennore, where a new Thermal Power Station is proposed to be put up by Tamil Nadu Electricity Board. This coal transportation between Telchar mines and the Thermal Station would be done first by rail to the loading port of Paradip and thereafter by coastal shipping to a new Statellite Port at Ennore which has been proposed to the North of the existing Madras Port. It has been decided to entrust the preparation of the Detailed Project Report to the Dutch under the Dutch Technical Assistance Programme. The terms of reference for this Detailed Feasibility Report has also been finalised and forwarded to them in the month of November, 1987 for their scrutiny and for initiating preliminary steps. This Ministry has already approached the Committee of the Public Investment Board seeking first stage clearance for formally commissioning the DPR. The investment decision on the project will be taken only after the feasibility report had been received and considered by the Government. There is no provision in VIIth Five Year Plan for this scheme at present. It is anticipated that the project will be ripe for an investment decision only by about June, 1989 presuming that the Project is included in the Seventh Plan by the Planning Commission.”

5.1 The Committee did not agree to the request of the Ministry for dropping of the assurance. They agreed to grant extension of time for fulfilling of the assurance upto 31 December, 1988. The Committee also desired that the Ministry be asked to furnish a note showing the progress made upto date in

regard to the proposal for setting up the mechanised coal handling facility at Paradip Port.

Memorandum No. 133 : Request for dropping of assurance given on 9 December, 1987, in reply to Unstarred Question No. 4877 regarding approval for medium and major irrigation projects in Orissa.

6. The Committee considered the request of the Ministry of Water Resources received through the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs *vide* their U.O. No. IX/WR(7) USQ. 4877-LS/87, dated 15 March, 1988 for the dropping of the assurance on the following grounds :

"The States are required to prepare project reports in accordance with the guidelines issued for this purpose and the project reports are sent to Central Water Commission for scrutiny from techno-economic angle. It is observed that project reports submitted by the State Governments are not formulated fully according to the guidelines, resulting in protracted correspondence and discussions to obtain clarifications. Settlement of observations made by Centre is dependent upon the priority assigned by the State Government to this work. Projects are also required to be cleared at the Centre by other Ministries, like Environment and Forests, Agriculture, etc. and date deficiency impedes this process. While efforts are being made to minimise the time taken in clearance of these projects, it is not practicable to ensure clearance within a pre-determined time-frame in view of the position explained above. It is, therefore, requested that reply given to parts (c) and (d) of the above mentioned question which merely presents the factual position may not be treated as an assurance and be deleted from the list of assurances."

6.1 The Committee did not agree to the request of the Ministry for dropping of the assurance. They observed that before considering the request of the Ministry for extension of time for fulfilling the assurance, the Ministry should submit a note for the consideration of the Committee by 31 August, 1988 giving in detail the progress made in regard to approval of the projects received from the Government of Orissa including the date when each project was received from the State Government and action taken by the various Government agencies thereon.

Memorandum No. 134 : Request for dropping of assurance given on 26 November, 1987, in reply to unstarred Question No. 3806 regarding national programme for drug testing.

7. The Committee considered the request of the Ministry of Health and Family Welfare received through the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs *vide* their

U.O. No. IX/HFW(6) USQ. 3106 LS/87, dated 13 May, 1988 for the dropping of the assurance on the following grounds :

“Since the term of the Seventh Five Year Plan will expire in March, 1990 and proposals for Eighth Five Year Plan (1990-95) will be drawn up some time in the next year, it is not possible at this stage to fulfil the assurance.”

7.1 The Committee did not agree to the request of the Ministry for dropping of the assurance but agreed to grant extension of time for fulfilling the assurance upto 30 September, 1988. The Committee also decided that the Ministry be asked to furnish a note showing the steps taken by them to draw up the proposals in regard to drug control measures for inclusion in the Eighth Five Year Plan.

Memorandum No. 1.5 : Request for dropping of assurance given on 9 December, 1987 in reply to Unstarred Question No. 4901 regarding High Court bench at Hubli.

8. The Committee considered the request of the Ministry of Law and Justice received through the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs vide their U.O. No. IX/LJ (10) USQ. 4904-LS/87 dated 11 May, 1988 for the dropping of the assurance on the following grounds :

“The Chief Minister of Karnataka had sent a proposal in August, 1981 for establishment of a Bench of the Karnataka High Court at Hubli-Dharwar. The State Government were requested in September, 1981 for some basic information for further consideration of the Proposal. Partial information was received in September 1983 but full requisite information was awaited from the State Government. The proposal was included in the enlarged terms of reference of the Jaswant Singh Commission in December, 1983.

The Jaswant Singh Commission submitted its Report on 30.4.85. While the Commission examined and reported on the proposals for establishment of Benches of Allahabad, Madhya Pradesh and Madras High Courts, and also on the general question of having Benches of High Courts away from their principal seats, it could not examine and report on the specific proposal of the Government of Karnataka for establishment of a Bench of the Karnataka High Court at Hubli-Dharwar.

The recommendations of the Jaswant Singh Commission on

the general question on having Benches of High Courts away from their principal seats were referred to the Government of Karnataka in October, 1986 for considering the matter of establishment of a Bench at Hubli-Dharwar in the light of those recommendations in consultation with the Karnataka High Court. Reply of the State Government giving their views has still not been received. No action can be taken by the Government of India in this regard unless a specific and complete proposal is received from the Government of Karnataka.

As mentioned above, the Government of Karnataka have not sent their views and comments on the recommendations of the Jaswant Singh Commission even after about a year and a half.

"There is no action pending on the part of the Central Government. The reply given to the Lok Sabha Unstarred Question No. 5904 on 9.12.87 was also not intended to constitute an assurance."

8.1 The Committee did not agree to the request of the Ministry for dropping of the assurance but agree to grant extension of time upto 9 September, 1988 for fulfilling the assurance. The Committee also desired that the Ministry should follow up the matter with the State Government to ascertain their final views in regard to establishment of a Bench of the High Court at Hubli.

Memorandum No. 136 : Request for dropping of assurance given on 3 December, 1987 in reply to Starred Question No. 403 regarding new level crossing device.

9. The Committee considered the request of the Ministry of Railways received through the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs vide their U.O. No. IX/Rly (8) SQ. 403 LS/87 dated 18 February, 1988 for the dropping of the assurance on the following grounds :

"The reply given to parts (c) and (d) of question does not constitute or intended to be an assurance. The new system is still under trial and there are a lot of teething problems which are to be attended to and remedial measures to be devised. In view of this, a specific schedule cannot be kept for introduction of this system. As already indicated in the reply to the question the introduction of the system on permanent basis can only be considered after the results of the trial are evaluated and found to be acceptable."

9.1 The Committee did not agree to the request of the Ministry for dropping of the assurance but agreed to grant extension of time upto 3 September, 1988 for fulfilling the assurance. The Committee also decided that the Ministry be asked to furnish a note indicating the result of field trial of the new level crossing device.

Memorandum No. 137 : Request for dropping of assurance given on 28 August, 1987 in reply to Unstarred Question No. 5330 regarding tourism development of Golconda Fort.

10. The Committee considered the request of the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs. The assurance was required to be implemented by the Ministry of Tourism by 27 November, 1987. The Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs vide their U.O. Note No. VIII-2/Tour (3) USQ 5330-LS/87 dated 18 February, 1988 have forwarded request of the Ministry of Tourism for the dropping of the assurance on the following grounds :—

“It is felt that the Assurance cited pertaining to the answer to the Parliament Question does not constitute an assurance since the Tourism Minister has stated that further action for providing Tourism infrastructure will be taken according to the recommendations of the Master Plan, It was also stated that the preparation of Master Plan has been assigned to the Town and Country Planning Organisation and the report is still awaited.”

10.1 The Committee did not agree to the request of the Ministry for dropping of the assurance. However, they agreed to the extension of time upto 31 August, 1988 for fulfilling the assurance. The Committee desired that the Ministry should submit a note indicating the progress made upto-date in regard to preparation of the master plan by the Town and Country Planning Organisation.

11. The Chairman also informed the Committee that the requests of the following Ministries for extension of time to implement their respective assurances in respect of which the previous Committee had taken evidence, have been agreed to :

(1) Assurance given on 5 December, 1985 in reply to Unstarred Question No. 2632 regarding report of National Commission on Teachers.

12. The Ministry of Human Resource Development had requested for grant of extension of time upto 30 September, 1988 for laying the action taken

statement on the Reports of the National Commission on Teachers in implementation of their earlier assurance. However, extension of time upto 15 August, 1988 only had been agreed to.

(2) Assurance given on 16 April, 1986 in reply to Unstarred Question No. 6827 regarding releasing of gold by Portuguese Government.

13. The Ministry of External Affairs had sought extension of time upto 15 February, 1989 for implementing the assurance. However, extension upto 15 November, 1988 only had been agreed to.

14. The Committee then adjourned.

ANNEXURE

***Opening Observations Made by Prof. Narain Chand Parashar,
Chairman, Committee on Government Assurances, Eighth Lok
Sabha (1988-89) at the First Sitting of the Committee
on Monday 18 July, 1988.***

Esteemed Friends,

I am greatly delighted to welcome you all to this first sitting of the Committee on Government Assurances of Lok Sabha appointed by the Honourable Speaker for 1988-89. My special greetings and welcome are to those Hon'ble Members who have been nominated to this Committee for the first time.

2. Before we take up the business on the Agenda, I consider it my duty to say a few words about the working of this Committee, which may be of special interest to those friends who have joined us this year.

3. The Committee came into being for the first time in 1953 with the object of keeping a track on the implementation of assurances given by Ministers from time to time in the House. The Committee is required to examine and report to the House on the extent of implementation of assurances and also ensure their timely implementation. The Committee have laid down that an assurance should normally be implemented within a period of three months from the date on which such assurance was given in the House. Obviously, this period is an outer limit and Government should try to implement the assurance as quickly as possible after these are given, not necessarily awaiting the expiry of three months' time. Where Government find it difficult to adhere to the stipulated period of three months, it is open to them to submit to the Committee a request for extension of time and the Committee is to give its earnest consideration to such a request. You would be called upon to consider such requests quite often.

4. Another kind of cases which you would be called upon to consider in the Committee are where Government come forward with a request for dropping of the assurance. Such requests have to receive your greater attention and consideration as acceding to such requests means the reversal of the decision of the Committee in treating a statement of a Minister as an assurance. Taking the experience as a guide, I must caution you that Ministries more often than not make requests for the dropping of the assurances on not too serious

grounds, if not totally frivolous. Without questioning the intention of the Government, in such cases, the Committee is required to apply its mind objectively to see that the solemn commitments made by the Ministers to the House are not lightly brushed aside because of sheer bureaucratic inaptitude, callousness and insensitivity to Parliamentary privileges. While the right of a Ministry or Department to express their difficulties and problems in implementing an assurance cannot be denied, the Committee has also to be constantly conscious of its role as a watch-dog in discharging its legitimate functions.

5. Friends, may I remind you of an established Parliamentary convention about which I am sure all of you being experienced parliamentarians are well aware. This Committee like other Parliamentary Committees functions on non-party lines in its examination even though we may belong to different parties. I do not think there has been any occasion in the past since inception of the Committee when any decision in this Committee was not unanimous. I need not over-emphasize that unanimity in the Committee's deliberations lends great strength to the Committee and also adds to its prestige. I have no doubt that you will always be mindful of this convention and the Committee shall maintain the tradition.

6. I would also like to inform you briefly about the work done by the Committee in the last year. During the present Lok Sabha upto the last session, 6,105 assurances were called out and out of them 4,011 have already been implemented. 10 assurances pertaining to the previous Lok Sabha are also being pursued by the Committee. During the previous year, the Committee held 14 sittings and presented to the House 4 Reports. We also had the occasion to hold the 3rd General Conference of Chairmen, Committees on Government Assurances of Lok Sabha, Rajya Sabha and State Assemblies in August, 1987.

7. I seek your constructive cooperation and I assure you of my own. I hope you will take a very active and keen interest in the working of the Committee despite your busy schedule because that alone would yield fruitful results in the Committee.

Thank you,

We may now take up the Agenda.

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 Raghbir 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 took up the following Memoranda for consideration :—

Memorandum No. 138. Request for dropping of assurance given on 13 March, 1987, reply to Unstarred Question No. 2834 regarding fake passport rackets.

4. The Committee considered the request of the Ministry of Home Affairs received through the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs *vide* their U.O. Note No. VIII/H.A(28) USQ.2834-LS/87 dated 15 February, 1988, for dropping of the assurance on the following grounds :—

“The case is under investigation. This was a factual statement given for information of the Hon’ble Member. The investigations referred to above are field investigations by the CBI and are in the nature of police investigations. The CBI will submit charge sheets or final reports in the courts after the investigations are over and the law will take its course. The courts will finally decide the cases. In view of the aforesaid facts where this Ministry has hardly any role to play, pending investigations may not kindly be construed as a Parliamentary Assurance.”

4.1 The Committee did not agree to the request of the Ministry of Home Affairs for the dropping of the assurance. They desired that the Ministry should pursue the matter with the CBI to expedite investigation and filing of the chargesheets.

In the courts. The Committee did not appreciate the plea taken by the Ministry that “pending investigations may not be construed as a Parliamentary Assurance” as it was for the Committee to decide as to whether or not this was an assurance. The Committee agreed to the request of the Ministry for grant of extension of time upto 12 June, 1988. They also decided that the Ministry should furnish a note showing progress made upto-date in the matter.

Memorandum No. 139. Request for dropping of assurance given on 1 December, 1987, in reply to USQ No. 3729 regarding seismological studies of Narmada Sagar Project.

5. The Committee considered the request of the Ministry of Energy received through the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs *vide* their U.O. Note

No. IX/ENGY(33)USQ. 3729-LS/87 dated 4 April, 1988, for the dropping of the assurance on the following grounds :

"The Narmada Sagar Project is still in the pipeline for World Bank assistance for which the Bank mission visited the Project during January 1988 to prepare it for possible reappraisal in March/April, 1988. This would be followed by a number of discussions to sort out various issues involved in it. Further, the details about the aid would also be known only after the conclusion of negotiations with the Bank, approval by the Board of Directors of the Bank, signing of the Agreement and the loan has been declared to be effective, in view of this it is not possible to fulfil the assurance within the prescribed limit of three months. Moreover, the various actions culminating in the implementation of the Assurance are beyond the control of this Department and are dependent upon the World Bank taking a view in the matter."

5.1 The Committee did not agree to the request of the Ministry for dropping of the assurance but agreed to grant extension of time upto 1 September, 1988, for implementation of the assurance.

Memorandum No. 140. Request for dropping of assurance given on 2 December, 1987, in reply to USQ. No. 3809 regarding implementation of suggestions by National Convention of Water.

6. The Committee considered the request of the Ministry of Water Resources received through the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs vide their U.O. Note No. IX/WR(6) USQ. 3809-LS/87 dated 18 March, 1988, for dropping of the assurance on the following grounds :

"The convention was a co-operative effort of Government Departments, public sector agencies, professional institutions and associations in concerned disciplines for exchange of ideas on development and management of Water Resource. The recommendation made at the Convention can be kept in view by State Governments and other concerned organisations for taking such action as deemed appropriate in the light of the National Water Policy which has been laid before the Parliament. The recommendations of the Convention have already been circulated. No further action by way of implementation of assurance is necessary."

6.1 The Committee did not agree to drop the assurance but agreed to grant extension of time upto 2 September, 1988, as requested by the Ministry of Water Resources. The Committee desired that the Ministry should furnish

a note showing the progress made by various agencies in implementing the recommendations made at the National Water Convention.

Memorandum No. 141. Request for dropping of assurance given on 11 December, 1987, in reply to USQ. No. 5527 regarding import of gold.

7. The Committee considered the request of the Ministry of Finance received through the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs *vide* their U.O. Note No. IX/Fin (90)USQ. 5527-LS/87, dated 12 May, 1988, for dropping of the assurance on the following grounds :

“The question, suggestions regarding import of gold have been referred to the Working Group on Gold Policy set up by the Government. The term of the Working Group has been extended upto 31st May, 1988. Processing and finalisation of Government’s decisions on the recommendations of the Working Group will take some time after the receipt of the report.

The reply has been treated as an assurance by the Lok Sabha. It may be mentioned here that a similar answer, given on a similar question on 1.8.86 in Lok Sabha had not been treated as an assurance by the Committee on Government Assurance of Lok Sabha.

7.1 The Committee did not agree to drop the assurance, but agreed to grant extension of time upto 10 October, 1988 to implement it. They desired that the Ministry should furnish a note showing the progress made in processing and finalisation of Government’s decision on the recommendations of the Working Group.

Memorandum No. 142. Request for dropping of assurance given on 24 April, 1986, in reply to USQ. No. 7602 regarding Institute for training of teaching staff of Engineering colleges in Kerala.

8. The Committee recalled that at their sitting held on 24 June, 1987 they had not accepted the plea of the Ministry of Human Resource Development for the dropping of the assurance and 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. The Ministry of Human Resource Development once again requested for the dropping of the assurance through the Ministry of Parlia-

mentary Affairs, *vide* their U.O. Note No. V/HRD (35)/USQ. 7602-LS/86 dated 11 January, 1988, on the following grounds :

"This Ministry has not received so far any proposal from the Government of Kerala to start an Institute for Training of Teaching Staff of Engineering Colleges in Kerala. The question of any action on the part of the All India arises only when the detailed project for the proposal is submitted by the State Government for consideration."

8.1 The Committee did not accede to the request of the Ministry for dropping of the assurance and desired that the Ministry should ascertain from the State Government whether they were still interested in setting up the Institute for training of Technical Staff of Engineering Colleges in the State.

Memorandum No. 143. Request for dropping of assurance given on 9 November, 1987, in reply to SQ. No. 35 regarding damage to crops due to natural calamities.

9. The Committee considered the request of the Ministry of Agriculture received through the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs *vide* their U.O. Note No. IX/Agri. (4)/SQ. 35-LS/87, dated 25 February, 1988, for dropping of the assurance on the following grounds :

"In part (a) of the Question mentioned above, information was sought about the details of the estimated damage to farmers due to floods, drought and other natural calamities during V, VI and VII Five Year Plan periods. Information in respect of damages due to drought prior to the year 1980-81 is not available in this Department. The reports of the various Finance Commissions have also been gone through to obtain this information. As such reply to this part of the Question was confined to the 6th and 7th Five Year Plans and it was mentioned that information in respect of the 5th Five Year Plan period is not readily available. Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs has treated this part of the reply as an assurance. It is mentioned here that information relating to the 5th Five Year Plan on damages due to drought is neither available in the Department of Agriculture and Cooperation nor in other concerned Departments and such the State Governments have been requested to furnish the same.

In this connection, it is mentioned that the statistics relating to 5th Five Year Plan on damages due to drought may not be readily available in the State Headquarters. They in turn will have to collect the same from their Divisional/District/Taluk levels and as

such, this process may take a very long time for getting the complete information. Further substantial amount of time and energy is involved in collecting this historical data which relates to about 10-13 years back. It is feared that even after spending so much of time and Labour the net result may not match with these efforts."

9.1 The Committee did not agree to the request of the Ministry for dropping of the assurance and desired that the Ministry should furnish whatever information on the subject was available to them from the States.

The Committee however granted extension of time up-to 8th May, 1988.

Memorandum No. 144. Request for dropping of assurance given on 19 March, 1986, in reply to SQ. No. 348 regarding inclusion of Tanti Community in the list of Scheduled Castes.

10. The Committee again considered the request of the Ministry of Welfare received through the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs *vide* their U.O. Note No. V/W(19) SQ-348-LS/85 dated 16 December, 1987, for dropping of the assurance on the following grounds :

"The question of comprehensive revision of the lists of Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes was placed before the Cabinet on the 25 July, 1986. The Cabinet referred it to the Group of Ministers for detailed examination of various proposals included therein. The Group of Ministers has so far held seven meetings and may take a few more meetings for finalise all the proposals. At this stage it is difficult to indicate any time limit by which the Group of Ministers would be able to finalise all the proposals. After the Group of Ministers given their recommendations in respect of all the proposals it will be placed before the Cabinet for a final decision. The Ministry of Law and Justice will then be requested to prepare Bill which will be introduced in Parliament. It would, thus, be seen that is in difficult to anticipate the time limit by which the whole process of finalisation of all the proposals is to be completed. Even after the Bill is introduced in the Parliament, it will be referred to a Joint Select Committee, as happened in the past.

For instance, the Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes Orders (Amendment) Bill, 1967 was referred to a joint Select Committee which took two years in submitting their report. Similarly in 1978, when this Bill was again introduced in the Lok Sabha, it was referred to a Joint Select Committee and that Committee could not finalise

Its report even after taking one year's time and the Bill eventually lapsed on the dissolution of the Lok Sabha in 1979. The past experience, therefore, shows that it cannot be possible to precisely fix any time limit within which the whole matter would be finalised and the Bill enacted."

10.1 The Committee did not agree to the request of the Ministry for dropping the assurance. They observed that the Government must have received representations not only from Bihar but from other States also for inclusion of some communities in the list of Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes. The Ministry should therefore bring forward urgently a comprehensive bill for revision of the lists of Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes. The Committee also observed that it was not correct on the part of the Ministry to pre-judge the issue and to state that even after the Bill is introduced in the Parliament it would be referred to a Joint Select Committee.

11. The Committee then adjourned.

MINUTES

Third Sitting

Minutes of the sitting of the Committee on Government Assurances held on Tuesday, 20 September, 1988, in Committee Room 'B' Parliament House Annexe, New Delhi from 15.30 hours to 16.25 hours.

PRESENT

- Prof. Narain Chand Parashar — *Chairman*
2. Shri L. Balaraman
 3. Shri Bapulal Malviya
 4. Shri Murlidhar Mane
 5. Dr. A.K. Patel
 6. Shri V. Krishna Rao
 7. Shri Bhola Raut
 8. Shri Prabhu Lal Rawat
 9. Shri Manik Reddy
 10. Shri Kamla Prasad Singh
 11. Shri Ramashray Prasad Singh
 12. Shrimati Usha Thakkar
 13. Shri Mahabir Prasad Yadav

SECRETARIAT

1. Shri C.K. Jain — *Director-IC(A)*
2. Shri Raghbir Singh — *Senior Examiner of Questions*

2. The Committee took up the following Memoranda for consideration :—

Memorandum No. 145 : Request for dropping of assurance given on 25 November, 1987, in reply to SQ. No. 272 regarding misuse of foreign funds

3. The Committee considered the request of the Ministry of Home Affairs received through the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs *vide* their U.O. Note No. IX/HA(25) SQ. 272-LS/87, dated 11 March, 1988, for the dropping of the assurance on the following grounds :—

“The Ministry had only meant to indicate the intentions, approach and anxiety of the Government to plug certain lacunae in the Foreign Contributions (Regulation) Act, 1976 by amending the same so that chances of its misuse are minimised. The Ministry do not consider that this statement amounts to ‘Assurance’. It would be appreciated that as the process of bringing about amendments in such enactments does take time, it is not possible to fulfil the assurance within a particular time frame.”

3.1 The Committee felt unhappy to note that the Ministry had tried to sit in judgement on their decision in treating the reply of the Minister of Home Affairs as an assurance. The Committee desired that in view of the importance of the matter, Government should bring forward necessary legislation to amend the foreign Contribution (Regulation) Act, 1976 without any further delay. The request of the Ministry for extension of time for the implementation of the assurance upto 24 November, 1988 was, however, granted.

Memorandum No. 146 : Request for dropping of assurance given on 26 November, 1987, in reply to Unstarred Question No. 2920 regarding teachers participation in action plan of New Education Policy

4. The Committee considered the request of the Ministry of Human Resource Development received through the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs *Vide* their U.O. No. IX/HRD (10)USQ. 2920-LS/87, dated 11 May, 1988, for the dropping of the assurance on the following grounds :—

“It is clear from the wording of the above sentence that it is not possible to lay down any specific time frame for conferral of statutory status of the National Council of Teacher Education (NCTE), but that this can be taken up for implementation only over a period of time. It is implicit in the above wording that this action is likely to take a considerable length of time,

A National Council of Teacher Education, Constituted by a Resolution of this Ministry, is already in existence since 1973. However, conferral of statutory status on it would require prior consultation with all states not merely because Education is in the Concurrent List of the Constitution but also because certain functions envisaged for the NCTE may impinge on the jurisdiction of the universities as it stands today under the various State Universities Acts. Such a process would naturally take a long time to complete.

In the light of above, it would be difficult to set down any deadline or time-limit by which the task of conferring statutory status on the NCTE would be completed. As such, it would not serve much purpose to keep the matter alive as a Parliamentary Assurance.

Conferral of statutory status on NCTE has already found mention in the National Policy on Education adopted by Parliament and in the Programme of Action. Hence the Central Government already stand committed to it and even without treating the above reply as an assurance, Parliament would always be kept informed of progress in the matter while submitting periodic Implementation Reports on the Nation Policy on Education."

4.1 The Committee were not convinced with the reasons given by the Ministry of Human Resource Development for the dropping of the assurance, particularly when Government were conscious of the importance of the matter and had reiterated their commitment to the conferment of statutory status on the National Council of Teacher Education. The Committee desired that Government should take early steps for implementation of the assurance and in the meantime submit a request of extension of time as required minimum for the purpose.

5.1 The Committee did not agree with the plea of the Ministry of Home Affairs. In the view of the Committee, the responsibility of Union Government in regard to the protection of minorities is envisaged in the Constitution itself. The Committee desired that Government of India should find out from the Government of Uttar Pradesh the action taken by them on the report of the Committee appointed to go into the riots at Meerut and lay the required information on the Table of the House in implementation of the assurance. The Ministry of Home Affairs should make a request for extension of time as considered minimum to implement the assurance.

Memorandum No. 148 : Request for dropping of the assurance given on 25 November, 1987, in reply to Unstarred Question No. 2891 regarding U.S. aid for drought

6. The Committee considered the request of the Ministry of External Affairs received through the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs *vide* their U.O. Note No. IX/EA(8) USQ. 2891-LS/87, dated 16 February, 1988, for the dropping of the assurance on the following grounds :

“It is felt that the answer given to this Unstarred Question did not constitute an assurance. There was an offer from USA to help mitigate the consequences of the drought. The details which are being worked out between the two countries are part of a continuous process in the overall context of Indo-US relations.”

6.1 The Committee considered the plea taken by the Ministry of External Affairs as inappropriate in stating that the reply given by the Minister of State for External Affairs to the Unstarred Question under reference did not constitute an assurance. In the opinion of the Committee, it was a clear and categorical assurance and the Ministry ought not to have questioned the decision of the Committee. The Committee desired that the Ministry of External Affairs should furnish a note giving the latest progress in the matter and in the meantime submit a request for extension of time as considered minimum to implement the assurance.

Memorandum No. 149 : Request for dropping of assurance given on 11 November, 1987, in reply to Unstarred Question No. 699 regarding reopening of Indian Consulate in Lhasa.

7. The Committee considered the request of the Minister of State in the Ministry of External Affairs received through the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs *vide* their U.O. Note No. IX/EA(3) USQ. 699-LS/87 dated 14 January, 1988, for the dropping of the assurance on the following grounds :

“This should not be regarded as an assurance, for the primary reason that it would not be feasible to specify a time-limit within which India and China will reopen Consulates in each other's country. The matter is under discussion with the Chinese Government and a final decision will emerge only when these discussions have been satisfactorily and thoroughly completed. It would, therefore, not be possible for Government to take the position that the Consulates will be reopened within a specified time-limit.

The entire subject of India-China relations is extremely sensitive and every aspect, is being handled with the utmost care and discretion by Government. We are trying to sort out the various issues involved in a positive manner and in keeping with our national interest. The process will take time. It is in this context that we request that the reply to Unstarred Question No. 699 should not be treated as an Assurance but only as an indication of the sincerity with which we are examining various proposals for the improvement of relations with China."

7.1 The Committee did not appreciate the reasoning given by the Ministry of External Affairs for the dropping of the assurance. Whether or not a particular reply of the Minister was to be treated as an assurance is for the Committee to decide and not for the Ministry or Department concerned. In the instant case, the reply to the question was clearly an assurance and the Committee desired that it should be implemented early. If the implementation of the assurance required more time, the Ministry should submit a request for extension of time of the assurance on the following grounds :

"The project authorities have to comply with the statutory requirements—under Section 29(2) of the Electricity (Supply) Act, 1948—regarding publication of the scheme in the Official Gazette/local newspapers for the prescribed period and examination of the representations/objections, if any, received thereon ; till this is completed, the proposal is not considered to have been submitted to the CEA for formal clearance. Before according formal clearance, various aspects—like availability of water, adequacy of land for ash disposal system coal linkage and suitability of the site for a power plant, including its approach from the point of view of means of transportation, including railways need to be satisfactorily tied up. The scheme has also to be examined with reference to the available transmission systems for evacuation of power, its impact on the environment of the surrounding areas and clearance of the Department of Civil Aviation for building high structures. Compliance of all these steps can be a long-drawn process and the typing up of inputs and various clearances involves active cooperation of the State authorities. Quite often, techno-economic appraisal of schemes is held up for want of clarifications/clearances from the project authorities on various aspects ; schemes can be accorded techno-economic clearance only after all the inputs have been tied up and necessary clearances have been obtained."

9.1 The Committee did not accept the plea of the Ministry of Energy for the dropping of the assurance. They desired that a note about the progress made upto date in regard to matter be furnished to the Committee. Meanwhile, the Ministry should submit a request for extension of time.

Memorandum No. 152. Request for dropping of assurance given on 20 November, 1987, in reply to Starred Question No. 220 regarding outstanding income-tax against film stars.

10. The Committee considered the request of the Ministry of Finance received through the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs *vide* their U.O. Note No. IX/Fin (36) SQ-220-LS/87, dated 5 February, 1988, for the dropping of the assurance on the following grounds :

“The answer given by this Ministry on the above Lok Sabha Question on 20.11.1987 is the final reply on all the parts of the Question. This Ministry has nothing to add further to the answer given by it on 20.11.1987.”

10.1 The Committee reiterated that the Ministry of Finance should implement the assurance by laying the information as required in part (b) of the answer to the question. If the Ministry required some more time in order to implement the assurance, a request to that effect should be submitted to the Committee. The Committee also desired that the Ministry of Finance should submit a report giving, *inter-alia*, the results of the steps taken by them for realisation of the income tax outstanding against the film stars referred to in the question and also the precise amount of tax outstanding against each of them.

Memorandum No. 153. Request for dropping of assurance given on 10 November, 1987, in reply to Starred Question No. 43 regarding clearance to Vijayawada Thermal Power Plant Stage-III.

11. The Committee considered the request of the Ministry of Energy received through the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs *vide* their U.O. Note No. IX/Energy (1) SQ. 43-LS/87, dated 15 March, 1988, for the dropping of the assurance on the following grounds :

“The project feasibility report in respect of the proposed Vijayawada Thermal Power Station Stage-III (1 × 500 MW) was received in the Central Electricity Authority in September, 1986 from the Andhra

Pradesh State Electricity Board (APSEB) and is under examination in consultation with the various appraising agencies. Before formal clearance could be accorded to the proposed scheme, various aspects such as availability of land for ash disposal, coal linkages and details of transmission system for evacuation of power need to be satisfactorily tied up. In addition, details of the cost for implementation of the environmental safeguards have yet to be received from the APSEB.

It may be mentioned that trying up of inputs and obtaining the requisite clearances calls for active cooperation of the State Authorities. Sometimes, the techno-economic appraisal of schemes is held up for want of clarification/clearance from the project authorities on various aspects. In replying to the aforesaid Lok Sabha Question it was not the intention to extend an Assurance in the matter."

11.1. The Committee decided not accept the request of the Ministry of Energy for the dropping of the assurance. They desired that a progress report upto date be furnished by the Ministry for their information. The Ministry should submit a request for extension of time as required for implementation of the assurance.

Memorandum No. 154. Request for dropping of assurance given on 11 November, 1987, in reply to Unstarred Question No. 675 regarding import of Pressurised water reactors from Soviet Union.

12. The Committee considered the request of the Department of Atomic Energy received through the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs vide their U.O. Note No. IX/AE(2)USQ. 675-LS/87, dated 27 April, 1988, for the dropping of assurance on the following grounds :

"As regards Lok Sabha USQ No. 675 on Soviet offer of Atomic Power Reactors, various aspects of the offer received from USSR viz. technical, economic safeguards etc. are still under consideration of the Government. The question specifically asked whether Government proposes to import reactors from USSR and main features of the proposal. In answer it was stated that discussions were continuing and Government have taken no decision in the matter. The matter is still under consideration of the Government and no final decision has yet been taken on the subject. Answer

given to the question on the floor of the House contains adequate information for the query raised. The phrase used in the reply viz, no decision in the matter has been taken may not be considered as an assurance.

It would, therefore, be difficult to liquidate the assurance within the stipulated period of time. Since the Committee on Government Assurances have always been responsive to the difficulties of the Government and have been giving due relief in terms of the inherent power to dispense with the fulfilment of such assurance, it is requested that the matter may kindly be placed before the Committee on Government Assurances for their consideration to delete the 'Assurance' referred to above."

12.1 The Committee did not accede to the request of the Department of Atomic Energy for the dropping of the assurance and desired that the Department should make efforts to implement the assurance at the earliest. In the meantime, a request for extension of time should be submitted to the Committee:

13. The Committee decided to hold their next sittings on 11 and 12 October, 1988.

14. The Committee then adjourned.

MINUTES

Fourth Sitting

Minutes of the sitting of the Committee on Government Assurances held on 11 October, 1988 in Committee Room 'B', Parliament House Annex, New Delhi.

The Committee met on Tuesday, 11 October, 1988 from 15.30 hrs. to 16.30 hrs.

PRESENT

Prof. Narain Chand Parashar—*Chairman*

MEMBERS

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

SECRETARIAT

1. Shri C.K. Jain—*Director—FC (A)*
2. Shri S.C. Gupta—*Deputy Secretary (Q)*
3. Shri Rajbir Singh—*Senior Examiner of Questions*

2. The Committee considered the draft Fourteenth Report adopted the same with the following modifications :

- (i) Page 4, para 8, line 8 : after the word the Committee add deplore this attitude of the Ministry 'and'
- (ii) Page 20, para 45, line 10 : after the word 'assurance' add 'and showing scant respect to the Parliamentary Procedure. The Committee expect that Government, irrespective of the Member supplying the information to them or not, would promptly find out the relevant information and also exercise necessary check on the entry of foreign airline officials so as to violate the sovereignty of the country and report to the House about the steps taken in this regard.'

3. The Committee authorised the Chairman to present the report to the House during ensuing Session of the Lok Sabha.

4. The Committee then took up Memoranda Nos. 155—161 for consideration.

Memorandum No. 155. Request for dropping of assurance given on 17 November, 1987 in reply to Unstarred Question No. 1665 regarding power projects proposed for private sector.

5. The Committee considered the request of the Ministry of Energy received through the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs vide their U.O. Note No. IX/Energy. (38) UQS. 1665-LS/87 dated 6 April, 1988 for the dropping of the assurance on the following grounds :

"The formulation of the broad principles to be followed in respect of such private sector participation keeping in view, *inter-alia*, the recommendations of the Working Group, has been under consideration ; being a matter of policy, various relevant aspects have to be examined in requisite detail which is likely to take some time. After a decision is reached, it would be necessary to consult the State Electricity Boards/State Governments/concerned Ministries/Departments in the event that amendments to the Electricity (Supply) Act, 1948 and the Indian Electricity Act, 1910 are to be effected. As such, implementation of the pending assurance in respect of this matter in a definite time frame, would not appear to be feasible."

5.1 The Committee found the plea taken by the Ministry of Energy to drop the assurance untenable. The Committee took exception to the manner in which the Ministry had couched their request for extension of time for fulfilling the assurance till the decision was taken on their request" for dropping of the assurance by the Committee." While making request for extension of time, the Committee felt, the Ministry should have indicated a specific time by which they would be able to fulfil the assurance instead of putting it vaguely which gave an impression of casualness and perfunctory manner. The Committee desired the Ministry to implement the assurance upto 31 December, 1988 and granted extension of time upto that date.

Memorandum No. 156. Request for dropping of assurance given on 13 November, 1987, in reply to Unstarred Question No. 1140 regarding Scheme for ex-servicemen in Karnataka.

6. The Committee considered the request of the Ministry of Defence received through the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs *vide* their U.O. Note No. IX/D (2) USQ. 1140-LS/87 dated 22 April, 1988 for dropping of the assurance on the following grounds :

"The observations/information given by the Hon'ble Minister in reply to part (b) of the subject, question have been examined and it is felt that the same do not appear to constitute an Assurance. Therein no such promise was made by the Minister to furnish any information in future to the House for the reason that it is not feasible to collect this information as explained in the subsequent sub-paras.

- (i) There are a number of self-employment ventures like allotment of industrial plots/sheds, shops/Jai Jawan stalls, fair price shops, route permits, transportation, small scale industries, etc. which are implemented by different agencies. For many of these ventures, the ex-servicemen may seek financial assistance from different sources like banks, State Financial Corporations, etc. In view of this, the relevant data is neither available at any single point with the concerned State Government nor can it be collected by the Centre.
- (ii) A number of Ex-Servicemen take to self-employment on their own. Some of them may seek loans, others may not do so. The Zila/Rajya Sainik Boards recommend or reject the cases for

grant of loans, to the financial agencies. Many ex-servicemen may not follow this channel and approach the financial institutions direct. In view of the multiplicity of institutions involved, the information cannot be collected.

Further it may be mentioned that as the intention of the Hon'ble MP was to elicit information as to how many ex-servicemen have been provided self-employment in Karnataka during 1987-88 through the SEMFEX Scheme which appears to be case from the wording of this part of the question following on from part (a) of the subject Question which refers to SEMFEX Scheme which has been launched in Karnataka on 1.9.1987, keeping this in view, information available relating to this aspect had already been furnished in the reply as follows :

“However, two persons have been sanctioned loans under the SEMFEX Scheme and 38 applications are being processed.”

Since SEMFEX Scheme is controlled at one point it was possible to obtain data/information relating to this aspect and furnish the same. Data regarding number of ex-servicemen who had been provided self-employment who had secured self-employment through the on going schemes (other than the SEMFEX Scheme) in Karnataka is neither collected by the Centre nor by any State Government nor it is feasible to collect the same on the grounds mentioned in sub-para above. It was therefore, mentioned in the reply that this information is not available. The intention of the Minister while replying as such was not that such information would be collected/and furnished later on. Information which could be collected relating to this aspect of the question had been furnished.”

6.1 The Committee were not satisfied with the arguments advanced by the Ministry of Defence to drop the assurance and desired that the specific assurance given by the Minister in respect of applications received under the SEMFEX scheme should be fulfilled expeditiously. The Committee granted an extension of time upto 30 November, 1988 for fulfilling the assurance.

Memorandum No. 157. Request for dropping of assurance given on 28 July, 1987, in reply to Unstarred Question No. 349 regarding working group on private sector participation in power generation.

7. The Committee considered the request of the Ministry of Energy received through the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs *vide* their U.O Note No. VIII-2/Epy (3) USQ, 349-LS/87 dated 23 March, 1988 for the dropping of the assurance on the following grounds :

"The formulation of the broad principles to be followed in respect of such private sector participation keeping in view, *inter-alia*, the recommendations of the Working Group, has been under consideration ; being a matter of policy, various relevant aspects have to be examined in requisite detail which is likely to take some time. After a decision is reached, it would be necessary to consult the State Electricity Boards/States Governments concerned Ministeries/Departments in the event that amendments to the Electricity (Supply) Act, 1948 and the Electricity Act, 1910 are to be effected. As such, implementation of the pending Assurances in respect of this matter, in a definite time-frame, would not appear to be feasible."

7.1 The Committee did not agree to the request of the Ministry for dropping of the assurance. They observed that the House having been informed that the Report of the Working Group was presently being examined it was correctly treated as an assurance and instead of making request for dropping of the assurance, the Ministry should have fulfilled it expeditiously by intimating the findings of the working Group and the action taken by Government in the matter.

As regards the alternative request of the Ministry for extension of time, the Committee expressed their unhappiness on the phraseology used which did not show due courtesy to them. While granting the extension upto 31 December, 1988 upto which the Ministry should report implementation of the assurance, the Committee desired that the Ministry should in future make such requests in specific terms.

Memorandum No. 158. Request for dropping of assurance given on 17 November, 1987, in reply to Unstarred Question No. 162 regarding trunk telephone services in Andaman and Nicobar Islands.

The Committee considered the request of the Ministry of Communications received through the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs *vide* their

U.O. Note No. IX/C (46) USQ.1621-LS/87 dated 7 July, 1988 for the dropping of the assurance on the following grounds :

“.....the development of telecommunication facilities in the country of which extension of trunk telephone facilities is a part, is a continuous process. The Development Plans are formulated and executed by the department progressively taking into consideration various factors like demand, technical solutions, economic viability, social/strategic needs and resources available to meet the broad objectives laid down for the various Five Year Plans. The general statement, “Other island communities will also be considered for provision of trunk telephone facilities progressively” cannot, therefore, be construed as an assurance especially when no time limit can be given for its fulfilment.”

8.1 The Committee did not agree to the request of the Ministry for dropping of the assurance and desired that the progress made in providing trunk telephone facilities on other Islands and Communities and the proposals under consideration of Government in this regard should be intimated to them. The Committee however granted extension of time upto 30 November, 1988 for fulfilling the assurance.

Memorandum No. 159, Request for dropping of assurance given on 19 November, 1987 in reply to Unstarred Question No. 1902 regarding exploitation of Copper in Bihar.

9. The Committee considered the request of the Ministry of Steel and Mines received through the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs *vide* their U.O. Note No. IX/SM(13) USQ-1902-LS/87 dated 24 June, 1988 for the dropping of the assurance on the following grounds :

“A part of the reply to the above mentioned USQ. *viz.* “the study is aimed at obtaining detailed project reports on deposits already explored in the area and to formulate a long term strategy for exploitation of the potential of the belt. The study, which is under progress, is expected to be completed in two years, has been treated as an assurance at the instance of the Lok Sabha Secretariat.

In this connection, it may be mentioned that the reply given by this Department is a factual one. The feasibility study has commenced on 1.9.87 and is to be completed by August, 1989 as per the contract entered into with M/s. Robertson Research Ltd.,

Australia by Hindustan Copper Ltd. Hence, it would not be possible to fulfil the Assurance before the completion of the feasibility study and receipt of feasibility study from M/s. Robertson Research, Australia. Besides this, the Question itself asks whether the feasibility study has been conducted, the reply given by this Department is a complete one and does not call for any additional information at this juncture".

9.1. The Committee did not agree to drop the assurance. They, however agreed to grant extension of time upto 31 August, 1989 for fulfilling the assurance. The Committee desired the Ministry to furnish a note indicating the progress made so far in regard to the feasibility study.

Memorandum No. 160. Request for dropping of assurance given on 28 August, 1987, in reply to Unstarred Question No. 5391 regarding fresh initiative to solve Punjab problem.

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

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

10.1. The Committee desired that the Ministry be asked to furnish a note indicating the steps taken to date by Government including the recent initiative taken by the Prime Minister, to solve the Punjab problem. The Committee would like to consider the request of the Ministry for the dropping of the assurance on the receipt of the information from them.

Memorandum No. 161. Request for dropping of assurance given on 17 November, 1987, in reply to Starred Question No. 146 regarding use of gas available at Cauvery Basin for power generation by Tamil Nadu Electricity Board.

11. The Committee considered the request of the Ministry of Energy received through the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs vide their U.O.

Note No. IX/Engy. (10) SQ. 146-LS/87 dated 21 March, 1988 for the dropping of the assurance on the following grounds :—

"A project report relating to 3210 MW capacity thermal station at Cuddalore at an estimated cost of Rs. 759 22 crores was received in the CEA in March, 1987. The Scheme is under examination and coal availability as also environmental clearance remains to be tied up. We ourselves are very eager and will try to help the Tamil Nadu people to the maximum extent possible.

The proposal in respect of installation of a thermal power station (3210 MW) at Cuddalore in South Arcot district is under examination in the CEA in consultation with the various appraising agencies, including the State Authorities. Before formal clearance could be accorded to the proposed scheme, various aspects such as coal linkage, availability of water and clearance from environmental angle and of the State Pollution Control Board, need to be satisfactorily tied up. The tying up of inputs and obtaining of requisite clearance involves both the Central and the State authorities. On occasion techno-economic appraisal of a scheme can be held up for want of clarifications/clearance from the project authorities in regard to various aspects. In making the above statement, in reply to Shri P. Kolanjaivelu, MP, it was not the intention to extend an Assurance in the matter."

11.1 The Committee observed that the Statement of the Minister informing the House that the proposal in respect of installation of a thermal power station at Cuddalore was under examination was clearly an assurance. Therefore, they took a serious view of the frivolous plea of the Ministry that it was not the intention to extend an assurance in the matter. While not agreeing to the dropping of the assurance, the Committee allowed extension of time upto 31 January, 1989 to implement the assurance.

12. The Committee then adjourned to meet again on 12 October, 1988.

MINUTES

Fifteenth Sitting

The Minutes of the Sitting of the Committee on Government Assurances held on 8 May, 1989 in Committee Room 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.