

**COMMITTEE  
ON  
GOVERNMENT ASSURANCES  
(2007-2008)**

**FOURTEENTH LOK SABHA  
EIGHTEENTH REPORT**

**REQUESTS FOR DROPPING OF ASSURANCES**

(Presented to Lok Sabha on )



**LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT  
NEW DELHI**

**AUGUST 2007/BHADRAPADA 1929 (Saka)**

## CONTENTS

	PAGE
Composition of the Committee (2007-2008)	(iv)
Introduction	(v)
 <b>Chapter I Requests for dropping of Assurances (Not Accepted)</b>	
(i) Unstarred Question No.2280 dated 15 December 2004 regarding Unified Licensing Regime.	1
(ii) Unstarred Question No.2770 dated 12 December 2005 regarding revival of BHPV.	5
(iii) Unstarred Question No.2698 dated 19 December 2003 regarding Violation of Rules by Co-operative Thrift and Credit Societies.	10
(iv) Starred Question No. 283 dated 17 December 1999 regarding Loans to Agricultural Sector.	13
(v) Unstarred Question No. 7088 dated 12 May 2005 regarding Offer of AI/IA Shares.	20
(vi) Starred Question No. 416 dated 21 December 2005 regarding Acquisition of Artifacts	23
(vii) Unstarred Question No. 1855 dated 29 November 2002 regarding Property of Revenue Officials	26
 <b>Chapter II Requests for dropping of Assurances (Accepted)</b>	
(i) Unstarred Question No.1906 dated 08 March 2006 regarding New Medicines for TB.	30
(ii) Unstarred Question No.5773 dated 03 May 2005 regarding Change the Name of Sub Tribes.	33
(iii) Starred Question No.281 dated 23 March 2005 regarding Vacancies in CBI.	37

## **APPENDICES**

- I Minutes of the Sitting of the Committee held on 15 March 2007.
- II Minutes of the Sitting of the Committee held on 16 May 2007.

**COMPOSITION OF THE COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT ASSURANCES\***  
**(2007-2008)**

**Shri Harin Pathak - CHAIRMAN**

**MEMBERS**

2. Shri Rashid J.M.Aaron
3. Shri Yogi Aditya Nath
4. Km. Mamata Banerjee
5. Shri Jigajinagi Ramesh Chandappa
6. Dr. K. Dhanaraju
7. Shri Biren Singh Engti
8. Shri Sunil Khan
9. Shri Vijoy Krishna
10. Shri Rasheed Masood
11. Shri A. Venkatesh Naik
12. Shri Nihal Chand
13. Smt. M.S.K. Bhavani Rajenthiran
14. Shri Rajiv Ranjan 'Lalan' Singh
15. Shri Aruna Kumar Vundavalli

**SECRETARIAT**

- |    |                    |   |                     |
|----|--------------------|---|---------------------|
| 1. | Shri S. Bal Shekar | - | Joint Secretary     |
| 2. | Shri Hardev Singh  | - | Director            |
| 3. | Shri B.S. Dahiya   | - | Deputy Secretary    |
| 4. | Shri V.P. Goel     | - | Deputy Secretary-II |

---

\* The Committee was constituted on 07 August 2007 vide Para No.3783 of Lok Sabha Bulletin Part-II dated 06 August 2007.

## INTRODUCTION

I, the Chairman of the Committee on Government Assurances, having been authorized by the Committee to submit the Report on their behalf, present this Eighteenth Report of the Committee on Government Assurances.

2. The Committee (2006-2007) was constituted on 7 August 2006.
3. The Committee at their sitting held on 15 March 2007 considered Memoranda Nos. 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50 and 51 containing requests received from the Ministries/Departments of the Government of India for dropping of pending assurances.
4. At their sitting held on 16 May 2007, the Committee considered and adopted their Eighteenth Report which had been drafted on the basis of the decisions taken by the Committee on the Memoranda.
5. The Minutes of the aforesaid sittings of the Committee form part of this report. (Appendices).
6. For facility of reference and convenience, the observations and recommendations of the Committee have been printed in bold letters in the Report.

**New Delhi;**

16 May 2007

26 Vaisakha 1929 (Saka)

**HARIN PATHAK**

CHAIRMAN

COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT ASSURANCES

## **REPORT**

### **CHAPTER-I**

#### **REQUESTS FOR DROPPING OF ASSURANCES (NOT ACCEPTED)**

##### **(I) UNIFIED LICENSING REGIME**

1.1 On 15 December 2004, Shri Asaduddin Owaisi, M.P., addressed the following Unstarred Question No.2280 to the Minister of Communications and Information Technology:-

- “(a) whether the TRAI has recommended for a unified licensing regime for all types of telecom and broadcasting services;**
- (b) if so, the details thereof;**
- (c) whether the TRAI has asked for views from different quarters;**
- (d) if so, the time by which the comments are likely to be received in this regard; and**
- (e) the time by when a final decision is likely to be taken in regard to broadcasting and telecom services?”**

1.2 In reply, the Minister of State in the Ministry of Communications and Information Technology (Dr. Shakeel Ahmad) stated as follows:-

- “(a) No, Sir.**
- (b) Does not arise in view of (a) above.**
- (c) Yes, Sir.**
- (d) Comments of various stakeholders were invited upto 31st August, 2004.**
- (e) According to information received from TRAI final recommendations on Unified Licensing Regime shall be submitted to Government very shortly.”**

1.3 The above reply to the question was treated as an assurance and was required to be fulfilled by the Ministry of Communications and Information Technology within three months of the date of the reply i.e. by 14 March 2005. However, the assurance is yet to be fulfilled.

1.4 The Ministry of Communications and Information Technology vide their letter No.12-22/2004-BS-I dated 15 July 2006 requested the Committee to drop the assurance on the grounds that the decision on the Unified Licensing recommendation is a policy matter and no time framework can be fixed to arrive at a conclusion in the matter.

**1.5 The Committee note that a question regarding Unified Licensing Regime was asked on 15 December 2004. The question sought information regarding recommendation of Telecom Regulatory Authority of India (TRAI) for a unified licensing regime for all types of telecom and broadcasting services, its details, calling for views from different quarters by TRAI and receipt thereof alongwith the time by when a final decision regarding broadcasting and telecom services would be taken. In reply, the Government stated that TRAI had not given any such recommendations and the comments of various stake holders were invited upto 31 August, 2004 and that TRAI would submit its final recommendations to the Government on Unified Licensing Regime very shortly. This reply to the question was treated as an assurance and was required to be fulfilled by the Ministry of Communications and Information Technology within three months of the reply but the same was not fulfilled. The Ministry now has requested for deletion of the assurance on the ground that the decision on the Unified Licensing Regime is a policy matter and no time framework can be fixed to arrive at a conclusion in the matter. The Committee considered this request of the Ministry at their sitting held on 15 March 2007 and decided not to drop the assurance.**

**1.6 The Committee note that in part (e) of the reply to USQ 2280 dated 15 December 2004, it was specifically mentioned that TRAI would submit to the Government its recommendations on Unified Licensing Regime very shortly. However, in the request submitted to**



**the Committee for dropping the assurance, the Ministry had not stated whether the said recommendations have been submitted by TRAI or not and if submitted, what action has been taken thereon. On the contrary, the Ministry has stated that decision on the Unified Licensing Regime is a policy matter and no time frame could be fixed in the matter. The Committee are not convinced with the grounds furnished by the Ministry for dropping the assurance and desire that the promise made to the House that the recommendations of TRAI would be submitted very shortly need to be fulfilled without any further loss of time. The Committee would also like to be apprised of the present status of the assurance.**

## **(II) REVIVAL OF BHPV**

1.7 On 12 December, 2005 Shri Badiga Ramakrishna and Shrimati D. Purandeswari, M.Ps., addressed the following Unstarred Question No.2770 to the Minister of Heavy Industries and Public Enterprises:-

**“(a) whether the Union Government has received any request from the Government of Andhra Pradesh seeking revival package of Bharat Heavy Plates & Vessels Limited (BHPV), Visakhapatnam;**

**(b) if so, the details thereof; and**

**(c) the action taken by the Government thereon?”**

1.8 In reply, the Minister of State (Independent Charge) of the Ministry of Heavy Industries and Public Enterprises and Minister of State (Independent Charge) of the Ministry of Water Resources (Shri Sontosh Mohan Dev) stated as follows:-

**“(a) & (b): Yes, Sir. In the suggested revival package, following four measures were indicated:-**

**(i) GOI counter guarantee for Rs.130 crore**

**(ii) Merger of BHPV with BHEL**

**(iii) Wage revision of the employees of BHPV**

**(iv) Orders on nomination basis for BHPV.**

**(c) Government of India has been making efforts for revival of the company and a revival package based on study of Consultants has been submitted to the Board for Reconstruction of Public Sector Enterprises (BRPSE). After receipt of their recommendations, Government will take a decision in the matter.”**

1.9 The above reply to the question was treated as an assurance and was required to be implemented by the Ministry of Heavy Industries and Public Enterprises within three months of the date of the reply *i.e.* by 11 March 2006, but the assurance is yet to be implemented.

1.10 The Ministry of Heavy Industries and Public Enterprises *vide* their O.M.No.8 (2)/2005-PE-IV dated 07 March and 26 July 2006 requested for dropping the assurance on the grounds that the Department had sent a Note for financial restructuring and strengthening of Bharat Heavy Plates & Vessels Limited (BHPV) to the Department of Public Enterprises on 21 October 2005 for placing it before the Board for Reconstruction of Public Sector Enterprises (BRPSE) for its consideration/recommendations. Subsequently, upon finalization of the Accounts and Balance Sheet of the Company for the year ended 31 March 2005, the financial figures had undergone some changes from the earlier reported in the Note forwarded to DPE on the basis of provisional figures. Accordingly, the amended Note was sent to DPE on 19 January 2006 for placing it before BRPSE for its consideration and recommendations thereon. The Note is yet to be considered by the BRPSE. After receipt of recommendations of BRPSE, the case of BHPV would be placed before the Cabinet for a final decision. The whole exercise is likely to take some time. The Ministry further stated that the reply given by the Ministry to the Question does not constitute an assurance in view of the fact that it is a routine matter for the Ministry involving decision-making on the future of a Public Sector Undertaking (PSU) by the Central Government after due consideration of the various factors a decision in the case,

as mentioned above, would be taken after considering the recommendations of BRPSE, which were awaited.

**1.11 The Committee note that a question was asked on 12 December 2005 regarding receipt of the request of the Andhra Pradesh Government by the Union Government for revival of Bharat Heavy Plates & Vessels Limited (BHPV) Visakhapatnam, its details and the action taken by the Union government thereon. In reply, it was *inter-alia* stated that such a request was received by the Union Government and for revival of BHPV the Government had submitted a revival package to Board for Reconstruction of Public Sector Enterprises (BRPSE) and further action would be taken after the receipt of recommendations of BRPSE. This reply to the question was treated as an assurance. The assurance remained unfulfilled. However, the Ministry of Heavy Industries and Public Enterprises requested for its deletion on the ground that a note for financial restructuring and strengthening of BHPV was submitted to Department of Public Enterprises on 21 October 2005 and also on 19 January 2006, which was yet to be considered by BRPSE and after receipt of its recommendations the case would be placed before the Cabinet, which is a time consuming process. The Ministry also stated that the reply does not constitute an assurance since it is a routine matter of the Ministry requiring decision making on the future of a Public Sector Undertaking (PSU). This request of the Ministry was considered by the Committee at their sitting held on 15 March 2007 and it was decided not to drop the assurance.**

**1.12 The Committee note that a note for financial restructuring and strengthening of BHPV has been submitted to the Department of Public Enterprises which is yet to be considered. The Committee consider the revival of BHVP as an important issue and therefore would like to know whether the said note has been considered by the Department of Public Enterprises or not. They would therefore like to know the present status of the assurance. As regards the plea of the Ministry that the reply does not constitute an assurance, the Committee express their strong displeasure over the language used by the Ministry and observe that it is the prerogative of the Committee to decide as to whether a reply of the Minister constitutes an assurance or not and it is not for the Ministry to comment on that.**

### **(III) VIOLATION OF RULES BY CO-OPERATIVE THRIFT AND CREDIT SOCIETIES**

1.13 On 19 December 2003, Shri Raj Narain Passi, MP addressed the following Unstarred Question NO.2698 to the Minister of Finance:-

- “(a) whether it is a fact that many Co-operative Thrift and Credit Societies having membership of more than 20,000 are violating the RBI guidelines as well as Income Tax Rules in the grab of Co-operative Rules and Act;**
- (b) if so, whether the RBI (Reserve Bank of India) also keeps a watch on the working of Co-operative Thrift and Credit Society by calling information from the concerned authorities;**
- (c) if so, the details thereof; and**
- (d) the number of such cases where RBI has taken action against such co-operative societies who have flouted RBI guidelines during the last three years, year-wise?”**

1.14 In reply, the then Minister of State in the Ministry of Finance (Shri Anandrao V. Adsul) stated as follows:-

**“(a), (b), (c) & (d): The Information is being collected and, to the extent available, will be placed on the Table of the House.”**

1.15 The above reply to the question was treated as an assurance and was required to be fulfilled by the Ministry of Finance within three months of the date of reply i.e. by 18 March 2004 but the assurance is yet to be implemented. The Ministry had sought extension of time upto 31.03.2006.

1.16 The Ministry of Finance vide their O.M. F.No. 4-82/2003-AC(PQ) dated 08 September 2006 requested for dropping the assurance on the ground that the matter was followed up with RBI and NABARD. However, RBI was not able to

provide any substantive material so as to fulfill this assurance. Moreover, the assurance is also more than two and half years old. Further, the information asked by the Hon'ble Member requires voluminous data, which seems difficult to compile.



**1.17 The Committee note that a question was asked on 19 December, 2003 regarding Violation of Rules by co-operative Thrift and Credit Societies. The question *inter-alia* sought information regarding violation of RBI guidelines and income tax rules in the garb of Co-operative rules and Act by many Co-operative Thrift and Credit Societies and also action taken by RBI against such societies. In reply, it was stated that information was being collected and would be placed on the Table of the House to the extent available. This reply was treated as an assurance. The Ministry of Finance requested for its deletion on the ground that the matter was taken up with RBI and NABARD and no substantial material could be provided by RBI. Moreover the assurance is more than two years and a half old, besides requiring voluminous data, which is difficult to be compiled. The Committee considered this request of the Ministry at their sitting held on 15 March 2007 and decided not to drop the assurance.**

**1.18 The Committee note that in the reply it was specifically mentioned that the information was being collected and to the extent available would be placed on the Table of the House. Now, instead of fulfilling the assurance the Ministry has requested for deletion of the assurance on the ground that the assurance is more than two years and a half old and the information is difficult to be compiled. The Committee are not at all convinced by these reasons and therefore desire that whatever information the Ministry has been able to gather so far be laid on the Table of the House without further loss of time.**

#### **(IV) LOANS TO AGRICULTURE SECTOR**

1.19 On 17 December 1999, S/Shri Bhartruhari Mahtab and U.V. Krishnamraju, M.Ps., addressed the following Starred Question No.283 to the Minister of Finance:-

- “(a) the target fixed for providing loans to small and marginal farmers through various banks during the last three years alongwith the target achieved;**
- (b) whether the RBI has issued directions to the banks in regard to granting of loans to agricultural sector, out of the total loan sanctioned by them;**
- (c) if so, the details thereof;**
- (d) the names of such banks which have not followed the directions;**
- (e) the action taken by the Government against those banks;**
- (f) whether despite the availability of loan on the basis of said directions, the capital required for the development of agricultural sector could not be mobilized; and**
- (g) if so, the steps taken by the Government to increase the loan to farmers, particularly to small and marginal farmers?”**

1.20 In reply, the then Minister of State in the Ministry of Finance (Shri Balasaheb Vikhe Patil) stated as follows:-

**“(a) to (g): A Statement is laid on the Table of the House.**

**STATEMENT LAID ON THE TABLE OF LOK SABHA IN REPLY TO PARTS (A) TO (G) OF STARRED QUESTION NO.283 FOR 17.12.1999 TABLED BY SHRI BHARTRUHARI MAHTAB AND SHRI U.V. KRISHNAMRAJU REGARDING LAONS TO AGRICULTURAL SECTOR**

**(a): Though no specific targets have been fixed for providing loans to small and marginal farmers, they are included under the targets fixed for agriculture and weaker sections. The direct advances of all scheduled commercial banks to small and marginal farmers viz., land holdings upto 5 acres during the last 3 years are given below:**

**(Rs. Crores)**

<b><u>Year</u></b>	<b><u>Amount disbursed</u></b>	<b><u>Amount outstanding</u></b>
<b>1995-96</b>	<b>3954</b>	<b>8620</b>
<b>1996-97</b>	<b>4468</b>	<b>9927</b>
<b>1997-98</b>	<b>4701</b>	<b>10499</b>

**(b) & (c): As per the extant policy of Reserve Bank of India (RBI), domestic scheduled commercial banks are required to lend 18 percent of their net bank credit for agriculture under the priority sector.**

**(d): The names of public sector and private sector banks which have not achieved the target of 18 percent, as reported by RBI, as on the last Friday of March 1999 are at Annexure-I and II respectively.**

**(e): All scheduled commercial banks have been advised from time to time to make every effort to achieve the stipulated target and sub-target for lending to priority sector as well as agriculture. Those banks which do not achieve the agricultural lending sub-target of 18 percent of net bank credit are required to make contribution to the Rural Infrastructure Development Fund (RIDF) maintained by National Bank for Agriculture and Rural Development (NABARD) equivalent to their shortfall in achieving the sub-target for agriculture subject to a maximum of 1.5% of Net Bank Credit. Accordingly, defaulting banks**

have been contributing to RIDF since the time of inception of this Fund.

(f): The total flow of credit to agriculture has been growing substantially. The ground level flow of credit to agriculture by all agencies, viz. co-operatives, regional rural banks and commercial banks for the last three years is as under:

**(Rs. Crores)**

<u>Year</u>	<u>Amount</u>	<u>Growth Rate (%)</u>
1996-97	26411	20
1997-98	31698	20
1998-99	38054	20

(g): With a view to further strengthen the flow of credit to small and marginal farmers certain relaxations in regard to margin money requirements, security norms etc. have been extended to such borrowers by RBI. The relaxation include:

- (1) Banks not to insist on margin money for crop loans/term loans granted to small and marginal farmers upto Rs.10,000/-
- (2) Banks not to insist upon collateral security/third party guarantee for crop loans upto Rs.10,000/- Hypothecation of crops can be taken as security.
- (3) As regards loans above Rs.10,000/- banks have discretion in the matters relating to margin/security.
- (4) Payment of interest to be insisted upon only at the time of repayment of loan instalments fixed.
- (5) Banks not to compound interest on current dues in respect of long duration crop loans and instalments not falling due in respect of term loans.

**(6) Total interest debited to the accounts of small and marginal farmers not to exceed the principal amount in respect of short term advances."**

1.21 During the course of supplementaries, Prof. Ummareddy Venkateshwarlu, M.P., asked the following Supplementary Question:-

**"I seek your protection. If the undisbursed amount is drawn to infrastructure, then what is the benefit that the farmer is getting?"**

1.22 The then Hon'ble Speaker directed the then Minister of State in the Ministry of Finance (Shri Balasaheb Vikhe Patil) to send the information to the Hon'ble Member.

1.23 The above direction of the then Hon'ble Speaker was treated as an assurance and was required to be fulfilled by the Ministry of Finance within three months of the date of the reply *i.e.* by 16 March 2000.

1.24 During the course of further supplementaries, Shri Devender Prasad Yadav, M.P., also asked the following Supplementary Question to know:-

**"The R.B.I. guidelines under which loans were provided to any sector. The Hon'ble Minister has also mentioned about 15 per cent. I would like to know from the Minister the details of the states which are not following these guidelines in these rural areas. If it is being followed in some rural areas than what is the ratio thereof?"**

1.25 In reply, the then Minister of State in the Ministry of Finance (Shri Balasaheb Vikhe Patil) *inter-alia* stated as follows:-

**"We will supply the information because it is not available at present."**

1.26 The above reply to the supplementary question was also treated as an assurance and was required to be fulfilled by the Ministry of Finance within three months of the date of the reply *i.e.* by 16 March, 2000. However, both the assurances are yet to be implemented.

1.27 The Ministry of Finance vide O.M.No.4-40/1999-AC(PQ) dated 07 September 2006 requested with the approval of the Minister of State (R) for dropping the above two assurances on the ground that they are of general nature.

**1.28 The Committee note that a question was asked on 17 December, 1999 regarding loans to agricultural sector. The question, *inter-alia*, sought information regarding the target fixed for providing loans to small and marginal farmers through various banks during the last three years alongwith the target achieved, issuing of directions by RBI to the banks in this regard, the names of those banks which had not followed the directions of RBI, the action taken in the matter etc. In reply, it was inter-alia stated that no specific targets had been fixed for providing loans to small and marginal farmers. However, they were included under the targets fixed for agriculture and weaker sections. It was also stated that the direct advances of all scheduled commercial banks to small and marginal farmers during the year 1995-96, 1996-97 and 1997-98 was Rs. 3954, 4468 and 4701 (crores), and the amount outstanding was Rs. 8620, 9927 and 10499 (crores) respectively. The Ministry further stated that commercial banks are required to lend 18 percent of their net bank credit for agriculture under the priority sector; however in case of failure to achieve this target of 18 per cent, the Banks contribute to the Rural Infrastructure Development Fund (RIDF) a sum equivalent to their shortfall in achieving the target of 18 percent, subject to a maximum of 1.5 per cent of Net Bank Credit. During the course of supplementaries Prof. Ummareddy Venkateswarlu, MP desired to know that if the undisbursed amount is drawn to infrastructure, then what would be the benefit that the farmers could get. The then Hon'ble Speaker directed the then Minister to provide the information. This direction of the Speaker was treated as an assurance. Similarly, during further supplementaries, Shri Devender Prasad Yadav, MP also, *inter-alia*, desired to know about the details of the states which were not following the guidelines of the RBI. In reply, the then Minister assured that the information would be supplied. This was also treated as an assurance. Later on, the Ministry of Finance requested the Committee for deletion of both the assurances on the ground that they are of general nature. The Committee considered this request at**

**their sitting held on 15 March, 2007 and decided not to drop both the assurances.**

**1.29 The Committee are surprised to note that the Ministry desires the two very important assurances relating to the provision of loan to small and marginal farmers dropped on the frivolous ground that the assurances were of general nature. The Committee fail to understand how such important assurances relating to agriculture sector can be of general nature?. The Committee are of the view that the Government first gave an assurance on the floor of the House and later on has dragged its feet to fulfil its solemn promise made to the august House. The Committee find that in the first issue the Government has not paid due attention to the Directions from the Chair. The Committee consider it a total disregard to the Chair. The Committee would, therefore, like that a status report on both the assurances highlighting the steps taken so far to implement them, may be furnished for their consideration and also gear up their machinery for fulfillment of these two assurances.**



## **(V) OFFER OF AI/IA SHARES**

1.30 On 12 May 2005, Shri Asaduddin Owaisi, M.P., addressed the following Unstarred Question No.7088 to the Minister of Civil Aviation:-

- “(a) whether the Government has decided to offer 20% to 25% of Air India(AI) and Indian Airlines (IA) shares to public;**
- (b) if so, the details thereof;**
- (c) whether the employees of both the airlines will also be offered shares; and**
- (d) if so, the details in this regard.”**

1.31 In reply, the Minister of State (independent charge) in the Ministry of Civil (Shri Praful Patel) stated as follows:-

**“(a), (b), (c) and (d): The issue of an Initial Public Offerings for Air India and Indian Airlines is at a preliminary stage of discussion.”**

1.32 The reply to the above question was treated as an assurance and was required to be fulfilled by the Ministry of Civil Aviation within three months of the date of the reply *i.e.* by 11 August 2005. However the assurance is yet to be implemented and the Ministry has not sought extension of time beyond 12 August 2006.

1.33 The Ministry of Civil Aviation vide O.M.No.H-11016/31/2005-AI dated 05 October 2006 requested for dropping of the assurance on the grounds that both the Airlines had already been given 'In Principle' approval for appointment of Advisors in connection with Initial Public Offerings (IPO). However, the IPO of both Air India and Indian Airlines have been put on hold due to impending merger of the two airlines, which is under active consideration of the

Government. The merger exercise is likely to be completed by the beginning of the next financial year. A decision for launching of IPO for a merged entity would be taken thereafter only.

**1.34 The Committee note that a question was asked on 12 May, 2005 regarding initial public offer of Air India (AI)/Indian Airlines (IA) shares. The question sought information regarding offering of 20 per cent to 25 percent shares of AI/IA by the Government to public, its employees and its details. In reply, it was stated that the issue of an Initial Public offerings (IPO) of AI & IA shares was at a preliminary stage of discussion. This reply was treated as an assurance; however the Ministry of Civil aviation requested for its deletion, *inter-alia*, on the ground that IPO of both entities have been put on hold due to the impending merger of the two airlines and a decision for launching of IPO for a merged entity would be taken thereafter only. The Committee considered this request at their sitting held on 15 March, 2007 and decided not to drop the assurance.**

**1.35 The Committee note that in reply to the question it was stated that the issue of an initial public offerings (IPO) for AI and IA shares was at a preliminary stage. However, the Ministry instead of fulfilling the assurance requested for deletion of the assurance on the ground that a decision for launching of IPO for a merged entity would be taken after the impending merger of IA & AI. The Committee while not agreeing to the request desire that the status report of the assurance be submitted first for their consideration. The Committee have also noted that no extension of time beyond 12 August, 2006 has been sought. The Committee, therefore, urge the Government to expedite the implementation of pending assurance under all circumstances and if they are not able to implement the assurance to seek further extension of time to fulfill the assurance till it is implemented/dropped.**

## **(VI) ACQUISITION OF ARTIFACTS**

1.36 On 21 December 2005, S/Shri Kishanbhai V. Patel and Shri Sugrib Singh, MPs addressed the following SQ No. 416 to the Minister of Culture:-

- “(a) the details of the institutions engaged in acquisition, preservation and restoration of art objects of historical importance ;**
- (a) whether functions of most of these institutions overlap and there is no synergy among them;**
- (b) if so, the details and the reasons therefor;**
- (c) whether the Government contemplates to chalk out any policy in respect of acquisition of artifacts;**
- (d) if so, the details in this regards;**
- (e) whether the Government has made any investigation into the theft of a fifth century Buddha head from the Sarnath Museum in December, 2004;**
- (f) if so, the details thereof; and**
- (g) the action taken by the Government against the persons responsible for the said lapse?”**

1.37 In reply, the then Minister for Urban Development and Culture (Shri S. Jaipal Reddy) stated as follows:-

**(a) to (h) : A statement is laid on the Table of the House.**

**STATEMENT REFERRED TO IN REPLY TO PARTS (a) TO (h) OF THE LOK SABHA STARRED QUESTION NO.416 FOR 21.12.2005 BY SHRI KISHANBHAI V. PATEL AND SHRI SUGRIB SINGH REGARDING 'ACQUISITION OF ARTIFACTS'.**

(a) to(c) : The main institutions under the Ministry of Culture engaged in acquisition, preservation and restoration of art objects of historical importance are National Museum, New Delhi; Archaeological Survey of India, New Delhi; National Gallery of Modern Art, New Delhi and Mumbai; National Research Laboratory for Conservation of Cultural Property, Lucknow; Salar Jung Museum,

Hyderabad; Allahabad Museum, Allahabad; Indian Museum, Kolkata; Victoria Memorial Hall, Kolkata.

Some activities of these organizations are of a similar nature like exhibition, display, seminar, publication, training etc.. However, these do not overlap as the nature of collections and hence areas of functioning are different. Work is undertaken as per their objectives set down for each institution.

(d) to (e) : All these organizations are governed by their respective Acts, Rules, Regulations and Bye-laws and they also have separate policies and Art Acquisition Committee for acquisition of artifacts in consonance with their existing collections.

(f) to (h) : Although no incident of theft occurred in Sarnath Museum in December, 2004, one sculpture named 'Buddha Head (Sarnath)' was found missing from the Archaeological Gallery of Indian Museum, Kolkata on 29th December, 2004. The matter has been referred to the Kolkata Police for investigation. After the incident the entire security system of Indian Museum has been further strengthened and additional CCTV have been installed with recording facilities. The matter is under investigation by the CBI, and Interpol has also been alerted.

1.38 The above reply to the question was treated as an assurance and was required to be fulfilled by the Ministry of Culture within three months of the date of reply i.e. by 20 March 2006 but the assurance is yet to be implemented. The Ministry have sought extension of time upto 20.03.2007.

1.39 The Ministry of Culture *vide* their O.M. No.F. 3-18/2002.M.I.) dated 8 May 2006 with the approval of Minister of Tourism and Culture requested for dropping the assurance on the ground that the reply may not be treated as an assurance since the case is under investigation of the Central Bureau of Investigation and it is an ongoing process. It may also take a long time before the case is charge-sheeted.

**1.40** The Committee note that a question was asked on 21 December, 2005 regarding acquisition of artifacts. The question, *inter-alia*, sought information regarding theft of a fifth century Buddha head from the Sarnath Museum in December 2004 and its investigation. In reply, it was, *inter-alia*, stated that the matter was being investigated by CBI and Interpol has also been alerted. This reply was treated as an assurance. The Ministry of Culture requested for its deletion on the ground that the case is under investigation of Central Bureau of Investigation and it is an ongoing process. According to them it will take a long time before the case is charge sheeted. The Committee considered this request at their sitting held on 15 March, 2007 and decided not to drop the assurance.

**1.41** The Committee note that the matter is being investigated by CBI since long and Interpol has also been alerted. The Committee, observe that protracted investigation is not a valid ground for dropping the assurance and therefore, desire to have a status report of the enquiry so far conducted by CBI at the earliest.

## **(VII) PROPERTY OF REVENUE OFFICIALS.**

1.42 On 29 November, 2002, Prof Dukha Bhagat and Shri Ram Tahal Choudhary, MPs, addressed the following USQ No. 1855 to the Minister of Finance and Company Affairs:-

- “(a) whether the Government keeps a watch on the officers of income tax, custom duty and excise duty who possess more properties than their known sources of income;**
- (a) if so, the details thereof;**
- (c) the number of cases of reported corruption and tax-evasion registered against these officers during the last three years, year-wise;**
- (d) the number of persons out of the above found guilty; and**
- (f) the number out of the above punished for their offence?”**

1.43 In reply, the then Minister of State in the Ministry of Finance and Company Affairs (Shri Jinge N. Ramachandran) stated as follows:-

**(a) & (b): Yes, Sir. Searches are conducted and cases registered by the CBI.**

**(c): CBI has registered 24 cases in respect of Group `A` and `B` officers of Income Tax during the last 3 years as under:**

<b>Year</b>	<b>2000-01</b>	<b>2001-02</b>	<b>2002 (upto 31.10.2002)</b>
<b>Cases</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>8</b>

**CBI has registered 21 cases in respect of Group `A`, `B` and `C` officers/officials of Customs and Central Excise during the last 3 years as under:**

<b>Year</b>	<b>2000</b>	<b>2001</b>	<b>2002 (upto 31.3.2002)</b>
<b>Cases</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>4</b>

**(d) & (e): In so far as officers of Income Tax are**

**concerned, final report has been received from CBI only in one case where no case of disproportionate assets has been established. As regards the officers/officials of Customs and Central Excise are concerned, two cases are pending trial, one case has been closed on account of death of accused, prosecution has been sanctioned in one case and in one case the officer is facing Regular Departmental Action for major penalty. The remaining cases are under investigation by the CBI.**

1.44 The above reply to the question was treated as an assurance and was required to be fulfilled by the Ministry of Finance within three months of the date of reply i.e. by 28 February 2003 but the assurance is yet to be implemented.

1.45 The Ministry of Finance *vide* their O.M. No. 9/1/2003-Coord dated 14 February 2003 requested for dropping the assurance on the ground that the cases are under investigation by the CBI and it may take a long time before the CBI can conclude its enquiries. Thereafter, litigations are likely to follow. Thus, fulfillment of this assurance will take a considerably long time.



**1.46 A question was asked on 29 November, 2002 regarding Property of Revenue Officials. The question sought information regarding the number of cases of corruption and tax evasion registered against officers of income tax, customs and central excise possessing property disproportionate to their income. In reply, it was, *inter-alia*, stated that searches are conducted and cases are also registered by the CBI. It was also stated that CBI registered 24 cases against Group 'A' & 'B' officers of Income Tax from the year 2000-01 to 2002 and the corresponding figure in respect of Group 'A' 'B' and 'C' officers/officials of customs and Central Excise during this period was 21. It was also stated that final report has been received from CBI only in one case relating to officers of Income Tax. However, as regards the cases of officers/officials of customs and Central Excise, two cases were pending trial, one case was closed, in another case prosecution was sanctioned and in an another one case the officer was facing action, whereas the rest of the cases were being investigated by the CBI. This reply was treated as an assurance. However, the Ministry of Finance requested for its deletion on the ground that cases are under investigation of the CBI and may take a long time and also thereafter litigations may follow. As such the fulfillment of the assurance would take a considerably long time. This request was considered by the Committee at their sitting held on 15 March, 2007 and the Committee decided not to drop the assurance.**

**1.47 The Committee note with concern that as many as 24 cases against Group 'A' & 'B' officers of Income Tax have been registered. Similarly, 21 cases against the officers/officials of Custom and Excise duty have been registered which include officers/officials of Group 'A' 'B' and 'C' as well, within a time span of just three years. The Committee express deep anguish over the widespread corruption in revenue generation departments of Government. The Committee, therefore, recommend that concrete steps be taken to check the menace of corruption at the earliest and the Committee be apprised of the steps so taken. The Committee also desire that the status report of the assurance may be furnished urgently for their consideration to enable this Committee to take a final decision on the request of the Ministry of Finance for dropping this assurance.**

## **CHAPTER-II**

### **REQUESTS FOR DROPPING OF ASSURANCES (ACCEPTED)**

#### **(I) NEW MEDICINE FOR TB**

2.1 On 08 March 2006, Shri Rakesh Singh, MP addressed the following USQ No. 1906 to the Minister of Health and Family Welfare:-

**“(a) whether the Scientists of the country have discovered any medicine since 1963 for reducing the treatment period for T.B.;**

**(a) if so, the details thereof;**

**(b) whether the Government has any plan to popularize the said medicine; and**

**(c) if so, the details thereof?”**

2.2 In reply, the Minister of State in the Ministry of Health & Family Welfare (Smt. Panabaks Lakshmi) stated as follows:-

**“(a) & (b) An Indian Pharmaceutical company has submitted an IND (Investigational New Drug) application for drug code name LL4858 (SUDOTIL) which includes new molecule LL3858 and Isoniazid; Rifampicin and Pyrazinamide.**

**The Firm has stated that pre-clinical and animal studies carried out with the above said combination drug shows 100% clearance of tubercle bacilli from lung and spleen of the animals infected with resistant or sensitive strain after a 12 week treatment with 5 days a week dose regime.**

**(c) & (d) the above said proposal is currently under evaluation of IND Expert Committee at ICMR.”**

2.3 The above reply to the question was treated as an assurance and was required to be fulfilled by the Ministry of Health and Family Welfare within three

months of the date of reply i.e. by 07 June 2006 but the assurance is yet to be implemented.

2.4 The Ministry of Health and Family Welfare vide their O.M No. H.11016/7/06-CCD dated 28 July 2006 requested for dropping the assurance on the ground that the present position of the matter is that as on today, there is no further development because Phase I Clinical Trial is still ongoing. As soon as firm completes Phase I trial, firm would submit its report and protocol for conducting Phase II Clinical trial. Based on the result of Phase I trial (which would be examined by ICMR). Phase II permission would be granted for IND LL 4858. Drug development is a long process and all parameters of safety and efficacy are studied in these "Pre-Market" trials. It is too early to predict when drug would be approved. There is no time frame for such development. Sometimes, it may take 8-10 years. In certain cases, drugs do not pass Phase I trial on the parameters of safety in human beings.

2.5 The Ministry further stated that as clinical trial of drug is a time taking process for which no time frame can be fixed and there is hardly anything which the Government can do to accelerate the process in order to fulfil the assurance within the prescribed extended time limit.

**2.6 A question was asked on 8 March 2006 regarding New Medicine for TB. The question sought information regarding discovery of new medicine by the scientists of the country for reducing the treatment period for TB and the plan of the Government, if any to popularize it. In reply, it was stated that an Indian Pharmaceutical company submitted an Investigational New Drug (IND) and the proposal was under evaluation of IND Expert Committee at ICMR. This reply was treated as an assurance and the Ministry of Health and Family Welfare requested for its deletion primarily on the ground that Phase I Clinical Trial is still ongoing. As soon firm completes Phase I trial, firm would submit its report and protocol for conducting Phase II Clinical trial. Based on the result of phase I trial (which would be examined by ICMR), phase II permission would be granted for IND LL 4858. Drug development is a long process and all parameters of safety and efficacy are studied in these "Pre-Market" trials. It is too early to predict when drug would be approved. There is no time frame for such development. Sometimes, it may take 8-10 years. In certain cases, drugs do not pass Phase I trial on the parameters of safety in human beings. Moreover, as clinical trial of drug is a time taking process for which no time frame can be fixed and the there is hardly anything which the Government can do to accelerate the process of evaluation of the proposal in order to fulfil the assurance. The Committee considered this request at their sitting held on 15 March 2007 and after being convinced by the reasons advanced by the Ministry decided to drop the assurance.**

**(II) CHANGE THE NAME OF SUB TRIBES.**

2.7 On 03 May 2005, Shri Kiren Rijiju, MP addressed the following USQ No. 5773 to the Minister of Tribal Affairs:-

**“(a) the reasons for delay in changing the name of “DAFLA” tribes with “NYISHI” in the Constitution Scheduled Tribes Order, 1950 with Bangru and Puroik as sub-tribes; and**

**(b) the time by which the necessary amendment expected to be adopted by the Union Government in this regard?”**

2.8 In reply, the Minister of Tribal Affairs (Shri P.R. Kyndiah) stated as follows:-

**“(a)&(b): The proposal for substitution in the list of Scheduled Tribes is being processed as per the approved modalities.”**

2.9 The above reply to the question was treated as an assurance and was required to be fulfilled by the Ministry of Tribal Affairs within three months of the date of reply i.e. by 02 August 2005 but the assurance is yet to be implemented. The Ministry have sought the extension of time upto 30 November 2006.

2.10. The Ministry of Tribal Affairs *vide* their O.M. No.16012/15/2005-C&LM-I dated 16 June 2006 requested for dropping the assurance on the ground that the answer given by the Ministry does not constitute an assurance in Parliament.

2.11 The scheduled Tribes are notified by a Presidential Order under article 342 (I) of the Constitution. In June 1999, the Government approved modalities for deciding claims for inclusion in or exclusion from the lists of Scheduled Tribes. According to these approved guidelines, only those claims that have been agreed to by the concerned State Government, The Registrar General of India and the National Commission for Scheduled Castes & Scheduled Tribes will be taken up for consideration. Whenever representations are received in the Ministry for

inclusion of any community in the list of Scheduled Tribes of a State/UT, the Ministry forwards these representations to the concerned State Government/UT administration for recommendations as required under Article 342 of the Constitution. If the concerned State Government recommends the proposal, then the same is sent to the Registrar General of India (RGI). The RGI, if satisfied with the recommendations of the State Government, recommends the proposal to the Central Government. Thereafter, the Government refers the proposal to the National Commission for Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes for their recommendation. If the National Commission for Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes also recommends, the matter is placed before the Cabinet for a decision, after consulting the concerned and administrative Ministries. Thereafter, the matter is put up before the Parliament in the form of a Bill to amend the Presidential Order.

2.12 In case, there is any disagreement between the views of the State Government and the RGI, the views of the RGI are sent to the State Government for reviewing or further justifying their recommendation. On the receipt of the further clarification from the State Government/Union Territory Administration, the proposal is again referred to the RGI for comments. In such cases, where the RGI does not agree to the point of view of the State Government/UT Administration on a second reference, the Government of India may reject the said proposal. Claims that neither the RGI nor the concerned State Government has supported are rejected. Similarly, those cases where the State Government and the RGI favour inclusion/exclusion, but not supported by the National Commission for Scheduled Tribes are also rejected.

2.13 Any revision in the lists of Scheduled Tribes requires consultation with the concerned State Government, the Registrar General of India and The National Commission for Scheduled Tribes, which takes time. So, no definite time frame can be indicated for inclusion/exclusion of any community in the list of Scheduled Tribes.

2.14 The matters raised by the Hon'ble Members of Parliament in their Question has already been processed by the Ministry as per above Approved modalities.



**2.15 A question was asked on 03 May, 2005 regarding change the name of sub-tribes. The question sought information regarding delay in changing the name of DAFLA tribes and the likely time by when the necessary amendment was expected. In reply, it was stated that the proposal for the said amendment was under process. This reply was treated as an assurance and the Ministry of Tribal Affairs requested for its deletion primarily on the ground that any revision in the list of Scheduled tribes requires consultation with the concerned State Government, the Registrar General of India and the National Commission for Scheduled Tribes, which takes time. So, no definite time frame can be indicated for inclusion/exclusion of any community in the list of Scheduled Tribes. The matter raised in the question has already been processed by the Ministry as per the approved modalities. The Committee considered this request at their sitting held on 15 March, 2007 and decided to drop the assurance in view of the grounds adduced by the Ministry.**

### **(III) VACANCIES IN CBI**

2.16 23 March 2005, S/Shri Mansukhbai D. Vasava and Kashiram Rana, MPs asked the following Starred Question No. 281 to the Prime Minister:-

**“(a) whether there are a number of vacancies at different levels in the Central Bureau of Investigation which have adversely affected its efficient working;**

**(a) if so, the facts thereof; and**

**(b) the steps being taken by the Government to increase the efficiency of CBI?”**

2.17 In reply, the Minister of State in the Ministry of Personnel, Public Grievances and Pensions and Minister of State in the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs (Shri Suresh Pachouri) stated as follows: -

**“(a) to (c): A statement is laid on the Table of the House.”**

**Statement referred to in reply to parts (a) to (c) of Lok Sabha Starred Question No. 281 for 23.3..2005 regarding Vacancies in CBI.**

**(a) to (c): In the Central Bureau of Investigation (CBI) as on January 1, 2005 against a sanctioned strength of 5891, there were 4811 employees in position with 1080 vacant posts at various levels. With effective use and deployment of existing personnel, the vacancies have not affected the performance of the CBI adversely. To improve the efficiency of CBI government has taken various measures, which inter alia include modernization, improvement in training infrastructure, housing and improving conditions of work and employment of the staff of the CBI.**

2.18 Shri Mansukhbai D. Vasava, MP while raising a supplementary question stated that corruption has been gradually eating into the vitals of the country. Stamp scams, cases of corruption in banks were increasing day-by-day and CBI is the main agency of the Government machinery to control them. Today, many doubts are being raised about CBI that it is not working properly. On the one hand, there is lack of staff in the CBI while on the other hand our country ranks 83<sup>rd</sup> in the world today in the matter of corruption due to lack of efficient staff. In this situation, he wanted to know the steps taken by the Government to fill up the vacancies.

2.19 In reply, the Minister of State in the Ministry of Personnel, Public Grievances and Pensions and Minister of State in the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs *inter-alia* stated that the vacancies have remained between 900 to 1100 during the last 5 to 7 years. But as far as performance is concerned, definitely it is affected due to vacant posts but if we look at the indicator, the number of cases investigated is more than the total registered cases. It results in over burden but the Government would try to take steps to fill up the vacancies at various levels and to provide other facilities to them.

2.20 The above reply was treated as an assurance and was required to be fulfilled by the Ministry of Personnel, Public Grievances and Pensions within three months of the date of reply i.e. by 22 June 2005, but the assurance is yet to be fulfilled.

2.21 The Ministry of Personnel, Public Grievances and Pensions vide their D.O. No. 235/17/2005-AVD.II dated 26 October 2005 requested for dropping of the said assurance. The request of the Ministry was considered by the Committee at their sitting held on 12 April 2006 and the Committee decided not to drop the assurance. The decision of the Committee was conveyed to the Ministry. Accordingly the Committee in their Eleventh Report (14<sup>th</sup> LS) *inter-alia* desired to be apprised of the steps taken for filling up of vacancies and effecting improvement in service conditions as was assured during the course of reply to the supplementary question.

2.22 The Ministry of Personnel, Public Grievances and Pensions vide their O.M. No. 235/17/2005-AVD.II dated 09 October 2006 again requested for dropping of the said assurance and as desired by the Committee, the Ministry furnished a note indicating steps taken or proposed to be taken to fill up the vacancies in CBI and for effecting improvements in service conditions of CBI personnel. The Ministry further submitted that as CBI is predominantly a deputation oriented organisation, Officers come on deputation for a limited period from the Indian Police Service, State Service and Central Police Organisations etc. and revert back to their parent organization on completion of their term of deputation. As such, while old vacancies get filled up, new vacancies keep arising and at no particular point of time, all posts remain filled up.

2.23. Occurrence and filling of vacancies and improvement in service conditions is a continuous process and Government is already taking steps to fill up vacancies and improve service conditions of CBI personnel.

**2.24 A question was asked on 23 March, 2005 regarding vacancies in CBI. The question sought information relating to the number of vacancies in CBI and the steps taken to increase the efficiency thereof. In response to it an affirmative reply was given by the Government. In reply to a supplementary question raised by a Member, the then Minister stated that the Government would try to take steps to fill up the vacancies. This reply was treated as an assurance and the Ministry of Personnel, Public Grievances and Pensions requested for its deletion inter-alia on the ground that the Government is already taking steps to fill up the vacancies. As desired by the Committee, the Ministry have furnished a note indicating steps taken or proposed to be taken to fill up the vacancies. The Committee considered this request at their sitting held on 15 March, 2007 and having satisfied with the reasons advanced by the Ministry decided to drop the assurance.**

**New Delhi;**

16 May 2007

03 Vaisakha 1929 (Saka)

**HARIN PATHAK**

CHAIRMAN

COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT ASSURANCES

## **MINUTES**

### **FIFTH SITTING**

Minutes of the sitting of the Committee on Government Assurances (2006-2007) held on 15 March 2007 in Chairman's Chamber Room No.133, Parliament House Annexe, New Delhi.

The Committee sat from 1500 hours to 1630 hours on Thursday 15 March 2007.

### **PRESENT**

#### **Chairman**

Shri Harin Pathak

#### **Members**

2. Shri J.M. Aaroon Rashid
3. Dr. K. Dhanaraju
4. Shri Sunil Khan
5. Shri A. Vankatesh Naik
6. Smt. M.S.K. Bhavani Rajenthiran
7. Shri Rajiv Ranjan 'Lalan' Singh
8. Shri Aruna Kumar Vundavalli

#### **Secretariat**

1. Shri S. Bal Shekar - Joint Secretary
2. Shri T.K. Mukherjee - Director
3. Shri B.S. Dahiya - Deputy Secretary
4. Shri V.P. Goel - Deputy Secretary-II

2. At the outset, the Chairman welcomed the Members and apprised them briefly about the agenda of the sitting of the Committee. First of all, the Committee took up for consideration the draft Sixteenth and Seventeenth

Reports regarding requests for dropping of assurances. After some deliberations, the Committee adopted both the draft Reports without any amendment. The Committee authorized the Chairman to finalise the draft report and present in the current session itself.

3. Thereafter, the Committee took up the following Memoranda regarding the requests received from various Ministries/Departments for dropping the assurances:-

**Memorandum No.42 Request for dropping of assurance given on 15 December 2004 in reply to USQ No.2280 regarding 'Unified Licensing Regime'.**

The Committee considered the above Memorandum and noted that in reply to para (d) of the Question the Minister had categorically stated that 'according to information received from TRAI final recommendations on Unified Licensing Regime shall be submitted to Government very shortly'. The Ministry has now requested to drop it on the ground that the decision on the Unified Licensing recommendation was a policy matter and no timeframe could be fixed to arrive at a conclusion in the matter. The Committee decided not to accede to the request of the Ministry to drop the assurance.

**Memorandum No.43 Request for dropping of assurance given on 12 December 2005 in reply to USQ No.2770 regarding 'Revival of BHPV'.**

The Committee considered the above Memorandum and expressed their displeasure on the language used by the Ministry while requesting for dropping the assurance. They observed that it is not for the Ministry to argue the decision

of the Committee to treat a particular reply of the Minister as an assurance. The Committee, therefore, decided not to drop the assurance.

**Memorandum No.44 Request for dropping of assurance given on 08 March 2006 in reply to USQ No.1906 regarding 'New Medicine for TB'.**

The Committee considered the above Memorandum and after being convinced by the reasons advanced by the Ministry decided to drop the assurance.

**Memorandum No.45 Request for dropping of assurance given on 19 December, 2003 in reply to USQ No.2698 regarding 'Violation of Rules by Co-operative Thrift and Credit Societies'.**

The Committee considered the above Memorandum and noted that in their reply the Government had committed that 'the information is being collected and, to the extent available, will be placed on the Table of the House'. The Ministry has now requested for dropping the assurance on the ground that the matter had been followed up with RBI and NABARD. The Committee are not convinced with the reasons. The Committee have however, emphasised that whatever information was available with them be laid on the Table of the House without further delay in fulfillment of this assurance.

**Memorandum No.46 Request for dropping of assurances given on 17 December 1999 in reply to supplementaries to Starred Question No.283 regarding 'Loans to Agricultural Sector'.**

The Committee considered the above Memorandum. The Committee observe that categorical promises were made by the Minister during the course of replies to supplementary points raised by the Members and it was also a



direction by the Chair. The Committee, therefore, desired a status report on the same and decided not to drop the assurance.

**Memorandum No.47 Request for dropping the assurance given on 03 May 2005 in reply to USQ No.5773 regarding 'Change the Name of Sub Tribes'.**

The Committee considered the request of the Ministry of Tribal Affairs and decided to drop the assurance in view of the grounds adduced by the Ministry.

**Memorandum No.48 Request for dropping of assurance given on 12 May 2005 in reply to Unstarred Question No.7088 regarding 'Offer of AI/IA Shares'.**

The Committee considered the above Memorandum and expressed their anguish over the fact that the Government had not sought any extension of time to fulfil the assurance. The Committee have asked for the status report and decided not to drop the assurance.

**Memorandum No.49 Request for dropping of assurance given on 23 March 2005 in reply to SQ No.281 regarding 'Vacancies in CBI'.**

The Committee considered the above Memorandum and having convinced with the reasons decided to drop the assurance.

**Memorandum No.50 Request for dropping of assurance given on 21 December 2005 in reply to SQ No.416 regarding 'Acquisition of Artifacts'.**

The Committee considered the above Memorandum and noted that the matter has been under investigation by the CBI since long. The Committee, therefore, decided not to drop the assurance and desired to have the status report of the CBI enquiry so far conducted in the implementation of this assurance.

**Memorandum No.51 Request for dropping the assurance given on 29 November 2002 in reply to USQ No.1855 regarding 'Property of Revenue Officials'.**

The Committee considered the above memorandum and did not agree to drop the assurance for the present as the cases of having more properties than their known sources of income by the officers of the Departments of Income-tax, Custom Duty and Excise Duty are under the investigation of CBI since long. The Committee desired the Ministry to submit a status report of these cases before taking a final decision on their request for dropping the assurance.

The Committee authorized the Chairman to call representatives of the Ministries/Departments that are not implementing the long pending assurances.

***The Committee then adjourned.***

# **MINUTES**

## **SIXTH SITTING**

Minutes of the sitting of the Committee on Government Assurances (2006-2007) held on 16 May 2007 in Committee Room 'E', Parliament House Annexe, New Delhi.

The Committee sat from 1500 hours to 1600 hours on Wednesday, 16 May 2007.

### **PRESENT**

#### **CHAIRMAN**

Shri Harin Pathak

#### **Members**

2. Shri Yogi Aditya Nath
3. Shri Biren Singh Engti
4. Shri Sunil Khan
5. Shri A. Venkatesh Naik
6. Shri Rajiv Ranjan 'Lalan' Singh
7. Shri Aruna Kumar Vundavalli

#### **Secretariat**

1. Shri T.K. Mukherjee - Director
2. Shri B.S. Dahiya - Deputy Secretary
3. Shri V.P. Goel - Deputy Secretary-II

At the outset, the Chairman welcomed the Members and apprised them briefly about the agenda for the sitting. Thereafter, the Committee considered and after discussion adopted draft Eighteenth Report regarding requests for dropping of pending assurances and authorised the Hon'ble Chairman to present the same to the House. The Committee, thereafter took up the following Memoranda on the requests received from various Ministries/Departments for dropping the assurances:-

XXXX          XXXX          XXXX          XXXX          XXXX          XXXX

Thereafter, the Committee discussed about the proposed study visit. The Committee decided that the study visit may be undertaken in two phases. In first Phase the Committee will visit Chennai, Andaman & Nicobar Islands and Kolkota and the places to be visited during the second phase will be decided later.

***The Committee then adjourned.***