

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

**FOURTEENTH LOK SABHA
TWENTY SECOND REPORT**

REQUESTS FOR DROPPING OF
ASSURANCES

(Presented to Lok Sabha on 12 March, 2008)



**LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT
NEW DELHI**

March, 2008/Phalguna, 1929 (Saka)

CONTENTS

	PAGE
Composition of the Committee (2007-2008)	(iii)
Introduction	(iv)
 Chapter I Requests for dropping of Assurances (Not Accepted)	
(i) Unstarred Question No.2173 dated 06 December, 2006 regarding Four Laning of National Highway.	1
(ii) Unstarred Question No.3246 dated 23 March, 2005 regarding Amendment in Telegraph Act.	5
Chapter II Requests for dropping of Assurances (Accepted)	
(i) Unstarred Question No.901 dated 29 November, 2005 regarding Passenger Ship Services.	9
(ii) Unstarred Question No.344 dated 26 July, 2005 regarding FDI in Elementary Education.	12
(iii) Unstarred Question No.2118 dated 06 December, 2006 regarding Directory of Mobile Phone Users.	15
(iv) Unstarred Question No.195 dated 23 February, 1999 regarding Rent Control Tribunal.	18

APPENDICES

- I Minutes of the Sitting of the Committee held on 02 August 2007.
- II Minutes of the Sitting of the Committee held on 19 December 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 06th 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 Twenty Second Report of the Committee on Government Assurances.

2. The Committee (2007-2008) was constituted on 7 August, 2007.

3. The Committee (2006-2007) at their sitting held on 02 August, 2007 considered Memoranda Nos. 78 and 82 to 90 containing requests received from the Ministries/Departments for dropping of pending assurances. In respect of Memorandum No.88 containing request of the Ministry of Petroleum and Natural Gas for dropping the assurance given in reply to USQ No.280 dated 24 November, 2005 regarding Gas Pipeline, the Committee decided to call the representatives of the Ministry to explain the reasons for delay in the implementation of the assurance. In the meantime assurances given in reply to USQ No.1477 dated 30 November, 2006 regarding construction of new Hotels by ITDC (Memorandum No.82) and USQ No.4479 dated 25 August, 2005 regarding Superannuation Benefit Scheme (Memorandum No.85) were implemented vide the statement laid in the House on 31 August, 2007. Similarly assurances given in reply to USQ No.2181 dated 22 July, 2004 regarding Doubling of Rail Line and USQ No.1399 dated 09 December, 2004 regarding Rail Lines between Surat and Bhusawal (Memorandum No.83) were implemented vide the statement laid in the House on 27 November, 2007. Accordingly these memoranda have not been included in this Report.

4. At their sitting held on 19 December, 2007, the Committee (2007-2008) considered and adopted their Twenty Second Report.

5. The minutes of the aforesaid sittings of the Committee form part of this Report. (Appendices-I).

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;

HARIN PATHAK

CHAIRMAN

COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT ASSURANCES

28 February 2008

09 Phalguna,1929 (Saka)

REPORT

CHAPTER – I

REQUESTS FOR DROPPING OF ASSURANCES (NOT ACCEPTED)

[i] FOUR LANING OF NATIONAL HIGHWAY

1.1 On 06 December, 2006, Shri S. Mallikarjuniah, MP addressed the following Unstarred Question No. 2173 to the Minister of Shipping, Road Transport and Highways:-

- “(a) whether the Government proposes to widen the NH-206 of Tumkur City from Batwade to Gubbi Gate into four lane;
- (b) if so, whether the Government has accorded its sanction for the said project;
- (c) the time by which the work on the said stretch will be completed; and
- (d) if not, the reasons for delay in according sanction?”

1.2 In reply, the Minister of State in the Ministry of Shipping, Road Transport and Highways (Shri K.H. Muniyappa) stated as follows:-

- “(a) to (d): There is no proposal for widening of National Highway (NH)-206 in the Tumkur City from Batwade to Gubbi Gate into four lane in current Annual Plan. A proposal to bypass the Tumkur Town, connecting NH-4 and NH-206 is under consideration. The widening of existing stretch of NH-206 in Tumkur Town will be considered as per the recommendation of the Detailed Project Report(DPR) Consultant for the bypass.”

1.3 The above reply to the question was treated as an assurance and was required to be fulfilled by the Ministry of Shipping, Road Transport and Highways

within three months of the date reply *i.e.* by 05 March, 2007. The Ministry has sought extension of time upto 14 July, 2007 to implement the assurance.

1.4 The Ministry of Shipping, Road Transport and Highways *vide* their O.M. No. RW/H-11012/10/2007-KNT (NH-7) dated 13 February, 2007 requested for dropping the assurance on the ground 'that the State PWD has already called for the bids for engaging the consultants for carrying out feasibility study and preparation of Detailed Project Report (DPR) for the construction of bypass to Tumkur town connecting NH-4 and NH-206. The construction of bypass will be taken up on the basis of the recommendation of the said study. Thus, the proposal for the construction of bypass presently is in its very initial stages and will take quite some time before the issue is finalized'.

1.5 In view of the above, the Ministry has stressed that no fruitful purpose would be served to continue the said assurance. Accordingly, the Ministry, with the approval of Secretary (RT&H), has requested to drop the assurance.

1.6 The Committee note that a question regarding Four Laning of National Highway was asked on 6 December, 2006. The question sought information about according sanction of the Government to widen the NH-206 in Tumkur City from Batwade to Gubbi Gate into four lane. In reply it was stated that a proposal to bypass the Tumkur Town connecting NH-4 and NH-206 was under consideration. This reply to the question was treated as an assurance. The assurance remained unimplemented. The Ministry requested for its dropping on the ground that 'the State PWD has already called for bids to carry out feasibility study and preparation of Detailed Project Report (DPR) for the construction of bypass to Tumkur town connecting NH-4 and NH-206 and the construction of the bypass would be based on the recommendations of the said study. The Ministry further stated that the proposal for construction of bypass is in its very initial phase and it will take quite some time before the issue is finalized. The Committee considered this request of the Ministry at their sitting held on 02 August, 2007 and decided not to drop the assurance.

1.7 The Committee note that the bids for engaging the consultants for carrying out feasibility study and preparation of Detailed Project Report (DPR) for construction of bypass have since been called for. According to the Ministry the proposal for the construction of bypass was in its very initial stages and would take quite some time to finalise the issue. The Committee do not consider it a valid plea to drop the assurance and

desire the Ministry to expedite the study and gear up their machinery to implement the assurance at the earliest. They also desire that a status report on the action taken so far for the implementation of the assurance be furnished to them.

[ii] **AMENDMENT IN TELEGRAPH ACT**

1.8 On 23 March, 2005, Shri Chandra Bhushan Singh, M.P., addressed the following Unstarred Question No.3246 to the Minister of Communications and Information Technology:-

- “(a) whether the Government is considering to make amendment in the Telegraph Act to ensure that the legal provision is more stringent for grey market operations;
- (b) if so, the details thereof;
- (c) whether it is true that the notional loss caused by grey market operators in the country since 1998 amounts to Rs 400.00 crores; and
- (d) if so, the details thereof?”

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

- “(a) & (b) The amendment to the Indian Telegraph Act for revising the amount of financial penalties is under consideration.
- (c) & (d) The estimated notional loss of more than Rs. 400 crores has been caused to the country, by 267 grey market cases detected till date, since 1998. As per available data, as on date the year- wise breakup is as given below:

Year	Notional Loss (Rupees in Crores)
1998	60
1999	55.92
2000	154.75
2001	126.63
2002	19.08
2003	17.56
2004	30.93

2005

27.57"

1.10 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 22 June, 2005. However the assurance is yet to be fulfilled. The Ministry has not sought extension of time beyond 22 September, 2007 to implement the assurance.

1.11 The Ministry of Communications and Information Technology vide their letter No.12-36/2005-BSII/LS/Budget dated 31 January, 2007 has stated that the decision on enhancement of penalties in the Indian Telegraph Act, 1885 is a policy matter and no timeframe can be fixed to arrive at a conclusion in the matter.

1.12 In view of the above, the Ministry, with the approval of Minister of State for Communications and Information Technology, has requested to drop the assurance.

1.13 The Committee note that a question regarding Amendment in Telegraph Act was asked on 23 March, 2005. The question sought information regarding amendment in the Telegraph Act to ensure that the legal provision is more stringent for grey market operations. In reply it was stated that the amendment to the Indian Telegraph Act for revising the amount of financial penalties was under consideration. This reply to the question was treated as an assurance. This assurance remained pending. The Ministry requested for its dropping on the ground that the decision on enhancement of penalties in the Indian Telegraph Act, 1885 is a policy matter and no timeframe can be fixed to arrive at a conclusion in this matter.’ The Committee considered the request of the Ministry at their sitting held on 02 August, 2007 and decided not to drop the assurance.

1.14 The Committee note that in reply to the question it was categorically stated that the amendment to the Indian Telegraph Act for revising the amount of financial penalties was under consideration. The Committee are surprised to note that in their request for dropping the assurance, the Ministry stated that the decision on enhancement of penalties within Indian Telegraph Act, 1885 was a policy matter and no timeframe can be fixed to arrive at a conclusion in the matter. The Committee are in total disagreement with the reasoning of the Ministry and desire that the promised amendments to the Indian Telegraph Act,

1885 be carried out at the earliest and thereby implement the commitment given on the floor of the House, since in the absence of the requisite amendments, the nation is suffering huge losses on account of the grey market operations.

CHAPTER – II
REQUESTS FOR DROPPING OF ASSURANCES (ACCEPTED)

[i] PASSENGER SHIP SERVICES

2.1 On 29 November, 2005, Shri L. Ganesan, MP addressed the following USQ No. 901 to the Minister of Shipping, Road Transport and Highways:-

- “(a) whether the Government proposes to introduce the passenger Ship Services with Malaysia and Singapore alongwith Ferry Service to Ports in Sri Lanka from the Indian Ports;
- (b) if so, the details thereof;
- (c) if not, the number of such proposals pending with the Government both from the public and private sector Shipping Companies;
- (d) whether the Cargo movers and tourist operators have made any demand in this regard;
- (e) if so, the details thereof; and
- (f) the time by which the passenger ship services are likely to be introduced?”

2.2 In reply, the Minister of Shipping, Road Transport and Highways (Shri T. R. Baalu) stated as follows:-

- “(a) No, Sir.
- (b) Does not arise.
- (c) No proposal is pending with the Government either from the public or private sector Shipping Companies.
- (d) to (f) Hunter Shipping & Trading, Chennai has requested for permission to operate passenger/cruise Liner service between Port Kelang (Malaysia) and Chennai. The proposal is under examination.”

2.3 The above reply to the question was treated as an assurance and was required to be fulfilled by the Ministry of Shipping, Road Transport and Highways within three months of the date of reply *i.e.* by 28 February, 2006 but the assurance is yet to be implemented. The Ministry has sought extension of time uptill dropping request is granted.

2.4 The Ministry of Shipping, Road Transport and Highways *vide* their O.M. No. H-11016/5/2005-FI) dated 20 December, 2006 requested for dropping the assurance on the ground that the proposal for granting permission to M/s Samrat Cruise Berhad, Malaysia for operating passenger/cruise liner service between Port Kelang and Chennai was received through M/s Hunter Shipping and Training, Chennai, an Indian agent in September, 2005. The proposal was examined by the Ministry. Since request for this kind of service had been made after a long time/or being a new proposal, the Ministry, *vide* letter dated 20 June, 2006, requested M/s Samrat Cruise Berhad to give a presentation on the proposal to the Ministry. It was requested that a convenient date and time may be indicated so that representatives from other Ministries/organizations could be requested to be present during the presentation. Despite several reminders to the shipping company as well as to its Indian agent, no response has so far been received.

2.5 The Ministry has also stated that since the shipping company does not seem to be interested to pursue their proposal to operate passenger/cruise liner service between Port Kelang (Malaysia) and Chennai, the matter may be treated as closed. Accordingly, the Ministry with the approval of Minister of Shipping, Road Transport and Highways has requested the Committee to drop the assurance.

2.6 The Committee note that a question was asked on 29 November, 2005 seeking information regarding passenger ship services with Malaysia and Singapore alongwith Ferry Service to ports in Sri Lanka from the Indian Ports. In reply, it was, *inter-alia*, stated that the proposal for granting permission to operate passenger/cruise liner service between Port Kelong (Malaysia) and Chennai was under examination. This reply to the question was treated as an assurance. As the assurance remained unimplemented the Ministry requested for dropping the assurance, *inter-alia*, on the ground that the proposal for granting permission to M/s Samrat Cruise Berhad, Malaysia for operating passenger/cruise liner service between Port Kelang and Chennai was received through M/s Hunter Shipping and Training, Chennai, an Indian agent in September, 2005. The proposal was examined in the Ministry. According to them M/s Samrat Cruise Berhad was requested to give a presentation on the proposal in the Ministry but despite several reminders to the Shipping Company as well as to its Indian agent, no response was received from their side. The Committee considered this request of the Ministry at their sitting held on 02 August, 2007 and having been satisfied with the submissions made by them, decided to drop the assurance.

[ii] FDI IN ELEMENTARY EDUCATION

2.7 On 26 July, 2005, Shri Sarbananda Sonowal, MP addressed the following USQ No. 344 to the Minister of Human Resource Development:-

- “(a) whether the Government has opened flood gates for possible foreign direct investment (FDI) in elementary education;
- (b) if so, any concrete policy in this regard has been framed; and
- (c) if so, the extent by which Government anticipates improvement in primary education through foreign direct investment?”

2.8 In reply, the then Minister of State in the Ministry of Human Resource Development (Shri M.A.A. Fatmi) stated as follows:-

- “(a) to (c) : Foreign Direct Investment in Education, covering all sectors including Elementary Education, is allowed under the automatic route without any sectoral cap since February 2000 vide Order No.7(4)/2000_IP dated 11th February, 2000 issued by the Department of Industrial Policy & Promotion. A sectoral policy on foreign investment in elementary education is being evolved.”

2.9 The above reply to the question was treated as an assurance and was required to be fulfilled by the Ministry of Human Resource Development within three months of the date of reply i.e. by 25 October, 2005 but the assurance is yet to be implemented. The Ministry has sought extension of time till the decision is taken on the request.

2.10 The Ministry of Human Resource Development *vide* their O.M. No. 4-6/2005-ICC dated 24 January 2007 requested for dropping the assurance on the ground that the first four lines of the answer, answers the question completely.

The sectoral policy on foreign investment in education may take quite some time, which they were not sure of.

2.11 In view of the above, the Ministry, with the approval of Hon'ble Minister of State in the Ministry of Human Resource Development, has requested the Committee to drop the assurance.

2.12 The Committee note that a question regarding FDI in Elementary Education was asked on 26 July, 2005. The question sought information regarding Foreign Direct Investment in Elementary Education. In reply, it was *inter-alia* stated that a Sectoral Policy on Foreign Investment in Elementary Education is being evolved. This reply was treated as an assurance. As the assurance remained unimplemented, the Ministry requested for dropping the assurance, *inter-alia*, on the ground that the Sectoral Policy on Foreign Investment in Education cannot be pursued in a definite time frame. This request was considered by the Committee at their sitting held on 02 August, 2007 and having been satisfied with the reasons advanced by the Ministry, decided to drop the assurance.

[iii] DIRECTORY OF MOBILE PHONE USERS

2.13 On 06 December, 2006, S/Shri Kishanbhai V. Patel and Sugrib Singh, MPs addressed the following USQ No. 2118 to the Minister of Communications and Information Technology:-

- “(a) whether the Government proposes to bring out a directory of mobile phone users;
- (b) if so, whether cellular operators have opposed the said move;
- (c) if so, the details thereof and the reasons therefor; and
- (d) the response of the Union Government thereto?”

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

- “(a) to (d) The Telecom Regulatory Authority of India (TRAI) has given its Recommendations on `Printing of Telephone Directory and Directory Enquiry Service` which are under examination of the Government.

During the consultation process and discussion held by TRAI, the operators were not in favour of publishing directory, specially mobile directory. The major reasons advanced by the operators against publication of telephone directory and directory enquiry services are rapid growth of mobile subscribers, high churn, majority of the customers are pre-paid, bulkness of printed directory, privacy issues, etc. Though the Cellular Operators Association of India (COAI) supports mandatory Directory Enquiry Services for fixed lines, it is not in favour of Directory Enquiry Services for mobile customers because of privacy issues, personal communication issues, etc.”

2.15 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 reply *i.e.* by 05 March, 2007. However, the assurance is yet to be implemented. The Ministry has sought extension of time upto 5 June, 2007 to implement the assurance.

2.16 The Ministry of Communications and Information Technology *vide* their O.M. No. 14-17/2006-PHP dated 13 February, 2007 requested for dropping the assurance on the ground that the Telephone Regulatory Authority of India (TRAI) has given recommendations on publication of Telephone Directory & Directory Enquiry Services which were being examined. As these are policy issues which require detailed examination, no specific time-frame could be fixed.

2.17 In view of above, the Ministry, with the approval of Hon'ble MOS (C&IT), has requested to drop the assurance.

2.18 The Committee note that a question regarding Directory of Mobile Phone Users was asked on 06 December, 2006. The question *inter-alia* sought information about the proposal of the Government to bring out a Directory of mobile phone users. In reply it was *inter-alia* stated that the Telecom Regulatory Authority of India has given its recommendation on 'Printing of Telephone Directory and Directory Enquiry Service' which were under examination of the Government. This reply to the question was treated as an assurance. As the assurance remained unimplemented, the Ministry requested for dropping the assurance, *inter-alia*, on the ground that the recommendations given by Telecom Regulatory Authority of India on Publication of Telephone Directory and Directory Enquiry Services are policy issues and required detailed examination and hence no specific time frame can be fixed. This request was considered by the Committee at their sitting held on 02 August, 2007 and agreeing with the grounds put forward by the Ministry, the Committee decided to drop the assurance.

[iv] RENT CONTROL TRIBUNAL

2.19 On 23 February, 1999, Shri A.C. Jose, M.P., addressed the following Unstarred Question No.195 to the Minister of Urban Affairs and Employment:-

- “(a) whether the Union Government have urged the States and UTs to set up Rent Control Tribunals by suitably amending their respective Rent Acts;
- (b) if so, the details thereof; and
- (c) the steps taken in this regard?”

2.20 In reply, the then Minister of Urban Affairs and Employment (Shri Ram Jethmalani) stated as follows:-

- “(a) to (c) Yes, Sir. The Ministry of Urban Affairs & Employment has written to the States and UTs to suitably amend their Rent Control Legislations. Model Legislation was communicated to the States/UTs. The Model Legislation among other things suggested ‘setting up of a two tier system of adjudication with rent controllers and tribunals and installing speedy and simplified procedures for settlement of disputes within a year’. The States have been asked to indicate the progress on modification of the State Legislations on the lines of Model Bill from time to time. The Governments of West Bengal and Punjab have already taken steps in this regard. The other States are being reminded. ”

2.21 The above reply to the question was treated as an assurance and was required to be fulfilled by the Ministry of Urban Development within three months of the date of the reply *i.e.* by 22 May, 1999. However, the assurance is yet to be fulfilled. The Ministry has sought extension of time upto 31 December, 2006 to implement the assurance.

2.22 The Ministry of Urban Development vide their D.O. No.20/2/99-UCU dated 20 February, 2007 requested for dropping the assurance on the ground that the Rent Control is a State subject and as such the State Governments have the exclusive powers to legislate on the subject. It is, however, open to the Central Government to prepare a Model Legislation for adoption by the States/UTs and they may adopt it with such suitable modifications to suit the local condition. The Ministry had prepared a Model Rent Control Legislation and the same was forwarded to the State Governments in 1992 for amending their existing Rent Control Laws or enacting new Rent Acts on the lines of Model Legislation. The Model Legislations among other things suggested "setting up of a two tier system of adjudication with rent controllers and tribunals and installing speedy and simplified procedures for settlement of disputes". The Ministry further stated that on the basis of information furnished by the Ministry on 12 October, 1999 to the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs, the assurance was treated partially fulfilled. State Governments have already initiated action to amend their Rent Control Legislation on the line of Model Legislation. Since Rent Law is a State subject and action to amend the rent law and establish Rent Tribunals has to be taken by the State Governments, no further action on the part of Central Government is pending in the matter.

2.23 In view of the above, the Ministry with the approval of the Secretary has requested for dropping of the assurance.

2.24 The Committee note that a question regarding Rent Control Tribunal was asked on 23 February, 1999. The question sought information regarding the setting up of Rent Control Tribunals by the States and U.Ts. by suitably amending their respective Rent Acts. In reply, it was *inter-alia* stated that the States have been asked to indicate the progress on modification of the State Legislations on the lines of Model Rent Control Legislation prepared by the Union Government, from time to time. The Government of West Bengal and Punjab have already taken steps in this regard. The other States are being reminded for the same. This reply was treated as an assurance. The assurance remained unimplemented and the Ministry requested for dropping the assurance, *inter-alia*, on the ground that the issue of setting up of Rent Control Tribunals falls under the domain of respective State Governments and Union Government had already brought a Model legislation in this regard. According to the Ministry, no further action on the part of Central Government is pending in the matter. This request was considered by the Committee at their sitting held on 02 August, 2007 and having been satisfied with the reasons adduced by the Ministry, decided to drop the assurance.

NEW DELHI;

HARIN PATHAK
CHAIRMAN

COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT ASSURANCES

28 February, 2008

09 Phalguna, 1929 (Saka)

MINUTES

TENTH SITTING

Minutes of the sitting of the Committee on Government Assurances (2006-2007) held on 02 August 2007 in Committee Room 'E', Parliament House Annexe, New Delhi.

The Committee sat from 1230 hours to 1310 hours on Thursday, 02 August, 2007.

PRESENT

CHAIRMAN

Shri Harin Pathak

Members

2. Shri Jigajinagi Ramesh Chandappa
3. Dr. K. Dhanaraju
4. Shri Sunil Khan
5. Shri Vijoy Krishna
6. Shri Rasheed Masood
7. Shri Nihal Chand
8. Smt. M.S.K. Bhavani Rajenthiran

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

At the outset, the Chairman welcomed the Members and informed them that the term of this Committee was upto 06 August, 2007. He expressed his gratitude towards the Members of the Committee for extending their kind cooperation and contribution throughout the term of the Committee. He also thanked the officers and the staff of the Committee and commended their work for enabling the Committee to produce valuable reports during its term. The Chairman apprised the Members briefly about the agenda for the sitting.

The Committee first of all considered the draft Twentieth report regarding requests for dropping of assurances and after discussion adopted the same without any amendment. The Committee authorised the Chairman to finalise the report and present the same to the House in the ensuing Session of the Lok Sabha. Thereafter, the Committee took up the following ten Memoranda containing requests received from various Ministries/Departments for dropping the assurances:-

Memorandum No.78 **Request for dropping the assurance given in reply to USQ No. 901 dated 29 November, 2005 regarding 'Passenger Ship Services'.**

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

Memorandum No.82 **Request for dropping the assurance given in reply to USQ No. 1477 dated 30 November, 2006 regarding 'Construction of New Hotels by ITDC'.**

The Committee considered the above memorandum and noted that the request was made for dropping the assurance on the ground that the proposal of ITDC to meet the additional demand for hotel rooms for Commonwealth Games are at planning stage and it was difficult to specify any definite time frame to make it feasible and implement this assurance. The Committee did not agree with the contention of the Ministry to drop the assurance as a categorical commitment was made in reply to the question and decided to have a status report on the steps taken to implement the assurance.

Memorandum No.83 **Request for dropping the assurances given on 22 July 2004 and 09 December 2004 in reply to USQ Nos. 2181 and 1399 regarding 'Doubling of Rail Line and Rail Lines between Surat and Bhusawal' respectively.**

The Committee considered the above memorandum and noted that within the span of five months the same question had been asked twice with the same reply 'that the examination of a survey report is going on'. The Committee was not convinced by the reasons advanced by the Ministry for dropping the assurance and decided not to drop it.

Memorandum No.84 **Request for dropping the assurance given in reply to USQ No. 344 dated 26 July 2005 regarding 'FDI in Elementary Education'.**

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

Memorandum No.85 **Request for dropping the assurance given in reply to USQ No. 4479 dated 25 August 2005 regarding 'Superannuation Benefit Scheme'.**

The Committee considered the above memorandum and noted that six cases out of 21 cases for claims are yet to be settled. The Committee, Therefore, decided not to drop the assurance and desired the Ministry to finalise the action on the remaining six cases also at the earliest.

Memorandum No.86 **Request for dropping the assurance given in reply to USQ No. 2173 dated 06 December 2006 regarding 'Four Laning of National Highway'.**

The Committee considered the above memorandum and noted that a proposal to construct the bypass to Tumkur town connecting NH-4 and NH-206 was in its very initial stages and would take quite some time before the issue is finalised. The Committee, therefore, desired to know the present status of the assurance and decided not to drop the assurance.

Memorandum No.87 **Request for dropping the assurance given in reply to USQ No. 2118 dated 06 December 2006 regarding 'Directory of Mobiles Phone Users'.**

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

Memorandum No.88 **Request for dropping the assurance given in reply to USQ No. 280 dated 24 November 2005 regarding 'Gas Pipelines'.**

The Committee considered the above memorandum and noted that the anticipated completion dates for Dahej-Uran Pipeline and Vijaipur-Kota Pipeline Projects were 31.03.2007 and 31.12.2006, respectively. Moreover, other Pipeline

Project were also at different stages of completion. The Committee, therefore, desired to know the progress made so far in the said projects, expenditure involved and the time by which the projects would be completed. The Committee did not agree to drop the assurance and decided to call the representatives of the Ministry of Petroleum and Natural Gas to hear their views on the subject.

Memorandum No.89 Request for dropping the assurance given in reply to USQ No. 3246 dated 23 March 2005 regarding 'Amendment in Telegraph Act'.

The Committee considered the above memorandum and noted that in reply to the question it was stated that the amendment to the Telegraph Act for revising the amount of financial penalties was under consideration. The Ministry in their request for dropping the assurance had stated that no time frame can be fixed to arrive at a conclusion in the matter. The Committee, not agreeing to the reasons advanced by the Ministry, decided not to drop the assurance.

Memorandum No.90 Request for dropping the assurance given in reply to USQ No. 195 dated 23 February 1999 regarding 'Rent Control Tribunal'.

The Committee considered the above memorandum and were convinced by the reasons advanced by the Ministry, decided to drop the assurance.

The Committee then adjourned.

MINUTES

THIRD SITTING

Minutes of the sitting of the Committee on Government Assurances (2007-2008) held on 19 December, 2007 in Committee Room No. 139 Parliament House Annexe, New Delhi.

The Committee sat from 1130 hours to 1230 hours on Wednesday, 19 December, 2007.

PRESENT

CHAIRMAN

Shri Harin Pathak

Members

2. Shri Jigajinagi Ramesh Chandappa
3. Dr. K. Dhanaraju
4. Shri Biren Singh Engti
5. Shri Sunil Khan
6. Shri Rasheed Masood
7. Smt. M.S.K. Bhavani Rajenthiran
8. Shri Rajiv Ranjan ` Lalan´ Singh

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

At the outset, the Chairman welcomed the Members to the sitting of the Committee and apprised them briefly about the agenda for the sitting. The Committee, thereafter, considered the draft Twenty first and Twenty second reports regarding requests for dropping of assurances and after discussion adopted both the reports without any amendments. The Committee authorized the Chairman to finalise the reports and present them to the House in the ensuing session.

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

XXXXXX

XXXXXXXXXX

XXXXXXXXXX

The Committee then adjourned.