

**COMMITTEE
ON
GOVERNMENT ASSURANCES
(2008-2009)**

(FOURTEENTH LOK SABHA)

TWENTY FOURTH REPORT

REQUESTS FOR DROPPING OF
ASSURANCES

Presented to Lok Sabha on 21-10-2008



**LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT
NEW DELHI**

October, 2008/Asvina, 1930 (Saka)

CONTENTS

	PAGE
Composition of the Committee (2007-2008)	(iii)
Composition of the Committee (2008-2009)	(iv)
Introduction	(v)

Chapter I Requests for dropping of Assurances (Not Accepted)

- (i) Unstarred Question No.2169 dated 14 December, 2004 regarding Declaration of Villages as MADA Areas in Maharashtra and Unstarred Question No.4048 dated 23 August, 2005 regarding Inclusion of Tehsil under Tribal Sub-plan Area. 1
- (ii) Unstarred Question No.1957 dated 05 August, 2005 regarding HIV Vaccine. 10
- (iii) Unstarred Question No.200 dated 25 July, 2006 regarding Setting up of IIITs. 16

Chapter II Requests for dropping of Assurances (Accepted)

- (i) Unstarred Question No.3746 dated 21 August, 2003 regarding Payment of Royalty to Artists. 22
- (ii) Unstarred Question No.3518 dated 15 December, 2006 regarding Loan to Ethiopia. 26
- (iii) Unstarred Question No.531 dated 27 July, 2006 regarding Import of Defence Technologies. 31
- (iv) Starred Question No.305 dated 24 March, 2005 regarding Indo-Iran Gas Pipeline Project, Starred Question No.669 dated 12 May, 2005 regarding India-Bangladesh-Myanmar Pipeline and Unstarred Question No.387 dated 24 November, 2005 regarding Indo-Bangladesh-Myanmar Gas Pipeline. 35
- (v) Starred Question No.123 dated 27 February, 2006 regarding Diversion of Foodgrains. 43
- (vi) Unstarred Question No.5777 dated 25 April, 2001 regarding Acquisition of Land by IAF in Rajasthan. 56

APPENDICES

- I Minutes of the Sitting of the Committee held on 19 December, 2007.
- II Minutes of the Sitting of the Committee held on 06 August, 2008.
- III Minutes of the Sitting of the Committee held on 14 August, 2008.

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 P. Sreedharan | - | Joint Secretary |
| 2. | Shri Rajeev Sharma | - | Director |
| 3. | Shri Dal Singh Malha | - | 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.

COMPOSITION OF THE COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT ASSURANCES*
(2008-2009)

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 P. Sreedharan | - | Joint Secretary |
| 2. | Shri Rajeev Sharma | - | Director |
| 3. | Shri D.S. Malha | - | Deputy Secretary |
| 4. | Shri V.P. Goel | - | Deputy Secretary-II |

-
- **The Committee was constituted on 07 August 2008 *vide* Para No.5004 of Lok Sabha Bulletin Part-II dated 06 August 2008.**

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 Fourth Report of the Committee on Government Assurances.

2. The Committee (2008-2009) was constituted on 7 August, 2008.
3. The Committee (2007-2008) at their sitting held on 19 December, 2007 considered Memorandum Nos. 12 to 21 containing requests received from the Ministries/Departments for dropping of pending assurances. Memorandum No.12 containing request of the Ministry of Railways for dropping the assurance given in reply to USQ No.7070 dated 12 May, 2005 regarding 'Committee on Revamping and Streamlining the Legal Set Up on Railway' has not been included in this Report.
4. At their sitting held on 06 August, 2008, the Committee (2007-2008) considered and adopted their Twenty-Fourth Report which was prepared on the basis of the decisions taken by the Committee on the aforesaid Memoranda. However, consequent upon re-constitution of the Committee for the term 2008-2009, the Report was again considered and adopted by the Committee at their sitting held on 14 August, 2008.
5. The Minutes of the aforesaid sittings of the Committee form part of this report. (Appendix).
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

01 October, 2008

09 Asvina 1930 (Saka)

REPORT

CHAPTER – I

REQUESTS FOR DROPPING OF ASSURANCES (NOT ACCEPTED)

[i] DECLARATION OF VILLAGES AS MODIFIED AREA DEVELOPMENT APPROACH (MADA) AREAS IN MAHARASHTRA AND INCLUSION OF TEHSIL UNDER TRIBAL SUB-PLAN AREA

1.1 On 14 December, 2004, Prof. Mahadeorao Shiwankar, M.P., addressed the following Unstarred Question No.2169 to the Minister of Tribal Affairs:-

- “(a) the criteria prescribed for an area to be declared as a tribal area;**
- (b) whether the Government of Maharashtra has sent a proposal for declaring some villages as an MADA area to the Union Government which has been returned by the Union Government for clarification;**
- (c) if so, whether the State Government has again sent the proposal to the Union Government;**
- (d) if so, whether the proposal has been reviewed; and**
- (e) if so, the details thereof?”**

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

- “(a) The criteria prescribed for an area to be declared as Integrated Tribal Development Project (ITDP), Modified Area Development Approach (MADA) Pockets and Cluster is given as under:**
 - (i) ITDPs are contiguous areas of the size of a tehsil or block or more in which the ST population is 50% or more of the total population.**

(ii) MADA Pockets are the identified pockets having 50% or more ST population of a total population of 10,000 or more. Clusters are the identified pockets having 50% or more ST population of a total population of 5,000 or more.

(b) to (e) Yes, Sir, The Government of Maharashtra has submitted the revised proposal for reorganization of MADA pockets and declaring some villages as MADA area to this Ministry. The proposal has been examined in consultation with the State Govt. Officers. The State Govt. has been requested to furnish some additional information."

1.3 On 23 August, 2005, Shri Dushyant Singh, M.P., addressed the following

Unstarred Question No.4048 to the Minister of Tribal Affairs:-

"(a) whether the Union Government has received any proposal from Government of Rajasthan to include ten more Tehsils under Tribal Sub-plan area;

(b) if so, the details thereof; and

(c) the action taken by the Government thereon?"

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

"(a)&(b) Yes, Sir. The Government of Rajasthan has submitted a proposal for inclusion of 10 more Tehsils in districts of Udaipur, Rajasamand, Chittorgarh, Sirohi and Pali in Tribal Sub-plan area.

(c) The State government have yet to submit the complete information which they were asked to send."

1.5 The above replies to the questions were treated as assurances and were required to be fulfilled by the Ministry of Tribal Affairs within three months of the date of their replies but the assurances are yet to be fulfilled. The Ministry have not sought extension of time beyond 09 February, 2008 and 02 January, 2008 respectively.

1.6 The Ministry of Tribal Affairs *vide* O.M. No.16013/2/2003-C&LM-II dated 03 July, 2007 requested to drop both the assurances on the following grounds:-

"A detailed and comprehensive review of tribal problems was taken on the eve of Fifth Five Year Plan and a Tribal Sub Plan (TSP) strategy was adopted in the country. To look after the Tribal population, coming within the new TSP strategy in a coordinated manner, Integrated Tribal Development Projects (ITDPs)/Integrated Tribal Development Agencies (ITDAs) were conceived and these have been continued since then. Andhra Pradesh and Orissa States have opted for an agency model under the Registration of Societies Act and the ITDPs there, are known as ITD Agencies (ITDA).

During the Sixth Five Year Plan, Modified Area Development Approach (MADA) was adopted to cover smaller areas of Tribal concentration and during the Seventh Five Year Plan, the TSP strategy was extended to cover even more smaller areas of Tribal concentration and thus Clusters of Tribal concentration were identified. The Government of India in August 1976 had decided to make the boundaries of Scheduled Areas co-terminus with TSP Areas (ITDP/ITDA only) so that the protective measures available to Scheduled Tribes in Scheduled Areas could be uniformly applied to the TSP areas. Tribal Sub-Plan areas (Integrated Tribal Development Projects/Integrated Tribal Development Agency Areas only) are co-terminus with Scheduled Areas in the States of Jharkhand, Gujarat, Himachal Pradesh, Madhya Pradesh, Chhattisgarh, Maharashtra, Orissa and Rajasthan.

The criteria regarding creation of ITDPs/ITDAs, MADA Pockets and Clusters is as under:-

Integrated Tribal Development Projects/Agencies (ITDPs/ITDAs) - are generally contiguous areas of the size of a Tehsil or Block or more in which the ST population is 50% or more of the total.

Modified Area Development Approach (MADA) Pockets- are the identified pockets of a concentration of ST population containing 50% or more ST population within a total population of minimum of 10,000.

Clusters – are the identified pockets of concentration of ST population containing 50% or more ST population within a total population of minimum of 5,000.

The procedural requirements for the proposals for declaration/reorganisation of ITDPs/ITDAs, MADA Pockets and Clusters to be submitted to the Ministry are as under:-

1. Name of the Project, *i.e.* ITDPs/ITDAs, MADA Pockets and Clusters.
2. Authenticated list of Villages with Census code numbers.
3. Village wise total population and ST population.
4. Indicative maps indicating the Census Code numbers of each villages etc.”

The Ministry further stated: -

“The proposals submitted by Government of Maharashtra regarding ‘Creation and reorganization of Modified Areas Development Approach (MADA) and Mini MADA Pockets in Maharashtra’ were examined by this Ministry in consultation with the representatives of Government of Maharashtra. The State Government was requested to furnish the authenticated village wise list with population details, Census Code no. and revised indicative maps to the Ministry so as to enable it to consider for final approval on the proposals considered vide Ministry’s letter dated 04 March, 2005. The State Government was reminded on 16 May, 2005.

The State Government of Maharashtra had furnished the information which was examined in the Ministry. It was

observed that the information furnished by the State Government was not complete and therefore the State Government was again requested to furnish the information on 08 June, 2006. The Government of Maharashtra furnished the information which was examined and it was observed that there were several issues which needed further clarification from the Government of Maharashtra. Accordingly the Government of Maharashtra has been requested to clarify the issue on 19 July, 2006. The Government of Maharashtra (Tribal Research and Training Institute, Pune) has furnished the information which is under examination and may require further clarifications."

1.7 As regards USQ No.4048 dated 23 August, 2005, the Ministry of Tribal Affairs *vide* their O.M. dated 03 July, 2007 also requested to drop the assurance on the following grounds:-

"These proposals were received from Government of Rajasthan in the year 2002. The State Government was requested to furnish comprehensive proposals including therein old as well as new proposals as per the prescribed norms and justifications for placing before the Scheduled Areas and Scheduled Tribes Commission appointed under Article 339(1) of the Constitution *vide* the Ministry's letter dated 29 August, 2002. The comprehensive proposals were not received from the State Government. Accordingly, the then Hon'ble Minister of Tribal Affairs replied the Question indicating therein that the Government of Rajasthan have yet to submit the complete information which they were asked to send.

This Ministry is continuously pursuing the matter with the State Government at higher level, *vide* DO dated 28 July, 2006 and 09 January, 2007. This issue was also brought to the notice of State Government of Rajasthan during the Rajasthan visit of the then Secretary (TA) in the month of January, 2007. Further, this issue was also brought to the notice of the State Government of Rajasthan in the Conference of the State Secretaries/Commissioners in-charge of Tribal Development, organized by the Ministry on 13 February, 2007 in India Habitat Centre, New Delhi. The Government of Rajasthan, has furnished the proposal for

expansion of the Tribal Sub Plan Area which includes reorganization of MADA Pockets and Clusters in the State along with the maps of proposed area.”

1.8 In regard to both the questions, the Ministry have informed that comprehensive proposals on the subjects have been received from the State Governments of Maharashtra and Rajasthan which are under examination and would require further time for processing. The Ministry have stated that under the circumstances explained, the assurances may not be kept pending for such a long period.

1.9 The Committee considered the request of the Ministry at their sitting held on 19 December, 2007 and decided not to drop the assurances. This decision of the Committee was communicated to the Ministry on 09 January, 2008.

1.10 The Committee note that two questions regarding 'Declaration of Villages as Modified Area Development Approach (MADA) Areas in Maharashtra' and 'Inclusion of ten more Tehsils under Tribal Sub-Plan Area' were asked on 14 December, 2004 and 23 August, 2005 respectively. The first question sought information on the proposals sent to the Union Government by the Government of Maharashtra for declaring some villages as an MADA area and the second related to the proposal from the Government of Rajasthan to include ten more Tehsils under Tribal sub-plan area. In reply to the first question, it was inter alia stated that the Government of Maharashtra had submitted the revised proposal for reorganization of MADA pockets and declaring some villages as MADA area and the proposal had been examined in consultation with the State Government Officers. It was also stated that the State Government had been requested to furnish some additional information. In reply to the second question, the Ministry inter alia stated that the Government of Rajasthan had submitted a proposal for inclusion of 10 more Tehsils in districts of Udaipur, Rajasamand, Chittorgarh, Sirohi

and Pali in Tribal Sub-plan area and the State Government had yet to submit the complete information which had been asked from them. These replies to the questions were treated as assurances. The assurances remained unimplemented. The Ministry, however, requested for dropping of both the assurances on the grounds that the comprehensive proposals on the subjects had been received from the State Governments of Maharashtra and Rajasthan which were under examination and would require further time for processing. The Committee considered this request of the Ministry at their sitting held on 19 December, 2007 and decided not to drop these assurances.

1.11 According to the Ministry of Tribal Affairs, the comprehensive proposals received from the States of Maharashtra and Rajasthan are under examination in the Ministry and would require time for processing. The Committee do not consider it a convincing argument for dropping the assurances and desire the Ministry of Tribal Affairs to examine both the proposals expeditiously and take a considered decision on the proposals received from the State Governments of Maharashtra and Rajasthan without any further loss of time. They also desire

that a status report on the steps taken so far in fulfillment of the assurances be furnished to them.

1.12 The Committee also take a serious view of the fact that the Ministry have not sought any extension of time beyond 09 February, 2008 and 02 January, 2008 respectively to fulfill the assurances despite the fact that the decision of the Committee to not to drop the assurances was communicated to the Ministry on 09 January, 2008. They, therefore, desire that requisite extension of time to fulfill the assurances in the instant case be sought by the Ministry at the earliest.

[ii] HIV VACCINE

1.13 On 5 August 2005, Shri Bapu Hari Chaur, M.P., addressed the following

Unstarred Question No.1957 to the Minister of Science and Technology:-

- “(a) whether further tests are being conducted for the HIV/AIDS vaccines developed by the scientists of our country;**
- (b) if so, the details thereof; and**
- (c) the number of scientists and details of the Research Institute involved in the aforesaid project?”**

1.14 In reply, the Minister of State (Independent Charge) of the Ministry of Science and Technology and Minister of State (Independent Charge) of the Department of Ocean Development (Shri Kapil Sibal) stated as follows:-

“(a)&(b) Under the National Jai Vigyan Science & Technology Mission launched by the Department of Biotechnology (DBT), a prototype candidate vaccine based on DNA and MVA (Modified Vaccinia Ankara) has been developed for HIV-1 subtype `C` at the All India Institute of Medical Sciences (AIIMS), New Delhi. This prototype vaccine has potential as preventive vaccine as it induces robust and broad based clade-specific and cross-clade specific immune response in experimental animals. The prototype vaccine is now ready for pre-clinical toxicological studies. If regulatory requirements are fulfilled, this vaccine candidate is slated for phase I human clinical trials. Negotiations with an Indian biotech firm are in progress for GMP grade production of vaccinogens for the human clinical trials.

In another effort, phase-I human clinical trial has been initiated using Adeno Associated Virus (AAV) based HIV/AIDS vaccine (tg AACO9) by National AIDS Research Institute (NARI), Pune on 7th February, 2005. Further, at the National Institute for Cholera and Enteric Diseases (NICED), Kolkata and the National AIDS Research Institute (NARI), Pune another HIV/AIDS vaccine candidate (MVA based) is under advanced stages of development. This vaccine is also slated for human clinical trials at Chennai shortly after the necessary scientific, ethical and regulatory clearances are obtained.

- (c) Nine scientists alongwith their team from AIIMS, New Delhi; NARI, Pune; NICED, Kolkata; Tuberculosis Research Centre (TRC), Chennai; Indian Institute of Science (IISc.); Jawaharlal Nehru Centre for Advanced Scientific Research (JNCASR), Bangalore and International Centre for Genetic Engineering and Biotechnology (ICGEB), New Delhi are the active groups involved in the vaccine development and related field."**

1.15 The above reply to the question was treated as an assurance and was required to be implemented by the Ministry of Science and Technology within three months of the date of the reply *i.e.* by 04 November 2005. The Ministry of Science and Technology (Department of Biotechnology) had sought extension of time up to 24 January, 2007 to implement the assurance. The assurance is yet to be implemented.

1.16 The Ministry of Science and Technology *vide* their O.M. No.BT/MED/PQ(LS)/2005 dated 6 June 2007 requested for dropping the assurance on the ground that the assurance pertained to National Jai Vigyan S & T Mission Project for development of a proto-type HIV-I Subtype 'C' Vaccine candidate based

on DNA-MVA at the AIIMS, New Delhi. According to the Ministry, the efforts towards GMP grade production of vaccinogens at the industrial level, preclinical toxicological studies and human clinical trial (Phase-I) would essentially depend on the outcome of the ongoing Phase-I clinical trials being conducted with similar type of vaccine candidates in India and abroad. As a matter of strategy, vaccine development efforts proceed further based on the scientific reasoning and feasibility, as the process was cost intensive.

1.17 The Ministry stated that "the assurance could be fulfilled once the above process is complete and the outcome of the human clinical trials are known".

1.18 The Ministry also stated that the latest position of "the matter is that the outcome of the clinical trials from India is not yet available. Also, the research outcome from the laboratory based research requires adequate scientific, technical and economical considerations before the industrial scale production and human clinical trials are undertaken. The project funded by the Department was primarily an R&D effort towards development of a putative HIV/AIDS vaccine candidate".

1.19 In view of the position explained above, the Ministry of Science and Technology, with the approval of the Minister of Science and Technology and Earth Sciences, requested that the assurance might be treated as fulfilled with the present status.

1.20 The Committee note that a question regarding HIV Vaccine was asked on 5 August, 2005. The question sought information regarding details of the tests being conducted for HIV/AIDS Vaccines developed by the Scientists of our country, the number of scientists involved and the details of the Research Institutes involved in the project. In reply, it was inter alia stated that negotiations with an Indian bio-tech firm were in progress for GMP grade production of vaccinogens for the human clinical trials. It was also stated that another HIV/AIDS Vaccine candidate (MVA based) was under advanced stages of development at the National Institute for Cholera and Enteric Diseases (NICED) Kolkata and the National Aids Research Institute (NARI) Pune. The above reply to the question was treated as an assurance. The assurance remained unimplemented. Later on, the Ministry of Science and Technology (Department of Biotechnology) requested for dropping of assurance on the ground that the assurance pertained to National Jai Vigyan S&T Mission Project for development of a proto-type HIV-1 Subtype 'C' Vaccine candidate based on DNA-MVA at the AIIMS, New Delhi. The Ministry further stated that the efforts towards GMP grade

production of vaccinogens at the industrial level, preclinical toxicological studies and human clinical trial (Phase I) would essentially depend on the outcome of the ongoing Phase-I clinical trials being conducted with similar type of vaccine candidates in India and abroad. The Ministry have also stressed on the point that the assurance can only be fulfilled after the ongoing process is completed and the outcome of the human clinical trials are known. The Committee considered this request at their sitting held on 19 December, 2007 and decided not to drop the assurance.

1.21 The Committee note that the project for development of a prototype HIV-1 Subtype C Vaccine candidate was primarily an R&D effort and that the research outcome from the laboratory based research requires adequate scientific, technical and economical considerations before the industrial scale production and human clinical trials are undertaken. While giving credence to the plea of the Ministry that the assurance can be fulfilled only after the outcome of the human clinical trials are known, the Committee are in no doubt that the subject matter of the assurance is very important as this serious ailment is affecting

the lives of a large number of people of the country. The Committee, therefore, desire that Research & Development efforts towards development of a putative HIV/AIDS vaccine candidate be pursued vigorously and the assurance be fulfilled at the earliest.

[iii] SETTING UP OF IIITs

1.22 On 25 July, 2006, S/Shri Ram Kripal Yadav and E.G. Sugavanam, M.Ps., addressed the following Unstarred Question No.200 to the Minister of Human Resource Development:-

- “(a) whether Government has any plan to establish new Indian Institutes of Information Technology (IIITs) in the country;**
- (b) if so, the details thereof;**
- (c) the details of the places where these IIITs are likely to be established; and**
- (d) the details of the action plan worked out in this regard?”**

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

- “(a) & (b): A proposal is under consideration for setting up of new Indian Institutes of Information Technology (IIITs) in the country. The proposed IIITs will focus on Information Technology alongwith one specific domain area of knowledge such as design, manufacturing, finance, management, library sciences and informatics, media arts and sciences, transportation systems etc.**
- (c) : Location of proposed IIITs is yet to be decided.**
- (d): A Detailed Project Report for setting up of IIITs has been prepared and is presently under consideration of the Planning Commission for their “in-principle” approval.”**

1.24 The above reply to the question was treated as an assurance and was required to be implemented by the Ministry of Human Resource Development within three months of the date of the reply *i.e.* by 24 October, 2006. The assurance remains unimplemented and the Ministry have not sought extension of time beyond 30 April, 2007 to implement the assurance.

1.25 The Ministry of Human Resource Development *vide* their O.M. No.H-11016-20/2006-TS.I dated 30 July, 2007 requested for dropping the assurance on the following grounds :-

“A proposal for setting up of 20 new IIITs in the country is under consideration’. The proposal for setting up of IIITs along with Detailed Project Report (DPR) has been sent to the Planning Commission for their ‘in principle’ approval. A meeting to discuss the proposal was held on 25 August, 2006 in the Planning Commission under the Chairmanship of Member-Secretary, Planning Commission and as decided therein, a Task Force has been set up by the Ministry of Human Resource Development in order to deliberate on the operational details of setting up of IIITs in public-private partnership (PPP) mode. The Task Force is yet to submit its report to the Planning Commission. The Task Force, after detailed deliberation, will furnish its report to the Planning Commission and the Planning Commission will decide about the operational details. After getting ‘in principle’ approval of the Planning Commission, draft Memorandum for Expenditure Finance Committee (EFC) has to be prepared. It is mandatory to incorporate in the EFC Note about the exact location of the 20 Institutes and the same has to be ascertained from the various State Governments/Union Territories (which is also time consuming). On obtaining comments from the appraisal Ministries, a meeting of the EFC will be held under the Chairmanship of Secretary (Expenditure). Thereafter, draft Cabinet Note will be prepared after consultation with appraisal Ministries and Cabinet approval obtained from the Cabinet etc”.

1.26 The Ministry also stated that "all this process would be time-consuming and it would be difficult to fulfill the assurance within a reasonable period".

1.27 The Committee note that a question regarding Setting up of Indian Institutes of Information Technology (IIITs) was asked on 25 July, 2006. The question sought information regarding the plan of Government to establish new IIITs in the country, the places where these IIITs were likely to be established and the action plan worked out in this regard. In reply, it was inter alia stated that a proposal was under consideration for setting up of new Indian Institutes of Information Technology in the country and that the location of the proposed IIITs was yet to be decided. It was also stated that a detailed Project Report for setting up of IIITs had been prepared and was under consideration of the Planning Commission for their “in-principle” approval. The above reply of the Government was treated as an assurance. The assurance remained unimplemented. The Ministry requested for its dropping on the grounds that a Task Force has been set up by the Ministry of Human Resource Development in order to deliberate on the operational details of setting up of 20 new IIITs in the country in Public-Private Partnership(PPP) mode. According to the Ministry, the Task Force is yet to submit its report to the Planning Commission and it is only after the Task

Force, furnished its report to the Planning Commission that the Planning Commission would decide about the operational details. Further, after getting, 'in-principle' approval of the Planning Commission a draft memorandum for Expenditure Finance Committee (EFC) would have to be prepared and various State Governments/Union Territories to be involved in the process to ascertain from them the exact location of the 20 IIITs to enable preparation of a draft Cabinet Note. The Committee considered this request of the Ministry at their sitting held on 19 December, 2007 and decided not to drop the assurance in view of the fact that it was specifically mentioned by the Government in the reply given way back on 25 July, 2006 that a detailed project report for setting up of new Indian Institutes of Information Technology (IIITs) in the country had been prepared and the same was under consideration of the Planning Commission for their "in-principle" approval. The Committee are astonished that the Ministry have now, in their request for dropping the assurance, outlined a detailed and time consuming process and expressed difficulty in implementing the assurance within a reasonable period. The Committee are of the considered opinion that the

Ministry have not taken appropriate follow-up action despite the lapse of a considerable period of time. The Committee, therefore, desire that the project be brought to its logical conclusion and solemn promise made in the House be fulfilled in a time bound manner. The Committee would also like to be apprised of the present position of the assurance.

1.28 The Committee express their unhappiness over the fact that the Ministry have not sought extension of time beyond 30 April, 2007 and, they, therefore, desire the Ministry to seek up-to-date extension of time at the earliest to implement the assurance.

CHAPTER – II
REQUESTS FOR DROPPING OF ASSURANCES (ACCEPTED)

[i] PAYMENT OF ROYALTY TO ARTISTS

2.1 On 21 August 2003, Shri Virendra Kumar, M.P., addressed the following Unstarred Question No.3746 to the Minister of Information and Broadcasting:-

- “(a) whether the Government have a proposal to pay royalty to lyricists, composers and publishers to encourage music;**
- (b) if so, the details thereof along with the rate at which royalty would be paid; and**
- (c) the other steps taken/likely to be taken by the Government in the matter?”**

2.2 In reply, the then Minister of State in the Ministry of Information and Broadcasting (Shri Ravi Shankar Prasad) stated as follows:-

- “(a): Prasar Bharati has informed that they have recently taken a decision to pay royalty to lyricists, composers and publishers.**
- (b) & (c): Prasar Bharati has informed that the details are being worked out to implement the decision.”**

2.3 The above reply to the question was treated as an assurance and was required to be fulfilled by the Ministry of Information and Broadcasting within three months of the date of the reply *i.e.* by 20 November 2003. However the assurance is yet to be fulfilled. The Ministry have not sought extension of time beyond 31 December, 2006 to implement the assurance.

2.4 The Ministry of Information and Broadcasting vide their O.M. No.11/34/2003-BC-IV dated 08 August 2006 and 25 May 2007 requested to drop the assurance on the following ground :-

“In the light of decision of Prasar Bharati to pay royalty, Prasar Bharati had contacted the Indian Performing Right Society (IPRS), which is the royalty-collecting agency from AIR. Directorate General: All India Radio (DG: AIR) was required to enter into an agreement with Indian Performing Rights Society (IPRS) in this regard. Prasar Bharati has informed that despite a number of written requests the IPRS has not furnished the documents required under Copyright Act, Clause 14(I) for entering into an agreement with AIR. In the absence of an agreement, the modalities for payment of royalty remain unresolved. Keeping this in view, it is not possible to keep the matter pending indefinitely. Fulfillment of the assurance will therefore be difficult.”

2.5 The Committee note that a question regarding payment of royalty to artists was asked on 21 August, 2003. The question, *interalia*, sought information regarding the details of the proposal of the Government to pay royalty to lyricists, composers and publishers to encourage music. In reply, it was, *interalia*, stated by the Ministry that Prasar Bharati had informed that they had recently taken a decision to pay royalty to lyricists, etc. and the details were being worked out to implement the decision. This reply to the question was treated as an assurance. As the assurance remained unimplemented, the Ministry requested for dropping the assurance on the ground that Directorate General, All India Radio was required to enter into an agreement with Indian Performing Rights Society (IPRS) which is the royalty collecting Agency from AIR. According to the Ministry, the IPRS has not furnished the documents required under the Copyright Act, for entering into an agreement with AIR despite a number of written requests. The Ministry have further stated that in the absence of an agreement, the modalities for payment of royalty remained unresolved. The request of the Ministry was considered by the Committee at their sitting held on 19 December, 2007 and

**having been satisfied with the reasons adduced by the Ministry,
decided to drop the assurance.**

[ii] LOAN TO ETHIOPIA

2.6 On 15 December, 2006, Shri Balashowry Vallabhaneni, M.P., addressed the following Unstarred Question No.3518 to the Minister of Finance:-

- “(a) whether the Government proposes to extend soft loan to Ethiopia;**
- (b) if so, the details alongwith the terms and conditions thereof ;**
- (c) whether there is any proposal to give similar loans to any other country ; and**
- (d) if so, the details thereof ?”**

2.7 In reply, the Minister of State in the Ministry of Finance (Shri S.S. Palanimanickam) stated as follows:-

“(a) & (b): Yes, Sir. There is a proposal for GOI supported Exim Bank of India line of credit of US\$ 640 million to the Government of Ethiopia for revamping of their sugar industry, which is under consideration. However, the terms and conditions thereof will be finalized in due course.

(c) Yes, Sir.

(d): Details are in the Annex.

ANNEXURE**Details of proposals of GOI supported Exim Bank of India lines of credit (LOC) to various countries**

Sl. No.	Recipient country	Amount of LOC (in Millions of US Dollars)	Purpose
1.	Sri Lanka	100	Purchase of Defence equipment/supplies.
2.	Nepal	35	For various road, electrification and hydro-power projects.
3.	Mauritius	60	For import of capital goods, purchase of an Advance Light Helicopter, construction of road, purchase of pharmaceutical products and ICT Education.
4.	Sudan	48	For agricultural inputs, technical and laboratory equipment, scientific equipment, solar electrification and meeting requirement of Sudan railways.
5.	Gabon	14.45	For housing project.
6.	Myanmar	80	Supply of heavy duty water pumps and power project.
7.	Lao PDR	17.34	For agriculture and irrigation schemes.
8.	Cambodia	35.20	For water resources development project, water pumps and electric transmission line project.
9.	Vietnam	45	For thermal plant project.

2.8 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 the reply i.e. by 14 March, 2007. However, the assurance is yet to be fulfilled.

The Ministry have not sought any extension of time to implement the assurance.

2.9 The Ministry of Finance vide their O.M. No.1/5/2006-CIE-II dated 11 May,

2007 requested not to treat the reply as an assurance on the following grounds:-

“This Department keeps on receiving proposals for line of credit (LOC) to various countries. Such proposals are examined with reference to strategic location and political or economic mileage that India could get by way of extension of LOC. This is a regular exercise. No assurance of any sort is given to the country requesting for such LOC. In the present context, the Department had received a proposal from Government of Ethiopia for revamping its sugar industry. Thus, the proposal is at its initial stage. This type of activity is a routine and regular in nature. Moreover, Government of Ethiopia has requested for US\$ 640 million for revamping of their sugar industry. This huge LOC cannot be given in one financial year.”

2.10 The Committee note that a question was asked on 15 December, 2006 regarding Loan to Ethiopia. The question sought information regarding details of the proposal of the Government to extend soft loan to Ethiopia. In reply it was, interalia stated that a proposal for Government of India supported Exim Bank of India line of credit of US\$ 640 million to the Government of Ethiopia for revamping of their sugar industry was under consideration and the terms and conditions thereof would be finalized in due course. The above reply was treated as an assurance. However, the Ministry requested for dropping the assurance on the ground that this type of activity is a routine and regular in nature. According to the Ministry, Government of Ethiopia had requested for US\$ 640 million for revamping of their sugar industry and this huge amount could not be given by the Indian Government in one financial year. The Committee agree with the plea of the Government that such proposals are examined with reference to strategic location and political or economic mileage. The Committee considered the above request at their sitting held on 19 December, 2007 and having been

satisfied with the reasons advanced by the Ministry acceded to the request of the Ministry to drop the assurance.

[iii] IMPORT OF DEFENCE TECHNOLOGIES

2.11 On 27 July, 2006, Shri Naveen Jindal, MP addressed the following Unstarred Question No. 531 to the Minister of Defence:-

- “(a) whether there is any proposal to grant special status to some premier private companies for importing Defence Technologies directly from abroad;**
- (b) if so, the details of such companies identified by the Government;**
- (c) whether the Government has earmarked the Defence Technologies which will be imported by these companies; and**
- (d) if so, the details thereof?”**

2.12 In reply, the Minister of State for Defence Production (Shri Rao Inderjit Singh) stated as follows:-

“(a)& (b): No, Sir. There is, however, a proposal to identify premier private companies, which can be treated at par with Defence PSUs for production of Defence items in terms of the provisions of Defence Procurement Procedure 2005.

(c)& (d): Do not arise.”

2.13 The above reply to the question was treated as an assurance and was required to be fulfilled by the Ministry of Defence within three months of the date of reply *i.e.* by 26 October, 2006. The Ministry sought extension of time upto 25 October, 2007 or till the decision for the deletion of assurance is received.

2.14 The Ministry of Defence, Department of Defence Production, *vide* their OM No. 4(18)/2006-D (S-III) dated 01 November, 2006 and 30 May, 2007, requested the Committee for dropping the assurance on the ground "that the Government of India had at the very outset stated that there is no proposal to grant any special status to some premier private companies for importing Defence Technologies directly from abroad". According to the Ministry it had only been further clarified about a proposal to identify premier private companies, which can be treated at par with Defence PSUs for production of Defence items in terms of the provisions of Defence Procurement Procedure, 2005.

2.15 In view of the position explained above, the Department of Defence Production have requested that the assurance may be dropped from the list of assurances.

2.16 The Committee note that a question was asked on 27 July, 2006 whether there was any proposal to grant special status to some premier private companies for importing Defence Technologies directly from abroad, the details of such companies identified and the defence technologies which would be imported by these companies. In reply, it was stated that there was no such proposal. It was further stated that there was, however, a proposal to identify premier private companies which could be treated at par with Defence PSUs for production of Defence items in terms of the provisions of Defence Procurement Procedure 2005. This part of information furnished by the Government in their reply was treated as an assurance. The Ministry however requested to drop the assurance on the ground that the Government had at the very outset stated that there was no proposal to grant any special status to some premier private companies for importing Defence Technology directly from abroad and they had only clarified that there was a proposal to identify premier private companies which can be treated at par with Defence PSUs for production of defence items. The Committee considered the request of the Ministry at their sitting

held on 19 December, 2007 and agreeing with the grounds put forward by the Ministry, decided to drop the assurance.

[iv] GAS PIPELINE PROJECTS

2.17 On 24 March, 2005, S/Shri Kinjarapu Yerrannaidu and Iqbal Ahmed Saradgi, MPs addressed the following Starred Question No. 305 to the Minister of Petroleum and Natural Gas:-

- “(a) the route chart of the proposed Indo-Iran gas pipe line;**
- (b) whether Iran has agreed to have a delivery point of the gas at the Indian border;**
- (c) if so, whether there is any proposal to connect it with the proposed national gas grid**
- (d) if so, the details thereof;**
- (e) whether the Government has finalised the scheme for domestic and industrial supply from said pipe line; and**
- (f) if so, the details thereof?”**

2.18 In reply, the then Minister of Petroleum and Natural Gas (Shri Mani Shankar Aiyar) stated as follows:-

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

STATEMENT REFERRED TO IN REPLY TO PARTS (a) TO (f) OF THE LOK SABHA STARRED QUESTION NO.305 BY SHRI KINJARAPU YERRANNAIDU AND SHRI IQBAL AHMED SARADGI, MPs TO BE ANSWERED ON 24TH MARCH, 2005 REGARDING INDO-IRAN GAS PIPE LINE PROJECT

(a) & (b): The proposal for a gas pipeline from Iran to India through Pakistan is at initial stages of discussion. It is proposed to have to separate back-to-back agreements: between Iran and India for the delivery of gas by pipeline to our agreed point on the India-Pakistan border: and Between Iran and Pakistan for transmission from Iran and transit through Pakistan. The details of the project including the pipeline route, deliver point, etc., are yet to be finalized.

(c) & (d): Yes, Sir. In principle, it is proposed to link supplies from Iran to the national network of pipelines, but the specifics are to be worked out.

(e) & (f): Marketing arrangements within India will be made after the details of supply to the India-Pakistan border have been finalized.

2.19 The above reply to the question was treated as an assurance and was required to be fulfilled by the Ministry of Petroleum and Natural Gas within three months of the date of reply *i.e.* by 23 June, 2005; but the assurance is yet to be implemented. The Ministry have sought extension of time till a decision is taken in the matter.

2.20 On 12 May, 2005, S/Shri Ramji Lal Suman and Nitish Kumar, MPs addressed the following Starred Question No. 669 to the Minister of Petroleum and Natural Gas:-

“(a) whether talks were held with Bangladesh in the recent past to bring gas pipeline from Myanmar to India.

(b) if so, the details thereof;

(c) whether any objection has been raised from some quarters in this regard; and;

(d) if so, the facts thereof?”

2.21 In reply, the then Minister of Petroleum and Natural Gas (Shri Mani Shankar Aiyar) stated as follows:-

“(a) to (d) A Statement is laid on the Table of the House.

STATEMENT REFERRED TO IN REPLY TO PARTS (a) TO (d) OF THE LOK SABHA STARRED QUESTION NO. 669 BY SHRI RAMJI LAL SUMAN AND SHRI NITISH KUMAR, MPs TO BE ANSWERED ON 12TH MAY, 2005 REGARDING INDIA-BANGLADESH-MYANMAR GAS PIPELINE.

(a) to (d) In January, 2005, a delegation led by the Minister of Petroleum & Natural Gas and Panchayati Raj visited Myanmar to participate in a trilateral meeting of Oil Ministers of Myanmar, Bangladesh and India to discuss cooperation in hydrocarbon sector with Myanmar and import of natural gas through an onland pipeline via Bangladesh. A Joint Press statement was issued by the three Ministers on 13 January, 2005. Simultaneously, a Joint Press Statement was also issued by the Ministers of Bangladesh and India. The three Ministers agreed to constitute a Techno-Commercial Working Committee to prepare an MoU for cooperation for implementation of Myanmar-Bangladesh-India Pipeline Project, to be signed by the three Governments. The draft MoU was prepared at the meeting of the Techno-Commercial Working Group in Yangon on 24-25 February, 2005. The draft MoU is under examination of the Governments of the three countries.

2.22 The above reply to the question was treated as an assurance and was required to be fulfilled by the Ministry of Petroleum and Natural Gas within three months of the date of reply *i.e.* by 11 August, 2005; but the assurance is yet to be implemented. The Ministry have not sought extension of time beyond 31 December, 2006 to implement the assurance.

2.23 On 24 November, 2005, S/Shri Rayapati Sambasiva Rao, Eknath M. Gaikwad, Jyotiraditya M. Scindia, Kirti Vardhan Singh and Smt. Nivedita Mane, MPs addressed the following Unstarred Question No. 387 to the Minister of Petroleum and Natural Gas:-

- “(a) the present status of the Indo-Bangladesh-Myanmar gas pipeline project;**
- (b) whether a fresh agreement has been signed among the three countries;**
- (c) if so, the details thereof;**
- (d) the likely cost of the project; and**
- (e) the time by which the said gas pipeline would be operational?”**

2.24 In reply, the then Minister of Petroleum and Natural Gas (Shri Mani Shankar Aiyar) stated as follows:-

“(a) to (e): In January, 2005, Minister (P&NG) participated in a trilateral Ministerial meeting between the Oil Ministers of Bangladesh, Myanmar and India. In pursuance of the trilateral Joint Press Statement released after that meeting, a Techno-Commercial Working Committee (TCWC) of the representatives of the three countries was constituted. The first meeting of the TCWC was held in Yangon on 24th – 25th February, 2005. The TCWC prepared a draft MoU to be signed by the three oil Ministers after the approval of their respective Governments. However, the approval of the MoU has been delayed on account of differences between India and Bangladesh over one preambular paragraph in the draft MoU. Minister (P&NG) visited Dhaka on 5 September, 2005 to discuss issues relating to the draft MoU. These issues continue to be under the consideration of the Governments of Bangladesh and India even as India explores with Myanmar other options of importing natural gas into India from Myanmar. An onshore pipeline through North East Indian territory is one of the options for the transportation of natural gas from Myanmar to India. No final decision has been taken as yet

and the details of various options are being worked out.”

2.25 The above reply to the question was treated as an assurance and was required to be fulfilled by the Ministry of Petroleum and Natural Gas within three months of the date of reply *i.e.* by 23 February, 2006; but the assurance is yet to be implemented. The Ministry have not sought extension of time beyond 31 December, 2006 to implement the assurance.

2.26 The Ministry of Petroleum and Natural Gas *vide* their OM No. L.-15015/58/05-GP.II dated 30 April, 2007, have requested the Committee for dropping the three assurances on the ground “that by the very nature, such transnational pipeline projects and long term contracts of LNG involve protracted discussions with various foreign Governments and other parties involving, examination in detail of various proposed agreements and different aspects of these projects. Further, the decision for selling the gas rests with the foreign Governments and is not within the jurisdiction of the Indian Government. At times, other countries would also be making similar efforts to procure gas and such measures bring in an element of uncertainty into such projects. Further, discussions with the foreign Governments on these projects are confidential and very sensitive in nature. While answering the question, all the relevant information, which could be furnished, is included in our reply, without prejudicing or jeopardizing the discussions on these projects. Therefore, while fulfilling the assurance, no additional information can be furnished which could prejudice the discussions. It may, therefore, not be in public interest to furnish any additional

information till negotiations are concluded and the projects are completed. It may take several years to fulfill these assurances as the duration for completion of project after signing of necessary agreements is long. Against this background, replies to such questions which are given on the basis of information available can not be construed as an assurance to fulfill a demand”.

2.27 In view of the above, the Ministry, with the approval of MOS (P&NG), have requested the Committee on Government assurances for dropping the above three assurances.

2.28 The Committee note that three questions were asked during 2005 regarding 'Indo-Iran Gas Pipeline Project; and 'India-Bangladesh-Myanmar Pipeline'. The first question sought information regarding the route chart of the proposed Indo-Iran Gas Pipeline, agreement with Iran Government to have a delivery point of gas at the Indian border; proposal to connect it with the proposed national gas grid and the scheme for its commercial supply. The other two questions sought information regarding the details of the gas pipeline from Myanmar via Bangladesh to India. In reply, it was, *inter alia*, stated by the Government that the details of the project including the pipeline route, deliver point, etc. were to be finalized. It also stated that marketing arrangements within India would be made after the details of supply to the India-Pakistan border have been finalized.

2.29 In reply to the second and third questions, the Ministry stated that the draft Memorandum of Understanding was under examination of the respective Government of the three countries i.e. Myanmar, Bangladesh and India and that no final decision was taken by that time and the details of various options were being worked out.

2.30 The above replies were treated as assurances. The Ministry requested for dropping these assurances on the grounds that it may not be in public interest to furnish any additional information till negotiations are concluded and the projects are completed. According to the Ministry, it may take several years to fulfill these assurances as the duration for completion of project after signing of necessary agreements is long. The Committee considered this request of the Ministry at their sitting held on 19 December, 2007 and agreed to drop these assurances.

[v] DIVERSION OF FOODGRAINS

2.31 On 27 February, 2006, S/Shri Asaduddin Owaisi and Nikhil Kumar, M.Ps., addressed the following Starred Question No.123 to the Minister of Consumer Affairs, Food and Public Distribution:-

- “(a) whether a recent survey by some independent agencies have indicated large scale diversion of Public Distribution System (PDS) foodgrains in North Eastern States as reported in The Hindu dated February 1, 2006;**
- (b) if so, the details thereof;**
- (c) the details regarding diversion of PDS foodgrains in other parts of the country during the last three years;**
- (d) whether diversion of other goods being distributed under PDS has also been reported;**
- (e) if so, the details thereof during the said period, State-wise;**
- (f) whether the monitoring system of PDS has failed to check this diversion;**
- (g) if so, the remedial measures taken in this regard; and**
- (h) the action taken against the officers held responsible?”**

2.32 In reply, the Minister of Agriculture and Minister of Consumer Affairs, Food & Public Distribution (Shri Sharad Pawar) stated as follows:-

“(a), (b), (c), (d), (e), (f) (g) & (h): A Statement is laid on the Table of the House.”

STATEMENT REFERRED TO IN REPLY TO PARTS (a) TO (h)
OF THE STARRED QUESTION NO. 123 DUE FOR ANSWER
ON 27.02.2006 IN THE LOK SABHA.

(a), (b) & (c): Yes, Sir. In a study conducted during 2003-04, by ORG Marg, New Delhi on evaluation of Targeted Public Distribution System in the country diversion of foodgrains (wheat and rice) has been reported in most of the States. In the North Eastern States the position has been as under:-

Name of the State	Diversion (%)	
	Rice	Wheat
Arunachal Pradesh	64.1	96.2
Assam	37.2	100.00
Manipur	97.7	100.00
Meghalaya	61.3	100.00
Mizoram	52.6	100.00
Nagaland	88.6	100.00
Sikkim	Negligible	100.00
Tripura	3.8	Not calculated

The diversion figures during 2003-04 brought out in the ORG Report referred to above in respect of other States are given below:

Name of the State	Diversion (%)	
	Rice	Wheat
Bihar	14.7	44.7
Chattisgarh	33.4	71.4
Dadra & Nagar Haveli	48.5	69.4
Delhi	10.5	25.1
Goa	42.9	Not calculated.
Gujarat	16.2	24.4
Harayana	Not calculated.	74.2
Himachal Pradesh	58.2	34.1
Jammu & Kashmir	64.3	13.5

Jharkhand	Neg.	37.5
Kerala	Neg.	42.6
Madhya Pradesh	48.3	44.7
Maharashtra	Neg.	25.6
Rajasthan	Not calculated.	59.0
Uttar Pradesh	32.4	59.1
Uttaranchal	53.3	58.0
West Bengal	34.9	86.6
All India	39.0	53.3

The Programme Evaluation Organization (PEO) of the Planning Commission has in a report based on study of 18 major States submitted in March, 2005 has also reported leakage and diversion of subsidized foodgrains in TPDS, as a percentage of offtake of BPL quota as follows:

Sl. No.	States	Foodgrains leakage through ghost cards	Foodgrains leakage at FPS.
1.	Andhra Pradesh	Negligible	20.60
2.	Assam	33.35	8.33
3.	Bihar	26.13	55.41
4.	Gujarat	28.29	13.77
5.	Haryana	Negligible	55.65
6.	Himachal Pradesh	31.03	0.41
7.	Karnataka	25.67	17.73
8.	Kerala	3.91	17.80
9.	Madhya Pradesh	54.48	7.94
10.	Maharashtra	10.78	15.75
11.	Orissa	13.49	9.90
12.	Punjab	Negligible	76.50
13.	Rajasthan	Negligible	31.95
14.	Tamil Nadu	9.26	6.40
15.	Uttar Pradesh	22.30	38.97
16.	West Bengal	13.85	5.30
	All India	16.67	19.71

(d) & (e): The terms of reference of the ORG Study did not include evaluation of distribution of sugar. As regards Kerosene, the State-wise details on estimated

leakage as per recent comprehensive study conducted by National Council of Applied and Economic Research are given below:-

Figures in percent

States	Siphoning off of kerosene for non-household purpose	Diversion of kerosene from PDS to open market	Diversion of kerosene to no card households	Total diversion
Andhra Pradesh	6.3	29.7	1.9	37.9
Assam	13.8	29.1	1.1	44.0
Bihar	15.7	31.2	7.6	54.5
Chandigarh	64.5	19.2	1.6	85.2
Chhattisgarh	16.9	10.9	12.4	40.3
Delhi	10.9	41.7	1.2	53.8
Goa	8.5	6.5	1.4	16.5
Gujarat	34.8	3.1	1.7	39.5
Haryana	21.7	18.0	0.9	40.6
Himachal Pradesh	2.0	5.6	3.1	10.7
Jharkhand	32.5	18.1	4.8	55.5
Karnataka	8.8	23.4	5.7	37.9
Kerala	6.7	11.9	0.6	19.2
Madhya Pradesh	20.1	16.9	2.8	39.8
Maharashtra	20.3	9.9	1.1	31.3
Meghalaya	11.0	14.1	0.0	25.1
Orissa	11.5	39.6	0.6	51.6
Punjab	52.6	15.9	0.3	68.8
Rajasthan	22.3	1.8	1.2	25.3
Tamil Nadu	7.7	37.7	1.0	46.4
Uttar Pradesh	21.7	13.5	3.9	39.1
Uttaranchal	39.6	3.5	0.8	43.9
West Bengal	4.5	13.7	0.6	19.1
Total	18.1	17.9	2.6	38.6

(f) & (g) : A system to monitor distribution of foodgrains and other goods being distributed under PDS is already in place. Under the System, the responsibility for distribution of foodgrains and other goods through PDS outlets lies with the respective State Governments. However, the following measures have been taken by the Government to reach the PDS items to the beneficiaries.

(i) The reports of the ORG Marg and the Programme Evaluation Organisation have been sent to the State Governments for their comments . In addition, the issue of diversion has been discussed in the recently held Regional Conferences with the State Governments. The State Governments have however, expressed reservations in these conferences on the findings of the studies.

(ii) As regards diversion of wheat particularly in the North Eastern States, the Central Government in addition to reducing wheat allocation in all rice eating states has also issued instructions that the custom of allowing flour mills to lift wheat directly from the FCI godowns be stopped and the State Governments should ensure that the wheat after being milled is put back in the PDS net-work, for distribution to ration card holders.

(iii) In the recently held Regional Conferences with the State Governments including the conference for North Eastern States held in Guwahati on 31st January, 2006 the issue of diversion of foodgrains has been discussed at length and State Governments asked to take steps like door delivery of foodgrains, involvement of Self-Help Groups of stakeholders in distribution, computerization of PDS beneficiaries etc. The Chhattisgarh Government has reported that it has cancelled the Fair Price Shops licenses and with a view to ensuring better distribution has allotted Fair Price Shops to 3404 Gram Panchayats, 2753 Primary Agriculture Cooperative Societies, 1587 Womens` Self Help Groups, 243 Forest Protection Committees and 2032 Shops to other cooperative societies. Andhra Pradesh and Karnataka have taken up review of the BPL beneficiaries and have started issue of computerized ration cards alongwith bar coded coupons. Sikkim has also computerized the TPDS operations.

(iv) The Public Distribution System (Control) Order, 2001 was issued in order to streamline the functioning of the PDS and to make the same more effective and accountable. Any offence committed in violation of the provisions of the Order invokes criminal liability under Section 7 of the Essential Commodities Act, 1955.

(v) The State Governments and the Union Territory Administrations have been asked to actively involve the Panchayati Raj Institutions to monitor the functioning of the Fair Price Shops, as a measure of social audit;

(vi) The State and Union Territories have also been asked to constitute Vigilance Committees at the State, District, Block and FPS levels to oversee the functioning of PDS;

(vii) With a view to efficiently reaching PDS commodities to the consumers in a transparent manner, a model Citizen`s Charter has been issued by the Central Government for adoption by the State Governments/UT Administration;

(viii) Under the Area Officers Scheme, the Senior Officers of the Government visits their allocated States/UTs to conduct review of the TPDS. The observations made by the Area Officers in their reports are sent to the concerned State Government/UT for taking necessary action.

(ix) The Central Government has made necessary provisions in the Kerosene (Restriction on Use and Fixation of Ceiling Price) Order, 1993, issued under the Essential Commodities Act, 1955 to check diversion of kerosene.

(x) Further to check the black marketing of the SKO, Oil Marketing Companies (OMCs) undertake inspections of SKO dealers and take action against guilty dealers based on the provisions of the Marketing Discipline Guidelines/Dealership Agreement. The action taken includes termination of dealerships, imposition of fines, suspension of supplies, warning, etc.

(h) Details of action taken by some of the State Governments, against the erring FPS owners under the PDS (Control) Order, after January 2004, are given in the Annexure.

ANNEXURE

ANNEXURE REFERRED TO IN REPLY TO PART (h) OF THE STARRED QUESTION NO.123 DUE FOR ANSWER ON 27.02.2006 IN THE LOK SABHA.

STATUS PAPER ON HALF YEARLY REPORT ON THE ACTION TAKEN UNDER CLAUSE 9 OF PDS (CONTROL) ORDER, 2001 BY THE STATE GOVERNMENTS/UT ADMINISTRATIONS

S. No.	State/UT	Period from Jan.,04 to June,04	Period from July,04 to Dec.,04
1.	Assam	No. of raids conducted- 84 No. of persons arrested- NIL No. of persons prosecuted-19 No. of persons convicted-2 Value of goods confiscated (Rs.-35,81,500)	No. of raids conducted-143 No. of persons arrested-NIL No of persons prosecuted-28 No. of persons convicted-NIL Value of goods confiscated (Rs.-1,104.00)
2.	Chattisgarh	No. of Cases-527 Action taken-187 Balance cases-340	No. of Cases-290 Action taken-87 Balance cases-203
3.	Delhi	No. of cases reported:44 Action taken-44 Penalty Imposed-Rs.92,300	No. of cases reported:211 Action taken-211 Penalty Imposed-Rs.2,86,100

4.	Gujarat	No. of raids-8179 No. of persons arrested-22 No. of persons against whom prosecution started-6 No. of persons punished under PDS (Control) orders,2001-Nil Amount of confiscation (Rs. in lakh)-6.78	No. of raids-13496 No. of persons arrested-37 (Police Case) No. of persons against whom prosecution started-33 No. of persons punished under PDS (Control) orders,2001-Nil Amount of confiscation (Rs. in lakh) -14.68
5.	Haryana	FPS Licence cancelled-66 Forfeited - Rs.2,27,250/-	FPS Licence cancelled-66 Forfeited - Rs.3,54,100/-
6.	Karnataka	No. of raids - 461 No. of persons arrested -41 No. of persons prosecuted-Nil No. of persons convicted-Nil Value of confiscated essential commodities(Rs.in lakh)-2.40	No. of licenses who have violated the orders-207 No. issue pending for enquiry-27 No. of suspended licenses-31 No. of licenses cancelled-02 Total penalty against the issues closed after levying penal try-Rs.1,02,891/-
7.	Kerala	No. of raids-2977 No. of persons arrested-NIL No. of persons prosecuted-NIL No. of persons convicted-Nil Value of confiscated-Rs28788.50	No. of raids-7872 No. of persons arrested-NIL No. of persons prosecuted-NIL No. of persons convicted-Nil Value of confiscated-Rs.54938.80
8.	Mizoram	No. of raids conducted -6 No. of persons arrested-NIL No. of persons prosecuted-NIL No. of persons convicted-NIL Value of goods confiscated (Rs. in lakh) - NIL	No. of raids conducted - 3 No. of persons arrested - NIL No. of persons prosecuted-NIL No. of persons convicted-NIL Value of goods confiscated (Rs. in lakh) - NIL
9.	Orissa	No. of raids conducted-287 No. of persons arrested-2 No. of persons prosecuted-13 No. of persons convicted-NIL Value of goods confiscated - Rs.2,10,585.00	No. of raids conducted-645 No. of persons arrested-6 No. of persons prosecuted-58 No. of persons convicted-NIL Value of goods confiscated- -Rs.32,76,537.94
10.	Punjab	Depots checked - 16550 Show cause notices issued-606 Depots suspended-284 Cancelled - 34 Depots fined-151	Depots checked-16024 Show cause notices issued-628 Depots suspended-215 Cancelled-35 Depots fined-145

11.	Rajasthan	No. of raids-80 No. of persons arrested-3 No. of persons prosecuted-18 No. of persons convicted-Nil Value of confiscated essential commodities (Rs.)-838681	No. of raids-12 No. of persons arrested-NIL No. of persons prosecuted-25 No. of persons convicted-1 Value of confiscated essential commodities (Rs.) -1450664
12.	Tamil Nadu	PDS (Control) Order, 2001 has not been Implemented in the State since this Govt. is not following APL/BPL classification for pricing commodities under PDS. Hence the question of furnishing Half yearly reports on the action taken under clause 9 of the PDS (Control) Order, 2001 does not arise	
13.	Uttar Pradesh	No. of raids-4322 No. of persons arrested-59 No. of persons prosecuted-Nil No. of persons convicted-Nil Value of confiscated essential commodities (Rs.) -6419413 No. of inspection-146950 No. of FIR register-137 Security deposit-Rs.-3612541 No. of FPS suspended-2711 No. of FPS cancelled-1029	#
14.	West Bengal	No. of raids conducted-400 No. of persons arrested-149 No. of persons prosecuted-39 No. of persons convicted-Nil Value of goods seized =Rs.76,45,218.00	No. of raids conducted-173 No. of persons arrested-66 No. of persons prosecuted-53 No. of persons convicted-4 Value of goods seized =Rs.29,16,016.00
15.	A&N Islands	No. of raids conducted-1 No. of surprise inspection-205 No. of persons arrested-1 Penalty charges-2 No. of cases initiated-1 Value of goods confiscated-NIL Irregularities Noticed-32	#
16.	D&N Haveli	NIL	No. of raids-1 No. of persons arrested-1 No. of persons prosecuted-Nil No. of persons convicted-Nil Value of goods confiscated (Rs.)-3971 Remarks-complaint lodged with the police for further investigation.

17.	Pondicherry	No. of raids-380 No. of persons arrested-5 No. of persons prosecuted-5 No. of persons convicted-2 Under investigator & 1 under Trial	No. of raids-1072 No. of persons arrested-17 No. of persons prosecuted-17 No. of persons convicted-4 under Trial
-----	-------------	---	---

No information has been received from these States/UTs.

STATUS PAPER ON HALF YEARLY REPORT ON THE ACTION TAKEN UNDER
CLAUSE 9 OF PDS (CONTROL) ORDER, 2001 BY THE STATE GOVERNMENTS/UT
ADMINISTRATIONS

S. No. State/UT Period from Jan., 05 to June, 05 Period from July,05 to Dec., 05

1.	Assam	No. of raids conducted-991 No. of persons arrested-NIL No. of persons prosecuted-24 No. of persons convicted-2 Value of goods confiscated (Rs. in lakh) -56,797/-	
2.	Delhi	No. of cases reported-785 Action taken-702 Penalty Imposed-Rs.11,09,900	
3.	Gujarat	No. of Inspection of FPS-16163 Seizure - Rs. 1339014 Confiscation - Rs. 377938 Deposit Confiscated - Rs. 2648189 Licence cancelled -68 Licence suspended-186 Prosecution No. of cases-28	
4.	Haryana	FPS licences cancelled-73 Forfeited-Rs.7,74,920/-	
5.	Kerala	No. of raids-3386 No. of persons arrested-9 No. of persons prosecuted-NIL No. of persons convicted-Nil Value of confiscated-Rs.22009.72	

- | | | | |
|-----|-------------|---|---|
| 6. | Mizoram | No. of raids made-10
No. of persons arrested-NIL
No. of persons prosecuted-NIL
No. of persons convicted-NIL
Value of goods confiscated
(Rs. in lakh)-NIL | |
| 7. | Punjab | Depots checked-16145
Show cause Notices issued-881
Depot suspended-204
Depot cancelled-45
Depot fined-295 | |
| 8. | Tamil Nadu | PDS (Control) Order, 2001 has not been Implemented in the State since this Govt. is not following APL/BPL classification for pricing commodities under PDS. Hence the question of furnishing Half yearly reports on the action taken under clause 9 of the PDS(Control) Order, 2001 does not arise. | |
| 9. | A&N Islands | No. of Inspection-56
No. of raids conducted-NIL
No. of persons arrested/
prosecuted/convicted-NIL
No. of FPS licenses suspended
/cancelled show cause notice
issued-1
Value of goods
seized-NIL | No. of Inspection-43
No. of raids conducted-NIL
No. of persons rested/prosecuted/
convicted-NIL
No. of FPS licenses suspended/cancelled
show cause notice issued-5
Value of goods seized-NIL |
| 10. | Chandigarh | No. of case registerd-1 | |
| 11. | Pondicherry | No. of raids-2673
No. of persons arrested-18
No. of persons prosecuted-18
No. of persons convicted- Under investigation | |
- # No information has been received from these States/UTs."

2.33 During the course of supplementaries on the question, Shri Asaduddin Owaisi, M.P., asked the following Supplementary Question:-

“I would like to reiterate my first specific question. What has been the monetary loss suffered by the Government?”

2.34 In reply, the Minister of Agriculture and Minister of Consumer Affairs, Food and Public Distribution (Shri Sharad Pawar) *inter-alia* stated as follows:-

“About the monetary loss, I said that I have to collect the figures and I have no hesitation in giving them.”

2.35 The above reply to the supplementary question was treated as an assurance and was required to be fulfilled by the Ministry of Consumer Affairs, Food and Public Distribution within three months of the date of the reply *i.e.* by 26 May, 2006. However, the assurance is yet to be implemented.

2.36 The Ministry have not sought extension of time beyond 27 November, 2006 to implement the assurance.

2.37 The Ministry of Consumer Affairs, Food and Public Distribution *vide* D.O. No.7(5)/2006-PD.I dated 19 June, 2007 addressed to the Committee Secretariat and letter No.7(5)/2006-PD.I dated 08 November, 2006 addressed to Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs had requested, with the approval of the Minister of Consumer Affairs, Food and Public Distribution, for dropping the assurance on the ground that after thorough examination of the proceedings obtained by the Department from Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs, it was ascertained that the Member had asked the Question on the monetary loss suffered by the Government. At first instance, the Minister had assured the Hon'ble MP that the figures would be

collected and will be given. However, at the later stage the Hon'ble Minister had informed the House as under:-

"I have now got the figures asked for. During the year 2003-2004, the total amount spent was Rs.7258 crores in 16 States. Out of that, Rs.4197 crores did not reach the BPL cardholders or households. So practically more than 55% of the amount has not reached the BPL households."

2.38 The Ministry further stated that as it is evident from the proceedings on the Question that the information asked by the Hon'ble M.P. had already been given by the Hon'ble Minister and the Department had no other additional information in the matter.

2.39 The Ministry of Consumer Affairs, Food and Public Distribution, therefore, with the approval of the Minister of Consumer Affairs, Food and Public Distribution, requested that the assurance may be dropped from the list of Assurances.

2.40 The Committee note that a question was asked on 27 February, 2006 regarding 'Diversion of Foodgrains'. The question sought information regarding the details about large scale diversion of Public Distribution System (PDS) foodgrains in North Eastern States. Shri Asaduddin Owaisi, M.P. during the course of supplementaries on the question enquired about the monetary loss suffered by the Government on this account. In reply, the Minister stated 'About the monetary loss.....I have to collect the figures and I have no hesitation in giving them'. This reply was treated as an assurance.

2.41 The Ministry requested for dropping of the assurance on the ground that on the same day the Minister informed the House at a later stage that during the year 2003-2004 the total amount spent was Rs.7,258 crores in 16 States out of which Rs.4,197 crores did not reach the BPL card holders or households. According to the Department, they have no other additional information in the matter. The Committee considered this request at their sitting held on 19 December, 2007 and having been satisfied with the reply of the Ministry, decided to drop the assurance.

[vi] ACQUISITION OF LAND BY IAF IN RAJASTHAN

2.42 On 25 April, 2001, Col. (Retd.) Sona Ram Choudhary, M.P., addressed the following Unstarred Question No.5777 to the Minister of Defence:-

- “(a) whether the Government are planning to acquire 47,299 bighas land at villages Motare, Dhandhusar, Dheerdesar, Bannasar and Bangasar, in tehsil Rawatsar, district Hanumangarh (Rajasthan) for use by Indian Air Force;**
- (b) whether, due to planned acquisition, the farmers/land owners are not permitted to utilise this land for the last ten years;**
- (c) whether all developmental works on this land have been stopped;**
- (d) whether the Government have received any representations from concerned Gram Panchayat for early decision about acquisition or otherwise; and**
- (e) if so, response of the Government thereto and the likely time by which the farmers are to be paid compensation for their land?”**

2.43 In reply, the then Minister of Defence (Shri Jaswant Singh) stated as follows:-

- “(a) Yes, Sir. A proposal, to acquire about 47,299 bighas of land in district Hanumangarh, Rajasthan, is under consideration for use by Indian Air Force.**
- (b) No, Sir. There are no restrictions on utilization of the land by legal owners.**

- (c) No, Sir. There are no restriction on the implementation of Developmental works on this land.**
- (d) Some representations have been received from Ex-Sarpanch, Gram Panchayat Motare, district Hanumangarh in this regard.**
- (e) As the land is yet to be acquired, the question of payment of compensation does not arise, at this stage."**

2.44 The above reply to part (a) of the question was treated as an assurance and was required to be fulfilled by the Ministry of Defence within three months of the date of the reply *i.e.* by 24 July, 2001. The Ministry of Defence requested to grant them extension of time up to 24 April, 2008 to fulfil the assurance.

2.45 The Ministry of Defence *vide* their O.M. No.5(46)/01/D(Air.-II) dated 1 June, 2007 requested the Committee to drop the assurance on the following grounds :-

"The proposal to acquire about 47,000 bighas of land in district Hanumangarh, Rajasthan was under active consideration for building an Air-to-Ground Firing Range for the Indian Air Force (IAF) since 1998. The physical verification of the land through a 'Board of Officers' (BOO) comprising representatives of all concerned, including the Government of Rajasthan was completed in July, 2005. Before the matter could be processed in the Ministry for obtaining the approval of the competent authority, Government of Rajasthan was requested to confirm whether the cost of land arrived at by them in 2000 would be acceptable if the Central Government decides to acquire the land. The Government of Rajasthan informed on 14 July, 2006 that Gazette Notification on which the cost of land was calculated had since expired for want of proper declaration of awards by Land Acquisition Officer within stipulated period. Hence, the entire acquisition process has to be initiated afresh. Government of Rajasthan has reiterated their view point on 17 November, 2006 stating that land acquisition proceedings have already lapsed. However, if Government of India requires the land, they may send proposal afresh giving details of

the land required. Necessary action in this regard has been initiated by the IAF.”

The Ministry further stated that

“This proposal has been hanging on for the last nine years due to issues such as legality of Gazette Notification, declaration of award by the State Government prior to Government sanction, reasonableness of the cost of land, issuance of a formal “No Objection Certificate” by the State Government and due to the insistence of the State Government that a fresh proposal is required. Therefore, the circumstances under which the instant assurance was given has changed. A fresh proposal from Air Head Quarter justifying the requirement and urgency for the Air to Ground Firing Range at Thukrana, district Hanumangarh (Rajasthan) is awaited. Since land acquisition is a long drawn procedure in which all concerned agencies have to be consulted time and again, the finalisation of the fresh proposal is likely to take a long time.”

2.46 In view of the position explained above, the Ministry requested to delete the assurance from the list of pending assurances.

2.47 The Committee note that a question was asked on 25 April, 2001 regarding 'Acquisition of Land by IAF in Rajasthan'. The question, *inter alia*, sought information regarding the plans of the Government to acquire 47,299 bighas of land at villages in district Hanumangarh in Rajasthan for use by Indian Air Force. In reply, it was inter-alia stated that a proposal to acquire about 47,299 bighas of land for use by IAF in district Hanumangarh, Rajasthan was under consideration. This reply was treated as an assurance. As the assurance remained unimplemented, the Ministry requested for dropping the assurance on the ground that the circumstances under which the assurance was given has changed due to the insistence of the State Government for a fresh proposal and the same is awaited from Air Head Quarters justifying the requirement and urgency for the Air force to Ground Firing Range at Thukrana, district Hanumangarh (Rajasthan). It has also been stated that land acquisition is a long drawn procedure in which all concerned agencies have to be consulted time and again and, therefore, the finalization of the fresh proposal would take a long time. The Committee considered this request at their sitting held on 19 December, 2007 and after being

convinced with the reasons adduced by the Ministry, decided to drop the assurance.

NEW DELHI;

01 October, 2008

09 Asvina 1930 (Saka)

(HARIN PATHAK)
CHAIRMAN
COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT ASSURANCES

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

Shri Harin Pathak - Chairman

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:-

**Memorandum No.12 Request for dropping of assurance given on 12 May, 2005
in reply to USQ No. 7070 regarding 'Committee on
Revamping and Streamlining the Legal Set Up on
Railway'.**

The Committee considered the above memorandum and noted that 14 recommendations of the Committee on revamping and streamlining the legal set up on Indian Railways are still pending. According to them, out of the 14 pending recommendations, most of recommendations were either not found feasible to implement or found feasible to implement only in part. The Committee noticed that the legal set up in the Railways is yet to be streamlined. The Committee, therefore, decided to call the representatives of the Ministry of Railways for oral evidence to know the reasons for delay in streamlining the same.

Memorandum No.13

Request for dropping of assurance given on 21 August, 2003 in reply to USQ No. 3746 regarding 'Payment of Royalty to Artists'.

The Committee considered the above memorandum and noted that despite a number of written requests, the Indian Performing Right Society (IPRS) which is the royalty-collecting agency from AIR, had not furnished the documents required under Copyright Act, Clause 14(I) for entering into an agreement with AIR. The Committee noted that in the absence of an agreement, the modalities for payment of royalty remained unresolved. The Committee, therefore, decided to drop the assurance.

Memorandum No.14

Request for dropping of assurance given on 15 December, 2006 in reply to USQ No. 3518 regarding 'Loan to Ethiopia'.

The Committee considered the above memorandum and noted that the Government of Ethiopia had requested for US\$ 640 million for revamping of their sugar industry and this huge amount could not be given by the Indian Government in one financial year. The Committee agreed to the reasoning of the Ministry and decided to drop the assurance.

Memorandum No.15

Request for dropping of assurance given on 27 July, 2006 in reply to USQ No. 531 regarding 'Import of Defence Technologies'.

The Committee considered the above memorandum and noted that there was no proposal to grant any special status to some premier private companies for importing Defence Technologies directly from abroad. The Committee, therefore, decided to drop the assurance.

Memorandum No.16 Request for dropping of the assurances given in replies to (i) Starred Question No. 305 dated 24 March,2005 regarding 'Indo-Iran gas pipeline project', (ii) Starred Question No. 669 dated 12 May,2005 regarding 'India-

Bangladesh-Myanmar Pipeline’, and (iii) Unstarred Question No. 387 dated 24 November,2005 regarding ‘Indo-Bangladesh-Myanmar gas pipeline.

The Committee considered the above memorandum and agreed with the contention of the Government that it may not be in public interest to furnish any additional information till negotiations are concluded and the projects are completed. As the discussions with the foreign Governments on these projects are confidential and sensitive in nature, the Committee decided to drop these assurances.

Memorandum No.17 Request for dropping of assurance given on 27 February, 2006 in reply to SQ No. 123 regarding ‘Diversion of Foodgrains’.

The Committee considered the above memorandum and after taking note of the submissions made by the Ministry decided to drop the assurance.

Memorandum No.18 Request for dropping of assurances given on (i) 14 December, 2004 in reply to USQ No. 2169 regarding ‘Declaration of Villages as MADA Areas in Maharashtra’; and (ii) 23 August, 2005 in reply to USQ No. 4048 regarding ‘Inclusion of Tehsil under Tribal Sub-plan Area’.

The Committee considered the above memorandum and noted that comprehensive proposals on the subjects have been received from the State Governments of Maharashtra and Rajasthan which are under examination and would require further time for processing. The Committee decided not to drop the assurances and also desired a status report of the assurances. The Committee take a serious view on the attitude of the Ministry not to seek extension of time and hence desired the Ministry to seek extension of time to fulfil the assurances.

Memorandum No.19 Request for dropping of assurance given on 25 April, 2001 in reply to USQ No. 5777 regarding 'Acquisition of Land by IAF in Rajasthan'.

The Committee considered the above memorandum and noted that a fresh proposal from Air Head Quarter justifying the requirement and urgency for the Air to Ground Firing Range at Thukrana, District Hanumangarh (Rajasthan) is awaited. The Committee, therefore, decided to drop the assurance. According to the Ministry for land acquisition, all concerned agencies have to be consulted time and again and the finalisation of the fresh proposal is likely to take a long time.

Memorandum No.20 Request for dropping of assurance given on 5 August, 2005 in reply to USQ No. 1957 regarding 'HIV Vaccine'.

The Committee considered the above memorandum and noted that the assurance pertains to National Jai Vigyan S & T Mission Project for development of a proto-type HIV-I Subtype 'C' Vaccine candidate based on DNA-MVA at the AIIMs, New Delhi. The Committee also noted that the subject matter of the assurance is very important, affects a large number of people and also deals with a serious ailment. The Committee, therefore, desired that Research and Development efforts towards development of a putative HIV/AIDS vaccine candidate be pursued. Vigorously, the Committee, therefore, decided not to drop the assurance.

Memorandum No.21 Request for dropping of assurance given on 25 July, 2006 in reply to USQ No. 200 regarding 'Setting up of IIITs'.

The Committee considered the above memorandum and noted that it was specifically stated by the Government in the reply that a proposal for setting up of new Indian Institutes of Information Technology (IIITs) in the country was under consideration. The Committee, therefore, desired a status report on the efforts made by the Ministry to implement the assurance and also desired the Ministry to seek extension of time to fulfil the assurance. The Committee also desired that the proposal be brought to its logical conclusion and hence, decided not to drop the assurance.

Thereafter, the Committee also decided to undertake a Study Visit to Banagalore, Mumbai, Cochin and Lakshadweep from 30 January to 6 February, 2008 and authorized the Hon'ble Chairman to finalise the Tour programme.

The Committee then adjourned.

MINUTES
ELEVENTH SITTING

Minutes of the sitting of the Committee on Government Assurances (2007-2008) held on 06 August, 2008 in Committee Room 'B', Parliament House Annexe, New Delhi.

The Committee sat from 1230 hours to 1330 hours on Wednesday 06 August, 2008.

PRESENT

Shri Harin Pathak - Chairman

Members

- 2. Shri Jigajinagi Ramesh Chandappa**
- 3. Dr. K. Dhanaraju**
- 4. Shri Biren Singh Engti**

5. Shri Rasheed Masood

6. Shri Nihal Chand

7. Shri Aruna Kumar Vundavalli

Secretariat

- | | | |
|--------------------------------|----------|----------------------------|
| 1. Shri P. Sreedharan | - | Joint Secretary |
| 2. Shri Rajeev Sharma | - | Director |
| 3. Shri Dal Singh Malha | - | 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 the Committee (2007-2008) would be over on that day *i.e.* 06 August, 2008. Giving statistical information on the work done during the term of the Committee, the Chairman elaborated on the steps taken during his term to ensure proper and timely implementation of assurances given on the floor of the House. 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. The Chairman then, apprised the members briefly about the agenda for the sitting.

Thereafter, the Committee took up for consideration the draft Twenty Fourth report regarding requests for dropping of assurances and after discussion adopted the same without any amendment. The Committee also authorised the Chairman to finalise the report and present the same to the House in the ensuing Session of the Lok Sabha.

After completing the agenda, some members appreciated the Chairman's commendable leadership and impartial attitude which enabled the Committee in taking unanimous decisions. The Committee also placed on record their appreciation for the Secretarial assistance rendered by the officers and staff of the Secretariat for the smooth working of the Committee.

The Committee then adjourned.

MINUTES
FIRST SITTING

Minutes of the first sitting of the Committee on Government Assurances (2008-2009) held on 14 August 2008 in Committee Room 'E', Parliament House Annexe, New Delhi.

The Committee sat from 1130 hours to 1230 hours on Thursday, 14 August 2008.

PRESENT

Shri Harin Pathak - Chairman

Members

- 2. Shri J.M. Aron Rashid**
- 3. Dr. K. Dhanaraju**
- 2. Shri Sunil Khan**
- 5. Shri Vijoy Krishna**
- 2. Shri Rasheed Masood**
- 7. Shri Rajiv Ranjan 'Lalan' Singh**

Secretariat

1. **Shri P. Sreedharan** - **Joint Secretary**
2. **Shri Rajeev Sharma** - **Director**
3. **Shri D.S. Malha** - **Deputy Secretary**
4. **Shri V.P. Goel** - **Deputy Secretary-II**

At the outset, the Chairman welcomed the Members to the First Sitting of the Committee and felicitated them on their renomination to the Committee w.e.f. 07 August, 2008. The Chairman apprised the Members about the performance of the Committee during the previous term (2007-2008). He informed the Members that the previous Committee considered and adopted seven Reports out of which five Reports had already been presented and the remaining two Reports would be presented during the ensuing Session of Lok Sabha. He also informed that the Committee held 11 sittings and considered 66 memoranda containing requests for dropping of assurances received from various Ministries/Departments. He also apprised the Members that the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs laid on the Table of the House the statements of fulfillment of 1278 assurances, including 19 partly fulfilled.

2. **The Committee then considered Memorandum No. 1 regarding working of the Committee on Government Assurances and the position**

of assurances pending implementation as on 14 August, 2008. The Chairman briefly explained the working of the Committee to the Members. He drew attention of the Members to the fact that 1811 assurances of Eighth, Ninth, Tenth, Eleventh, Twelfth, Thirteenth and Fourteenth Lok Sabha (upto 12th Session) were pending and the Committee would have to pursue them.

3. Thereafter the Committee reconsidered the Draft Reports and after discussion adopted the Draft 23rd and 24th Reports regarding requests for dropping of assurances and also authorized the Chairman to present those Reports in the House. The Chairman urged all the Members to take active interest in the working of the Committee and share their considerable experience and expertise in various fields to act as watchdog over the fulfillment of assurances.

4. The Committee then decided to undertake study visit to Ahmedabad, Junagarh, Mumbai, Ooty and Bangalore for 6 - 7 days from 12 September, 2008 onwards.

The Committee then adjourned.