

**96 COMMITTEE ON
GOVERNMENT ASSURANCES**

FOURTEENTH LOK SABHA

TWENTY SIXTH REPORT

**REQUESTS FOR DROPPING OF
ASSURANCES**

Presented to Lok Sabha on 22 October 2008



सत्यमेव जयते

LC
328.3658R
P8.26.4

**LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT
NEW DELHI**

October, 2008/Asvina, 1930 (Saka)

CGANo.211

Price : Rs. 42.00

LC
328.3658R
P8.2534

PARLIAMENT LIBRARY ⑤
Govt. Publications
No. HG 125359
Date 16/3/9

© 2008 BY LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT

Published under Rule 382 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in Lok Sabha (Twelfth Edition) and printed by the Manager, Government of India Press, Minto Road, New Delhi-110 002.

CONTENTS

	PAGE
COMPOSITION OF THE COMMITTEE (2008-2009).....	(iii)
INTRODUCTION.....	(v)
CHAPTER I. Requests for dropping of Assurances (Not Accepted)	
(i) Unstarred Question No. 2839 dated 14 March, 2000 regarding 'Revision of SC/ST List'	1
(ii) Unstarred Question No. 403 dated 30 November, 1999 regarding 'Lambadi Community'	5
(iii) Unstarred Question No. 3832 dated 19 December, 2006 regarding 'Purchase from SC/ST Entrepreneurs'	8
(iv) Unstarred Question No. 4154 dated 21 April, 1994 regarding 'Disposal of Wakf Cases'	9
(v) Unstarred Question No. 3712 dated 13 December, 2000 regarding 'Setting up of Atomic Power Plants in Private Sector, Unstarred Question No. 1937 dated 21 July, 2004 regarding 'Review of Atomic Energy Act' and Unstarred Question No. 1095 dated 29 November, 2006 regarding 'Private Power Sector in Nuclear Generation'	12
CHAPTER II. Requests for dropping of Assurances (Accepted)	
(i) Starred Question No. 295 dated 16 March, 1999 regarding 'Elementary Education'	16
(ii) Unstarred Question No. 1855 dated 29 November, 2002 regarding 'Property of Revenue Officials'	20
(iii) Unstarred Question No. 1156 dated 15 July, 2004 regarding 'Conduct of Entrance Examination in other Languages' ..	23
(iv) Unstarred Question No. 2138 dated 14 March, 2007 regarding 'Two-Child Norm for Panchayat Polls'	25
(v) Unstarred Question No. 4078 dated 20 December, 2005 regarding 'Education to Girls'	27
APPENDICES	
I. Minutes of the Sitting of the Committee held on 03 April, 2008...	30
II. Minutes of the Sitting of the Committee held on 24 September, 2008.....	34

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 Fifth 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 sittings held on 31 January, 2008 and 6 May, 2008 considered Memorandum Nos. 32 to 36 and 47 to 51 respectively containing requests received from the Ministries/Departments for dropping of pending assurances. Memorandum No. 32 containing request of the Ministry of Civil Aviation for dropping the assurance given in reply to USQ No. 3167 dated 11 May, 2006 regarding 'Irregularities in Purchase of Executive Jet Planes' has not been included in this Report since the assurance was implemented *vide* Statement No. IX/3 on 30 April, 2008.

4. At their sitting held on 24 September, 2008, the Committee (2008-2009) considered and adopted their Twenty-Fifth Report which was prepared on the basis of the decisions taken by the Committee on the aforesaid Memoranda.

5. The Minutes of the aforesaid sittings of the Committee form part of this report. (Appendices).

6. For facility of reference and convenience, the observations and recommendations of the Committee have been printed in bold letters in the Report.

NEW DELHI;
October, 2008
Asvina, 1930 (Saka)

HARIN PATHAK,
Chairman,
Committee on Government Assurances.

REPORT
CHAPTER I
REQUESTS FOR DROPPING OF ASSURANCES
(NOT ACCEPTED)

[i] Revision Of SC/ST List

1.1 On 14 March, 2000 Shri S.D.N.R. Wadiyar, MP addressed the following Unstarred Question No. 2839 to the Minister of Tribal Affairs:—

- “(a) whether the State Governments have proposed to revise list of SC/ST;
 (b) if so, the specific requests made by each State for the inclusion of communities in the list of SC and ST, State-wise; and
 (c) the steps taken by the Government in this regard?”

1.2 In reply, the then Minister of Tribal Affairs (Shri Jual Oram) stated as follows:—

- “(a) Yes, Sir.
 (b) A Statement showing State-wise number of communities proposed by the State Governments and Union Territory Administrations for inclusion in the list of Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes is Annexed.
 (c) The matter is under process in the light of modalities approved by the Government for deciding such claims.

Statement referred to in part (B) of the answer to Unstarred Question No. 2839 for answer on 14.03.2000 by Shri S.D.N.R. Wadiyar regarding revision of SC/ST lists.

Statement showing number of communities recommended by various State Governments and UT Administrations for their inclusion in Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes lists:

Sl.No.	Name of State	No. of Communities	
		Scheduled Caste	Scheduled Tribe
1	2	3	4
1.	Andhra Pradesh	6	20
2.	Arunachal Pradesh	-	25
3.	Assam	-	70
4.	Bihar	2	7
5.	Goa	1	4
6.	Gujarat	4	2

1	2	3	4
7.	Himachal Pradesh	17	7
8.	Haryana	9	1
9.	Jammu & Kashmir	3	4
10.	Karnataka	8	10
11.	Kerala	29	35
12.	Maharashtra	6	52
13.	Manipur	1	6
14.	Madhya Pradesh	7	5
15.	Meghalaya	-	3
16.	Mizoram	-	2
17.	Nagaland	-	3
18.	Orissa	32	53
19.	Punjab	4	8
20.	Rajasthan	1	1
21.	Sikkim	-	11
22.	Tripura	7	14
23.	Tamil Nadu	1	7
24.	West Bengal	5	2
25.	Andaman & Nicobar Island	-	-
26.	Dadra & Nagar Haveli	1	-
27.	Chandigarh	3	14
28.	Daman & Diu	1	-
29.	Delhi	6	-
30.	Pondicherry	6	8
31.	Lakshadweep	-	-

1.3 The above reply to part (c) of the question was treated as an assurance and was required to be implemented by the Ministry of Tribal Affairs within three months of the date of the reply *i.e.*, by 13 June, 2000. However, the assurance remained unimplemented and the Ministry sought extension of time upto 31 March, 2008 to implement the assurance.

1.4 The Ministry of Tribal Affairs *vide* their O.M. F. No.16012/8/2007-C&LM-I dated 28 September, 2007 requested for dropping the assurance on the following grounds :—

“The inclusion/exclusion of any community from the lists of Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes notified under articles 341 & 342 of the Constitution is an ongoing process. Therefore, the reply of the question was given by using the term ‘the matter is under process in the light of modalities approved by the Government for deciding such claims’.

The Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes are notified by a Presidential Order under article 341(1) and 342 (1) of the Constitution, respectively. In June, 1999, the Government approved modalities for deciding the claims for inclusion in, exclusion from and other modifications in the Orders specifying

Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes lists. According to these approved guidelines, only those claims that have been agreed to by the concerned State Government/UT Administration, the Registrar General of India and National Commission for Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes (now National Commission for Scheduled Tribes and National Commission for Scheduled Castes) will be taken up for consideration. Whenever representations are received in the Ministry (Ministry of SJ &E/Ministry of Tribal Affairs) for inclusion of any community in the list of Scheduled Tribes/Scheduled Castes of a State/UT, the Ministry forwards these representations to the concerned State Government /UT Administration for recommendations as required under Article 341 & 342 of the Constitution. If the concerned State Government/UT Administration recommends the proposal, then the same is sent to the Registrar General of India (RGI). The RGI, if satisfied with the recommendations of the State Government/UT Administration, recommends the proposal to the Central Government. Thereafter, the Government refers the proposal to the National Commission for Scheduled Tribe/National Commission for Scheduled Castes for their recommendation. If the National Commission for Scheduled Tribe/ National Commission for Scheduled Castes also recommends, the matter is placed before the Cabinet for a decision, after consulting the concerned administrative Ministries. Thereafter, the matter is put up before the Parliament in the form of a Bill to amend the Presidential Order.

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

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

The matter raised by the Hon'ble Member of Parliament in the question have already been processed by the Ministry of Social Justice and Empowerment and the Ministry of Tribal Affairs as per above approved modalities. The Ministry of Social Justice and Empowerment and Ministry of Tribal Affairs have considered those various proposals which have been agreed by above three agencies as

prescribed in the approved modalities. The details of Gazette Notifications issued in relation to the lists of Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes are as under:

Ministry of Social Justice and Empowerment

- (i) The Constitution (Scheduled Castes) Order (Amendment) Act, 2002 (No.25 of 2002) dated 24.05.02 provides for deletion, insertion and substitution in the lists of Scheduled Caste in the States of Orissa, Punjab and West Bengal.
- (ii) The Constitution (Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes) Orders (Amendment) Act, 2002 (No. 32 of 2002) dated 3.6.02 provides for inclusion of certain Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes oostees of the States of Madhya Pradesh and Maharashtra, who have been displaced due to Sardar Sarovar Project on the Narmada River and are settled or may be settled in the State of Gujarat, in the lists of SCs/STs specifying in relation to the State of Gujarat.
- (iii) The Constitution (Scheduled Castes) Order (Second Amendment) Act, 2002 (No. 61 of 2002) dated 17.12.02 provides for deletion, insertion and substitution in the communities notified in the Scheduled Caste lists in the States of Andhra Pradesh, Bihar, Gujarat, Haryana, Himachal Pradesh, Karnataka, Kerala, Madhya Pradesh, Orissa, Punjab, Tripura, Arunanchal Pradesh and J&K; and UTs of Delhi, Chandigarh, Daman & Diu, Dadra and Nagar Haveli and Pondicherry.

Ministry of Tribal Affairs

- (iv) The Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes Orders (Amendment) Act, 2002 (No. 10 of 2003) dated 7-1-03 provides for inclusion in the list of Scheduled Tribes, of certain tribes or tribal communities, or parts or groups within tribes or tribal communities, equivalent names or synonyms of such tribes or communities, removal of area restriction and bifurcation and clubbing of entries, imposition of area restriction in respect of certain castes in the list of Scheduled Castes, Scheduled Tribes and in the list of Scheduled Castes, and the exclusion of certain castes and tribes from the lists of Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes, in relation to the States of Andhra Pradesh, Arunanchal Pradesh, Assam, Bihar, Goa, Gujarat, Himachal Pradesh, Jharkhand, Karnataka, Kerala, Madhya Pradesh, Maharashtra, Manipur, Mizoram, Orissa, Sikkim, Tamil Nadu, Tripura, Uttar Pradesh and West Bengal.”

1.5 In view of the facts stated above, the Ministry stated that the assurance may not be kept pending for such a long period and requested for deletion of the assurance. The Ministry also stated that it had the approval of Minister of Tribal Affairs.

1.6 The Committee note that a question regarding Revision of SC/ST List was asked on 14 March, 2000. The question sought information regarding the proposals of the State Governments to revise the list of SC/ST and the steps taken by the Government thereon. In reply, it was, *inter-alla*, stated by the Government that the

matter was under process in the light of the modalities approved by the Government for deciding such claims. This reply was treated as an assurance. The assurance remained unimplemented and the Ministry requested for dropping the assurance, *inter-alla*, on the ground that the inclusion/exclusion of any community from the lists of Scheduled Castes/Scheduled Tribes was an ongoing process and as such the reply of the question was given by using the term “the matter was under process in the light of modalities approved by the Government for deciding such claims”. According to the Ministry, the matter raised in the question has already been processed by the Ministry of Social Justice and Empowerment and the Ministry of Tribal Affairs as per the approved modalities and four Gazette Notifications viz., (i) The Constitution (Scheduled Castes) Order (Amendment) Act, 2002 (No. 25 of 2002) (ii) The Constitution (Scheduled Castes & Scheduled Tribes) Order (Amendment) Act, 2002 (No. 32 of 2002) (iii) The Constitution (Scheduled Castes) Order (Second Amendment) Act, 2002 (No. 61 of 2002) and (iv) The Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes Orders (Amendment) Act, 2002 (No. 10 of 2003) have been issued in relation to the list of Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes. The Committee considered this request of the Ministry at their sitting held on 3 April, 2008 and decided not to drop the assurance.

1.7 The Committee note that while requesting for dropping the assurance, the Ministry have not only stated that the matter raised in the question has already been processed and considered by the Ministry of Social Justice and Empowerment and Ministry of Tribal Affairs as per approved modalities but also furnished details of four Gazette Notifications issued in the matter. The Committee find it astonishing that rather than laying the entire information on the Table of the House in the form of implementation statement, the Ministry resorted to making a request for dropping the assurance. The Committee strongly feel that the Ministry have acted in a very casual manner in following up their reply to the Parliamentary Question in the instant case. The Committee, therefore, desire that the Ministry should make earnest efforts to implement the assurance at the earliest. They also desire that in the meantime, specific information regarding the proposals received from various State Governments on the subject along with the progress made thereagainst, be expeditiously furnished to them.

[ii] Lambadi Community

1.8 On 30 November, 1999 Shri P.D. Elangovan, M.P., addressed the following Unstarred Question No. 403 to the Minister of Tribal Affairs:—

- “(a) whether the Lambadi Community listed as Scheduled Tribe in Karnataka is proposed to be considered as Scheduled Tribe in Tamil Nadu;**
- (b) if so, the details thereof;**
- (c) whether this community has been considered as backward community in Tamil Nadu;**
- (d) if so, the reasons therefor; and**
- (e) the steps taken to include this community in Scheduled Tribe?”**

1.9 In reply, the then Minister of Tribal Affairs (Shri Jual Oram) stated as follows:—

- “(a) & (b): Lambadi Community has not been specified as Scheduled Tribe in relation to the State of Karnataka rather it has been included in the list of Scheduled Castes. The proposal to include Lambadi community in the list of Scheduled Tribes of Tamil Nadu is under examination
- (c) & (d): Lambadi Community has been declared as Other Backward Class in Tamil Nadu, as it answers the criteria of a Backward Class community.
- (e) The matter is being examined as per modalities approved by the Government of India on 15 June, 1999.”

1.10 The above reply to the question was treated as an assurance and was required to be fulfilled by the Ministry of Tribal Affairs within three months of the date of the reply *i.e.*, by 29 February, 2000 but the assurance remained unfulfilled. The Ministry, however, sought extension of time upto 31 March, 2008 for fulfilling the assurance.

1.11 The Ministry of Tribal Affairs *vide* their O.M. No. 16012/7/2007-C&LM-I dated 28 September, 2007 requested for dropping of the assurance on the following ground:—

“Ministry is of the considered opinion that the answer given does not constitute an assurance. The Scheduled Tribes are notified by a Presidential Order under Article 342(1) of the Constitution. In June, 1999, the Government approved modalities for deciding the claims for inclusion in, exclusion from and other modifications in the Orders specifying Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes lists. According to these approved guidelines, only those claims that have been agreed to by the concerned State Government/UT Administration, the Registrar General of India and National Commission for Scheduled Tribes will be taken up for consideration. Whenever representations are received in the Ministry for inclusion of any community in the list of Scheduled Tribes of a State/UT, the Ministry forward these representations to the concerned State Government/UT Administration for recommendations as required under Article 342 of the Constitution. If the concerned State Government/UT Administration recommends the proposal, then the same is sent to the Registrar General of India (RGI). The RGI, if satisfied with the recommendations of the State Government/UT Administration, recommends the proposal to the Central Government. Thereafter, the Government refers the proposal to the National Commission for Scheduled Tribe for their recommendation. If the National Commission for Scheduled Tribe also recommends, the matter is placed before the Cabinet for a decision, after consulting the concerned administrative Ministries. Thereafter, the matter is put up before the Parliament in the form of a Bill to amend the Presidential Order.”

1.12 The Ministry further stated that “in case, there is any disagreement between the views of the State Government/UT Administration and the RGI, the views of the RGI are sent to the State Government for reviewing or further justifying their recommendation.” On receipt of the further clarification from the State

Government/UT Administration, the proposal is again referred to the RGI for comments. In such cases, where the RGI does not agree to the point of view of the State Government/UT Administration on a second reference, the Government of India may reject the said proposal. Claim that neither the RGI nor the concerned State Government/UT Administration have supported are rejected. Similarly, those cases where the State Government and the RGI favour inclusion/exclusion, but not supported by the National Commission for Scheduled Tribes are also rejected. The Ministry also stated that “any revision in the lists of Scheduled Tribes requires consultation with the concerned State Government/UT Administration, the Registrar General of India and the National Commission for Scheduled Tribes and this takes time. So, no definite time frame can be indicated for inclusion/exclusion of any community in the list of Scheduled Tribes”.

1.13 In view of the above, the Ministry with the approval of Hon’ble Minister of Tribal Affairs, stated that the assurance may not be kept pending for such a long period and requested for deletion of the assurance. The Ministry also stated that it had the approval of Minister of Tribal Affairs.

1.14 The Committee note that a question regarding Lambadi Community was asked on 30 November, 1999 seeking, *inter-alla*, information on the proposal for considering Lambadi Community as Scheduled Tribe in Tamil Nadu. In reply, it was, *inter-alla*, stated that the matter was being examined as per modalities approved by the Government of India on 15 June, 1999. This reply was treated as an assurance. The assurance remained unimplemented and the Ministry of Tribal Affairs requested for dropping the assurance on the ground that the Ministry was of the considered opinion that the answer given in the instant case did not constitute an assurance. According to the Ministry, any revision in the lists of Scheduled Tribes requires consultation with the concerned State Governments/Union Territory Administration, the Registrar General of India and the National Commission for Scheduled Tribes which is time consuming process and as such no definite time frame can be indicated for inclusion/exclusion of any community in the list of Scheduled Tribes. The Committee considered this request of the Ministry at their sitting held on 3 April, 2008 and decided not to drop the assurance.

1.15 The Committee note that in reply to the question, it was clearly stated that the “matter was being examined as per modalities approved by the Government of India”. In the opinion of the Committee, this reply constituted a clear-cut assurance as the question sought information on the steps taken to include that community in Scheduled Tribe. The Committee therefore, do not agree with the contention of the Ministry that the answer given in the instant case did not constitute an assurance. Further, in the absence of any precise information on the steps taken in the matter, the Committee are anxious to know the status of progress made in this regard. The Committee wish to point out that it is their prerogative to treat a particular reply as an assurance and it is not for the Ministry to give their “considered opinion” in such matters. The Committee, therefore, desire that the Ministry should furnish the chronological details of the steps taken by them in this case. They also urge the Ministry to take concrete measures for early implementation of the assurance.

[iii] Purchase from SC/ST Entrepreneurs

1.16 On 19 December, 2006, Shri Mohan Jena, MP, addressed the following Unstarred Question No. 3832 to the Minister of Small Scale Industries:—

- “(a) whether the Government proposes to purchase items from the entrepreneurs belonging to the SC/ST categories to financially empower them;
- (b) if so, the details thereof; and
- (c) the details of the recommendations of Group of Ministers in this regard?”

1.17 In reply, the Minister of Small Scale Industries & Agro and Rural Industries (Shri Mahabir Prasad) stated as follows:—

- “(a) & (b): Under the existing “Purchase & Price Preference Policy” for small scale industries (SSIs), there is no specific provisions for Government purchases from SC/ST-owned SSI units.
- (c) The recommendations of the Committee of Ministers on Dalit Affairs are yet to receive final approval.”

1.18 The above reply to part (c) of the question was treated as an assurance and was required to be implemented by the Ministry of Micro, Small and Medium Enterprises (Small Scale Industries) within three months of the date of reply *i.e.* by 18 March, 2007, however, the assurance has neither been fulfilled so far nor any extension of time sought to fulfil the same.

1.19 The Ministry of Micro, Small and Medium Enterprises *vide* their letter No. 9(1)/2006-MA dated 27 April, 2007 requested to drop the assurance on the following grounds :—

“The subject-matter of the question pertains to the Ministry of Social Justice and Empowerment (SJ & E) but it has been admitted in the name of the Ministry of Small Scale Industries. Although, it was not directly related to this Ministry, it could not be considered for transfer to the Ministry of Social Justice and Empowerment due to shortage of time. However, the question was replied to by the Ministry of Small Scale Industries on the basis of information collected from the Ministry of Social Justice and Empowerment. However, it may be seen that the answer to the Unstarred Question No. 3832 does not seem to constitute as assurance. Further, the recommendation of Committee of Ministers on Dalit Affairs are yet to receive final approval of Cabinet by the Ministry of SJ & E.”

1.20 Accordingly, the Ministry requested to delete the assurance in respect of Ministry of Small Scale Industries. The Ministry also stated that it had the approval of Minister (SSI) and Ministry of Agro and Rural Industries.

1.21 The Committee note that a question regarding ‘Purchase from SC/ST Entrepreneurs’ was asked on 19 December, 2006. The question sought information regarding proposal of the Government to purchase items from the entrepreneurs belonging to the SC/ST categories to empower them financially and the details of the

recommendations of the Group of Ministers in this regard. In reply, it was stated by the Government that there was no specific provisions for Government purchases from SC/ST owned SSI units under the existing "Purchase & Price Preference Policy for Small Scale Industries (SSIs)" and that the recommendations of the Committee of Ministers on Dalit Affairs were yet to receive final approval. This reply was treated as an assurance. However, the Ministry of Small Scale Industries (SSIs) requested for dropping this assurance on the ground that the answer given by them did not seem to constitute an assurance. The Ministry of SSIs also stated that the subject-matter of the question was not directly related to them and it could not be considered for transfer to the Ministry of Social Justice and Empowerment due to shortage of time. The request of the Ministry for dropping the assurance was considered by the Committee at their sitting held on 3 April, 2008 and they decided not to drop the assurance.

1.22 The Committee regret to note that the assurance could not be implemented by the Government even after a lapse of more than one and a half year. What is more regrettable is the fact that the Ministry of SSIs have now come out with the plea that the subject-matter of the question was not directly related to them and it could not be considered for transfer to the Ministry of Social Justice and Empowerment due to shortage of time. The Committee are not inclined to accept this plea of the Ministry of Small Scale Industries and they are of firm view that had the Ministry of SSIs been serious in taking the matter to its logical conclusion, they would have initiated appropriate steps for transfer of the subject-matter of assurance to the Ministry of Social Justice and Empowerment. Evidently, inaction was writ large in the Ministry of SSIs which displayed a casual attitude in this matter. The Committee trust that the Ministry of SSIs would, at least now, take appropriate steps to sort out the matter so that the assurance is implemented at the earliest. The Committee also express their unhappiness over the contention of the Ministry of SSIs that the reply to the question does not seem to constitute an assurance. The Committee wish to point out that it is their prerogative to treat a reply as an assurance and it is not for the Ministry to draw their own conclusion in such matters. The Committee also observe that the Ministry have not sought the necessary extension of time to implement the assurance. They trust that the Ministry will atleast now, seek requisite extension of time to implement the assurance.

[iv] Disposal of Wakf Cases

1.23 On 21 April, 1994 Shri Mohammad Ali Ashraf Fatmi and Shri Chhedi Paswan, MPs, addressed the following Unstarred Question No. 4154 to the Minister of Welfare:—

- (a) whether the Government have considered over expeditious disposal of the Wakf cases;
- (b) if so, the details thereof;
- (c) if not, the reasons therefor; and
- (d) the number of Wakf cases pending as on 31st January, 1994, State-wise?"

1.24 In reply, the then Minister of State in the Ministry of Welfare (Shri K.V. Thangka Balu) stated as follows:—

- “(a) to (b): The Central Government has from time to time, been drawing attention of State Governments/Union Territory Administrations, at the highest-level, to ensure expeditious disposal of wakf cases. The then Prime Minister had addressed a communication in 1976 to Chief Ministers of select States having large number of Wakf properties, suggesting ways and means for quick settlement of cases of adverse possession of cases of Wakf properties by State Government Departments and local bodies. The matter has thereafter been followed up by respective Welfare Ministers with the Chief Ministers of State Governments and Chief Executives of Union Territory Administrations.
- (c) Does not arise.
- (d) The information is being collected and will be laid on the Table of the House as soon as received from the State Government.”

1.25 The above reply to the question was treated as an assurance and was required to be fulfilled by the Ministry of Welfare within three months of the date of reply, *i.e.*, by 20 July, 1994. However, the assurance is yet to be implemented. The Ministry sought extension of time upto 20 January, 2008 to implement the assurance.

1.26 The Ministry of Minority Affairs *vide* their OMF. No. 10(12)/2007-Wakf dated 31 December, 2007, requested for dropping of the assurance on the following grounds :—

“The administration of wakfs is governed by the provisions of the Wakf Act, 1995. Section 32 of the Act provides that general superintendence of all wakfs in a State shall vest in the Board established or the State. Section 54 & 55 lays down the procedure for removal of encroachment from wakf properties by the State Wakf Board/State Government. Section 83 provides for constitution of Tribunals by the State Government. The entire issue raised in Part (d) of the above mentioned question, therefore, comes under the purview of State Government/State Wakf Board as per the provisions of the Wakf Act, 1995.

Rule 41 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in Lok Sabha lays down the criteria for admissibility of questions. Rule 41 (viii) lays down that the question should not relate to any matter which is not primarily the concern of the Government of India. Rule 41 (xvii) lays down that the question should not raise matters under the control of bodies or persons not primarily responsible to the Government of India.

The issues raised in Part (d) of the above mentioned Question do not relate to the issue on which a question in the Lok Sabha should normally be admissible. It has been the experience of the Ministry that State Governments do not respond promptly to such references from the Central Government and the compilation of data about wakf cases pending in various States, if attempted

afresh, is likely to take considerable time. There is no provision in the existing Wakf Act which makes furnishing such information by the State Wakf Board/State Governments mandatory, and this has proved to be a serious handicap in the Central Government's ability to monitor developments or compile data in respect of wakfs. This issue is already receiving attention of the Government and also of the Joint Parliamentary Committee on Wakfs and the possibility of amending the Act to facilitate collection and compilation of such information is being explored. Nevertheless, no such provision exists on date and it may not be practicable to collect the information from States on this issue within a reasonable time frame."

1.27 In view of the above position, the Ministry further submitted that no useful purpose would be served by pursuing the matter with the State Government afresh. The Ministry, therefore, requested the Committee to consider for dropping of assurance.

1.28 The Committee note that a question regarding Disposal of Wakf Cases was asked on 21 April, 1994. The question sought information regarding consideration of expeditious disposal of the Wakf cases by the Government and the State-wise number of Wakf cases pending as on 31 January, 1994. In reply, it was *inter-alla* stated that the State-wise information regarding the number of Wakf cases pending as on 31 January, 1994, was being collected and would be laid on the Table of the House as soon as received from the State Government. This reply was treated as an assurance. Later on, after 14 years, the Ministry of Minority Affairs requested for dropping the assurance, *inter-alla*, on the grounds that there is no provision in the existing Wakf Act, which makes furnishing such information by the State Wakf Board/State Government mandatory and this has proved to be a serious handicap in the Central Government's ability to compile data in respect of Wakfs. The Ministry further stated that it has been their experience that State Governments do not respond promptly to such references from the Central Government and the compilation of data about Wakf cases pending in various States is likely to take considerable time. According to the Ministry, the issue is already receiving attention of the Government and also of the Joint Parliamentary Committee on Wakf and the possibility of amending the Act to facilitate collection and compilation of the desired information is being explored. The Committee considered this request of the Ministry at their sitting held on 3 April, 2008 and decided not to drop the assurance.

1.29 The Committee are concerned to note that a categorical assurance given fourteen years ago remains unimplemented even after the lapse of such a long period and the Ministry have now stated that State Governments do not respond promptly and the compilation of data about Wakf cases pending in various States is likely to take considerable time. However, the Ministry have not mentioned about the steps taken by them to collect the desired information from the State Governments. The Committee, therefore, desire to be apprised of the chronological details of the steps taken so far by the Ministry to collect the requisite information and to implement the assurance.

[v] (A) Setting up of Atomic Power Plants in private sector, (B) Review of Atomic Energy Act and (C) Private Sector in Nuclear Power Generation

1.30 On 13 December, 2000 Shri Raghuvir Singh Kaushal, MP addressed the following Unstarred Question No. 3712 to the Prime Minister:

- “(a) whether the Government contemplate to amend the Atomic Energy Act, 1962 to rope in the participation of private sector in the setting up of the atomic energy plants in the country;
- (b) if so, the details thereof; and
- (c) the time by which the amended act is likely to take effect?”

1.31 In reply, the then Minister of State in the Department of Atomic Energy (Smt. Vasundhara Raje) stated as follows:—

“(a) to (c): Yes, Sir. The process of reviewing the Atomic Energy Act, 1962 (AE Act) and suggesting amendments with a view to, *inter-alia*, enable private sector participation in the production and supply of nuclear power, is currently underway. After finalizing its review, Government will introduce a bill in both the Houses of Parliament to amend the concerned sections of the Act.”

1.32 The above reply to the question was treated as an assurance and was required to be fulfilled by the Department of Atomic Energy within three months of the date of reply *i.e.*, by 12 March, 2001; but the assurance is yet to be implemented. The Ministry sought extension of time upto 30 June, 2008 to implement the assurance.

1.33 On 21 July, 2004, Shri Virendra Kumar, MP addressed the following Unstarred Question No. 1937 to the Prime Minister:—

- “(a) whether the Government proposes to review the Atomic Energy Act;
- (b) if so, the details thereof; and
- (c) the steps proposed to be taken in the said matter?”

1.34 In reply, the Minister of State in the Prime Minister's Office (Shri Prithviraj Chavari) stated as follows: —

“(a) to (c): The proposal is under consideration of the Government.”

1.35 The above reply to the question was also treated as an assurance and was required to be implemented by the Department of Atomic Energy within three months of the date of reply *i.e.*, by 20 October, 2004; but this assurance is also yet to be implemented. The Ministry sought extension of time upto 30 June, 2008 to implement the assurance.

1.36 On 29 November, 2006, Shri Jyotiraditya M. Scindia, MP addressed the following Unstarred Question No. 1095 to the Prime Minister:—

- “(a) whether the Government proposes to allow private sector participation including foreign countries and MNCs in the production of nuclear power;

- (b) if so, the details thereof and the reasons therefor; and
- (c) the steps contemplated to provide due security to the nuclear power plants and connected infrastructure?"

1.37 In reply, the Minister of State in the Prime Minister's Office (Shri Prithviraj Chavan) stated as follows:—

“(a) & (b): A proposal to amend the Atomic Energy Act, 1962 to enable private sector participation in nuclear power generation in the country is currently under consideration of the Government. However, no final decision has been taken.

- (c) Adequate security measures for physical protection of the facilities are already in place in all our nuclear power plants and connected infrastructure. The same measures would apply to new power plants.”

1.38 The above reply to parts (a) and (b) of the question was treated as an assurance and was required to be fulfilled by the Department of Atomic Energy within three months of the date of reply *i.e.*, by 28 February, 2006; but the assurance is yet to be implemented. The Ministry sought extension of time upto 30 June, 2008 to implement the assurance.

1.39 The Department of Atomic Energy *vide* their letter ID No. 11/7/03-Parl. dated 18 December, 2007, have requested the Committee for dropping of the aforesaid three assurances on the following grounds :—

“that an internal Committee constituted by the Department to undertake comprehensive review of the Atomic Energy Act, 1962 had finalised its review and suggested amendments to the Act. This Department has initiated necessary action for bringing out a comprehensive Atomic Energy Amendment Bill for approval of Parliament. After circulating the draft note for the Cabinet to the Ministries/Departments concerned and obtaining their comments/views, the draft Bill was submitted to the Ministry of Law and Justice for legal vetting in December 2003. The Legislative Department had then advised that as a new Government has taken over, inter-ministerial consultations in the Government of India should be done afresh for obtaining the comments of various Ministries/Departments concerned. Accordingly, with the approval of the PM, revised draft note to the Cabinet was circulated to the Ministries/Departments concerned on 20 April, 2005 for obtaining their views/comments afresh. After incorporating the comments/views received from various Ministries/Departments, a draft note was submitted to the Prime Minister in July 2005 for approval for placing before the Cabinet. Prime Minister then directed that the Department may undertake further assessment of the proposed draft amendments taking into account the recent developments including harmonization of its provision with WMD and their delivery system (Prohibition of Unlawful Activities) Act, 2005, implications of the joint statement with the US and changes that may be required for preparing nuclear power sector for foreign participation. Accordingly, after reviewing the proposed amendments

by the Department, a revised draft note to the Cabinet was circulated to the Ministries/Departments concerned on 21.10.2005 for obtaining their views/comments afresh. A revised Cabinet Note incorporating the comments received from the various Ministries/Departments was sent to the Legislative Department, Ministry of Law and Justice for legal vetting on 30.03.2006. Based on the advice of the Legislative Department, a revised note to the Cabinet and revised draft Bill were again submitted to the Legislative Department for vetting. On the basis of response received from the Legislative Department, draft Bill and a draft Cabinet Note were submitted on 22.1.2007 for obtaining approval of the Prime Minister as Minister-in-Charge. Prime Minister had approved the submission of the Note to the Cabinet with certain modifications *vide* PMO Note dated 24.4.2007. After carrying out the modifications, the draft Bill and Cabinet Note were submitted to the Law Ministry for vetting on 12.6.2007 which were duly vetted by the Legislative Department *vide* their Dy. No. dated 10.8.2007. The final Note for Cabinet was sent to Cabinet Secretary on 22.8.2007. Provisions to facilitate private sector participation in Nuclear Power Generation had been deleted in the final version of the Cabinet note. This item has, however, been withdrawn in the meeting of the Cabinet held on 6.9.2007. The matter will now be reviewed by the Government depending on the changing global scenario.”

1.40 In view of the above, the Department of Atomic Energy requested to drop the assurances from the list of pending assurances. The Department of Atomic Energy also stated that it had the approval of the Minister of State (PMO).

1.41 The Committee note that three questions regarding review of Atomic Energy Act, 1962 and the participation of private sector in the setting up of the atomic energy plants in the country for production of nuclear power were asked between December 2000 and November 2006. In reply to these questions, it was, *inter-alia*, stated that the process of reviewing the Atomic Energy Act, 1962 to enable private sector participation in the production and supply of nuclear power was under consideration and a Bill to amend the said Act would be introduced in Parliament. These replies were treated as assurances. However, the Department of Atomic Energy requested for dropping these assurances, *inter-alia*, on the ground that after getting the draft Bill and Cabinet Note vetted by the Legislative Department, the provisions to facilitate private sector participation in Nuclear Power Generation had been deleted in the final version of the Cabinet Note and this item had, however, been withdrawn in the meeting of the Cabinet held on 06 September, 2007. According to the Department, the matter would be reviewed by the Government depending on the changing global scenario. The Committee considered this request of the Department of Atomic Energy at their sitting held on 3 April, 2008 and decided not to drop the assurances.

1.42 The Committee note that the first assurance on the subject was given on 13 December, 2000 and even after the lapse of about eight years and despite several steps taken by the Government to review/amend the Atomic Energy Act, 1962, no final decision has been taken by the Government to give effect to the desired amendments and also to implement the assurance. Although the Government is stated to have now

decided to review the matter depending on the changing global scenario, the Committee are of the considered view that the subject-matter of the assurances is very important as it relates to the Atomic Power Plants in the country. The Committee, therefore, desire that utmost priority should be accorded to the matter and a final decision be taken at the earliest to implement the pending assurances.

CHAPTER II
REQUESTS FOR DROPPING OF ASSURANCES
(ACCEPTED)

[i] Elementary Education

2.1 On 16 March, 1999, Prof. Ajit Kumar Mehta and Shri Jayarama I.M. Shetty, MPs addressed the following Starred Question No. 295 to the Minister of Human Resource Development:—

- “(a) whether attention of the Government has been drawn to the news-item captioned “Plan to make elementary education a Fundamental Right-where is fund: Empty coffers tell the tale” in the ‘Hindustan times’ dated February 17, 1999;
- (b) if so, the facts thereof and the observations made therein;
- (d) the main recommendations of the expert-group appointed to assess the feasibility of making elementary education as Fundamental Right;
- (e) whether the Government have accepted all the recommendations;
- (f) if so, the details thereof and if not, the reasons therefor; and
- (g) the further reaction of the Government in this regard?”

2.2 In reply, the then Minister of Human Resource Development, Minister of Science and Technology and Minister of Department of Ocean Development (Dr. Murli Manohar Joshi) stated as follows:—

- “(a): Yes, Sir.
- (b) and (c): The News-item refers to excerpts from the report of the Group of Experts constituted by the Department of Education in June, 1997 to examine the financial requirements of States/UTs for achieving the goal of Universalisation of Elementary Education, to suggest measures for mobilizing additional resources and to determine suitable sharing arrangements between the Centre and States. The major findings and recommendations of the Group include:
 - (i) Requirement of an additional estimated amount of Rs. 1,36,822 crore over a period of ten years to achieve the goal of Universalisation of Elementary Education.
 - (ii) Enhancement of Government allocations for Education to 60% of GDP, assuming an annual growth rate of 5% in real terms over this period.
 - (iii) Provision of additional resources for achieving Universalisation of Elementary Education through augmentation of tax revenues, increase in non-tax revenues and restructuring of Government expenditure in favour of education.

(d) to (f): Government's response would follow a detailed examination of the report."

2.3 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 15 June 1999. However, the assurance is yet to be implemented and the Ministry have not sought any extension of time to implement the assurance.

2.4 The Ministry of Human Resource Development *vide* their O.M. F.No.7-14/2007-EE-4 dated 12 November, 2007 requested for dropping the assurance on the following ground :—

“A proposal to make right to Free and Compulsory Education a Fundamental Right, as resolved by the then United Front Government in its CMP, was discussed in the Conference of Chief Ministers on 4-5 July, 1996. The Proposal was also discussed in the Conference of State Education Ministers held in August, 1996. As per recommendations made in the meeting of State Education Ministers (SEM), a Committee was constituted under the Chairmanship of Sh. M.R. Saikia, the then MoS for HRD to examine the legal, financial, administrative and academic implications of the proposal. The report of the Committee of State Education Ministers on implications of the proposal to make Elementary Education a Fundamental Right had recommended the setting up of a Group of Experts to assess the financial resource requirements for operationalising the then proposed 83rd Amendment Bill making the Right to Free Compulsory Education upto 14 years a Fundamental Right.

Accordingly, the Group of Experts was constituted in June, 1997 under the Chairmanship of Prof. Tapas Majumdar. The Group submitted its report in January, 1999. The major findings and recommendations of the Group included:

- (i) Requirement of an additional estimated amount of Rs. 1,36,822 crore over a period of ten years to achieve the goal of universalisation of Elementary Education.
- (ii) Enhancement of government allocations for Education to 6% of GDP, assuming an annual growth rate of 5% in real terms over this period.
- (iii) Provision of additional resources for achieving universalisation of Elementary Education through augmentation of tax revenues, increase in non-tax revenues and restructuring of Government expenditure in favour of education.

Subsequently, a Cabinet Note proposing amendment of Constitution of India was prepared. Cabinet considered the Cabinet Note dated 12.05.1997 and approved certain proposals. In pursuance of the approval of the proposals by the Cabinet, Constitution (83rd Amendment) Bill, 1997 was introduced in the Rajya Sabha. The Bill was referred to the Parliamentary Standing Committee (PSC) on HRD. PSC on HRD gave their report on 24 November, 1997. 165th Report of the Law Commission was also received which also looked into the issue of making elementary education free and compulsory. Subsequently, a

Cabinet Note dated 3 December, 1999 was put up proposing withdrawal of the Constitution (83rd Amendment) Bill, 1997 and introduction of new Bill in Parliament. The Union Cabinet considered the Cabinet Note dated 3 December, 1999 and decided that the matter, in the first instance be considered by the Group of Ministers (GoM). GoM gave their recommendations/decisions. Cabinet Note dated 10 September, 2001 was put up seeking permission to withdraw Constitution (83rd Amendment) Bill, 1997 and to introduce a fresh bill to make elementary education a Fundamental Right. Cabinet approved the proposal seeking permission to withdraw Constitution (83rd Amendment) Bill, 1997 and to introduce a fresh Bill to make elementary education a Fundamental Right. Fresh Bill—Constitution (93rd Amendment) Bill, 2001 to make Elementary Education a Fundamental Right was introduced in the Lok Sabha on 26 November, 2001. The Bill was considered and passed by the Lok Sabha with the amendment that the 'Ninety-Third Amendment' be substituted by the 'Eighty-Sixth Amendment.' The Bill as passed by the Lok Sabha was considered and passed by the Rajya Sabha on 14 May, 2002.

The Constitution (86th Amendment) Act, 2002, enacted in December, 2002 seeks to make free and compulsory education a Fundamental Right for all Children in the age group 6-14 years by inserting a new Article 21A in Part III ("Fundamental Right") of the Constitution. The new Article 21A reads as follows:—

"21A. Right to Education

The State shall provide free and compulsory education to all children of the age of six to fourteen years in such manner as the State may, by law, determine."

The reconstituted Central Advisory Board of Education (CABE) in its meeting on 10-11 August, 2004, had constituted a Committee under the Chairmanship of Shri Kapil Sibal, the then Minister of State for Science and Technology and Ocean Development, to suggest a draft of the Legislation envisaged under Article 21A of the Constitution as well as to consider other issues related to elementary education. The Report of the Committee, containing "essential provisions" of the draft legislation, was submitted on 2 July, 2005 and considered by CABE in its meeting on 14-15th July, 2005.

Based on the suggestions and comments received during the CABE meeting, a complete version of the draft legislation was prepared and sent to Chief Secretaries of all States/UTs and placed on the website for comments from the public at large. In the meanwhile, the PM constituted a High Level Group (HLG) comprising HRM, Finance Minister, Dy. Chairman, Planning Commission and Chairman of the PM's Economic Advisory Council to examine the legal, constitutional and financial implications of the Bill. The recommendations of the HLG were forwarded to the PM for his consideration.

Based on further consultations, it was proposed that instead of Central Legislation, a Model Right to Education Bill should be formulated and circulated as a framework to the States/UTs. Accordingly, a Model Bill on Right to Education

was drafted. In order to motivate the State Governments to adopt the Model Right to Education Bill, 2006, it was proposed that the funding under Sarva Shiksha Abhiyan (SSA) will be made contingent upon enactment of appropriate State Acts on free and compulsory education where none exist, or suitable adaptation of existing Acts.

Draft note for the Cabinet and draft Model Right to Education Bill, 2006 were circulated to various Ministers/Departments of Government of India with a view to seek their comments thereon. Similarly, the draft Model Bill on Right to Education as well as the proposals to incentivize the States to adopt the Model Bill was sent to all the States/UTs for obtaining their considered views. Comments from 23 States were received.

The State Governments/UTs who have responded to the draft Model Bill have opposed the linking of SSA funding with the adoption of the Model Bill. They have also opposed the provision to make Elementary Education First charge on State revenues after law and order. States have also objected to the financial liability for Free and Compulsory Education to be taken by the States. They have drawn attention to the fact that the Education Cess is levied by the Central Government and the Central Government should substantially fund education and make all efforts to ensure the norms of 6% of GDP on education. Regarding enactment of legislation by the States on the lines of the Model Bill, the comments furnished by the States/UTs are mixed.

In the meanwhile, Hon'ble HRM had written a letter to Hon'ble Prime Minister on 4 April, 2007 apprising him of the developments pursuant to the recommendations of the High Level Group on Right to Education Bill and requested for advice and guidance in the matter keeping in view strong reservations expressed by various States.

In reply, Prime Minister has stated that we are committed to facilitate the enactment of an appropriate law that would enable the realization of making education a fundamental right as required by the Constitution. However, given the complexity of the matter and the difficulties encountered by the draft Model Bill, we have been advised to once again convene the meeting of the High Level Group. HLG may effectively examine the issues involved and advise the Government on how best to take the matter forward with a view to fulfilling our commitment. The meeting of HLG has been held on 6 November, 2007.

It would be observed from the position explained above that the Report, findings and recommendations of the Group of expert constituted by this Department under the Chairmanship of Prof. Tapas Mjumdar in June, 1997 and the Government's response to that Report is no longer relevant now. After the submission of the Report of the aforesaid Group of experts, many new developments have taken place leading to insertion of Article 21A in the Constitution of India consequent upon enactment of 86th Constitution Amendment Act as explained above. After the notification of 86th Constitution Amendment Act, this Department is in the process of putting in place a suitable consequential legislation envisaged in Article 21A."

2.5 According to the Ministry, implementation of the assurance given in reply to parts (d) to (f) of the Lok Sabha Starred Question No. 295 dated 16.3.1999 regarding Government's response following a detailed examination of Expert Group's Report is no longer relevant. The Ministry, have with the approval of MOS (SE&L) in the Ministry of Human Resource, therefore, requested to drop the assurance.

2.6 The Committee note that a question regarding Elementary Education was asked on 16 March, 1999. The question sought information on the feasibility of making elementary education as Fundamental Right. In reply, it was *inter-alla* stated that Government's response would follow a detailed examination of the report of the Expert Group constituted in June, 1997. This reply was treated as an assurance. The assurance remained unimplemented and the Ministry of Human Resource Development have now requested for dropping the assurance on the ground that the Constitution (86th Amendment) Act, 2002, enacted in December, 2002, seeks to make free and compulsory education a Fundamental Right for all Children in the age group 6 – 14 years, by inserting a new Article 21A in Part III ("Fundamental Right") of the Constitution. The Committee considered this request of the Ministry at their sitting held on 03 April, 2008 and having been satisfied with the progress made in the matter, decided to drop the assurance.

[ii] Property of Revenue Officials

2.7 On 29 November, 2002 Prof. Dukha Bhagat and Shri Ram Tahal Choudhary, MPs addressed the following Unstarred Question No. 1855 to the Minister of Finance and Company Affairs:—

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

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

- (a) & (b): Yes, Sir. Searches are conducted and cases registered by the CBI.
- (c): CBI has registered 24 cases in respect of Group 'A' and 'B' officers of Income Tax during the last 3 years as under:

Year	2000-01	2001-02	2002 (upto 31.10.2002)
Cases	2	14	8

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

Year	2000	2001	2002 (upto 31.3.2002)
Cases	8	9	4

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

2.9 The above reply to the question was treated as an assurance and was required to be fulfilled by the Ministry of Finance within three months of the date of reply, *i.e.*, by 28 February 2003 but the assurance is yet to be implemented. The Ministry sought extension of time upto 28 February, 2008 to implement the assurance in case the Committee decided not to drop the assurance.

2.10 The Ministry of Finance *vide* their O.M. No. 9/1/2003-Coord. dated 14 February 2003 requested for dropping the assurance on the ground that the cases are under investigation by the CBI and it may take a long time before the CBI can conclude its enquiries. The Committee considered the request of the Ministry at their sitting held on 15 March, 2007 and decided not to drop the assurance and the Committee in their 18th Report (14th Lok Sabha) *vide* para 1.47 expressed deep anguish over the widespread corruption in revenue generation Departments of the Government. The Committee also recommended that concrete steps be taken to check the menace of corruption at the earliest and the Committee be apprised of the steps so taken.

2.11 The Ministry of Finance *vide* their O.M of even number dated 23 November, 2007 have again requested to drop the assurance on the following grounds:—

“In order to check the menace of corruption, several steps have been taken by the CBEC & CBDT like reducing interface between the public and the officials, computerization and transparency in the system, simplification of rules and procedures, not posting the officers of doubtful integrity to sensitive posts, strengthening of vigilance set up, etc.

Twenty four cases were registered by the CBI in respect of Group 'A' & 'B' officers of Income Tax involving 13 Group A officers & 11 Group B officers. Regarding Group A officers, sanction for prosecution has been accorded by the Department in 12 cases and in 1 case the officer has passed away and the proceedings have abated. Further charge-sheet under Rule 14 of the CCS (CCA) Rules have been issued in 10 cases. The CBI has filed charge-sheet in 2 cases. A penalty of dismissal from service has been imposed in one case.

Regarding Group 'B' officers, out of the 11 officers, prosecution proceedings were initiated in 7 cases but the Courts have discharged 3 officers. Out of the

remaining 4 officers, one officer has been compulsorily retired after conclusion of departmental proceedings, charge-sheet under Rule 14 of the CCS (CCA) Rules has been issued in another 2 cases and in one case the CBI has not reported anything.

The CBDT has also mentioned that the action has been taken in all the cases. The prosecution proceedings take a long time to conclude and it is not possible to say as to how many persons will ultimately be found guilty and punished.

Twenty one cases were registered by the CBI in respect of Group 'A', 'B' & 'C' officers/officials of Customs and Central excise. Information regarding status of these cases is awaited from the CBI. However, sometime back, *vide* their OM dated 19 February, 2007, the CBEC had reported the status in respect of 13 cases. Out of 13 cases, 10 cases are under trial. In one case, conviction has been made. One case has been closed and one case has abated as accused has expired. It may be worth mentioning here that the final outcome of the cases will be known after the court proceedings are over."

2.12 In view of the above, the Ministry, with the approval of MoS (Revenue), requested the Committee to drop the assurance.

2.13 The Committee note that a question regarding Property of Revenue Officials was asked on 29 November, 2002. The question sought information on the number of cases of corruption and tax evasion registered against officers of Income tax, Customs and Central Excise who possessed property disproportionate to their income. In reply, the Government, *inter-alia*, furnished the statistics on number of cases registered by CBI against officers/officials of Income Tax and Customs and Central Excise during the year 2000-01 to 2002. It was also stated that final report has been received from CBI only in one case related to officer of Income Tax and in case of Customs and Central Excise officials, two cases were pending trial; one case was closed; prosecution was sanctioned in one case; the officer was facing departmental action in one case and the rest of the cases were being investigated by the CBI. This reply was treated as an assurance. As the assurance remained unimplemented, the Ministry of Finance requested for dropping the assurance on the ground that cases were under investigation of the CBI and might take long time and thereafter litigation might follow. The Committee considered this request of the Ministry at their sitting held on 15 March, 2007 and in paragraph 1.47 of their Eighteenth Report (Fourteenth Lok Sabha) desired that the status report of the assurance be furnished by the Ministry to the Committee to enable them to take a final decision in the matter. Subsequently, the Ministry of Finance furnished status report on the cases registered by CBI against officers/officials of Income Tax and Customs and Central Excise. The Ministry also elaborated on the steps taken by Central Board of Direct Taxes and Central Board of Excise and Customs to check the menace of corruption. The Committee considered the information furnished by the Ministry at their sitting held on 3 April, 2008 and taking into account the reply now furnished by the Ministry, decided to drop the assurance.

[iii] Conduct of Entrance Examination in Other Languages

2.14 On 15 July, 2004 Shri Hari Kewal Prasad, M.P., addressed the following Unstarred Question No.1156 to the Minister of Defence:—

- “(a) whether the entrance examination to officer cadre and other cadre in defence service is conducted only in English;
- (b) if so, the reasons therefor;
- (c) whether the army alone is short of 13000 ranks of Captains and Majors;
- (d) whether the Government is aware that a large number of courageous and intelligent rural youth are unable to take Officer grade examination because of English language;
- (e) whether the Government proposed to conduct entrance examination to officer cadre and other cadre in defence services in Hindi and other regional languages also;
- (f) if so, the details thereof and the steps taken by the Government in this regard; and
- (g) if not, the reasons therefor?”

2.15 In reply, the then Minister of Defence (Shri Pranab Mukherjee) stated as follows:—

“(a) to (g): A Statement is attached.

**STATEMENT REFERRED TO IN REPLY TO PARTS (a) TO (g) OF
LOK SABHA UNSTARRED QUESTION NO. 1156 FOR 15.7.2004**

The entrance examination for Combined Defence Services (CDS) and National Defence Academy (NDA) & National Academy (NA) for Officers Cadre in Armed Forces is conducted by Union Public Service Commission (UPSC). There are three papers for CDS examination which are English, General Knowledge and Elementary Mathematics and three papers for NDA & NA examination which are English, General Knowledge and Mathematics. The question papers in General Knowledge and Mathematics in the NDA & NA examination and in General Knowledge and Elementary Mathematics in the CDS examination are printed bilingually that is in English and Hindi from the year 2004. As regards recruitment of Lower Ranks in Armed Forces, the examinations are conducted bilingually.

There is a shortage of 12447 officers in the ranks of Major and below in the Army. In view of the fact that the question papers are printed bilingually, the issue of rural youth being unable to take officers grade examination does not arise.

In pursuance of the Official Language Resolution, 1968 passed by both the Houses of the Parliament, the option to write answers in any of the

languages included in the Eighth Schedule of the Constitution of India has been extended only in the Civil Services (Main) Examination conducted by UPSC. The Question of extension of this facility to other Examinations conducted by UPSC is under consideration of the Government on the basis of the recommendations made by the Dr. Satish Chandra Committee. In view of the importance and sensitivity of the matter and divergent views on the subject, Government's endeavour is to seek a consensus and evolve a nationally acceptable policy after holding wider consultation with the State Governments and others concerned, efforts for which are on.

2.16 The above reply to the question was treated as an assurance and was required to be implemented by the Ministry of Defence within three months of the date of the reply *i.e.* by 14 October, 2004. However the assurance is yet to be implemented. As the subject matter of the assurance was being looked into by the Ministry of Personnel, Public Grievances and Pensions, the Ministry of Defence requested for its transfer which was acceded to by the Ministry of Personnel, Public Grievances and Pensions.

2.17 The Ministry of Personnel, Public Grievances and Pensions sought extension of time up to 31 March, 2008 for fulfilment of the assurance.

2.18 The Ministry of Personnel, Public Grievances and Pensions *vide* their O.M No. 42012/1/2004-Estt.(B) dated 29 November, 2007 stated that there were other assurances on the same subject in the name of the Ministry relating to the multilingual system/Indian languages as medium of examinations conducted by the UPSC and these assurances have been dropped by the Committee on Government Assurances, Lok Sabha. The Ministry further stated that as the other assurances relating to Dr. Satish Chandra Committee's recommendations on competitive examinations in Indian languages by the UPSC for recruitment to various services have been dropped by the Committee, the Committee is requested to consider dropping of the assurance arising out of Unstarred Question No.1156.

2.19 In this connection, it was stated that twenty-one assurances given in reply to various Starred/Unstarred Questions tabled from 21 May, 1990 to 01 December, 2004 regarding conduct of UPSC examinations in Indian languages, were dropped by the Committee at their sitting held on 12 October, 2007 as not even 5% of the candidates opted for 8th Schedule languages other than Hindi, as the language medium for the Civil Services (Main) Examination conducted by UPSC.

2.20 In view of the above, the Ministry requested for dropping the assurance and also stated that it had the approval of the Minister of State in Personnel, Public Grievances and Pensions.

2.21 The Committee note that a question regarding Conducting of Entrance Exam in other Languages was asked on 15 July, 2004 seeking information whether entrance examination to officer cadre and other cadre in defence services was conducted only in English and whether the Government proposed to conduct such entrance examination in Hindi and other regional languages. In reply, it was *inter-alia* stated by the Government that in pursuance of Official Language Resolution, 1968, the option to

write answers in any of the languages included in the Eighth Schedule of the Constitution have been extended only in Civil Services (Main Examination) and the question of extension of this facility to other examinations conducted by UPSC was under consideration. This reply was treated as an assurance. The assurance remained unimplemented. The Ministry of Personnel, Public Grievances and Pensions requested for dropping the assurance on the ground that other assurances on the same subject were dropped by the Committee earlier and as such this assurance may also be dropped. The Committee considered this request of the Ministry at their sitting held on 3 April, 2008 and noted that 21 similar assurances given in reply to various Starred/Unstarred Questions tabled from 21 May, 1990 to 01 December, 2004 regarding conduct of UPSC examinations in Indian languages, were earlier dropped by the Committee. Accordingly, the Committee acceded to the request of the Ministry and decided not to pursue this assurance as well.

[iv] Two-child norm for Panchayat polls

2.22 On 14 March, 2007, Shri Narahari Mahato, MP, addressed the following Unstarred Question No. 2138 to the Minister of Panchayat Raj:—

- “(a) whether some States like West Bengal, Haryana, Rajasthan, Andhra Pradesh, Madhya Pradesh and Orissa have adopted the ‘two child’ norm for Panchayat polls;
- (b) if so, the details therefor;
- (c) whether 79th Constitution Amendment Bill, introduced in the Rajya Sabha in 1992 on the subject, is pending for consideration;
- (d) if so, the details thereof;
- (e) whether the Bill is likely to be taken for consideration during the ensuing session of Parliament; and
- (f) if not, the reasons therefor?”

2.23 In reply, the Minister of Panchayati Raj (Shri Mani Shankar Aiyar) stated as follows:—

- “(a) & (b): The ‘two child’ norm for Panchayat Polls has been adopted by Rajasthan, Andhra Pradesh and Orissa. Madhya Pradesh initially made a similar announcement but subsequently modified the ‘two-child’ norm to a ‘three-child norm’. At present, no such norm exists in West Bengal or Haryana.
- (c) to (f): The Constitution (Seventy-Ninth Amendment) Bill, 1992 was introduced in the Rajya Sabha in December, 1992. The Bill seeks to amend the Directive Principles of State Policy to provide that the State shall endeavour to promote population control and the small family norm and to include in the Fundamental duties, a duty to promote and adopt the small family norm. Under the provisions of the Bill, a person shall be disqualified for being chosen as, and for being a member of either House of Parliament or

the Legislative Assembly or, as the case may be, either of the Legislature of the State, if he/she has more than two children. However, it will not apply to those who already have more than two children or those who beget an additional child within one year of the commencement of the Act.

The Bill was referred to the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Human Resource Development for examination. The Committee examined the Bill and recommended the Bill for passage without any change. While recommending the Bill for passage, the Committee also recommended that the Government might convene a meeting of leaders of various political parties in Parliament to evolve consensus to ensure the passage of the Bill. However, no consensus could emerge among the political parties. This issue was discussed in the meeting of the Consultative Committee of the Parliament on 2nd May, 2003 where a consensus emerged among the members on the need for more effective measures for controlling population growth in the country.

Since the policy of the Government is to keep a family welfare programme as voluntary, free from any incentives, disincentives or coercion, the option of withdrawing the Bill is under the consideration of the Government.

2.24 The above reply to the question was treated as an assurance and was required to be implemented by the Ministry of Panchayati Raj within three months of the date of reply *i.e.*, by 13 June, 2007; but the assurance is yet to be implemented. The Ministry sought no extension of time to implement the assurance.

2.25 The Ministry of Health and Family Welfare *vide* their OM No. 11016/6/2007-Ply dated 16 November, 2007 requested for dropping of the assurance on the following grounds:—

“The Constitution (Seventy-Ninth Amendment) Bill, 1992” has been pending before the Rajya Sabha since 1992. The Bill seeks to amend the Directive Principles of State Policy to provide that the State shall endeavor to promote population control and the small family norm and to include in the Fundamental duties, a duty to promote and adopt the small family norm. Under the provisions of the Bill, a person shall be disqualified for being chosen as, and for being a member of either House of Parliament or the Legislative Assembly or, as the case may be, either of the Legislature of the State, if he/she has more than two children. However it will not apply to those who already have more than two children or those who beget an additional child within one year of the commencement of the Act.

The Bill was referred to the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Human Resource Development for examination. The Committee examined the Bill and recommended the Bill for passage without any change. While recommending the Bill for passage, the Committee also recommended that the Government might convene a meeting of leaders of various political parties in Parliament to ensure the passage of the Bill.

Accordingly, meetings were held on 14 August, 1997 and 13 December 1999. However, no consensus could emerge in these meetings. In the last meeting held

on 13 December 1999, many leaders were of the view that the Bill needs to be withdrawn from the Rajya Sabha.

A Cabinet Note, seeking the advice of the Cabinet on this issue was prepared and sent to the Cabinet Secretariat on 5 September, 2000. The Cabinet in its meeting held on 16 November, 2000 deferred the matter with a view to continue the consultations with leaders of the political parties in the Parliament to evolve consensus in favour of the Bill.

This issue was discussed in the meeting of the Consultative Committee of the Parliament on 2 May, 2003, where a consensus emerged among the Members on the need for more effective measures for controlling population growth in the country. However, it was felt that there was a need for larger consensus on the matter, for which another meeting of leaders of political parties could be convened. Since the policy of the Government is to keep the family welfare programme as voluntary and free from any incentives, disincentives or coercion, the option of withdrawing the Bill is still open.”

2.26 The Ministry further stated that in view of the requirement of political consensus on this issue, and present policy of non-coercive, voluntarism for adoption of small family, it may not be possible to fulfil this assurance. The Ministry, therefore, with the approval of Minister of State for Health & Family Welfare, requested for dropping this assurance.

2.27 The Committee note that a question regarding Two-Child Norm for Panchayat Polls was asked on 14 March, 2007. The question *inter-alia* sought information regarding adoption of two-child norm for Panchayat Polls by some States, introduction of 79th Constitution amendment Bill on the subject in Rajya Sabha and its details. In reply, it was *inter-alia* stated by the Government that the two-child norm for panchayat polls has been adopted by some States and at present no such norms exist in West Bengal or Haryana. It was also stated that the option of withdrawing the Constitutional Amendment Bill on this aspect was under consideration of the Government. This reply was treated as an assurance. The assurance remained unimplemented and the Ministry of Health and Family Welfare requested for dropping the assurance on the ground that in view of the requirement of political consensus on the issue of two-child norm for panchayat polls and the present policy of non-coercive, voluntarism for adoption of small family, it may not be possible to fulfill the assurance. The Committee considered this request of the Ministry at their sitting held on 03 April, 2008 and having been satisfied with the reasons advanced by the Ministry, decided to drop the assurance.

[v] Education to Girls

2.28 On 20 December, 2005 Sarvashri Narendra Kumar Kushawaha, Ashok Kumar Rawat, Shishupal Patle, Prof. Mahadeorao Shiwankar and Shri Munshi Ram, M.Ps., addressed the following Unstarred Question No.4078 to the Minister of Human Resource Development:—

- “(a) whether some States are neglecting the scheme launched by the Union Government for promotion of education of Dalit Girls and backward people as reported in the Dainik Jagaran dated August 27, 2005;

- (b) if so, the names of the States which have not been able to implement the said scheme ;
- (c) the number of residential schools for the children of backward castes at block level in remote areas;
- (d) the number of States which have started such schools; and
- (e) the steps Government propose to get the scheme implemented in all the remaining States ?”

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

“(a) to (e) : Government of India has sanctioned 750 Kasturba Gandhi Balika Vidyalayas (KGBV) in 21 eligible States of the country. Out of 750 KGBV schools, 503 KGBVs are reported to be operational so far in 13 States. The States where the KGBV schools have not yet been operationalized are Arunachal Pradesh, Bihar, Haryana, Maharashtra, Meghalaya, Punjab, Tripura and West Bengal. The Central Government is closely monitoring the status of the programme.”

2.30 The above reply of 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 the reply *i.e.* by 19 March, 2006, but the assurance is yet to be implemented.

2.31 The Minister of State for Human Resource Development *vide* her D.O.No.10-43/2006-EE.8 dated 14 March, 2006 addressed to Minister of State for Parliamentary Affairs and the Ministry of Human Resource Development *vide* their D.O. No.10-43/2005-EE.8 dated 28 December, 2007 requested the Committee to drop the assurance on the following grounds :—

“The Kasturba Gandhi Balika Vidyalaya (KGBV) Scheme has been launched in July, 2004 for setting up residential schools at upper primary level for girls belonging predominantly to SC/ST/OBC and minority communities in educationally backward blocks of the country. The Government of India has sanctioned 750 KGBVs between December, 2004 and May, 2005. Based on the model of the KGBV adopted by the States, the residential schools involve construction of either a new upper primary school or addition of a hostel facility in an existing upper primary school. Most of the States have already initiated the construction process. Pending their construction, the residential schools are presently being run in rented accommodation. As on date, 642 KGBVs (86%) residential school have been reported to have been made operational by the concerned States. The Government of India has asked the lagging States to expedite operationalization of the remaining KGBVs.”

2.32 In view of the above, the Ministry requested that the reply to the question may not be treated as an assurance and the assurance may be dropped from the list of pending assurances.

2.33 The Committee note that a question regarding Education to Girls was asked on 20 December, 2005. The question sought information on non-implementation of

the scheme launched by the Union Government for promotion of education of Dalit Girls and backward people by some States. In reply, it was, *inter-alia*, stated that the Government had sanctioned 750 Kasturba Gandhi Balika Vidyalayas (KGBVs) in 21 eligible States and was closely monitoring the status of the programme. This reply was treated as an assurance. The assurance remained unimplemented and the Ministry of Human Resource Development requested for dropping the assurance, *inter-alia*, on the ground that out of 750 sanctioned KGBVs, 642 KGBVs residential schools are reported to have been made operational by the concerned States and the Government have asked the lagging States to expedite the operationalisation of the remaining KGBVs. The Committee considered this request of the Ministry at their sitting held on 3 April, 2008 and after being satisfied by the progress made in operationalisation of KGBVs, decided to drop the assurance. The Committee, however, trust that earnest efforts would continue to be made to operationalise the remaining 108 KGBVs at the earliest possible.

NEW DELHI;
15 October, 2008
23 Asvina, 1930 (Saka)

HARIN PATHAK,
Chairman,
Committee on Government Assurances.

MINUTES
SEVENTH SITTING

Minutes of the sitting of the Committee on Government Assurances (2007-2008) held on 03 April, 2008 in Committee Room 'D' Parliament House Annexe, New Delhi.

The Committee sat from 1130 hours to 1230 hours on Thursday, 03 April, 2008.

PRESENT

Shri Harin Pathak — *Chairman*

MEMBERS

2. Dr. K. Dhanaraju
3. Shri Biren Singh Engti
4. Shri Sunil Khan
5. Shri Vijoy Krishna
6. Shri Rasheed Masood
7. Smt. M.S.K. Bhavani Rajenthiran
8. Shri Aruna Kumar Vundavalli

SECRETARIAT

1. Shri S. Bal Shekar — *Joint Secretary*
2. Shri B.S. Dahiya — *Deputy Secretary*
3. Shri V.P. Goel — *Deputy Secretary-II*

At the outset, the Chairman welcomed the Members and apprised them briefly about the agenda for the sitting. The Committee then took up the following ten Memoranda pertaining to requests received from various Ministries/Departments for dropping of assurances:—

Memorandum No. 37 Request for dropping of assurance given on 16 March, 1999 in reply to Starred Question No. 295 regarding 'Elementary Education'.

The Committee considered the above memorandum and noted that the Constitution (86th Amendment) Act, 2002, enacted in December, 2002 seeks to make free and compulsory education a Fundamental Right for all Children in the age group 6-14 years by inserting a new Article 21-A in Part III ("Fundamental Right") of the Constitution. Accordingly, the Committee agreeing to the reasons furnished by the Ministry, decided to drop the assurance.

Memorandum No. 38 Request for dropping of assurance given on 14 March, 2000 in reply to Unstarred Question No. 2839 regarding 'Revision of SC/ST List'.

The Committee considered the above memorandum and noted that a number of States/Union Territory Administrations sent proposals for inclusion of communities in the list of Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes. Considering the reply of the Ministry that any revision in the list of SC/ST requires consultation with the State Governments, Registrar General of India and the National Commission for SC/ST which takes time, the Committee desired that specific information about all such proposals along with progress made so far in this regard be obtained from the Ministry and decided not to drop the assurance.

Memorandum No. 39 Request for dropping of assurance given on 29 November, 2002 in reply to Unstarred Question No. 1855 regarding 'Property of Revenue Officials'.

The Committee considered the above memorandum and noted that the request of the Ministry was also considered by the Committee earlier and they had at that time desired that concrete steps be taken to check the menace of corruption. Taking into account the reply now furnished by the Ministry that they have taken several steps to check the menace of corruption and some cases are under trial, the Committee decided to drop the assurance.

Memorandum No. 40 Request for dropping of assurance given on 15 July, 2004 in reply to Unstarred Question No. 1156 regarding 'Conduct of entrance examination in other languages'.

The Committee considered the above memorandum and noted that 21 similar assurances given in reply to various Starred/Unstarred Questions tabled from 21 May, 1990 to 01 December, 2004 regarding conduct of UPSC examinations in Indian languages, were earlier dropped by the Committee. Accordingly, the Committee, acceding to the request of the Ministry, decided to drop the assurance.

Memorandum No. 41 Request for dropping of assurance given on 30 November, 1999 in reply to Unstarred Question No. 403 regarding 'Lambadi Community'.

The Committee considered the above memorandum and expressed their displeasure over the reasoning of the Ministry that the reply did not constitute an assurance. The Committee expressed the view that it was the prerogative of the Committee to treat a particular reply as an assurance and it was not for the Ministry to question decision of the Committee. They accordingly desired to be apprised of the steps taken by the Ministry in regard to the fulfillment of the assurance and decided not to drop the assurance.

Memorandum No. 42 Request for dropping of assurance given on 19 December, 2006 in reply to Unstarred Question No. 3832 regarding 'Purchase from SC/ST Entrepreneurs'.

The Committee considered the above memorandum and expressed their displeasure on the statement of the Ministry that their reply did not constitute an assurance. They

observed that it was not for the Ministry to question the decision of the Committee to treat a particular reply as an assurance. The Committee also noted that the Ministry had not sought any extension of time to implement the assurance. Emphasising the need to seek up-to-date extension of time to fulfil the assurance, the Committee decided not to drop the assurance.

Memorandum No. 43 Request for dropping of assurance given on 14 March, 2007 in reply to Unstarred Question No. 2138 regarding 'Two-Child Norm for Panchayat Polls'.

The Committee considered the above memorandum and noted that in view of the requirement of political consensus on the issue of two child norm for Panchayat polls and the present policy of non-coercive, voluntarism for adoption of small family, it was not possible to fulfil the assurance. The Committee, therefore, decided to drop the assurance.

Memorandum No. 44 Request for dropping of assurance given on 21 April, 1994 in reply to Unstarred Question No. 4154 regarding 'Disposal of Wakf Cases'.

The Committee considered the above memorandum and noted that the issue of disposal of Wakf cases was already receiving attention of the Government as well as the Joint Parliamentary Committee on Wakfs and the possibility of amending the Act to facilitate collection and compilation of such information was being explored. The Committee, therefore, desired that the concerted efforts be taken and the matter brought to its logical conclusion. Accordingly, the Committee decided not to drop the assurance.

Memorandum No. 45 Request for dropping of assurance given on 20 December, 2005 in reply to Unstarred Question No. 4078 regarding 'Education to Girls'.

The Committee considered the above memorandum and noted that the Kasturba Gandhi Balika Vidyalaya (KGBV) Scheme was launched in July, 2004 for setting up residential schools at upper primary level for girls belonging predominantly to SC/ST/OBC and Minority Communities in educationally backward Blocks of the Country and the Government of India sanctioned 750 KGBVs between December, 2004 and May, 2005, out of which 642 KGBVs (86%) residential school were reported to have been made operational by the concerned States and the States lagging behind have been asked to expedite the operationalisation of the remaining KGBVs. Accordingly, the Committee decided to drop the assurance.

Memorandum No. 46 Request for dropping of assurances given in replies to: (i) Unstarred Question No. 3712 dated 13 December, 2000 regarding 'Setting up of Atomic Power Plants in Private Sector' (ii) Unstarred Question No. 1937 dated 21 July, 2004 regarding 'Review of Atomic Energy Act' and (iii) Unstarred Question No. 1095 dated 29 November, 2006 regarding 'Private Sector in Nuclear Power Generation'.

The Committee considered the above memorandum and noted that the proposal to amend the Atomic Energy Act, 1962 to enable private sector participation

in nuclear power generation would be reviewed by the Government depending on the changing global scenario. The Committee, therefore, desired that the necessary review may be undertaken by the Government expeditiously. Accordingly, the Committee decided not to drop the assurance.

The Committee then took up the subject matter of study tour and decided to undertake a Study visit to Kochi and Lakshadweep Islands from 15 May to 22 May 2008.

The Committee then adjourned.

MINUTES
SECOND SITTING

Minutes of the sitting of the Committee on Government Assurances (2008-2009) held on 24 September, 2008 in Committee Room 'B' Parliament House Annexe, New Delhi.

The Committee sat from 1130 hours to 1230 hours on Wednesday, 24 September, 2008.

PRESENT

Shri Harin Pathak — *Chairman*

MEMBERS

2. Shri Biren Singh Engti
3. Shri Sunil Khan
4. Shri Vijoy Krishna
5. Shri Rasheed Masood
6. Shri Nihal Chand
7. Smt. M.S.K. Bhavani Rajenthiran
8. Shri Rajiv Ranjan 'Lalan' Singh
9. Shri Aruna Kumar Vundavali

SECRETARIAT

- | | | | |
|----|----------------------|---|----------------------------|
| 1. | Shri P. Sreedharan | — | <i>Joint Secretary</i> |
| 2. | Shri Rajeev Sharma | — | <i>Director</i> |
| 3. | Shri Dal Singh Malha | — | <i>Deputy Secretary</i> |
| 4. | Shri V.P. Goel | — | <i>Deputy Secretary-II</i> |

2. At the outset, the Chairman welcomed the Members and apprised them briefly about the agenda of the sitting of the Committee. Thereafter, the Committee took up for consideration the draft Twenty Fifth and Twenty Sixth Reports regarding requests for dropping of assurances and after discussion adopted both the Reports without any amendment. The Committee also authorised the Chairman to finalise both the Reports and present the same to the House in the ensuing Part-II Session of the Lok Sabha. Thereafter, the Committee took up the following ten Memoranda containing requests received from various Ministries/Departments for dropping the pending assurances:—

The Committee then adjourned.

GMGIPMRND—3762LS-28-11-2008.

"All Parliamentary Publications including DRSC Reports are available on sale at the Sales, Counter, Reception, Parliament House (Tel. Nos. 23034726, 23034495, 23034496), Agents appointed by Lok Sabha Secretariat and Publications Division, Ministry of Information and Broadcasting, CGO Complex, Lodhi Road, New Delhi (Tel. Nos. 24367260, 24365610) and their outlets. The said information is available on website 'www.parliamentofindia.nic.in'.

The Souvenir Items with logo of Parliament are also available at Sales Counter, Reception, Parliament House, New Delhi. The Souvenir items with Parliament Museum logo are available for sale at Souvenir Shop (Tel. No. 23035323), Parliament Museum, Parliament Library Building, New Delhi. List of these items are available on the website mentioned above."
