



## CONTENTS

		Page
<b>Composition of the Committee (2005-2006)</b>		4
<b>Introduction</b>		5
<b>Chapter I</b>	<b>Request for dropping of Assurances (Not Accepted)</b>	
(i)	Unstarred Question No. 3032 dated 10 August 2001 regarding Functioning of Financial Institutions.	6
(ii)	Unstarred Question No. 5895 dated 2 May 2003 regarding Motor Accident Claims Tribunals.	9
(iii)	Unstarred Question No. 3566 dated 19 August 2003 regarding Vacant Posts of SCs/STs.	13
(iv)	Starred Question No. 125 dated 10 December 2003 regarding Creation of additional capacity in ports.	17
<b>Chapter II</b>	<b>Request for dropping of Assurances (Accepted)</b>	
(i)	Starred/Unstarred Questions tabled from 14 March 1990 to 5 July 2004 regarding Central Legislation for Agricultural Workers.	21
(ii)	Unstarred Question No. 241 dated 19 February 2003 regarding Disinvestment of Samrat Hotel.	25
(iii)	Unstarred Question No. 182 dated 9 March 1999 regarding Satellite Cities.	28
(iv)	Unstarred Question No. 5859 dated 3 May 2002 regarding C & AG observation on Income-Tax/Wealth Tax Assessments.	31
(v)	Unstarred Question No. 1524 dated 27 November 2002 regarding Missing Radioactive Device in Assam.	34
(vi)	Unstarred Question No. 2465 dated 4 December 2002 regarding Ferry Services to Colombo.	37
(vii)	Unstarred Question No. 2774 dated 10 March 2003 regarding Production of Foodgrains.	40
(viii)	Unstarred Question No. 46 dated 2 December 2003 regarding National Policy on Slums.	43

## **APPENDICES**

- I Minutes of Sitting of the Committee held on 18 November 2004.
- II Minutes of Sitting of the Committee held on 16 March 2005.
- III Minutes of Sitting of the Committee held on 26 October 2005.

**COMPOSITION OF THE COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT ASSURANCES\***  
(2005-2006)

Shri Harin Pathak - CHAIRMAN

**MEMBERS**

2. Shri Rashid J.M.Aaron
3. Shri Yogi Aditya Nath
4. Shri Anandrao Vithoba Adsul
5. Shri Ajit Singh
6. Shri Jigajinagi Ramesh Chandappa
7. Shri Biren Singh Engti
8. Shri Mohan Jena
9. Shri Sunil Khan
10. Shri Rasheed Masood
11. Shri Kailash Meghwal
12. Shri A. Venkatesh Naik
13. Shri M. Shivanna
14. Shri Aruna Kumar Vundavalli
15. Shri Kailash Nath Singh Yadav

**SECRETARIAT**

- |    |                     |   |                 |
|----|---------------------|---|-----------------|
| 1. | Shri John Joseph    | - | Secretary       |
| 2. | Shri P. Sreedharan  | - | Joint Secretary |
| 3. | Shri T.K. Mukherjee | - | Director        |
| 4. | Shri K. Jena        | - | Under Secretary |

---

\* The Committee was constituted on 7 August 2005 vide Para No.1484 of Lok Sabha Bulletin Part-II dated 5 August 2005.

## 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 Fourth Report of the Committee on Government Assurances.

2. The Committee (2005-2006) was constituted on 7 August 2005.

3. The Committee (2004-2005) at their sittings held on 18 November 2004 and 16 March 2005 considered *inter-alia* Memoranda Nos. 11, 13, 14, 17, 18, 20, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26 and 27 containing requests received from the Ministries/Departments of the Government of India for dropping of pending assurances.

4. At their sitting held on 26 October 2005, the Committee (2005-2006) considered and adopted their Fourth Report.

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

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

NEW DELHI;

26 October 2005

-----  
4 Kartika 1927 (Saka)

**HARIN PATHAK**

CHAIRMAN

COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT ASSURANCES

## REPORT CHAPTER – I

### REQUEST FOR DROPPING OF ASSURANCES (NOT ACCEPTED)

#### (I) FUNCTIONING OF FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS

On 10 August 2001, Shri Ramanaidu Daggubait, MP addressed the following Unstarred Question No. 3032 to the Minister of Finance:-

- “(a) Whether the Reserve Bank of India has sought additional power to monitor the functioning of the financial institutions in the country;
- (b) if so, the present status of the proposal received by the Government from RBI in this regard; and
- (c) the reaction of the Union Government thereof?”

In reply to the above question, the then Minister of State in the Ministry of Finance (Shri Balasabheb Vikhe Patil) stated as follows:-

- “(a) Yes, Sir.
- (b) to (c); Matter is presently under examination and consideration of the Government.”

The reply to the question above 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 9 November 2001. As the assurance was not fulfilled within the stipulated time, the Ministry requested for extension of time up to 10 January 2005 vide their OM F. No. 5(73)/2001-IF-I dated 2 September 2004 to fulfil the aforesaid assurance.

Subsequently the Ministry of Finance vide their OM. F.NO.5 (73)/2001-IF.I dated 26 October 2004, requested for dropping of the above assurance on the ground that RBI had requested the Government for enhancement of supervisory and regulatory powers over the functioning of Financial Institutions to improve their financial soundness and stability, which was considered by the Government and it incorporated necessary

provisions to include additional powers to RBI under the Banking Regulation Amendment Bill, 2003. The Bill has not yet been passed by Parliament. The Banking Division had obtained 11 extensions of time to fulfil the assurance. The time to be taken for the passage of the Bill in Parliament is not definitely known while fulfillment of this assurance depends on the Banking Regulations Amendment Bill becoming a full fledged Act. The Ministry are of the view that it may not be advisable to keep an assurance pending indefinitely when the time for the bill to become an Act is not known at all. In response to an adverse news report in Times of India (TOI) dated 29 September 2004 on unfulfilled assurances for many years, the Minister of State for Finance had directed the Ministry to take appropriate action urgently to expedite all pending assurances.

The Committee note that a question was asked on 10 August 2001 to know about the proposal of Reserve Bank of India (RBI) seeking additional powers to monitor the functioning of the Financial Institutions (FIs) and the fate of the proposal. In reply, it was stated by the Government that the matter was under its consideration. However, the Ministry later requested the Committee to drop the assurance *inter-alia* on the grounds that RBI requested for enhancement of supervisory and regulatory powers over the functioning of FIs and the Government, therefore, decided to amend the Banking Regulation Act and for this the Banking Regulation Amendment Bill 2003 was brought forward which is yet to be passed by Parliament.

The Committee considered the request for dropping of the assurance at their sitting held on 16 March 2005. They observed that the proposed Bill seeking to provide enhanced powers to RBI has not been placed before Parliament for their consideration even after lapse of about two years. Since the Government is already stated to have finalised the legislation proposal the Committee did not find any reason for the delay in the matter. Accordingly the Committee decided not to drop the assurance, pending enactment of the proposed Banking Regulation Amendment Bill. The Committee, therefore, recommend that the Ministry should make earnest efforts for placing the said Bill before Parliament so that necessary amendments in the Banking Regulation Act are made.



**(II) MOTOR ACCIDENT CLAIMS TRIBUNALS**

On 2 May 2003, Shri Adhir Chowdhury, MP addressed the following Unstarred Question No. 5895 to the Minister of Law and Justice:-

- “(a) whether the Government have accepted the Supreme Court verdict regarding awarding of compensation to road accidental victims by the Motor Accident Claims Tribunals;**
- (b) if so, the details thereof and if not, the reasons therefor;**
- (c) whether the insurance companies pay compensation to the third party in such cases; and**
- (d) if so, the details thereof during the last three years?”**

In reply to the above question, the then Minister of Law and Justice and Commerce and Industry (Shri Arun Jaitley) stated as follows:-

- “(a) to (d): The information is being collected and will be laid on the Table of the House.**

The reply to the above question was treated as an assurance and was required to be fulfilled by the Ministry of Law and Justice within three Months of the date of reply *i.e.* by 1 August 2003. As the Ministry could not fulfil the assurance within the stipulated time, they had requested for extension of time vide their OMs dated 1 August, 3 November 2003 and 11 February 2004 upto 2 November 2003, 2 February and 2 May 2004 respectively to fulfil the assurance.

The Ministry of Law and Justice vide their O.M. F. No.3(29)/2003-Adv.B dated 19 April 2004 stated that the relevant factual information for fulfillment of the assurance was called from the Ministry of Road Transport & Highways since the subject matter of the Question comes under the purview of that Ministry as per the (Allocation of Business) Rules, 1961.”

The Ministry also stated that the Motor Vehicles Act, 1988, already contains categorical provisions for compensation to be paid to victims. The Question as asked by the Hon'ble Member did not contain the details/citations of Supreme Court verdict. As such in the absence of details/citations of Supreme Court verdict in respect of which Hon'ble Member had desired the information, the Ministry of Road Transport and Highways expressed their inability to furnish any information.

The Committee note that a question was asked on 2 May 2003 to know whether the Government had accepted the verdict of the Supreme Court regarding awarding of compensation to victims of road accidents by the Motor Accident Claims Tribunal and also by insurance companies to third parties in cases involving motor accidents and the details of such payments made during the last three years. In reply the Government gave an assurance that the information would be laid on the table of the House after its collection. Subsequently vide O.M. F. No.3(29)/2003-Adv.B dated 19<sup>th</sup> April, 2004, the Ministry of Law and Justice informed the Committee that the question pertained to the Ministry of Road Transports & Highways, who had stated that the Motor Vehicle Act, 1988 has categorical provisions for payment of compensation to the victims. They further informed that in the absence of details/specific information regarding citations of Supreme Court verdict referred in the question, it is difficult to fulfil the assurance. As such the Committee were requested to drop the assurance. The Committee considered the request of the Ministry at their sitting held on 18 November 2004 and decided not to drop the assurance. The Committee, do agree with the contention of the Ministry that though it is difficult to provide information in the absence of details of the Supreme Court judgment but they are of the opinion that with some efforts the relevant case could have been located. Further, the Committee note with concern that the Ministry took almost a year's time just to inform this fact though it could have been done in a much shorter time. The Committee are of the view that for the early implementation of the assurance, due care has not been taken by the Ministry. They therefore, recommend that in future the Ministry should act promptly in such cases. The Committee desire that the information gathered by the Ministry

**should be laid on the table of the House. Moreover, the number of vehicles on roads is increasing day by day causing apprehensions of motor accidents to a great extent. Therefore the payment of compensation to the victims of such accidents needs immediate attention.**

**(III) VACANT POSTS OF SC/STs**

On 19 August 2003, Shri Shivaji Mane, MP and Shri Mansukhbhai D. Vasava, MP addressed the following Unstarred Question No. 3566 to the Minister of Home Affairs:-

- “(a) the details of various posts pertaining to SCs/STs lying vacant in the Ministry of Home Affairs and its subordinate offices, category-wise;**
- (b) the period of their vacancy vacant; and**
- (c) the steps being taken by the Government in this regard?”**

In reply to the above question, the then Minister of State in the Ministry of Home Affairs (Shri I.D. Swami) stated as follows:-

- “(a) to (c): The information is being collected and will be laid on the Table of the House.**

The reply to the above question was treated as an assurance and was required to be fulfilled by the Ministry of Home Affairs within three months of the date of reply *i.e.* by 18 November 2003. As the assurance could not be fulfilled within that period, the Ministry vide their O.M. dated 17 November 2003 had sought extension of time upto 18 February 2004 to fulfil the assurance.

Subsequently, the Ministry of Home Affairs vide their O.M. No. 11017/05/2003-Ad.V dated 12 May 2004 requested for dropping of the assurance on grounds that collection/compilation of the requisite information has been a very time consuming and cumbersome process, in view of the fact that it involved offices located throughout the length and breadth of the country, particularly in respect of organisations such as the Central Para-Military Forces, Registrar General of India, Department of Official language etc. Moreover, the information would have undergone many changes in the meantime and hence would have lost the relevance with the passage of time. The

information being compiled may, therefore, no longer be valid and may not serve any useful/worthwhile purpose. Further, the vacancy position indicated by the offices may not hold good as on date since the respective offices might have already filled up many of the posts. A sample analysis of the information furnished so far by the various organizations in reply to the question raised by the Hon'ble Members reflects the following position:-

(a)	<b>No. of posts of SCs/STs in the Ministry of Home Affairs and its offices</b>	<b>A very large number of posts of SCs/STs of different rank are vacant, for example, BSF alone have intimated 474 vacancies and that of Assam Rifles, 510 vacancies.</b>
(b)	<b>The date since when these are lying vacant.</b>	<b>This itself will be very voluminous information if we have to indicate the date of the fact that the types/numbers of posts vacant are very large.</b>
(c)	<b>Reasons for keeping these posts vacant.</b>	<p><b>There are many reasons for non-filling of vacancies, such as:</b></p> <p><b>*Occurrence of vacancies on account of promotion to higher grades, retirement including voluntary retirement, resignation, death etc. is a continuous process.</b></p> <p><b>*Non-availability of candidates against reserved categories by recruiting agencies.</b></p> <p><b>*Non-completion of recruitment process.</b></p> <p><b>To mention reason of vacancy for each vacant post is very cumbersome and may not serve purpose.</b></p>
(d)	<b>Action being taken by the Government to fill up the vacancies.</b>	<b>Some of the vacancies from the date of collection of the information have been filled up by now and some new vacancies have come up. Occurrence of vacancies and filling up the same are regular features and continuous process. The other crucial factors such as delay in verification of character and antecedents, Court/CAT cases etc. have a bearing on the filling up these posts.</b>

The Ministry therefore stated that the whole exercise may, thus, turn out to be an effort in vain and the time, energy and labour put in the collection/compilation of the above information will not be commensurate with the result of the output.

A question was asked on 19 August 2003 regarding posts pertaining to SCs/STs lying vacant in the Ministry of Home Affairs and its subordinate offices and also the steps taken by the Government to fill up such posts. In its reply the Government assured the House that the information would be provided after the same is collected. Subsequently, a request was received from the Ministry of Home Affairs for dropping of the assurance, *inter-alia* on the ground that collection of the information sought in the question is a time consuming and cumbersome process. The Government also admitted that a large number of posts of SCs/STs of different ranks are lying vacant. This request of the Ministry was considered by the Committee at their sitting held on 18 November 2004 and the Committee decided not to drop the assurance.

The Committee note with serious concern that a large number of posts for SCs/STs of different rank are lying vacant. For example, Border Security Force, which has been entrusted with the task of securing the boundaries of the country, alone has 474 vacancies. It may be difficult, as stated by the Ministry, to collect the information sought in the question but the main objective of tabling the question by the Hon'ble Member was not only to know the exact figures of vacant posts pertaining to SCs/STs but to know the ground realities prevailing as regards filling up of vacancies reserved for them. The Committee, therefore, strongly recommend that earnest efforts should be made by the Ministry to fill up the reserved vacancies by suitable SC/ST candidates. The Committee would also like to be apprised of the steps taken by the Ministry in this regard. The Committee desire that all the information collected by the Ministry so far should be laid on the table of the House at the earliest.



**(IV) CREATION OF ADDITIONAL CAPACITY IN PORTS**

On 10 December 2003, Shrimati Nivedita Mane and Shri C.N. Singh, MPs addressed the following Starred Question No. 125 to the Ministry of Shipping:-

- “(a) whether the Government propose to create additional capacity in major ports during the Tenth Five Year Plan;**
- (b) if so, the details thereof;**
- (c) whether the participation of private sector for the purpose has been sought;**
- (d) if so, the details thereof;**
- (e) the funds earmarked for the creation of additional capacity during the said period;**
- (f) whether tariff authority for major ports has fixed tarrif ceiling and floor discount rate as directed by the Government; and**
- (g) if so, the details thereof?”**

In reply to the above question, the then Minister of Shipping (Shri Shatrughan Sinha) stated as follows:-

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

**STATEMENT**

- (a) Yes, Sir.**
- (b) The aggregate capacity in the 12 major ports at the end of the 9<sup>th</sup> Plan period on 31 March 2002 was 343.95 million tones per annum (MTPA). This capacity is anticipated to go upto 470.60 MTPA by the end of the 10<sup>th</sup> Five Year Plan on 31 March 2007. Thus, capacity addition of 126.65 MTPA is envisaged during the Tenth Five Year Plan in major ports.**
- (c) Yes Sir.**

(d) Participation of private sector in expansion and development of the major ports has been sought in order to mobilize the resources required for the purpose and in order to improve efficiency, productivity and quality of service as well as bring in competitiveness in port services in consonance with the general policy of liberalization/globalisation of India's economy.

(e) An amount of Rs. 3325 crore has been allocated in the Tenth Plan outlay for projects, which will add to the capacity in major ports. This however, does not include private sector investment in development of ports.

(f) Yes, Sir.

(g) The Government has issued directions to Tariff Authority for Major Ports (TAMP) under Section 111 of the Major Ports Trusts Act, 1963 to fix the scale of rates as ceiling rates and to so specify in their notification fixing the rates so that the major ports have the flexibility to charge at reduced rates, if they so desire, to compete with others. Similarly, the discounts and rebates prescribed by TAMP in the scale of rates will act as the floor level and the port trusts will have the flexibility of giving higher discounts and rebates. Accordingly, in its order passed on 28 August 2003, TAMP has, *inter-alia*, amended the Scale of Rates of all the major ports trusts to insert the following general conditionality therein:-

“The rates prescribed in the Scale of Rates are ceiling levels; likewise, rebates and discounts are floor levels. The Port Trust may, if it so desires, charge lower rates and/or allow higher rebates and discounts.”

**The above order has been notified by TAMP vide No.TAMP/53/2003-Genl. Dated 29 August 2003 published in the Gazette of India Extraordinary Part III-Section 4.**

During supplementary question, Smt. Nivedita Mane, MP asked whether the Government has identified the areas for private sector participation, if so, the area and the criterion therefore.

**In his reply, the then Minister stated that apart from permission to 17 private parties for port development, requests have been received from 21 other parties and these are under consideration.”**

The reply given during the discussion was treated as an assurance and was required to be implemented by the Ministry of Shipping within three months of the date of reply *i.e.* by 9 March 2004.

The Ministry of Shipping vide their O.M. No. PD-H-11016/20/2003-US(I) dated 18 March 2004 forwarded a request for dropping of the said assurance on the grounds that the supplementary question by Shrimati Nivedita Mane sought information on whether the Government has identified the criterion therefore. In his reply, which has been treated as an Assurance, the Hon'ble Minister of State for Shipping has indicated that apart from permission to 17 private parties for port development, requests have been received from 21 other parties and these are under consideration. The reply thus indicates the present status of the projects, which are under consideration for private sector participation as part of the on going process for development of major ports. There is no certainty that decisions on the 21 proposals referred to in the reply could be taken with finality since these are subject to the responses from the prospective bidders to the tenders and other market conditions.”

The Committee note that a question was asked on 10 December 2003, regarding the proposal of the Government to create additional capacity in major ports during the Tenth Five Year Plan, participation of private sector, funds earmarked for the purpose, etc. In reply, it was *inter-alia* stated by the Government that addition of 126.65 million tones per annum (MTPA) is envisaged during the Tenth Five Year Plan in major ports for which participation of private sector has also been sought. Besides granting permission to 17 private parties, Government was also considering requests of 21 other parties for port development. The reply of the Government was treated as an assurance. However, the Government have requested the Committee to drop the same *inter-alia* on the grounds that the reply stated the present status of the project. The Committee at their sitting held on 16 March 2005 decided not to drop the assurance because they are anxious to know the fate of 21 other proposals of private parties, which are under the consideration of the Government. The Committee are of the opinion that the developmental activities in major ports should be carried out as already planned and in a time bound manner. Since the development of the ports is directly linked to the growth of the country's economy, the Committee urge the Government that all necessary steps be taken to ensure that the target of 126.65 MTPA, as already envisaged is achieved during the Tenth Five Year Plan.

**CHAPTER – II****REQUEST FOR DROPPING OF ASSURANCES (ACCEPTED)****(I) CENTRAL LEGISLATION FOR AGRICULTURAL WORKERS**

A total twenty five assurances were given in reply to the following Starred and Unstarred Questions by the then Ministers of Labour and Employment during the period from 1990 to 2004 in regard to Central legislation for agricultural workers:-

- (i) **Unstarred Question No. 373 dated 14.03.1990**
- (ii) **Starred Question No. 123 dated 21.03.1990**
- (iii) **Starred Question No. 123 dated 21.03.1990**
- (iv) **Starred Question No. 227 dated 28.03.1990**
- (v) **Unstarred Question No. 852 dated 29.07.1991**
- (vi) **Starred Question No. 735 dated 09.09.1991**
- (vii) **Unstarred Question No. 1363 dated 04.03.1992**
- (viii) **Unstarred Question No. 103 dated 08.07.1992**
- (ix) **Unstarred Question No. 1303 dated 10.12.1993**
- (x) **Unstarred Question No. 2639 dated 11.03.1994**
- (xi) **Unstarred Question No. 894 dated 29.07.1994**
- (xii) **Starred Question No. 21 dated 11.07.1996**
- (xiii) **Starred Question No.21 dated 11.07.1996**
- (xiv) **Starred Question No. 31 dated 21.11.1996**
- (xv) **Starred Question No. 416 dated 19.12.1996**
- (xvi) **Starred Question No. 9 dated 19.11.1997**
- (xvii) **Unstarred Question No. 198 dated 19.11.1997**
- (xviii) **Starred Question No. 183 dated 09.06.1998**
- (xix) **Starred Question No. 122 dated 04.03.1999**
- (xx) **Unstarred Question No. 2382 dated 15.12.1999**
- (xxi) **Unstarred Question No. 978 dated 01.03.2000**
- (xxii) **Unstarred Question No. 2025 dated 08.03.2000**
- (xxiii) **Unstarred Question No. 2799 dated 06.12.2000**
- (xxiv) **Unstarred Question No. 4388 dated 16.04.2001**
- (xxv) **Starred Question No. 19 dated 05.07.2004**

The above mentioned assurances (Annexures 1 to 25) could not be implemented and the Ministry of Labour & Employment sought extension of time on several occasions for fulfillment of the aforesaid assurances as the final decision regarding central legislation for agricultural workers was yet to be taken.

The Ministry of Labour & Employment vide their latest communication, D.O. No. H-11017/1/90-RW (Pt) dated 5 February 2005 stated that the proposal for enactment of a comprehensive legislation for agricultural workers has been under consideration of the Ministry of Labour since 1975. A draft Bill was prepared in 1980, and again in 1997. Since then, the proposal was discussed at various fora including meetings of Standing Committee on Labour, Indian Labour Conference, Parliamentary Committees attached to the Ministry of Labour and All Party Meetings.

The Ministry also stated that since 'Agriculture' is a State subject, and welfare of agricultural workers and framing of policy is primarily the responsibility of the State Governments, the comments of the state Governments were invited. This was also discussed in the State Labour Ministers conferences held in July 1997 and January 2000. However, no headway could be made due to divergent views of the State Governments notably on issues like raising of corpus of the welfare funds, and to widely varying conditions in different States. In the absence of consensus amongst the State Governments, the Ministry of Labour & Employment is of the view that the proposal for legislation on agricultural workers could appropriately be left to the States to act upon.

In the meantime, the Government drafted the Unorganised Sector Workers bill, 2004. The draft Bill envisages regulating employment and conditions of service of the unorganized sector workers, and to provide for their safety and social security, including old age pension health care. The schedule, of employments, inter-alia, include

agricultural workers. The proposal is at the stage of consultations with the Central Ministries/Departments, State Governments, Central Trade Unions etc. The time frame for completing the process cannot be indicated at this stage.

In view of the continuous efforts being made by the Government, for the betterment of unorganized workers including agricultural workers, the Ministry requested the Committee to drop the above mentioned 25 assurances.

The Committee note that as many as twenty-five questions were asked regarding Central Legislation for Agricultural Workers and the Government also assured in reply to each question that the matter was under their consideration. However, the Government could not fulfil the assurances, because agriculture is a State subject and also because of no consensus among the States in view of the widely varying conditions in different States. The Committee were, therefore, requested to drop all these twenty-five assurances. This request was considered by the Committee at their sitting held on 16 March 2005. The Committee noted that not only agriculture was a State subject but also the Government have drafted the Unorganised Sector Workers Bill, 2004 for regulating employment and conditions of service of workers of the unorganized sector and to provide for their safety and social security including old age pension, health care. The schedule of employment *inter-alia* includes agricultural workers also. The Committee, therefore, decided to drop the said twenty-five assurances. However, the Committee desire that the Unorganised Sector Workers Bill, 2004 should be placed for the consideration of Parliament at the earliest.



**(II) DISINVESTMENT OF SAMRAT HOTEL**

On 19 February 2003, Shri Ananta Nayak, MP addressed the following Unstarred Question No.241 to the Minister of Communications and Information Technology and Minister of Disinvestment:-

- “(a) whether the Government have a proposal to go in for the disinvestment of Samrat Hotel at New Delhi;**
- (b) if not, whether the Government propose to transfer the Hotel to private sector on long lease; and**
- (c) if so, the details of steps taken in the matter including the present status of the proposal?”**

In reply to the above question, the then Minister of Communications and Information Technology and Minister of Disinvestment (Shri Arun Shourie) stated as follows:-

**“(a) to (c): The disinvestment structure envisages handing over Samrat Hotel, New Delhi on long-term lease-cum-management contract basis through competitive bidding process. Advertisement inviting Expression of Interest for the hotel was issued on 5/8/2.2001. Financial bids were not invited due to security related concerns. It was decided in March 2002 that advertisement for this hotel may be issued after addressing the security related concerns in consultation with the security agencies. The process is on.”**

The above reply was treated as an assurance and was required to be fulfilled by the Ministry of Disinvestment within three months of the date of reply *i.e.* by 18 May 2003.

The Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs vide their U.O. No. XIII-XII/Disinvestment (1) USQ 241-L.S./03 dated 30 April 2003 forwarded a request for dropping of the said assurance on the following grounds: -

- (i) Disinvestment is an ongoing process and number of agencies need to be consulted for arriving at any decision.**

**(ii) That the 'process is on' has been indicated in replies to several Questions, both in the Lok Sabha and Rajya Sabha. Such statements in the past have not been treated as assurance.**

**(iii) The information provided reflects the true position at the time of replying to the Question relating to Disinvestment of Samrat Hotel, New Delhi and the reply was not intended as an assurance.**

**(iv) The Disinvestment process is still on. It is not possible to accurately estimate the time by which Samrat Hotel could be transferred to a party on long-term lease-cum-management contract.**

In the above background, the Ministry requested this Secretariat to place the matter before the Committee on Government Assurances for deletion of the assurance.

A question regarding disinvestment of Samrat Hotel was asked on 19 February 2003. In reply the Government stated that the disinvestment of the Samrat Hotel involved handing over of the Hotel on long-term lease-cum-management contract basis through competitive bidding process, but bids were not invited due to security related concerns and the same were to be invited in consultation with security agencies for which the process was on. The reply was construed as an assurance, but the Ministry requested the Committee to drop it stating *inter-alia* that disinvestment is an on-going and lengthy process and the time by which the whole process of the disinvestment would be completed cannot be assessed. The Ministry also contended that the reply “the process is on” should not be considered an assurance. This request was considered by the Committee at their sitting held on 18 November 2004. The Committee did not accept the contention of Ministry that the reply “the process is on” did not constitute as an assurance. However the Committee decided to drop the assurance since they were otherwise satisfied by the reasons furnished by the Ministry for dropping of the assurance.

### (III) SATELLITE CITIES

On 9 March 1999, Dr. Ashok Patel and Shri Chetan Chauhan, MPs addressed the following Starred Question No. 182 to the Minister of Urban Affairs and Employment:-

- “(a) whether the Government have formulated any plan to develop new satellite cities around the metropolitan cities to reduce the population pressure;**
- (b) if so, the details thereof;**
- (c) whether the said plan is likely to be included in the Ninth five Year Plan; and**
- (d) if so, the salient features thereof?”**

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

- “(a) A scheme for New Township Development was posed to the Planning Commission for an allocation of Rs.100 crores as seed money in the Ninth Plan.**
- (b) The Scheme aims at developing 100 Model New Townships during the Ninth and Tenth Plans to decongest metropolitan/large cities and create satellite towns as engines of economic growth.**
- (c) The Scheme has not yet been cleared by the Planning Commission due to paucity of funds. Therefore, at present no such scheme is in operation.**
- (d) Does not arise.”**

During the course of Supplementary the following question was asked by Dr. Ashok Patel:-

**“I would like to know from the Government about the difficulties faced by them in the way of sanctioning the amount that lapses due to remaining unutilized and the amount received from other sources for the plan.”**

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

**“I can only assure the hon. Member and the entire House that the Government will exert all its skill to see that the Planning Commission finds fund or we will explore alternative source of fund and see that this scheme comes into operation some day in the very near future.”**

The above reply was treated as an assurance and was required to be fulfilled by the Ministry of Urban Development & Employment within three months of the date of reply *i.e.* by 8 June 1999. As the Ministry could not fulfil the assurance within the stipulated time, they had requested for extension of time on several occasions for fulfillment of the aforesaid assurance.

The Ministry of Urban Development vide their O.M. No. H-11016/1/99-UD.III dated 4 November 1999 requested for dropping of the said assurance on the ground that the success of the scheme hinges on the approval by the Planning Commission which, as the things stand, is not likely to materialize. It will therefore, be extremely difficult to fulfil this assurance. As a matter of fact the assurance should not qualify as an assurance as the Ministry of Urban development on its own cannot, because of the resource crunch, ensure success of the scheme. Since the matter is entirely in the hands of the Planning Commission, it is requested that the assurance may kindly be dropped.

A question was asked on 9 March 1999 to know about the plan of the Government to develop new satellite cities around the Metropolitan cities to reduce the population pressure and its salient features. In reply the Government stated that a scheme for developing 1000 Model new Township is yet to be approved by the Planning Commission due to paucity of funds. Since it was difficult for the Government to fulfil the assurance because of non-approval of the said scheme by the Planning Commission, a request was made to the Committee for dropping the assurance and the Committee considered this request of the Ministry at its sitting held on 16 March 2004 and noted that the success of the scheme depends on the approval by Planning Commission and also due to paucity of funds the Ministry on its own cannot ensure the success of the scheme. The Committee, therefore, decided to drop the assurance.

**(IV) C & AG OBSERVATION ON INCOME TAX/WEALTH TAX ASSESSMENTS**

On 3 May 2002, Shri Prabhunath Singh, MP addressed the following Unstarred Question No. 5859 to the Minister of Finance:-

- “(a) whether the audit carried out an in-depth audit scrutiny of some of the companies in certain strategic sectors to examine the quality of income-tax and wealth assessments done by the income-tax department as can be seen from the C & AG Report No. 12A of 2002 in paragraph 4.1 etc. and the audit raised Tax effect of Rs.654.42 crore;**
- (b) if so, the reasons for not taking due care by the assessing officers while assessing the income of the given companies and determination of tax liabilities; and**
- (c) the action taken by the Government in this behalf?”**

In reply, the then Minister of State in the Ministry of Finance (Shri Gingee N. Ramachandran) stated as follows:-

- “(a) The C & AG in their Report No. 12A of 2002 (for the year ended March 2001) laid down in Parliament on 15 March 2002 have included the results of the Review on audit of assessments of Companies in select sectors, namely Cement, Automobiles and Textiles. The review focused on the income tax and wealth tax assessments of 97 selected companies (24-cement, 35 – automobiles, 38 – textiles) in these sectors for the assessment years 1994-95 to 1999-2000 having profit before tax of Rs.25 lakh. 326 audit observations were raised having tax effect of Rs. 654.42 crore.**
- (b) The Report of the C & AG is being examined in the CBDT and also in the field formations with a view to give parawise reply to C & AG and to determine the correctness or otherwise of aforesaid audit observations.**

**(c) CBDT has already issued instructions to the Assessing Officers/Field Formations to take due care in assessment and to avoid mistakes. There is also a monitoring system where the ledger cards recording mistakes committed are maintained and the explanations of the officers concerned are called for when they are found to have committed such mistakes. The Director of Income–Tax (Audit) oversees the audit work and prescribes checklists for guidance of the Assessing Officers.**

The reply to the above question was treated as an assurance and was required to be fulfilled by the Ministry of Finance within three months of the date of the reply i.e. by 2 August 2002. As the assurance was not fulfilled within the stipulated time, the Ministry sought extension of time on several occasions for fulfillment of the aforesaid assurance.

The Ministry of Finance vide O.M.FN.240/3/2002-A&PAC-II dated 10 December 2002 requested to drop the assurance on the ground that in many cases the audit objection is not found acceptable because of debatable issue involved and different interpretation of law by the C & AG. Even in such cases remedial action is initiated as a precautionary measures as per CBDT's instructions.

The tax effect quoted by the C & AG is likely to undergo changes due to, other additions/deductions made in reassessment, due to effects of appeal and Audit's computation of disputed tax being incorrect.

The re-opening of the assessment u/s 147, passing of certificatory orders u/s 154, Revision of assessment order by the C.I.T. u/s 263 are governed by the procedure prescribed in the Income-Tax Act. Delay in remedial action arises when the assessee goes in appeal or stay is granted by appellate authorities.

In view of the above, the Ministry requested that the above mentioned assurance may be dropped.



The Committee note that question regarding audit of some companies to examine the quality of income-tax and wealth assessments, was asked on 3 May 2004. There was also a reference of C & AG's report in the question. In reply it was *inter-alia* stated by the Government that the said report of C & AG includes the results of the review on audit of assessment of companies. The Government desired that the Committee should drop the assurance because of debatable issues and different interpretation of law. The Committee at their sitting held on 16 March 2005 considered the request and having satisfied by the reasons advanced by the Government, acceded to the request of the Government to drop the assurance.

**(V) MISSING RADIOACTIVE DEVICE IN ASSAM**

On 27 November 2002, Shri Mohan Rawale, MP addressed the following Unstarred Question No. 1524 to the Prime Minister:-

- “(a) whether a radioactive device used for industrial purposes has been missing while being transported in Assam.**
- (b) if so, the details thereof;**
- (c) whether the Atomic energy Regulatory Board has issued any warning in this regard;**
- (d) if so, the details thereof; and**
- (e) the present position in the matter?”**

In reply to the above question, the then Minister of State in the Ministry of Small Scale Industries, Minister of State in the Ministry of Personnel, Public Grievances and Pensions, Minister of State in the Ministry of Planning and Minister of State in the Department of Atomic Energy and Space (Smt. Vasundhara Raje) stated as follows:-

- “(a) Yes, Sir.**
- (b) A gamma radiography camera owned by a Kolkata based industrial Radiography Company was lost in transit on 17 July 2002 while being transported from Lakhimpur to Digboi in Assam. A report has been lodged by the company with the police.**

**The Camera is a shielded container made to depleted uranium and weighs around 24 kg. It is very sturdy equipment which cannot be easily tampered with and would not cause any significant hazard to persons so long as the source is inside the container. A “Danger” warning sign along radiation symbol is displayed on the device.**

**(c) & (d):Yes, Sir. The Atomic energy regulatory Board (AERB) has issued a warning letter to the user of the device in this regard.**

**The authorization issued to the Industrial Radiography Institution has been suspended until the investigating is completed and the company has been directed to return all its industrial radiography cameras pertaining to the site to safe and secured storage.**

**(e) the matter is under investigation by the police.”**

The above reply was treated as an assurance and was required to be fulfilled by the Department of Atomic Energy and space within three months of the date of reply i.e. by 26 February 2003. As the Department could not fulfil the assurance within the stipulated time, they had requested for extension of time upto 30 June 2003, 31 December 2003 and 31 December 2004 vide their O.Ms dated 17 March 2003, 3 July 2003 and 29 March 2004 respectively to fulfil the said assurance.

The Department of Atomic Energy vide their O.M. No.H-11/7/2004-Parl./344 dated 17 May 2004 requested for dropping of the said assurance on the ground that the Police authorities in Assam who undertook thorough investigation for the recovery of the camera, have informed that no logical purpose would be served by keeping the case pending and that the case can be revived if any clue is found about the missing radiographic camera in future. The Ministry have also stated that the radioactivity of the source would have come down by a factor of more than 140 and it is continuously reducing further.

A question was asked regarding missing radioactive device in Assam on 27 November 2002. The Government *inter-alia* replied that a gamma radiography camera was lost and the matter was being investigated by the Police. A request was made by the Government to drop the assurance on the ground that Police authorities are of the view that no logical purpose would be served by keeping the case pending. Moreover, the radioactivity of the lost equipment would have come down by a factor of more than 140 and is continuously reducing. This request was placed before the Committee at their sitting held on 16 March 2005 and having satisfied by the reasons, the Committee decided to drop the assurance. However, the Committee are of the opinion that radioactive devices should be handled carefully in future.

**(VI) PROPOSAL FOR COMMENCEMENT OF FERRY SERVICE BETWEEN TUTICORIN AND COLOMBO PORTS**

On December 4 2002 Shri A. Krishnaswamy, MP addressed the following Unstarred Question No. 2465 to the Minister of Shipping:-

**“(a) the details of the revival of Ferry Services from Tuticorin to Colombo?”**

In reply, the then Minister of State in the Ministry of Shipping (Shri S.U. Thirunavukkarasar) stated as follows:-

**“(a) A proposal to commence Ferry Services between Tuticorin Port in India and Colombo Port in Sri Lanka is under consideration of the Government.**

The reply to the above question was treated as an assurance and was required to be fulfilled by the Ministry of Shipping within three months of the date of the reply i.e. by 4 March 2003. As the assurance was not fulfilled within the stipulated time, the Ministry had sought extension of time on several occasions for fulfillment of the aforesaid assurance.

The Ministry of Shipping vide O.M. No.H-11016/1/2004-FI dated 24 January 2005 requested to drop the assurance on the grounds that signing of the MOU with Sri Lankan Government for the purpose was postponed on account of security concerns raised by the State Government of Tamil Nadu. The issue was discussed with the representatives of Ministry of Home Affairs (MHA), Ministry of External Affairs (MEA), Government of Tamil Nadu and Tuticorin Port Trust. It was decided to reassess the security situation and reconcile the issue immediately in consultation with MHA.

The Ministry also stated that the Ministry of Home Affairs forwarded their views on the subject vide I.D. No. II/20034/99/99/2001-US(IS-II) dated 31 August 2004 addressed to the Prime Minister's Office and copy endorsed to them. Ministry of Home

Affairs reconsidered the security issue on Tuticorin-Colombo route in consultation with intelligence agencies and had informed that the security arrangements proposed by the intelligence agencies were difficult to follow. The Tamil Nadu Government are also not in favour of commencement of ferry service at this stage. Taking into account the views of Tamil Nadu Government on the commencement of ferry service and the present security scenario, MHA have informed that they do not recommend commencement of ferry service between Tuticorin and Colombo.

In the light of the position explained, PMO were informed that Ministry of Shipping feel that the commencement of ferry service at this juncture may not be possible. In the meantime, Hon'ble Prime Minister has also informed Chief Minister, Tamil Nadu that Government of India is not in favour of operating the ferry service on this route until adequate security infrastructure is developed.

In view of the above, the Ministry requested that the above mentioned assurance may be dropped. The Ministry also stated that this has the approval of Hon'ble Minister of Shipping, Road Transport and Highways.

The Committee note that a question was asked on 4 December 2002 regarding revival of ferry services from Tuticorin to Colombo. In reply it was stated that such a proposal was under consideration of the Government. The Committee was subsequently informed that primarily because of security reasons raised by the State Government of Tamil Nadu, the Memorandum of Understanding could not be signed with the Sri Lanka Government. The Government also requested that the assurance be dropped on this very ground. The Committee considered this request at their sitting held on 16 March 2005 and noted that neither the State Government of Tamil Nadu nor the Ministry of Home Affairs including Prime Minister's Office was in favour of commencing the ferry service due to security reasons. The Committee, therefore, decided to drop the assurance.

**(VII) PRODUCTION OF FOODGRAINS**

On 10 March 2003, Dr. Jaswant Singh Yadav, MP addressed the following Unstarred Question No. 2774 to the Minister of Agriculture:-

- “(a) the schemes formulated by the Government to make all the States self-reliant in foodgrains including pulses by the end of the Tenth Five Year Plan; and**
- (b) the steps taken by the Government for the implementation of these schemes?”**

In reply to above question, the then Minister of Agriculture (Shri Hukumdeo Narayan Yadav) stated as follows:-

**“(a) & (b): Centrally sponsored Schemes of ‘Integrated Cereals Development Programme in Rice/Wheat/Coarse-cereals based Cropping system Areas (ICDP-Rice, IDCP-Wheat and ICDP-Coarse cereals)’ were implemented till October, 2000 to increase production and productivity of Rice, Wheat and Coarse-cereals. Now, these schemes have been subsumed under Macro Management Mode alongwith 24 other schemes to provide for flexibility to States according to their priorities. In addition, Centrally Sponsored Scheme of ‘National Pulses Development Programme (AMDP)’ and ‘On-farm Water management for increasing Crop Production in Eastern India’ are also under implementation for increasing foodgrains production and productivity.”**

The above reply was treated as an assurance and was required to be fulfilled by the Ministry of Agriculture (Department of Agriculture & cooperation) within three months of the date of reply i.e. by 9 June 2003. As the assurance could not be fulfilled within that period, the Ministry vide their O.Ms dated 5 September and 5 December 2003 had sought extension of time upto 9 December 2003 and 9 March 2004 respectively to fulfil the assurance.



The Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs vide their U.O. No. XIII-XII/Agri.(14) USQ 274-L.S./03 dated 14 May 2003 forwarded a request of the Ministry of Agriculture for dropping of the said assurance on the following grounds:-

**“That the reply given in response to above mentioned question does not constitute an assurance at all. In the reply it had been stated that schemes are under implementation as such there is no assurance given which need to be fulfilled. Hence, the assurance may be deleted from the list.”**

A question was asked on 10<sup>th</sup> of March 2003 regarding making all the States self-reliant in the production of foodgrains and pulses by the end of Tenth Five-Year Plan. In reply it was *inter-alia* stated that several Centrally Sponsored Schemes were implemented till October 2000 in order to increase production of foodgrains, pulses, etc. However, these schemes were later merged with Macro Management Mode and other schemes. In addition to this, schemes for development of pulses, maize, etc. were also being implemented for increasing production of foodgrains in the country.

The Committee were later requested by the Ministry to drop the assurance on the ground that the reply to the question did not constitute an assurance at all. This request was considered by the Committee at their sitting held on 18 November 2004 and the Committee having been satisfied that the implementation of the said schemes is a continuous process decided to drop the assurance. However, the Committee desire that the country should be self-reliant in production of foodgrains, pulses, etc. Viewing the country marching ahead on the road of progress, the Committee urge the Government to introduce concrete schemes/programmes to make the country self-reliant in production of foodgrains. The on-going schemes should be reviewed periodically to see that such schemes are really benefiting the country in achieving the desired target.

**(VIII) NATIONAL POLICY ON SLUMS**

On 2 December 2003, Shri Pawan Kumar Bansal, Dr. Venkataswamy, Shri Kirit Somaiya and Shri Virendra Kumar, MPs addressed the following Unstarred Question No. 46 to the Minister of Urban Employment & Poverty alleviation:-

- “(a) whether there is any proposal to formulate a National Policy on Slums;**
- (b) if so, the salient features thereof and the factors to be addressed;**
- (c) whether the draft proposal has been sent to the State Governments;**
- (d) if so, the response of the State Governments thereto;**
- (e) the extent to which the life of poor people staying in slums is likely to be improved;**
- (f) the time by which the said policy is likely to be finalized; and**
- (g) the total number of house-holds living in slums, State-wise; and**
- (h) the action taken so far to ameliorate their lot and improve their living conditions?”**

In reply, the then Minister of State (Independent Charge) in the Ministry of Urban Employment Poverty Alleviation (Shri Bandaru Dattatraya) stated as follows:-

- “(a) to (f): The National Slum Policy is under consideration.**
- (g) Slum development being a State subject, State Governments survey and take stock of slums in their respective States. However, the Town and Country Planning Organisation (TCPO) conducted a one-time study on slums in 1995-96 and brought out a report titled “A Compendium on Indian slums-1996”. According to this report the estimated slum Population of the country in 1991 and 2001 was 462.603 lakhs and 618.258 lakh respectively.”**

**(h) Slum Development is a State subject. The State Governments formulate specific plans, programmes and schemes for development of slums in various cities as per their priorities and make necessary provisions therefore, in their respective State Plans. To improve the living standards of slum dwellers by providing basic facilities, National slum Development Programme (NSDP) was launched by the Central Government in August, 1998. Under this programme additional Central Assistance (ACA) is being provided to the States/UTs for provision of basic amenities.**

**In 2001, Valmiki Ambedkar Awas Yojana (VAMBAY) was launched to provide shelter or upgrade the existing shelter for people living below the poverty line in urban slums. There is also a component for providing community toilets under Nirmal Bharat Abhiyan.**

The reply to the above question was treated as an assurance and was required to be fulfilled by the Ministry within three months of the date of the reply i.e. by 1 March 2004. As the Ministry could not fulfill the assurance within the time, they sought extension of time upto 31 March 2005.

The Ministry of Urban Employment and Poverty Alleviation vide their O.M. No.H-11016/12/2002-DD(M) dated 29 September 2004 requested for dropping of the assurance on the grounds that the condition of slums vary from State to State and even from city to city and so a uniform and rigid "National Policy on Slums" may not be very meaningful or effective. Broad indications of the points and guidelines for improvement of the conditions of slums are issued from time to time. It is upto the concerned

States/UTs to formulate policies/guidelines in the interest of slum dwellers for their welfare and development, as the subject of slums falls within the list of state subjects.

In view of the above position, the Ministry of Urban Employment and Poverty Alleviation requested the Committee on Government Assurances to drop the above mentioned assurance.

The Committee note that a question was asked on 2 December 2003 regarding the proposal of the Government to formulate a National Policy on slums. It was *inter-alia* replied by the Government that a National Policy on slums was under their consideration and the development of slums is a State subject. Since the said policy was under consideration of the Government, the reply was treated as an assurance, but the Government requested for deletion of this assurance because a uniform and rigid National Policy on slums is not feasible keeping in view the fact that the conditions of slums vary from State to State and also because formulation of policies/guidelines falls within the list of State subjects. The Committee, therefore, at their sitting held on 16 March 2005 decided to drop the assurance. However, the Committee desire that appropriate guidelines for improvement of the conditions of slums be issued from time to time.

NEW DELHI;

26 October 2005

-----  
4 Kartika 1927 (Saka)

**HARIN PATHAK**  
CHAIRMAN

COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT ASSURANCES



**Memorandum No.11 Request for dropping of assurance given on 19<sup>th</sup> February, 2003 in reply to USQ No. 241 regarding 'Disinvestment of Samrat Hotel'**

The Committee considered the above memorandum and noted that the disinvestment is an ongoing and lengthy process, which is still in progress. The Committee, therefore, acceded to the request of the Ministry and decided to drop the assurance. The Committee however did not agree to the Ministry's contention that the reply "the process is on" did not constitute as an assurance.

**Memorandum No.12 Request for dropping of assurance given on 27<sup>th</sup> February, 2003 in reply to USQ No. 1575 regarding 'Construction of Mysore-Calicut Line'.**

The Committee considered the above mentioned memorandum and noted that the transmission project is envisaged to be completed by 2006-07 for which a feasibility report is being prepared by POWERGRID and the work on the project line can start after the investment approval by the Government has been accorded. Accordingly, the Committee desired to know whether the said approval has been obtained or not and also the present position of the project. In any case the project should not be delayed and the target date of completion should be adhered to. The Committee, therefore, decided not to drop the assurance.

**Memorandum No.13 Request for dropping of assurance given on 10<sup>th</sup> March, 2003 in reply to USQ No. 2774 regarding 'Production of Foodgrains'.**

The Committee considered the above mentioned memorandum and agreed to drop the assurance after perusing the reasons advanced by the Ministry of Agriculture.

**Memorandum No.14 Request for dropping of assurance given on 2<sup>nd</sup> May, 2003 in reply to USQ No. 5895 regarding 'Motor Accident Claims Tribunals'.**

The Committee considered the above memorandum and noted that an assurance was given to the House that the desired information would be laid on the Table of the



House after its collection, but now the Ministry wants to get the assurance dropped on the ground that the requisite information is not forthcoming from the Ministry of Road Transport & Highways. The Committee desired that, whatever information has been collected by the Ministry, should be laid on the Table of the House once the House has been assured. The Committee, therefore, decided not to drop the assurance.

**Memorandum No.15      Request for dropping of assurance given on 24<sup>th</sup> July, 2003 in reply to USQ No. 548 regarding 'Contribution Based Pension Scheme'.**

The Committee considered that above memorandum and desired to know the present status of the assurance in view of the fact that the redefined contribution based pension plan was yet to be notified by Department of Pension & Pensioners Welfare under the Ministry of Personnel, Public Grievances. The Committee did not agree to the Ministry's contention that the reply given to the question did not constitute as an assurance. The Committee, therefore, were not in favour of dropping the assurance.

**Memorandum No.16      Request for dropping of assurance given on 11<sup>th</sup> August, 2003 in reply to USQ No. 2773 regarding 'Setting up of National Commission on Land Use Policy'.**

The Committee considered the above memorandum and noted that the proposal of the Department of Agriculture and Cooperation for constituting the National Commission on Land Use Policy has been kept on hold, till a decision is taken by the Cabinet on setting up of the Lok Nayak Jayaprakash Narayan watershed Mission. The Committee, therefore, desired to know the fate of the said policy and decided not to drop the assurance.

**Memorandum No.17      Request for dropping of assurance given on 19<sup>th</sup> February, 2003 in reply to USQ No. 241 regarding 'Disinvestment of Samrat Hotel'**

The Committee considered the above memorandum and noted the difficulties encountered by the Ministry while collecting the information. The Committee were however of the view that once the House has been assured about the desired information, the same should be duly laid on the Table of the House despite the time constraints. The Committee were, therefore, not in favour of dropping the assurance.

***The Committee then adjourned.***

**MINUTES****NINTH SITTING**

Minutes of the Sitting of Committee on Government Assurances held on 16<sup>th</sup> March, 2005 at 1500 hours in Committee Room 'C' Parliament House Annexe, New Delhi.

The Committee sat from 1500 hours to 1530 hours on Wednesday, 16 March, 2005.

**PRESENT**

Shri Harin Pathak - Chairman

**MEMBERS**

2. Shri Anandrao Vithoba Adsul
3. Shri J. M. Aaroon Rashid
4. Shri Biren Singh Engti
5. Shri Sunil Khan
6. Shri A. Venkatesh Naik
7. Shri M. Shivanna
8. Shri Mohan Jena

**SECRETARIAT**

1. Shri S.K. Sharma - Additional Secretary
2. Shri P. Sreedharan - Joint Secretary
3. Shri A.K. Singh - Director
4. Shri. K. Jena - Under Secretary

At the outset, the Chairman welcomed the Members to the sitting of the Committee. Therefore, the Committee took up the following memoranda for of the assurances in pursuance of the requests received from different Ministries:-

**Memorandum No. 18 Request received from the Ministry of Labour regarding dropping of assurances given in reply to as many as 25 Starred/Unstarred Questions tabled from 14.03.1990 to 05.07.2004 regarding 'Central legislation for agricultural workers'.**

The Committee considered the above memoranda regarding 25 assurances on the same issue and noted that the Central Government could not bring forward a comprehensive legislation for agricultural workers, as per assurance given because agriculture is a State subject, the welfare of agricultural workers as well as framing of policy is primarily the responsibility of the State Governments, and there was no consensus among the States in view of the widely varying conditions in different States. The Committee also noted that the Government have drafted the Unorganised Sector Workers Bill, 2004 which envisages regulating employment and conditions of service of the unorganized sector workers and to provide for their safety and social security, including old age pension health care. The schedule of employment *inter-alia* include agricultural workers also. The Committee, therefore, acceded to the request of the Ministry to drop the assurances. The Committee, however, desired that the said draft bill should be brought before Parliament as soon as possible.

**Memorandum No. 19 Request received from the Ministry of Human Resource Development regarding dropping of assurance given on 24<sup>th</sup> November, 1997 in reply to USQ No. 712 regarding 'Payment of Scholarship in Bihar (and Jharkhand)'.**

The Committee considered the above mentioned memorandum and noted that it is a serious issue as information regarding disbursement of scholarship in respect of only 5 districts has been received. Complete information regarding details of disbursement of scholarships to students is yet to be obtained from the remaining 55 districts of Bihar and Jharkhand. Moreover, no reply has been received from the State

Governments despite several reminders including D.O. from senior officers and letters from Union Minister of State to the State education Minister as well as to the Chief Minister of Bihar. The Committee, therefore, decided not to accede to the request for dropping of assurance but desired to look into the reasons for the inordinate delay and, if need be, to call the representatives of the Ministry of Human Resource Development, Government of Bihar and Government of Jharkhand to appear before the Committee for oral evidence.

**Memorandum No. 20 Request received from the Ministry of Urban Affairs regarding dropping of assurance given on 9<sup>th</sup> March, 1999 in reply to SQ No. 182 regarding 'Development of Satellite Cities'.**

The Committee considered the above mentioned memorandum and agreed to drop the assurance after perusing the reasons advance by the Ministry of Urban Affairs and Employment that the success of the scheme depends on the approval by the Planning Commission and also because of the resource crunch, success of the scheme cannot be ensured by the Ministry on its own.

**Memorandum No. 21 Request received from the Ministry of Home Affairs regarding dropping of assurance given on 16<sup>th</sup> March, 1999 in reply to USQ No. 3037 regarding 'Non-Official Members'.**

The Committee considered the above memorandum and observed that the assurance was given in the year 1999 and the NIC is yet to be constituted. The committee took into consideration the view of the Ministry that "it is the normal practice that NIC is reconstituted after the change of every Government at the Centre. They, therefore, desired that NIC should be reconstituted as soon as possible and decided not to drop the assurance.

**Memorandum No. 22 Request received from the Ministry of Finance regarding dropping of assurance given on 10<sup>th</sup>**

**August, 2002 in reply to USQ No. 3032 regarding 'Functioning of financial Institutions'.**

The Committee considered the above memorandum and decided not to drop the assurance, pending enactment of the proposed Banking Regulation Amendment Bill.

**Memorandum No. 23 Request received from the Ministry of Finance regarding dropping of assurance given on 3<sup>rd</sup> May, 2002 in reply to USQ No. 5859 regarding 'C&AG observation on Income-Tax/Wealth Tax assessments'.**

The committee considered the above memorandum and found that debatable issues and different interpretations of law are involved in the assurance. Moreover, such observations in the Reports of C&AG are also followed up by the Public Accounts Committee. The Committee, therefore, decided to drop the assurance.

**Memorandum No. 24 Request received from the Ministry of Atomic Energy and Space regarding dropping of assurance given on 27<sup>th</sup> November, 2002 in reply to USQ No. 1524 regarding 'Missing Radioactive Device in Assam'.**

The Committee considered the above memorandum and acceded to the request of the Ministry to drop the assurance since the Radioactive device was lost three years back and radioactivity of the source would have come down by a factor of more than 140 and was further reducing continuously.

**Memorandum No. 25 Request received from the Ministry of Urban Affairs regarding dropping of assurance given in reply to USQ No. 46 dated 02.12.2003 regarding 'National Policy on Slums'.**

The Committee considered the above memorandum and were convinced by the reasons forwarded by the Ministry that a uniform and rigid national policy on slums may not serve any meaningful and effective purpose. The Committee, therefore, decided to drop the assurance with the observation that guidelines for improvement of the conditions of slums be issued from time to time.

**Memorandum No. 26 Request received from the Ministry of Shipping regarding dropping of assurance given on 4<sup>th</sup> December, 2002 in reply to USQ No. 2465 regarding 'Ferry services to Colombo'.**

The Committee considered the above memorandum and noted that the State Government of Tamil Nadu and also the ministry of Home Affairs including PMO are not in favour of commencing of ferry service between Tuticorin and Colombo due to security reasons. As such the Committee decided to drop the assurance.

**Memorandum No. 27 Request received from the Ministry of Shipping regarding dropping of assurance given on 10<sup>th</sup> December, 2003 in reply to SQ No. 125 regarding 'Creation of additional capacity in ports'.**

The Committee considered the above memorandum and noted that permission was given to 17 private parties for port development and also requests were received from 21 other parties, which were under the consideration of the Government. It was also stated by the Government that there was no certainty that decision on the 21 proposals referred to in the reply could be taken with finality since these are subject to the responses from the prospective bidders to the tenders and other market conditions. The Committee, therefore, decided not to drop the assurance and desired that the fate of such proposals be intimated to them.

***The Committee then adjourned.***

## **MINUTES** **SECOND SITTING**

Minutes of the sitting of the Committee on Government Assurances (2005-2006) held on 26 October 2005 in Committee Room No. 62, Parliament House, New Delhi.

The Committee sat on Wednesday 26 October 2005 from 1100 hours to 1200 hours.

### **PRESENT**

#### **CHAIRMAN**

Shri Harin Pathak

#### **Members**

2. Shri Anandrao Vithoba Adsul
3. Shri Ajit Singh
4. Shri Jigajinagi Ramesh Chandappa
5. Shri Mohan Jena
6. Shri Sunil Khan
7. Shri Kailash Meghwal
8. Shri Aruna Kumar Vundavalli
9. Shri Kailash Nath Singh Yadav

#### **Secretariat**

1. Shri P. Sreedharan - Joint Secretary
2. Shri T.K. Mukherjee - Director
3. Shri K. Jena - Under Secretary



2. At the outset, the Hon'ble Chairman welcomed the Members and apprised them about the agenda of the sitting. Thereafter, the Committee considered the following seven memoranda containing requests received from various Ministries for dropping of pending assurances:-

XXXX

XXXXXXXXXXXX

XXXX

3. Thereafter the Committee considered the draft fourth Report regarding dropping of pending assurances and adopted the same. The Committee also authorized the Hon'ble Chairman to present the report in the ensuing winter session of Parliament.

***The Committee then adjourned.***

**Lok Sabha USQ No. 373 dated 14.02.1990 by Shri Ram Sajivan**

**CENTRAL LEGISLATION ON LANDLESS AGRICULTURAL WORKERS**

- (a) Whether Government have accepted in principle the need to bring forward a central legislation on landless agricultural workers; and
- (b) if so, the steps being taken in this regard?

**ANSWER**

The Minister of Labour and Welfare ( Shri Ram Vilash Paswan)

- (a) Central legislation for Agricultural Workers was one of the recommendations made at the National Seminar on Agricultural Workers held recently.
- (b) This is under consideration.

**Lok Sabha SQ No. 123 dated 21.03.1990 Supplementary by Shri K. Pradhani**

**MINIMUM WAGES FOR AGRICULTURAL LABOUR**

- (a) what is the minimum wage fixed for agricultural labour in different States;
- (b) when this limit was fixed;
- (c) whether Government propose to reconsider this limit in view of the rise in prices and inflation; and
- (d) if so, the details thereof?

**ANSWER**

The Minister of Labour and Welfare ( Shri Ram Vilash Paswan)

“We are considering to bring a Central Legislation in the Parliament”.

**Lok Sabha SQ No. 123 dated 21.03.1990 (Supplementary by Shri K. Pradhani)****MINIMUM WAGES FOR AGRICULTURAL LABOUR**

While stating, that the minimum wages fixed for states differs from state to state, but in a state there are different type of lands varying in fertility and production, the Hon'ble Member wanted to know whether the Government would consider to issue guidelines to the State Govts. to fix up minimum wages according to fertility of soil from region to region, so that it could be implemented in practicality for the labourers and the farmers.

**ANSWER**

**The Minister of Labour and Welfare (Shri Ram vilas Paswan) stated inter-alia as follows**

“We are considering to bring a central legislation in the Parliament”

**Lok Sabha SQ No. 227 dated 28.03.1990 - Supplementary by Prof. P.J. Kurien****CENTRAL LEGISLATION FOR UNORGANISED LABOUR**

Mentioning about the agricultural workers the Hon'ble member wanted to know whether the Central Government are proposing to bring any legislation to give old age pension to those agriculture workers who are unable to work and if the Central Government would aid the State Governments for this purpose.

**ANSWER**

**The Minister of Labour and Welfare (Shri Ram Vilas Paswan) stated inter-alia as follows**

“the issues raised in the Seminar are being seriously considered. As stated, all issues, whether of employment guarantee or of provident fund or any other welfare measure; the Government are considering the proposals”

**Lok Sabha USQ No. 852 dated 29.07.1991 by Shri N. Dennis**

**AGRICULTURAL LABOUR**

(a) will the Minister of Labour be pleased to state the steps taken to improve the living conditions of agricultural labour in the country?

**ANSWER**

**The Minister of State in the Ministry of Labour (Shri K. Ramamurthy)**

Various Labour laws like Minimum Wages Act, 1948, Payment of Wages Act, 1938, Inter-State Migrant Workmen (Regulation of Employment and Conditions of Service) Act, 1979 exist to safeguard and protect the interests of Agricultural labour. Besides, various schemes such as IRDP, Jawahar Rozgar Yojana, NREP, RLEGP aimed at upliftment of the poor and wage employment are being implemented. The Government constituted a National Commission on Rural labour to go into the conditions of agriculture labour and the commission is expected to submit their Report this month.

A Central legislation to regulate employment conditions of Service and Welfare Measures for the Agricultural Workers, is also under the consideration of Government.

**Lok Sabha SQ No. 735 dated 09.09.1991 - Supplementary by Shri Basu Deb**

**Acharia**

**NATIONAL COMMISSION ON RURAL LABOUR**

The Hon'ble Member stated as under:-

“Whether the Government is going to enact a comprehensive legislation on agricultural labourers so that the agricultural labourers including the female labourers can get the minimum wages and get employment in rural areas.

**ANSWER**

**The Deputy Minister in the Ministry of Labour (Shri Paban Singh Ghatowar)**

“after receiving the comments and report from the various Departments the Government will look into that. Further, we have to discuss it with the State Governments also for taking any decision.”

**Lok Sabha USQ No. 1363 dated 04.03.1992 by Shri Gangadhare Sanipalli and Shri Bare Lal Jatav**

**LEGISLATION ON AGRICULTURAL WORKERS**

- (a) whether the Government propose to enact any Central Legislation on agricultural workers; and
- (b) if so, the salient features thereof?

**ANSWER**

**The Deputy Minister in the Ministry of Labour (Shri Paban Singh Ghatowar)**

- (a) & (b) A proposal to enact Central legislation for Agricultural Workers in under consideration of the Government.



**Lok Sabha USQ No. 103 dated 08.07.1992 by Kumari Farida Topno**

**POLICY FOR AGRICULTURAL LABOURERS**

- (a) whether the Government propose to introduce a Bill incorporating uniform policy for the Agricultural labourers;
- (b) if so, the details thereof; and
- (c) if not, the reasons therefore?

**ANSWER**

**Deputy Minister in the Ministry of Labour (Shri Paban Singh Ghatowar)**

- (a) & (b) A bill to provide for the Welfare of Agricultural workers and to regulate their employment and conditions of service is under consideration of the Government.
- (b) Does not arise.

**Lok Sabha USQ No. 1303 dated 10.12.1993 by Shri Mohammad Aliashraf Fatmi**

**AGRICULTURAL LABOUR**

- (a) whether the Government are considering to provide old age pension, medical aid and financial assistance for the education of children to the agriculture labourers;
- (b) if so, the details thereof;
- (c) the annual expenditure likely to be incurred for providing these facilities; and
- (d) the steps taken for providing such facilities to agriculture labourers?

**ANSWER**

**The Minister of State in the Ministry of Labour (Shri P.A. Sangama)**

(a) to (d): The Government are considering to bring forward a Central legislation for agricultural workers in which there is a proposal to set up a welfare fund on the pattern of the Kerala Agricultural Workers Welfare Fund. However the details of the proposal are still to be finalised.

**Lok Sabha USQ No. 2639 dated 11.03.1994 by Prof. M. Kamson**

**LABOUR LAWS**

- (a) whether the Government propose to bring about changes in the existing labour laws and enact certain new laws in order to strengthen the social security network;
- (b) if so, whether these changes relate to the Workmen's Compensation Act, 1923 and the Minimum Wages Act, 1948;
- (c) whether the proposed changes will also deal with the welfare of agriculture and construction workers; and
- (d) if so, the details thereof?

**ANSWER**

**The Minister of State in the Ministry of Labour ( Shri P.A. Sangama)**

(a) & (b): The social Security laws in regard to which the Labour Ministry has proposed changes are, Employees Provident Fund and Miscellaneous Provisions Act, 1952, Payment of Gratuity Act, 1973, and Workmen's Compensation Act, 1923.

(c) & (d): The details of the laws for welfare of Agricultural and construction workers are under examination.

**Lok Sabha USQ No. 894 dated 29.07.1994 by Shri Sharad Dighe and Shri Anand Ratna Maurya**

**AGRICULTURAL LABOUR**

- (a) whether the Government are contemplating to introduce a legislation for safeguarding the interests of agricultural workers in regard to employment security, payment of wage, regulation of hours of work, settlement of disputes and social security; and
- (b) if so, the details thereof?

**ANSWER**

**The Minister of State in the Ministry of Labour (Shri P.A. Sangma)**

- (a) Yes, Sir.
- (b) The details of the proposal are still to be finalised.

**Lok Sabha USQ No. 21 dated 11.07.1996 - Supplementary by Shri Pawan Diwan**

**LEGISLATION FOR AGRICULTURAL LABOURERS**

The Hon'ble Member demanded that the bill related to agricultural workers be placed in House and desired to know the steps being taken by the Government to make independent those poor labourers.

**ANSWER**

**The Minister of Labour (Shri M. Arunachalam)**

It was inter-alia sated "The new Govt's Common Minimum Programme has clearly mentioned that this legislation is in advanced stage; we are taking it to the Cabinet and after the approval of the Cabinet, we will be placing it in the House".

**Lok Sabha SQ No. 31 dated 21.11.1996 by S/Shri Balai Chandra Ray and Ajay Chakraborty.**

**LEGISLATION ON AGRICULTURAL WORKERS**

- (a) whether the Government proposes to introduce and pass a comprehensive Bill to protect the interests of agricultural workers during the current session; and
- (b) if so, the details thereof?

**ANSWER**

**The Minister of Labour (Shri. M. Arunachalam)**

- (a) & (b) The proposed bill is under consideration of Government.

**Lok Sabha SQ No. 416 dated 19.12.1996 by Shri Jai Prakash Agarwal****WELFARE SCHEME FOR AGRICULTURAL LABOURERS**

- (a) the welfare schemes approved by the union Government for agricultural labourers in Delhi and other States during each of the last three years, during each of the last three years, and the current financial year so far;
- (b) the extent of which the agricultural labourers have been benefited by these schemes;
- (c) the amount allocated for the purpose during the above period;
- (d) whether the Government propose to take some more steps in this regard; and
- (e) if so, the details thereof?

**ANSWER****The Minister of Labour (Shri M. Arunachalam)**

(d) & (e): The Government are considering enactment of a comprehensive legislation to regulate employment condition of service and to provide for welfare of agricultural workers.

**Lok Sabha SQ No. 9 dated 19.11.1997 by Shri L. Ramana and Shri Madan Patil****LEGISLATION ON AGRICULTURAL WORKERS**

- (a) whether the Government have a proposal under their consideration to enact a legislation for the welfare of agricultural workers;
- (b) if so, the details thereof;
- (c) the time by which it is likely to be passed;
- (d) the reasons for the delay in this regard;
- (e) whether the Government also propose to set up labour committees to attend to the urgent needs of the agricultural workers; and
- (f) if so, the details thereof and the time frame worked out therefore?

**ANSWER****The Minister of State of the Ministry of Labour (Shri M.P. Veerendra Kumar)**

(a) to (d): Proposal for enacting a comprehensive law providing for regulation of employment and conditions of service of agricultural workers and for establishing of a welfare fund for financing various welfare activities has been drawn up. Final decision on the proposal has not yet been taken and the same is under Government's consideration. Efforts are being made finalise a Bill on the subject and introduce it in the Parliament at the earliest.

(c) No. Sir.

(d) Does not arise.



**Lok Sabha USQ No. 198 dated 19.11.1997 by S/Shri A.C. Jose, Siro T. Govindan and Sunil Khan**

**MINIMUM WAGES**

- (a) whether any labour Welfare Bill including minimum wages is likely to be introduced during the ensuing session of Parliament;
- (b) if so, the proposed minimum wages therein;
- (c) if not, the reasons therefor; and
- (d) the steps being taken to ensure payment of minimum wages to workers?

**ANSWER**

**The Minister of State of the Ministry of Labour ( Shri M.P. Veerendra Kumar)**

(a) to (d): Agricultural workers in the country are already covered under the provision of the Minimum Wages Act, 1948. However proposal for enacting a comprehensive law providing for regulation of complement and conditions of service of agricultural workers and for establishing a welfare fund for financing various welfare activities has been drawn up. Final decision on the proposal has not been taken and the same is under Government's consideration. Efforts are being made to finalise a Bill and introduce it in the Parliament at the earliest.

**Lok Sabha SQ No. 183 dated 09.06.1998 by Dr. Chinta Mohan and Prof. Pren Singh Chandumajra**

**UNEMPLOYMENT**

- (a) whether the number of unemployed persons had gone to 58 million by 1997;
- (b) if so, the reasons therefor;
- (c) whether the Government have set a target for elimination of unemployment by 2002 in the country;
- (d) if so, the steps taken to achieve this target and the percentage of additional avenues of employment required to be generated annually for this purpose?

**ANSWER**

**The Minister of Power (Shri P.R. Kumarmangalam)**

- (a) No, Sir.
- (b) Does not arise.
- (c) & (d): The approach to the Ninth Plan envisages priority to agriculture and rural development with a view to generating adequate productive employment and eradication of poverty. Greater productive employment will be generated in the growth process itself by concentrating on sectors, sub-sectors and technologies, which are labour, intensive, in regions characterized by higher rates of unemployment and underemployment. The details will be known only after the Ninth Plan document is finalised by the Government.

**Lok Sabha SQ No. 122 dated 04.03.1999 by Shri Lakshman Chandra Seth and Shri Sanat Kumar Mandal**

**COMPREHENSIVE BILL FOR AGRICULTURE WORKERS**

- (a) whether the Government are introducing a comprehensive bill for protection of interest of Agriculture workers;
- (b) if so, the stage at which the proposal stands; and
- (c) by when the same is likely to be finalised?

**ANSWER**

**The Minister of Labour (Dr. Styanarayan Jatiya)**

(a) to (c): A proposal for enacting a Central Legislation to protect the interests of the agricultural labourers in the country is at the stage of consultation with various Ministries/Department of Government. Government would endeavour to finalise the Bill and introduce it in the Parliament at the earliest.

**Lok Sabha USQ No. 2382 dated 15.12.1999 by Shri Lakshman Seth****KHET MAJDOOR**

- (a) whether the Government propose to introduce a comprehensive Central legislation for Agricultural Worker;
- (b) if so, by when; and
- (c) if not, the reasons therefor?

**ANSER****Minister Of State For Labour & Employment (Shri Muni Lal)**

(a) to (c): A proposal for enacting a comprehensive law for regulation of employment and conditions of service of agricultural workers and for establishing a welfare fund for financing various welfare activities has been drawn up. Final decision on the proposal has not yet been taken and the same is under Government's consideration.

**Lok Sabha USQ No. 978 dated 1.3.2000 by Shri Brij Bhushan Sharan Singh**

**WELFARE SCHEMES FOR AGRICULTURAL LABOUR**

- (a) whether some States have sent new proposals for the welfare of Agriculture Labour to the Union Government;
- (b) if so, the details thereof and the decision taken thereon;
- (c) if not, whether the Union Government propose to prepare any scheme for the upliftment of agriculture labour?

**ANSWER**

**Minister Of State For Labour & Employment (Shri Muni Lal)**

- (a) No, Sir.
- (b) Does not arise.
- (c) A proposal to enact a comprehensive legislation is under consideration of the government to regulate employment and conditions of service and to provide certain welfare measures to agricultural workers.  
views/comments of the State Governments.

**Lok Sabha USQ No. 2025 dated 8.3.2000 by S/Shri Lakshman Seth and Hannan Mollah****INTRODUCE BILL ON AGRICULTURAL WORKERS**

- (a) whether the Government have decided to introduce Comprehensive Central Legislature on agricultural workers;
- (b) if so, the salient features thereof; and
- (c) the time by which it is likely to be introduced?

**ANSWER****Minister of State for Labour & Employment (Shri Muni Lall)**

(a) to (c): Yes, Sir. A proposal to enact a comprehensive legislation for agricultural workers is under consideration of the government. It includes provision for regulating the working conditions, working hours, minimum harvesting wages, speedy dispute resolution, security of employment and creation of a welfare Fund for providing certain welfare/social security measures including health, maternity benefit, old age pension, children's education, housing etc. to these workers. As it is the endeavour of the government to reach a consensus on the matter, a conference of the State Labour Ministers was again held on 18.01.2000 in New Delhi when views of the State Governments were obtained. The proposal is being re-examined on the basis of the views/comments of the State Governments.

**Lok Sabha USQ No. 2799 dated 6.12.2000 by Shri A. Narendra Kumar**

**LEGISLATION FOR WORKERS**

- (a) whether the Government has a proposal to enact a Central legislation for workers engaged in agriculture and construction works;
- (b) if so, what are its salient features;
- (c) whether State Governments have been consulted in this regard;
- (d) if so, what are its details; and
- (e) what is the present position of said Central legislation?

**ANSWER**

**Minister of State for Labour & Employment (Shri Muni Lall)**

The Minister inter-alia stated that the proposal is being re-examined on the basis of the views/comments of the State Governments.

**Lok Sabha USQ No. 4388 dated 16.4.2001 by Shri Vilas Muttemwaar and Dr. Jaswant Singh Yadav**

**CENTRAL LAW FOR FARM WORKERS**

- (a) whether Government have taken any decision about enacting a Central law for the farm workers;
- (b) if so, the details thereof;
- (c) the time by which the proposed Bill is likely to be introduced in Parliament; and
- (d) if not, the reasons therefor?

**ANSWER**

**Minister of State for Labour and Employment (Shri Muni Lall)**

(a) to (d): A proposal to enact a Central Law for agricultural workers has been under consideration. This matter has been discussed in meetings of State Labour Ministers and various forums and in the absence of any definite consensus in this respect, it is now proposed to introduce a social security scheme for agricultural workers.



**Lok Sabha SQ No. 19 dated 5.7.2004 by Shri Ajoy Chakraborty and Shri Bir Singh Mahato**

**COMPREHENSIVE LEGISLATION FOR AGRICULTURAL LABOUR**

- (a) whether the Government is aware of the long pending proposal for enacting a comprehensive Central legislation to protect the interests of unorganized sector including agricultural labour all over the country;
- (b) if so, the measures proposed to be taken for the enactment of such a legislation; and
- (c) details of the other schemes being implemented for the welfare of unorganized labour alongwith the funds provided to State Governments under these schemes during the last three years?

**ANSWER**

**Minister of Labour & Employment (Shri Sis Ram Ola)**

(a) to (b): A proposal regarding enactment of a Central legislation for the welfare of agricultural labourers had been under consideration of the Government. Due to lack of consensus amongst the State Governments on various components on the draft Bill, the matter could not be processed further. Another proposal regarding comprehensive legislation for unorganized sector workers is also under consideration. The category of workers proposed to be covered, inter-alia, include agricultural workers.

(c): The Government has initiated several measures for the welfare of the labourers in the unorganized sector. The government have set up Welfare funds to provide social security/welfare measures to certain categories of workers i.e. beedi workers, certain non-coal mine workers and cine workers. The welfare measures include health care, housing, educational assistance for children, drinking water supply etc. About 40 lakhs beedi workers, 0.31 lakh cine workers and about 0.76 lakh non-coal mine workers and their families are availing benefits under these welfare measures. The details indicating the amount disbursed during the last three years are given in Annexure.

Statement referred to in part (c) of the Lok Sabha Starred Question No. 19

Sl. No.	Name of the fund	2001-2002	2002-2003	2003-2004
1.	Beedi workers welfare fund	53.31	65.82	82.14
2.	Limestone & Dolomite Mines Labour Welfare fund	6.18	6.22	6.50
3.	Iron Ore Mines, Maganese Ore Mines & Chrome Ore Mines Labour Welfare Fund	8.92	7.96	9.16
4.	Mica Mines Labour Welfare Fund	1.43	1.25	1.16
5.	Cine Workers Welfare Fund	0.51	0.54	0.84
	<b>Total</b>	<b>70.35</b>	<b>81.79</b>	<b>99.80</b>