

COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT ASSURANCES
(2002-2003)

THIRTEENTH LOK SABHA

NINTH REPORT

(Request for Dropping of Assurances)



LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT

NEW DELHI

**COMPOSITION OF THE COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT
ASSURANCES***
(2002-2003)

Chairman

Dr. S. Venugopal

Members

2. Shri E.Ahamed
3. Shri Priya Ranjan Dasmunsi
4. Adv. Uttamrao Dhikale
5. Dr. S. Jagathrakshakan
6. Shri Brahma Nand Mandal
7. Shri Ramjee Manjhi
8. Shri Sudarsana E.M. Natchiappan
9. Shri Rupchand Pal
10. Shri S.B.P.B.K. Satyanarayana Rao
11. Shri Kishan Singh Sangwan
12. Shri Raghuraj Singh Shakya
13. Shri Bahadur Singh
14. Rajkumari Ratna Singh
15. Shri Tarlochan Singh Tur

Secretariat

- | | | | |
|----|--------------------------|---|----------------------|
| 1. | Shri P.D.T. Achary | - | Additional Secretary |
| 2. | Shri M. Rajagopalan Nair | - | Joint Secretary |
| 2. | Shri A.K. Singh | - | Deputy Secretary |
| 3. | Ms. J.C. Namchyö | - | Assistant Director |

* The Committee was nominated by the Speaker w.e.f. January 16,2002 vide
Para No.2528 of Lok Sabha Bulletin Part-II dated January 16, 2002

INTRODUCTION

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

The Committee (2002-2003) was constituted on January 16, 2002.

The Committee (2001-2002) at their sittings held on June 29, 2001, considered inter-alia Memoranda Nos.10, 12, 13, 15, 16 & 17 containing requests received from the Ministries/Departments of the Government of India for dropping of pending assurances.

At their sitting held on May14,2002, Committee(2002-2003) considered and adopted Ninth Report.

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

The conclusions/observations of the Committee are contained in this Report.

NEW DELHI;
May 14, 2002
Vaisakha 24, 1924(Saka)

DR. S. VENUGOPAL
Chairman
Committee on Government Assurances

CONTENTS

PAGE

Composition of the Committee (2002-2003)
Introduction

Report Request for dropping of Assurances (Accepted)

- (i) USQ No, 1233 dated 4.12.1995 regarding Construction of Housing in Rural Areas.
- (ii) USQ No. 407 dated 25.02.1997 regarding Incident of Police Firing in Uttarakhand.
- (iii) USQ No. 2776 dated 12.3.1997 regarding Grabbing of Land.
- (iv) USQ No. 224 dated 08.3.1999 regarding Foreign Investment.
- (v) USQ No. 1908 dated 8.3.1999 regarding Amendment in MRTP Act.
- (vi) USQ No. 3522 dated 12.10.2000 regarding One Man Fact Finding Committee.

APPENDICES

- I Minutes of the Seventh sitting of the Committee held on 29.06.2001.
- II. Minutes of the Third Sitting of the Committee held on 14.5.2002

ANNEXURES

- I Statement No. SS XII/13 dated 28.10.1999 in part fulfilment of USQ No. 1233 dated 4.12.1995 laid on the Table of the House on 28.10.1999

REPORT

(i) Construction of Houses in Rural Areas

1.1 On December 04, 1995, Shri Chandresh Patel, MP addressed the following Unstarred Question No.1233 to the Minister of Rural Areas and Employment:-

“(a) the number of houses constructed by various agencies in the rural areas of the country and details of the persons who were allotted these houses during this year;

(b) the details of the employment opportunities provided to people of various categories during the above mentioned period; and

(c) the number of the houses proposed to be constructed, and employment opportunities likely to be made available during the years 1996 and 1997 and the details of the plan and estimated cost thereof?”

1.2 In reply, the then Minister of State in the Ministry of Rural Areas and Employment (Department of Rural Employment and Poverty Alleviation) and Minister of State in the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs (Shri Vilas Muttemwar) stated as follows:-

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

1.3 The above reply was treated as an assurance and was required to be fulfilled by the Ministry of Rural Areas and Employment within three months of the date of the reply i.e. by March 03, 1996.

1.4 The assurance given was partially implemented on October 28, 1999 and was laid on the Table of the House vide S.S.No.XII/13 (Annexure-I).

1.5 The Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs vide their U.O. No.XV/RA&E(1)USQ1233-LS/95 dated July 04, 2000 forwarded a request of the

Ministry of Rural Areas and Employment for dropping of the assurance on the grounds indicated below:-

“that this Assurance is pending with the Ministry of Rural Development since December 04, 1995. We have, since then, been taking up the matter with all concerned State Governments in writing and also during review of all development programmes. We have reminded the State/UT Government of Orissa, Punjab, Tamil Nadu and Lakshdweep from the level of Secretary (RD) and Director (RH), but except the UT of Lakshdweep none of these has reponded so far. The UT of Lakshdweep has furnished `Nil` information.

Keeping in view the continuous – efforts made by this Office in obtaining information from the defaulting States and the long period that has already elapsed in the process, it is requested that a liberal view may be taken and the assurance given on LS/USQ no1233 be treated as fulfilled on the basis of available information.”

1.6 The Committee considered the request of the Ministry of Rural Development at their sitting held on June 29, 2001.

1.7 The Committee note that an assurance was given on December 4, 1995 in reply to a question which sought detailed information regarding houses constructed by various agencies in rural areas. On October 28, 1999 the Government laid a statement containing information collected from some States & UTs. That statement, however, did not contain information from the States/UT of Manipur, Orissa, Punjab, Tamilnadu and Lakhsadweep. The Committee are apprised that the Government made efforts to obtain information from those defaulting States and UT but without success. The Committee observe that this is not an isolated occasion when information sought from States/UTs have not been given to the Union Government. The Committee are of the view that the Union Government should evolve some mechanism so that it becomes obligatory on the part of State Governments/UTs to furnish information to Parliament promptly. The Committee need not emphasise that in case the assurances are kept pending for a long

time the very purpose of an important Parliamentary instruments gets diluted. The Committee, however, dropped this assurance in question.

(ii) **Incident of Police Firing in Uttarakhand**

1.8 On February 25, 1997, Shri Bhakta Charan Das, MP addressed the following Unstarred Question No.407 to the Home Minister:-

“(a) whether the Judicial Commission constituted to probe into the killing of 15 persons in Police Firing in Uttarakhand in October, 1994 has submitted its report;

(b) if so, the findings thereof;

(c) if not, the reasons for delay;

(d) whether some other similar Commissions have also been appointed in Uttar Pradesh;

(e) whether those Commission have since submitted their reports;

(f) if so, the details thereof; and

(g) if not, the time by which the reports of those Commissions are likely to be submitted?”

1.9 In reply, the then Minister of State in the Ministry of Home Affairs (Shri Mohd. Maqbool Dar) stated as follows:-

“(a) to (g): Information is being collected and will be laid on the Table of the House.”

1.10 The above reply was treated as an assurance and was required to be fulfilled within three months of the date of the reply i.e. by May 24, 1997.

1.11 The Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs vide their U.O. No.IV/Home(2)USQ407-LS/97 dated September 09, 2000 forwarded a request for dropping of the above mentioned assurance on the following grounds:-

“the fulfilment of the Parliament Assurance is pending on account of non-receipt of requisite information from the State Government of Uttar Pradesh.

Government of Uttar Pradesh was requested to send us information for fulfilling the assurance. Government of Uttar Pradesh has reported that the Judicial Commission, which was set up for looking into the violent incidents of October 2, 1994 between the police and the people who were demanding a separate Uttarakhand, had submitted its report to the Government. The report of the Commission is under consideration of the Government. The report of the Judicial Commission has not yet been laid before the Legislative Assembly of Uttar Pradesh, so its recommendation can not be made public.

The Government of UP have further reported that they had set up another Judicial Commission on 26.11.1995 under the Chairmanship of Mr. Justice V.P. Singh (Retd.) for inquiring into the incident of October 2, 1994 in which two dead bodies were found near the river Alaknanda on Shri Yant Tapu. The Government of Uttar Pradesh did not extend the tenure of the Commission beyond 31.03.1998 and the Commission had given its incomplete report to the Government on December 23, 1999. The report of the Commission is still under consideration of the Government.

It may please be appreciated that the subject matter of the assurance falls within the purview of the State Government concerned. It is for the State Government to make the findings of the Commission public and to initiate any further action in accordance with the findings of the Inquiry Commission. The Government of India has hardly any say in this matter and indefinite delay in fulfilling the assurance relating to the State subject cannot be ruled out.

In view of the above, it is requested that the matter may please be placed before the Committee on Government Assurances with a request to delete the issue from the list of pending assurances.”

1.12 The Committee considered the request of the Ministry of Home Affairs at their sitting held on June 29, 2001.

1.13 The Committee note that a question was asked on February 25, 1997 whether a judicial commission was constituted to enquire into the incident of police firing on people agitating for Uttarakhand in October 1994 and to know details of the

report submitted by the commission. In this connection, the Minister of State in the Ministry of Home Affairs had promised to lay the information on the Table of the House.

1.14 The Committee have no doubt, that the assurance was given in February 1997 since the State of UP was under President's Rule at that time and, under such circumstance, it was obligatory on the part of Union government to furnish information to the Parliament. The Committee, however, note that the Union Government could not have the details of the reports although the State Government of UP had constituted two judicial commissions and the reports submitted by those commissions were still not laid in the Legislative Assembly of U.P and were under consideration of the State Government.

1.15 The Committee feel that the request of Union Government that the subject matter falls within the purview of State Government could have been sent earlier as soon as the new democratically constituted Government took over in UP. The Committee, however, had no option but to accede to the request of the Ministry of Home Affairs as the new State of Uttaranchal has also now been created for which the incident of police firing took place. The Committee recommend that the assurance relating to state subject should be implemented on priority and not kept pending awaiting on constitution of new Government.

(iii) Grabbing of Land

1.16 On March 12, 1997, Shri Jang Bahadur Singh Patel, MP addressed the following Unstarred Question No.2776 to the Prime Minister:-

“(a) whether land worth crores of rupees has been grabbed in Allahabad and Nainital with the connivance of the State Officials;

(b) if so, the details thereof and the names of the persons who have grabbed the land as also the names of the Officials who have connived with the land grabbers; and

(c) the action the Government propose to take in the matter to reclaim the grabbed land?”

1.17 In reply, the then Minister of State in the Ministry of Urban Affairs and Employment and Minister of State in the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs (Shri Dr. U. Venkateswarlu) stated as follows:-

“(a) to (c): Information is being collected and will be laid on the Table of the House.”

1.18 The above reply was treated as an assurance and was required to be fulfilled within three months of the date of the reply i.e. by June 11, 1997.

1.19 The Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs vide their U.O. No.IV/UAE(5)USQ2776-LS/97 dated September 28, 1999 forwarded a request for dropping of the above mentioned assurance on the following grounds:-

“that the matter was taken up with the Government of Uttar Pradesh for furnishing the requisite information. A number of letters including D.O. letters have been written to the Chief Secretary, Government of Uttar Pradesh but the complete information is still awaited from them.

In this regard, it is observed that this question was raised in the Lok Sabha when the State of Uttar Pradesh was under President’s rule. Further, it is also pertinent to mention that land is a State subject. Since the State Legislative Assembly/Council is very much in existence, the elected representatives of the Uttar Pradesh can very well seek any information in this regard by raising further questions in the State Assembly/Council.

Since this assurance has been pending for more than two years and despite our pursuing the matter with the State Government for furnishing the information, the requisite information has not been furnished by the State Government. It is requested that the assurance may please be dropped because of the time and efforts involved and particularly, in view of the fact that land is a State subject and the

issue was raised in the Lok Sabha when the State was under the President's Rule.”

1.20 The Committee considered the request of the Ministry of Urban Development & Poverty Alleviation at their sitting held on June 29, 2001.

1.21 An assurance was given on March 12, 1997 in reply to a question asked about the alleged land grabbing in Allahabad and Nainital. The Committee have been informed that this question was raised in Lok Sabha as the State of UP was under the President's Rule at that time. The Committee note that one of the reasons pleaded for dropping the assurances is that the State Government of UP had not furnished complete information despite several letters to the Chief Secretary, Government of UP. The Committee feel that the Ministry of Urban Development & Poverty Alleviation could have furnished the available information to Lok Sabha as the Parliament have every right to know about the information sought in the House. The Committee would therefore like the Government to lay the available facts whenever received so that the transparency in the working of the Government is maintained. The Committee, however, accede to the request of the Ministry of Urban Development and Poverty Alleviation to drop the assurance.

(iv) Foreign Investments.

1.22 On June 11, 1998, Prof. Prem Singh Chandumajra and Shri Anand Ratna Maurya, MPs addressed the following Starred Question No.224 to the Minister of Urban Affairs and Employment:-

“(a) whether the Government propose to allow foreign investments in the development of basic infrastructure and construction of dwelling units in the country;

(b) if so, the details thereof; and

(b) the time by which the final decision is likely to be taken in this regard?"

1.23 In reply, the then Minister of Urban Affairs and Employment (Shri Ram Jethmalani) laid the following statement:-

“(a) to (c): Government is actively considering the proposal to allow foreign investment (FDI) in the housing sector. Detailed proposal is being formulated by this Ministry, which will be placed before the Union Cabinet, and after the Cabinet has approved the proposal, appropriate orders will be issued.

As per the existing NRI scheme, formulated by this Ministry, non-residents of Indian nationality/origin and Overseas Corporate Bodies (OCBs) which are owned directly or indirectly to the extent of at least 60% by NRI/People of Indian Origin (PIO) are allowed to invest in housing and urban development sector. The scheme permits existing or new companies, both private and public limited, to issue equity shares/convertible debentures to non-residents of Indian nationality/origin upto 100% with repatriation benefits after a lock-in-period of 3 years with 16% cap on repatriation of profits and no cap on dividend and interest earned for OCB, if the company is engaged in development of serviced plots or construction of residential, commercial premises including business centres and offices, development of townships, city and region level urban infrastructural facilities, including roads and bridges, manufacturing of building materials and financing of housing development.”

1.24 As a Supplementary to the Question, Prof. Prem Singh Chandumajra, MP wanted to know the maximum investment fixed for foreign investment by NRIs and Multinational Companies in Housing sector as also the criteria laid down in this regard.

In reply, the then Hon'ble Minister stated as under:-

“The main question was whether the Government is really permitting foreign direct investment in the housing sector. The answer is that we are still at the consideration stage. It is being very seriously considered.”

1.25 The above reply to the supplementary question was treated as an assurance and was required to be fulfilled by the Ministry of Urban Affairs and Employment within three months of the date of the reply i.e. by September 10, 1998.

1.26 The Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs vide their U.O. Note No. UAE(2)SQ224/LS/98 dated January 09, 2001 forwarded a request of the Ministry of Urban Development and Poverty Alleviation for dropping of the assurance on the grounds indicated below:-

This Ministry has been considering the issue of inviting foreign direct investment (FDI) in housing and real estate and the matter was referred to the Union Cabinet and later to a Group of Ministers. Recently, it was observed by the Hon'ble Minister for Urban Development and Poverty Alleviation that "time was not yet ripe for inviting FDI in housing and real estate and that the matter be looked into afresh, if need be." It was accordingly decided to request Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs to move the Committee on Government Assurances to drop this assurance. Meanwhile it appears that the Group of Ministers has also ceased to exist.

I shall be grateful, if you could get this assurance deleted from the list of pending assurances, as early as possible....."

1.27 The Committee considered the request of the Ministry of Urban Development & Poverty Alleviation at their sitting held on June 29, 2001.

1.28 The Committee note that on June 11, 1998 when an Hon'ble Member specifically sought to know the maximum investment that NRIs and MNCs could invest in Housing Sector, the Minister stated that the Union Government was actively considering a proposal to allow foreign direct investment in the Housing Sector. The Committee now note that the Union Government do not deem it ripe at present to invite foreign direct investment in housing and real estate. In view of change in policy perception of the Government the Committee have agreed to drop the assurance.

Amendment in the MRTTP Act

1.29 On March 08, 1999, Dr. T.Subbarami Reddy and Shri A.C. Jose, MPs addressed the following Unstarred Question No.1908 to the Minister of Law, Justice and Company Affairs:-

“(a) whether the Union Government have decided to amend the MRTP Act to align with the present corporate needs;

(b) if so, the main points of amendment being proposed in this regard and the time by which the Bill is likely to be introduced in Parliament;

(c) whether these amendments will be introduced during the current session of Parliament;

(d) if so, the number of multinational companies against whom investigation has been made by Director General, Investigation and Registrar of the Companies during the last two years separately; and

(e) the action taken by the Government against them?”

1.30 In reply, the then Minister of Law, Justice and Company Affairs (Dr. M. Thambi Durai) stated as follows:-

“(a) & (c): Yes Sir. It is proposed to appoint a Committee to examine the MRTP Act, 1969 and to suggest a modern Competition Law suitable to our conditions. A Bill will be introduced in the Parliament to amend the MRTP Act after the recommendations of the Committee are received and examined by the Government.

(d) & (e): There is no generally acceptable definition of a “multi-national company.” As such Government do not maintain any statistics on companies based on so called classification of multinational companies.”

1.31. Reply to parts (a) to (c) of the question was treated as an assurance and was required to be fulfilled by the Ministry of Law, Justice and Company Affairs within three months of the date of the reply i.e. by June 07, 1999.

1.32 The Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs vide their U.O. No.IV/Law(3)USQ1908-LS/99 dated January 27, 2000 forwarded a dropping request of

the Ministry of Law, Justice and Company Affairs in regard to the assurance on the grounds indicated below:-

“that Government of India has constituted a Committee, under the Chairmanship of Shri S.V.S. Raghevan, to examine the provisions of MRTP Act, 1969 and to propose a Modern Competition Law. The Committee is expected to submit its report by March 31, 2000. Amendments to the MRTP Act, 1969 can be taken up only after the Report is examined.

As any new legislative proposal is a long drawn process, and as no time limit could be drawn for enactment of a law, the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs are requested to move the Committee on Government Assurances, Lok Sabha and request them kindly to drop the assurance.”

1.33 The Ministry of Law, Justice and Company Affairs vide their OM No. 9/14/99-IGC dated March 7, 2001 informed that the Committee examining the provisions of MRTP Act, 1969 submitted its report in May 2000. After inter-ministrial discussions with various Chambers of Commerce and Industry, the Department of Company Affairs prepared a draft Concept Bill on Competition Law for consideration by the Cabinet.

1.34 The Committee considered the request of the Ministry of Law, Justice & Company Affairs at their sitting held on June 29, 2001.

1.35 The Committee, considering the fact that the draft Concept Bill has since been approved by the Cabinet, agreed to drop the assurance.

(vi) **One Man Fact Finding Committee.**

1.36 On December 12, 2000, S/Shri Abdullakutty and S.P. Lepcha, MPs addressed the following Unstarred Question No.3522 to the Minister of Science and Technology:-

“(a) whether the One Man Fact Finding Committee constituted to enquire into various irregularities in National Institute of Science Communication, Council of Scientific and Industrial Research has submitted its report;

- (b) if so, whether the Government accepted the findings and recommendations in the report;**
- (c) if so, the steps taken to implement said report for the last three years;**
- (d) whether the Government make the report available to the public;**
- (e) if so, the details thereof; and**
- (f) if not, the reasons therefor?"**

1.37 In reply, the Minister for Human Resource Development and Science and Technology (Dr. Murli Manohar Joshi) stated as follows:-

“(a) & (b): Yes Sir.

(a) On the basis of the report, disciplinary proceedings were initiated against 18 officials by the respective disciplinary authorities. One case has already been finalised and others are approaching conclusion.

(b) No, Sir.

(c) Does not arise.

(d) Making the report public will be prejudicial to the ongoing disciplinary process.”

1.38 Part (c) of the above reply was treated as an assurance and was required to be fulfilled by the Ministry of Science and Technology within three months of the date of the reply i.e. by March 11, 2001.

1.39 The Minister of Science and Technology and Ocean Development vide his D.O. No. 456-MIN, (S&T) dated June 04, 2001 requested for dropping of the assurance on the grounds indicated below:-

“You will kindly appreciate that by the very nature the disciplinary cases take a long time to come to the conclusion as there are several agencies involved in the process. Moreover, the charged Officers

themselves have the right to represent to the various authorities at every stage of a disciplinary proceedings, which results in unavoidable delays. In fact, two of the Charged Officers, out of a total of 18 who were issued charge sheet as per the advice of CVC, have moved CAT, Principal Bench, New Delhi. The cases are pending before the Hon'ble Tribunal. I hope you will kindly appreciate that under these circumstances it may not be possible to indicate a specific schedule for disposal of these disciplinary cases. In view of the foregoing, you will kindly agree that the reply to part (c) cannot be construed an assurance.

I assure you that the pace of progress in these vigilance cases is satisfactory, yet it is not possible to achieve conclusion of all these cases within the time stipulations of Rules of Business in regard to fulfillment of assurance.”

1.40 The Committee considered the request of the Minister of Science & Technology at their sitting held on June 29, 2001.

1.41 The Committee note that Government have accepted the findings and recommendations made by the One Man Fact Finding Committee constituted to enquire into various irregularities in National Institute of Science Communication, Council of Scientific & Industrial Research. The Committee are satisfied that disciplinary proceedings have already been initiated against the guilty. The Committee, therefore, dropped the assurance.

NEW DELHI;
May 14, 2002
Vaisakha 24, 1924(Saka)

DR. S. VENUGOPAL
Chairman
Committee on Government Assurances

APPENDIX-I

MINUTES
SEVENTH SITTING

Minutes of the Seventh sitting of the Committee on Government Assurances held on June 29, 2001 in Party Meeting Room '139', First floor, Parliament House Annexe, New Delhi.

The Committee met from 1500 hours to 1545 hours on Friday, June 29, 2001.

PRESENT

Shri Rupchand Pal - in the Chair

Members

2. **Shri Haribhai Chaudhary**
3. **Shri Padam Sen Choudhry**
4. **Shri Brahmanand Mandal**
5. **Shri Sudarsana E.M. Natchiappan**
6. **Dr. Prasanna Kumar Patasani**
7. **Shri Dharam Raj Singh Patel**
8. **Shri Manoj Sinha**
9. **Rajkumari Ratna Singh**

SECRETARIAT

1. **Shri A.K. Singh, Deputy Secretary**
2. **Ms. J.C. Namchy, Assistant Director**

In the absence of the Chairman (Dr. S. Venugopal) Shri Rupchand Pal, MP conducted the Sitting of the Committee after his name was proposed and seconded by the Members of the Committee present.

The Committee considered the following Memoranda regarding dropping of assurances:-

- | | |
|-------------------------|---|
| Memorandum No.9 | Request for dropping of assurances given in reply to various Unstarred Questions tabled from December 18, 1992 to June 02, 1998 regarding Setting up of Manpower Export Promotion Council. |
| Memorandum No.14 | Request for dropping of assurance given on August 06, 1997 in reply to USQ No.214 regarding Rehabilitation Scheme for Gulf Returnees. |

Both the above Memoranda were taken up together. Assurances had been given on the subject of a proposal for setting up of Manpower Export Promotion Council. According to the Ministry of Labour, the existing Emigration Act, 1983 does not provide for Government to have a promotional role to study the need and demands of the overseas Labour market and/or to provide any training, career counselling to the workers going overseas. With a view to facilitating deployment of vast reservoir of skilled, semi-skilled and unskilled manpower to other countries for contractual employment and also enhancing their functional capability to compete with workers from other labour exporting countries, the proposal for constitution of Central Manpower Export Promotion Council had been under consideration of the Ministry. The Ministry of Labour were of the opinion that the objective of the assurances has been achieved as a very elaborate process of consultation and legal examination has been put into effect for introduction of Bill for setting up the Manpower Export Promotion Council.

The Committee discussed the matter in detail. The Committee were of the view that the subject matter is very important and the rights of labourers going abroad need also be protected especially in case of ill-treatment. A Member mentioned about the recent incidence of maltreatment of Indian workers which happened in Maldives. The Committee were of the opinion that the representatives of the Ministry of Labour and Ministry of External Affairs may be called for oral evidence to know in detail about the provisions being made in the Bill. These assurances were, therefore, not dropped.

Memorandum No.10 Request for dropping of assurance given on December 04, 1995 in reply to USQ No.1233 regarding Construction of Houses in Rural Areas.

Assurance with regard to above request was given when a question was asked about the detailed information regarding construction of houses in rural areas by different

agencies and details of employment opportunities provided to people of different category. The Committee noted that the assurance were partially implemented in October, 1999 and that the Ministry of Rural Areas and Employment were not able to collect information from States of Manipur, Orissa, Punjab and Tamil Nadu despite repeated reminders. The Committee acceded to the request of the Ministry for dropping of assurance.

Memorandum No.11 Request for dropping of assurance given on September 03, 1995 in reply to USQ No.3943 regarding Fake Railway Passes.

The committee noted that earlier too, the ministry of railways had requested the committee to drop this assurance on the plea that CBI/police are independent agencies and the investigation may take quite some time. The committee, however, did not agree to drop the assurance but desired to summon the representatives of the ministry of the railways to spell out the entire policy and views involved with regard to issue of railway passes.

The present request for dropping of the assurance is based on the fact that 2 cases relating to northeast railway have not yet been accepted by cbi patna for investigation despite request. In case of eastern railway - 2 cases have been closed after prosecution, 1 case was closed by local police as charges were not substantiated and in case of other, cbi has not yet submitted the charge sheet and that 1 case pertaining to western railway is pending trial in mumbai metropolitan court. According to latest information, the status had not changed.

The Committee were of the view that the representatives of Ministry of Railways may be called for Oral Evidence before their request is dropped.

Memorandum No.12 Request for dropping of assurance given on February 25, 1997 in reply to USQ No.407 regarding Incident of Police Firing in Uttarakhand.

The Committee took up the above Memorandum for dropping of the assurance in pursuance of a request received from Ministry of Home Affairs. The Committee acceded to their request on the plea that the Government of India has hardly any say in the Commission's Report on police firing in Uttarakhand to be made public.

Memorandum No.13 Request for dropping of assurance given on March 12, 1997 in reply to USQ No.2776 regarding Grabbing of Land.

The Committee considered the above mentioned Memorandum. The Committee agreed that Land is a State subject and that the assurance was given when the State of UP was under President's Rule. The Committee, therefore, acceded to the request of the Ministry to drop this assurance.

Memorandum No.15 Request for dropping of assurance given on June 11, 1998 in reply to USQ No.224 regarding Foreign Investment.

The Committee considered the above request of the Ministry of Urban Affairs and Employment. The Committee noted that the matter of Foreign Direct Investment in Housing and Real Estate was no more valid. The Committee acceded to the request of the Ministry for dropping of assurance.

Memorandum No.16 Request for dropping of assurance given on March 08, 1999 in reply to USQ No.1908 regarding Amendments in the MRTP Act.

The Committee took up the above Memorandum pertaining to the Ministry of Law, Justice and Company Affairs to drop the assurance on the ground that the Draft concept Bill on Competition Law had been prepared, made available on the web site of that Department (www.nic.in/dca) for eliciting comments/suggestions from all

concerned. It has further been stated that a note for Cabinet for introduction of Draft Bill has been put up. The Committee noted that the Draft Bill has since been approved by the Cabinet and, therefore, decided to drop.

Memorandum No.17 Request for dropping of assurance given on December 12, 2000 in reply to USQ No.3522 regarding One Man Fact Finding Committee.

Lastly, the Committee took the above mentioned request of the Ministry of Human Resource Development. The above Memorandum relates to One Man Fact Finding Committee constituted to enquire into the various irregularities in National Institute of Science Communication Council of Scientific and Industrial Research. The Committee noted that disciplinary proceedings initiated would take a long time and that 2 cases had already been pending before CAT, Principal Branch, New Delhi. The Committee acceded to the request of the Minister of Science & Technology and Ocean Development.

Thereafter the Committee were informed that the sitting of the Committee fixed for Monday, July 9, 2001 had been postponed and that the next date of sitting would be intimated in due course.

The Committee then adjourned.

MINUTES
THIRD SITTING

Minutes of the Third Sitting of the Committee on Government Assurances held on May 14, 2002 in Committee Room 'E', Basement, Parliament House Annexe, New Delhi.

The Committee met from 1530 hours to 1620 hours on Tuesday, May 14, 2002.

PRESENT

Dr. S. Venugopal - *Chairman*

Members

2. Shri Priya Ranjan Dasmunsi
3. Shri Brahma Nand Mandal
4. Shri Rupchand Pal
5. Shri S.B.P.B.K. Satyanarayana Rao
6. Shri Kishan Singh Sangwan
7. Shri Bahadur Singh
8. Rajkumari Ratna Singh
9. Shri Tarlochan Singh Tur

SECRETARIAT

Shri A.K. Singh, Deputy Secretary

The Committee considered draft 8th and 9th Reports and adopted the same.

2. The Committee authorised the Chairman to present the Reports on May 16, 2002.

3. The Committee decided that during tour assurances regarding one Ministry may be taken up at one station and that too pending for the last 5-6 years may be taken up first.

4. The Committee also decided to go on study tour to Shimla and Kulu Manali in second week of June, 2002 in connection with certain pending assurances.

The Committee then adjourned.

XV SESSION 1995 OF TENTH LOK SABHA
Ministry of Rural Areas and Employment

Question No. & Date & Name of M.P	Subject	Promise made	When and How fulfilled	Reasons for delay
<p>USQ No. 1233, dated 24.12.95 Shri Chandresh Patel, MP</p>	<p>CONSTRUCTION OF HOUSES IN RURAL AREAS</p> <p>(a) the number of houses constructed by various agencies in the rural areas of the country and details of the persons who are allotted these house during this year;</p> <p>(b) the details of the employment opportunities provided to people of various categories during the above mentioned period; and</p> <p>(c) the number of houses proposed to be constructed and employment opportunities likely to be made available during the years 1996 and 1997 and the details of the plan and estimated cost thereof?</p>	<p>(a) to (c): The information is being collected and will be laid on the Table of the House.</p>	<p>(a) As per the information received from State Governments, excluding Manipur, Orissa, Punjab, Tamil Nadu and Lakshadweep around 10,80,143 houses have been constructed in rural areas of the country during 1995-96 and the same have been allotted to Landless, SC/ST and others.</p> <p>(b) Around 1497.54 lakh mandays of employment opportunity were provided to SC/STs and others through construction of these houses</p>	<p>The information required is usually not maintained as part of regular monitoring and therefore it took time to obtain information from States/UTs.</p>

			during 1995-96. (c) About 17,24,985 houses were proposed to be constructed during 1996-97 to provide employment opportunities to the tune of 1799.52 lakh mandays. The estimated cost was Rs. 1802.50 crore to achieve this target.	
--	--	--	--	--