

**COMMITTEE
ON
GOVERNMENT ASSURANCES**

(1990-91)

(NINTH LOK SABHA)

SECOND REPORT

(Presented on 24 AUG 1990)



**LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT
NEW DELHI**

June, 1990 / Jyaishta, 1912 (Saka)

Price: Rs. 2.00

C O R R I G E N D A
to the Second Report of the
CGA (1990-91)

(Ninth Lok Sabha)

<u>Page No.</u>	<u>Para No.</u>	<u>Line</u>	<u>Correction</u>
16	13.3	3	<u>for</u> 'assurances' <u>read</u> 'assurance'
	13.4	last line	<u>for</u> '6030' <u>read</u> '60.30' crores
17	13.4	4	<u>for</u> 'Sleepers' <u>read</u> 'sleepers'
17		13	<u>for</u> 'undated' <u>read</u> 'updated'
17		15	<u>for</u> 'undating' <u>read</u> 'updating'
18		15	<u>for</u> 'Shri Kusuma Krishna Murthy' <u>read</u> 'Shri Kusuma Krishnamurthy'
20	3	10	<u>delete</u> 'time'
24	10	7&8	<u>delete</u> 'However the Committee did not consider these cases'
27.		11	<u>for</u> 'Shri Mahadeepak Singh' <u>read</u> Dr. Mahadeepak Singh 'Shakya'
27.		12.	<u>for</u> Shri Kusuma Krishna Murthy' <u>read</u> 'Shri Kusuma Krishnamurthy'

C O N T E N T S

	PAGE
COMPOSITION OF THE COMMITTEE	(iii)
INTRODUCTION	(v)
CHAPTER Requests for dropping of assurances	1.

M I N U T E S

Minutes of Sitting held on 6 March, 1990	18
Minutes of Sitting held on 24 April, 1990	20
Minutes of Sitting held on 11 June, 1990	27

**COMPOSITION OF THE COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT
ASSURANCES***
(1990-91)

- Dr. Vijay Kumar Malhotra—*Chairman*
2. Shri Jai Parkash Agarwal
 3. Smt. Subhasini Ali
 4. Shri Bhajaman Behera
 5. Shri Het Ram
 6. Shri Kamal Nath
 7. Shri Mahabir Prasad
 8. Dr. Mahadeepak Singh Shakya
 9. Shri Harjibhau Shankar Mahale
 10. Shri Kusuma Krishnamurthy
 11. Shri Debi P. Paul
 12. Shri Amar Roy Pradhan
 13. Shri C. Srinivasan
 14. Shri Ramji Lal Suman
 15. Shri P. K. Thungon

SECRETARIAT

1. Shri C. K. Jain — *Joint Secretary*
2. Shri S. C. Gupta — *Director*
3. Shri Jyoti Prasad — *Under Secretary*

* The Committee was nominated by the Speaker w.e.f. January 19, 1990 vide para No. 125 of Lok Sabha Bulletin Part-II dated 19 January, 1990.

** Ceased to be a member of the Committee consequent upon his appointment as Minister of State w.e.f. 21 April, 1990.

INTRODUCTION

I, the Chairman of the Committee on Government Assurances, as authorised by the Committee, do present on their behalf this Second Report of the Committee on Government Assurances.

2. The Committee (1990-91) were constituted on 19 January, 1990.

3. The Committee (1990-91) at their sittings held on 6 March, 1990 and 24 April, 1990 considered requests for dropping of assurances. At their sitting held on 11 June, 1990, the Committee considered and adopted the draft Second Report.

4. The Minutes of the aforesaid sittings of the Committee form part of the Report.

5. The conclusions/observations of the Committee are contained in the succeeding chapters.

NEW DELHI;
11 June, 1990

21 Jyaishta, 1912 (Saka)

DR. VIJAY KUMAR MALHOTRA,
Chairman,
Committee on Government Assurances.

REQUESTS FOR DROPPING OF ASSURANCES

(i)

Pending Applications for Freedom Fighters Pension

1.1 On 14 August, 1987, Sarvashri K. Kunjambu, N. Dennis, Ajoy Biswas and Mohanbhai Patel MPs addressed the following Unstarred Question No. 2985 to the Minister of Home Affairs:—

- “(a) the total number of applications of freedom fighters pending for grant of pension, State-wise as on 1 July, 1987;
- (b) whether any deadline has been fixed for clearance of these pending pension cases; and
- (c) if so, the date so fixed?”

1.2 In reply to the above question, the then Minister of State in the Ministry of Home Affairs (Shri Chintamani Panigrahi) stated as follows:—

- (a) A statement is annexed.
- (b) & (c) “Every effort is being made to dispose of pending cases expeditiously”.

1.3 The above reply to the question was treated as an assurance by the Lok Sabha Secretariat and the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs. The assurance was required to be implemented by the Ministry of Home Affairs by 14 November, 1987.

1.4 The Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs vide their U.O. Note No. VIII-2/H.A. (42) USQ. 2985 LS/87 dated 12.2.1990 forwarded request of the Ministry of Home Affairs for the dropping of the assurance on the following grounds:

“The number of pending committee cases have since been reduced from 3172 to 692. A meeting of the non-official committee was fixed in the last week of October, 1989 to consider these cases. However, the Committee did not consider these cases for the reasons that they did not want to make adverse recommendations in the election year. Regarding the other cases having special features, all the cases in which State Governments' verification reports received have since been disposed off. Substantial progress has been made with regard to the disposal of pending cases.”

1.5 The committee at their sitting held on 24 April, 1990 considered the request of the Ministry and decided not to drop the assurance. The decision of the Committee was conveyed to Ministry.

1.6 The Ministry had sought extension of time upto 14.4.90 to implement the assurance. The assurance is yet to be implemented.

1.7 The Committee find that the assurance relates to an important matter, namely, disposal of pending cases of pension to freedom fighters and was given as far back as August, 1987. They regret to note that instead of taking measures for disposing off all pending cases expeditiously and to implement the assurance, the Ministry approached them to drop it for reasons which are totally unconvincing. The Committee recommend that the Ministry should implement the assurance expeditiously and seek further extension of time beyond 14th April, 1990 as considered to be minimum necessary to implement the assurance.

(ii)

Steps to Improve Business in Share Markets

2.1 On 20 November, 1987, Smt. Basavarajeswari, Sarvashri Braja Mohan Mohanty and Shantaram Naik, M.Ps addressed the following Unstarred Question No. 2190 to the Minister of Finance:—

- “(a) whether Union Government are considering the proposal for relaxation of trading curbs in a bid to improve the volume of business in share markets;
- (b) if so, what are the proposals being considered; and
- (c) to what extent, they have helped in improving stock exchange?”

2.2 In reply to the above question, the then Minister of State in the Ministry of Finance (Shri B.K. Gadhi) stated as follows:

“(a), (b) & (c): The recommendations of the informal working group headed by Dr. Dave which studied the working of share markets are under implementation by the various stock exchanges. It is too early to assess the impact of the recommendations.”

2.3 The above reply to the question was treated as an assurance by the Lok Sabha Secretariat and the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs. The assurance was required to be implemented by the Ministry of Finance by 19 February, 1988.

2.4 The Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs *vide* their U.O. Note No. IX/ Fin. (104) USQ 2190—LS/87 dated 20.2.90 forwarded the request of the Ministry of Finance for the dropping of the assurance on the following grounds:

“It may kindly be noted that in the wake of steep fall in prices of scrips in major stock exchanges during the early part of 1987, Stock Exchanges had imposed restrictions in trading. With a view to consider measures for restoration of normalcy in trading, an informal working group was constituted which *inter-alia* included representatives of Stock Exchanges. The informal Working Group headed by Dr. Dave, had recommended the relaxation in trading curbs in phases. This was taken up for implementation by the Stock Exchanges at Ahmedabad, Bombay, Calcutta and Delhi on a concerted basis from October, 1987. Since the aforesaid Parliament Question (dated 20th Nov., 1987) desired to know as to whether Government were considering proposals for relaxation of trading

curbs, this Ministry had indicated a factual reply that "recommendations of the informal Working Group headed by Dr. Dave which studied the working of share markets are under implementation by the various Stock Exchanges". As it reflected a factual position and was not in any way meant to imply that the proposals were under consideration or that action was pending, it is stated that the reply to the aforesaid question may not be construed as an Assurance. Since at that time it was too early to assess the impact of the measures initiated (in end October, 1987), the same position was also indicated in the reply. It may readily be noted that over a period of time all the trading curbs have been relaxed by the Stock Exchanges and normal trading is taking place at present".

2.5 The Committee at their sitting held on 6th March, 1990 considered the request of the Ministry for dropping the assurance.

2.6 In view of the position explained by the Ministry, the Committee agree to the request of the Ministry to drop the assurance.

(iii)

Termination of Services of Defence Nurses on Marriage

3.1 On 21 November, 1988 Shri Thampan Thomas, Smt. Geeta Mukherjee and Shri P.A. Antony, M.Ps addressed the following Unstarred Question No. 1408 to the Minister of Defence:—

- “(a) whether the services of the nurses working in Defence Services are terminated on getting married;
- (b) if so, the reasons therefor;
- (c) the number of married nurses whose services have been terminated this year;
- (d) how many are continuing in service on court orders; and
- (e) whether Government propose to withdraw the orders on the subject?”

3.2 In reply to the above question, the then Minister of State in the Ministry of Defence (Shri Chintamani Panigrahi) stated as follows:—

“(a) & (b): Yes, Sir. Military nursing is a profession where total devotion to patient care is absolutely essential and marriage, with its commitments, makes it difficult for nurses to function in the military, especially in field conditions. Due to shortages in the nursing Cadre in the past, measures were taken since January, 1968, to retain nursing officers in service even after marriage if their performance of duties was satisfactory. This was achieved by granted them extensions in service for two years at a time. These shortages have been brought down now; hence, the existing policy was reviewed. In the interests of functional efficiency the Services of only those married nurses whose performance is not satisfactory are now being terminated.

(c) & (d): In the last one year the services of 45 married nurses were not extended due to their unsatisfactory record. Sixteen of them have gone to court and obtained stay orders. The final orders of the court are awaited.

(e) Government maintains that the present policy, which permits retention of married nurses in service only if their performance is satisfactory in terms of laid down criteria, is in the interests of the particular needs of the Armed Forces”.

3.3 The above reply to parts (c) and (d) of the question was treated as an assurance by the Lok Sabha Secretariat and the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs. The Assurance was required to be implemented by the Ministry of Defence by 20 February, 1989.

3.4 The Ministry of Defence *vide* their communication No. F.H. 11012/12/89/D(Parl.) dated 20 April, 1990 requested for the dropping of the assurance on the following grounds:—

“ the cases had been filed in different Courts by the Nurses, which are still pending finalisation. The nurses have obtained stay orders from Courts against their termination and they continue in service. In view of this, it will not be feasible to implement the assurance till the Courts decide the matter.”

3.5 The Committee at their sitting held on 24 April, 1990 considered the request of the Ministry and decided not to drop the assurance. The decision of the Committee was conveyed to the Ministry.

3.6 The Ministry had sought extension of time upto 20 May, 1990 for fulfilment of the assurance. The assurance is yet to be implemented.

3.7 The Committee are unable to agree to the request of the Ministry for the dropping of the assurance. They desire that the Ministry should initiate action to get the pending court cases decided at the earliest and to implement the assurance. The Ministry should also seek further extension of time beyond 20th May, 1990 as may be considered minimum to fulfil the assurance.

(iv)

Military Stations At Una and Hamirpur

4.1 On 10 April, 1989, Prof. Narain Chand Parashar, M.P. addressed the following Unstarred Question No. 5533 to the Minister of Defence:—

“(a) whether any decision has been taken regarding setting up of Military Stations at Hamirpur and Una in Himachal Pradesh;

(b) if so, the exact decision and date on which it has been taken; and

(c) if not, the likely date by which the decision would be taken to end the uncertainty among the people of the villages whose land is

likely to be acquired for the purpose in each district, reasons for delay and the latest position in the case?"

4.2 In reply to the above question, the then Minister of State in the Ministry of Defence (Shri Chintamani Panigrahi) stated as follows:—

"The State Government have yet to issue 'No Objection Certificate' for the acquisition of land required at Hamirpur. As regards Una, the matter is under further examination in the Army Hqrs. It is not practical to indicate the date by which final decisions shall be taken in respect of the proposal to establish Military Stations at Hamirpur and Una."

4.3 The above reply to the question was treated as an assurance by the Lok Sabha Secretariat and the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs. The assurance was required to be implemented by the Ministry of Defence by 9 July, 1989.

4.4 The Ministry of Defence *vide* their O.M. No. F.H.11012 /66 / 89 /D(Parl.) dated 21 March, 1990 requested for the dropping of the assurance on the following grounds:—

".....The present position in the case of Hamirpur is that Board of Proceedings have been received and are under examination with the Ministry. In case of Una, suitable land is yet to be identified. After doing the same, further action i.e. getting 'NOC' from State Government, preparation of DPR and issue of 'Go ahead' sanction etc. will be taken.

In this connection it may be stated that setting up of a new Military Station is a time consuming process. Lot of formalities are required to be completed before actual work is started for creation of assets and infrastructure. Once the necessity is accepted for setting up of such a station, suitable land is identified and 'No Objection Certificate' is obtained from the concerned State Government for acquisition / requisition or transfer of the subject land. Thereafter the Detailed Project Report is prepared and based on the DPR 'Go ahead' sanction is issued for acquisition of land. Action for acquisition of land is also initiated which also involves a number of formalities, such as issue of notification of acquiring land, assessment of cost of land and declaration of awards for payment of compensation etc. The whole process takes years before the actual work starts on creation of assets etc. for the proposed Military Station."

4.5 The Committee at their sitting held on 24 April, 1990 considered the request of the Ministry to drop the assurance.

4.6 Taking into consideration the position explained by the Ministry, the Committee are inclined to agree to their request for dropping of the assurance.

Desert Biosphere Reserve at Barmer and Jaisalmer

5.1 On 12 April, 1989, Shri Virdhi Chander Jain, M.P. addressed the following Starred Question No. 604 to the Minister of Environment and Forests:—

“(a) whether the Union Government have sanctioned a sum of Rs. 900 lakhs for the establishment of Desert Biosphere Reserve at Barmer and Jaisalmer;

(b) whether Government of Rajasthan has given clearance for this project if not, the reasons therefor; and

(c) the further steps being taken by Union Government in the matter?”

5.2 In reply to the above question, the then Minister of Environment and Forests (Shri Z.R. Ansari) stated as follows:

“(a) No, Sir.

(b) and (c) A Project Report for setting up a Biosphere Reserve at Thar Desert in Barmer and Jaisalmer districts of Rajasthan has been prepared and referred to the Government of Rajasthan for their concurrence. The matter is under the consideration of the State Government.”

5.3 The above reply to parts (b) and (c) of the question was treated as an assurance by the Lok Sabha Secretariat and Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs. The assurance was required to be implemented by the Ministry of Environment and Forests by 11 July, 1989.

5.4 The Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs *vide* their U.O. Note No. XIII / E&F(21) SQ 604-LS /89 dated 17.4.90 forwarded the request of the Ministry of Environment and Forests for the dropping of the assurance on the following grounds:—

“.....that the concurrence of State Government is still awaited inspite of a D.O. reminder from Minister of State to Chief Minister, Rajasthan.

In the meantime a seminar was organised on 11.2.90 at Jodhpur to discuss the various aspects related to setting up of the Thar Desert Biosphere Reserve in which a number of experts, scientists, planners and State Government Officials participated. During the seminar it emerged that substantial portion of the area selected for the Biosphere Reserve has rich deposits of limestone, lignite etc., large areas will also come under the command of the Indira Gandhi Canal system in course of time. In view of these facts it may be necessary to reconsider the area to be included in the proposed Biosphere Reserve.

The State Government have been asked to appoint a multidisciplinary team for identifying a suitable area for the proposed Biosphere Reserve. In view of the above it may not be possible to fulfil the

assurance in question as the site for the proposed Biosphere Reserve will now be different and is yet to be identified.”

5.5 The Committee at their sitting held on 24 April, 1990 considered the request of the Ministry to drop the assurance.

5.6 In view of the fact that the matter is pending with the State Government, the Committee agree to the request of the Ministry to drop the assurance.

(vi)

Tea Garden and Ex-Tea Garden Tribes in Assam

6.1 On 24 April, 1989 Shri Piyus Tiraky, M.P. addressed the following Unstarred Question No. 6638 to the Minister of Welfare:

- (a) the total number of tea-garden and Ex-tea garden Tribes in Assam;
- (b) whether they have been demanding for their inclusion in the list of Scheduled Tribes;
- (c) if so, the steps taken by Government for their welfare and inclusion in Scheduled Tribes list; and
- (d) the details of amounts sanctioned for their welfare during the last three years, year-wise?

6.2 In reply to the above question, the then Deputy Minister in the Ministry of Welfare (Smt. Sumati Oraon) stated as follows:

- (a) There are 12 principal migrated tribes in the tea gardens of Assam.
- (b) and (c) Proposals for comprehensive revision of the lists of Scheduled Tribes are under consideration of the Government. Amendment to the existing lists of Scheduled Tribes can be done only through an Act of Parliament in view of Article 342(2) of the Constitution. No further information can be disclosed at this stage.
- (d) As the above mentioned migrated tribes are not included in the list of Scheduled Tribes in Assam, no specific allocations are being made for them out of funds for tribal welfare and development.

6.3. The reply to Parts (b) and (c) of the above question was treated as an assurance by the Lok Sabha Secretariat and the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs. The assurance was required to be implemented by the Ministry of Welfare by 23.7.1989.

6.4 The Ministry of Welfare sought extension of time upto 24 March, 1990 to implement the assurance on following grounds:—

“Cabinet has deferred the matter of revision of the list of Scheduled Tribes and the present position remains the same”.

6.5 The Minister of Parliamentary Affairs *vide* his D.O. No. XIII / Wel(13)USQ. 6638-LS-89 dated 20 February, 1990 forwarded the

request of the Minister of Welfare for the dropping of the assurance on the following grounds:—

“The proposals for comprehensive revision of the lists of Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes are presently under consideration of the Cabinet. The Cabinet has deferred the matter without fixing a further date. The Cabinet is likely to take some time for taking a decision in this matter. Further an amendment to the existing lists of STs can be done only through an Act of Parliament. The matter is sensitive in nature and premature disclosure of the information would not be desirable. It will therefore not be possible for this Ministry to fulfil the assurance within a time limit”.

6.6 The Committee at their sitting held on 6 March, 1990 considered the request of the Ministry to drop the assurance.

6.7 Taking into consideration the position explained by the Ministry, the Committee are inclined to agree to the request of the Ministry to drop the assurance.

(vii)

Livestock Census

7.1 On 27 April, 1989, Shri P.R. Kumaramangalam, M.P. addressed the following Unstarred Question No. 7167 to the Minister of Agriculture:—

- “(a) whether Livestock Census which was due in 1987 had been completed;
- (b) if so, the results thereof;
- (c) whether the published Livestock Census also gives estimates of animal products and their value; and
- (d) if so, the details thereof?”

7.2 In reply to the above question, the then Minister of State in the Ministry of Agriculture (Shri Shyam Lal Yadav) stated as follows:—

“(a) The XIV quinquennial Livestock Census was due in 1987. However, all the States / Union Territories could not take up the Census due to severe drought conditions in 1987. Accordingly, such States which could not take up Census during 1987, were allowed to undertake the Census during 1988. The present status of the conduct of XIV Livestock Census is given in the statement below. It may be seen that nine States and four Union Territories organised the Livestock Census in 1987 (reference date 15 October, 1987); while 11 States and 2 Union Territories organised the Census in 1988 (reference date 15 October, 1988). However, five States could not organise the Census even in 1988 but have confirmed to undertake the Census in 1989 with reference dates indicated against each State.

(b) Only some of these States / Union Territories which conducted Census in 1987 could bring out provisional results so far. It is understood that for the remaining States / Union Territories the work

is under progress. The final Census figures are still due from all the States / Union Territories.

(c) No, Sir.

(d) Does not arise”.

7.3 The above reply to part (b) of the question was treated as an assurance by the Lok Sabha Secretariat and the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs. The assurance was required to be implemented by the Ministry of Agriculture by 26.7.1989.

7.4 Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs *vide* their U.O. Note No. XIII / Agri / (55)USQ.7167-LS / 89 dated 18 April, 1990 forwarded the request of the Ministry of Agriculture for dropping of the assurance on the following grounds:—

- (1) In part (a) of the question, the Hon'ble Member of Parliament had enquired whether Livestock Census, which was due in 1987, had been completed. Replies to Parts (b), (c) and (d) would have flown from reply to Part (a) of the Question. The information sought for is factual in nature and the simple and factual reply to the Question at that point of time was in the negative as the Livestock Census for 1987 was not complete. However, in order to inform the Hon'ble MP about the details of the progress made till the date of answering the question, an annexure was appended to the reply giving information regarding the position of the conduct of the Census as it was undertaken in various States / UTs.
- (2) Even as on today, many States have not completed the Livestock Census. In the other States where it has been conducted, the results have not yet been made available by all the State Governments. It will be appreciated that the magnitude of the work involved in Livestock Census collection is time consuming and the collection, collation and authentication of the final results would take years to be completed. As all the work involved in the Census as well as the subsequent work of compilation and finalisation of the Census data have to be done by the State Governments concerned, the Govt. of India can consolidate and furnish only that information which the State Govts. concerned make available to it. In view of these reasons, it will take a very long time for the State Govts. concerned to furnish the results of the exercises undertaken by them.
- (3) All such results are published by the State Govts. and the all India data are released by the Govt. of India. Thus, the data / reports become available to the public and others, including Hon'ble Members of Parliament, as and when the results are finalised. The data will also be sent to the library of Lok Sabha Secretariat”.

7.5 The Committee at their sitting held on 24 April, 1990 considered the request of the Ministry to drop the assurance.

7.6 In view of the position explained by the Ministry, the Committee agree to the request of the Ministry to drop the assurance.

(viii)

Banerjee Committee on Pesticide Use

8.1 On 4 May, 1989 Dr. G. Vijaya Rama Rao and Dr. S.L. Shailesh, M.Ps addressed the following Starred Question No. 852 to the Minister of Agriculture;

- “(a) whether Government have finalised its decision on the reports of Banerjee Committee received in 1986 and 1987;
- (b) if so, the details thereof;
- (c) whether these reports have been made public; and
- (d) if not, the reasons therefor?

8.2 In reply to the above question, the then Minister of Agriculture (Shri Bhajan Lal) stated as follows:—

“(a) The Expert Committee under the Chairmanship of Dr. S.N. Banerjee submitted in 1986 and 1987 two reports covering six pesticides. A decision has been taken in respect of BHC.

(b) The Government has decided that:

- (i) use of BHC in agriculture and public health restricted to the present level; --
 - (ii) the manufacturing capacity of BHC may be frozen at the present level; and
 - (iii) use of BHC on vegetables and fruits, Oilseeds crops and for preservation of grains, pulses, etc. should be restricted.
- (c) & (d): The question of making the reports public would be decided by the Government after decisions are taken on all the reports”.

8.3 The above reply to Parts (c) and (d) of the question was treated as an assurance by the Lok Sabha Secretariat and the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs. The assurance was required to be implemented by the Ministry of Agriculture by 3 August, 1989.

8.4 The Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs *vide* their U.O. Note No.X-III /Agri(77)SQ.852-LS / 89 dated 7 December, 1989 forwarded a request of the Ministry of Agriculture for the dropping of the assurance on the following grounds:

“The Banerjee Committee has been submitting reports in part so far, it has submitted 4 reports. Decisions on three have been taken while the fourth is still under examination. In the meantime the Committee is being reconstituted / restructured to quicken the process of review of various pesticides banned or restricted in other countries. The Committee has so far received 14 pesticides while many more (17 in the next phase) have yet to be studied. A decision whether to publish

the reports of the Committee can be taken only after all the reports have been received and final decision taken thereon.

In this connection, it may be mentioned that a similar question No. 2151 was answered in the Rajya Sabha on 13.5.88, Part (c) for which reads as under:—

“(c) whether the reports will be made public”.

A similar reply was given therein. Though initially the Rajya Sabha Secretariat treated it as an assurance the Chairman of the Committee on assurances decided to drop it *vide* Rajya Sabha Secretariat O.M. No. RS 1 / 38(11)88-COM-II, dated 12.7.88.

8.5 The Committee at their sitting held on 24 April, 1990 considered the request of the Ministry and decided not to drop the assurance.

8.6 The Ministry had sought extension of time to implement the assurance upto 4 May, 1990. The assurance is yet to be implemented.

8.7 The Committee regret to note that instead of implementing the assurance given over one year back, the Ministry have approached them for dropping it for unjustifiable reasons. The assurance related to making public the two reports submitted by the Banerjee Committee in 1986 and 1987. Government having already taken a decision on three out of four reports submitted by the Banerjee Committee, they see no reason for the delay in deciding about making public these reports alongwith the decisions taken thereon. The Committee, therefore, desire that the decision in this regard should be expedited and the assurance implemented at the earliest. The Ministry should also seek further extension of time beyond 4th May, 1990 to implement the assurance.

(ix)

Amendment to the Wakf Act, 1954

9.1 On 8 May, 1989, Shri G.M. Banatwalla, M.P. addressed the following Unstarred Question No. 8393 to the Minister of Welfare:—

“(a) whether amendments to Wakf Act, 1954 are under active consideration of the Union Government;

(b) if so, the present stage thereof; and

(c) when the amending bill is likely to be introduced in Parliament?”

9.2 In reply to the above question, the then Minister of State in the Ministry of Welfare (Dr. Rajendra Kumari Vajpai) stated as follows:—

“(a) to (c) : Proposals to amend the Wakf Act, 1954 are under consideration of Government. No further information can be disclosed at this stage. It is also not possible to indicate any date by which the bill will be introduced in Parliament.”

9.3 The above reply to the question was treated as an assurance by the Lok Sabha Secretariat and the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs.

The assurance was required to be implemented by the Ministry of Welfare by 7 August, 1989.

9.4 The Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs *vide* their U.O. Note No.X-III / Wel. (23)USQ.8393-LS / 89 dated 23 March, 1990 forwarded request of the Ministry of Welfare for the dropping of the assurance on the following grounds:—

“The above assurance relates to an intricate Legislation matter. The intricacy and complexity of the subject can be gauged from the fact that many of the provisions of the Wakf (Amendment) Act, 1984 could not be given effect to leading to further consideration of these amendments. It is therefore, difficult to have any idea about the time by when the necessary Legislation could be introduced in Parliament.”

9.5 The Committee at their sitting held on 24 April, 1990 considered the request of the Ministry and decided not to drop the assurance. The decision of the Committee was conveyed to the Ministry.

9.6 The Ministry of Welfare sought extension of time upto 8 May, 1990 to implement the assurance. The assurance is yet to be implemented.

9.7 The Committee find that the question of amendments to the Wakf Act, 1954 has been engaging the attention of the Government for quite a long time and still no definite legislative proposal has been placed before the Parliament in the matter. They regret to note that instead of implementing the assurance expeditiously, the Ministry approached them to drop it. The Committee are unable to agree to the request of the Ministry and desire that the assurance should be implemented at the earliest. The Ministry should also seek extension of time beyond 8th May, 1990 as considered necessary to implement the assurance.

(x)

CAG's Report on Performance of State Electricity Boards

10.1 On 18 July, 1989, Shri Narsing Suryavansi, M.P. addressed the following Unstarred Question No. 56 to the Minister of Energy:-

“(a) whether the Comptroller and Auditor General of India in his report on the performance of State Electricity Boards has pointed out some glaring deficiencies in the planning and execution of transmission line works of the State Electricity Boards, as reported in the “Deccan Herald” dated 8 June, 1989; and

(b) if so, the corrective steps taken by Government in this regard?”

10.2 In reply to the above question, the then Minister of State in the Ministry of Energy (Shri Kalpnath Rai) stated as follows:—

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

10.3 The above reply to the question was treated as an assurance by the Lok Sabha Secretariat and the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs. The

assurance was required to be implemented by the Ministry of Energy by 17 October, 1989.

10.4 The Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs *vide* their U.O. Note No. XIV/Energy(4)USQ56-LS/89 dated 26 Feb. 90 forwarded request of the Ministry of Energy for the dropping of the assurance on the following grounds:-

“The matter has been re-examined in this Department. It is felt that although the question has been answered in the form of Assurance, it should not have been admitted as it relates to a matter which is not primarily the concern of the Government of India”.

10.5 The Committee at their sitting held on 24 April, 1990 considered the request of the Ministry and decided not to drop the assurance. The decision of the Committee was conveyed to the Ministry.

10.6 The Ministry had sought extension of time upto 30 June, 1990 to implement the assurance. The assurance is yet to be implemented.

10.7 The Committee take a serious view of the fact that instead of implementing the assurance given about a year back, the Ministry had approached them to drop the assurance questioning the decision of the Speaker about the admission of the question itself. They need hardly point out that it is for the Speaker to decide whether or not a question is admissible and the Ministry cannot sit in judgement over the decision of the Speaker in this regard. The reply given by the Minister clearly constituted an assurance and the Ministry should implement it expeditiously.

(xi)

Foreign Aid for Education Sector

11.1 On 3 August, 1989 Shri Mohanbhai Patel, M.P. addressed the following Starred Question No. 248 to the Minister of Human Resource Development:

“(a) whether Government propose to seek external aid for the education sector for implementation of the New Education Policy;

(b) if so, whether any final decision has been taken in this regard;

(c) whether some foreign countries/agencies have been approached for it;

(d) if so, the response of those countries; and

(e) the reaction of Government thereto?”

11.2 In reply to the above question, the then Minister of Human Resource Development (Shri P. Shiv Shanker) stated as follows:

(a) to (e) The Ministry of Human Resource Development are exploring the possibility of external funding through multilateral and bilateral sources in some crucial areas of education. The discussions are at very preliminary stages and concrete projects have not yet been finalised.

11.3 The reply to the above question was treated as an assurance by the

Lok Sabha Secretariat and the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs. The assurance was required to be implemented by the Ministry of Human Resource Development by 2.11.1989.

11.4 The Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs *vide* their U.O. Note No. XIV/HRD (24) SQ 248-LS/89 dated 24 January, 1990 forwarded the request of the Ministry of Human Resource Development for the dropping of the assurance on the following grounds:

“The process of exploring the possibility of seeking external assistance from foreign agencies is still at a nascent stage. Department of Education has been exploring the possibility of tapping funds through multilateral and bilateral sources, in crucial areas of Education included in the National Policy on Education. So far, no clear picture has emerged which depends upon the reaction of the foreign agencies to our various educational programmes.

With the change of the Government at the Centre, Certain thrust areas might undergo a change. It is also difficult to say as to how the foreign agencies will react to the situation.”

Subsequently intimating the latest position, the Ministry of Human Resource Development (Department of Education) *vide* their O.M.No.F 6-10/89 PN (D II) dated 21 February, 1990 stated as follows:

“.....that the papers were submitted to the Minister of State for Education for his approval for extension of time for the fulfilment of the assurance upto December, 1990. Honourable Minister of State has munuted therein that a Committee is bieng set up will review all aspects of the New Education Policy, including funding. And that since this will be looked at afresh in the light of national priorities defined by the New Approach and then the main VIII Five Year Plan, fulfilment of Assurance, as it stands will not be a relevant exercise.”

11.5 The Ministry had sought extension of time upto 31 December, 1990 to implement the assurance.

11.6 The Committee at their sitting held on 24 April, 1990 considered the request of the Ministry and decided not to drop the assurance. The Committee did not agree the proposal of the Ministry to grant long term extension upto 31 December, 1990 for implementing the assurance and agreed to extension of time upto 31 August, 1990 only. The decision of the Committee was conveyed to the Ministry.

The assurance is yet to be implemented.

11.7 The Committee are not satisfied with the reasons advanced by the Ministry for dropping of the assurance. The assurance related to the limited aspect of exploring the possibility of external funding for some crucial areas of education and should not be linked to overall review on New Education Policy. They, therefore, desire that the assurance should be implemented expeditiously. The Committee are

also not in favour of granting long term extension upto 30th December, 1990 for implementing the assurance and desire that the steps may be taken to fulfil it by 31st August, 1990.

(xii)

N.R.I. Investment

12.1 On 4 August, 1989, Shri G.S. Basavaraju, M.P. addressed the following Starred Question No. 263 to the Minister of Finance:—

“(a) whether the progress of investments by non-resident Indians in the country has been encouraging;

(b) if not, the reasons therefor;

(c) whether Union Government propose to provide further concessions in this regard; and

(d) if so, the details thereof and to what extent this will be popularised?”

12.2 In reply to the above question, the then Minister of State in the Department of Economic Affairs in the Ministry of Finance (Shri Eduardo Falerio) stated as followed:—

“(a) Yes, Sir.

(b) Does not arise,

(c) & (d) the existing scheme, rules and regulations regarding NRI investments are continuously under review and suitable changes are made where necessary”.

12.3 During the course of supplementaries on the question Shri G.S. Basavaraju requested the Hon'ble Minister to lay the rules and regulations regarding NRI investment on the Table of the House. He further wanted to know how many proposals had been received uptill now and out of them how many applications were pending and whether the Government had been giving direction that they would have to invest their amount only in the non-industrial areas and if so, how many applications were received from Karnataka.

12.4 In reply to the above supplementary, the Minister of State in the Ministry of Finance (Shri Eduardo Falerio) stated as follows:

“This information does not arise directly from the question. I do not have it at the moment”.

12.5 The above reply to the supplementary question was treated as an assurance by the Lok Sabha Secretariat and the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs. The assurance was required to be implemented by the Ministry of Finance by 4 November, 1989.

12.6 The Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs forwarded on 16.11.89 request of the Ministry of Finance for the dropping of the assurance on the following grounds:

“The Minister's reply clearly indicated that the Minister had no

intention to give any promise as he had stated that the information does not arise directly from the question under reply. The wording used by the Hon'ble Minister do not find a place in the standard list of expression which normally constitute an assurance."

The Committee at their sitting held on 24 April, 1990 considered the request of the Ministry to drop the assurance.

12.8 In view of the position explained by the Ministry, the Committee agree to the request of the Ministry to drop the assurance.

(xiii)

Conversion of Jabalpur-Gondia Railway Line

13.1 On 11 August, 1989, Shri Ajay Mushran, M.P. addressed the following Unstarred Question No. 3607 to the Minister of Railways:—

"(a) whether South Eastern Railway has undertaken a re-appraisal survey to examine the feasibility of the conversion of Jabalpur-Gondia Metro Gauge Line for being utilised as an alternative North-South route;

(b) if so, whether the survey has been completed an action taken on the report; and

(c) if not, the reasons therefore?"

13.2 In reply to the above question, the then Minister of State in the Ministry of Railways (Shri Madhavrao Scindia) stated as follows:—

"(a) to (c): The reappraisal survey for conversion of Jabalpur-Gondia MG section to BG, for serving as an alternative North South route has not been completed. This is one of the many surveys, at present in hand, on the South Eastern Railway and exhaustive data has to be collected to work out the viability of the proposal."

13.3 The above reply to the question was treated as an assurance by the Lok Sabha Secretariat and the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs. The assurances was required to be implemented by the Ministry of Railways by 10 November, 1989.

13.4 The Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs vide their U.O. Note No. XIV / Rly(30)USQ 3607-LS / 89 dated 26 March, 1990 forwarded request of the Ministry of Railways for the dropping of the assurance on the following grounds:

"...the answer to the Question had stated only the factual position. As may be seen from the detailed position given below, this was not an assurance to the House which could be fulfilled by this Ministry in a limited period.

A Preliminary Engineering-cum-Traffic Survey for the conversion of Gondia-Jabalpur section alongwith Balaghat-Katangi Branch from Narrow Gauge to Broad Gauge was completed in 1980, according to which the conversion of Jabalpur-Gondia and Balaghat-Katangi Narrow Gauge section into Broad Gauge section, totalling 278 Kms, would cost about Rs. 6030 crores at the then prevailing prices. It would yield a return of only

3.25%, provided the land and wooden sleepers are given free of cost by the State Government. The internal rate of the return would have been much less almost zero, had the project not been credited with the savings on account of land and Sleepers being made available free of cost. As per the present policy such concessions are not to be sought from the State Government.

The project was found to be financially unremunerative and was, therefore dropped.

The present Jabalpur-Gondia NG line passes through the States of Madhya Pradesh and Maharashtra and serves Jabalpur, Seoni, Mandla, Balaghat and Bhandara districts. It has now been decided that the survey earlier carried out in 1980 for conversion of Jabalpur-Gondia NG line upto BG should be undated and its viability examined as an alternative North-South route. The S.E. Railway has been sanctioned Rs. 2.5 lakhs on 14.10.1988 for undating this survey. The Railway has been advised to complete the survey urgently.”

13.5 The Committee at their sitting held on 24 April, 1990 considered the request of the Ministry to drop the assurance.

13.6 In view of the position explained by the Ministry, the Committee agree to the request of the Ministry to drop the assurance.

NEW DELHI

11 June, 1990

DR. VIJAY KUMAR MALHOTRA,

*Chairman,
Committee on Government Assurances.*

21, Jyaistha, 1912 (Saka)

MINUTES

FOURTH SITTING

Minutes of the fourth sitting of the Committee on Government Assurances held on 6 March, 1990 in Committee Room 'C', Parliament House Annexe, New Delhi

The Committee met on Tuesday, the 6 March, 1990 from 11.00 hrs. to 12.45 hrs.

PRESENT

1. Dr. Vijay Kumar Malhotra — *Chairman*

MEMBERS

2. Shri Bhajaman .Behera
3. Shri Het Ram
4. Shri Mahabir Prasad
5. Dr. Mahadeepak Singh Shakya
6. Shri Kusuma Krishna Murthy

SECRETARIAT

1. Shri C. K. Jain -*Joint Secretary*
2. Shri S.C. Gupta -*Director*
3. Shri Jyoti Prasad -*Under Secretary*

* * * * *

The Committee took up for consideration Memorandum Nos. 2 and 3.

Memorandum No. 2: Request for dropping of the assurance given on 20 November, 1987 in reply to Unstarred Question No. 2190 regarding steps to improve business in share markets.

The Committee considered the request of the Ministry of Finance received through the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs *vide* their U.O. Note No. IX / Fin. (104) USQ 2120-LS / 87 dated 20 February, 1990 for the dropping of the assurance on the following grounds:-

“It may kindly be noted that in the wake of steep fall in prices of scrips in major stock exchanges during the early part of 1987, Stock Exchanges had imposed restrictions in trading. With a view to consider measures for restoration of normalcy in trading, an informal Working Group was constituted which inter-alia included representatives of Stock Exchanges. The informal Working Group headed by Dr. Dave, had recommended the relaxation in trading curbs in phases. This was taken up for implementation by the Stock Exchanges at Ahmedabad, Bombay Calcutta and Delhi on concerted basis from October, 1987. Since the aforesaid Parliament Question (dated 20th Nov., 1987) desired to know

as to whether Government were considering proposals for relaxation of trading curbs, this Ministry had indicated a factual reply that "recommendations of the informal Working Group headed by Dr. Dave which studied the working of share markets, are under implementation by the various Stock Exchanges. As it reflected a factual position and was not in any way meant to imply that the proposals were under consideration or that action was pending, it is stated that the reply to the aforesaid question may not be construed as an Assurance. Since at that time it was too early to assess the impact of the measures initiated (in end October, 1987), the same position was also indicated in the reply. It may kindly be noted that over a period of time all the trading curbs have been relaxed by the Stock Exchanges and normal trading is taking place at present."

In view of the reasons advanced by the Ministry, the Committee decided to drop the assurance.

Memorandum No. 3: Request for dropping of the assurance given on 24th April, 1989, in reply to Unstarred Question No. 6638 regarding Tea-garden and ex-tea garden tribes in Assam.

The Committee considered the request of the Ministry of Welfare received through the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs *vide* their U.O. Note No. XIII / Wel (13) USQ 6638-LS/89 dated 20 February, 1990 for the dropping of the assurance on the following grounds:

"The proposal for comprehensive revision of the lists of Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes are presently under consideration of the Cabinet. The Cabinet had deferred the matter without fixing a further date. The Cabinet is likely to take some time for taking a decision in this matter. Further an amendment to the existing lists of STs can be done only through an Act of Parliament. The matter is sensitive in nature and premature disclosure of the information would not be desirable. It will therefore not be possible for this Ministry to fulfil the Assurance within a time limit."

The Committee decided to drop the Assurance.

The Committee Then Adjourned.

MINUTES

Minutes of the Fifth Sitting of the Committee on Government Assurances held on 24 April, 1990 in Committee Room No. 50, Parliament House, New Delhi.

The Committee met on Tuesday, 24 April, 1990 from 15.45 to 16.45 hrs.

PRESENT

Dr. Vijay Kumar Malhotra

MEMBERS

2. Shri Jai Prakash Agarwal
3. Shri Het Ram
4. Shri Haribhau Shankar Mahale
5. Shri Amar Roy Pradhan
6. Shri P.K. Thungan

SECRETARIAT

1. Shri C.K. Jain - *Joint Secretary*
2. Shri S.C. Gupta - *Director*
3. Shri Jyoti Prasad - *Under Secretary*

2. The Committee took up for consideration Memoranda Nos. 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, and 14.

Memorandum No. 4: Request for dropping of assurance given on 27 April, 1989, in reply to Unstarred Question No. 7167 regarding Livestock Census.

3. The Committee considered the request of Ministry of Agriculture received through the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs *vide* their U.O. Note No. XIII / Agri / (55) USQ. 7167-LS / 89 dated 18 April, 1990 for the dropping of the assurance on the following grounds:

“(1) In part (a) of the question, the Hon’able Member of Parliament had enquired whether livestock Census, which was due in 1987 had been completed. Replies to Parts (b), (c) and (d) would have flown from reply to Part (a) of the Question. The information sought for is factual in nature and the simple and factual reply to the Question at that point of time, time was in the negative as the Livestock Census for 1987 was not complete. However, in order to inform the Hon’able MP about the details of the progress made till the date of answering the question, an annexure was appended to the reply giving information regarding the position of the conduct of the Census as it was undertaken in various States / Uts.

(2) Even as on today, many States have not completed the Livestock Census. In the other States where it has been conducted, the results

have not yet been made available by all the State Governments. It will be appreciated that the magnitude of the work involved in Livestock Census collection is time consuming and the collection, collation and authentication of the final results would take years to be completed. As all the work involved in the Census as well as the subsequent work of compilation and finalisation of the Census data have to be done by the State Governments concerned, the Govt. of India can consolidate and furnish only that information which the State Govts. concerned make available to it. In view of these reasons, it will take a very long time for the State Govts. concerned to furnish the results of the exercises undertaken by them.

- (3) All such results are published by the State Govts. and the all India data are released by the Govt. of India. Thus, the data / reports become available to the public and others, including Hon'able Members of Parliament, as and when the results are finalised. The data will be sent to the Library of Lok Sabha Secretariat.

3.1 In view of the position explained by the Ministry, the Committee decided to drop the assurance.

Memorandum No. 5: Request for dropping of assurance given on 4 May, 1989 in reply to Starred Question No. 852 regarding Banerjee Committee on Pesticide use.

4. The Committee considered the request of Ministry of Agriculture received through the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs *vide* their U.O. Note No.XIII / Agri(77) SQ. 852-LS/89 dated 7.12.89 for the dropping of the assurance on the following grounds:

"The Banerjee Committee has been submitting reports in part so far, it has submitted 4 reports. Decisions on three have been taken while the fourth is still under examination. In the meantime the Committee is being reconstituted / restructured to quicken the process of review of various pesticides banned or restricted in other countries. The Committee has so far received 14 pesticides while many more (17 in the next phase) have yet to be studied. A decision whether to publish the reports of the Committee can be taken only after all the reports have been received and final decision taken thereon.

In this connection, it may be mentioned that a similar question No. 2151 was answered in the Rajya Sabha on 13.5.88, Part (c) for which reads as under:-

"(c) whether the reports will be made public."

A similar reply was given therein. Though initially the Rajya Sabha Secretariat treated it as an assurance the Chairman of the Committee

on assurances decided to drop it *vide* Rajya Sabha Secretariat O.M. No. RS1 / 38(11)88 COM-II dated 12 July, 1988.”

4.1 The Committee were not satisfied with the reasons advanced by the Ministry of Agriculture for dropping of the assurance and decided not to drop it. The Ministry should seek extension of time as considered to be minimum necessary to implement the assurance pertaining to making public the two reports submitted by the Banerjee Committee in 1986 and 1987.

Memorandum No. 6: Request for dropping of assurance given on 21 November, 1988, in reply to Unstarred Question No. 1408 regarding termination of services of Defence Nurses on marriage.

5. The Committee considered the request of the Ministry of Defence received *vide* their communication No. F.H.-11012 / 12 / 89 / D(Parl.) dated 20 April, 1990 for the dropping of the assurance on the following grounds:—

“... the cases had been filed in different Courts by the Nurses, which are still pending finalisation. The nurses have obtained stay orders from Courts against their termination and they continue in service. In view of this, it will not be feasible to implement the assurance till the Courts decide the matter.”

5.1 The Committee decided not to drop the assurance. They desired that the Ministry should initiate action in order to get the pending cases decided at the earliest and report them by laying the final decisions of the Court in all these cases. The Ministry should seek further extension of time considered to be minimum necessary to implement the assurance.

Memorandum No. 7: Request for dropping of assurance given on 10 April, 1989, in reply to Unstarred Question No. 5533 regarding Military Stations at Una and Hamirpur.

6. The Committee considered the request of the Ministry of Defence received *vide* their U.O. Note No. F.H.-11012 / 66 / 89 / D (Parl.) dated 21 March, 1990 for the dropping of the assurance on the following grounds:—

“.....The present position in the case of Hamirpur is that Board of Proceedings have been received and are under examination with the Ministry. In case of Una, suitable land is yet to be identified. After doing the same, further action i.e. getting ‘NOC’ from State Government, preparation of DPR and issue of ‘Go ahead’ sanction etc. will be taken.

In this connection it may be stated that setting up of a new Military Station is a time consuming process. Lot of formalities are required to be completed before actual work is started for creation of assets and infrastructure. Once the necessity is accepted for setting up of such a station suitable land is identified and ‘No Objection Certificate’ is obtained from the concerned State Government for acquisition/requisition or

transfer of the subject land. Thereafter the Detailed Project Report is prepared and based on the 'DPR 'Go ahead' sanction is issued for acquisition of land. Action for acquisition of land is also initiated which also involves a number of formalities, such as issue of notification of acquiring land, assessment of cost of land and declaration of awards for payment of compensation etc. The whole process **TAKES YEARS BEFORE THE ACTUAL WORK STARTS** on creation of assets etc. for the proposed Military Station."

6.1 In view of the position explained by the Ministry, the Committee decided to drop the assurance.

Memorandum No. 8: Request for dropping of assurance given on 18 July, 1989, in reply to Unstarred Question No. 56 regarding CAG's Report on performance of State Electricity Boards.

7. The Committee considered the request of the Ministry of Energy received through the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs *vide* their U.O. Note No. XIV/Energy(4) USQ 56-LS/89 dated 26 February, 1990 for the dropping of the assurance on the following grounds:—

"The matter has been re-examined in this Department. It is felt that although the question has been answered in the form of Assurance, it should not have been admitted as it relates to a matter which is not primarily the concern of the Government of India."

7.1 The Committee did not agree to drop the assurance. They will took exception to the remarks of the Ministry that the question should not have been admitted as it related to a matter which was not primarily the concern of the Government of India. They pointed out that it was for the Speaker to decide whether a question was or was not admissible and the Ministry could not sit in judgement over the decision of the Speaker. An assurance having been given on the floor of the House by the Minister concerned, the Ministry should take measures to implement it expeditiously.

Memorandum No. 9: Request for dropping of assurance given on 12 April, 1989 in reply to Starred Question No. 604 regarding Desert Biosphere Reserve at Barmer and Jaiselmer.

8. The Committee considered the request of the Ministry of Environment and Forests received through the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs *vide* their U.O. Note No. XIII/E&F(21) SQ 604-LS/89 dated 17.4.1990 forwarded for the dropping of the assurance on the following grounds:—

"...that the concurrence of State Government is still awaited inspite of a D.O. reminder from Minister of State to Chief Minister, Rajasthan.

In the meantime a seminar was organised on 11.2.90 at Jodhpur to discuss the various aspects related to setting up of the Thar Desert Biosphere Reserve in which a number of experts, scientists, planners and State Government Officials participated. During the seminar it emerged

that substantial portion of the area selected for the Biosphere Reserve has rich deposits of limestone, lignite etc., large areas will also come under the command of the Indira Gandhi Canal system in course of time. In view of these facts it may be necessary to reconsider the area to be included in the proposed Biosphere Reserve.

The State Government have been asked to appoint a multidisciplinary team for identifying a suitable area for the proposed Biosphere Reserve.

In view of the above it may not be possible to fulfil the assurance in question as the site for the proposed Biosphere Reserve will now be different and is yet to be identified."

8.1 Taking into consideration the position explained by the Ministry, the Committee decided to drop the assurance.

Memorandum No. 10: Request for dropping of assurance given on 4 August, 1989 in reply to Starred Question No. 263 regarding NRI investment.

9. The Committee considered the request of the Ministry of Finance received through the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs for the dropping of the assurance on the following grounds:—

"The Minister's reply clearly indicated that the Minister had no intention to give any promise as he had stated that the information does not arise directly from the question under reply.

The wording used by the Hon'ble Minister do not find a place in the standard list of expression which normally constitute an assurance".

9.1 In view of position explained by the Ministry, the Committee decided to drop the assurance.

Memorandum No. 11: Request for dropping of assurance given on 14 August, 1987 in reply to Unstarred Question No. 2985 regarding pending applications for freedom fighters pension.

10. The Committee considered the request of the Ministry of Home Affairs received through the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs *vide* their U.O. Note No. VIII-2/H.A. (42) USQ 2985 LS/87 dated 12.2.1990 for the dropping of the assurance on the following grounds:—

"The number of pending committee cases have since been reduced from 3172 to 692. A meeting of the non-official committee was fixed in the last week of October, 1989 to consider these cases. However, the Committee did not consider these cases. However, the Committee did not consider these cases for the reasons that they did not want to make adverse recommendations in the election year. Regarding the other cases having special features, all the cases in which State Governments' verification reports received have since been disposed off. Substantial progress has been made with regard to the disposal of pending cases".

10.1 The Committee were not convinced with the grounds advanced by the Ministry for dropping the assurance. They decided to pursue to matter

and desired that the Ministry should initiate action to fulfil the assurance expeditiously. The Ministry should also seek further extension of time considered to be minimum necessary to implement the assurance.

Memorandum No. 12: Request for dropping of assurance given on 3 August, 1989 in reply to Starred Question No. 248 regarding Foreign aid for education sector.

11. The Committee considered the request of the Ministry of Human Resource Development (Department of Education) received *vide* its O.M. No. F.6-10/89 PN (D II), dated 21 February, 1990 for the dropping of the assurance on the following grounds:

“.....that the papers were submitted to the Minister of State for Education for his approval for extension of time for the fulfilment of the assurance upto December, 1990. Honourable Minister of State has munuted therein that a Committee is being set up will review all aspects of the New Education Policy, including funding. And that since this will be looked at afresh in the light of national priorities defined by the New Approach and then the main VIII Five Year Plan, fulfilment of Assurance, as it stands will not be a relevant exercise.”

11.1 The Committee did not agree to drop the assurance. They also did not approve the proposal of the Ministry to grant long term extension upto 31 December, 1990 for implementing the assurance and agreed to extension of time upto 31 August, 1990 only.

Memorandum No. 13: Request for dropping of assurance given on 11 August, 1989 in reply to Unstarred Question No. 3607 regarding conversion of Jabalpur-Gondia Railway Line.

12. The Committee considered the request of the Ministry of Railways received through the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs *vide* their U.O. Note No. XIV/Rly (30)USQ 3607-LS/89 dated 26 March, 1990 for the dropping of the assurance on the following grounds:—

“.....The answer to the Question has stated only the factual position. As may be seen from the detailed position given below, this was not an assurance to the House which could be fulfilled by the Ministry in a limited period.

A Preliminary Engineering-cum-Traffic Survey for the conversion of Gondia-Jabalpur section alongwith Balaghat-Katangani Branch from Narrow Gauge to Broad Gauge was completed in 1980, according to which the conversion of Jabalpur-Gondia and Balaghat-Katangani Narrow Gauge section into Broad Gauge section, totalling 278 Kms, would cost about Rs. 60.30 crores at the then prevailing prices. It would yield a return of only 3.25% provided the land and wooden sleepers are given free of cost by the State Government. The internal rate of return would have been much less almost zero, had the project not been credited with the savings on account of land and Sleepers being made

available free of cost. As per the present policy such concessions are not to be sought from the State Government.

The project was found to be financially unremunerative and was therefore, dropped.

The present Jabalpur-Gondia NG line passes through the States of Madhya Pradesh and Maharashtra and serves Jabalpur, Seoni, Mandla, Balaghat and Bhandara districts.

It has now been decided that the survey earlier carried out in 1980 for conversion of Jabalpur-Gondia NG line into BG should be updated and its viability examined as an alternative North-South route. The S.E. Railway has been sanctioned Rs. 2.5 lakhs on 14.10.1988 for updating this survey. The Railway has been advised to complete the survey urgently."

12.1 Taking into consideration the reasons advanced by the Ministry, the Committee decided to drop the assurance.

Memorandum No. 14: Request for dropping of assurance given on 8 May, 1989, in reply to Unstarred Question No. 8393 regarding amendment to Wakf Act, 1954,

13. The Committee considered the request of the Ministry of Welfare received through the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs *vide* their U.O. Note No. XIII/Wel. (23) USQ 8393-LS/89 dated 23 March, 1990 for the dropping of the assurance on the following grounds:—

"The above assurance relates to an intricate legislation matter. The intricacy and complexity of the subject can be gauged from the fact that many of the provisions of the Wakf (Amendment) Act, 1984 could not be given effect to leading to further consideration of these amendments. It is therefore, difficult to have any idea about the time by when the necessary Legislation could be introduced in Parliament".

13.1 The Committee did not agree to drop the assurance and desired that Ministry should take steps to implement the assurance expeditiously. The Ministry should seek extension of time considered to be minimum necessary to implement the assurance.

14. The Committee adjourned to meet again at 15.00 hrs. on Thursday, 17 May, 1990.

MINUTES

Minutes of the Sixth Sitting of the Committee on Government Assurances held on 11 June, 1990 in Committee Room No. 53, Parliament House, New Delhi

The Committee met on Monday, 11 June, 1990 from 11.00 to 11.40 Hrs.

PRESENT

Dr. Vijay Kumar Malhotra

MEMBERS

2. Shri H~~e~~t Ra~~m~~
3. Shri Kamal Nath
4. Shri M~~ah~~adeepak Singh
5. Shri Kusuma Krishna Murthy
6. Shri Amar Roy Pradhan
7. Shri C. Srinivasan
8. Shri Ramji Lal Suman

SECRETARIAT

1. Shri C.K. Jain — *Joint Secretary*
2. Shri Jyoti Prasad — *Under Secretary*

2. The Committee considered and adopted the draft Second Report.
3. The Committee decided to have their next sittings on 28 and 29 June, 1990 at 15.00 hours

The Committee then adjourned.