

**COMMITTEE  
ON  
GOVERNMENT ASSURANCES  
(1995-96)**

**TENTH LOK SABHA**

**THIRTY-FIFTH REPORT  
REQUEST FOR DROPPING OF ASSURANCES**

*(Presented on \_\_\_\_\_)*



**LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT  
NEW DELHI**

Price: Rs. 10/-

**COMMITTEE  
ON  
GOVERNMENT ASSURANCES  
(1995-96)**

**TENTH LOK SABHA**

**THIRTY-FIFTH REPORT**

**REQUEST FOR DROPPING OF ASSURANCES**

*(Presented on.....)*



**LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT  
NEW DELHI**

Price: Rs. 10/-

# C O N T E N T S

**PAGE**

Composition of the Committee (1995-96)	(iii)
INTRODUCTION	(v)
<b>CHAPTER I</b>	
Request for dropping of assurances (not accepted and pending)	
(i) Request for dropping of the assurance given on March 3, 1994 in reply to SQ No. 123 regarding Southern Gas Grid .....	1
(ii) Request for dropping of assurance given on July 25, 1994 in reply to USQ No. 101 regarding Oil Exploration.	3
(iii) Request for dropping of assurance given on July 26, 1993 in reply to SQ No. 2 regarding privatisation of DESU .....	5
<b>CHAPTER II</b>	
Request for dropping of assurance (accepted)	
Request for dropping of assurance given on August 22, 1991 in reply to USQ No. 3996 regarding request by Amnesty International to Visit India.....	10
<b>APPENDICES</b>	
I. Minutes of the Thirteenth sitting of the Committee held on August 8, 1995 .....	11
II. Minutes of the Seventeenth sitting of the Committee held on October 5, 1995.....	13
III. Minutes of the Eighteenth sitting of the Committee held on October 27, 1995 .....	15
IV. Minutes of the Nineteenth sitting of the Committee held on November 8, 1995.....	19
<b>ANNEXURES</b>	
I. List of Foreign and Indian Companies which put in bids in the Fifth, Sixth and Seventh rounds for oil exploration .....	17

COMPOSITION OF THE COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT  
ASSURANCES \*(1995-96)

CHAIRMAN

Shri Basudeb Acharia

MEMBERS

2. Shri Vishveshwar Bhagat
3. Shri Gurcharan Singh Dadhahoor
4. Shri Santosh Kumar Gangwar
5. Shri P.P. Kaliaperumal
6. Shri Prabhu Dayal Katheria
7. Shri Harpal Panwar
8. Smt. Suryakanta Patil
9. Shri Shashi Prakash
10. Shri V. Sreenivasa Prasad
11. Shri J. Chokka Rao
12. Shri Asht Bhuja Prasad Shukla
13. Shri Ummareddy Venkateswarlu
14. Shri V.S. Vijayaraghavan
- 15.\*\*Shri Shailendra Mahto

SECRETARIAT

1. Smt. Reva Nayyar —*Joint Secretary*
2. Shri P.D.T. Achary —*Director*
3. Shri Mangc Ram —*Under Secretary*

---

\* The Committee was nominated by the Speaker w.e.f. 4 February, 1995 and as published *vide* para 3723 of Lok Sabha Bulletin Part-II dated 13.2.1995.

\*\* Nominated to the Committee on 9 August, 1995 as published *vide* para 4164 of Lok Sabha Bulletin Part-II dated 9.8.1995.

## INTRODUCTION

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

2. The Committee (1995-96) was constituted on February 4, 1995.

3. The Committee at their sittings held on August 8, October 27, 1995 considered four requests (*vide* Memoranda Nos. 113, 114, 115 and 117) received from the Ministries/Departments of the Government of India for dropping of four pending assurances. At their sitting held on November 8, 1995 the Committee considered and adopted the draft Thirty-Fifth Report.

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

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

NEW DELHI;  
November 27, 1995  
-----  
Agrahayana 6, 1917 (Saka)

BASUDEB ACHARIA,  
Chairman,  
Committee on Government Assurances.

**CHAPTER I**  
**REQUEST FOR DROPPING OF ASSURANCES**  
**(NOT IMPLEMENTED)**

*(i) Southern Gas Grid Project*

1.1 On March 3, 1994, the following Starred Question No. 123 given notice of by S/Shri Sultan Salahuddin Owaisi and S.B. Sinal, M.Ps, was addressed to the Minister of Petroleum and Natural Gas:—

- “(a) whether the Southern Gas Grid Project is pending with the Government for a long time;
- (b) if so, the details thereof and the reasons therefor; .
- (c) whether the Chief Minister of the Southern States and the Union Territory of Pondicherry have recently requested the Union Government for early clearance to the project;
- (d) if so, the action taken by the Union Government in this regard;
- (e) whether there is any proposal to link the Southern Gas Grid with the Gas pipeline from Oman;
- (f) if so, the details thereof; and
- (g) the time by which it is likely to be completed?”

1.2 The Minister of State in the Ministry of Petroleum and Natural Gas (Capt. Satish Sharma) gave the following reply:—

- “(a) to (g): Requests have been received from the Southern States for the supply of natural gas through a pipeline. The concept of laying a gas pipeline from the Western Offshore to the Southern Region has been approved in principle. The proposal envisages the use of surplus gas from the Western Offshore, to be supplemented by gas imported from the Middle East. A proposal has been received from the Oman Oil Company for the transportation of gas from Oman to India.”

1.3 During the course of supplementaries on the question, Shri Ram Kapse, M.P. desired to know the States that were going to be benefited because of the use of surplus gas from Western Offshore and from Oman as also the State-wise quantum of the Southern States.

1.4 In reply, the Minister of Petroleum & Natural Gas (Capt. Satish Sharma) stated as follows:—

- “The State-wise techno-economic feasibility studies are going on. The discussions are being held. As far as the information which the

Hon'ble Member wanted is concerned that I am not in a position at this point of time to give. Once I have that information, I will pass on to him."

1.5 The above reply to the supplementaries was treated as an assurance and was required to be implemented by the Ministry of Petroleum and Natural Gas within three months of the date of assurance given by the Minister i.e. by June 3, 1994.

1.6 The Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs *vide* their U.O. Note No. IX/PNG(4)-SQ-123-LS/94 dated 19.5.95 forwarded a request of the Ministry of Petroleum and Natural Gas for dropping of the aforesaid assurance on the following grounds:—

"An agreement on principal terms has been signed with the Sultanate of Oman in September, 1994. In terms of the agreement the Oman Oil Company has taken up the detailed feasibility study for the project. The registration of the demand for gas in the Southern States is proposed to be taken after the feasibility study has made sufficient progress. Once the demand has been registered, the techno-economic feasibility of supply will be worked out. It is only after that stage is reached that we will be able to decide on the quantum of gas to be supplied to the various States. In view of the position explained above, it will be seen that this involves a time consuming process."

1.7 The Committee considered the request of the Ministry of Petroleum and Natural Gas for dropping of the assurance at their sitting held on August 8, 1995.

1.8 The Committee did not agree to drop the assurance and decided to pursue it. The decision of the Committee was accordingly conveyed to the Ministry of Petroleum and Natural Gas for compliance.

1.9 Meanwhile, the Ministry of Petroleum and Natural Gas had also sought extension of time upto March 3, 1996 for fulfilment of the assurance on the following grounds:—

"The Statewise registration of demand for gas is proposed to be taken after the feasibility study has been finalised. Once the demand has been registered, the techno-economic feasibility of supply will be worked out. It is only after that stage is reached that this Ministry will be able to decide on the quantum of gas to be supplied to the various States."

1.10 The Committee note that during the course of supplementaries, a member sought information regarding the States that would be benefited by the use of surplus gas from Western offshore and from Oman as also the State-wise quantum of the gas likely to be distributed amongst the Southern States. The Committee also note that at that point of time, the Minister of State in the Ministry of Petroleum and Natural Gas was not in a position to

furnish the reply as according to him, discussions on the subject were being held and the State-wise techno-economic feasibility studies of the project were being carried out and he had promised to pass on the information as soon as he had it.

1.11 Later on, the Committee were informed by the Ministry that an agreement on principal terms had already been signed with the Sultanate of Oman in September 1994 and that the Oman Oil Company had in turn, taken up the detailed feasibility study of the project as per the terms of the agreement. The Committee were also informed that the registration of the demand for gas in the Southern States would be taken after the feasibility study had made sufficient progress and the techno-economic feasibility of supply be worked out once the demand had been registered. The Committee, however, feel that the reason advanced to drop the assurance at this stage is not sufficient. Instead, the Committee desire that the Ministry of Petroleum & Natural Gas should see that the detailed feasibility study of the project being carried out by the Oman Oil Company is completed in time. Meanwhile, the Committee also desire that the Ministry of Petroleum & Natural Gas should fix a target date for completing registration of the demand for gas in Southern States so that there should not be any delay in carrying out the techno-economic feasibility study for supply of gas.

1.12 The Committee would like the Government to furnish the required information to the House in the form of implementation report latest by March 3, 1996, the date requested by the Ministry of Petroleum & Natural Gas for fulfilment of assurance.

(ii) *Oil Exploration*

1.13 On July 25, 1994, the following Unstarred Question No. 101 given notice of by Shri S.B. Sidnal, M.P., was addressed to the Minister of Petroleum and Natural Gas:—

- “(a) whether the Government had invited bids in 1993-94 for oil exploration in various blocks;
- (b) if so, the foreign and Indian companies which have responded;
- (c) the details of companies which have been allotted exploration work, company wise and statewise;
- (d) whether all the blocks have been allotted; and
- (e) if not, the reasons therefor;”

1.14 The Minister of State in the Ministry of Petroleum & Natural Gas (Capt. Satish Sharma) gave the following reply:—

- “(a) & (b) During 1993-94 Government of India had invited Indian and foreign Companies for exploration of oil and gas in specified blocks under the Fifth, Sixth and Seventh rounds. The list of foreign and Indian companies which put in bids in these three rounds is given in the *annexure*.



(c) to (e): While proposals received under Fifth Round are under consideration of Government negotiations with bidders who submitted bids under Sixth Round are in progress. The bids received under Seventh Round are under evaluation?"

1.15 The above reply to parts (c) to (e) of the question was treated as an assurance and was required to be implemented by the Ministry of Petroleum & Natural Gas within three months of the date of assurance given by the Minister i.e. by October 23, 1994.

1.16 The Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs *vide* their U.O. Note No. XI/PNG(10)USQ—101—LS/94 dated May 26, 1995 forwarded a request of the Ministry of Petroleum and Natural Gas for dropping of the assurance on the following grounds:—

“The process of evaluation of bids carrying on negotiations with the bidders for finalising the contracts and recommending the cases to the Government for its approval is a very protracted process and no time limit can be fixed for such activities although every effort is made to decide the cases as expeditiously as possible. Such type of negotiations are commercial in nature and involves two commercial organisations *i.e.* ONGC/OIL and the bidders. In view of the fact that contract negotiations are of an ongoing nature, it is not possible to fix a time for their completion. It is also not possible to predict the outcome of the negotiations”.

1.17 The Committee considered the request of the Ministry of Petroleum and Natural Gas for dropping the assurance at their sitting held on October 5, 1995.

1.18 The Committee did not agree to drop the assurance. The decision of the Committee was accordingly conveyed to the Ministry of Petroleum and Natural Gas for compliance.

1.19 Meanwhile, the Ministry of Petroleum and Natural Gas had also sought extension of time upto December 25, 1995 for fulfilment of the assurance on the following grounds:—

“.....it would take sometime to finalise the proposals received under 5th, 6th and 7th round of bidding”.

1.20 The Committee note that during 1993-94, Union Government had invited bids from the Indian and Foreign Companies for the exploration of Oil and Gas in specified blocks under the Fifth, Sixth and Seventh rounds. The Committee also note that in July 1994, the proposals received under the Fifth round were under consideration of the Government and negotiations were in progress with the bidders who supported bids under the Sixth round and that the bids received under the Seventh round were under the evaluation.

1.21 The Committee agree that the process of evaluation of bids, carrying on negotiations with the bidders for finalising the contracts and

recommending the cases to the Government for its approval is a very protracted process. But the Committee are of the view that it is not appropriate on the part of the Government to say that it was not possible to fix a time limit for their completion. The Committee, therefore, like the Government to persuade the undertakings namely, ONGCOIL to expedite process of evaluation and negotiation without compromising on any matter which may be detrimental to the interest of the country.

1.22 The Committee need not emphasise that under no circumstances any laxity should be allowed in finalising the bids as gas and petroleum products are important ingredients for economic development of the country. The Committee are of the view that the Ministry of Petroleum and Natural Gas will not take it as a routine work and furnish a final list of the contracts alongwith their recommendations to the Union Government for approval at the earliest.

1.23 The Committee desire that a report in respect of the progress made in the Fifth, Sixth and Seventh rounds should be submitted for the information of the Committee.

*(iii) Privatisation of DESU and maintaining the Reservation Policy*

1.24 On July 26, 1993, the following Starred Question No. 2 given notice of by SShri Chiranji Lal Sharma and Devi Bux Singh, MPs, was addressed to the Minister of Power:—

- “(a) whether the Government propose to hand over the management of the Delhi Electric Supply Undertaking to Private Sector;
- (b) if so, the details thereof and the reasons thereof; and
- (c) the steps taken to meet the power demand of Delhi?”

1.25 The Minister of Power (Shri N.K.P. Salve) gave the following reply:-

- “(a) & (b) It is proposed to privatise electricity distribution in Delhi (excluding NDMC and Cantonment areas). Delhi Administration has been advised to invite offers from private parties in this regard. It is hoped that privatisation will augment and modernise the transmission and distribution system and improve quality of supply and service to consumers.
- (c) The power requirements of Delhi are met from DESU's generating stations at Rajghat, Indraprastha Power Station, Gas Turbines and Supplies from Badarpur Power Station and Northern Grid. Delhi will have 90% share in the National Capital Thermal Power Project (840/450 MW) coming up at Dadri (U.P.) Besides this, setting up of 400/450 MW Gas-based Thermal Power Station at Bawana (Delhi) is also envisaged”.

1.26 During the course of supplementaries on the question, Shri Chiranji

Lal Sharma, M.P. desired to know about the management of generation, distribution, the reasons for privatisation of electricity distribution and the number of offers received from the private parties.

1.27 In reply, the Minister of State in the Ministry of Power (Shri P.V. Rangayya Naidu) stated as follows:—

“...There is no proposal to hand over generation at present to any private party. Generation will continue to be with DESU. The proposal is only to consider privatisation of distribution secondary transmission and distribution.

The reasons for such a proposal is that DESU has been incurring heavy loss for the last several years. There have been several complaints about the functioning of DESU. The attempts made by the Government, the Delhi Administration, to improve the financial position of DESU by increasing the tariff in March 1991 have also not resulted in any improvements.”

One proposal was received and that had been examined by a high-power Committee headed by the Cabinet Secretary. This Committee, referred to as Task Force, was headed by the Chief Secretary of the Delhi Administration. And this Task Force had given certain recommendations. On the basis of the recommendations received from the Task Force, the Government of India, the Ministry of Power, had advised the Delhi Administration to examine this and take necessary action by calling for competitive tenders and not give it by any nomination”.

1.28 Shri Kalka Das also put a supplementary Question regarding maintaining the reservation policy in the event of privatisation of the undertaking.

1.29 In reply, the Minister of Power (Shri N.K.P. Salve) stated as follows:—

“The suggestion is very good, we will consider it”.

1.30 The above replies to the supplementaries were treated as assurances and were required to be implemented by the Ministry of Power within three months of the date of assurance given by the Minister *i.e.* by October 26, 1993.

1.31 The Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs *vide* their U.O. Note No. VIIP(1)SQ 2—LS93 dated 31.7.95 have forwarded a request of the Ministry of Power for dropping of the aforesaid assurance given in para No. of the Report on the following grounds:—

“It is observed that portion of the statement made by Minister of Power in reply to the supplementaries has been treated as an assurance. It may be mentioned in this regard that during the debate, the subject shifted to the general policy of the Government regarding reservation for SCs/STs in the event of privatisation of public bodies.

Hon'ble Speaker, therefore, agreed to allow "Half-an-Hour discussion" on the issue.

The "Half-an-Hour Discussion" was subsequently admitted and the entire issue was deliberated in the House on 23.8.1993. The points raised during the debate were clarified by the Minister of Power".

1.32 The relevant extracts of the reply of the Minister of Power (Shri N.K.P. Salve) are reproduced below:—

...I will have to give a complete reply to the second question of the hon. Member. ...(*Interruptions*).

You have mentioned that Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes have constitutional guarantees in the Constitution and, therefore, according to the Constitution, whether the successor private companies will give and keep up the requisite reservation. That is the second query. In that connection, all that I want to submit is, the Constitutional guarantee perhaps he is referring to Article 16 of the Constitution. I read out Article 16. That, in-fact is one of the difficulties we have. Unfortunately for us, today for me, I do not have any injunction which stipulates that you should provide for reservation of SC/ST in the private sector. Neither the Constitutional guarantees are there in the Labour law, nor in the mercantile law, nor in the Company law. Nowhere there is any stipulation so far as the reservation of SC/ST is concerned. So far as the question of Shri Rajnath Sonker Shastriji is concerned, I refer o Article 16 which refers to opportunity in matters of public employment Clause 1 of Article 16 provides:

"(1) There shall be equality of opportunity for all citizens in matters relating to employment or appointment to any office under the State."

Under the State, you have to give equal opportunity to all the citizens. That is the rule in Clause I of Article 16. Article 16 is an exception to this which stipulates that

- (4) Nothing in this article shall prevent the State from making any provision for the reservation of appointments or posts in favour of any backward class of citizens which, in the opinion of the State is not adequately represented in the services under the State".

I want to submit to hon. Members that there are no constitutional guarantees provided to Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes which are not under the State Reservations which are coming by way of that exception for Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes apply only to the States and not to be private sector. There is no provision in the companies. Act, there is no other provision in the Mercantile Law or anywhere else. That is the main issue. We have to take a decision. Ultimately, the Prime Minister himself has said, while replying to the question on the No-confidence Motion that this is a policy matter.

And hon. Member Shri Kalka Das will be satisfied with that. It is not as though that on this important issue, we want to shy away. We have to face it. We want to come before this House and tell whatever we want to do—whether we can do it. Whether we cannot do it. Whether we want to do it and we cannot do it. This House will have to be taken into confidence. (Interruptions).

1.33 Further, the Minister of Power stated when Shri Kalka Das mentioned that constitution should be amended and that 22½ per cent reservation should be maintained even in the organisations being privatised:—

“I do welcome your suggestion. I would first convey how the hon. Prime Minister reacted to this suggestion, and then only I will move ahead”.

“...I am explaining to you the serious limitations in which the entire problem is hedged. And hon. Member, Shri Kalka Das rightly said that unless we amend the Constitution, if we can, perhaps this kind of a thing cannot be done. But, it is not a question, so far as I am concerned, because I am only replying with reference to the privatisation of DESU and the continuation or otherwise of the reservations in the hands of the successor private companies...”.

1.34 In regard to National Capital Thermal Power Project coming up at Dadri(U.P.) and Gas based Thermal Power Station at Bawana (Delhi) the Minister of Power stated:—

“As far as Dadri projects are concerned, three units of 210 MW each have already been installed and one unit of 210 MW has already been put into commercial operation. So far as Bawana gas project is concerned, tenders from four parties have been short-listed. The matter is under evaluation and is likely to be finalised shortly.”

1.35 During reply to Half-an-Hour Discussion, the Ministry of Power elaborated that reasons for privatisation of distribution of power only as under:—

“I am connected with DESU because the Badarpur plant is owned by Government of India. It is managed by NTPC, I supply power worth Rs. 35—40 crore every month and I get paid only Rs. 4 crore and there is so much of loss, over Rs. 1 crore every day. And, therefore, we have suggested for privatisation of distribution and as soon as the privatisation is complete, the losses will be borne by the successor private companies....”

The main objective of the privatisation is to do away with infinite loopholes, corruption, mismanagement etc. Once the private companies come on the scene they will have to provide a better consumer service in order to earn profit. We are facing power crisis today, even then, we shall supply 1500 MW of electricity tomorrow,

though the position of power supply is acute and we need 1600 MW of electricity. We supplied 1500 MW of electricity to Delhi yesterday. But the distribution system is so lethargic and overburdened that it creates hassels. I hope the woes of the consumers will come to an end on privatisation."

1.36 In regard to fate of the employees of DESU connected with distribution of Power, the Minister stated that they would be absorbed by the successor private company.

1.37 The Committee considered the request of the Ministry of Power for dropping the assurance at their sitting held on October 27, 1995.

1.38 The Committee did not agree to drop the assurance. The decision of the Committee was accordingly conveyed to the Ministry of Power for compliance.

1.39 The Committee note that the Minister of Power while replying to supplementary to SQ No. 2 regarding privatisation of DESU on July 26, 1993 had categorically assured that the suggestion regarding maintenance of reservation policy for SCs and STs in the event of privatisation of DESU will be considered.

1.40 Subsequently, an Half-An-Hour Discussion on the subject was admitted on it on August 23, 1993. The Committee are of the view that the Minister of Power during the Half-an-Hour Discussion did not give a satisfactory reply in regard to reservation policy for SCs and STs in the event of privatisation of public undertakings. The Committee strongly feel that reservation for SCs and STs is a very important and crucial matter and unless implemented, the Committee do not agree to drop the assurance on the plea that the Government would consider the matter even after a public undertaking is privatised. The Committee, therefore, strongly recommend that the policy of reservation for SCs and STs in ~~private~~ private sector should be considered in all seriousness even if the Government have to amend the constitution.

## CHAPTER II

### REQUEST FOR DROPPING OF ASSURANCE (ACCEPTED)

#### *Request by Amnesty International to Visit India*

2.1 On August 22, 1991, the following Unstarred Question No. 3996 given notice of by Shri Mukul Wasnik, M.P., was addressed to the Minister of External Affairs:—

- “(a) Whether the Government have received any request from the Amnesty International to visit certain parts of India.  
(b) if so, the details thereof; and  
(c) the reaction of the Government thereto?”

2.2 The then Minister of External Affairs (Shri Madhav Singh Solanki) gave the following reply:—

- “(a) Yes, Sir.  
(b) Amnesty International has requested for permission to visit Punjab, Jammu & Kashmir, North Eastern States, Andhra-Pradesh, Maharashtra and Tamil Nadu; and  
(c) These requests are under consideration by the Government.”

2.3 Reply to part (c) of the question was treated as an assurance by the Committee and it was to be fulfilled within three months of the date of reply i.e. by November 21, 1991.

2.4 The Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs *vide* their U.O. Note No. V/EA(10)USQ-3996-LS/dated 31.5.95 forwarded a request of the Ministry of External Affairs for dropping the assurance on the following grounds:—

“...the position regarding Amnesty International's request for onsite visit was that the Prime Minister had decided that” for the time being decisions on their requests for visiting different parts of India for actual investigation of specific cases of human rights violations should be withheld.”

2.5 The Committee considered the request of the Ministry of External Affairs for dropping the assurance at their sitting held on August 8, 1995.

**2.6. The Committee decided to drop the assurance.**

New Delhi:  
*November, 2, 1995*  

---

*Agrahayana 6, 1917 (Saka)*

BASUDEB ACHARIA,  
*Chairman,*  
*Committee on Government Assurances.*

## APPENDIX I

### MINUTES

(Vide Para 4 of Introduction)

#### Thirteenth Sitting

MINUTES OF THE SITTING OF THE COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT ASSURANCES HELD ON AUGUST 8, 1995 IN COMMITTEE ROOM NO. 'C', PARLIAMENT HOUSE ANNEXE, NEW DELHI

The Committee met on Tuesday, August 8, 1995 from 15.00 hours to 15.30 hours.

#### PRESENT

Shri Basudcb Acharia—*Chairman*

#### MEMBERS

2. Shri Santosh Kumar Gangwar
3. Shri P.P. Kaliaperumal
4. Shri Shashi Prakash
5. Shri Ummareddy Venkateswarlu
6. Shri V.S. Vijayaraghavan

#### SECRETARIAT

1. Shri P.D.T. Achary—*Director*
2. Shri Mange Ram—*Under Secretary*
2. The Committee took up for consideration Memoranda Nos. 113 & 114 regarding dropping of assurances.

*Memorandum No. 113*:—Request for dropping of the assurance given on August 22, 1991 in reply to Unstarred Question No. 3996 regarding request by Amnesty International to visit India.

3. The Committee considered the request of the Ministry of External Affairs received through the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs *vide* their U.O. Note No. L/EA(10) USQ-3996-LS/91 dated May 31, 1995 for the dropping of the assurance on the following grounds:—

“The position regarding Amnesty International's request for onsite visit was that the Prime Minister had decided that for the time being decisions on their requests for visiting different parts of India for



actual investigation of specific cases of human rights violations should be withheld.”

**3.1. The Committee decided to drop the assurance.**

*Memorandum No. 114*:—Request for dropping of the assurance given on March 3, 1994 in reply to Starred Question No. 123 regarding Southern Gas Grid.

4. The Committee considered the request of the Ministry of Petroleum and Natural Gas received through the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs vide their U.O.. Note No. IX/PNG(4)-SQ-123-LS/94 dated May 19, 1995 for the dropping of the assurance on the following grounds:—

“An agreement on principal terms has been signed with the Sultanate of Oman in September, 1994. In terms of the Agreement, the Oman Oil Company has taken up the detailed feasibility study for the project. The registration of the demand for gas in the Southern States is proposed to be sufficient progress. Once the demand has been registered the techno-economic feasibility of supply will be worked out. It is only after the stage is reached that we will be to decide on the quantum of gas to be supplied to the various States”.

4.1. The Committee did not agree to drop the assurance and decided to pursue it.

5. Thereafter, the Committee decided to hold their-next sitting on Tuesday, August 22, 1995 at 15.30 hours.

*The Committee then adjourned.*

## APPENDIX II

### MINUTES

(Vide Para 4 of Introduction)

#### Seventeenth Sitting

### MINUTES OF THE SITTING OF THE COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT ASSURANCES HELD ON THURSDAY, OCTOBER 5, 1995 IN PARTY MEETING ROOM NO. '139' PARLIAMENT HOUSE ANNEXE, NEW DELHI

The Committee met on Thursday, October 5, 1995 from 15.00 hours to 16.00 hours.

#### PRESENT

Shri Basudeb Acharia—*Chairman*

#### MEMBERS

2. Shri Vishveshwar Bhagat
3. Shri Santosh Kumar Gangwar
4. Shri Shashi Prakash
5. Shri J. Chokka Rao
6. Shri Asht Bhuja Prasad Shukla
7. Shri V.S. Vijayaraghavan

#### SECRETARIAT

1. Smt. Reva Nayyar—*Joint Secretary*
2. Shri Mange Ram—*Under Secretary*
3. Km. J.C. Namchoy—*Committee Officer*

2. The Committee took up Memoranda Nos. 115 and 116 for consideration.

*Memorandum No. 115:* Request for dropping of assurance given on July 25, 1994 in reply to the USQ No. 101 regarding Oil Exploration.

3. The Committee considered the request of the Ministry of Petroleum & Natural Gas received through the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs *vide* their U.O. Note No. XI/PNG/(10)USQ-101-LS/94 dated May 26, 1995 for dropping of the assurance on the following grounds:—

“The Process of evaluation of bids carrying on negotiations with the bidders for finalising the contracts and recommending the cases

to the Government for its approval is a very protracted process and no time limit can be fixed for such activities although every effort is made to decide the cases as expeditiously as possible. Such type of negotiations are commercial in nature and involves two commercial organisations *i.e.* ONGC/OIL and the bidders In view of the fact that contract negotiations are of an on going nature, it is not possible to fix a time limit for their completion. It is also not possible to predict the outcome of the negotiations.”

3.1 The Committee did not agree to drop the assurance.

*Memorandum No. 116:* Request for dropping of assurance given on February 24, 1994 in reply to SQ No. 41 regarding Jammu & Kashmir situation.

4. The Committee considered the request of the Ministry of Home Affairs received through the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs *vide* their U.O. Note No. IX/HA(1)SQ-41-LS/94 dated May 15, 1995 for dropping of the assurance on the following grounds:—

“Since the time when the assurance was given by the Home Minister there have been various developments in the State of Jammu & Kashmir and pertaining thereto. A separate department of Jammu and Kashmir Affairs has also been since created under the charge of the Prime Minister. During the debate in Parliament on the issue of extension of President’s Rule in the State beyond March 2, 1995 it had been stated by Home Minister that he would hold discussions with leaders of various political parties on issues pertaining to Jammu & Kashmir. A preliminary round of consultations has since been held by Home Minister with leaders of various parties including the AIDMK, BJP, CPI, CPM, Forward Block, Janta Dal, Janta Dal(S) on 20 March, 1995. Such consultations shall continue. Keeping in view of the above developments, it is requested that the Committee on Government Assurances may kindly be requested to drop the pending assurance.”

4.1 The Committee did not agree to drop the assurance. The Committee also desired to know the views expressed by the leaders of the various parties at the meeting... held on March 20, 1995 with the Home Minister. The Committee also decided to hear the views of the Secretary of the Ministry of Home Affairs (J&K Affairs Division) before taking a final decision on the request for the dropping of the assurance.

5. The Committee decided to undertake an on the spot study tour to Jaipur, Jodhpur, Udaipur, Bombay, Goa and Bombay w.c.f. November 13, 1995 on the pending/implemented assurances.

6. The Committee also decided to hold their next sitting on Friday, October 27, 1995.

7. *The Committee then adjourned.*

## APPENDIX III

### MINUTES

#### Eighteenth Sitting

MINUTES OF THE EIGHTEENTH SITTING OF THE COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT ASSURANCES HELD ON OCTOBER 27, 1995 IN COMMITTEE ROOM NO. 'E', PARLIAMENT HOUSE ANNEXE

The Committee met on Friday, October 27, 1995 from 11.00 hours to 12.00 hours.

#### PRESENT

Shri Basudeb Acharia—*Chairman*

#### MEMBERS

2. Shri Gurcharan Singh Dadhahoor
3. Shri Santosh Kumar Gangwar
4. Shri Prabhu Dayal Katheria
5. Shri J. Chokka Rao
6. Shri Asht Bhuja Prasad Shukla
7. Shri Ummareddy Venkateswarlu
8. Shri V.S. Vijayaraghavan
9. Shri Shailendra Mahto

#### SECRETARIAT

1. Shri P.D.T. Achary — *Director*
2. Shri Mange Ram — *Under Secretary*
3. Km. J.C. Namchyo — *Committee Officer*

2. At the outset the Committee took up for consideration Memorandum No. 117 regarding dropping of an assurance given on July 26, 1993 in reply to SQ No. 2 regarding Privatisation of DESU. The request of the Ministry of Power was received through the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs vide their U.O. Note No. VII/P(1)SQ-2-LS/93 dated 31.7.95 for dropping of an assurance regarding maintaining the reservation policy even after the privatisation of the undertaking(DESU).

3. The following grounds were advanced by the Ministry for the same:—

“It is observed that portion of the statement made by Minister of Power in reply to the supplementaries has been treated as an assurance. It may be mentioned in this regard that during the debate, the subject shifted to the general policy of the Government regarding reservation of SCs/STs in the event of privatisation of

public bodies. Hon'ble Speaker, therefore, agreed to allow 'Half-an-Hour discussion' on the issue.

The Half-an-Hour discussion was subsequently admitted and the entire issue was deliberated in the House on 23.8.93. The point raised during the debate were clarified by the Minister of Power".

4. The Committee expressed the view that reservation for SCs & STs is a very important and crucial matter and an assurance that the Government will consider the question of providing it even after a public undertaking is privatised cannot be dropped unless it is implemented. The Committee took the view that the Minister for Power did not clarify the issue during the half-an-hour discussion. The Committee stated that the matter should be pursued and wanted the Government to amend the Constitution, if necessary, to provide for reservation for SCs and STs in undertakings which are privatised.

5. The Committee thereafter, took up the draft Thirty-Fourth Report of the Committee for their consideration and adopted the same. The Committee authorised the Chairman to present the report during the ensuing Winter Session.

6. The Chairman also informed the Committee that Shri Rajesh Pilot, the then Minister of State (Internal Security) in the Ministry of Home Affairs has made a request for dropping the assurance given in reply to Starred Question No. 344 dated December 17, 1992 regarding restructuring of Medical Cadres in Central Para Military Forces *vide* his letter dated September 14, 1995. The Committee acceded to the request and decided to drop the assurance.

7. The Committee also discussed the tentative Study Tour Plan to Jaipur, Jodhpur, Udaipur, Bombay and Goa starting from November 14 to November 23, 1995.

8. The Committee decided to hold their next sitting on Wednesday, November 8, 1995 at 15.00 hours.

*The Committee then adjourned.*

*Annexure*

**ANNEXURE REFERRED TO IN REPLY TO PARTS (a) and (b) OF  
THE LOK SABHA UNSTARRED QUESTION NO. 101 REGARDING  
OIL EXPLORATION FOR REPLY ON 25.7.94 *vide para 1.14 of the  
Report***

*Fifth Round*

*Indian Companies*

Hindustan Oil Exploration Company, Baroda  
Essar Oil, Bombay  
Videocon International Ltd., Ahmedabad  
Phoenix Overseas Ltd., India  
Rupsa Petroleum  
Tata Petrodyne (P) Ltd.

*Foreign Companies*

Rexwood Corporation, USA  
Okland Oil Company, USA  
Command Petroleum Holding NL, Australia  
Vaalco Energy Inc., USA  
Hyundai Heavy Industries Co. Ltd., Korea.

*Sixth Round*

*Indian Companies*

Tata Petrodyne, New Delhi  
Reliance Industries, Bombay  
Videocon Petroleum, Aurangabad  
Larsen & Toubro, Bombay  
Hindustan Oil Exploration Co., Baroda  
Rupsa Petroleum, West Bengal  
Gujarat State Petrochemicals Corporation, Ahmedabad  
Phoenix Overseas, New Delhi  
Harsh Oil and Gas consultants, New Delhi  
Naharwar Marketing Private Ltd., New Delhi  
Petrodrill (P) Ltd., New Delhi

*Foreign Companies*

BHP Petroleum, Australia  
Amoco Petroleum Co., USA  
Enron Exploration Co., USA  
Command Petroleum, Australia  
Vaalco Energy, USA

Phoenix Geophysics, Canada  
Samson International, USA  
Rexwood Corporation, USA  
Okland Oil Co., USA

*Seventh Round*

*Indian Companies*

Gujarat State Petrochemicals Ltd.  
Essar Oil Ltd.  
Harsh Oil and Gas Consultants (P) Ltd.  
Phoenix Overseas Ltd.  
Reliance Industries Ltd.  
Tata Petrodyne  
Hindustan Oil Exploration Company

*Foreign Companies*

Phoenix Geophysics Ltd. Canada  
Vaalco Energy Inc. USA  
Rexwood Corporation and Okland Oil Co. USA  
Opsets Geophysical Systems, USA

## APPENDIX IV

### MINUTES

(Vide Para No. 4 of the introduction)

#### Nineteenth Sitting

MINUTES OF THE SITTING OF THE COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT ASSURANCES HELD ON WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 8, 1995 IN MAIN COMMITTEE ROOM, PARLIAMENT HOUSE ANNEXE, NEW DELHI

The Committee met on Wednesday, November 8, 1995 from 15.00 hours to 16.00 hours.

#### PRESENT

Shri J. Chokka Rao—*In the Chair*

#### MEMBERS

2. Shri Prabhu Dayal Katheria
3. Shri Harpal Panwar
4. Shri Asht Bhuja Prasad Shukla
5. Shri V.S. Vijayaraghavan
6. Shri Shailendra Mahto

#### SECRETARIAT

1. Smt. Reva Nayyar — *Joint Secretary*
2. Shri Mange Ram — *Under Secretary*
3. Km. J.C. Namchyo — *Committee Officer*

2. The Committee considered the draft Thirty-Fifth Report of the Committee on Government Assurances and adopted the same. The Committee authorised the Chairman to present the Report of the Committee during the ensuing Winter Session.

*The Committee then adjourned.*



---

---

© 1995 By LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT

Published under Rule 382 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in Lok Sabha (Seventh Edition) and printed by the Manager, P.L. Unit, Govt. of India Press, Minto Road, New Delhi.

---

---