

**COMMITTEE
ON
GOVERNMENT ASSURANCES
(1992-93)**

(TENTH LOK SABHA)

**ELEVENTH REPORT
ON
DROPPING REQUESTS**

(Presented on) 21 APR 1993



**LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT
NEW DELHI**

April 7, 1993/Chaitra 17, 1915 (Saka)

Price: Rs. 10/-

LOK SABHA

CORRIGENDA

to the Eleventh Report of the
Committee on Government Assurances (1992-93)
(Tenth Lok Sabha)

PAGE
(v)
(vii)
(ix)

Page No.	Para No.	Line	Correction	
				1—16
(ii)		12	<u>Add</u> '(accepted)' <u>after</u> 'assurances'	
(iii)		16	<u>For</u> 'December 21' <u>read</u> 'December 27'	
(vii)		7	<u>For</u> 'Shri Asai Prathap' <u>read</u> 'Shri A. Sai Prathap'	1
3	1.4	1	<u>For</u> 'June 13' <u>read</u> 'June 23'	
5	1.16	2	<u>For</u> 'Government Assurance' <u>read</u> 'Government Assurances'	
	1.17	3	<u>For</u> '146-IS/90' <u>read</u> '146-LS/90'	4
6		6	<u>For</u> 'there' <u>read</u> 'their'	
	1.20	2-3	<u>For</u> 'above mentioned grounds' <u>read</u> 'the following grounds'	
	1.22	2	<u>For</u> 'questions' <u>read</u> 'question'	
7		8	<u>For</u> 'submit there' <u>read</u> 'submit their'	
		9	<u>For</u> 'Govern.nt' <u>read</u> 'Government'	7
		10	<u>For</u> 'and it' <u>read</u> 'and it'	
		32	<u>For</u> 'approval a view' <u>read</u> 'approach'	
	1.23	5	<u>For</u> 'aircrafts' <u>read</u> 'aircraft'	
11	1.41	6	<u>Delete</u> 'and corruption in the purchase'	8
13	1.50	Part (b) 2	<u>For</u> 'KICCL' <u>read</u> 'KIOCL'	
14	1.55	8	<u>For</u> 'KICCL' <u>read</u> 'KIOCL'	
15	1.61	4	<u>Delete</u> 'forwarding request of the Ministry of Finance'	9
16	1.64	2	<u>For</u> 'therefore' <u>read</u> 'thereafter'	
17	2.2	13	<u>Insert</u> ' ' ' <u>after</u> 'processed'	
	2.3	2	<u>For</u> 'Assurance' <u>read</u> 'Assurances'	
18		4	<u>For</u> 'procession' <u>read</u> 'processing'	10
	2.6	9	<u>For</u> 'EQU' <u>read</u> 'ECU'	
	2.7	10	<u>For</u> 'observed' <u>read</u> 'observe'	
23	3.9	1	<u>Delete</u> ' , ' <u>appearing</u> after consideration	
25	3.19	2	<u>Delete</u> 'vide Annexure'	10
26		31	<u>For</u> '29.12.90 annexed' <u>read</u> '29.12.89'	

P.T.O.

13

(v) Request for dropping of assurance given on August 23, 1991 in reply to Unstarred Question No. 4186 regarding alleged cases of cheating in Bank of Maharashtra.

15

<i>Page No.</i>	<i>Para No.</i>	<i>Line</i>	<i>Correction</i>
29	3.38		<u>For '3.38' read '3.39'</u>
		appearing for the second time	
	3.52	Part (a) Last Line	<u>Delete 'enclosed' and after Statements I & add 'of Annexure-I'</u>
32	3.54	1	<u>Insert '19' after 'February'</u>
33		1	<u>For 'assurances' read 'assurance'</u>
34		7	<u>For 'he' read 'the'</u>
		Parts (c) & (d) 3	<u>For 'workloan' read 'workload'</u>
	3.59	3	<u>Insert '4' after 'December'</u>
	3.60	1	<u>Insert '11' after 'November'</u>
44		11	<u>Delete 'annexed'</u>
		28	<u>Delete ' "' appearing after the word Question</u>
51		30	<u>For 'divided' read 'decided'</u>
64 & 65		At the top	<u>For 'ANNEXURE-II' read 'ANNEXURE-III'</u>

CONTENTS

	PAGE
COMPOSITION OF THE COMMITTEE (1992-93)	(v)
COMPOSITION OF THE COMMITTEE (1991-92)	(vii)
INTRODUCTION	(ix)
CHAPTER I	
Request for dropping of assurances — (Not accepted and Pending)	1—16
(i) Request for dropping of assurance given on August 3, 1989 in reply to Unstarred Question No. 2403 regarding quality of stainless steel.	1
(ii) Request for dropping of assurance given on March 22, 1990 in reply to Starred Question No. 146 regarding guidelines to Governors regarding nominations to State Legislative Councils.	4
(iii) Request for dropping of assurances given on:—	
(a) March 27, 1990 in reply to a supplementary question by Shri Hari Kishore Singh, M.P. on SQ No. 206 regarding Kickbacks received in purchase of aircraft with Air India;	7
(b) March 29, 1990 during General Discussion under Rule 193 regarding accidents to Indian Airlines Airbus A-320 at Bangalore;	8
(c) August 21, 1990 in reply to USQ No. 1932 by Prof. Rupchand Pal, M.P. regarding rogatory letter to Switzerland for A-320 Airbus deal;	9
(d) January 10, 1991 in reply to USQ No. 862 by Shri Prakāsh Koko Brahmhatt and Shri Samarendra Kundu, M.Ps regarding purchase of Airbus A-320 deal; and	10
(e) Request for dropping of an assurance given on September 10, 1991 in reply to Unstarred Question No. 6437 regarding enquiry in Airbus A-320 deal.	10
(iv) Request for dropping of assurance given on August 31, 1990 in reply to Unstarred Question No. 3934 regarding setting up of sponge iron plant by KIOCL in Karnataka.	13
(v) Request for dropping of assurance given on August 23, 1991 in reply to Unstarred Question No. 4186 regarding alleged cases of cheating in Bank of Maharashtra.	15

(ii)

CHAPTER II	PAGE
Request for dropping of assurances (Not accepted and Implemented)	17—21
(i) Request for dropping of assurance given on 30 August, 1990 in reply to Unstarred Question No. 3667 regarding Integrated Watershed Management Project for Doon Valley.	17
(ii) Request for dropping of an assurance given on July 24, 1991 in reply to Unstarred Question No. 504 regarding heavy water plant in IFFCO.	19
CHAPTER III	
Request for dropping of assurances	22—39
(i) Request for dropping of assurance given on November 25, 1987 in reply to Starred Question No. 272 regarding misuse of foreign funds.	22
(ii) Request for dropping of assurance given on September 5, 1988 in reply to Unstarred Question No. 4957 regarding handling of cargo by Air India at Kennedy Airport.	23
(iii) Request for dropping of assurance given on August 10, 1989 in reply to Unstarred Question No. 3302 regarding non-formal education centres.	25
(iv) Request for dropping of assurances given on:—	
(a) April 20, 1990 in reply to Unstarred Question No. 5827 regarding ratio of direct and indirect taxes to GDP;	27
(b) May 11, 1990 in reply to Unstarred Question No. 8414 regarding New Fiscal Policy; and	28
(c) December 28, 1990 in reply to Unstarred Question No. 370 regarding Economic Policy.	28
(v) Request for dropping of assurance given on August 8, 1990 in reply to Unstarred Question No. 459 regarding inclusion of Peruvannan Community in Scheduled Tribe List.	29
(vi) Request for dropping of assurance given on August 14, 1991 in reply to points raised during General Discussion.	30
(vii) Request for dropping of assurance given on August 10, 1990 in reply to Unstarred Question No. 932 regarding tax arrears of cine artists.	32

(iii)

- (viii) Request for dropping of assurance given on September 5, 1990 in reply to Unstarred Question No. 4508 regarding extension of Horticulture Department of C.P.W.D. 33
- (ix) Request for dropping of assurance given on September 9, 1991 in reply to Unstarred Question No. 6117 regarding development of town in Kerala. 35
- (x) Request for dropping of assurance given on March 4, 1991 in reply to Unstarred Question No. 1074 regarding Integrated Development of Horticulture.
- (xi) Request for dropping of assurance given on July 25, 1991 in reply to Unstarred Question No. 575 regarding population of Nepali Speaking Indians.

APPENDIX

MINUTES

- Minutes of Second Sitting held on December 21, 1991. 40
- Minutes of Seventh Sitting held on April 9, 1992. 56
- Minutes of Fourth Sitting held on April 7, 1993 58

ANNEXURES

- I Name of Film Cine Artists/Directors/Producers who owed more than Rs. one lakh as Income-Tax as on 31.3.1990.
- II Demands of Junior Engineers of CPWD

COMPOSITION OF THE COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT
ASSURANCES*
(1992-93)

CHAIRMAN

Dr. Laxminarain Pandey

MEMBERS

2. Dr. Krupasindhu Bhoi
3. Shri B. Devarajan
4. Smt. Saroj Dubey
5. Shri B.K. Gudadinni
6. Shri Prabhu Dayal Katheria
7. Shri Balin Kuli
8. Shri Manphool Singh
9. Shri Ajoy Mukhopadhyay
10. Shri Surendra Pal Pathak
11. Smt. Pratibha Devisingh Patil
12. Shri Naval Kishore Rai
13. Dr. D. Venkateshwara Rao
14. Shri A. Prathap Sai
15. Shri Chinmaya Nand Swami

SECRETARIAT

Shri R.C. Bhardwaj	— <i>Additional Secretary</i>
Shri Murari Lal	— <i>Director</i>
Shri Joginder Singh	— <i>Deputy Secretary</i>
Shri K.K. Ganguly	— <i>Under Secretary</i>

*The Committee was nominated by the Speaker w.e.f. 13 December, 1992 vide Para 1596 of Lok Sabha Bulletin Part-II dated 14.12.1992.

COMPOSITION OF THE COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT
ASSURANCES*
(1991-92)

CHAIRMAN

Dr. Laxminarain Pandey

MEMBERS

2. Shri Asai Prathap
3. Dr. Krupasindhu Bhoi
4. Shri B. Devarajan
5. Shri B.K. Gudadinni
6. Shri Prabhu Dayal Katheria
7. Shrimati Krishnendra Kaur (Deepa)
8. Shri Balin Kuli
9. Shri Manphool Singh
10. Shri Ajoy Mukhopadhyay
11. Shrimati Pratibha Devisingh Patil
12. Shri Shashi Prakash
13. Shri Naval Kishore Rai
14. Shri Gadam Ganga Reddy
15. Shri Chinmaya Nand Swami

SECRETARIAT

Shri R.C. Bhardwaj	— <i>Additional Secretary</i>
Shri Murari Lal	— <i>Director</i>
Shri Joginder Singh	— <i>Deputy Secretary</i>
Shri K.K. Ganguly	— <i>Under Secretary</i>

*The Committee was nominated by the Speaker w.e.f. 25 November, 1991 vide Para 515 of Lok Sabha Bulletin Part-II dated 25.11.1991.

INTRODUCTION

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

2. The Committee (1992-93) were constituted on December 13, 1992.

3. The Committee (1991-92) at their second sitting held on December 27, 1991 considered requests (*Vide* Memoranda Nos. 4 to 22) received from the Ministries/Departments of the Government of India for dropping of pending assurances and their decisions are contained in this Report. The Committee also reviewed their decision in respect of one assurance (Memo No. 16) at their sitting held on April, 9, 1992. At their sitting held on April, 7, 1993 the Committee considered and adopted the Draft Eleventh 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 this report.

NEW DELHI:
April 7, 1993

Chaitra 17, 1915 (Saka)

DR. LAXMINARAIN PANDEY,
Chairman,
Committee on Government Assurances.

CHAPTER I
(i)
QUALITY OF STAINLESS STEEL

On August 3, 1989, the following Unstarred Question No. 2403 given notice of by Shri Mohanbhai Patel, M.P. was addressed to the then Minister of Steel and Mines:—

- “(a) whether the quality of certain brands of stainless steel is very poor;
(b) whether Government have received any complaints in this regard;
(c) if so, the action taken or proposed to be taken by Government to control the quality of stainless steel products being sold in the market; and
(d) if not, the reasons therefor?”

1.1 The then Minister of Steel and Mines (Shri M.L. Fotedar) gave the following reply:—

(a) to (d): “Government have noted that certain reports in the press have appeared wherein it has been stated that the quality of some of the stainless steel in the domestic market is not upto internationally accepted standards.

The Public Sector Steel plant at Salem has been taking steps to adhere to stringent quality parameters of stainless steel. However presently there is no statutory mechanism to control the quality of stainless steel being produced by other producers. Government will look into the question of introducing quality control and monitoring mechanism”.

1.2 The reply to the question was treated as an assurance by the Committee on Government Assurances which was required to be fulfilled within three months of the date of reply *i.e.* by November 2, 1989.

1.3 On October 21, 1991, the Ministry of Steel & Mines approached the Committee through the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs *vide* their U.O. Note No. XIV/SM(17)USQ 2403-LS/89 dated 21 October, 1991, to drop the assurance on the grounds indicated below:—

“Stainless steel product as a whole can be classified into two broad categories namely, long product and flat products. Long products are mainly produced by the units under Alloy Steel Producers Association in the secondary sectors including Alloy Steel Plant, Durgapur. Stainless steel flat products are produced by Salem Steel Plant Jindal Steel Ltd. and small scale units. The small scale units normally cater

to the requirement of stainless steel utensil manufacture. While there has been no specified complaint for poor quality of stainless steel long products, there has been some newspaper reports in the past for poor quality of stainless steel kitchenware and raw material thereof.

Presently there are several Indian Standards for flat products as well as long products as under:

IS	5522:1978	Stainless steel sheets coils
IS	65 27:1972	Stainless steel wire rods
IS	6528:1972	Stainless steel wire
IS	6529:1972	Stainless steel blooms, billets and slabs for forging
IS	6603:1972	Stainless steel bars and flats
IS	6911:1972	Stainless steel plates, sheets and strips

The long products mentioned above are required mostly by the engineering industry as per their specifications. Quality is, therefore, checked by the users. The flat products are used mainly (about 80%) by the utensils sector. All these standards for flat products i.e. IS 552 2 and IS 6911 are covered under the Govt. notification for Compulsory Certification Mark Scheme of Bureau of Indian Standard. However, the above notification is lacking in poor implementation. Also there is no penalty measures for non-fulfilment of the above provision. The notification also provides that untested/off grade material could be sold freely in the market and there is no measure for restricting their uses. Unless these loopholes are plugged, it is unlikely that supply of stainless steel poor quality raw material could be stopped. Accordingly this Deptt. under the direction of Sectoral Coordination Committee on Standard & Quality, have initiated action to suitably amend the Government notification 1971, so as to include all items concerning public health and safety, including SS sheets/strips and also assign suitable implementing agency and penalty measures. It is also proposed to provide suitable clause for management of untested/off grade material.

The above responsibility has been assigned to DCI&S, Calcutta who in consultation with BIS to submit a draft recommendation for revision of the Gazette Notification. The two meetings of the Group have already taken place and next meeting is due shortly. Once the recommendations are available, effective steps would be taken up in this Department for issue of revised notification. It is expected that the availability of poor quality stainless steel raw material will be curtailed to a great extent after the exercise is completed. Also this Deptt. has recommended to Ministry of Civil Supplies to examine the possibility to enforce Compulsory Certification Mark Scheme in the case of stainless steel utensils also so as to restrict the use of stainless steel untested/off grade material and also provide a double check.

It may be seen from the above that this is a long and time consuming exercise bound to take its own time. The reply of the Parliament Question would be possible only thereafter. Therefore, it is felt that instead of keeping the Parliament Assurance pending may be desirable to get it dropped. In any case suitable action has already been initiated and it is expected that it will bear good results so as to restrict availability of poor grade stainless steel material."

1.4. The Ministry of Steel have sought extension of time upto June 13, 1992.

1.5. The Committee considered the request of the Ministry of Steel and Mines for the dropping of the assurance at their sitting held on December 27, 1991. The Committee while granting extension of time did not accede to the request of the Ministry to drop the assurance.

1.6. The decision of the Committee was accordingly conveyed to the Ministry for compliance.

1.7 Again the Ministry sought extension of time upto December 31, 1993 to implement the assurance on the following grounds:—

"The proposal for introduction of compulsory certification of the stainless steel is to be considered by Sectoral Coordination Committee in its next meeting which is now likely to be held in February, 1993. If the scheme is approved, it could be introduced to stop the market of off-grade stainless steel items. The assurance of the Parliament Question could be fulfilled only thereafter".

1.8 The Committee need hardly highlight the press reports regarding poor quality of some of the stainless steel utensils in the domestic market which do not conform to internationally accepted standards and are also injurious to health. The matter was raised in the Parliament on August 3, 1989. In reply to the Question, assurance was given that Public Sector Steel Plant at Salem has been taking steps to adhere to stringent quality parameters of stainless steel and Governemnt will look into the question of introducing quality control and monitoring mechanism as at present there is no statutory mechanism to control the quality of stainless steel being produced by other producers.

1.9 The Committee are agrieved to note that even after a lapse of more than two years the Ministry instead of putting efforts to fulfill the assurance have tried to get rid of the assurance by requesting to get the assurance dropped. The Committee learnt that only when they have turned down the dropping request, the Ministry have appointed a Sectoral Coordination Committee to examine the proposal for introduction of compulsory certification of the stainless steel which is essential to meet the quality of stainless steel items. The Committee regret to note that the sittings of the Sectoral Coordination Committee is yet to take place and a final decision is pending with the Government and consequently the stainless steel is getting a set back in domestic as well as in the international markets due to sub-standard

products. The Committee need hardly stress that the time has come when the Government must ensure quality control as a tool with which to shape our approach to life.

1.10 The Committee find no reason why the Government are not alive of the issue of maintaining and up-keep the quality of stainless steel items before they are being marketed in the country as well as in other neighbouring countries. The Committee observe that the poor quality of stainless steel is, undoubtedly, due to the carelessness or negligence of the quality control department. The Committee also find that it is not too late to have a check on quality of steel products. If required, a seminar on quality control of stainless steel manufacturers and other key producers in the country and the officials of the quality control department should also be convened to take a final decision in the matter without any further loss of time.

1.11 The Committee would like to stress the importance of ensuring that consumers must get things of better quality which is relevant in improving their quality of life.

(II)

SARKARIA COMMISSION

1.12 On March 22, 1990, the following Starred Question No. 146 given notice of by Sarvashri L.K. Advani and Shankar Singh Vaghela, M.Ps was addressed to the Minister of Home Affairs :—

- “(a) whether any guidelines have been issued to the Governors in regard to making nominations to the State Legislative Councils; and
(b) if so, the details thereof?”

1.13 The then Minister of Home Affairs (Shri Mufti Mohammad Sayeed) gave the following reply:—

- “(a) No, Sir.
(b) Does not arise.”

1.14 During the course of supplementaries, Shri L.K. Advani desired to know *inter-alia* whether various recommendations of the Sarkaria Commission in respect of the role of Governors had been considered by the Government and whether the Government had accepted those recommendations.

1.15 The then Minister of Home Affairs, in the reply, stated as under :—

- “Those recommendations are under the consideration of the Government.”

1.16 Reply to the point raised during supplementaries on the question was treated as an assurance by Committee on Government Assurance and was required to be implemented within three months of the date of reply i.e. by June 21, 1990.

1.17 On January 15, 1991, the Ministry of Home Affairs approached the Committee on Government Assurances through the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs *vide* their U.O. Note No. II/HA(11) SQ No. 146-IS/90 dated January 15, 1991, to drop the assurance on the grounds indicated below :—

“...during the course of supplementary Questions, it was stated by the Home Minister that the recommendations of the Sarkaria Commission in respect of functioning of the Governors are under consideration of the Government. It may be mentioned that this supplementary Question was not directly connected with the subject matter of the Question.

The Governor of a State is a Constitutional functionary and derives his powers and authority to function as Head of the State from the provisions of the Constitution and various practices and conventions inherent in the Cabinet form of Government adopted under our Constitution. As Governor, he has his functions laid down in the Constitution. Most of the recommendations of the Sarkaria Commission in respect of functioning of the Governors are only a reiteration of well recognised interpretations of these provisions based on commentaries in text books, decisions of the Supreme Court, etc. As the powers and functions of the Governor in this regard are derived by him directly from the Constitution itself, the recommendations of the Commission are intended to be taken note of by the Governors and the State Governments.

As regards Sarkaria Commission's report, this report has been widely circulated and debated. The comments of most of the State Governments have been obtained and considered. The report was taken up for detailed consideration at the meetings of the Parliamentary Consultative Committee attached to the Ministry of Home Affairs which devoted its five sittings to discuss this report (5.2.88, 29.4.88, 14-15 July, 88, 1.9.88, 27.10.88). the report was also discussed in the Rajya Sabha on 28th, 29th and 30th November, 1988 and in the Lok Sabha on 30-31st March and 4-5th April, 1989. An important recommendation of the Sarkaria Commission with regard to the setting up of an Inter-State Council under article 263, was considered in a meeting of the Chief Ministers held on 12th April, 1990. As a result of the consideration of this recommendation, the Government decided to set up the Inter-State Council under article 263 of the Constitution and the President's Order was notified on 28th May, 1990. The first meeting of the Inter-State Council was held recently on 10th October, 1990. In the first meeting, the Sarkaria Commission

Report as such, was taken up for consideration and it was decided to set up a Sub-Committee of the Council to consider the recommendations of the Sarkaria Commission on Centre-State Relations and give concrete suggestions thereon. It was also decided that this Committee would consider wider aspects relating to Centre-State relations and submit their views to the Council.

In view of the above facts, it is requested that the above assurance which concerns only a limited field of the recommendations of the Sarkaria Commission relating to the functioning of the Governor, may kindly be dropped."

1.18 The Committee considered the request of the Ministry of Home Affairs for dropping of the assurance at their sitting held on December 27, 1991.

1.19 The Committee did not agree to the request of the Ministry to drop the assurance.

1.20 The Ministry sought extension of time upto June 30, 1991 and thereafter upto March 31, June 30, 1992 and March 31, 1993 on above mentioned grounds :—

"That the recommendations of the Sarkaria Commission Report on Centre-State Relations are still under consideration of the Inter-State Council..... This Ministry has approached the Committee on Government Assurances for dropping of this assurance and their decision is still awaited."

1.21 The decision of the Committee was accordingly conveyed to the Ministry.

1.22 The Committee note that during the course of supplementary on the questions regarding guidelines to Governors regarding nominations to State Legislative Councils, the Hon. Member raised supplementary questions and desired to know *inter-alia* whether various recommendations of the Sarkaria Commission in respect of role of Governors have been considered by the Government and whether the Government had accepted those recommendations. The Committee also note that an assurance was given in reply to the supplementaries as back as in March, 1990, stating that those recommendations were under consideration of the Government. The assurance was required to be implemented within three months period of time but the Ministry sought further extension of time upto end of March, 1990 and thereafter approached the Committee with a request for dropping of the assurance. The Ministry / Government have tried to intermingle the whole issue by giving a statement that most of the recommendations of the Sarkaria Commission in respect of the functioning of the Governors are only a reiteration of well recognised interpretations of the provisions based on commentaries in text books, decisions of the Supreme Court etc. and the powers of the Governors are derived by him directly from the Constitution

itself. The recommendations of the Commission are intended to be taken note of by the Governors and the state governments. On the contrary, the dropping request highlights that in the first meeting, the Sarkaria Commission report was taken up for consideration and it was decided to set up a Sub-Committee of the Council to consider the recommendations of the Sarkaria Commission on Centre-State Relations and give concrete suggestions thereon. It was also submitted that Committee would consider wider aspects relating to Centre-State Relations and submit their views to the council. The Committee also note that the Government have set up the inter-state council under the President's orders and it was notified on May 28, 1990. The Committee also note that Ministry have sought extension of time upto 31st March, 1993 on the plea that they have not received any decision of the Committee for their request for dropping of the assurance. The Committee was distressed to note that a decision in this regard was conveyed on February 20, 1992 to the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs as well as to the Ministry of Home Affairs and in confirmation the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs have also conveyed the same decision to the Ministry of Home Affairs on April 20 / 27, 1992. The Ministry has not acknowledged both these letters on the subject, which shows casual and lackadaisical approach of the Ministry of Home Affairs. The Committee are constrained to observe that the issue of considering the recommendations of the Justice Sarkaria Commission are still hanging fire although the Committee was constituted in the month of May 19, 1990, i.e. almost three years back to consider the matter. The Committee express their displeasure on the drifting attitude of the Ministry on such a vital issue which will help to maintain harmonious Centre-State relations which are paramount to a federal state and the role of the Governor in this regard is second to none. The Committee hope that Sarkaria Commission report which contains the whole gamut of Centre-State relationship should be considered seriously either to accept or to reject each recommendation of Justice Sarkaria Commission and should be weighed in the new political environment of the country with an approval a view to create national consciousness to reinforce unity and integration and a final view should be formed thereon.

(iii)

ALLEGED KICKBACKS IN PURCHASE OF A-320 AIRCRAFT

1.23 On March 27, 1990, the following Starred Question (No. 206) given notice of by Prof. K.V. Thomas, M.P. was addressed to the Minister of Civil Aviation:—

- “(a) the number and type of aircraft with Air India as on date;
- (b) the capacity utilisation of these aircrafts;
- (c) whether there is any proposal to purchase more aircraft; and

(d) if so, the details in this regard?"

1.24 The then Minister of Energy and Civil Aviation (Shri Arif Mohd. Khan) gave the following reply:—

“(a) Air India has following aircraft in its fleet:—

Boeing 747-200 aircraft	10
Boeing 747-300 (Combi) aircraft	2
Airbus A-310-300 aircraft	6
Airbus A-300-B4 aircraft	3

IL 62M	} taken on lease
IL 76F	
B-747F	

(b) Utilisation of these aircraft in terms of Revenue hours per day and per annum is given below:—

Aircraft type	Revenue Hrs. per day	Revenue Hrs. per annum
B-747-200	9.16	3343
B-747-300 (Combi)	10.50	3833
A-310-300	8.58	3132
A-300-B4	7.89	2880

(c) and (d): During the 8th Plan, Government has approved the acquisition of two A-310-300 aircraft in 1990-91 at an estimated cost of Rs. 217.81 crores. A proposal for the acquisition of four B-747-400 (Combi) aircraft during the period 1992-94 at an estimated cost of Rs. 1399.60 crores has also been received from Air India.”

1.25 Replying to a supplementary question raised by Shri Hari Kishore Singh, M.P. regarding the alleged kickbacks received in the purchase of aircraft from Seattle-Tokyo from Paris, the then Minister of Energy and Civil Aviation stated as follows:—

“Sir, I have already replied to another question, I think it was last week, and I think that has widely been reported that whatever allegations had been published, Government had taken note of those allegations and the question of reviewing the whole thing is under consideration.”

1.26 The above reply to the supplementary questions was treated as an assurance and was required to be implemented by June 26, 1990.

General Discussion

1.27 On March 29, 1990, Sri Samarendra Kundu, M.P. during the General Discussion under Rule 193 on the accident of the Indian Airlines Airbus A-320 at Bangalore, stated that the deal to purchase Airbus

Aircraft was pushed through hurriedly and the hush-hush created some suspicion and raised the following points:—

“I would like this suspicion, this scandalous thing, where a great fraud has been committed, should be enquired into by a Parliamentary Committee. The Minister in the Rajya Sabha, had gone quite for an record. He had admitted many basic things. I would like the Minister to concede to our request for a Parliamentary probe to enquire into the whole thing.”

1.28 The then Minister of Energy and Civil Aviation (Shri Arif Mohd. Khan) gave the following reply:—

“We have taken note of the points which have been made by the Members and then Civil Aviation Ministry decided to refer this matter to investigation agencies. That is why I was replying that this proposal to review the deal is under investigation of the Government.”

1.29 The above reply was treated as an assurance and was required to be implemented by June 28, 1990.

1.30 The Ministry of Civil Aviation and Tourism approached the Committee on Government Assurances through the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs *vide* their U.O. Note Nos. II/CA(7)SQ 206-LS/90 dated 16.10.1990 and II/CA(12) GD--LS/90 dated 20.10.90 to drop the above two assurances given on March 27, and March 29, 1990 in reply to supplementary question to SQ 206 and general Discussion respectively on the grounds indicated below:—

“***** the CBI has filed an FIR in the case of alleged irregularities in the purchase of Airbus A-320 aircraft by Indian Airlines on 29.3.1990. The FIR sets in motion the investigative process. By their very nature, investigations take time for their completion. Having regard to the various processes involved in such case, it is not feasible to indicate any definite time limit for their conclusion.”

1.31 The Committee (1990-91) considered the request at their sitting held on November 13, 1990 and decided not to drop both these assurances.

1.32 On August 21, 1990, the following Unstarred Question (No. 1932) given notice of by Prof. Rupchand Pal, M.P. was addressed to the Minister of Civil Aviation:—

“(a) whether Union Government have decided to send a rogatory letter to Switzerland seeking the seizure of vital Swiss Bank documents and examination of witnesses in connection with the A-320 Airbus deal; and

(b) if so, the details thereof?”

1.33 The then Minister of Steel and Mines and Law and Justice (Shri Dinesh Goswami) gave the following reply:—

“(a) Yes, Sir.

(b) The Central Bureau of Investigation has already registered a regular case No. 2 (A)/90-ACU(II) on 29.3.90 in this regard. The case is under investigation.”

1.34 The above reply to part (b) of the question was also treated as an assurance and was required to be implemented by the Ministry of Civil Aviation and Tourism within three months from the date of the answer i.e. by November 20, 1990.

1.35 On 10 January, 1991, the following Unstarred Question (No. 862) given notice of by S/Shri Prakash Koko Brahmhatt and Samarendra Kundu, M.Ps referring to reply given on March 13, 1990 to starred Question No: 5, was addressed to the Minister of Civil Aviation:—

“The latest progress made so far regarding purchase of Airbus A-320?”

1.36 The then Minister of State in the Ministry of Civil Aviation (Shri Harmohan Dhawan) gave the following reply:—

“The matter is still under investigation by the Central Bureau of Investigation.”

1.37 The above reply to the question was treated as an assurance and was required to be implemented by the Ministry of Civil Aviation and Tourism within three months of time i.e. by April 9, 1991.

1.38 On September 10, 1991 the following Unstarred Question (No. 6437) given notice of by Shri Harikewal Prasad, M.P. was addressed to the Minister of Civil Aviation and Tourism:—

“(a) whether the enquiry being conducted regarding technical lacuna in Airbus A-320 has since been completed;

(b) if so, the time by which its report would be available;

(c) whether the Government have completed the investigation into payment of commission in Airbus A-320 deal; and

(d) if so, the action being taken in this regard?”

1.39 The Minister of Civil Aviation and Tourism (Shri Madhavrao Scindia) gave the following reply:—

“(a) No such enquiry is being conducted.

(b) Does not arise.

(c) and (d) The matter is still under investigation by the Central Bureau of Investigation.”

1.40 The above reply to the question was also treated as an assurance and was required to be implemented by the Ministry of Civil Aviation and Tourism within three months from the date of the answer given i.e. by December 9, 1991.

1.41 On October 31, 1991 the Ministry of Civil Aviation and Tourism approached the Committee through the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs *vide* their U.O. Note II/CA(7)SQ-206-LS/90 dated 31.10.1991 to drop the aforesaid assurances on the following grounds:—

“It is submitted that the Central Bureau of Investigation (CBI) has filed an FIR RC.2(A)/90-ACU(A) and corruption in the purchase on 29th March, 1990 regarding allegation of bribery and corruption in the purchase of A-320 aircraft during the period 1984-85 to 1988-89. The CBI has informed us that since the case is under investigation and foreign investigation is involved, it is not possible to say at this stage as to when the report would be finalised. The CBI has also stated that letters rogatory have been sent to U.K. and USA, for obtaining information in this regard, while letters rogatory for France and Switzerland are under consideration.

The CBI is not under the administrative control of the Department of Civil Aviation and this Department is therefore, not in a position to indicate when the investigation would be completed by the CBI.

In view of the above, it is requested that the committee on Government Assurances (Lok Sabha) may kindly be moved to drop these assurances”

1.42 The Committee (1991-92) considered the request of the Ministry for dropping of all these five assurances *vide* Memo No. 9 and 21 at their sitting held on December 27, 1991. The Committee decided not to drop the subject matter and pursue the same.

1.43 The decision of the Committee was conveyed to the Ministry and they were asked to initiate further action on them.

1.44 On 27.1.1993, the Ministry of Civil Aviation and Tourism once again requested the Committee through Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs *vide* their O.M. No. II/CA(7)/SQ 206-LS/90 dated January 27, 1993 to drop the subject matter.

1.45 The Committee have taken notice that a specific assurance was given on March 27, 1990 regarding the charges of corruption for kickbacks received in connection with the purchase of technically inferior types of airbus as these remained grounded due to technical flaw in the aircraft. The Committee also note that an impression is given that these aircraft have been purchased hurriedly and even at higher cost than that was prevailing in international market. The Minister gave a categorical assurance ‘that Government had taken notice of those allegations and the question of

reviewing the whole thing was under consideration.' The Committee also observe that immediately after 2 days, on March 29, 1990 during the course of General Discussion, again a specific assurance was given that Government was reviewing the deal and the same was under investigation of the Government. The Ministry, thereafter, made a request to the Committee seeking extension of time and subsequently get the assurance dropped on the ground that the Central Bureau of Investigation had filed a FIR RC2(A)/90-ACU (II) on 29th March, 1990 regarding allegation of bribery and corruption in the purchase of A-320 aircraft during the period 1984-85 to 1988-89. It has also been submitted that letters rogatory had been sent to U.K. and U.S.A. for obtaining information in this regard, while letters of rogatory for France and Switzerland are under consideration. Thus, the Committee are of the view that CBI has tacitly concluded that deals have not been fair and there might have been some doubts of kickbacks in the deals too. The Committee have reasons to believe that the Ministry of Civil Aviation and Tourism have merely requested to drop the subject matter on the plea that CBI has taken a long time in concluding their findings as much time has been taken in processing and investigation in foreign countries. The execution of the letters rogatory in the countries abroad is dependent on the cooperation of the foreign agencies/Government. The Committee do not appreciate the slow pace of working of the Government and in particular of CBI's investigation that have taken, undoubtedly, long time of more than three years as the FIR was lodged on 29th March, 1990.

1.46 The Committee observe that CBI should deal this subject on its own merit instead of adopting an approach of procedural delay, expediting the findings and bringing a final picture before the country on the issue as a whole as quickly as possible. The Committee hope that CBI would conclude their deliberations and bring facts before the Committee without any further loss of time.

1.47 The Committee also deprecate the repeated attempts as many as three times made by the Ministry of Civil Aviation and Tourism, (Department of Civil Aviation) for dropping all these assurances in the guise that CBI enquiry is going on and a time frame cannot be given within which the enquiry would be completed by them. The Committee hope that the Ministry of Civil Aviation and Tourism would also give all sorts of assistance to the CBI in order to finalise their report and bring the factual position before the public at large by implementing the assurance.

1.48 The Committee also recommend and hope that the CBI would take up the matter at higher level with all concerned agencies in other countries of the world which are directly or indirectly linked with the deals. The Committee hardly need to reiterate the essentiality to enquire into the matter thoroughly probing whether the deal was finalised hurriedly in the Ministry and whether the set guidelines were followed meticulously. These facts should be analysed and furnished to the Committee immediately.

(iv)

SPONGE IRON PLANT AT MANGALORE

1.49 On August 31, 1990 the following Unstarred Question (No. 3934) given notice of by Shri H.C. Srikantaiah, M.P. was addressed to the Minister of Steel and Mines:—

“(a) whether the Kudremukh Iron Ore Company Limited has proposed to set up a sponge iron plant and a second pellet plant at Mangalore in Karnataka;

(b) if so, the total capacity and estimated cost of the above proposed plants;

(c) the details of the source of finance for these plants; and

(d) by when these plants are likely to be completed?”

1.50 The then Minister of Energy and Civil Aviation (Shri Arif Mohammed Khan) gave the following reply:—

“(a) Yes, Sir.

(b) There is a proposal to set up a Sponge Iron Plant of a capacity of 0.75 million tonnes of HBI per year. KICCL also have a proposal for expansion of capacity of iron ore concentrate from 7.5 million tonnes to 10 million tonnes and of iron ore pellets from 3 million tonnes to 6 million tonnes per annum.

(c) & (d): For the proposed Sponge Iron Plant, a detailed Project Report (DPR) is being prepared. The expansion proposal is also yet to be considered by PIB.

The precise implementation schedule, mode of financing etc. will be known after the DPR is ready and investment decision is taken on the proposals.”

1.51 The reply to parts (c) and (d) of the question was treated as an assurance by the Committee on Government Assurances which was to be fulfilled within three months of the date of reply *i.e.* by November 30, 1990.

1.52 On September 30, 1991, the Ministry of Steel approached the Committee on Government Assurances through U.O. Note No. III/S & M (13)/USQ. 3934-LS/90 dated September 30, 1991 to drop the assurance on the grounds indicated below:—

“that the status of the projects mentioned in the above Unstarred Question have not changed much since the assurance given by the Hon’ble Minister.

Further it is submitted that both the projects *i.e.* expansion of Pellet Plant and the establishment of the Sponge Iron Plant are in the initial

stages of consideration. The implementation will be taken up only after necessary approvals are accorded to the investment decisions by the Cabinet, after requisite clearances from the Deptt. of Environment, Finance, etc. and after finalisation of the VIII Plan proposals. Execution and completion of the project will take about 3½ years after Government's approval."

1.53 The request of the Ministry of Steel for dropping of the assurance was considered by the Committee at their sitting held on December 27, 1991.

1.54 The Committee did not agree to drop the assurance and accordingly the decision of the committee was conveyed to the Ministry.

1.55 The Ministry have sought extension of time upto November 30, 1991 and thereafter upto April 30, 1992, July 31, 1992 and March 31, 1993 to implement the assurance on the following grounds:—

"That the assurance given to the above question related to the implementation schedule, mode of financing etc. in respect of some of the projects proposed by Kudremukh Iron Ore Co. Ltd. While one of their projects, namely, Sponge Iron Plant has been shelved by KICCL, the project proposal regarding expansion of the Pellet Plant is under consideration of the Government and its implementation will be taken up only after a decision on investment is taken by the Government."

1.56 The Committee express their deep displeasure over the delay in implementation of the assurance. It seems that in the view of Ministry, three years is not enough to arrive at a final decision on two important matters specifically mentioned in the Lok Sabha regarding precise implementation schedule and mode of financing etc. in respect of setting up a sponge iron plant of a capacity of 0.75 million tonnes of HBI per year and expansion of the Pellet Plant. The Committee observe that had the detailed project Report for setting up a Sponge Iron Plant been prepared the assurance could have been implemented. The time taken, is undoubtedly, beyond the scope of justification and the expansion proposal is still hanging fire. The Committee feel that there is no reason to keep the issue indecisive. The Committee appreciate a negative decision rather than keeping it pending for years together.

1.57 The Committee recommend that the Government should gear up their machinery in the right direction and with a moto to execute the work with the same zeal with which an assurance is given. The Committee wish that the responsibility should be fixed to check delay on the one pending issue of expansion of the Pellet Plant which is still under consideration. The Committee also desire a holistic approach should be followed in areas of economic development as upgradation of technology is essential to advance business and to survive in a competitive world.

CHEATING CASES IN BANK OF MAHARASHTRA

1.58 On August 23, 1991, the following Unstarred Question (No. 4186) given notice of by Prof. Ram Kapse, M.P. was addressed to the Minister of Finance:—

- “(a) whether case of alleged cheating involving a sum of Rs. 121.71 crores in the Bank of Maharashtra has come to the notice of the Government;
- (b) if so, whether any enquiry has been conducted in this regard;
- (c) if so, the outcome thereof; and
- (d) the action taken by the Government in the matter?”

1.59 The Minister of State in the Ministry of Finance (Shri Dalbir Singh) gave the following reply:—

“(a) Yes, Sir.

(b), (c) & (d): Bank of Maharashtra has reported that credit facilities extended to a group of accounts with the bank started showing sticky tendencies and in 1985 bank filed a suit for the recovery of a total amount of Rs. 34.42 crores plus interest for subsequent period till realisation. Subsequently, an ex-employee of the bank filed a writ petition in the High Court at Bombay alleging a multi-crore fraud in Bank of Maharashtra allegedly committed by the clients and some senior officials of the bank. Bombay High Court has directed the CBI to conduct investigation. CBI has since registered two cases and has taken up the matter for investigation.”

1.60 The reply to parts (b) (c) and (d) of the question was treated as an assurance by the Committee on Government Assurances and was required to be implemented by the Ministry of Finance by November 22, 1991.

1.61 On December 9, 1991, the Ministry of Finance approached the Committee on Government Assurances through the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs *vide* their U.O. Note No. 1/Fin (30) USQ 4186-LS/91 dated 9.12.1991 forwarding request of the Ministry of Finance to drop the assurance on the grounds indicated below:—

“while answering the above question, the action taken by the Central Bureau of Investigation was informed. Further investigation into the case is to be done by the Central Bureau of Investigation. Hence, Ministry of Finance will not be able to inform the outcome of the investigation till it is completed. The Ministry has written to the CBI on 14.10.1991 to keep it informed about the progress made.

It may be noted that as per orders dated 22.2.91 of the Hon'ble High Court of Judicature at Bombay in Criminal Writ Petition No. 1243/90, CBI has registered 2 cases viz. RC. 2/A/91/SIU (ix) and RC. 3/A/91/SIU (ix) dated 22.3.91 under Section 120B IPC read with Section 420, 468, 471, IPC and Section 5 (3) read with Section 5(1) (d) of PC Act, 1947. As per directions of the High Court, CBI is sending progress reports to the Principal Judge, Greater Bombay, It may be noted that *there was no conscious Assurance in the reply.*

Considering the fact that completion of investigation is not in the hands of the Ministry of Finance and that the progress of investigations is being reported on quartely basis to the Court, it is requested that the above reply may not be considered as an assurance."

1.62 The Committee considered the request of the Ministry of Finance for dropping of the assurance at their sitting held on December, 27, 1991.

1.63 The Committee did not accede to the request of the Ministry to drop the assurance.

1.64 The Ministry of Finance have sought extension of time upto 30.6.1992 and therefore upto December, 31, 1992 and June 30, 1993 on the following grounds:—

"Completion of investigation by the CBI will take considerable time. We have requested CBI to expedite the completion of investigation."

1.65 While conceding that investigation agencies such as CBI which take their time in conducting the investigations, the case under investigation is required to be finalised and cannot be allowed to remain pending *ad infinte*. The present investigations relate to alleged cheating involving a sum of Rs. 34 crores by bank officials. Obviously, their scope is not very wide. Also in the interest of the bank the investigation should be finalised quickly and whatever the outcome may be, a final decision by the CBI must be taken. The Committee do not appreciate the plea taken by the Ministry that "that the completion of investigation is not in the hands of Ministry of Finance and that the progress of investigation is being reported on quaterly basis to the court." This reflects the attitude of helplessness as well as laxity. The Committee cannot but deplore it and expect the Ministry to show a sense of urgency in this matter. The Ministry should take up the matter at an appropriate level to see that the investigation is completed quickly and thereafter finalise their decision without any further loss of time. The Committee do not appreciate the plea taken for seeking extension of time that the completion of investigation by CBI will likely to take considerable time. The CBI should be helped by providing and making available to them all the documents relating to the cases of enquiry. The Committee hope that the CBI shall finalise their investigation by June 30, 1993, by all means, as the delay encourages to commit more irregularities particularly with regard to financial transanctions in nationalised banks. The Government should provide assistance and guidance for expediting implementation of the assurance.

CHAPTER II

(i)

INTEGRATED WATERSHED MANAGEMENT PROJECT IN DOON VALLEY

2.1. On 30 August, 1990, the following Unstarred Question (No. 3667) given notice of by Shri M.S. Pal, M.P. was addressed to the Minister of Agriculture:—

“(a) whether Government have received any proposal in respect of Integrated Watershed Management Project in 1853.86 Sq. Kms. area of Doon Valley regarding forestry fruit industry, soil conservation, agriculture small scale industries, animal husbandry and programmes of environmental improvement; and

(b) if so, the details of the project and the action taken thereon?”

2.2. The then Minister of State in the Department of Agriculture and Cooperation in the Ministry of Agriculture (Shri Nitish Kumar) gave the following reply:—

“(a) & (b): Yes, Sir. The revised proposal on Integrated Watershed Management Project for Doon Valley eco-restoration has been received from the Government of Uttar Pradesh in the month of June, 1990 for availing external financial assistance.

The total outlay of the project is Rs. 42.98 crores and components include Forestry, Horticulture, Agriculture, Soil Conservation, Animal Husbandry, Minor Irrigation, Energy Conservation, etc.

The project has been posed to European Economic Community (EEC) for external assistance, who mounted a Mission from July 26th to August 22nd, 1990. The project is being processed.

2.3. The reply given to the question was treated as an assurance by the Committee on Government Assurance which was required to be implemented by the Ministry of Agriculture within three months of the date of reply *i.e.* November 29, 1990.

2.4 On December 28, 1990, the Ministry of Agriculture approached the Committee through the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs *vide* their U.O. Note No. III/Agri(31)USQ 3667-LS/90 dated 28 December, 1990 to drop the assurance on the grounds indicated below:—

“According to information given by the Deptt. of Economic Affairs, this project would be included for discussion during the Indo-EEC Annual Aid Talks which are scheduled to be held in Dec. 1990. Launching of the project depends upon negotiation of the project which involves multi-national and also budgetary provision and

clearances from various administrative Ministries such as Defence, Home, External Affairs and Planning Commission which required considerable time and may not be completed in a specific time. In view of the above, procession of this project may not be categorised as Parliament Assurance."

2.5. The request of the Ministry of Agriculture was considered by the Committee at their sitting held on December 27, 1991. The Committee did not agree to drop the assurance.

2.6 Subsequently the Ministry laid a statement (No. SSIX/1) on March 31, 1992 on the Table of the Lok Sabha in fulfilment of the assurance. In the statement the Ministry of Agriculture furnished the following statement:—

"(a) & (b): The Doon Valley Integrated Watershed Management Project Uttar Pradesh was posed for European Economic Community assistance after following normal procedure of clearances. The Agreement has been signed on 3rd December, 1991. The total cost of the project is EOU 23.70 million for nine years from 1992".

2.7. The Committee are extremely happy to note that the Ministry of Agriculture geared up their machinery to implement the assurance given to execute an agreement with Economic Community assistance regarding development of project known as Integrated Watershed Management for Doon Valley. The European Economic Community has agreed for giving assistance to the tune of 23.70 million for nine years from 1992. The agreement signed will give a boost to the development projects regarding development of forestry fruit industry, soil conservation, agriculture, small scale industries, animal husbandry and programmes on environmental improvement etc. But the Committee are constrained to observe that the initial request by the Ministry before the Committee for getting this assurance dropped reflects that sincere efforts were not made by the Ministry right from the beginning and they had a tendency to get rid of the responsibility for materialising the proposal through foreign agencies. Undoubtedly, the Committee realise the difficulties that the Ministry might face in materialising such an agreement with foreign agencies but it is not proper on the part of the Ministry to put a plea before the Committee that 'the processing of this project may not be categorised Parliament Assurance.' The Committee deprecate such tendency towards solemn promises made on the floor of the House and would like to stress that sincere efforts should be made right from the very beginning in implementing the assurances given on the floor of the House. Where the Ministry find that it may take a long time to implement an assurance, the request for granting extension of time should be sought from the Committee rather than try to get it dropped on flimsy grounds on one plea or the other.

(ii)

HEAVY WATER PLANT IN IFFCO

2.8 On July 24, 1991, the following Unstarred Question (No. 504) given notice of by Shri Santosh Kumar Gangwar, M.P. was addressed to the Prime Minister:—

“(a) whether any scheme is under consideration to set up heavy water plant in IFFCO Fertilizer Plant (Aonla) Bareilly;

(b) if so, the details thereof; and

(c) the time by which the said plant is likely to be set up?”

2.9 The Minister of State in the Ministry of Personnel, Public Grievances and Pensions (Smt. Margaret Alva) gave the following reply:—

(a), (b) and (c): “Aonla is one of the sites recommended by the Site Selection Committee for setting up of a Heavy Water Plant. However, Government is yet to take a decision in the matter.”

2.10 Reply to the question was treated as an assurance by the Committee which was required to be implemented by the Department of Atomic Energy within three months of the date of the reply *i.e.* by October 23, 1991.

2.11. On November 13, 1991, the Department of Atomic Energy approached the Committee on Government Assurances through the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs *vide* their U.O. Note No. I/AE(2) USQ 504-LS/91 dated 13.11.1991 to drop the assurance on the grounds indicated below:—

“It may be mentioned in this connection that the answer given, Aonla is one of the sites recommended by the site selection committee for setting up of a Heavy Water Plant. However, Government is yet to take a decision in the matter, does not strictly constitute an assurance, with reference to the standard list of expressions which normally constitute an assurance, as reproduced in the Parliamentary procedure. In fact, an identical answer had been given in reply to Parts (a) and (b) of the Lok Sabha Unstarred Question No. 1679 answered by this Department on January 7, 1991 on setting up of Heavy Water Plant in Aonla and this had not been taken as an assurance at that time (Annexure-I). As mentioned in the answer, Aonla is only one of the sites recommended by the Site Selection Committee and a final decision in the matter is yet to be taken. It may be quite sometime before Government is in a position to take this decision as in the first instance the 8th

Plan proposals have to be finalised by the Planning Commission and approved by the Government. Thereafter, depending upon the nuclear power generation capacity to be installed, the necessity for putting up additional Heavy Water Plants will have to be considered.

It is, therefore, requested that the answer given to the question may be deleted from the list of assurances as the same does not constitute an assurance as explained above."

2.12 The request of the Department of Atomic Energy was placed before the Committee for their consideration at their sitting held on December 27, 1991.

2.13 The Committee did not agree to drop the assurance and the decision of the Committee was conveyed to the Ministry for compliance.

2.14 Subsequently the Ministry fulfilled the assurance by laying an implementation report on the Table of the Lok Sabha on November 25, 1992 *vide* SS IX/5. The implementation report furnished read as follows:—

"Government do not propose to set up any new Heavy Water Plants during the VIII Five years."

2.15 The Committee note with dissatisfaction that a simple issue of taking a decision regarding setting up of a Heavy Water Plant at (Aonla) Bareilly has not only been attempted to be twisted but also, a refusal to fulfil the assurance given on the floor of the House without any cogent reason is not convincing. The Committee would never mind if a negative decision is taken in the matter but the Committee take a serious view if the issue is kept alive by indecisiveness.

2.16 The Committee do not appreciate the contention of the Ministry that the phrase—"Government is yet to take a decision in the matter"—does not strictly constitute an assurance with reference to standard list of expressions which normally constitute an assurance. The argument of the Ministry is clearly untenable. In the reply, the Minister unambiguously disclosed that Aonla is one of the sites recommended by the Site Selection Committee for setting up of a heavy water plant for which Government is yet to take a decision in the matter. In the Committee's opinion it implies that the matter is under their examination and the Committee urge that the Government must inform the House of their final decision on the proposal. To say, that the proposal shall be included in the Eighth Plan and finalised only after knowing the envisaged nuclear power generation capacity, does not give a licence to the Ministry to sit over the proposal for an indefinite period without taking any final decision. The Committee would stress the importance of taking up the challenge and bring about a solution in the matter suited to Indian conditions immediately.

2.17 The Committee desire to stress that it is only the prerogative of the Committee to decide whether a particular reply constitute as an assurance and it is not for the Ministry to decide the matter. The Committee would

like to state that such tendency of trying to evade the solemn promises made by the Minister should be discouraged in future.

CHAPTER III

(i)

MISUSE OF FOREIGN FUNDS

3.1 On November 25, 1987, the following Starred Question (No. 272) given notice of by Shri Jagannath Patnaik, M.P. was addressed to the Minister of Home Affairs:—

“(a) whether the events of the last two years have clearly established that the foreign funds flowing into the country ostensibly for the promotion of religious, social and such other programmes of the voluntary agencies are finding their way to finance terrorists and other anti-national activities; and

(b) if so, the steps Government propose to take to effectively control and regulate the flow of such foreign funds?”

3.2 The then Minister of Home Affairs (Shri Buta Singh) gave the following reply:—

“(a) & (b): There is no definite information that foreign contributions received by the voluntary agencies are being used for such purposes. However, some amendments to the Foreign Contribution (Regulation) Act, 1976 are under consideration with a view to making it more effective.”

3.3 During the course of supplementaries, Shri Jaipal Reddy, M.P. stated that there was no monitoring mechanism to scrutinise the expenditure incurred by various voluntary agencies receiving foreign funds. The Member wanted to know whether the Minister had received complaints about the misuse of the funds and if so, what action had been taken thereon?

3.4 In reply to the above supplementary, the then Minister of State in the Ministry of Home Affairs (Shri P. Chidambaram) stated as follows:—

“It is not correct to say that we do not have any monitoring mechanism. It is because we have a monitoring mechanism that we have been able to place some persons and organisations in the prohibited category. It is because we have a monitoring mechanism that we have been able to place some others in the prior permission category. I think the hon. Member is having a particular organisation in mind. He has spoken to me about this and I told him that I will give him an answer.”

3.5 Reply to the supplementary point raised was treated as an assurance by the Committee on Government Assurances which was required

(d) the approximate annual payments to be made to British Airways in this regard?"

3.11 The then Minister of State in the Ministry of Civil Aviation and Tourism (Shri Shivraj V. Patil) gave the following reply:—

“(a) At Kennedy Airport, New York the activity relating to import cargo has been contracted out with effect from 1st April, 1986. With regard to export cargo etc. the contract is not yet final and negotiations are in progress.

(b), (c) & (d): Air India has a proposal to contract out passenger and ramp handling in London with effect from November, 1988 to British Airways to provide improved passenger handling facilities with greater economy.”

3.12 the reply to part (a) of the question was treated as an assurance by the Committee on Government Assurances which was to be implemented within three months of the date of reply i.e. by December 4, 1988.

3.13 On May 1, 1991, the Ministry of Civil Aviation and Tourism approached the Committee on Government Assurances through the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs *vide* their U.O. Note No. XI/CA&T(30)USQ 4957-LS/88 dated May 1, 1991 to drop the assurance on the grounds indicated below:—

“Failing to achieve any solution through direct negotiations with the Union, the Management of Air-India in New York, as provided under the local law, made an application for mediation on 15th November, 1989, before the National Mediation Board on the dispute between Air India and the Union. In spite of four meetings under the supervision of the Government mediator, the situation remained unchanged. In the circumstances, it is practically impossible for this Ministry to indicate any reasonable time limit within which the assurance could be fulfilled.”

3.14 The Ministry have also sought extension of time upto March 3, 1992.

The Committee considered the request of the Ministry of Civil Aviation and Tourism for dropping of the assurance at their sitting held on December 27, 1991.

3.15 The Committee are convinced that the dispute between Management of Air India and the Union, pending for more than two years is an intricate matter and no reasonable time limit can be assigned by which the impasse can be resolved. the Committee therefore agree to drop the assurance.

(iii)

NON-FORMAL CENTRES

3.16 On August 10, 1989, the following Unstarred Question (No. 3302) given notice of by Shri Narsing Suryavanshi, M.P. was addressed to the Minister of Human Resource Development:—

- “(a) whether Union Government have drawn up a crash programme to set up non-formal education centres in the country;
- (b) if so, the details thereof;
- (c) the places where such non-formal education centres are proposed to be set up; and
- (d) the progress made in this regard so far?”

3.17 The then Minister of Human Resource Development (Shri P. Shiv Shanker) gave the following reply:—

“(a), (b) & (c) : Under the Action Plan in Key Areas for the Development of Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes, the Government propose a package of services in 10,000 habitations having 200 or more Scheduled Caste/Scheduled Tribe population (or combination of both) in States having a sizeable SC/ST population, namely, Andhra Pradesh, Assam, Bihar, Madhya Pradesh, Maharashtra, Orissa, Rajasthan, Tamil Nadu, Uttar Pradesh and West Bengal.

This package of benefits include (i) setting up a non-formal education centre with a building if there is no primary school in the vicinity, (ii) provision of a handpump/drinking water source, (iii) street lighting and single point light connections to the poorest households under the Kutir Jyoti Programme, (iv) irrigation wells to small and marginal SC/ST farmers who do not have irrigation facilities, and (v) verification and restoration of possession of land holdings wherever required, etc.

(d): The process of identification of 10,000 habitations *in these 10 States is under way.*”

3.18 Reply to Part(d) of the question was treated as an assurance by the Committee on Government Assurances and was required to be implemented within three months from the date of reply i.e. by November 9, 1989.

3.19 On December 29, 1989, Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs laid on the Table of the House a Statement (No. II/72 vide Annexure) containing Part Implementation Report of the aforesaid assurance.

3.20 On December 19, 1990, the Ministry of Human Resource Development approached the Committee on Government Assurances through the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs *vide* their U.O. Note No. XIV/HRD(34)

USQ-3302-LS/89 dated December 19, 1990 to drop the assurance on the grounds indicated below:—

“Under the Action Plan in Key Areas for the Development of Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes, the Government proposed a package of services in 10,000 habitations having 200 or more Scheduled Caste/Scheduled Tribe population (or combination of both) in States having a sizeable SC/ST population, namely, Andhra Pradesh, Assam, Bihar, Madhya Pradesh, Maharashtra, Orissa, Rajasthan, Tamil Nadu, Uttar Pradesh and West Bengal. This package of benefits included setting up of NFE Centres with buildings provision of drinking water, electricity, irrigation facilities etc. It was *inter-alia* stated that the process of identification of 10,000 habitations in these 10 States is under way, which is an assurance required to be fulfilled.

On 14th December 1989 *vide* this Ministry’s O.M. of even number information was furnished indicating the progress of the process of identification of habitations and release of grants in part fulfilment of the assurance. Thereafter, there has not been any significant development under this programme as the decision about the continuance of the programme in the 8th Plan in the shape, size and manner of its implementation as visualised originally is yet to be taken. Pending this decision the matter could not be pursued with the remaining States. In view of this it is unlikely that any additional information would be forthcoming about the programme.

In these circumstances, the Deptt. of Education has no additional information to furnish to fulfil the assurance in full. It is, therefore, requested that the Committee on Government Assurances may be requested to consider the assurance as deemed to have been fulfilled on the basis of the information already furnished to the Lok Sabha Secretariat on 14.12.1989.”

(*Vide* part implementation Report SS No. II/72 dt. 29.12.90 *annexed.*)

3.21 The Ministry of Human Resource Development also sought extension of time upto August 9, 1991.

3.22 The Committee considered the request of the Ministry of Human Resource Development for dropping of assurance at their sitting held on December 27, 1991.

3.23 The Committee take notice of the part fulfilment of the assurance and is convinced that decision about the continuation of non-formal education centres in the Eighth Plan shall be known only after the Plan is finalised. The Committee decide to treat the assurance as fully implemented.

(iv)
LONG TERM FISCAL POLICY
 (iv)

3.24 On April 20, 1990 the following Unstarred Question (No. 5827) given notice of by Shri S. Krishna Kumar, M.P. was addressed to the Minister of Finance:—

- “(a) the ratio of direct and indirect taxes to the GDP;
 (b) how does it compare with the same in other developing countries;
 (c) whether Government propose to change this ratio as a part of long term economic policy; and
 (d) if so, the details thereof?”

3.25 The then Minister of Finance (Prof. Madhu Dandavate) gave the following reply:

“The ratio of Central Government direct and indirect taxes (gross) to GDP during the year 1988-89 worked out to 2.3 per cent and 8.9 per cent respectively.

(b) The ratio of ‘Taxes on Income, Profits and Capital Gains’ and of ‘Domestic Taxes on Goods and Services’ expressed as per cent of GDP for some selected developing countries as published in the latest issue of ‘Government Finance Statistics Year-Book’ brought out by the International Monetary Fund are given below:—

Country	Year	Taxes on Income, Profits and Capital Gains (As per cent of Gross Domestic Pro- ducts)	Domestic Taxes on Goods & Services
1. India	1986	2.06	10.05
2. Indonesia	1986	8.57	5.15
3. Thailand	1986	3.29	8.32
4. Egypt	1986	6.37	4.27
5. Brazil	1986	4.56	10.78

(c) & (d): The issue is under consideration of the Government and a new Long Term Fiscal Policy is currently under formulation which shall be placed before Parliament.”

3.26 Reply to parts (c) and (d) of the question was treated as an assurance by the Committee on Government Assurances and it was required to be implemented within three months of the date of reply *i.e.* by July 19, 1990.

3.27 On May 11, 1990, the following Unstarred Question (No. 8414) given notice of by Shri Prataprao B. Bhonsale and Shri S. Krishna Kumar, M.Ps was addressed to the Minister of Finance:

- “(a) whether Government propose to chalk out some new fiscal policy;
and
(b) if so, the details thereof?”

3.28 The then Deputy Finance Minister (Shri Anil Shastri) gave the following reply:

- (a)&(b): “A new Long Term Fiscal Policy for the period 1990-95 is under formulation.”

3.29 Reply to the question was treated as an assurance by the Committee on Government Assurances and it was required to be implemented within three months of the date of reply i.e. by August 10, 1990.

3.30 On December 28, 1990, the following Unstarred Question (No. 370) given notice of by Shri M.V. Chandrashekhara Murthy, Shri V. Sreenivasa Prasad and Shrimati Vasundhara Raje, M.Ps was addressed to the Minister of Finance:

- “(a) whether the Associated Chambers of Commerce and Industry have urged the Government to come out with a comprehensive long term economic policy;
(b) if so, the reaction of Union Government thereon; and
(c) the steps proposed to be taken to have a stable economic policy?”

3.31. The then Deputy Finance Minister (Shri Digvijay Singh) gave the following reply:

- “(a). Yes, Sir.
(b)&(c): Formulation of Long Term Fiscal Policy is under consideration of the Government of India.”

3.32 Reply to the question was treated as an assurance by the Committee on Government Assurances and was required to be fulfilled within three months of the date of the reply i.e. by 27 March, 1991.

3.33 On November 8, 1991, the Ministry of Finance approached the Committee on Government Assurances through the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs *vide* their U.O. Note No. VI/FIN(8) USQ. 370-LS/90 dated 8.11.1991 to drop the aforesaid three assurances on the grounds indicated below:-

“While answering Parliament Questions, assurances have been given that the Long Term Fiscal Policy is under formulation and would be laid on the table of the Sabha. In view of the deep crisis in

the economy, where the process of macro-economic adjustment and fiscal correction would take at least three years, the Government have reconsidered the question of presentation of a Long Term Fiscal Policy. The Government are of the view that it would not be advisable to lay down any Long Term Fiscal Policy document either new or in the foreseeable future. Government have appointed a high level Committee on tax reforms whose recommendations on the fiscal policy in the medium term will receive due consideration. In view of the above, it is requested that the Assurances given in answers to Parliament Questions may please be dropped."

3.34 The request of the Ministry of Finance was considered by the Committee at their sitting held on December 27, 1991.

3.35 The Committee take notice of the fact that due to deep crisis in the economy, the presentation of long term fiscal policy in near future is not advisable. As the Government have appointed a high level Committee on tax reforms to suggest fiscal corrections, the Committee agree to drop the assurance.

(v)

INCLUSION OF PERUVANNAN COMMUNITY IN SCHEDULED TRIBES LIST

3.36 On August 8, 1990, the following Unstarred Question (No. 459) given notice of by Shri A. Vijayaraghavan, M.P. was addressed to the Minister of Welfare:

- “(a) whether Union Government have received any representation for including the Peruvannan Community in the list of Scheduled Tribes;
- (b) if so, the action taken thereon; and
- (c) if not, whether Government propose to include the above mentioned community in the List of Scheduled Tribes?”

3.37 The then Minister of Labour and Welfare (Shri Ram Vilas Paswan) gave the following reply:

“(a) Yes, Sir.

(b)&(c): Proposal for comprehensive revision of Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes is under consideration of the Government.”

3.38 Reply to parts(b) and (c) of the question was treated as an assurance by the Committee which was to be fulfilled within three months of the date of the reply i.e. by November 7, 1990.

3.38 On November 21, 1990, the Ministry of Welfare approached the Committee on Government Assurances through the Ministry of Parliament Affairs vide their U.O. Note No. III/Wel (7)USQ. 459-LS/90 dated November 21, 1990, to drop the assurance on the grounds indicated below:—

“The fulfilment of the assurance is linked with the proposed comprehensive revision of lists of Scheduled Castes and Scheduled

Tribes and such a revision in these lists can be done only through an Act of Parliament in view of the provisions made under Articles 341(2) and 342(2) of the Constitution. Since the exact time requirement in the matter cannot be assessed and the Parliament cannot be assigned any time limits in the matter, the aforesaid Assurance may kindly be dropped.”

3.40 The Committee (1990-91) considered the request of the Ministry of Welfare at their sitting held on December 12, 1990. The Committee did not agree to drop the assurance.

3.41 The decision of the Committee was conveyed to the Ministry.

3.42 On February 14, 1991, the Ministry of Welfare again approached the Committee on Government Assurances through the Ministry of Parliament Affairs *vide* U.O. Note No. III/Wel. (7) USQ. 459-LS/90 dated February 14, 1991, to drop the assurance on the grounds indicated below:—

“The issue of inclusion of Peruvannan Community is linked with the Comprehensive revision of Scheduled Castes/Scheduled Tribes lists which has remained pending since long. The revision of these lists can be done through an act of Parliament in view of Articles 341(2) and 342(2) of the Constitution. In this particular case no decision can be taken about this community in isolation as the same is linked up with the broader issue of the comprehensive revision of the lists of Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes. Therefore, no specific time limit can be fixed for a Parliamentary legislation though the Government is considering the issue again for revision of SC/ST lists comprehensively.”

3.43 The Committee considered the request of the Ministry of Welfare for dropping of the assurance at their sitting held on December 27, 1991.

3.44 The Committee have taken notice of the fact that a comprehensive list of SCs/STs is already under consideration with the Government. The requests received from individual States to include a specific tribe in the list will be considered simultaneously. The Committee therefore decide to drop the assurance.

(vi)

COMPREHENSIVE REVISION of SC/ST LIST

3.45 On August 14, 1991, during the course of General Discussion on the Constitution (Scheduled Tribes) Order (Amendment) Bill, 1991 Members raised points to include some more Tribes in the List of Scheduled Castes/Scheduled Tribes and desired that a comprehensive Bill should be brought by the Government.

3.46 The Minister of Welfare (Shri Sitaram Kesari) gave the following reply:—

“The suggestions given by the Hon’ble Members will be considered and we shall consider their suggestions in future.”

3.47 Reply to the points raised during General Discussion was treated as an assurance by the Committee on Government Assurances which was required to be fulfilled within three months of the date of reply *i.e.* by November 13, 1991.

3.48 On December 3, 1991, the Ministry of Welfare approached the Committee on Government Assurances through the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs *vide* their U.O. Note No. 1/Wel (9) General Discussion dated December 3, 1991 to drop the assurance on the grounds indicated below:—

“During the General Discussion on the Constitution (Scheduled Tribes) Order (Amendment) Bill, 1991, some of the Members of Parliament, particularly S/Shri Syed Shahabuddin, Rajnath Sonkar Shastri, Ram Nihar Roy, Piyus Tiraky, etc. raised the issue that the castes/communities recommended by some States may be included in the list of Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes and a comprehensive revision of these castes/communities be made. The fulfilment of the assurance as per reply given in the Lok Sabha is linked up with the proposed comprehensive revision of lists of Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes and such a revision in these lists can be done only through an Act of Parliament in view of the provisions made under Article 341(2) and 342(2) of the Constitution. The subject matter had been considered several times in the past also.

At this stage it is rather difficult to indicate any time limit for bringing a bill before Parliament for the comprehensive revision of the list of Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes.”

3.49 The Committee considered the request of the Ministry of Welfare for dropping of the assurance at their sitting held on December 27, 1991 and did not agree to drop the assurance. The Committee reviewed their decision alongwith another request on the same subject at their sitting held on April 9, 1992.

3.50 The Committee take notice of the fact that a comprehensive revision of list of SCs/STs is already under consideration with the Government. The requests received from individual states to include a specific tribe in the list will be considered simultaneously. The Committee decide to drop the assurance.

INCOME TAX ARREARS OF CINE-ARTISTS

3.51 On 10 August, 1990, the following Unstarred Question (No. 932) given notice of by Shri Somjibhai Damor was addressed to the Minister of Finance:—

- “(a) the details of the Film Cine Artists/Directors/Producers who owe more than Rs. 1 lakh as Income-tax/Wealth-tax demand to the Income-tax Department as on 31 July, 1990;
- (b) whether Government have initiated proceedings u/s 226(3) of the Income Tax Act, 1961 and Wealth Tax Act, 1957 to attach their moveable and immoveable properties;
- (c) if so, in how many cases, and if not, the reasons therefor; and
- (d) the action Government propose to take to recover such huge outstanding Income-tax arrear demands?”

3.52 The then Deputy Minister in the Ministry of Finance (Shri Anil Shastri) gave the following reply:—

- “(a) The latest information available in Central Board of Direct Taxes is as on 31.3.90. The names of Film Cine Artists/Directors/Producers who owed more than Rs. 1 lakh as Income-tax/Wealth tax as on 31.3.1990 are given in the enclosed *statements I & II*.
- (b) Yes, Sir. In a number of cases action to attach moveable and/or immoveable properties has been initiated.
- (c) & (d) Action for attachment of properties has been initiated in 19 cases. In some of the cases where properties have not been attached, either the demands had not fallen due for payment, or the demands are disputed, or there are no properties for attachment. In some cases, recovery has been stayed or payment has been allowed to be made in instalments. In some other cases, applications for rectification/waiver of the demand/settlement, are pending before various authorities. Recovery of outstanding demands in all the cases is under constant review at various levels.”

3.53 Reply to part (d) of the question was treated as an assurance by Committee on Government Assurances which was required to be implemented within three months of the date of reply *i.e.* by 9 November, 1990.

3.54 On February, 1991 the Ministry of Finance approached the Committee on Government Assurances through the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs *vide* their U.O. Note No. III/Fin. (18) USQ 932-LS/90 dated

February 19, 1991 to drop the assurances on the grounds indicated below:—

“that while replying to part (d) of the above said question, this Ministry did not intend any assurance in the matter.... the Question was about action proposed to be taken by the Govt. to recover the income-tax/wealth-tax demands from such film artists/directors/producers who owed tax demands of over Rs. 1 lakh. The last line of reply to this part *i.e.* ‘Recovery of outstanding demands in all the cases is under constant review at various levels’ referred to the system obtaining in the Income-tax Department under which periodical (quarterly) dossier reports in all such cases are sent by the Assessing Officers to higher authorities in the Department for their review of recovery action taken by the Assessing Officers and Tax Recovery Officers. This review is an on-going process. This reply was complete in itself and no further action was to be taken by this Ministry.”

3.55 The Committee considered the request of the Ministry of Finance at their sitting held on December 27, 1991.

3.56 The Committee appreciate that Income Tax Department periodically review recovery of all outstanding demands in respect of cine artists and therefore agree to drop the assurance.

(viii)

**DEMANDS OF SECTION OFFICERS (HORTICULTURE) AND
JUNIOR ENGINEERS OF
C.P.W.D.**

3.57 On September 5, 1990, the following Unstarred Question (No. 4508) given notice of by Shri S. Krishna Kumar, M.P. was addressed to the Minister of Urban Development:—

- “(a) whether the officers of the Directorate of Horticulture, CPWD are at par in terms of duties and responsibilities as per CPWD Manual to the Officers/Engineers of their ranks of Civil and Electrical of CPWD; if not, the reasons for not treating them as par;
- (b) what steps Government have taken to solve the long pending demands of Sectional Officers (Horticulture) and Junior Engineers of CPWD for which they had gone for 37 days strike in 1987;
- (c) whether any plan has been drawn up for the expansion of Horticulture Wing of CPWD as done for the Civil and Electrical Wing; and
- (d) if so, the details thereof?

3.58. The then Minister of Urban Development (Shri Murasoli Maran) gave the following reply:—

- “(a) Nature of work and expertise of the officers of Horticultural discipline and Civil/Electrical discipline are distinct and are not inter-changeable. For the purpose of organisational set up, a

uniform pattern is followed for Horticultural, Civil/Electrical disciplines such as Circle, Division and Sub-Division. The provision in the Manual has to be read in this context as the general duties and responsibilities of the Director/Additional Director of Horticulture and his sub-ordinate officers only are similar to those of the Superintending Engineers, the Executive Engineers and the Assistant Engineers, and not the specific duties.

- (b) Necessary details in respect of Junior Engineers are given in the *Annexure I*. Information in respect of Sectional Officer (Horticulture) is being collected and will be laid on the Table of the Sabha.
- (c) & (d): A proposal prepared by the CPWD for creation of additional posts in various disciplines including Horticulture discipline has not been agreed to by Government as the workload norms are under revision."

3.59 Reply to part (b) of the question was treated as an assurance by the Committee on Government Assurances which was required to be fulfilled within three months of the date of reply i.e. by December, 1990.

3.60 On November, 1991 the Ministry of Urban Development approached the Committee on Government Assurances through the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs *vide* their U.O. Note No. III/UD (25) USQ 4508-25/90 dated 11 November, 1991 to drop the assurance on the grounds indicated below:—

"....Assurance given in respect of Demand Nos. 6, 8 and 9(a) in answer to the Unstarred Question are yet to be fulfilled. Factual position with regard to these Assurances is indicated below:

(1) *Item No. 6 Fixed Travelling Allowance*

Decision has since been taken by Government. As this is an item in the Departmental Council (JCM) of the Ministry of Urban Development, the matter is to be settled in the Departmental Council and till then, this Demand cannot be treated as finalised.

(2) *Demand No. 8 Store handling Special Allowance/Pay*

This demand has also been considered and decision taken by Government. Since this is an item in the Departmental Council (JCM) this has to be settled in the Council and hence this demand cannot be treated as finalised for the present.

(3) *Demand No. 9 (a) Abolition of Class II direct recruitment Rules 3(a) of CES and CEES Class II Rules*

Though the provisions in the Recruitment Rules have not been amended, yet direct recruitment to Class II (Group 'B') posts in the Central Engineering Service and Central Electrical Engineering Service Group 'B' already stands suspended. The issue of amendment of relevant Rules is under consideration but this is likely to take some more time.

In view of the position explained above, it would not be possible to fulfil the Assurance in respect of Demand Nos. 6, 8 and 9(a).”

3.61 The Ministry laid two statements in part fulfilment of the assurance on July 19, 1991 and November 22, 1991 (Annexures II and III). The Ministry also sought extension of time upto 5.9.1991.

3.62 The request of the Ministry of Urban Development for dropping of the assurance was considered by the Committee at their sitting held on December 27, 1991.

3.63 In view of the position explained by the Ministry, the Committee decide to drop the assurance.

(ix)

DEVELOPMENT OF TRIVANDRUM, CALICUT AND COCHIN

3.64 On September 9, 1991, the following Unstarred Question (No. 6117) given notice of by Shri T.J. Anjalose, M.P. was addressed to the Minister of Urban Development:—

“(a) whether the Government have received any proposal from the Government of Kerala for development of Trivandrum, Calicut and Cochin;

(b) if so, the details thereof; and

(c) the action taken by the Government in this regard?”

3.65 The then Minister of State in the Ministry of Urban Development (Shri M. Arunachalam) gave the following reply:—

(a), (b) & (c): “Government of Kerala has submitted a Preliminary Project Report for taking up Urban Development Schemes with the assistance of World Bank in Trivandrum, Cochin and Kozhikode at a cost of Rs. 316.5 crores. Discussions have been held with the Government of Kerala in this regard. The detailed Project Reports have not been received from the State Government.”

3.66 Reply to the question was treated as an assurance and was required to be implemented by the Ministry of Urban Development by December 8, 1991.

3.67 On December 5, 1991, the Ministry of Urban Development approached the Committee on Government Assurances through the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs *vide* their U.O. Note No. 1/(65) USQ. 6117-LS/91 dated December 5, 1991 to drop the assurance on the grounds indicated below:—

“...that the reply given to the Unstarred Question was a complete reply to all the parts a, b & c of the said question. It cannot be treated as a promise or an assurance for taking any further action in the matter with regard to the Parliament question.”

3.68 The request of the Ministry of Urban Development was placed before the Committee for their consideration at their sitting held on December 27, 1991.

3.69 The Committee decide to drop the assurance.

(x)

INTEGRATED DEVELOPMENT OF HORTICULTURE

3.70 On March 4, 1991, the following Unstarred Question (No. 1074) given notice of by Shri Srikantha Datta Narasimharaja Wadiyar and Shri H.C. Srikantaiah M.Ps, was addressed to the Minister of Agriculture:—

“(a) whether Karnataka Government has submitted any proposal to the Union Government seeking World Bank assistance for implementation of the integrated development of horticulture;

(b) if so, the details thereof; and

(c) the total World Bank assistance provided to Karnataka for development of horticulture during last three years?”

3.71 The then Minister of State in the Department of Agriculture and Cooperation in the Ministry of Agriculture (Shri J.V. Shah) gave the following reply:—

“(a) Yes, Sir.

(b) The Government of Karnataka has submitted a revised proposal on integrated development of horticulture in Karnataka with World Bank assistance in June, 1987. The duration of the project was five years and proposed outlay Rs. 49.91 crores. The main objective of the project was to benefit the farming community by increasing the area under cultivation of horticultural crops, stepping up productivity of horticultural crops by adoption of a package of practices, developing marketing and processing facilities, and bridging the missing links in the infrastructural development.

This project was posed to World Bank in August, 1987 who observed in mid 1989 that Bank was proposing a Multi-State Tropical Horticulture Project in which Karnataka could also participate. At present, an integrated horticulture development project for tropical areas covering nine States including Karnataka is under consideration with the Government.

(c) Question does not arise.”

3.72 Reply to Part (b) of the question was treated as an assurance by the Committee on Government Assurances which was required to be fulfilled within three months of the date of reply *i.e.* by June 3, 1991.

3.73 On August 13, 1991, the Ministry of Agriculture approached the Committee on Government Assurances through the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs *vide* their U.O. Note No. VII/Agri(2)USQ. 1074-LS/91 dated 13.8.91 to drop the assurance on the grounds indicated below:—

“A proposal for the Integrated Development of Horticulture in Karnataka with World Bank assistance was received from the

n
b
fi

ai
C
G
R

Government of Karnataka in June, 1987. However, the World Bank informed in mid-1989 that the proposal submitted by the Government of Karnataka was not accepted. The Bank proposed instead a Multi-State Tropical Horticulture project in which Karnataka could also participate.

Several discussions were held with the World Bank officials on the proposed coverage and area of the project. At a meeting on 11.3.1991, the World Bank representative explained that the optimal number of States to be covered by the project under World Bank could be 4-5. This was with a view to have effective monitoring and control over the implementation of the project. It was thereafter decided that it would be necessary to have a feasibility study for the proposed project covering 8-9 States out of which the most potential 4-5 could be selected for implementation. The terms of reference for such a study have since been worked out in consultation with the Departments concerned has been submitted through the Department of Economic Affairs to the World Bank on 9.7.1991 for their approval.

In this connection it may be pointed out that approval of World Bank projects involves lengthy procedures and usually takes a minimum of 3-4 years before they are finally accepted and agreements signed between the World Bank/GOI and the State concerned. The implementation of the project would be only after these exercises are gone through. The stages for preparation and signing of a World Bank project are briefly as under:—

- (i) Conduct of feasibility study.
- (ii) Preparation of project outline on approval study report.
- (iii) Discussions/consultations with State Govts./agencies concerned with the implementation.
- (iv) Consultations with the Planning Commission/Plan Finance/Department of Economic Affairs.
- (v) Finalisation of project report and submission to World Bank by Department of Economic Affairs for further processing.
- (vi) Preliminary discussions on the project proposals with the World Bank.
- (vii) Mounting of pre-appraisal Mission by the World Bank.
- (viii) Internal discussions on conditionalities and covenants by Department of Economic Affairs with the concerned State Government.
- (ix) Appraisal Mission and preparation of staff appraisal report by World Bank.
- (x) Negotiations with the World Bank by the negotiating team.

- (xi) Approval of the project by the Board of the World Bank.
- (xii) Signing of different agreements between the World Bank, GOI/ State Govts./agencies concerned with the implementation.

At any of the stages above, it is likely that the project may not find full acceptance and could be dropped. Presuming that the project is finally approved after observing the procedures above, formal sanction for implementation of the project would be issued. Thereafter, the implementation of the project may take several years depending on the project period prescribed.

In the circumstances explained above, the present proposal is at a very preliminary stages and has not been taken up formally with the World Bank. The reply given to Parliament Question No. 1074 may not be treated as an 'assurance'."

3.74 The Committee considered the request of the Ministry of Agriculture for dropping of the assurance at their sitting held on December 27, 1991.

3.75 The Committee are convinced that specified time limit cannot be assigned for fulfilling the assurance. The Committee have decided to drop the assurance. The Committee are also of the opinion that the assurance has been given without much thought over the nature and extent of work involved therein. The Committee is of the opinion that Ministry should exercise due caution and care before giving an assurance.

(xi)

POPULATION OF NEPALI SPEAKING INDIANS

3.76 On July 25, 1991, the following question (No. 575) given notice of by Shrimati D.K. Bhandari, M.P. was addressed to the Minister of Home Affairs:—

"that population of the Nepali speaking Indian people according to 1991 census, State-wise and Union Territory-wise?"

3.77 The then Minister of State in the Ministry of Home Affairs (Shri M.M. Jacob) gave the following reply:—

"the population of Nepali-speaking people in India is yet to be tabulated."

3.78 Reply given to the question was treated as an assurance by Committee on Government Assurances which was required to be fulfilled within three months from the date of reply i.e. by October, 24, 1991.

3.79 On October 21, 1991, the Ministry of Home Affairs approached the Committee on Government Assurances through the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs *vide* their U.O. Note No. I/HA(3)USQ. 575-LS/91 dated 21.10.1991 to drop the assurance on the grounds indicated below:—

"In the reply to the question no commitment to anything special has been made. The regular process of tabulation will be done in the

normal time frame which is expected to be the year 1993. By simply keeping it as an assurance, no purpose will be served. It is, therefore, requested that this may not please be treated as an assurance.”

3.80 The Committee considered the request of the Ministry of Home Affairs for dropping of the assurance at their sitting held on December 27, 1991.

3.81 In view of the position explained by the Ministry the Committee agree to the request for dropping of the assurance.

New Delhi,

April 7, 1993

Chaitra 17, 1915 (Saka)

DR. LAXMINARAIN PANDEY,

Chairman,

Committee on Government Assurances.

APPENDIX

MINUTES

SECOND SITTING

The Committee met on Friday, December 27, 1991 from 15.00 hours to 16.30 hours.

PRESENT

- Dr. Laxminarain Pandey — *Chairman*
2. Shri Sai Prathap Annayagari
 3. Shri B. Devarajan
 4. Shri B.K. Gudadinni
 5. Shrimati Krishnendra Kaur (Deepa)
 6. Shri Balin Kuli
 7. Shri Manphool Singh
 8. Shri Ajoy Mukhopadhyay
 9. Shrimati Pratibha Devisingh Patil
 10. Shri Shashi Prakash
 11. Shri Naval Kishore Rai
 12. Shri Chinmaya Nand Swami

SECRETARIAT

- Shri R.C. Bhardwaj — *Joint Secretary*
Shri K.M. Mittal — *Under Secretary*

6. The Committee then took up Memoranda Nos. 4 to 22 containing requests received from various Ministries/Departments for dropping of assurances.

Memorandum No. 4 Request for dropping of assurance given on November 25, 1987 in reply to Starred Question No. 272 regarding misuse of foreign funds.

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/HS(26) SQ.272-LS/87 dated August 12, 1991 for the dropping of the assurance on the following grounds:—

“Since the then Minister of State in the Ministry of Home Affairs had some doubt about the name of the organisation referred to in the reply, the Hon’ble Member, Shri S. Jaipal Reddy was requested to intimate the name of the organisation in question as

the assurance on the following grounds:—

“Stainless steel product as a whole can be classified into two broad categories namely, long product and flat products. Long products are mainly produced by the units under Alloy Steel Producers Association in the secondary sectors including Alloy Steel Plant, Durgapur. Stainless steel flat products are produced by Salem Steel Plant, Jindal Steel Ltd., and small scale units. The small scale units normally cater to the requirement of Stainless steel utensil manufacture. While there has been no specified complaint for poor quality of stainless steel long products, there has been some newspaper reports in the past for poor quality of stainless steel kitchenware and raw material thereof.

Presently there are several Indian Standards for flat products as well as long products as under:

IS	5522:1978	Stainless steel sheets coils
IS	6527:1972	Stainless steel wire rods
IS	6528:1972	Stainless steel wire
IS	6529:1972	Stainless steel blooms, billets and slabs for forging
IS	6603:1972	Stainless steel bars and flats
IS	6911:1972	Stainless steel plate, sheets and strips.

The long products mentioned above are required mostly by the engineering industry as per their specifications. Quality is, therefore, checked by the users. The flat products are used mainly (about 80%) by the utensils sector. All these standards for flat products i.e. IS 5522 and IS 6911 are covered under the Govt. notification for Compulsory Certification Mark Scheme of Bureau of Indian Standard. However, the above notification is lacking in poor implementation. Also there is no penalty measures for non-fulfilment of the above provision. The notification also provides that untested/off grade material could be sold freely in the market and there is no measure for restricting their uses. Unless these loopholes are plugged, it is unlikely that supply of stainless steel poor quality raw material could be stopped. Accordingly this Deptt. under the direction of Sectoral Coordination Committee on Standard & Quality, have initiated action to suitably amend the Government Notification 1971, so as to include all items concerning public health and safety, including SS sheets/scrips and also assign suitable implementing agency and penalty measures. It is also proposed to provide suitable clause for management of untested/off grade material.

The above responsibility has been assigned to DC I&S, Calcutta who in consultation with BIS is to submit a draft recommendation for revision of the Gazette Notification. The two meetings of the Group have already taken place and next meeting is due shortly. Once the recommendations are available, effective steps would be taken up in this Department for issue of revised notification. It is expected that the availability of poor quality stainless steel raw

material will be curtailed to a great extent after the exercise is completed. Also this Deptt. has recommended to Ministry of Civil Supplies to examine the possibility to enforce Compulsory Certification Mark Scheme in the case of stainless steel utensils also so as to restrict the use of stainless steel utensils/off grade material and also provide a double check.

It may be seen from the above that this is a long and time consuming exercise bound to take its own time. The reply of the Parliament Question would be possible only thereafter. Therefore, it is felt that instead of keeping the Parliament Assurance pending may be desirable to get it dropped. In any case suitable action has already been initiated and it is expected that it will bear good results so as to restrict availability of poor grade stainless steel material."

After considering all aspects of the matter and the reasons advanced by the Ministry, the Committee did not agree to drop the assurance and decided to pursue the subject matter. The Committee also granted extension of time upto 23 June, 1992 to implement the assurance.

Memorandum No. 7: Request for dropping of assurance given on August 10, 1989 in reply to Unstarred Question No. 3302 regarding non-formal education centres.

The Committee considered the request of the Ministry of Human Resource Development received through the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs *Vide* their U.O.Note No. XIV/HRD(34)USQ-3302-LS/89 dated December 19, 1990 for the dropping of the assurance on the following grounds:—

"Under the Action Plan in Key Areas for the Development of Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes, the Government proposed a package of services in 10,000 habitations having 200 or more Scheduled Caste/Scheduled Tribe population (or combination of both) in States having a sizeable SC/ST population, namely, Andhra Pradesh, Assam, Bihar, Madhya Pradesh, Maharashtra, Orissa, Rajasthan, Tamil Nadu, Uttar Pradesh and West Bengal. This package of benefits included setting up of NFE Centres with buildings, provision of drinking water, electricity, irrigation facilities etc. It was *inter-alia* stated that "the process of identification of 10,000 habitations in these 10 States is under way" which is an assurance required to be fulfilled.

On 14th Decembér, 1989 *vide* this Ministry's O.M. of even number information was furnished indicating the progress of the process of identification of habitations and release of grants in part fulfilment of the assurance. Thereafter, there has not been any significant development under this programme as the decision about the continuance of the programme in the 8th Plan in the shape, size and manner of its implementation as visualised originally is yet to be taken. Pending this decision the matter could not be pursued

with the remaining States. In view of this it is unlikely that any additional information would be forthcoming about the programme.

In these circumstances, the Deptt. of Education has no additional information to furnish to fulfil the assurance in full. It is, therefore, requested that the Committee on Government Assurances may be requested to consider the assurance as deemed to have been fulfilled on the basis of the information already furnished to the Lok Sabha Secretariat on 14.12.1989."

(*Vide* Part Implementation Report
SS No. II/72 dt. 29.12.90 *annexed.*)

The Committee took notice of the Part Implementation Report along with the dropping request of the Ministry and decided to treat the assurance as *fully implemented*.

Memorandum No. 8: Request for dropping of assurance given on March 22, 1990 in reply to Starred Question No. 146 regarding guidelines to Governors regarding nominations to State Legislative Councils.

The Committee considered the request of the Ministry of Home Affairs received through the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs *vide* their U.O. Note No.II/HA(11) SQ.146-LS/90 dated January 15, 1991 for the dropping of the assurance on the following grounds:—

....."during the course of supplementary Questions, it was stated by the Home Minister that the recommendations of the Sarkaria Commission in respect of functioning of the Governors are under consideration of the Government. It may be mentioned that this supplementary Question was not directly connected with the subject matter of the Question."

The Governor of a State is a Constitutional functionary and derives his powers and authority to function as Head of the State from the provisions of the Constitution and various practices and conventions inherent in the Cabinet form of Government adopted under our Constitution. As Governor, he has his functions laid down in the Constitution. Most of the recommendations of the Sarkaria Commission in respect of functioning of the Governors are only a reiteration of well recognised interpretations of these provisions based on commentaries in text books, decisions of the Supreme Court, etc. As the powers and functions of the Governor in this regard are derived by him directly from the Constitution itself, the recommendations of the Commission are intended to be taken note of by the Governors and the State Governments.

As regards Sarkaria Commission's report, this report has been widely circulated and debated. The comments of most of the State

Governments have been obtained and considered. The report was taken up for detailed consideration at the meetings of the Parliamentary Consultative Committee attached to the Ministry of Home Affairs which devoted its five sittings to discuss this report (5.2.88, 29.4.88, 14-15 July, 88, 1.9.88, 27.10.88). The report was also discussed in the Rajya Sabha on 28th, 29th and 30th November, 1988 and in the Lok Sabha on 30-31st March and 4-5th April, 1989. An important recommendation of the Sarkaria Commission with regard to the setting up of an Inter-State Council under article 263, was considered in a meeting of the Chief Ministers held on 12th April, 1990. As a result of the consideration of this recommendation, the Government decided to set up the Inter-State Council under article 263 of the Constitution and the President's Order was notified on 28th May, 1990. The first meeting of the Inter-State Council was held recently on 10th October, 1990. In the first meeting, the Sarkaria Commission Report as such, was taken up for consideration and it was decided to set up a Sub-Committee of the Council to consider the recommendations of the Sarkaria Commission on Centre-State Relations and give concrete suggestions thereon. It was also decided that this Committee would consider wider aspects relating to Centre-State Relations and submit their view to the Council.

In view of the above facts, it is requested that the above assurance which concerns only a limited field of the recommendations of the Sarkaria Commission relating to the functioning of the Governor, may kindly be dropped."

After considering the pros and cons of the matter, the Committee did not agree to the request of the Ministry to drop the assurance and desired that Government should expedite their decision on the recommendation of the Sarkaria Commission.

Memorandum No. 9: Request for dropping of assurances given on:—

- (i) March 27, 1990 in reply to a supplementary question by Shri Hari Kishore Singh, M.P. on SQ. No. 206 regarding kickbacks received in purchase of aircraft with Air India;
- (ii) March 29, 1990 during General Discussion under Rule 193 regarding accident to Indian Airlines Airbus A-320 at Bangalore;
- (iii) August 21, 1990 in reply to USQ. NO. 1932 by Prof. Rupchand Pal, M.P. regarding rogatory letter to Switzerland for A-320 Airbus deal; and
- (iv) January 10, 1991 in reply to USQ. No. 862 by Shri Prakash Koko Brahmhatt and Shri Samarendra Kundu, M.P.s regarding purchase of Airbus A-320 deal.

The Committee considered the request of the Ministry of Civil Aviation and Tourism received through the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs *vide*

their U.O. Note No. II/CA(7)SQ-206-LS/90 dated 31.10.91 for the dropping of the assurances on the following grounds:—

“It is submitted that the Central Bureau of Investigation (CBI) had filed an FIR RC.2(A)/90-ACU(II) on 29th March, 1990 regarding allegation of bribery and corruption in the purchase of A-320 aircraft during the period 1984-85 to 1988-89. The CBI has informed us that since the case is under investigation and foreign investigation is involved, it is not possible to say at this stage as to when the report would be finalised. The CBI has stated that letters rogatory have been sent to U.K. and U.S.A for obtaining information in this regard, while letters rogatory for France and Switzerland are under consideration.

The CBI is not under the administrative control of the Department of Civil Aviation and this Department is therefore, not in a position to indicate when the investigation would be completed by the CBI.

In view of the above, it is requested that the Committee on Government Assurance (Lok Sabha) may kindly be moved to drop these assurances.”

The Committee decided to pursue the subject matter and desired that all the four assurances pending implementation may be implemented expeditiously.

Memorandum No. 10: Request for dropping of Assurances given on:—

- (i) April 20, 1990 in reply to Unstarred Question No. 5827 regarding ratio of direct and indirect taxes to GDP;
- (ii) May 11, 1990 in reply to Unstarred Question No. 8414 regarding New Fiscal Policy; and
- (iii) December 28, 1990 in reply to Unstarred Question No. 370 regarding Economic Policy.

The Committee considered the request of the Ministry of Finance received through the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs *vide* their U.O. Note No.VI/FIN(8)USQ.370-LS/90 dated 8.11.1991 for the dropping of the assurances on the following grounds:—

“While answering Parliament Questions, assurances have been given that the Long Term Fiscal Policy is under formulation and would be laid on the Table of the Sabha. In view of the deep crisis in the economy, where the process of macro-economic adjustment and fiscal correction would take at least three years, the Government have reconsidered the question of presentation of a Long Term Fiscal Policy. The Government are of the view that it would not be advisable to lay down any Long Term Fiscal Policy document either new or in the foreseeable future. Government have appointed a high level Committee on tax reforms whose recommendations on the fiscal policy

in the medium term will receive due consideration. In view of the above, it is requested that the Assurances given in answer to Parliament Questions may please be dropped.”

The Committee agreed to drop all the three assurances.

Memorandum No. 11: Request for dropping of assurance given on August 8, 1990 in reply to Unstarred Question No. 459 regarding inclusion of Peruvannan Community in Scheduled Tribe List.

The Committee considered the request of the Ministry of Welfare received through the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs *vide* their U.O. Note No. III/Wel(7)USQ.459-LS/90 dated 14.2.91 for the dropping of the assurance on the following grounds:—

“The fulfilment of the assurance is linked with the proposed comprehensive revision of lists of Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes and such a revision in these lists can be done only through an Act of Parliament in view of the provisions made under Articles 341(2) and 342(2) of the Constitution. Since the exact time requirement in the matter can not be assessed and the Parliament cannot be assigned any time limits in the matter, the aforesaid Assurance may kindly be dropped.”

The Committee noted that since the comprehensive revision of SC/ST lists is still pending, the inclusion of Peruvannan Community in the List shall be taken care of during the introduction of the Bill and hence, agreed to drop the assurance.

Memorandum No. 12: Request for dropping of assurance given on August 10, 1990 in reply to Unstarred Question No. 932 regarding tax arrears of cine artists.

The Committee considered the request of the Ministry of Finance received through the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs *vide* their U.O. Note No. III/Fin(18)USQ.932-LS/90 dated February 19, 1991 for the dropping of the assurance on the following grounds:—

“That while replying to part(d) of the above said question, this Ministry did not intend any assurance in the matter....the Question was about action proposed to be taken by the Government to recover the income-tax/wealth-tax demands from such film artists/directors/producers who owned tax demands of over Rs. 1 lakh. The last line of reply to this part i.e. ‘Recovery of outstanding demands in all the cases is under constant review at various level’s referred to the system obtaining in the Income-tax Department under which periodical (quarterly) dossier reports in all such cases are sent by the Assessing

Officers to higher authorities in the Department for their review of recovery action taken by the Assessing Officers and Tax Recovery Officers. This review is an on-going process. This reply was complete in itself and no further action was to be taken by this Ministry.”

The Committee did not find any reason to pursue the assurance further and decided to drop the assurance.

Memorandum No. 13: Request for dropping of assurance given on August 30, 1990 in reply to Unstarred Question No. 3667 regarding Integrated Watershed Management Project for Doon Valley.

The Committee considered the request of the Ministry of Agriculture forwarded through the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs *vide* their U.O. Note No. III/Agri(31)USQ.3667-LS/90 dated 28.12.1990 for the dropping of the assurance on the following grounds:—

“According to information given by the Deptt. of Economic Affairs, this project would be included for discussion during the Indo-EEC Annual Aid Talks which are scheduled to be held in Dec. 1990. Launching of the project depends upon negotiation of the project which involves multi national and also budgetary provision and clearances from various administrative Ministries such as Defence, Home, External Affairs and Planning Commission which require considerable time and may not be completed in a specific time. In view of the above, processing of this project may not be categorised as Parliament Assurance.”

The Committee did not agree to drop the assurance and desired that the Ministry should seek minimum extension of time necessary to implement the assurance.

Memorandum No. 14: Request for dropping of assurance given on August 31, 1990 in reply to Unstarred Question No. 3934 regarding setting up of sponge iron plant by KIOCL in Karnataka.

The Committee considered the request of the Ministry of Steel forwarded through the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs *vide* their U.O. Note No. III/S&M(13)USQ.3934-LS/90 dated September 30, 1991 for the dropping of the assurance on the following grounds:—

“That the status of the projects mentioned in the above Unstarred Question have not changed much since the assurance given by the Hon’ble Minister.

Further it is submitted that both the projects i.e. expansion of Pellet Plant and the establishment of the Sponge Iron Plant are in the initial

stages of consideration. The implementation will be taken up only after necessary approvals are accorded to the investment decisions by the Cabinet, after requisite clearances from the Deptt. of Environment, Finance, etc. and after finalisation of the VIII Plan proposals. Execution and completion of the project will take about 3-1/2 years after Government's approval."

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

Memorandum No. 15: Request for dropping of assurance given on September 5, 1990 in reply to Unstarred Question No. 4508 regarding expansion of Horticulture Department of C.P.W.D.

The Committee considered the request of the Ministry of Urban Development received through the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs vide their U.O. Note No. III/UD(25)USQ.4508-LS/90 dated 11 November, 1991 for dropping of the assurance on the following grounds:—

".....Assurance given in respect of Demand Nos. 6, 8 and 9(a) in answer to the Unstarred Question are yet to be fulfilled. Factual position with regard to these Assurances is indicated below:

(1) *Item No. 6: Fixed Travelling Allowance*

Decision has since been taken by Government. As this is an item in the Departmental Council (JCM) of the Ministry of Urban Development, the matter is to be settled in the Departmental Council and till then, this Demand cannot be treated as finalised.

(2) *Demand No. 8: Store handling Special Allowance/Pay*

This Demand has also been considered and decision taken by Government. Since this is an item in the Departmental Council (JCM) this has to be settled in the Council and hence this Demand cannot be treated as finalised for the present.

(3) *Demand No. 9(a): Abolition of Class II direct recruitment Rules 3(a) of CES and CEES Class II Rules*

Though the provisions in the Recruitment Rules have not been amended, yet direct recruitment to Class II (Group 'B') posts in the Central Engineering Service and Central Electrical Engineering Service Group 'B' already stands suspended. The issue of amendment of relevant Rules is under consideration but this is likely to take some more time.

In view of the position explained above, it would not be possible to fulfil the Assurance in respect of Demand Nos. 6, 8 and 9(a)."

The Committee agreed with the convincing reasons advanced by the Ministry and decided to drop the assurance.

Memorandum No. 16: Request for dropping of assurance given on August 14, 1991 in reply to points raised during General Discussion.

The Committee considered the request of the Ministry of Welfare received through the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs *vide* their U.O. Note No.I/Wel(9)General Discussion dated December 3, 1991 for the dropping of the assurance on the following grounds:-

“During the General Discussion on the Constitution (Scheduled Tribes) Order (Amendment) Bill, 1991, some of the Members of Parliament, particularly S/Shri Syed Shahabuddin, Rajnath Sonkar Shastri, Ram Nihore Roy, Piyus Tiraky, etc. raised the issue that the castes/communities recommended by some States may be included in the list of Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes and a comprehensive revision of these castes/communities be made. The fulfilment of the assurance as per reply given in the Lok Sabha is linked up with the proposed comprehensive revision of lists of Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes and such a revision in these lists can be done only through an Act of Parliament in view of the provisions made under Article 341(2) and 342(2) of the Constitution. The subject matter had been considered several times in the past also.

At this stage it is rather difficult to indicate any time limit for bringing a bill before Parliament for the comprehensive revision of the list of Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes.”

The Committee did not agree to drop the assurance and decided to pursue the subject matter.

Memorandum No. 17: Request for dropping of assurance given on September 9, 1991 in reply to Unstarred question No. 6117 regarding development of town in Kerala.

The Committee considered the request of the Ministry of Urban Development received through the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs *vide* their U.O. Note No.I/UD(65)USQ.6117-LS/91 dated December 5, 1991 for the dropping of the assurance on the following grounds:—

“.....that the reply given to the Unstarred Question was a complete reply to all the parts a, b & c of the said question. It cannot be treated as a promise or an assurance for taking any further action in the matter with regard to the Parliament question.”

The Committee acceded to the request of the Ministry and decided to drop the assurance.

Memorandum No. 18: Request for dropping of assurance given on July 24, 1991 in reply to Unstarred Question No. 504 regarding heavy water plant in IFFCO.

The Committee considered the request of the Department of Atomic Energy received through the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs *vide* their U.O. Note No.1/AE(2)USQ.504-LS/91 dated 13.11.1991 for the dropping of the assurance on the following grounds:—

“It may be mentioned in this connection that the answer given, “Aonla is one of the sites recommended by the site selection committee for setting up of a Heavy Water Plant. However, Government is yet to take a decision in the matter,” does not strictly constitute an assurance, with reference to the standard list of expressions which normally constitute an assurance, as reproduced in the Parliamentary procedure. In fact, an identical answer had been given in reply to Parts (a) and (b) of the Lok Sabha Unstarred Question No. 1679 answered by this department on January 7, 1991 on setting up of Heavy Water Plant in Aonla and this had not been taken as an assurance at that time (*Annexure-1*). As mentioned in the answer, Aonla is only one of the sites recommended by the Site selection Committee and a final decision in the matter is yet to be taken, It may be quite sometime before Government is in a position to take this decision as in the first instance the 8th Plan Proposals have to be finalised by the Planning Commission and approved by the Government. Thereafter, depending upon the nuclear power generation capacity to be installed, the necessity for putting up additional Heavy Water Plants will have to be considered. It is, therefore, requested that the answer given to the question may be deleted from the list of assurances as the same does not constitute an assurance as explained above.

The Committee did not agree to drop the assurance and divided to pursue the subject matter.

Memorandum No. 19: Request for dropping of assurance given on March 4, 1991 in reply to Unstarred Question No. 1074 regarding Integrated Development of Horticulture.

The Committee considered the request of the Ministry of Agriculture forwarded through the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs *vide* their U.O. Note No.VII/Agri(2) USQ.1074-LS/91 date 13.8.1991 for the dropping of the assurance on the following grounds:-

“A proposal for the Integrated Development of Horticulture in Karnataka with World Bank assistance was received from the Government of Karnataka in June, 1987. However, the World Bank informed

in mid-1989 that the proposal submitted by the Government of Karnataka was not accepted. The Bank proposed instead a Multi-State Tropical Horticulture project in which Karnataka could also participate.

Several discussions were held with the World Bank officials on the proposed coverage and area of the project. At a meeting on 11.3.1991, the World Bank representative explained that the optimal number of States to be covered by the project under World Bank could be 4-5. This was with a view to have effective monitoring and control over the implementation of the project. It was thereafter decided that it would be necessary to have a feasibility study for the proposed project covering 8-9 States out of which the most potential 4-5 could be selected for implementation. The terms of reference for such a study have since been worked out in consultation with the Departments concerned has been submitted through the Department of Economic Affairs to the World Bank on 9.7.1991 for their approval.

In this connection it may be pointed out that approval of World Bank projects involves lengthy procedures and usually takes a minimum of 3-4 years before they are finally accepted and agreements signed between the World Bank/GOI and the State concerned. The implementation of the project would be only after these exercises are gone through. The Stages for preparation and signing of a World Bank project are Briefly as under:—

- (i) Conduct of feasibility study.
- (ii) Preparation of project outline on approval study report.
- (iii) Discussions/consultations with State Govts./agencies concerned with the implementation.
- (iv) Consultations with the Planning Commission/Plan Finance/Department of Economic Affairs.
- (v) Finalisation of project report and submission to World Bank by Department of Economic Affairs for further processing.
- (vi) Preliminary discussions on the project proposals with the World Bank.
- (vii) Mounting of pre-appraisal Mission by the World Bank.
- (viii) Internal discussions on conditionalities and covenants by Department of Economic Affairs with the concerned State Government.
- (ix) Appraisal Mission and preparation of staff appraisal report by World Bank.
- (x) Negotiations with the World Bank by the negotiating team.

- (xi) Approval of the project by the Board of the World Bank.
- (xii) Signing of different agreements between the World Bank, GOI/State Govts. agencies concerned with the implementation.

At any of the stages above, it is likely that the project may not find full acceptance and could be dropped. Presuming that the project is finally approved after observing the procedures above, formal sanction for implementation of the project would be issued. Thereafter, the implementation of the project may take several years depending on the project period prescribed.

In the circumstances explained above, the present proposal is at a very preliminary stage and has not been taken up formally with World Bank. The reply given to Parliament Question No. 1074 may not be treated as an 'assurance'.

The Committee was convinced by the reasons advanced by the Ministry and decided to drop it.

Memorandum No. 20: Request for dropping of assurance given on August 23, 1991 in reply to Unstarred Question No. 4186 regarding alleged cases of cheating in Bank of Maharashtra.

The Committee considered the request of the Ministry of Finance received through the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs *vide* their U.O. Note No. 1/Fin (30)USQ. 4186-LS/91 dated 9.12.1991 for the dropping of the assurance on the following grounds:

"While answering the above question, the action taken by the Central Bureau of Investigation was informed. Further investigation into the case is to be done by the Central Bureau of Investigation. Hence, Ministry of Finance will not be able to inform the outcome of the investigation till it is completed. The Ministry has written to the CBI on 14.10.1991 to keep it informed about the progress made.

It may be noted that as per orders dated 22.2.91 of the Hon'ble High Court of Judicature at Bombay in Criminal Writ Petition No. 1243/90, CBI has registered 2 cases viz. RC. 2/A/91/SIU(ix) and RC. 3/A/91/SIU(ix) dated 22.3.91 under Section 120B IPC *read with* Section 420, 468, 471, IPC and Section 5(3) *read with* Section 5(1)(d) of PC Act, 1947. As per directions of the High Court, CBI is sending progress reports to the Principal Judge, Greater Bombay. It may be noted that there was no conscious Assurance in the reply.

Considering the fact that completion of investigation is not in the hands of the Ministry of Finance and that the progress of investigations is being reported on quarterly basis to the Court, it is requested that the above reply may not to be considered as an Assurance."

The Committee did not accede to the request of the Ministry and decided to pursue the subject matter.

Memorandum No. 21: Request for dropping of assurance given on September 10, 1991 in reply to Unstarred Question No. 6437 regarding inquiry in Airbus A-320 deal.

The Committee considered the request of the Ministry of Civil Aviation and Tourism received through the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs *vide* their U.O. Note No. I/CAT(26) USQ.6437-LS/91 dated 17.12.1991 for the dropping of the assurance on the following grounds:—

“It is submitted that the Central Bureau of Investigation (CBI) had filed an FIR RC. 2(A)/90-ACU(II) on 29.3.90 regarding allegation of bribery and corruption in the purchase of A-320 aircraft during the period 1984-85 to 1988-89. The CBI has informed us that since the case is under investigation and foreign investigation is involved, it is not possible to say at this stage as to when the report would be finalised. The CBI has also stated that letters rogatory have been sent to U.K. and U.S.A. for obtaining information in this regard while letters rogatory for France and Switzerland are under consideration.”

The Committee did not agree to drop the assurance and granted extension of time up to 10 June, 1992 and desired that Ministry should implement the assurance within the extended time.

Memorandum No. 22: Request for dropping of assurance given on July 25, 1991 in reply to Unstarred Question No. 575 regarding population of Nepali speaking Indians.

The Committee considered the request of the Ministry of Home Affairs received through the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs *vide* their U.O. Note No. I/HA(3)USQ.575-LS/91 dated 21.10.1991 for the dropping of the assurance on the following grounds:—

“In the reply to the Question no commitment to anything special has been made. The regular process of tabulation will be done in the normal time frame which is expected to be the year 1993. By simply keeping it as an assurance, no purpose will be served. It is, therefore, requested that this may not please be treated as an assurance.”

The Committee decided not to treat it as an assurance.

The Committee decided to undertake an on-the-spot study visit to Bombay, Cochin, Trivandram and Madras w.e.f. 29th January, 1992 for a week or so.

The Committee also decided that the Chairman will finalise the assurances which are to be examined during the study tour of the

Committee as well as the details of tour programme itself on obtaining the approval of Hon'ble Speaker.

The Committee further decided to have their next sitting on Monday, the January 20, 1992 at 14.30 hours.

The Committee then adjourned.

MINUTES
SEVENTH SITTING

The Committee met on Thursday, April 9, 1992 from 15.30 hours to 16.15 hours.

PRESENT

- Dr. Laxminarain Pandey — *Chairman*
- 2. Shri Sai Prathap Annayagari
- 3. Dr. Krupasindhu Bhoi
- 4. Shri B.K. Gudadinni
- 5. Shri Manphool Singh
- 6. Shri Ajoy Mukhopadhyaya
- 7. Shri Naval Kishore Rai
- 8. Shri Gadam Ganga Reddy

SECRETARIAT

- Shri Murari Lal — *Director*
- Shri Joginder Singh — *Deputy Secretary*
- Shri K.K. Ganguly — *Under Secretary*

2. The Committee considered their Draft Third Report and adopted it.

3. The Committee then took up Memo. No. 29 relating to review of pending assurances pertaining to the Ministry of Personnel, Public Grievances and Pensions—Ninth Lok Sabha. The Committee decided to pursue 12 pending assurances and drop and assurance given on August 20, 1990 in reply to USQ No. 1724 regarding service selection bodies in Punjab.

4. The Committee then took up Memo. Nos. 30 and 31 containing requests received from Ministries of Welfare and Human Resource Development for dropping of assurances.

Memorandum No 30: Request for dropping of assurance given on December 9, 1991 in reply to Unstarred Question No. 2944 regarding backward classes for inclusion in the Scheduled Castes List.

5. The Committee considered the request from the Ministry of Welfare received through the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs *vide* their U.O.

Note No. IL/Wel(8) USQ. 2944-LS/91 dated March 10, 1992 for dropping of assurance on the following grounds:—

“The fulfilment of the assurance is linked with the comprehensive revision of Scheduled Caste and Scheduled Tribe lists which is already under consideration of the Government. The revision in these lists can be done only by an Act of Parliament as laid down under Articles 341(2) and 342(2) of the Constitution.

It is not possible to indicate any time limit for amending the existing lists of Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes through an Act of Parliament as it involves consultation with concerned agencies such as State Govts., the Registrar General of India, which is a time consuming process. It is, therefore, requested that under the circumstances, the assurance may be dropped.”

6. The Committee took notice that at their sitting held on December 27, 1991, they considered requests for dropping of 2 assurances given on (i) August 8, 1990 in reply to USQ No. 459 regarding inclusion of Peruvannan Community in Scheduled Tribes (Memo. No. 11) and (ii) August 14, 1991 during the course of General Discussion regarding Bill for comprehensive revision of list of SC/ST (Memo No. 16). The Committee had decided to drop the assurance given in reply to USQ No. 459 (Memo No. 11) but did not agree to drop the assurance given on August 14, 1991 (Memo No. 16).

7. The Committee reviewed their earlier decision and decided to drop assurance given on August 14, 1991 (Memo No. 16). Accordingly, the Committee also decided to drop the assurance given on December 9, 1991 in reply to USQ No. 2944 (Memo No. 30).

10. The Committee authorised the Chairman and in his absence Shri Ajoy Mukhopadhyay to present the Third Report to the House on April 21, 1992.

11. The Committee also decided to hold their next sitting on April 28, 1992 at 15.30 hours.

The Committee then adjourned.

MINUTES

FOURTH SITTING

SITTING OF THE COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT ASSURANCES

The Committee met on Wednesday, April 7, 1993 from 14.30 hours to 15.30 hours.

PRESENT

- Dr. Laxminarain Pandey — *Chairman*
2. Shri B. Devarajan
 3. Shri Prabhu Dayal Katheria
 4. Shri B.K. Gudadinni
 5. Shri Ajoy Mukhopadhyay
 6. Shri Surendra Pal Pathak
 7. Smt. Pratibha Devisingh Patil
 8. Shri Chinmaya Nand Swami

SECRETARIAT

- Shri Joginder Singh — *Deputy Secretary*
Shri K.K. Ganguly — *Under Secretary*

2. The Committee considered draft Tenth and Eleventh Reports and adopted them with certain verbal modifications in the Eleventh Report.

3. The Committee authorised the Chairman and, in his absence Shrimati Pratibha Devisingh Patil, M.P. to present the Reports on the Table of the House on Wednesday, April 21, 1993.

4. The Committee also decided to hold their next sitting on Thursday, April 15, 1993, at 15.30 hours.

5. *The Committee then adjourned.*

ANNEXURE-I

STATEMENT-I

(Vide Para No. 3.52)

Statement referred to in reply to part(a) of Lok Sabha Unstarred Question No. 932 for 10.8.1990

Names of Film Cine Artists/Directors/Producers who owed more than Rs. one lakh as Income-tax as on 31.3.1990.

<i>S.No.</i>	<i>Name</i> <i>Mr. / Ms.</i>	<i>S.No.</i>	<i>Name</i> <i>Mr. / Ms.</i>
1.	Amjad Khan	31.	J. Jamuna
2.	Ashish Sen Gupta	32.	Kishore Kumar Ganguly (late)
3.	Amitabh Bachhan	33.	K. Bhagyaraj
4.	A. Sreedevi	34.	Kamal Vijay Production
5.	A. Venkatanarayana Rao	35.	K. A. Narayan
6.	Arjun Hingorani	36.	Kamaluddin Kazi
7.	Akbar Ali Khan	37.	K. C. N. Trust
8.	A. V. Mohan	38.	K. S. Dattatreya
9.	Ashok Khanna	39.	K. Balaji
10.	Anubhava Film (P) Ltd.	40.	K. J. Joy
11.	A. R. Raju	41.	K. Subramaniam
12.	Biswajit Chatterjee	42.	Lakshmi Productions
13.	Barkha Roy	43.	Maushmi Chatterjee
14.	Bhappi Lahiri	44.	M. R. R. Vasu
15.	C. Suhasini Hasan	45.	M. R. Radhika
16.	Chhaya Lok (P) Ltd.	46.	Mukta Arts (P) Ltd.
17.	Dilip Kumar	47.	M. S. Gohan
18.	Deepti Naval	48.	N. T. Ramarao
19.	D. Venkatesh	49.	Nasirkhan Sarvarkhan (late)
20.	E. V. Saroja	50.	Nageswara Rao
21.	Farooq Ahmed Farrpur (Deceased)	51.	N. Hari Krishan
22.	G. Madhave (Km)	52.	N. Mohana Krishan
23.	G. Prabhu	53.	N. Jayakrishna
24.	G. Vijaya Nirmala	54.	Navketan Ind. Film (P) I.td.
25.	Gulab M. Gulbani	55.	Mrs. Neera P. Mehra
26.	G. Venkateswaran	56.	N. N. Sippy
27.	G. Adishesagiri Rao	57.	Nitin D. Kapoor
28.	G. Hanumantha Rao	58.	Smt. N. Radha
29.	Helen Ann Richardson	59.	O. P. Ralhan
30.	Hermesh Malhotra	60.	Parveen Babi

<i>S.No.</i>	<i>Name</i> <i>Mr. / Ms.</i>	<i>S.No.</i>	<i>Name</i> <i>Mr. / Ms.</i>
61.	Padmini Kolhapure	87.	S. Kamal Hasan
62.	M/s. Prakash Mehra Combine	88.	Satram Rohra
63.	Shri Prakash Mehra	89.	Sohan Lal Kanwar
64.	M/s. Padmalaya Films	90.	Subhas Ghai
65.	M/s. Padmalaya Studio (P) Ltd.	91.	S. M. Sagar
66.	M/s. Praveena Films	92.	Sardar Malik
67.	Rajesh Khanna	93.	Satyendrapal Choudhary
68.	Rekha Ganeshan	94.	M/s. Sumeet Films
69.	Rati Agnihotri	95.	M/s. Sangam Art Interna- tional
70.	Raj Babbar	96.	M/s. Supraja Film Studio
71.	Rajendra Kumar Tuli	97.	Shree Vijay Krishan Movies
72.	R. Jayapradha	98.	Tina Munim
73.	R. Rajni Kanth	99.	Tahir Hussain Khan
74.	R. K. Films Studios (P) Ltd.	100.	T. M. Bihari
75.	R. D. Burman	101.	T. Rama Rao
76.	Ranjit Singh Virk	102.	T. R. Chandran
77.	Ramanand Sagar	103.	Vikram Alias M.N. Makandan
78.	Shatrughan Sinha	104.	Vidya Sinha
79.	Shabana Azmi	105.	Vijay Anand
80.	Satyendra Kumar Sharma	106.	Vinay Kumar Sinha
81.	Shreeram Lagoo	107.	Varna Shree Films
82.	Sarika Thakur	108.	V. C. Shanmugam
83.	Sanjay Alias Abhas Khan	109.	V. C. Ganeshan
84.	Shashi Raj Kapoor	110.	W. Rajesh
85.	S. S. Rajendra	111.	Yash Raj Chopra
86.	Sri Vidhya		

STATEMENT-II

(Vide Para 3.52 of the Report)

Statement referred to in reply to part (a) of Lok Sabha Unstarred Question No. 932 for 10.8.1990.

Names of Film Cine Artists/Directors/Producers who owed more than Rs. one lakh as Wealth-tax as on 31.3.1990.

<i>S.No.</i>	<i>Name Mr./Ms.</i>
1.	Amjad Khan
2.	Dev Anand
3.	Jeetender Kappor
4.	Lata Mangeshkar
5.	N.T. Ramarao
6.	Nirupa Roy
7.	O.P. Ralhan
8.	Prem Kishan Sikand
9.	Rajesh Khanna
10.	Rekha Ganeshan
11.	Raj Kumar Pandit
12.	Shatrughan Sinha
13.	Vijay Anand
14.	Vinod Khanna
15.	Yash Raj Chopra

(Vide Para No. 3.61 of the Report)

Demands of Junior Engineers of CPWD for which they had gone on strike in 1987 and the action by the Government on these demands.

<i>Demand</i>	<i>Action taken</i>
1. Removal of existing anomaly in pay scale with rest and minimum Rs. 1660-2900 Pay Scale (Basic grade) for the Junior Engineers of CPWD 2. No bifurcation of the Cadre of the Junior Engineers. 3. Personnel Promotion to the Junior Engineers at least after 15 years service.	The matter is under consideration of the Government
4. At least two promotions in service life.	This is being considered as part of Cadre Review of Junior Engineers and S.Os Horticulture CPWD. The Cadre Review Committee's report is under consideration of the Government.
5. Immediate implementation of Cadre Review promotion through Seniority cum fitness basis.	All the 559 posts of AE's created as a result of the First cadre review of JE's have been filled up.
6. Fixed Travelling allowance.	The matter is under consideration.
7. Enhancement of Planning Special Pay and Design Special Pay.	Orders have already been issued in this regard.
8. Store Handling Special Allowance/Pay.	This is being considered separately as an item in the Departmental Council (JCM) of the Ministry.

<i>Demand</i>	<i>Action taken</i>
9. (a) Abolition of Class II direct recruitment rules 3(a) of CES & CEES Class II Rules and (b) Ban on Class I recruitment	The matter is under consideration.
10. Expansion of the department, Ex-cadre promotion etc. for the removal of unprecedented stagnation.	Necessary instructions were issued by DG(W) CPWD to all concerned to the effect that the JE's may be relieved liberally for deputation to ex-cadre posts in other departments.

(Vide Para No. 3.61 of the Report)

ANNEXURE-II

MINISTRY OF URBAN DEVELOPMENT

Q. No. & Date	Subject	Promise made	When & How Fulfilled	Remarks (Reasons for delay)
1	2	3	4	5
USQ No. 4508 dt. 5.9.90 by Shri S. Krishna Kumar	EXPANSION OF HORTICULTURE DEPARTMENT OF CPWD (a) whether the officers of the Directorate of Horticulture, CPWD are at par in terms of duties and responsibilities as per CPWD Manual to the Officers/Engineers of their ranks of Civil and Electrical of CPWD; if not, the reasons for not treating them at par; and		(b) In respect of Demand Nos. 1, 2 and 3, Government have issued orders on 22nd March, 91 (copy enclosed) Other demands are either under consideration or Government's decisions are first to be communicated to the Deptl. Council (JCM).	These matters required detailed consideration in consultation with the Ministry of Finance, etc.
Partly Implemented on 19.7.1991 vide SS No. IV/ Item No. 153)	(b) what steps Government have taken to solve the long pending demand of Sectional Officers (Horticulture) and Junior Engineers of CPWD for which they had gone for 37 days strike in 1987.	(b) Action pending decision on demand No. 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 8, and 9 mentioned in assurance referred to in reply to part (b) of the question. "Information in respect of Sectional Officer (Horticulture) is being collected and will be laid on the Table of the Sabha."	Hence this is part fulfilment of the assurance.	

No. 12014/2/87-EW2
GOVERNMENT OF INDIA
Ministry of Urban Development
(WORKS DIVISION)

New Delhi, Dated 22.3.1991

The Director General (Works),
CPWD, Nirman Bhawan,
New Delhi.

(with 50 spare copies)

SUBJECT : *Pay Scale of Junior Engineers of CPWD*

Sir,

I am directed to say that the question of grant of uniform pay-scale of Rs. 1640-2900 to all the Junior Engineers and Sectional Officers (Horticulture) of CPWD and grant of personal promotion to them had been under consideration of the Government for quite sometime. After careful consideration, it has now been decided by Government as under:—

- (i) There will be two scales of pay for Junior Engineers/Sectional Officers (Horticulture) in the CPWD, viz. Rs. 1400-2300 and Rs. 1640-2900 and the incumbents thereof will be designated as Junior Engineer/ Sectional Officer (Horticulture) in the grade of Rs. 1400-2300, and, Junior Engineer/ Sectional Officer (Horticulture) in the Grade of Rs. 1640-2900. The entry grade will be Rs. 1400-2300. The Junior Engineers/Sectional Officers (Horticulture), on completion of 5 years service in the entry grade, will be placed in the scale of Rs. 1640-2900, subject to the rejection of unfit. This higher grade will not be treated as a promotional one but will be non-functional and the benefit of FR 22(I) (a)(i) will not be admissible, while fixing the pay in the higher grade, as there will be no change in duties and responsibilities.
- (ii) Junior Engineers/ Sectional Officers (Horticulture), who could not be promoted to the post of Assistant Engineers/ Assistant Directors (Horticulture) in the scale of Rs. 2000-3500, due to non-availability of vacancies in the grade of Assistant Engineers/ Assistant Directors (Horticulture), will be allowed the scale of Assistant Engineer/ Assistant Director (Horticulture) i.e.

Rs. 2000-3500, on a personal basis, after completion of 25 years of total service as Junior Engineer/ Sectional Officer (Horticulture). This personal promotion will be given on fitness basis. As and when regular vacancies in the cadre of Assistant Engineer/ Assistant Director (Horticulture) arise, the Junior Engineers/ Sectional Officers enjoying personal promotion will be adjusted against these vacancies, subject to observance of normal procedure.

- (iii) In the matter of pay fixation, the Junior Engineers/ Sectional Officers (Horticulture) allowed the personal scale of Rs. 2000-3500 will get the benefit of F.R. 22(I)(a)(i).
- (iv) On being granted personal promotion the Junior Engineer/ Sectional Officer (Horticulture) will continue to perform the same duties/ functions of Junior Engineer/ Sectional Officer (Horticulture).

2. This order supersedes all other orders issued in regard to revised pay scales of Junior Engineers/ Sectional Officers (Horticulture) in the CPWD, based on the recommendations of the Fourth Central Pay Commission.

3. The orders regarding placement in the scale of Rs. 1640-2900 after 5 years of service will be effective from 1.1.86 while those relating to personal promotion after 15 years of service will be effective from 1.1.91.

4. This is issued with the concurrence of Finance Divisions (W&E) vide their No. 629/ W&E/ DI/ 91, dated 21.3.1991.

Yours faithfully,

Sd/-

(S. RANGANATHAN)

*Deputy Secretary to the Government
of India*

Copy to:—

1. Ministry of Finance, Department of Expenditure with reference to D.O. No. 5(33)/90-EIII/135/SE/90-1, dated 3.9.90.
2. The Department of Personnel and Training with reference to their D.O. No. 1/4/89-pay Pt. II dated 4.9.90.
3. The Cabinet Secretariat with reference to their communication No. 50/CM/90, dated 5.11.90.

4. Copy for information to Finance Division (W&E), Ministry of Urban Development, with reference to No. 620/W&E/DI/91, 21.3.91.
5. Copy to P.S. to UDM/Secretary/AS(W)/JS(WA)

Sd/-

(S. RANGANATHAN)

Deputy Secretary to the Govt. of India

©1992 BY LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT

Published under Rules 382 of the Rules of Procedure and conduct of Business in Lok Sabha (Seventh Edition) and Printed by Manager, Government of India Press, PL Unit, Minto Road, New Delhi.