

PARLIAMENT OF INDIA
RAJYA SABHA
COMMITTEE
ON
GOVERNMENT ASSURANCES

FIFTY - SIXTH REPORT
(Presented on the 19th December, 2002)

RAJYA SABHA SECRETARIAT
NEW DELHI

Website-<http://rajyasabha.nic.in>

E.Mail: rsc3as@sansad.nic.in

CONTENTS

1. [Composition of the Committee on government assurances](#)
2. [Introduction](#)
3. [Report](#)
 - i) [Assurances culled during the 195th and 196th—Sessions of Rajya Sabha;](#)
 - ii) [Implementation of assurances;](#)
 - iii) [Assurances found not to have been fully or satisfactorily fulfilled;](#)
 - iv) [Request for extension of time;](#)
 - v) [Request for dropping of assurances;](#)
 - vi) [Deposition before the Committee](#)
 - vii) [Visit of the Committee](#)
 - viii) [Conclusion](#)

4. Appendices
 - 1) [Appendix I\(Statement of observations/recommendations\)](#)
 - 2) Appendix II
 - 3) Appendix III

**COMPOSITION OF THE COMMITTEE ON
GOVERNMENT ASSURANCES**

W.E.F. 30.5.2002

1. Shri Suresh Pachouri *¾Chairman*
2. Shri K.B.Krishna Murthy
3. Shri Balbir K.Punj
4. Shri Kripal Parmar
5. Shri Nilotpal Basu
6. Shri Rama Shanker Kaushik
7. Shri J.Chitharanjan
8. Shri S.Sivasubramanian
9. Shri Sukhdev Singh Libra
10. Shri R.S.Gavai

Secretariat

1. Shri N.C.Joshi,*Joint Secretary*
2. Shri S.S.Rana, *Director*
3. Shri S. K.Tripathi, *Under Secretary*
4. Shri K.Sudhakaran, *Committee Officer*

INTRODUCTION

I, the Chairman of the Committee on Government Assurances, having been authorised by the Committee to present the report on its behalf, hereby present this Fifty-sixth Report to the Rajya Sabha.

2. The Draft Report was considered and adopted by the Committee at its meeting held on Wednesday, the 18th December, 2002.

NEW DELHI;
December 18, 2002

SURESH PACHOURI
*Chairman,
Committee on Government Assurances,
Rajya Sabha*

REPORT

I. Assurances culled during the 195th and 196th Sessions of the Rajya Sabha

During the 195th and 196th Sessions of the Rajya Sabha 825 assurances were culled and the concerned Ministries were asked to take appropriate steps to fulfil them expeditiously. As per the existing practice, Ministries/Departments are required to fulfil an assurance within a period of three months from the date of the assurance. However, if they have genuine difficulties in fulfilling some assurances, they should move the Committee direct for extension of time, giving details of the difficulties encountered by them and the steps taken to overcome such difficulties. In very exceptional and genuine cases where it is practically impossible to fulfil the assurances, the Ministries/Departments can move the Committee direct for dropping of the assurances.

It has been observed by the Committee that some of the Ministries/Departments request the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs for dropping of assurances or seek extension of time for fulfilment of the assurances. The Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs in turn sends such communications received from the Ministries/Departments back to them with the advice to move the Committee direct for the purpose as the power to drop an assurance or extend time limit for its fulfilment is vested in the Committee. The entire process consumes a lot of time and results in avoidable

delays. The Committee therefore recommends that the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs should impress upon all the Ministries/Departments through a circular to strictly adhere to all instructions forwarded at the time of sending of the culled assurances.

The Committee further recommends that the Ministries/Departments must ensure that the Status Notes and Implementation Statements furnished by them to the Committee are also duly approved by the Minister Incharge .

II. Implementation of Assurances

-

The Secretariat scrutinised 734 Statements laid on the Table of the Rajya Sabha on 7.3.2002, 21.3.2002, 24.4.2002, 16.5.2002, 18.7.2002 and

12.8.2002 in fulfilment of the various assurances(Appendix-II). The Committee notes that the pace of fulfilment of assurances has gained some momentum which is reflected in the fact that out of 734 assurances in respect of which the Implementation Statements were laid, 191 assurances were fulfilled within the stipulated period of three months. However, the Committee is not entirely satisfied with the pace of fulfilment of assurances. It is the considered view of the Committee that if the Ministries/Departments streamline their monitoring mechanism and deal with Parliamentary assurances with greater urgency, the pace of fulfilment of assurances would be accelerated substantially.

The Committee, therefore, recommends that the Ministries/Departments of the Government of India should streamline their existing mechanism of monitoring of assurances with a view to liquidating them within the shortest possible time. Timely fulfilment of assurances is critically important, for, if their fulfilment is delayed inordinately, the assurances become irrelevant and lose their significance with the passage of time and their fulfilment gets reduced to a mere technical formality.

III. Assurances found not to have been fully or satisfactorily implemented

-

The scrutiny of the Implementation Statements furnished by various Ministries revealed that in eight cases, the assurances were found not to have

been fully or satisfactorily fulfilled as the Implementation Statements did not reflect the entire spectrum of the issues involved in the assurances. Appropriate references were accordingly made to the Ministries concerned for taking necessary action in the matter.

The details of the eight cases are as follows:-

(i) Assurance given in reply to Unstarred Question No.916 answered on 27.11.2001 of the Ministry of Civil Aviation regarding issue of complimentary/concessional tickets by AIIA:- On being asked whether (a) Indian Airlines and Air India had been giving free/complimentary/concessional tickets for travel in India and abroad (b) the number of such tickets issued by Air India and Indian Airlines during the last three years and the loss caused to the Airlines each year (c) who were the top 20 beneficiaries of above tickets in terms of frequency and value of tickets; and (d) what were the norms prescribed for the issue of such tickets, the Minister of Civil Aviation in reply to Unstarred Question had stated that the information was being collected and would be laid on the Table of the House.

The Ministry of Civil Aviation fulfilled the assurance on 6.4.02. However, the scrutiny of the Implementation Statement revealed that the same was deficient inasmuch as part (c) of the Question *viz* "the top twenty beneficiaries of above tickets in terms of frequency and value of tickets" was not answered at all. Therefore, the Implementation Statement was treated part fulfilment of the assurance and appropriate reference was made to the Ministry. The Part Implementation Statement was laid on the Table of the Rajya Sabha on 18.7.2002. The Committee notes with satisfaction that the Ministry took prompt action in the matter and *vide* their O.M. dated 16.7.2002 furnished a revised Implementation Statement incorporating the specific and full information to part (c) of the question. The revised Implementation Statement was laid on the Table of the House on 12.8.2002.

(ii) Assurance given in reply to Unstarred Question No.3984 answered on 29.8.2001 of Ministry of Coal (now Ministry of Coal and Mines) regarding loss suffered by CIL:- In reply to parts (a) & (b) of Unstarred Question No.3984 dated 29.8.2001 asking about the loss

suffered by CIL during the year 2000-2001 and the facts and details thereof; an assurance was given to the effect that the final and correct

position of profit and losses could be known on finalisation of accounts by the C&AG. In reply to part (e) of the Question, under reference asking about the other strategies being adopted to check the losses of CIL, another assurance was given to the effect that since the Eastern Coalfields Limited (ECL), Bharat Coking Coal Limited (BCCL) and Central Coalfields Limited (CCL) had been consistently incurring losses, CIL has instituted studies by consultants *viz* ICICI for ECL and BCCL, and IDBI for CCL. The studies would also suggest measures for revival of these companies. In respect of ECL, ICICI had submitted its final report, which has been examined by the Ministry of Coal. For BCCL and CCL, the reports from the consultants were awaited.

The Ministry of Coal and Mines (earstwhile Ministry of Coal) fulfilled the assurance on 26.2.2002, stating, *inter alia*, that the recommendation of ICICI on the revival of the Eastern Coalfields Limited (ECL) had been examined and were not found acceptable by the Government. On closer scrutiny it was found that the Implementation Statement was silent about the reports submitted by the consultants in respect of BCCL and CCL and Government's reaction thereto. Therefore, the Implementation Statement was treated part fulfilment of the assurance and the Ministry were accordingly asked to furnish a revised Implementation Statement incorporating the findings of the consultants in respect of BCCL and CCL and the Government's reaction thereto. The part Implementation Statement was laid on the Table of the Rajya Sabha on 6.3.2002. The Ministry are yet to finish the revised Implementation Statement in the matter.

The Committee is of the view that the Ministry ought to have taken caution and circumspection in furnishing the material for fulfilment of the assurances. The Committee is not satisfied with the Ministry of Coal's attempt to liquidate the assurance without spelling out the findings of consultants in respect of BCCL and CCL. The Committee, however, does hope and trust that the Ministry would come forward with detailed information so that the purpose for which the information was sought is served.

(iii) Assurance given in reply to Unstarred Question No.1072 dated 31.7.2001 of the Ministry of Petroleum & Natural Gas regarding Benami LPG Agencies:- On being asked (a) whether it had come to the notice of the Government that a number of LPG benami agencies are functioning throughout the country in violation of ownership norms fixed by the Government (b) if so, the details of such agencies (c) whether the Government had cancelled their allotments and kept those outlets for further allotment by the Oil Selection Board; and (d) what other action the Government had taken or proposed to take against those benami agencies, the Minister of State in the Ministry of Petroleum and Natural Gas gave an assurance to the effect that the information was being collected and would be laid on the Table of the House.

The Ministry of Petroleum and Natural Gas *vide* their O.M. dated the 21st January,2002 furnished a Statement in fulfilment of the assurance stating that the Public Sector Oil Marketing Companies had terminated eight LPG distributorships for reasons of violation of the terms of LPG distributorship agreement during the last three years and that Oil Marketing Companies were authorised to set up alternate distributorship in lieu of terminated distributorships as laid down procedure. On closer scrutiny, it was found that the Implementation Statement did not answer parts (b) and (d) of the Question in specific terms . Consequently, the Implementation Statement was treated as part fulfilment of the assurance and the Ministry were advised to furnish a revised Implementation Statement in the matter, incorporating specific information to parts (b) and (d) of the Question. The part Implementation Statement was laid on the Table of the Rajya Sabha on 7.3.2002. The Committee notes with appreciation that the Ministry acted with promptitude and *vide* their O.M. dated 8.3.2002 furnished the revised Implementation Statement, incorporating the specific information to parts (b) and (d) as asked for. The revised Implementation Statement which was found to be satisfactory, was laid on the Table of the Rajya Sabha on 16.5.2002.

(iv) Assurance given in reply to a Supplementary to Starred Question No. 504 dated 10.5.1995 of the Ministry of Environment & Forests regarding pollution in Delhi:- Pollution in Delhi figured in Starred Question No.504 answered on 10.5.1995 . To a supplementary raised by Smt. Veena Verma, regarding identification of sites for disposal of hazardous waste in the Capital, the then Minister of Environment & Forests gave an assurance in the following terms:-

"It is correct that sites are being selected for disposal

of hazardous wastes. Whether they have been finalised,

I am not aware of. I will inform the Member separately."

The reply was treated as an assurance and appropriate reference made to the Ministry .

The Committee is appalled to find that from 18.8.1995 to 25.11.01, the Ministry did not care either to fulfil the assurance or to seek

extension of time or to apprise the Committee of the reasons for pendency of the assurance. The Ministry sought to fulfil the assurance on 26.11.2001 in a half- hearted and casual manner, stating *inter alia* that the Central Pollution Control Board had assigned a detailed Environmental Impact Study for setting up hazardous waste disposal site in Delhi to the National Productivity Council (NPC) in 1995-96. The Report was submitted in 1997 and based on the

recommendations the site in village Bavana at Bavana-Narela Road was selected. However, due to certain problems, the site could not be acquired and developed as hazardous waste disposal site. Presently, an EIA study has been awarded to NPC for three other sites at Wazirpur CETP, Bavana Industrial Relocation Project and village Gumenhera. On scrutiny, the Implementation Statement was found deficient to the extent that the hazardous waste disposal site was yet to be finalised. Appropriate reference was made to the Ministry accordingly. The part Implementation Statement was laid on the Table of the House on 7.3.2002 .

The Committee notes that though the first Environmental Impact Assessment study was assigned to the National Productivity Council in 1995-96 and the report was submitted in 1997, the finalisation of hazardous waste disposal site in Delhi still remains a far cry. Now, another EIA study has been awarded to NPC which forebodes further delay. Thus the matter is back to square one even after lapse of more than seven and half years. The Committee feels that inordinate delay in finalisation of sites for disposal of hazardous wastes has the potential of endangering the lives of the people living in Delhi. The Committee, therefore, is of the view that there is no room for laxity in the matter and strongly recommends that the Ministry should treat the matter with utmost urgency and implement the assurance on a top priority basis.

(v) Assurance given in reply to Starred Question No.82 dated 3.12.99 of the Ministry of Chemicals and Fertilizers regarding performance of Chairman and MDs of PSUs. Performance of Chairman and M.Ds. of PSUs figured in reply to Starred Question No.82 dated 3.12.1999. Replying to a supplementary raised by Shri Dipankar Mukherjee, regarding the foreign visits of KRIBHCO officials , the then Minister of Chemicals & Fertilizers gave an assurance in the following terms:-

"....the foreign travel does not necessarily mean that it is just a foreign jaunt. It could be for some genuine business. As my Hon'ble friend has pointed out, I will look into this and I will get satisfied myself as to why these foreign trips were undertaken."

To another supplementary put by Shri Deepankar Mukherjee regarding extending of loan by KRIBHCO to Durgapur unit of HFC, the then Minister of Chemicals & Fertilizers gave yet another assurance to the effect that he would look into the matter.

The Ministry fulfilled the assurance on 14.5.2002 and the Implementation Statement was laid on the Table of the Rajya Sabha on 18.7.2002. On scrutiny, it was found that the Implementation Statement had shed no light on the assurance arising from the first supplementary of Shri Dipankar Mukherjee and the Ministry had attempted to liquidate the assurance by merely stating that KRIBHCO, a Multi-State Cooperative Society registered under the Multi-State Cooperative Societies Act (MSCS Act) has conveyed its inability to extend any loan to the Durgapur Unit of HFC as under Section 63 of MSCS Act, it could not make loan to a non-Member .

The Implementation Statement was treated part fulfilment of the assurance and a reference was accordingly made to the Ministry, asking them to fulfil the assurance in totality.

The Committee is happy to note that the Ministry have since furnished a revised Implementation Statement, fulfilling

the assurance satisfactorily on 8.11.2002.

(vi) Assurance given in reply to Unstarred Question No.2406 dated 11.12.2001 of the Ministry of Tourism and Culture regarding Development of Ajanta-Ellora Caves. On being asked whether the Japan Bank of International Corporation (JBIC) had agreed to extend Rs.350 crore loan for the second phase of the Ajanta-Ellora conservation and tourism development project; if so, the details of the project which would be taken in phase-II and by when those works would start, the then Minister of Tourism and Culture gave an assurance to the effect that the matter was under discussion with the authorities.

The Ministry *vide* their O.M. dated 2.4.2002 furnished a statement in fulfilment of the assurance. The Implementation Statement *inter alia* stated that after the discussions with the authorities concerned, it was decided to include additional sites. Accordingly, the Government of Maharashtra which would be the implementing agency, had been requested to revise the proposal. The proposal from the Government of Maharashtra had been posed to the Department of Economic Affairs for external funding. Upon examination, it was found that the specific reply to parts (a) and (c) of the Question under reference had not been given in the Implementation Report. The Implementation Report was, therefore, treated as part fulfilment of the assurance and a reference was accordingly made to the Ministry. The part Implementation Statement was laid on the Table of the House on 24.4.2002.

Thereafter, the Ministry *vide* their O.M. dated 28.6.02 furnished a revised Implementation Statement in the matter, stating that the Department of Tourism, the Government of India had recommended the proposal received from the Government of Maharashtra to the Department of Economic Affairs to take up with the Japanese Government for funding of that project on top priority basis. Till then Japan Bank of International Co-operation (JBIC) had not agreed to extend loan for the second phase of Ajanta-Ellora conservation and tourism development project.

The revised Implementation Statement was treated satisfactory fulfilment of the assurance and the same was laid on the Table of the House on 18.7.2002.

(vii) Assurance given in reply to Unstarred Question No.2347 dated 15.4.2002 of the Ministry of Urban Development and Poverty Alleviation regarding construction of flyovers. In reply to parts (c) & (d) of Unstarred Question No.2347 dated 15.4.2002 asking whether traffic on the Outer Ring Road near Panchsheel club in South Delhi was very heavy and whether Government would take a decision to construct flyover at this junction immediately, an assurance was given to the extent that the PWD, Delhi was examining a proposal for construction of a flyover at that location.

The Ministry fulfilled the assurance on 17.6.2002, stating that the Public Works Development had informed that the proposal for construction of flyover at outer Ring Road near Panchsheel Club at Khel Gaon Marg Junction had been approved by the DDA, the Technical Committee and the same had been sent for approval of the Delhi Urban Arts Commission. Upon scrutiny, it was found that though the proposal was approved by the DDA, it was yet to be approved by the Delhi Urban Arts Commission. Therefore, the Implementation Statement was treated part fulfilment of the assurance and a reference was made to the Ministry, advising them to fulfil the assurance in totality. The part Implementation Statement has since been laid on the Table of the House on 18.7.2002.

(viii) Assurance given in reply to Unstarred Question No.698 dated 27.7.2001 of the Ministry of Human Resource Development regarding irregularities in Kendriya Vidyalaya in Jaipur Division. Irregularities in Kendriya Vidyalaya in Jaipur Division formed the subject matter of Unstarred Question No.698 dated 27.7.2001 . On being asked (a) whether several allegations of irregularities and corruption had been made by various institutions and officials against the Principals and Group (A) Officers who came on deputation in Kendriya Vidyalaya in Jaipur Division , (b) if so, the details of the complaint, (c) the steps taken to conduct an enquiry into those allegations and (d) the result thereof , the Minister of HRD stated in his reply that the information was being collected and would be laid on the Table of the House.

-

The Ministry fulfilled the assurance on 25.6.2002. On scrutiny, it was found that the Implementation Statement *inter alia* stated

that a complaint about sexual harassment reported against Shri A.Jyoti Kumar, Principal, Kendriya Vidyalaya No.II, Jaipur was under investigation. It was evident from the Implementation Statement that the issue raised in the question was still alive and needed to be pursued further. Therefore, the Implementation Statement was treated part fulfilment of the assurance and the Ministry were asked to fulfil the assurance in totality indicating the final outcome of the investigation. The part Implementation Statement was laid on the Table of the House on 18.7.2002.

The Committee notes that in this case the Ministry sought to fulfil the assurance even though the action on their part was still not complete and urges upon the Ministry to have the investigation completed at the earliest.

It has been brought to the notice of the Committee that sometimes the Ministries/Departments send 15 copies of the Implementation Statements to the Rajya Sabha Secretariat for laying them on the Table of the House rather than sending these statements to the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs. This results in delay and duplication of work because these statements have ultimately to be forwarded to the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs for laying on the Table of the House as it is the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs who are concerned with laying of the Implementation Statements. The Committee, therefore, enjoins upon all the Ministries/Departments of the Government of India to send the requisite number of copies of Implementation Statements for laying on the Table of the Rajya Sabha only to the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs.

IV. Request for extension of time

The Committee considered quite a large number of requests received from the Ministries/Departments of the Government of India for grant of extension of time for fulfilment of the various assurances given on the floor of the Rajya Sabha. After satisfying itself of the genuineness of each request, the Committee granted extension of time as it deemed fit, and where the Committee was not satisfied with the pace of Implementation of some assurances, it called for Status Notes from the Ministries concerned, detailing the steps taken by them and the progress made towards fulfilment of those assurances.

The Committee has observed that some Ministries/Departments continue to move the Committee for grant of extension of time using the hackneyed expressions like "it will take some more time to fulfil the assurance," " the assurance is

unlikely to be fulfilled within the extended period", "the Ministry requires some more time for fulfilment of the assurance", etc. despite the fact that the Committee in its 52nd and 54th Reports presented to the Rajya Sabha on 21.12.2000 and 29.8.2001, respectively had recommended that the Ministries/Departments should invariably indicate the steps taken and the progress made towards fulfilment of the assurances while moving the Committee for grant of extension of time.

The Committee once again impresses upon the Ministries/Departments of Government of India to scrupulously adhere to above recommendations of the Committee .

It has also been brought to the notice of the Committee that some Ministries/Departments move the Committee for extension of time after considerable lapse of time and that too after they are reminded by the Secretariat in this regard.

The Committee takes a serious view of this kind of attitude on the part of some of the Ministries/Departments and exhorts them to be careful and keep track of all pending assurances so as not to miss making timely request for extension of time for fulfilment of the assurances.

The Committee would like to make it amply clear that seeking extension of time in the event of the pendency of assurances beyond the initial three months and acquainting the Committee with the progress made towards their fulfilment is a sacrosanct Parliamentary practice which should be observed by all Ministries/Departments scrupulously.

The Committee reviewed the progress of Implementation of pending assurances concerning several Ministries and issued appropriate directions, wherever required. The statement showing the number of pending assurances is given at Appendix-II.

While reviewing the progress of Implementation of the assurances pertaining to the Ministry of External Affairs on 6.9.2001, the Committee found that out of 31 assurances for which extensions of time were due, the Ministry moved the Committee for extension of time in six cases only. Taking a serious view of the lapse, the Chairman of the Committee on Government Assurances directed that the Ministry be asked to furnish a Status Note in respect of each of the pending assurances separately, detailing the steps taken and the progress made towards fulfilment of the assurances and to immediately move the Committee for grant of extension of time in respect of those assurances extension of which had expired, latest by the 30th September, 2001. The directions of the Chairman of the Committee were conveyed to the then Foreign Secretary *vide* this Secretariat letter No.RS.1/4/EA/2001-Com.III dated 11.9.2001. When the Ministry did not respond to the letter cited above even three months after the 30th September,2001 deadline, the then Foreign Secretary was reminded *vide* this Secretariat letter of even number dated the 10th January,2002 to furnish the requisite information. Thereafter, the Ministry *vide* D.O. No.AA/125/Parl./87/2001 dated 15.1.2002, *inter alia*, informed the Committee that the concerned Divisions of the Ministry had been reminded to expedite fulfilment of the assurances expeditiously and that they had been advised to seek necessary extension in case the assurance was not likely to be fulfilled within the stipulated/extended period of time. Subsequently, the Ministry *vide* their D.O. of even number dated the 30th January,2002 again gave a reply on the same line.

When no progress was reported in the matter even after lapse of more than three and a half months since the Ministry's assurance dated the 30th January,2002 to act in the matter of seeking timely extension of time, the then Foreign Secretary was once again requested *vide* this Secretariat letter dated the 22nd May,2002 to furnish the requisite information and also to move the Committee latest by the 10th June,2002 for grant of extension of time in all such cases where the assurance had not been fulfilled within the prescribed period or the extended period of time, drawing her attention to the following observations/recommendations contained in the 54th Report of the Committee presented to the Rajya Sabha on 29.8.2001:-

"It has been brought to the notice of the Committee that in some cases the Ministries/Departments did not seek any extension of time during the pendency of the assurance or sought extensions of time after lapse of a considerable period of time. The time gap in seeking extension varied from six months to more than six years after the expiry of the prescribed period or the extended period and during that period the Ministries/Departments concerned did not care either to fulfil the assurances or to inform the Committee of the reason for pendency thereof.

The Committee takes a serious view of such lapses and advises all the Ministries to be careful in future to ensure that extensions of time for fulfilment of assurances are sought well in advance before the expiry of the prescribed period of three months or the extended period."

When the Ministry again defaulted in the matter, they were reminded *vide* this Secretariat D.O. dated the 18th July,2002 to furnish the requisite information. Yet another communication was sent to the Ministry *vide* this Secretariat letter dated the 21st October,2002.

The Committee is exercised over the indifference of the Ministry of External Affairs in furnishing the information sought by the Committee. The Committee notes that in all six communications have been sent by the Secretariat to the Ministry impressing upon them the need to furnish the requisite information and to expedite the fulfilment of assurances given to Parliament, by way of furnishing Status Notes and seeking extension of time. But the Ministry have not shown the requisite urgency in pursuing the matter. The Ministry have all along been using the refrain 'Heads of Divisions have been requested to seek necessary extension of time wherever necessary', yet no headway could be made in the matter. Merely informing the Committee that action is being taken towards the fulfilment of the assurances is no substitute to the actual fulfilling of the assurances and it certainly does not wipe out the imperative for action in concrete terms on the part of the Ministry. The Committee is, therefore, constrained to observe that the Ministry have not shown any seriousness in fulfilling the assurances.

The Committee would like to make it absolutely clear that timely and proper implementation of assurances given in Parliament is an important aspect of the entire concept of the accountability of the Government to Parliament and, therefore, any laxity shown either in not seeking timely extension of time for fulfilment of assurances or causing inordinate delay in fulfilment of the same without any valid reasons or failing in furnishing the requisite information asked for by the Committee would be viewed seriously .

That the Ministry of External Affairs are not attaching due importance to Parliamentary Assurances is further illustrated by the following instance:

In his reply to Starred Question No.340 dated 9.7.1998 regarding replacement of Haj Act, the then Minister of State in the Ministry of External Affairs *inter alia* stated that a nine-member Advisory Committee had prepared a draft Haj Bill to replace the existing Act. The draft was circulated to elicit the comments of the other Government Departments as also the State Governments. On the basis of those comments, a revised draft Bill was now under preparation. This reply was treated as an assurance and appropriate reference was made to the Ministry. The assurance remained pending till the 18th October,2002 when the Ministry furnished an Implementation Statement but did not indicate the reasons for inordinate delay in fulfilment of the assurance. The Ministry also did not seek any extension of time during the pendency of the assurance.

The Implementation Statement stated that Haj Committee Bill, 2000 was introduced in Rajya Sabha on 15.12.2000. The Bill was passed by Rajya Sabha and Lok Sabha on 8.5.2002 and 16.5.2002, respectively and assented to by the President on 11.6.2002.

The Chairman, Committee on Government Assurances took a serious note of the casual manner with which the Ministry sought to fulfil the assurance and directed them to explain the reasons for the same. In compliance with the directions of the Chairman of the Committee, the Ministry *vide* their O.M. No. M(Haj)/125/20/02 dated the 14th November,2002 regretted the delay in fulfilment of the assurance and stated that the directions of the Chairman had been taken note of for strict future compliance. The Ministry also furnished a revised Implementation Statement indicating the reasons for delay in fulfilment of the assurance.

The Committee takes a serious note of the fact that during the four and half years' pendency of the assurance, the Ministry did not care to move the Committee even once for grant of extension of time for fulfilment of the assurance or acquainting the Committee with the progress made in the matter. Even after taking unduly long time in fulfilling the assurance, the Ministry did not indicate the reasons for delay in the Remarks Column of the Implementation Statement which clearly indicates that the Ministry did not take the matter seriously. Though the Committee has condoned this lapse in view of the explanation offered by the Ministry *vide* their latest communication, it, however, directs them to streamline the system of dealing with assurances given to Parliament in order to ensure that no such lapse recurs.

V. Request for dropping of Assurances

Between 1.1.2002 and 15.11.2002, the Committee considered 71 requests for dropping of assurances received from various Ministries/Departments. The Committee after taking into account the genuine difficulties encountered by the Ministries/Departments of the Government of India in fulfilling some of the assurances, dropped 54 assurances from the list of pending assurances (APPENDIX-III).

The Committee has noted with concern that despite its recommendation made in its 54th Report presented to the Rajya Sabha on the 29th August,2001 that "a request for dropping of an assurance should be couched in proper and definite terms and each such request should be supported by cogent and convincing reasons", some of the Ministries/Departments continue to move the Committee using the refrain "this is an on-going process..... and reply should not be treated as an assurance," "this Ministry feels that the information furnished by this Ministry in reply to the said Question should not be treated as an assurance," "the answer given to the question was a statement of fact and not

assurance on the subject "etc. This should be avoided.

The Committee would like to bring the following instance to the notice of the House:-

On being asked (a) whether the rent of residence of Indian High Commissioner in U.K. was revised by reviewing the lease for 65 years effective from 1990 (b) if so, the financial involvement of the Government of India in the renewal; (c) whether similar exercise had been done for revising the rent of 2, Rajaji Marg, New Delhi which was leased to the British Commissioner and (d) if not, the reasons therefor, it was, *inter alia*, stated in reply to part (c) & (d) of Starred Question No.80 dated 22.11.01 that the matter of revising the rental of 2, Rajaji Marg, New Delhi which was leased to the British High Commission in New Delhi was under consideration.

The reply was treated as an assurance. Subsequently, the Ministry of External Affairs *vide* their D.O. No.398/JS(Coord)/2002 dated March 18,2002 requested the Rajya Sabha Secretariat for deletion of the said assurance, stating as under:-

"It will be seen from the answer given to the Question that it was a statement of fact and not the assurance on the subject. Minister of

External Affairs has also seen these papers and directed that the matter may be taken up with the Rajya Sabha Secretariat for deleting it from the list of assurances."

The matter was placed before the Chairman, Committee on Government Assurances who rejected the plea of the Ministry on the ground that the reply to the Question did constitute an assurance. Appropriate reference was accordingly made to the Ministry.

Subsequently, the Ministry *vide* their U.O. No.D.III/125/10/2000 dated the 13th June,2002 moved the Committee for dropping of the Assurance, stating as under:-

"In this connection it is mentioned that the matter regarding revision of rent of No.2,Rajaji Marg, New Delhi, the residence of the British High Commissioner, which is part of C&AG Report (Para 8.1) for the year ending 31st March,1999, was selected by Public Accounts Committee (PAC 2000-2001) and oral evidence of this Ministry was given. It has been selected by Public Accounts Committee (2001-2002) for continuation of examination. On this basis and in accordance with Rule 41 (w)(xxi)(xxii) of Procedure & Conduct of Business in Lok Sabha, Lok Sabha Starred Question Dy. No.6132 for answer on 13th March,2002 was disallowed."

Taking into consideration the fact that the matter was being examined by the Public Accounts Committee, this Committee at its meeting held on the 12th August, 2002 acceded to the request of the Ministry and the assurance was

accordingly dropped.

The Committee would like to make it clear that an observation made by a Minister on the floor of the House is viewed in a given context by way of giving information and is matched with the intention behind seeking such information in its entirety. Moreover, it should be clearly understood that it is the prerogative of the Committee alone to treat a reply as an assurance and once it is so treated, the Government is not authorised to question the decision of the Committee. The Committee, therefore, directs that the Ministries/Departments should desist from transgressing the exclusive domain of the Committee in the matter of treating a reply as an assurance.

VI. Deposition before the Committee

With a view to giving added momentum to the fulfilment of pending assurances as also to have a first-hand information and seeking clarifications in respect of certain vital issues involved in assurances, the Committee heard during the period under report, the representatives of the Ministries of Health and Family Welfare, Communications and Information Technology, Social Justice and Empowerment and Power.

The Committee heard on 8.7.2002 the Secretary in the Ministry of Health and Family Welfare, the Drug Controller, Delhi and the representatives of the Medical Council of India (MCI) in connection with the fulfilment of assurances pertaining to (i) SQ.No.181 dated 3.12.2001 regarding admissions by unapproved Medical/Dental Colleges and (ii) USQ.2843 dated 15.12.2000 regarding raids for fake drugs in Delhi. The Members sought clarifications in regard to (i) violation of rules in granting approval for setting up of Medical/Dental Colleges in Karnataka and other States and (ii) circulation of spurious/fake drugs and steps taken to curb the menace. The Committee expressing its unhappiness over the state of affairs especially in regard to lack of coordination between the Medical Council of India and the Deptt. of Health directed the Secretary to furnish a detailed Status Note on the points/issues raised by the Members and the assurances under reference. The Committee decided to hear the Secretary and representatives of MCI once again at a later date on the assurance pertaining to unapproved Medical/Dental Colleges. The Committee also impressed upon the need to set a definite time frame for fulfilling the pending assurances.

The Committee heard on 8.7.2002 the Secretary of Communications and Information Technology (Department of Telecommunications) in connection with the fulfilment of pending assurances pertaining to the Department of Telecommunications. The Committee in general appreciated the steps taken by the Ministry for timely fulfilment of assurances. The Committee directed that efforts be continued to fulfil those assurances expeditiously which are pending for collection of information.

The Committee heard on 17.9.2002 the Secretary, Ministry of Social Justice and Empowerment in connection with the fulfilment of pending assurances pertaining to that Ministry and in particular seven assurances pertaining to reservation for OBCs in educational institutions. The Committee expressed its unhappiness on the long pending assurances and impressed upon the Ministry the need to set a definite time-frame for fulfilling the same and follow up the cases vigorously. The Committee in particular directed that more strenuous efforts be made to fulfil those assurances expeditiously which are pending for collection of information.

The Committee heard on 17.9.2002 the Secretary, Ministry of Power in connection with fulfilment of pending assurances pertaining to the Ministry of Power. The Committee in general appreciated the steps taken by the Ministry for timely fulfilment of the assurances.

From its interaction with the representatives of the aforesaid Ministries, the Committee has noted that a large number of assurances involving collection of information have been pending since long. The Committee has also noted that lack of inter-Ministerial coordination also comes in the way of speedy fulfilment of the assurances.

The Committee, therefore, recommends that with a view to expediting fulfilment of assurances pending for want of information from States as well as the Ministries and other government agencies, each Ministry should create a separate cell to coordinate the work of different divisions/units within a Ministry charged with the fulfilment of an assurance and also to regularly monitor the progress in collection of information from States as well as the Ministries of the Government of India and to enter into regular correspondence with the Chief Secretaries of the States and the Secretaries of the Ministries for the purpose.

The Committee is of the view that if vigorous efforts are made towards this end, there is no reason why tangible results would not be achieved.

The Committee is happy to note that direct discussion with the representatives of the said Ministries had a salutary effect as it helped in ascertaining directly from the representatives of the said Ministries whether the reasons given by them for the delay were justified or not. Some cases in which implementation had already been delayed or which would have either been further delayed or would have even gone unnoticed were given prompt attention and they were implemented forthwith after the representatives were called for a discussion.

VII. Visit of the Committee

The Committee undertook visits to Bangalore, Mangalore, Mumbai, Chennai, Port Blair and Kolkata and interacted with the management of some Public Sector Undertakings (PSUs) and Public Sector Banks in connection with fulfilment of some pending assurances.

(i) Assurance given in reply to SQ.125 dated 7.12.99 regarding NPAs of Nationalised Banks- The Committee had discussion with the managements of Canara Bank, State Bank of Mysore, Vijaya Bank at Bangalore, Corporation Bank and Syndicate Bank at Mangalore, Indian Bank and Indian Overseas Bank at Chennai, Allahabad Bank and United Bank at Kolkata, State Bank of India, Bank of Baroda, Bank of India, Bank of Maharashtra, NABARD, Dena Bank, Union Bank of India, IDBI and Central Bank of India at Mumbai, Punjab and Sind Bank and Punjab National Bank in New Delhi in connection with the fulfilment of above mentioned assurance.

The Committee was informed that when a party could not pay interest or instalments of a loan which remain overdue for

more than 180 days, then it becomes Non-performing Assets (NPA) as it ceases to get income for the Bank. The representatives of the Bank were of the view that the slowdown in certain important sectors of the economy such as industry, services, manufacturing, etc. and some of the units falling sick due to competition in post liberalization period has led to continuous upward trend in the quantum of NPAs. In the Agriculture sector also, crop failures, competition from imported goods like coffee, rubber, tea, etc. has led to increase in the NPA level. Most of the CMDs of the Banks outlined the following reasons that resulted in certain borrowal accounts becoming NPAs:-

- (i) adverse business conditions in the market
- (ii) diversion of funds by promoters
- (iii) inordinate delay in realization of receivables and
- (iv) wilful default on the part of certain borrowers.

The CMDs of the banks further informed the Committee that all NPAs were monitored closely at different levels, depending upon the amount involved and a recovery wing headed by a General

19

Manager is continuously following with branches for initiating steps

for reduction of NPAs. The Committee came to know that the borrowers were contacted personally through recovery camps, individual contacts and through letters to persuade them to regularize their accounts and where the borrowers were not amenable for softer options, suits were filed in DRTS and Civil Courts. As a preventive measure, a system of identifying potential NPAs have also been adopted and close monitoring is done to avoid slippages.

The CMDs informed the Committee that the biggest impediment in the recovery is the problem in realizing the securities with their depreciative value. The managements of banks were of the view that since *status quo* was maintained and no action was initiated for five years, BIFR was a convenient haven for many of the large NPAs to seek protection from any prosecution. Further, on reference to BIFR, the borrowers also stop operating account with their earlier bank and open account with some new bank. This practice is detrimental to lender Bank and borrowers should be prevented from doing so. The banks felt that they should have more powers to take action against wilful defaulters.

The Managements of the Banks also informed the Committee that banks extended huge amounts to corporation/other bodies sponsored by State Governments on Government guarantees. Since State Government guarantees have overwhelming influence on the credit decision of the banks, huge amounts were extended without looking at the repaying capacity of the borrowers. The representatives of the Banks were of the view that whenever the Government guarantees are invoked, they should be paid immediately without seeking any relief or relaxation as delay or demur shakes the confidence of the bank in such guarantees and adversely affects the credibility of such guarantees.

While the Committee was amidst its deliberation on the subject, the Government on the 21st June, 2002 issued an Ordinance namely, the Securitisation and Reconstruction of Financial Assets and Enforcement of Security Interest Ordinance, 2002 which had the effect of addressing the problem of NPAs in right earnest as it *inter alia* enables

realization of

financial assets. Now that the Parliament had already passed the Bill replacing the Ordinance, the Committee feels that sufficient powers have been given to the Banks and Financial institutions under the new law which will have the desired impact of reducing the NPAs drastically.

The Committee recommends that since the Banking Nationalization Act prohibits disclosure of information relating to NPA accounts, suitable amendments should be made in the Act to give the banks, right to publish the names and other information of defaulters in national dailies and on their website so as to build pressure on them for repaying dues of the banks.

(ii) Assurance given in reply to Unstarred Question No.3187 dated 19.12.2000 of the Ministry of Finance regarding financial assistance to SCs/STs by the National Housing Bank(NHB) - On being asked whether the issue of pension scheme for NHB employees is pending with the Ministry of Finance and if so, the reasons therefor and action plan taken for early finalisation of the pension scheme, the Minister of State in the Ministry of Finance informed the House that NHB had submitted a draft pension regulation for its employees in November,1999 which is likely to be finalised shortly.

The Committee interacted with the Management of NHB in New Delhi on 18.9.2002. The management of the Bank informed the Committee that on the advice of the Banking Division to encourage pension schemes on a defined contribution basis, draft regulations based on the prevailing regulations in the Public Sector Banks and in tune with the provisions obtaining in the banking industry at large were submitted to the Banking Division on 9.5.2002 for consideration and notification. The approval and implementation of NHB Pension regulations is still pending with the Banking Division of the Ministry of Finance.

The Committee expressed its deep anguish at the perfunctory manner the Pension Policy was dealt with and felt that the inordinate delay in finalising the policy has proved detrimental to the interest of the employees of the Bank. The Committee also noted with displeasure that the RBI pension policy is being applied to those employees who have joined the bank from RBI and inspite of the fact that NHB being a subsidiary of RBI, the RBI pension policy is not uniformly implemented for the benefit of all employees of the Bank. The Committee directed the Ministry to finalise the Pension Policy within a definite time frame or implement the Pension Policy prevalent in RBI.

VIII Conclusion

During the last two years, the number of assurances has gone up considerably and there is a need for greater efforts to fulfil the assurances within the minimum time necessary for the purpose. The Committee expects that the concerned Ministry/Department would consider all the aspects of a given matter before the Minister holds out an assurance in the House and having done so, it is the bounden responsibility of the concerned Ministry/Department to

implement the assurance within a period of three months.

The Committee hopes that due steps will be taken by the Government in the light of the recommendations for satisfactory fulfilment of all pending assurances.

NEW DELHI;

December 18, 2002

SURESH PACHOURI

Chairman,

Committee on Government Assurances,

Rajya Sabha

APPENDIX-I

STATEMENT OF OBSERVATIONS/RECOMMENDATIONS

Sl. Observations/Recommendations

No.

1. It has been observed by the Committee that some of the Ministries/Departments request the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs for dropping of assurances or seek extension of time for fulfilment of the assurances. The Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs in turn sends such communications received from the Ministries/Departments back to them with the advice to move the Committee direct for the purpose as the power to drop an assurance or extend time limit for its fulfilment is vested in the Committee. The entire process consumes a lot of time and results in avoidable delays. The Committee therefore recommends that the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs should impress upon all the Ministries/Departments through a circular to strictly adhere to all instructions forwarded at the time of sending of the culled assurances.
2. The Committee further recommends that the Ministries/Departments must ensure that the Status Notes and Implementation Statements furnished by them to the Committee are also duly approved by the Minister Incharge.
3. The Committee, therefore, recommends that the Ministries/Departments of the Government of India should streamline their existing mechanism of monitoring of assurances with a view to liquidating them within the shortest possible time. Timely fulfilment of assurances is critically important, for, if their fulfilment is delayed inordinately, the assurances become irrelevant and lose their significance with the passage of time and their fulfilment gets reduced to a mere technical formality.
4. The Committee is of the view that the Ministry ought to have taken caution and circumspection in furnishing

the material for fulfilment of the assurances. The Committee is not satisfied with the Ministry of Coal's attempt to liquidate the assurance without spelling out the findings of consultants in respect of BCCL and CCL. The Committee, however, does hope and trust that the Ministry would come forward with detailed information so that the purpose for which the information was sought is served.

5. The Committee notes that though the first Environmental Impact Assessment study was assigned to the National Productivity Council in 1995-96 and the report was submitted in 1997, the finalisation of hazardous waste disposal site in Delhi still remains a far cry. Now, another EIA study has been awarded to NPC which forebodes further delay. Thus the matter is back to square one even after lapse of more than seven and half years. The Committee feels that inordinate delay in finalisation of sites for disposal of hazardous wastes has the potential of endangering the lives of the people living in Delhi. The Committee, therefore, is of the view that there is no room for laxity in the matter and strongly recommends that the Ministry should treat the matter with utmost urgency and implement the assurance on a top priority basis.
6. The Committee notes that in this case the Ministry sought to fulfil the assurance even though the action on their part was still not complete and urges upon the Ministry to have the investigation completed at the earliest.
7. It has been brought to the notice of the Committee that sometimes the Ministries/Departments send 15 copies of the Implementation Statements to the Rajya Sabha Secretariat for laying them on the Table of the House rather than sending these statements to the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs. This results in delay and duplication of work because these statements have ultimately to be forwarded to the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs for laying on the Table of the House as it is the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs who are concerned with laying of the Implementation Statements. The Committee, therefore, enjoins upon all the Ministries/Departments of the Government of India to send the requisite number of copies of Implementation Statements for laying on the Table of the Rajya Sabha only to the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs.
8. The Committee has observed that some Ministries/Departments continue to move the Committee for grant of extension of time using the hackneyed expressions like "it will take some more time to fulfil the assurance," "the assurance is unlikely to be fulfilled within the extended period", "the Ministry requires some more time for fulfilment of the assurance", etc. despite the fact that the Committee in its 52nd and 54th Reports presented to the Rajya Sabha on 21.12.2000 and 29.8.2001, respectively had recommended that the Ministries/Departments should invariably indicate the steps taken and the progress made towards fulfilment of the assurances while moving the Committee for grant of extension of time.

The Committee once again impresses upon the Ministries/Departments of Government of India to scrupulously adhere to above recommendations of the Committee .
9. The Committee takes a serious view of this kind of attitude on the part of some of the Ministries/Departments and exhorts them to be careful and keep track of all pending assurances so as not to miss making timely request for extension of time for fulfilment of the assurances.
10. The Committee would like to make it amply clear that seeking extension of time in the event of the pendency of assurances beyond the initial three months and acquainting the Committee with the progress made towards their fulfilment is a sacrosanct Parliamentary practice which should be observed by all Ministries/Departments scrupulously.

11. "It has been brought to the notice of the Committee that in some cases the Ministries/Departments did not seek any extension of time during the pendency of the assurance or sought extensions of time after lapse of a considerable period of time. The time gap in seeking extension varied from six months to more than six years after the expiry of the prescribed period or the extended period and during that period the Ministries/Departments concerned did not care either to fulfil the assurances or to inform the Committee of the reason for pendency thereof.

The Committee takes a serious view of such lapses and advises all the Ministries to be careful in future to ensure that extensions of time for fulfilment of assurances are sought well in advance before the expiry of the prescribed period of three months or the extended period."

12. The Committee is exercised over the indifference of the Ministry of External Affairs in furnishing the information sought by the Committee. The Committee notes that in all six communications have been sent by the Secretariat to the Ministry impressing upon them the need to furnish the requisite information and to expedite the fulfilment of assurances given to Parliament, by way of furnishing Status Notes and seeking extension of time. But the Ministry have not shown the requisite urgency in pursuing the matter. The Ministry have all along been using the refrain ' Heads of Divisions have been requested to seek necessary extension of time wherever necessary', yet no headway could be made in the matter. Merely informing the Committee that action is being taken towards the fulfilment of the assurances is no substitute to the actual fulfilling of the assurances and it certainly does not wipe out the imperative for action in concrete terms on the part of the Ministry. The Committee is, therefore, constrained to observe that the Ministry has not shown any seriousness in fulfilling the assurances.

13. The Committee would like to make it absolutely clear that timely and proper implementation of assurances given in Parliament is an important aspect of the entire concept of the accountability of the Government to Parliament and, therefore, any laxity shown either in not seeking timely extension of time for fulfilment of assurances or causing inordinate delay in fulfilment of the same without any valid reasons or failing in furnishing the requisite information asked for by the Committee would be viewed seriously .

14. The Committee takes a serious note of the fact that during the four and a half years' pendency of the assurance, the Ministry did not care to move the Committee even once for grant of extension of time for fulfilment of the assurance or acquainting the Committee with the progress made in the matter. Even after taking unduly long time in fulfilling the assurance, the Ministry did not indicate the reasons for delay in the Remarks Column of the Implementation Statement which clearly indicates that the Ministry did not take the matter seriously. Though the Committee has condoned this lapse in view of the explanation offered by the Ministry *vide* their latest communication, it, however, directs them to streamline the system of dealing with assurances given to Parliament in order to ensure that no such lapse recurs.

15. The Committee has noted with concern that despite its recommendation made in its 54th Report presented to the Rajya Sabha on the 29th August, 2001 that "a request for dropping of an assurance should be couched in proper and definite terms and each such request should be supported by cogent and convincing reasons", some of the Ministries/Departments continue to move the Committee using the refrain "this is an on-going process..... and reply should not be treated as an assurance," "this Ministry feels that the information furnished by this Ministry in reply to the said Question should not be treated as an assurance," "the answer given to the question was a statement of fact and not assurance on the subject "etc. This should be avoided.

16. The Committee would like to make it clear that an observation made by a Minister on the floor of the House is viewed in a given context by way of giving information and is matched with the intention behind seeking such information in its entirety. Moreover, it should be clearly understood that it is the prerogative of the Committee alone to treat a reply as an assurance and once it is so treated, the Government is not authorised to question the decision of the Committee. The Committee, therefore, directs that the Ministries/Departments should desist from transgressing the exclusive domain of the Committee in the matter of treating a reply as an assurance.

17. The Committee, therefore, recommends that with a view to expediting fulfilment of assurances pending for want of information from States as well as the Ministries and other government agencies, each Ministry should create a separate cell to coordinate the work of different divisions/units within a Ministry charged with the fulfilment of an assurance and also to regularly monitor the progress in collection of information from States as well as the Ministries of the Government of India and to enter into regular correspondence with the Chief Secretaries of the States and the Secretaries of the Ministries for the purpose.

The Committee is of the view that if vigorous efforts are made towards this end, there is no reason why tangible results would not be achieved.

18. While the Committee was amidst its deliberations on the subject, the Government on the 21st June, 2002 issued an Ordinance namely, the Securitisation and Reconstruction of Financial Assets and Enforcement of Security Interest Ordinance, 2002 which had the effect of addressing the problem of NPAs in right earnest as it *inter alia* enables realization of financial assets. Now that the Parliament had already passed the Bill replacing the Ordinance, the Committee feels that sufficient powers have been given to the Banks and Financial institutions under the new law which will have the desired impact of reducing the NPAs drastically.

19. The Committee recommends that since the Banking Nationalization Act prohibits disclosure of information relating to NPA accounts, suitable amendments should be made in the Act to give the banks, right to publish the names and other information of defaulters in national dailies and on their website so as to build pressure on them for repaying dues of the banks.

20. The Committee expressed its deep anguish at the perfunctory manner the Pension Policy was dealt with and felt that the inordinate delay in finalising the policy has proved detrimental to the interest of the employees of the Bank. The Committee also noted with displeasure that the RBI pension policy is being applied to those employees who have joined the bank from RBI and in spite of the fact that NHB being a subsidiary of RBI, the RBI pension policy is not uniformly implemented for the benefit of all employees of the Bank. The Committee directed the Ministry to finalise the Pension Policy within a definite time frame or implement the Pension Policy prevalent in RBI.

The Committee hopes that due steps will be taken by the Government in the light of the recommendations for satisfactory fulfilment of all pending assurances.