

**COMMITTEE ON
GOVERNMENT ASSURANCES
(1985-86)**

(EIGHTH LOK SABHA)

THIRD REPORT

Presented on 19 December, 1985



**LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT
NEW DELHI**

December 16, 1985/Agrahayana 25, 1907 (Saka)

3726

Price Re. 1.00

LOK SABHA

C O R R I G E N D A

Third Report of the Committee on
Government Assurances (Eighth Lok
Sabha).

Page No.

Correction

- (iii) Foot note line 1: for 'vice' read 'vide'
- 3 line 15: for '100' read 'too'
- 7 lines 13-14: for 'addressed' read 'addressed'
- 9 line 21: for 'Agrawal' read 'Agrawal'
- 12 line 18: for '19.11.1982' read '19.11.1983'
- 12 line 19: for 'Committee agree' read 'Committee to agree'
- 15 line 1: for '1,14,000' read '1,40,000'
- 16 line 19: for 'Chanan' read 'Chanan'

CONTENTS

	PAGES
COMPOSITION OF THE COMMITTEE	(iii)
INTRODUCTION	(v)
REPORT	i
Implementation of assurance given in reply to Unstarred Question No.9837 on 3 May, 1983.	i
RECOMMENDATIONS	5

MINUTES

(i) Minutes of the Third Sitting held on 10 July, 1985	8
(ii) Minutes of the Eighth Sitting held on 18 December, 1985	15

APPENDIX

Reply to Unstarred Question No. 9837 dated 3 May, 1983.	16
---	----

PARLIAMENTARY LIBRARY

69470.00
28-2-86

328.372R
M5

COMPOSITION OF THE COMMITTEE* ON GOVERNMENT ASSURANCES

(1985-86)

CHAIRMAN

Shri B. K. Gadhvi

MEMBERS

2. Shri T. Bala Goud
3. Shri V. Kishore Chandra S. Deo
4. Shri Jagannath Prasad
5. Shri Virdhi Chander Jain
6. Shri Rahim Khan
7. Shri Channaiah Odeyar
8. Shri S. S. Ramasamy Padayachi
9. Shri Keshorao Pardhi
10. Shri Ram Pujan Patel
11. Shri K. Pradhani
12. Shri Ram Bahadur Singh
13. Shri Sode Ramalah
- **14. Shri Jitendra Prasada
- **15. Shri K. N. Pradhan

SECRETARIAT

1. Shri C. K. Jain—*Chief Examiner of Questions.*
2. Shri D. M. Chanan—*Senior Examiner of Questions.*

* The Committee was nominated by the Speaker w.e.f. 20 May, 1985 *Vide* para 490 of Lok Sabha Bulletin Part-II dated 21-5-1985.

** Nominated by the Speaker w.e.f. 23 September, 1985, *vide* Sarvaswari Martand Singh and Bhagwat Jha Azad resigned, *Vide* para 632 of Lok Sabha Bulletin Part-II dated 23-9-1985.

INTRODUCTION

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

2. The Committee (1985-86) were constituted on 20 May, 1985.

3. At their third sitting held on 10 July, 1985, the Committee took the evidence of the representatives of the Ministry of Communications (Department of Posts) in connection with the non-implementation of the assurance given on 3 May, 1983 during the Eleventh Session of Seventh Lok Sabha in reply to USQ. No. 9837 regarding Post Offices working on Sundays and postal holidays. At their eighth sitting held on 18 December, 1985, the Committee considered and adopted the draft Third Report.

4. The Minutes of the aforesaid sitting of the Committee form part of this Report.

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

6. The Committee wish to express their thanks to the officials of the Ministry of Communications (Department of Posts) who appeared before the Committee.

NEW DELHI;
December 16, 1985.

Agrahayana 25, 1907 (Saka)

B. K. GADHVI,
Chairman,
Committee on
Government Assurances.

REPORT

I

On 3 May, 1983 in reply to a written question No. 9837 regarding Post Offices working on Sundays and postal holidays (Appendix), the Deputy Minister in the Ministry of Communications gave an assurance that the information in regard to the names of post offices and their working hours which functioned on Sundays and postal holidays in the years 1980, 1981, 1982 and 1983 and the number of letter boxes in the country with State-wise list which had clearances of daks on Sundays and postal holidays, was being collected and would be laid on the Table of Lok Sabha.

2. On 21 January, 1984, the Ministry moved the Committee through the Department of Parliamentary Affairs for dropping the assurance on the ground that the information to be furnished in fulfilment of the assurance in question was very voluminous and would involve considerable work which might not be commensurate with the object or purpose for which the question had been asked.

3. At their sitting held on 6 February, 1984, the Committee, after considering all aspects of the matter and the reasons advanced by the Ministry of Communications (P & T Board) for dropping of the assurance and decided not to accede to the request of the Ministry. The Committee desired that the Ministry might implement the assurance by laying on the Table of the House information in convenient batches each covering part of the information.

4. The Ministry again requested the Committee on 30 November, 1984, through the Department of Parliamentary Affairs for dropping the assurance on the plea that:

"When the assurance was given the magnitude of the work involved in the fulfilment of the assurance could not be adjudged properly.... Now the Department of Parliamentary Affairs... have intimated that the Committee on Government Assurances have not agreed to drop this assurance. As such this assurance is required to be fulfilled.

information furnished by the postal circles is in the shape of big volumes and it will take a lot of time in compila-

tion.... There are 16 Postal Circles in the country from whom such information has been received by us..... this work will have to be completed by deputing 2 or 3 dealing hands for 10 hours daily for a number of months and the estimated expenditure in fulfilment of the assurance is about Rs. 34,000....."

5. The Ministry furnished a booklet of information received by them from the Post Master General, Kerala Circle to fortify their plea that the collection of information involved enormous time, labour and expenditure.

6. Subsequently on 16 June, 1985 in reply to a reference made, the Ministry informed the Committee as follows:—

"The information required in respect of part (b) of the question is very voluminous and would consume a lot of time for its compilation. The labour and the cost involved for compilation would also be quite huge. The information from 1-6-1982 onward is under compilation and would be furnished by 25th instant. Compilation of information in respect of years 1980 and 1981 would take about one year. As already suggested that the information would be quite voluminous and time consuming, it is once again requested that this part of the assurance may be dropped".

7. At their sitting held on 13 June, 1985, the Committee decided to hear the views of the representatives of the Ministry on 10 July, 1985. After the communication to this effect had been issued to the Ministry on 19 June, 1985, the Ministry furnished a statement containing the complete information required in implementation of the aforesaid assurance.

8. On 10 July, 1985, the Secretary, Ministry of Communications (Department of Posts) appeared before the Committee. When asked to state the reasons for delay in implementing the assurance and also for making the request for dropping of the assurance, the representative of the Ministry replied:—

"When our Minister made an assurance on the floor of Lok Sabha and stated that he would be giving certain information regarding the post offices working on holidays, it was definitely our intention to honour the assurance. But during the time when the material was being collected, it was noticed that the information to be collected was

voluminous and, therefore, the concerned officer at that time had some doubts and some discussions which were rather unfortunate because it is quite obvious when the Minister had made an assurance to the Parliament, this had to be carried out and the delay in fulfilling this assurance is very deeply regretted. In fulfilment of the assurance given by the Minister, we have been able to furnish information to you and we are sorry that we are late and we would like to assure the Chairman and others here that on similar matters the Department will be taking all care to see that the assurances are invariably fulfilled in proper time."

9. Enquired about the precise steps taken to collect the requisite information for implementation of the assurance and also the stage when it was realised that the requisite information would be 100 voluminous, the witness informed the Committee as follows:—

"Immediately after our Minister gave the assurance in the Lok Sabha, action was taken to address all the Heads of Postal Circles all over India for the information. Following our letter, we started getting the information, the first one on 13-5-83 from certain Heads. They wanted further clarification. There are certain Post Offices which are departmental, certain others which are extra-departmental, there are certain telegraph offices. Post Offices do not work on Sundays; but telegraph offices work. . . . In the process of answering these queries some time was unfortunately lost and at that time the then officer who was handling this case considered that the matter was voluminous and was running into lots of pages. So, he thought it fit to come back to the Minister."

10. The representative of the Ministry was asked on what date the advance copy of Unstarred Question No. 9837 admitted for answer on 3 May 1983 was received by the Ministry and what action was initiated to collect the requisite information. In reply, he stated:—

"The advance copy of the question was received on 22-4-83. We wrote to all Heads of Circles on 5-5-1983. They had in turn to get the information from subordinate postal divisions. So some of them wrote back to them (Heads of Circles) and some of them took action after some time

and then we received certain queries about what type of offices should be included etc."

11. Pursuing the matter further, the Committee asked the Secretary of the Department about the dates when different Heads of Circles sent the requisite information and the date when the Department of Posts made a request to the Committee to drop the assurance on the plea that the information was "voluminous." The witness clarified:

"Information was received as a result of our letter of 5-5-1983 from some circles. Some of them were complete and some were not complete. Therefore, this matter was explained in a note to our own Minister, Mr. Patil who made the assurance to Parliament. It was brought to his notice on 19-11-1983. We sought the Minister's permission to refer it back to the Committee and request that the assurance may be dropped. This was agreed to and thereafter we wrote to the Committee."

12. The Committee asked the witness as to what action had been taken to implement the assurance during the period from 5 May, 1983 to 19 November, 1983 when the matter was placed before the Minister for approaching the Committee to agree to drop the assurance. The witness informed that the Department issued reminders and clarification sought by the Heads of the Circles (Posts).

13. Drawing attention to the reply to the question on 3 May, 1983 that "the information is being collected and will be laid on the Table of the House" and to the actual issuance of Ministry's letter only on 5 May, 1983 to the authorities concerned to supply the requisite information i.e. 2 days after the reply was given in Lok Sabha, the Committee enquired of the witness to reconcile the contradiction. The witness submitted:

"I would like to clarify. When this Unstarred Question came to us, at that stage we decided that some information could be given straightaway and in respect of some other, we have to collect it from other sources.... It should be viewed that when this reply was given, the intention was to say that the information was being collected, that is, in the process of being collected."

14. The witness added that the words "is being collected", were intended to convey that the information would be collected and laid on the Table of the House.

15. Asked about the mechanism in the Department of Posts to deal with the Parliamentary matters and the level at which the decisions were taken, the witness stated:—

"Our office is divided into a number of branches and each branch maintains a register of all references from MPs. or MLAs. or matters relating to Parliament questions and a watch is kept by the Section Officer or the Branch Officer and even at the level of Secretary, the register is being looked into every now and then. But in this particular case, probably because the reply was given, a total watch on the implementation of the assurance seems to have been overlooked."

16. When asked about the efforts made to do away with this kind of laxity prevalent in the Department, the witness stated:—

"Definitely. All the officers concerned have been informed that there has been a slackness in the particular case. They have been cautioned to see that all the pending cases are reviewed and that note is taken of anything which is unduly delayed so that a similar thing does not occur."

17. The Committee enquired further as to why action in this case was not taken to implement the assurance by laying the information in suitable batches as it was considered to be voluminous, in terms of the earlier recommendation of the Committee on Government Assurances (1984-85) contained in para 5.1 of their Tenth Report, namely, that if the information required to be furnished in fulfilment of the assurance in question was very voluminous and likely to involve considerable time, the Ministry might implement the assurance by laying the information in convenient batches. In reply, the witness informed the Committee as under:

"As I mentioned earlier some portions were being collected and we had some information in relation to one or two States. At that there was a written communication to the Committee on Government Assurances and also personal representation from the Officers concerned so there seemed to be lack of follow up. Officers felt that it might be dropped. The officers who attended it at that time they felt

that the information would be voluminous and they thought it would be dropped."

18. The Committee further pointed out that when once the request of the Ministry for dropping the assurance was not acceded to by the Committee, why efforts were not made since then to collect the information. The witness stated:

"After August 1984 efforts have been made to collect information from the circles from where we had received incomplete information. As I mentioned earlier, let me again say that this work not being done in the previous one and a half years was not justified. It should have been done. If we had put a little extra effort we would have been able to complete it."

19. Pointing out that the post offices and letter boxes forming the basic structure of the Department of Posts, the Committee desired to know the reasons as to why such information was not available. The witness explained:

"All over India there are 1,40,000 post offices. The timings of these post offices is fixed according to the receipt of the mail by train or plane and this work of fixing time is done by a large number of subordinate offices and not by us."

20. Asked about the criteria for opening Post Offices on Sundays and holidays, the witness replied:

"Formerly certain post offices used to be kept open on Sundays and holidays. Some four-five years back a review was done and we found the amount of traffic generated on Sundays and holidays is low and, as such, it was not considered necessary to keep these Post Offices open on Sundays and holidays. Only some telegraph offices and night post offices are kept open on Sundays and holidays."

21. The Committee then asked that if it was so why did the Department reply in the affirmative to the question of post offices being opened on Sundays and holidays instead of replying in negative in their written answer. The witness stated:

"The question was whether there were some post offices which worked on Sundays and holidays and the answer was in the affirmative."

22. The Committee desired to know as to how it became possible to implement the assurance just a day before the date fixed for the representative of the Ministry to appear before the Committee for oral evidence while it was being considered difficult for more than two years necessitating the request to drop the assurance. In a written reply, the Ministry furnished the following explanation:

"It is a fact that most of the information that was sought for had been collected by November, 1983. The request to drop the assurance was made only because the information was voluminous. When the Committee on Government Assurances decided in June, 1985 that the assurance could not be dropped, it was observed that information from three circles was not in file. The circles were also addressed again to send the information in Hindi as the Hindi version had also to be furnished to the Committee."

II

RECOMMENDATIONS/OBSERVATIONS

23. From the facts mentioned in the preceding paragraphs, the Committee are constrained to observe that the Ministry did not accord due importance and required attention to the assurance given by the Minister in the House. The Committee would like to observe that before suggesting an assurance in reply of the Minister all considerations about the time, efforts and expenditure involved should be carefully weighed and once it is decided to give assurance, necessary action with a proper planning should be initiated and pursued closely with appropriate speed so as to ensure that the assurance is implemented within the least loss of time.

24. The Committee are of the view that in the instant case it could have been well anticipated that the postal network being spread all over the country, the work involved was bound to cover a wide area. With a proper and clear direction, the information could have been collected much earlier avoiding waste of time and efforts.

25. The Committee regret that the Ministry showed a typical casual and lax attitude in dealing with this assurance right from the very beginning. First the Ministry did not take timely and well concerted steps to collect the information and then after a lapse of about nine months it was realised that the required information would be voluminous and Committee should be approached to drop the assurance. And when the Committee decided to call the representative of the Ministry for oral evidence, it became

possible to implement the assurance within a few weeks' time just a day before the oral evidence. This sequence speaks itself and does not need any further comments. The Committee further regret that while most of the information had been collected by November, 1983, it was still considered appropriate to make a request for dropping the assurance. In fact the right course for the Ministry should have been to submit the information in batches as recommended by the Committee in their Tenth Report (1984-85).

26. The Committee are of the opinion that the casualness in dealing with this assurance was apparently due to lack of proper appreciation of the importance of the task on the part of the officers concerned. The Committee recommend that the officers entrusted with the Parliamentary work should be given special reorientation in regard to the responsibility of the Department towards Parliament, its institutions and procedures and suitable guidelines laid down for them inter-alia to keep the Minister informed from time to time of the progress in each case. In this connection, the Committee take note of the steps taken recently by the Secretary of the Department and hope that situation of this kind would not be repeated in future.

B. K. GADHVI,

Chairman,

Committee on Government Assurances.

NEW DELHI;

December 16, 1985.

Agrahayana 25, 1907 (Saka).

MINUTES

Third Sitting

Minutes of the Third Sitting of the Committee on Government Assurances held on 10 July, 1985 in Committee Room No. 'B', Ground Floor, Parliament House Annexe, New Delhi.

The Committee met on Wednesday, 10th July, 1985 from 11.00 hours to 11.51 hours.

PRESENT

Shri B. K. Gadhvi—Chairman

MEMBERS

2. Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad
3. Shri V. Kishore Chandra S. Deo
4. Shri Jagannath Prasad
5. Shri Virdhi Chander Jain
6. Shri Keshorao Pardhi
7. Shri Ram Pujan Patel
8. Shri K. Pradhani
9. Shri Ram Bahadur Singh

SECRETARIAT

Shri C. K. Jain—Chief Examiner of Questions

Shri M. G. Agarwal—Senior Examiner of Questions.

WITNESS EXAMINED

*Ministry of Communications
(Department of Posts)*

Shri K. R. Murthy—Secretary, Deptt. of Posts

Shri P. S. Raghvachari—Member (Operations) Postal Services Board

Shri L. D. Bonnell—Dy. Director General (M.O.) Postal Service Board

Shri S. Balasubramanian—Director P and T Postal Service Board.

2. The Committee took evidence of the representatives of the Ministry of Communications (Department of Posts) in connection with the non-implementation of the assurance given on 3rd May, 1983 during the Eleventh Session of Seventh Lok Sabha in reply to USQ No. 9837 regarding Post Offices working on Sundays and Postal holidays.

3. At the outset, the Chairman drew attention of the witnesses to the provisions of Direction 58 of the Directions issued by the Speaker, Lok Sabha, under the Rules of Procedure and conduct of Business in Lok Sabha. Thereafter, the Chairman made the following observations:—

“We have been informed by our Secretariat that your Ministry forwarded a statement giving the information in fulfilment of the aforesaid assurance yesterday afternoon (9th July, 1985). As you may be aware, the assurance will be deemed to have been fulfilled after the statement is laid on the Table of Lok Sabha and possibly you must be proposing to have it laid during the ensuing session (3rd Session of 8th Lok Sabha). We hope that the statement gives full and complete information as promised by the Minister in his reply. Before we start the discussion, I would request you to give a general statement giving the reasons for delay in implementing the assurance and even making a request for the dropping of the assurance.”

4. In reply, the Secretary, Department of Posts, Ministry of Communications stated as follows:—

“When our Minister made an assurance on the floor of Lok Sabha and stated that he would be giving certain information regarding the post offices working on holidays, it was definitely our intention to honour the assurance. But during the time when the material was being collected, it was noticed that the information to be collected was voluminous and, therefore, the concerned officer at that time had some doubts and had some discussions

which were rather unfortunate because it is quite obvious when the Minister had made an assurance to the Parliament, this had to be carried out and the delay in fulfilling this assurance is very deeply regretted. In fulfilment of the assurance given by the Minister, we have been able to furnish information to you, and we are sorry that we are late and we would like to assure the Chairman and others here that on similar matters the Department will be taking all care to see that the assurances are invariably fulfilled in proper time."

5. The Committee enquired from the witness about the precise steps that had been taken by the Ministry to collect the requisite information for implementation of the assurance and also the stage when the Ministry felt that the requisite information was too voluminous. The witness stated:—

"Immediately after our Minister gave the assurance in the Lok Sabha, action was taken to address all the Heads of Postal Circles all over India for the information. Following our letter, we started getting the information, the first one on 13-5-1983 from certain Heads. They wanted further clarification. There are certain Post Offices which are departmental, certain other which are extra-departmental, there are certain telegraph offices. Post Offices do not work on Sundays; but telegraph offices work.....

In the process of answering these queries some time was unfortunately lost and at that time the then officer who was handling this case considered that the matter was voluminous and was running into lots of pages. So, he thought it fit to come back to the Minister."

6. Asked about the date when the advance copy of USQ No. 9837 admitted for answer on 3-5-1983 was received by the Ministry and the action taken to collect the requisite information to answer the question, the witness stated:

"The advance copy of the question was received on 22-4-1983. We wrote to all Heads of Circles on 5-5-1983. They had in turn to get the information from subordinate postal divisions. So some of them wrote back to them (Heads of Circles) and some of them took action after some time and then we received certain queries about what type of offices should be included etc."

7. Asked further about the dates when different Heads of Circles sent the requisite information and the date when the Department of Posts made a request to the Committee to drop the assurance on the plea that the information was voluminous, the witness stated:—

"Information was received as a result of our letter of 5-5-83 from some circles. Some of them were complete and some were not complete. Therefore, this matter was then discussed and the matter was explained in a note to our own Minister, Mr. Patil who made the assurance to Parliament. It was brought to his notice on 19-11-1983. We sought the Minister's permission to refer it back to the Committee and request that the assurance may be dropped. This was agreed to and thereafter we wrote to the Committee."

8. The Committee desired to know that between 5.5.1983 when the Department wrote to Heads of Circles to furnish requisite information and 19.11.1982 when the matter was placed before the Minister for approaching the Committee agree to drop the assurance i.e. during the intervening period of six months, what efforts were made to procure the information, the witness replied that the Department issued reminders and gave clarifications sought by the Heads of Circles (Posts).

9. When asked about the efforts made to implement the assurance indicating the dates chronologically and details of action taken on such dates, the witness replied that the information was not readily available and the same will be furnished to the Committee subsequently.

10. Asked whether a reference was made to the Directors of Post Offices in various States to collect the information and if so, how many of these States furnished the information before 19.11.1984 and how many of them did not respond to the request of the Department, the witness stated that such information was also not readily available and the same would be collected and furnished to the Committee later.

11. When it was pointed out by the Committee that on 3.5.1983 in the reply prepared by the Ministry to the Unstarred Question under reference, the Minister had stated that "The information is

being collected and will be laid on the Table of the House" which meant that by that time the process of collecting the information had already begun whereas the Ministry sent their first communication to Heads of Circles etc. on 5.5.1983 i.e. 2 days after the date of reply for collecting the requisite information, the witness explained:—

"I would like to clarify. When this Unstarred Question came to us, at that stage we decided that some information could be given straightaway and in respect of some other, we have to collect it from other sources. It should be viewed that when this reply was given, the intention was to say that the information was being collected, that is, in the process of being collected."

12. In reply to another question, the witness explained:—

"The words are 'being collected', as explained by the Hon. Member, the intention here was only to collect it and then place it before the House."

13. Asked about the mechanism in the Department of Posts to deal with the Parliamentary matters and the level at which the decisions were taken, the witness stated:—

"Our office is divided into a number of branches and each branch maintains a register of all references from MPs. or MLAs. or matters relating to Parliament questions and a watch is kept by the Section Officer or the Branch Officer and even at the level of Secretary, the register is being looked into every now and then. But in this particular case, probably because the reply was given, a total watch on the implementation of the assurance seems to have been overlooked."

14. When asked about the efforts made to do away with this kind of laxity prevalent in the Department, the witness stated:—

"Definitely. All the officers concerned have been informed that there has been a slackness in the particular case. They have been cautioned to see that all the pending cases are reviewed and that note is taken of anything which is unduly delayed so that a similar thing does not occur."

15. The Committee enquired further as to why action in this case was not taken to implement the assurance by laying the information in suitable batches as it was considered to be voluminous in terms of the earlier recommendation of the Committee on Government Assurances (1984-85) contained in para 5.1 of their Tenth Report, namely, that if the information required to be furnished in fulfilment of the assurance in question was very voluminous and likely to involve considerable time, the Ministry might implement the assurance by laying the information in convenient batches. In reply, the witness informed the Committee as under:—

"As I mentioned earlier some portions were being collected and we had some information in relation to one or two States. At that time there was a written communication to the Committee on Government Assurances and also personal representation from the Officers concerned so there seemed to be lack of follow up. Officers felt that it might be dropped. The Officers who attended it at that time they felt that the information would be voluminous and they thought it would be dropped."

16. When the Committee pointed out that the first request of the department for dropping of the assurance has been rejected by the Committee, the witness replied that it was a mis-guided effort on the part of concerned officer to get it dropped.

17. The Committee further pointed out that when once the request of the Ministry for dropping the assurance was not acceded to by the Committee, why efforts were not made since then to collect the information. the witness then stated:—

"After August 1984 efforts have been made to collect the information from the Circles from where we had received incomplete information. As I mentioned earlier, let me again say that this work not being done in the previous one and a half years was not justified. It should have been done. If we had put a little extra effort we would have been able to complete it."

18. The Committee then pointed out that the post offices and letter boxes form the basic structure of the Department of Posts and still the information is not available about them. the witness replied:—

All over India there are 1,14,000 post offices. The timings of these post offices is fixed according to the receipt of the mail by train or plane and this work of fixing time is done by a large number of subordinate offices and not by us."

19. Asked about the criteria for opening Post Offices on Sundays and holidays, the witness replied:—

"Formerly certain post offices used to be kept open on Sundays and holidays. Some four-five years back a review was done and we found the amount of traffic generated on Sundays and holidays is low and, as such, it was not considered necessary to keep these Post Offices open on Sundays and holidays. Only some telegraph offices and night post offices are kept open on Sundays and holidays."

20. The Committee then asked that if it was so then why did the Department reply in the affirmative to the question of post offices being opened on Sundays and holidays instead of replying in negative in their written answer. The witness stated:—

"The question was whether there were some post offices which worked on Sundays and holidays and the answer was in the affirmative."

21. Asked about date from which these post offices discontinued to open, on Sundays and postal holidays, the witness replied that he would check up and furnish the information to the Committee.

22. The Committee then adjourned.

MINUTES

Eighth Sitting

Minutes of the Eighth Sitting of the Committee on Government Assurances held on 18 December, 1985 in Room No. 143, Third Floor, Parliament House, New Delhi

The Committee met on Wednesday, 18 December, 1985 from 15.30 hours to 16.15 hours.

PRESENT

Shri B. K. Gadhvi—Chairman

Members

2. Shri T. Bala Goud
3. Shri Jagannath Prasad
4. Shri Virdhi Chander Jain
5. Shri Rahim Khan
6. Shri Channalal Odeyar
7. Shri Keshorao Pardhi

SECRETARIAT

Shri C. K. Jain—Chief Examiner of Questions

Shri D. M. Chaman—Senior Examiner of Questions

2. The Committee considered their draft Third Report and adopted the same. The Committee authorised the Chairman to present the Report on Thursday, 19 December, 1985.

3. The Committee decided to undertake on-the-spot study tour to Hyderabad, Trivandrum, Goa and Bombay from about 8 to 15 January, 1985.

The Committee then adjourned.

APPENDIX

(Vide Para 1 of the Report)

LOK SABHA

UNSTARRED QUESTION NO. 9837

to be answered on 3rd May, 1983

Vaisakha 13, 1905 (Saka)

Post Offices working on Sundays and Postal Holidays

9837. SHRI CHINTAMANI JENA: Will the Minister of COMMUNICATIONS be pleased to state:

(a) whether there are some post offices all over the country which function on Sundays and Postal Holidays;

(b) if so, the names of such post offices and their working hours on Sundays and Postal Holidays in the years 1980, 1981, 1982 and 1983;

(c) are there some letter boxes in the country which have clearances of daks on Sundays and Postal Holidays; and

(d) if so, the number of such letter boxes in the country, with State-wise list?

ANSWER

DEPUTY MINISTER OF COMMUNICATIONS (SHRI VIJAY N. PATIL): (a) and (c). Yes, Sir,

(b) and (d). The information is being collected and will be laid on the Table of the House.