

COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT ASSURANCES
(2003-2004)

THIRTEENTH LOK SABHA

THIRTEENTH REPORT

(Request for Dropping of Assurances)

(Presented to Lok Sabha on July 24, 2003)



LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT
NEW DELHI

CONTENTS

Composition of the Committee (2003-2004)

Composition of the Committee (2002-2003)

Introduction

Chapter I Request for dropping of Assurances (Not Accepted)

- (i) Unstarred Question No.3078 dated March 16, 1999 regarding Identification of Minority Concentration.
- (ii) Starred Question No.100 dated March 01, 2000 regarding Pension to Unorganised Sector.
- (iii) Unstarred Question No.3800 dated April 18, 2000 regarding Dissolution of IMDT Act.

Chapter II Request for dropping of Assurances (Accepted)

- (i) Unstarred Question Nos.4447 dated August 26, 1991, 2007 dated July 21, 1992, 1269 dated August 03, 1993 & 4821 dated April 26, 1994 regarding Gujral Committee/Ali Sardar Jafri Committee Reports on Promotion of Urdu language.
- (ii) Unstarred Question No.1553 dated August 03, 1994 regarding Corruption Cases against IAS/IPS Officers.
- (iii) Unstarred Question No.6284 dated May 18, 1995 regarding Offshore Platform project of ONGC.
- (iv) Unstarred Question No.1493 dated August 01, 2000 regarding Sarkaria Commission.

APPENDICES

- I Minutes of the Second Sitting of the Committee held on March 19, 2002.
- II. Minutes of the Fourth Sitting of the Committee held on June 28, 2002.
- III. Minutes of the Fourth Sitting of the Committee held on May 23, 2003.
- IV. List of recommendations implemented by State Governments and Central Ministries/Departments as mentioned in Chapter-II regarding Gujral Committee/Ali Sardar Jafri Committee Reports on promotion of Urdu Language.
- V. Details of action taken in some cases as mentioned in Unstarred Question No.1553 dated 3rd August, 1994 regarding Corruption Cases Against IAS/IPS Officers.

**COMPOSITION OF THE COMMITTEE ON
GOVERNMENT ASSURANCES***
(2003-2004)

CHAIRMAN

Dr. S. Venugopal

MEMBERS

2. Shri Adhi Sankar
3. Shri E.Ahamed
4. Shri Ramakant Angle
5. Shri Padam Sen Choudhry
6. Shri Priya Ranjan Dasmunsi
7. Adv. Uttamrao Dhikale
8. Shri E.M. Sudarsana Natchiappan
9. Shri Rupchand Pal
10. Shri Dharam Raj Singh Patel
11. Shrimati Renu Kumari
12. Shri Kishan Singh Sangwan
13. Shri Bahadur Singh
14. Rajkumari Ratna Singh
15. Shri Tarlochan Singh Tur

SECRETARIAT

- | | | | |
|----|--------------------|---|----------------------|
| 1. | Shri P.D.T. Achary | - | Additional Secretary |
| 2. | Shri S.K. Sharma | - | Joint Secretary |
| 3. | Shri R.C. Gupta | - | Director |
| 4. | Ms. J.C. Namchyö | - | Under Secretary |

* The Committee was nominated by the Speaker w.e.f. January 25, 2003
vide Para No.3507 of Lok Sabha Bulletin Part-II dated January 28, 2003

**COMPOSITION OF THE COMMITTEE ON
GOVERNMENT ASSURANCES*
(2002-2003)**

CHAIRMAN

Dr. S. Venugopal

MEMBERS

2. Shri E.Ahamed
- 3.** Shri Padam Sen Choudhry
4. Shri Priya Ranjan Dasmunsi
5. Adv. Uttamrao Dhikale
6. Dr. S. Jagathrakshakan
7. Shri Brahma Nand Mandal
8. Shri Ramjee Manjhi
9. Shri E.M. Sudarsana Natchiappan
10. Shri Rupchand Pal
11. Shri Kishan Singh Sangwan
12. Shri Raghuraj Singh Shakya
13. Shri Bahadur Singh
14. Rajkumari Ratna Singh
15. Shri Tarlochan Singh Tur

SECRETARIAT

- | | | | |
|----|--------------------|---|----------------------|
| 1. | Shri P.D.T. Achary | - | Additional Secretary |
| 2. | Shri R.C. Gupta | - | Director |
| 3. | Ms. J.C. Namchyö | - | Assistant Director |

* The Committee was nominated by the Speaker w.e.f. January 16, 2002
vide Para No.2528 of Lok Sabha Bulletin Part-II dated January 16, 2002

** Nominated to the Committee on August 12, 2002 by the Speaker as published
vide Para No.3145 of Lok Sabha Bulletin Part-II dated August 12, 2002 vice Shri
S.B.P.B.K. Satyanarayana Rao who resigned from the Committee.

INTRODUCTION

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

The Committee (2003-2004) was constituted on January 25, 2003.

The Committee (2002-2003) at their sittings held on March 19, 2002 & June 28, 2002 considered *inter-alia* Memoranda Nos.1, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10 & 12 containing requests received from the Ministries/Departments of the Government of India for dropping of pending assurances.

At their sitting held on May 23, 2003, the Committee (2003-2004) considered and adopted their Thirteenth Report. The Minutes of the aforesaid sittings of the Committee form part of this Report. (Appendix-III)

The conclusions/observations of the Committee are contained in this Report have been printed in bold letters.

NEW DELHI;
July 21, 2003

DR. S. VENUGOPAL
Chairman
Committee on Government Assurances

REPORT
CHAPTER – I
(i) IDENTIFICATION OF MINORITY CONCENTRATION

1.1 On March 16, 1999, Shri Mohammad Ali Ashraf Fatmi, MP addressed the following Unstarred Question No.3078 to the Minister of Social Justice & Empowerment:-

- “(a) whether the Government have any proposal to identify more minority concentration areas which are educationally and economically backward in the country:**
- (b) if so, the details thereof;**
- (c) if not, the reasons therefor; and**
- (d) the steps taken by the Government in this regard?”**

1.2 In reply, the then Minister of State of the Ministry of Social Justice & Empowerment (Smt. Maneka Gandhi) stated as follows:-

“(a) & (d) : Yes Sir. The matter is under consideration ”

1.3 Reply to Parts (a) & (d) of the question was treated as an assurance and was required to be fulfilled by the Ministry of Social Justice & Empowerment within three months of the date of reply i.e. by June 15, 1999.

1.4 The Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs *vide* their UO No. XII-IV/S.J.E.(13)USQ 3078-Lok Sabha/2000 dated March 14, 2002 had forwarded a request of the Ministry of Social Justice & Empowerment for dropping of the assurance on the following grounds:-

“41 districts were identified as Minority concentration districts (MCDs) in 1987 based on the population of minorities as per 1971 census. Subsequently, this matter was discussed in a meeting of the Committee of Secretaries in 1994 and it was decided that the identification may be made afresh based on poverty and backwardness in addition to population of minorities.

This matter was accordingly referred to the National Commission for Minorities (NCM). The Commission suggested inclusion of 137 district in `A` category and 84 districts in `B` category. As the number of MCDs suggested by the Commission is very large, the NCM was requested to review the matter and suggest a list based on the incidence of poverty and social backwardness.

The socio-economic conditions of the minorities have improved on account of the efforts of various Ministries/Departments of the Government through schemes implemented by the Ministry of Human Resource Development; Maulana Azad Education

Foundation, Central Wakf Council and the National Minorities Development and Finance Corporation. Besides these, the benefit from the various poverty alleviation programmes of Ministries such as Rural Development and Urban Development and activity based programmes for skill development and income generation of all other Ministries have also been available to the minorities. It is felt that strategies need to be evolved to identify and reach out to the minority community in backward districts and provide adequate assistance to members of the community for enabling them to cross the poverty line.

The matter has accordingly been referred back to the National Commission for Minorities to examine the entire issue with regard to identification of minority concentration districts and also consider suitable alternate strategies for reaching out to the members of the minority community who are educationally and economically backward. As the matter will involve consultation with the State Governments, it is likely to take considerable time. It may not be appropriate to keep the matter pending for a long time

In view of the above, the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs is requested to move the Committee on Government Assurances to kindly consider for dropping of the assurance.”

1.5 The Committee note that the reply given to Unstarred Question No.3078 on March 16, 1999 shows that the Government were considering a proposal to identify more minority concentration areas which are educationally and economically backward in the country. Even after a period of four years of giving an assurance that the matter is under consideration of the Government, the latter have not been able to fulfil it. The Ministry of Social Justice and Empowerment have reasoned that the matter involves consultation with the State Governments and that it would take considerable time in fulfilling the assurance. In their opinion, therefore, it may not be appropriate to keep the matter pending for a long time but to drop the assurance. The Committee, however, decided not to drop the assurance at their sitting held on June 28, 2002.

1.6 The Committee note that earlier in 1987, 41 districts were identified as Minority concentration Districts (MCDs) based on the population of minorities as per 1971 census. Later on, as per the decision taken in 1994 by the Committee of Secretaries to identify the MCDs afresh based on poverty and backwardness in addition to population of minorities, the matter was referred by the Government to the National Commission for Minorities (NCM). The Committee also note that the NCM suggested for inclusion of 137 districts in ‘A’ category and 84 districts in ‘B’ category with which the Government, however, did not agree. As such they referred back the matter to the NCM to review and suggest a list of MCDs based on the incidence of poverty and social backwardness. To prove their point that NCM has

suggested a large number of MCDs, the Ministry of Social Justice & Empowerment have made mention of several schemes/programmes being implemented by various Ministries/Departments, the Central Wakf Council; the National Minorities Development and Finance Corporation etc. engaged in eradicating poverty and backwardness amongst the minorities. But in the absence of any mode of identification adopted by the NCM it is difficult for the Committee to comment on their findings. As the NCM is a Commission constituted for the welfare of the minority communities, it is perhaps possible that they exactly know about the districts where the concentration of minority population are backward and poverty stricken despite implementation of various schemes/programmes by the Ministries/Departments of Government, the Wakf Council, the National Minorities Development and Financial Corporation, etc. Since the matter has already been referred back to NCM, the Committee, therefore, recommend that the Ministry of Social Justice & Empowerment should obtain the suggestion/opinion of NCM with regard to the query raised by them at the earliest. In the meanwhile, the Committee would also like the Ministry of Social Justice & Empowerment to find out for themselves the extent to which the schemes/programmes being implemented by the different Ministries/Departments of the Government as also by Central Wakf Council and other agencies have actually benefited the minority communities in different parts of the country. They would also like the Government to keep data of such findings so that these could be handy while deciding the MCDs. The Committee may also be apprised about the progress made in regard to action taken so far by the NCM in identifying the Minority Concentration Districts (MCDs).

(ii) PENSION TO UNORGANISED SECTOR

1.7 On March 1, 2000, S/Shri Akbor Ali Khandoker and M.V.V.S. Murthi, MPs addressed the following Starred Question No.100 to the Minister of Social Justice & Empowerment:-

- “(a) whether the attention of the Government has been drawn to the news-item captioned, ‘Parallel Pension Scheme for unorganised sector mooted’ appearing in Economic Times dated January 18, 2000;**
- (b) if so, the facts of the matter reported therein;**
- (c) the other recommendations made by the Dave Committee and Government’s reaction thereon; and**
- (d) the time by which all the recommendations are likely to come into force?”**

1.8 In reply, the then Minister of State of the Ministry of Social Justice and Empowerment (Shrimati Maneka Gandhi) stated as follows:-

- “(a): Yes, Sir.**

(b) & (c): The Ministry of Social Justice & Empowerment commissioned a national project for Old Age Social and Income Security (OASIS) and nominated an 8 member Expert committee to examine policy questions connected with old age income security in India and submit its recommendations to the Government. The need for such a study was felt on account of the increasing number of aged and the fact that the formal system of old age pension and security covered only about 11% of the working population.

The Committee submitted its final report to the Government on 11.1.2000. The Report recommends the measures, which can help every worker to build up enough savings during his/her working life which could serve as a shield against poverty during their old age. The recommendations have a twin focus of further improving existing pension provisions and to devise a fresh pension plan for excluded workers. These recommendations of the report are being examined by the Government.

(d): The recommendations are presently under active consideration of Government and it is difficult to indicate a time frame”

1.9 Reply given at parts (b), (c) and (d) was treated as an assurance and was required to be implemented by the Ministry of Social Justice and Empowerment within three months of the date of reply i.e. May 31, 2000.

1.10 The Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs *vide* their UO. No. III/S.J.E.(1)SQ 100Lok Sabha/2000 dated July 10, 2001 had forwarded a request of the Ministry of Social Justice & Empowerment for dropping of the assurance on the following grounds:-

“The Ministry had appointed an Expert Committee under the Chairmanship of Dr. S.A. Dave, former chairman of UTI to examine the policy questions connected with Old Age Income Security in India and submit its recommendations to the Government. The Committee has submitted its final report to this Ministry on 11.1.2000. The report has been sent to various Ministries/Departments to examine the feasibility of implementation of all or part of it. While Ministry of Labour has not accepted some of the recommendations, response from some Ministries is still awaited. Since it is a policy matter and it is difficult to give any time frame for the implementation or otherwise of all or some of the recommendations contained in the Report, it was inter-alia stated in reply to parts (b) & (d) of the question that these recommendations of the report are being examined by the Government and to part (d) that “the recommendations are presently under active consideration of Government and it is difficult to indicate a time frame. This Ministry considered that answer complete. But, the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs have treated it as an

Assurance.

Based on the above facts, this Ministry feels that reply to parts (b), (c) & (d) of the question do not constitute an Assurance but reflects the factual position. This Ministry is still not in position to give any time frame for implementation of the recommendations nor will it be possible to do so in the near future. The implementation of the report requires long term continuing action at various levels by different organizations. In view of this, it is requested that the Committee on Government Assurances (Lok Sabha) may kindly be moved for deletion of the Assurance.”

1.11 On March 01, 2000 a question was asked to know the facts with regard to parallel pension schemes for unorganized sector, the recommendations made by the Dave Committee in this regard and the reaction of the Government thereto. In this connection, the Committee are informed that the Ministry of Social Justice & Empowerment had commenced a national project for Old Age Social and Income Security (OASIS) and for that purpose, an 8 Member Expert Committee under the Chairmanship of Dr. S.A. Dave, former Chairman of UTI was appointed to examine the policy questions connected with Old Age Income Security in India and to submit its recommendations to the Government. The need for such a study was felt by the Government on account of the increasing number of aged and due to the fact that the formal system of Old Age Pension and security covered only about 11% of the working population. The Dave Committee had submitted its final report to the Government on January 11, 2000 and the same were being examined by the Government.

1.12 Whereas, the Ministry of Social Justice & Empowerment have made a request to treat the reply given at parts (b), (c) & (d) as complete, the Committee feel that the reply given is incomplete in as much as the reaction of the Government has not been made known to them. It is clear from the reply given to the question that the Government have not formed any opinion or have not taken any decision on the recommendations made by the Dave Committee and they were still in the process of compiling the feasibility report from different Ministries/Departments to decide whether the recommendations have to be accepted or to be rejected. Under such circumstances, the Committee decided not to accede to the request of the Ministry of Social Justice & Empowerment to delete it from the list of assurances at their sitting held on June 28, 2002.

1.13 The Committee note with concern that the Ministry of Social Justice & Empowerment do not seem to have made much progress in examining the recommendations of the Dave Committee which submitted its final report on January 11, 2000 due to which an important issue of providing Old Age Income Security to the workers has been stalled. They are perturbed that the Ministry of Social Justice & Empowerment have still not been able to get feedback from various Ministries/Departments on the recommendations *ibid* although more than three years have passed. The Committee, therefore, strongly recommend that the matter

should be vigorously pursued with various Ministries/Departments since it involves an important policy matter for the social security for aged. Apart from this, the matter requires an immediate urgent action keeping in view of the fact that the present system of old age pension and security has covered only a miniscule of the working population and there is need to extend the security cover beyond 11% of the working population who are yet to be covered. The Committee may also be informed about the present position in this regard.

(iii) DISSOLUTION OF IMDT ACT

1.14 On April 18, 2000, Shri Abdul Hamid, MP addressed the following Unstarred Question No.3800 to the Minister of Home Affairs:-

“(a) whether the Government of Assam has urged the Union government regarding the dissolution of the Illegal Migrants (Determination by Tribunals) Act, 1983 (IMDT Act 1983) prevailing in the State;

(b) if so, the details thereof; and

(c) the reaction of the Government thereto?”

1.15 In reply, the Minister of State in the Ministry of Home Affairs (Shri I.D. Swami) stated as follows:-

“(a) to (b) : The Government of Assam have recommended to the Government of India to repeal the IM (DT) Act, 1983.

(c): The repeal of IM(DT) Act, 1983 is under consideration of the Government.”

1.16 Reply at part (c) of the question was treated as an assurance and was required to be fulfilled by the Ministry of Home Affairs within three months of the date of reply i.e. July 17, 2000.

1.17 The Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs vide their UO No. XIII-III/Home (24) USQ 3800-Lok Sabha/2000 dated October 31, 2001 forwarded a request for dropping of the assurance on the following grounds:-

“The previous Government of Assam had recommended to the Central Government to repeal the Illegal Migrants (Determination by Tribunals) Act, 1983 (IMDT Act, 1983). However, the present Government of Assam is not in favour of withdrawing the IMDT Act, 1983.

Public interest litigations, challenging the constitutional validity of the IMDT Act, 1983 and another opposing the repeal of the IMDT Act,

1983 are pending before the Hon. Supreme Court of India. The final decision of the Hon. Supreme Court in the matter may take a long time. The matter is subjudice, therefore, it is beyond the control of the Ministry to fulfill the assurance.

The above facts may kindly be placed before the Committee on Government Assurances, Lok Sabha for dropping the Assurance.”

1.18 The Committee note that on April 18, 2000, a question was asked whether the Government of Assam had urged the Union Government for the dissolution of the Illegal Migrants (Determination by Tribunals) Act, 1983 prevailing in that State and also sought to know the reaction of the Government thereto. In reply, it was stated that the then Government of Assam had recommended to the Union Government to repeal the IM(DT) Act and the matter was under consideration of the Government. The Committee have now been informed that the present Government of Assam are no longer in favour of withdrawing the IM(DT) Act and that public interest litigations challenging the constitutional validity of the IMDT Act, 1983 and other opposing the repeal of the IMDT Act, 1983 are pending before the Supreme Court. Under the circumstances, the Government have stated that it would take longer time to fulfil the assurance and requested to drop the assurance. The Committee, however did not accede to the request of the Ministry at their sitting held on June 28, 2002.

1.19 The Committee would like to be apprised of the details of fact which made the then Government of Assam to request the Union Government to repeal the IM(DT) Act 1983 in the first instance. They would also like to be informed about the date of receipt of another request from the present Government of Assam for not repealing the Act *ibid* along with the reasons given by them. The Committee may be informed about the present status of the public interest litigations on the subject pending in the Supreme Court and the views of the Union Government thereon.

CHAPTER – II

(i) GUJRAL COMMITTEE/ALI SARDAR JAFRI COMMITTEE REPORTS ON PROMOTION OF URDU LANGUAGE

2.1 (i) On August 26, 1991, Shri Mukul Balkrishna Wasnik, M.P addressed the following Unstarred Question No.4447 to the Minister of Human Resource Development:

“(a) whether the Gujral Committee had suggested for the formation of a permanent Committee to be headed by the Prime Minister for the promotion of Urdu language in the country;

(b) whether the Committee has further suggested for the formation of a permanent Secretariat to monitor the implementation of the Gujral Committee Report; and

(c) if so, the decision taken by the Government thereon?”

2.2 In reply, the then Minister of Human Resource Development, (Shri Arjun Singh) stated as follows:

(a) & (b): No Sir. However, the Committee to examine the implementation of recommendations of Gujral Committee for promotion of Urdu has inter-alia, made similar recommendations.

(c): The recommendations of the Committee are under consideration.”

2.3 Reply to part (c) of the question was treated as an assurance & was required to be fulfilled within three months of the date of reply i.e., November 25, 1991.

2.4 (ii) On July 21, 1992, Shri Vishwanath Pratap Singh, M.P addressed the following Unstarred Question No.2007 to the Minister of Human Resource Development:

“(a) whether the recommendations of the Ali Sardar Jafri Committee on the implementation of the Gujral Committee Report on Promotion of Urdu have been examined by the Government;

(b) If so, the details of the recommendations proposed to be implemented by the Government; and

(c) If not, the reasons for the delay?”

2.5 In reply, the then Deputy Minister in the Ministry of Human Resource Development (Department of Education and Department of Culture) (Kumari Selja) stated as follows:-

“(a) to (c) The matter is under consideration of the Government.”

2.6 The above reply to the question was treated as an assurance and was required to be fulfilled by the Ministry of Human Resource Development within three months of the date of the reply i.e. by October 20, 1992.

2.7 (iii) On August 3, 1993, Shri Syed Shahabuddin, M.P addressed the following Unstarred Question No.1269 to the Minister of Human Resource Development:

- “(a) the present status of implementation of the recommendations of the Ali Sardar Jafri Committee which was set up to review the report of the Ali Suroor Committee on the Gujral Committee’s recommendations on Urdu; and**
- (b) the particulars of the progress made during 1992-93, Ministry/Department-wise in the Union Government and State-wise?”**

2.8 The then Deputy Minister in the Ministry of Human Resource Development (Department of Education and Department of Culture), (Kumari Selja) replied as follows:-

- “(a)&(b): The recommendations of the Committee to examine implementation of recommendations of Gujral Committee for promotion of Urdu under the Chairmanship of Shri Ali Sardar Jafri are under active consideration of the Government.”**

2.9 The above reply to the question was treated as an assurance and was required to be fulfilled by the Ministry of Human Resource Development within 3 months of the date of reply i.e., November 2, 1993.

2.10 (iv) On April 26, 1994, Shri Mohammad Ali Ashraf Fatmi, M.P addressed the following Unstarred Question No.4821 to the Minister of Human Resource Development:

- “(a) the decision taken by the Government on the report submitted by the Ali Sardar Jafri Committee on propagation of Urdu language; and**
- (b) the time by which action is likely to be taken thereon?”**

2.11 In reply, the then Deputy Minister in the Ministry of Human Resource Development (Department of Education & Department of Culture) (Kumari Selja) stated as follows:

- “(a)&(b) The report of the Committee to examine the implementation of recommendations of Gujral Committee for Promotion of Urdu under the Chairmanship of Ali Sardar Jafri is under consideration of the Government.”**

2.12 The above reply to the question was treated as an assurance and was required to be fulfilled by the Ministry of Human Resource Development within three months of the date of reply i.e., July 25, 1994.

2.13 The Ministry of Human Resource Development vide their D.O. No.F.3-1/2001-D.III (L) dated March 12, 2001 forwarded a request for dropping of the assurances on the following grounds:-

“All the above assurances relate to the Gujral/Jafri Committee reports on Urdu. The Gujral Committee appointed by the Government in 1972 to suggest measures for the promotion of Urdu language submitted its report on 8th May 1975 which was placed before the Cabinet on 30th June 1979. The Cabinet decided that since most of the recommendations of the report were to be implemented by the States, their views might be ascertained and accordingly the copies of the report were sent to the State Governments. Subsequently, another Committee of Experts under the Chairmanship of Shri Ali Sardar Jafri was appointed to examine the Gujral Committee Report and assess the status of its implementation. This Committee submitted its report on 18th September 1990. The Jafri Committee broadly accepted the recommendations made by the Gujral Committee.

There are two important recommendations made in the Jafri Committee report which are indicated below:-

- (1) Urdu medium schools should be set up in areas where Urdu speaking population constitutes 10% or more; and**
- (2) Modifications in the Three Language Formula for teaching of Urdu. Different options suggested for Hindi speaking and Non-Hindi speaking states.**

The above two recommendations in particular have wide socio-political ramifications in view of the multi-lingual and multi-cultural society of our country. Implementation of most of the recommendations lies in the domain of the State Governments. Although a final view as such has not been taken so far on these reports, by and large, several recommendations have already been implemented by the State Governments as well as the Central Ministries. A gist of the recommendations implemented by the State Governments and Central Ministries/Departments are at Appendix-IV. In view of the peculiar nature of the recommendations made by the Committee, there are practical difficulties in arriving at a final view in the matter within a set time-frame.

Over a period of time, this Ministry had given six assurances to the Rajya Sabha on the Gujral/Jafri Committee reports. However, the Committee on Government Assurances (Rajya Sabha) has been kind enough to drop all these assurances since they were convinced about the practical difficulties involved in the case. The same analogy applies to the assurances pending in the Lok Sabha also. Since the issues involved in the assurances pending fulfillment in the Lok Sabha

are identical to those assurances which have now been dropped by the Rajya Sabha, I would request you to kindly place the matter before the Committee on Government Assurances (Lok Sabha) and obtain orders for dropping of the pending four assurances mentioned above.”

2.14 The Committee note that from 1991 to 1994 as many as four questions had been asked as to know the decision taken by the Government on the recommendations of the Gujral Committee Report/the Sardar Ali Jafri Committee Report on promotion of Urdu. Replies to all these four questions suggested that the matter was being considered by the Government.

2.15 The Committee note that the Gujral Committee had submitted its report in May, 1975 followed by the Sardar Ali Jafri Committee Report in September, 1990. The Committee, however, express their concern to find that even after more than two decades the Government had not been able to decide on the recommendations of these Reports. The reasons being that the two recommendations of the Jafri Committee regarding setting up of Urdu medium schools in such areas where Urdu speaking population constitutes 10% or more and modifications in the three language formula for teaching of Urdu, have wide socio-political ramifications in view of the multi-lingual and multi-cultural society of our country and that most of the recommendations have to be implemented by the State Governments. In this connection, the Committee have also been apprised that several recommendations have already been implemented by the State Governments and by the Union Government and there are practical difficulties in arriving at a final decision in a fixed time-frame.

2.16 The Committee have no doubt agreed to drop the above four assurances at their sitting held on March 19, 2002 despite the facts that the recommendations of Gujral Committee have not been fully implemented. They, however, would like the Government to make sure that the programmes initiated already are properly monitored and progressive reports in this regard are obtained periodically.

(ii) CORRUPTION CASES AGAINST IAS/IPS OFFICERS

2.17 On August 03, 1994, S/Shri Lal Babu Rai, Harikewal Prasad, Ram Tahal Choudhary, MPs addressed the following Unstarred Question No.1553 to the Prime Minister:-

- “(a) the number of IAS & IPS officers against whom cases of corruption have come to light and referred to the Ministry of Personnel during the last three years;**
- (b) the names and number of such officers against whom action has been taken; and**
- (c) the details of action taken against the officers?”**

2.18 In reply, the then Minister of State in the Ministry of Personnel, Public Grievances & Pensions (Smt.Margaret Alva) stated as follows:-

“(a), (b) & (c): For the All India Services, the authority to deal with the cases of corruption against a Member of the Service rests with the respective Government in connection with whose affairs the Member of the Service is serving for the time being. Thus, the Central Government as well as the State Governments are competent to take action against All India Services officers as the case may be. If the State Government comes to a conclusion that the officer is required to be prosecuted under the Prevention of Corruption Act, 1988 or one of the major penalties of dismissal, removal and compulsory retirement or withholding of pension of the officer is required to be imposed on the conclusion of Departmental proceedings, then only, the cases are referred to the Central Government. This information is not centrally maintained or monitored in this Department. During the last three years, the number of IAS officers allegedly involved in corruption against whom cases have been referred to the Department of Personnel & Training is 27.

Cases of corruption against IPS officers are not referred to the Department of Personnel & Training. Out of the cases referred to above, prosecution sanctions under the P.C. Act, 1947/1988 have been accorded in 6 cases. In 10 cases, RDA proceedings for major penalty have been ordered by the Central Government resulting in the imposition of various penalties in 4 cases, whereas in 2 cases minor penalty proceedings have been instituted. In 3 cases, on the advice of the Government of India, RDA proceedings for major penalty have been initiated by the State Governments concerned. 3 cases have been closed. The remaining cases are under process.”

2.19 The above reply to the question was treated as an assurance and was required to be fulfilled by the Ministry within three months of the date of the reply i.e. by November 02, 1994.

2.20 A Statement furnishing details of 6 IAS Officers against whom departmental action had been taken or criminal prosecution initiated was laid on the Table of the House on March 08, 1996 vide SS X/22.

2.21 The Ministry of Personnel & Public Grievances vide D.O. No. 14/2/94-AVD.I dated January 19, 2000 forwarded a request for dropping of the assurance on the grounds indicted below:-

“after forwarding this Department’s O.M. of even number dated 30.1.96, wherein disposal position of 6 cases (3 prosecution and 3 departmental proceedings_ was shown in the statement 6(six) more cases pertaining to disciplinary proceedings and grant of sanction for prosecution under the P.C. Act against IAS officers, have been

disposed of by this Department in the mean time. The brief details of these cases and manner of disposal, as well as the remaining two cases which are yet to be disposed of, are given in enclosed statement at Appendix-V. It will be seen from the statement and the position brought out above that out of 27 prosecution/ departmental cases mentioned in reply to the said Parliament Question, 25 have been disposed of after 3.8.1994 suggesting that substantial progress towards implementation of the said Assurance has been made.

In view of this, I shall be grateful if you could kindly place the factual position before the Committee on Government Assurances so as to enable the Committee to drop this assurance in the light of the position stated above.”

2.22 In their communication vide D.O. No. 124/2/94-AVD.I dated 14.7.2000 Department of Personnel and Training, Ministry of Personnel, Public Grievances and Pensions stated that the relevant file of the case of Shri B.M. Vohra had been submitted for obtaining orders/decision of the Competent Disciplinary Authority so as to enable them to pass final orders in that case. Regarding the case of Shri A.K. Tripathi, it had been stated vide D.O. No. 124/2/94-AVD.I dated September 26, 2000 that the views of the State Government as obtained were examined further by the Department and in their reconsidered advice the CVC advised them to initiate departmental action against the officer, instead of prosecuting him. The Government of Orissa (being the competent authority) was to be advised to initiate departmental action against Shri Tripathi.

2.23 The Committee considered the above request during their sitting held on September 29, 2000, but did not accede to the request of the Ministry. They, however, desired to have the latest position as also the action taken in disposing of each case. In their communications *vide* D.O letter No.124/2/94-AVD.I dated February 4, 2002, the Ministry of Personnel, Public Grievances & Pensions stated that the remaining one case i.e., the departmental case against Sh.B.M.Vohra has since been disposed of vide order dated 25.1.2002 and requested the Committee to drop the assurance.

2.24 A question was asked on August 03, 1994 to know about the IAS/IPS Officers against whom cases of corruption had come to light and which were referred to the Ministry of Personnel, Public Grievances & Pensions. In reply, it was *inter-alia* stated that during the period of three years, 27 cases of IAS officers who were allegedly involved in corruption cases had been referred to that Department. In this connection, the Department of Personnel, Public Grievances & Pensions furnished details of 6 cases which were laid on the Table of the House on March 08, 1996 to the Committee.

2.25 The Committee having been satisfied with the action taken in the remaining cases acceded to the request of the Department of Personnel, Public Grievances & Pensions and dropped the assurance at their sitting held on June 28, 2002. The Committee, however, like the Department of Personnel, Public Grievances &

Pensions to maintain the record of all the corruption cases of IAS Officers with them also and take prompt action against them in such cases and not to drag on the cases as they did in the cases furnished to the Committee. The Committee would also like that the list of the corrupt IAS Officers may be furnished to them.

(iii) OFFSHORE PLATFORM PROJECT OF ONGC

2.26 On May 18, 1995, Shri M.V.V.S Murthy, MP addressed the following Unstarred Question No.6284 to the Minister of Petroleum & Natural Gas:-

“(a) whether the Hindustan Shipyard has transgressed international tendering norms by awarding a contract to a high bidder for an offshore platform project of the Oil and Natural Gas Corporation;

(b) if so, the details thereof;

(c) whether any foreign company has lodged any protest;

(d) if so, the details thereof;

(e) whether the matter has been enquired in this regard; and

(f) if so, the outcome thereof?”

2.27 In reply, the then Minister of State in the Ministry of Petroleum & Natural Gas (Capt.Satish Kumar Sharma) stated as follows:-

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

2.28 The reply to the above question was treated as an assurance and was required to be fulfilled by the Ministry within three months of the date of the reply i.e. by August 17, 1995.

2.29 A statement was laid on the Table of the House on 7.12.1998 stating therein that HSL has denied to have transgressed international tendering norms in the matter of awarding contract for offshore platform project of Oil and Natural Gas Commission and after examination in the light of the information obtained from Hindustan Shipyard Limited, the matter had been entrusted on January 12, 1998 to the Central Vigilance Commission for further action. The statement, however, was not treated as implemented of the assurance as the matter was still being looked into by CVC.

2.30 The Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs vide their U.O. Note No.XIII/ST(7) USQ-6284-LS/95 dated 9.7.99 had forwarded a request of the Ministry of Surface Transport for dropping of the assurance on the grounds indicated below:-

“with the approval of Minister (SFT), we have sent the complete and full and final implementation report in respect of assurance in question. As regards part (e) and (f) of the question, it is further clarified that the matter was enquired into in this Ministry in consultation with the Vigilance Section of this Ministry and as a result thereof, a decision was taken to entrust it to CVC for further action.

In view of the facts stated above, I shall be grateful if you could kindly have the matter placed before the Committee on Government Assurances so as to consider to treat the implementation report as full and final. This issues with the approval of Minister of State (SFT).”

2.31 The request of the Ministry of Surface Transport (now Ministry of Shipping) was considered by the Committee at their sitting held on September 29, 2000. The Committee, however, did not accede with the request of the Ministry.

2.32 The Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs *vide* their U.O. Note No.XIII/Shipping(7)USQ6284-LS/95 dated 19th September, 2001 again forwarded the request of the Ministry of Shipping for dropping of the assurance on the following grounds:-

“Central Vigilance Commission (CVC) had recommended for closure of the case and accordingly, this Ministry as per CVC’s advice has closed the case. It is requested that Committee on Government Assurances (Lok Sabha) may be requested to drop the Assurance/treat the Implementation Report already sent as full and final.”

2.33 The Committee note that an assurance was given on May 18, 1995 to collect and lay the information on the Table of the House when a question was asked to know the details whether Hindustan Shipyard had transgressed international tendering norms for awarding a contract for an offshore platform project of ONGC. The Committee are concerned to note that the Ministry of Shipping took more than 3 years just to inform them that the Hindustan Shipyard Limited had denied to have transgressed international tendering norms in the matter of awarding contract for offshore platform project of ONGC. It is surprising to note that on the one hand the Ministry have stated that Hindustan Shipyard Limited (HSL) had denied to have transgressed international tendering norms in the matter of awarding contract for Offshore Platform Project of Oil & Natural Gas Commission and, on the other, in the light of the information obtained from HSL, the Ministry had entrusted the matter to the Central Vigilance Commission for further action on 12.01.1998. The basis on which the matter had to be referred to CVC for further action needs to be explained to them. Failure of the Ministry to apprise the Committee of the full facts clearly shows that they have concealed vital information from the Committee to evade its responsibility. Otherwise when HSL had not transgressed international tendering norms in the awarding of contract of offshore platform project then why the matter was entrusted to CVC for further action. The Committee, therefore,

desire that complete and correct information should be furnished to them in this case and it should be ensured that such things do not recur. They, however, decided to drop the assurance at their sitting held on June 28, 2002.

(iv) SARKARIA COMMISSION

2.34 On August 1, 2000, Shri Braj Mohan Ram, MP addressed the following Unstarred Question No.1493 to the Minister of Home Affairs:-

- “(a) whether the Government have accepted the recommendations made by the Sarkaria Commission;**
- (b) if so, the details thereof;**
- (c) the decision taken by the Government on the remaining recommendations of the Commission; and**
- (d) the time by which the remaining recommendations are likely to be accepted?”**

2.35 In reply, the Minister of State in the Ministry of Home Affairs (Shri I.D. Swami) stated as follows:-

“(a) & (b) : The Sarkaria Commission in its report on Centre-State Relations has made 247 recommendations. Out of 247 recommendations, the Inter-State Council has taken a view on 171 recommendations. 160 of these recommendations have been accepted by the Inter-State Council as such or with some modifications. 11 recommendations have been rejected. These recommendations relate to Centre State financial relations, Inter-State river water dispute, forests, industries, agriculture, etc.

(c) & (d) : The remaining 76 recommendations of the Sarkaria Commission are to be placed before the Standing Committee/Inter-State Council in the next meeting(s) for deliberations.”

2.36 Reply to Parts (c) & (d) of the question was treated as an assurance and was required to be fulfilled by the Ministry of Home Affairs within three months of the date of reply i.e. October 30, 2000.

2.37 The Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs vide their OM No. XIII-IV/Home(26)USQ 1493-Lok Sabha/2000 dated July 4, 2001 forwarded a request for dropping of the assurance on the following grounds:-

“The Inter-State Council has hitherto been mainly considering the recommendations of the Sarkaria Commission on Centre-State Relations. The Inter-State Council so far held six meetings and taken decision on 171 out of 247 recommendations of the Sarkaria Commission. 92 out of 171 recommendations have been implemented,

64 recommendations are under various stages of implementation and 15 recommendations have been rejected. Of the remaining 76 recommendations on which decisions are required to be taken by the Inter-State Council, the Standing Committee of the Inter State Council has taken decision on 59 recommendations. 17 of the remaining recommendations have been referred by the Standing Committee to a Sub-Committee of the Standing Committee. The report of the Sub-Committee will then be placed before the Standing Committee and then before the Inter-State Council for final decision.

It may be informed in this connection that the Inter-State Council is a body of which Chief Ministers of all States are members. Examination of the recommendations of the Sarkaria Commission by the Inter-State Council is an ongoing process and no time-frame can be fixed for completion of the examination of the recommendations.

The Ministry of Home Affairs, is, therefore, of view that reply given with reference to part (c) and (d) of the Lok Sabha Question No. 1493 dated 1.8.2000 may not be treated an assurance.”

2.38 The Committee note that a question was asked on August 01, 2000 about the recommendations made by Sarkaria Commission on Centre-State Relations and the decision taken by the Government on those recommendations. In reply, it was stated that out of 247 recommendations made, the Inter-State Council had taken a view on 171 recommendations and the remaining 76 recommendations of the Sarkaria Commission were to be placed before the Inter-State Council for deliberations. It had further been elaborated that out of 171 recommendations considered by the Inter-State Council only 160 recommendations had been accepted and 11 were rejected.

2.39 The Committee considered the request of the Ministry of Home Affairs at their sitting held on June 28, 2002 and acceded to their request to drop the assurance. The Committee note that the request sent for dropping of the assurance to the Committee mentions categorically that out of 171 recommendations considered by the Inter-State Council, 92 recommendations of Sarkaria Commission are being implemented, 64 recommendations are under various stages of implementation and that 15 recommendations have been rejected whereas as per the reply given to the House on August 01, 2000, it was *inter-alia* stated that out of

171 recommendations which were considered by the Inter-State Council 11 recommendations had been rejected. The Committee, therefore, like the Government to clarify as to how the number of recommendations which had been rejected by the Inter-State Council has increased from 11 to 15. They may also be apprised of the progress made in examining the remaining recommendations by the Inter-State Council.

NEW DELHI;
July 21, 2003

DR. S. VENUGOPAL
Chairman
Committee on Government Assurances

MINUTES
SECOND SITTING

Minutes of the Second sitting of the Committee on Government Assurances held on March 19, 2002 in Chairman's Room No.133, First Floor, Parliament House Annexe, New Delhi.

The Committee met from 1300 hours to 1530 hours on Tuesday, March 19, 2002.

PRESENT

Dr. S. Venugopal

-

Chairman

MEMBERS

2. Adv. Uttamrao Dhikale
3. Shri Kishan Singh Sangwan
4. Shri Raghuraj Singh Shakya
5. Shri Bahadur Singh
6. Shri Tarlochan Singh Tur

SECRETARIAT

1. Shri A.K. Singh, Deputy Secretary
2. Ms. J.C. Namchyo, Assistant Director

XX	XX	XX	XX	XX	XX
XX	XX	XX	XX	XX	XX

The Committee also considered the following Memoranda regarding dropping of assurances:-

Memorandum No.01

Request for dropping of assurances given on August 26, 1991, July 21, 1992, August 03, 1993 and April 26, 1994 to Unstarred Question Nos.4447, 2007, 1269 & 4821 regarding Promotion of Urdu.

The Committee considered the above mentioned Memorandum. The Committee agreed to the request of the Ministry of Human Resource Development to drop the above assurances.

Memorandum No.02

Request for dropping of assurance given on June 02, 1998 in reply to SQ No.82 regarding National Family Welfare Programme.

The Committee took up the above Memorandum for consideration. The Committee acceded to the request of the Ministry of Health and Family Welfare for dropping the above assurance.

Memorandum No.03

Request for dropping of assurances given on November 22, 1996 and December 11, 1998 in reply to SQ/USQ Nos.42 & 2261 regarding Scheme for Scientists of Commodity Board.

The Committee considered the request of the Ministry of Commerce and decided that the above matter pertains to policy matter and decided to call for representatives to take Oral Evidence.

Memorandum No.04

Request for dropping of assurance given on November 28, 2000 in reply to SQ No.132 regarding Rehabilitation of Kashmiri Migrants.

The Committee considered the above mentioned Memorandum. The Committee felt that since the matter under consideration pertains to an important subject matter they decided to call for Oral Evidence.

Memorandum No.05

Request for dropping of assurance given on December 07, 2000 in reply to USQ No.2886 regarding Compensation of Farmers for their land in Pune.

The Committee considered the above mentioned Memorandum. The Committee did not agree to the request of the Ministry of Defence for dropping the above assurance.

The Committee then adjourned.

MINUTES
FOURTH SITTING

Minutes of the Fourth sitting of the Committee on Government Assurances held on June 28, 2002 in Committee Room No.139, First Floor, Parliament House Annexe, New Delhi.

The Committee met from 1500 hours to 1540 hours on Tuesday, June 28, 2002.

PRESENT

Shri E. Ahamed - in the Chair

MEMBERS

2. Adv. Uttamrao Dhikale
3. Shri Brahma Nand Mandal
4. Shri Ramjee Manjee
1. Shri Sudarsana E.M. Natchiappan
6. Shri Kishan Singh Sangwan
7. Shri Raghuraj Singh Shakya
8. Shri Tarlochan Singh Tur

SECRETARIAT

1. Shri R.C. Gupta - Director
2. Ms. J.C. Namchyo - Assistant Director

In the absence of the Chairman (Dr. S. Venugopal), Shri E. Ahamed, MP was chosen to Chair the sitting of the Committee in terms of Rule 258(3) of the Rules of Procedure & Conduct of Business in Lok Sabha.

The Committee then took up the following Memoranda for dropping of the assurances in pursuance of the request received from different Ministries.

Memorandum No.06 Request for dropping of assurance given on August 03, 1994, in reply to USQ No. 1553 regarding Corruption cases against IAS/IPS Officers.

The Committee considered the above mentioned Memorandum. The Committee agreed to the request of the Ministry of Personnel, Public Grievances & Pensions to drop the above assurance.

Memorandum No.07 Request for dropping of assurance given on May 18, 1995 in reply to USQ No.6284 regarding Contract for Offshore Platform Project of ONGC.

The Committee took up the above Memorandum for consideration. The Committee acceded to the request of the Ministry of Petroleum & Natural Gas for dropping the above assurance.

Memorandum No.08 Request for dropping of assurance given on March 16, 1999 in reply to USQ No.3078 regarding Identification of Minority Concentration.

The Committee considered the request of the Ministry of Social Justice & Empowerment and were not in favour of dropping the assurance since they were not convinced by the reason forwarded by the Ministry for dropping of the assurance that it may not be appropriate to keep the matter pending for a long time.

Memorandum No.09 Request for dropping of assurance given on March 1, 2000 in reply to SQ No.100 regarding Pension of unorganised sector.

The Committee considered the above mentioned Memorandum. They were not convinced by the reasons forwarded by the Ministry and accordingly decided not to drop the assurance.

Memorandum No.10 Request for dropping of assurance given on April 18, 2000 in reply to USQ No.3800 regarding Dissolution of IMDT Act.

The Committee considered the above mentioned Memorandum and they were not convinced by the reasons advanced by the Ministry for dropping of the assurance. It was therefore decided not to accept the request of the Ministry.

Memorandum No.11 Request for dropping of assurance given on April 25, 2000 in reply to USQ No.4733 regarding Homoeopathy Pharmacy.

The Committee considered the request of the Ministry of Health and Family Welfare and were not at all convinced by the reasons advanced by the Ministry for dropping of the assurance and instead decided to call for representatives of the Ministry of the Health & Family Welfare to give Oral Evidence on the assurance.

Memorandum No.12 Request for dropping of assurance given on August 1, 2000 in reply to USQ No.1493 regarding Sarkaria Commission.

The Committee considered the above-mentioned Memorandum. The Committee decided to drop the assurance.

The Committee decided to hold the next sitting of the Committee on Government Assurances on July 8, 2002.

The Committee then adjourned.

MINUTES
FOURTH SITTING

Minutes of the Fourth Sitting of the Committee on Government Assurances held on May 23, 2003 at 1200 hours in Committee Room 'E', Basement, Parliament House Annexe, New Delhi.

The Committee met from 1200 hours to 1300 hours on Friday, May 23, 2003.

PRESENT

Dr. S. Venugopal - Chairman

MEMBERS

2. Shri Adhi Sankar
3. Shri E.Ahamed
4. Shri Ramakant Angle
5. Shri Padam Sen Choudhary
6. Shri Priya Ranjan Dasmunsi
7. Adv. Uttamrao Dhikale
8. Shri E.M. Sudarsana Natchiappan
9. Shri Dharam Raj Singh Patel
10. Shrimati Renu Kumari
11. Shri Kishan Singh Sangwan
12. Rajkumari Ratna Singh
13. Shri Tarlochan Singh Tur

SECRETARIAT

1. Shri S.K. Sharma - Joint Secretary
2. Shri R.C. Gupta - Director
3. Ms. J.C. Namchyo - Under Secretary

At the outset, the Committee considered and adopted the draft 13th Report of the Committee regarding dropping of assurances by adding the following sentence at the end of paragraph No.2.25 at page No.28 of the Report:-

“The Committee would also like that the list of the corrupt IAS Officers may be furnished to them.”

The Committee also authorized the Chairman to present the Report in the ensuing Monsoon Session.

XX XX XX XX XX XX
XX XX XX XX XX XX

The Committee then adjourned.

GUJRAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS
COMMENTS OF STATE GOVERNMENTS

Sl No	Name of State/UT	Comments
(1)	(2)	(3)
1.	Haryana	Urdu speaking population is only 4.63%. Under Three Languages Formula students can opt Urdu in classes 6 th to 8 th . Arrangements for teaching Urdu as an additional language in Primary classes are made provided there are four students in a class or 15 students in a school. A Government elementary teachers training institute is functioning at Gurgaon where 125 seats are reserved for Diploma in Education (Urdu). 100 additional posts of JBT(Urdu) teachers sanctioned for teaching of Urdu at primary level in the Mewat Region. The State has set up an Urdu academy.
2.	Punjab	Urdu speaking population is only 0.19% of the total population of Punjab. Hence most of the recommendations of Gujral Committee are not relevant to this State. However, facilities are provided for teaching Urdu in areas having concentration of Urdu speaking people like Malerkotla. Urdu is taught as a subject in Government high schools. The State Language Department is running free Urdu classes at all the District headquarters. Separate Urdu section provided in the State and University Library.
3.	Goa	Urdu speaking population is only 5.25% of the total population of Goa. All the needs i.e. educational as well as socio-economic of the Urdu speaking community, are well attended in Goa. The Government has so far opened 28 Urdu primary schools. There are 5 private aided Urdu primary schools. Total enrolment is 2056 students. About 200 students receiving education through Urdu medium in standard 5 to 7. 4 high schools imparting instructions exclusively in Urdu. 900 students are receiving education in these schools.
4.	Kerala	The recommendations of Gujral-Jafri Committee are not applicable to Kerala since Urdu speaking people do not come under the Microscopic Linguistic Minority Group.
5.	Dadra & Nagar Haveli	Urdu speaking population negligible – not application in this UT.
6.	Sikkim	Very few Urdu speaking population.
7.	Nagaland	No Comments.
8.	Mizoram	Not practical to adopt Urdu. Not necessary to implement the Gujral Committee recommendations
9.	Assam	Not relevant.
10.	Lakshadweep	Not relevant.
11.	Himachal Pradesh	Urdu speaking population too less. However, Urdu is taught under the three Language Formula in the 9 th and 10 th Classes in 148 schools. 400 teachers have been trained in teaching Urdu at this level.
12.	UT of Chandigarh	Urdu speaking population too less.
13.	Madhya Pradesh	Steps being taken to implement the Gujral/Jafri Committee Reports. Due importance given to Urdu teaching. Urdu teachers appointed in schools. During 1995-96, 1100 posts of Assistant Urdu teachers created. Urdu text books are made available to the students well of time. Urdu Text Books provided free of cost to students of weaker sections.
14.	Delhi	Steps already taken and more being taken to implement the Gujral Committee Report. Urdu academy established in 1981. 80 Urdu medium primary schools run by MCD and 11 Urdu medium primary and 3 Urdu medium middle schools run by NDMC. Directorate of Education has opened 21 Government Urdu medium schools at the Secondary stage. There are 9 Government senior secondary schools in Delhi having concentration of Urdu speakers. Books are given free of cost to the Primary class students in Urdu medium schools run by MCD. SCERT organises in-service training

programme for Urdu teachers. Urdu cell exists in the Government of N.C.T. of Delhi.

15 Andhra Pradesh

200 Urdu medium primary schools established in Urdu minority concentration Districts. 300 teacher posts created exclusively for Urdu medium schools during 1996-97. The following are the statistics pertaining to exclusively Urdu Medium schools and parallel Urdu sections in the schools of other media:-

Category	Urdu Medium Schools	
	Complete	Parallel
Primary Schools	1042	135
Upper primary Schools	119	54
High Schools	81	122

Urdu medium text books printed and distributed well in time. Urdu translation cell set up in General Administrative Department. Urdu Academy established in the State.

16 Tamil Nadu

There are 2 Urdu Teachers Training in the State. The following are the details regarding number of Urdu schools in Tamil Nadu, teachers and enrolment of children as on 30.09.1996:

Number of Urdu Primary & Middle Schools
Number of Students
Number of Teachers

17 Meghalaya

Urdu treated as a M.I.L. But it is a non-teaching subject in view of the small number of candidates.

18 Daman & Diu

Urdu speaking population is very less and there are no grievances. Gujral Committee recommendations not applicable.

19 Bihar

Adequate provision exists for Urdu teaching. An Urdu teacher provided wherever more than 10 students want to learn Urdu.

20 Jammu & Kashmir

Urdu is the official language of the State and is widely used in educational and administrative matters. Much of the work in Revenue Department and Courts upto District level is done in Urdu. Urdu is taught from 1st to 8th to the students who opt for the same. The medium of instruction in Urdu speaking areas is Urdu. All text books are available in Urdu. Urdu is available as an optional subject upto University level.

21 Uttar Pradesh

In the Primary and upper Primary schools run by U.P. Basic Education Council, provision exists for appointment of Urdu teachers wherever there are more than 5 students whose mother tongue is Urdu.

Minority dominated (more than 10%) areas have been identified and schools established. 11,388 Urdu teachers appointed so far in areas with less than 10% minority population also.

Three Language formula being followed in the State in which students have an option to choose Urdu.

Facilities exist for training of Urdu teachers.

APPENDIX - V

CONFIDENTIAL

STATEMENT SHOWING THE DISPOSAL POSITION/STATUS OF THE DEPARTMENTAL CASES CRIMINAL PROCEEDINGS INITIATED BY THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT AGAINST IAS OFFICERS DURING THE RELEVANT PERIOD

LOK SABHA UNSTARRED QUESTION NO.1553 DATED 03.08.1994

(A) DEPARTMENTAL PROCEEDINGS FOR MAJOR/MINOR PENALTIES -
CASES IN WHICH THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT IS THE COMPETENT AUTHORITY

Sl No	Name of Officer/Cadre S/Shri	Allegations/Charges	Action taken against the Officer/Disposal position	Remarks
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
1.	S.S. Jamwal, IAS (MH:68) (Retd)	Charge sheeted by the Central Government on 27.07.92 on the charges of contravention of provisions of AIS (Conduct) Rules, 1968 by not intimating the transactions to the prescribed authority.	Based on the findings of the I.O. and the evidence on record, the Central Government imposed on him a penalty of 10% cut in the monthly pension <i>vide</i> Order No.107/4/91-AVD.I Dated 23.12.1997.	This was one of the 10 major penalty proceedings cases as mentioned in reply to Question against part (b) & (c).
2.	B.M. Vohra, IAS (UP:68) (F.No.106/1/93-	Irregularities committed in the import of Black-Matpe by placing orders	The Officer was charge sheeted in this case by the Central Government	This was one of the 10 cases wherein RDA

	AVD.I)	on a private firm at exorbitant rates without inviting tenders when the Officer was holding addl. Charge of the post of MD, NCCF.	as during the relevant period he was functioning as Joint Secretary, on Central deputation. The Disciplinary Authority, in the light of finds of I.O. and the evidence on record and in consultation with UPSC has taken a tentative view to impose upon him one of the penalties prescribed in Rule 6 of the AIS(D&A) Rules, 1969. However, final orders in this regard are yet to be issued.	proceedings for major penalty were ordered by the Central Government.
3.	A.K. Mitra, IAS (WB) (Retd)	Charge sheeted by the State Government on the allegations of committing irregularities/lapses in the matter of repair/renovation of Modern Villa, Darjeeling in disregard of the provisions of the delegation of West Bengal Financial Powers Rules, 1977 while the Officer was working as Additional DC, Darjeeling from 26.08.1981 to 10.12.1983.	During the pendency of proceedings, the Officer had retired on superannuation and hence the case was processed by the Central Government in terms of Rule 6 (i) of the AIS (DCRB) Rules, 1958. based on the findings of the I.O., recommendations of the State Government and in the light of the advice of UPSC, a penalty of withholding of 20% monthly pension of the Officer was imposed on him <i>vide</i> DOPT's Order No.106/6/93-AVD.I dated 21.11.96.	This was one of the major penalty cases as mentioned in reply to the Question against part (b) & (c).
4.	P.P. Williams, IAS (AP: 66)	While functioning as Chairman, Tobacco Board in 1987, the Officer showed undue favour to a few private firms by selecting them through quotations rather than adopting established procedure of tendering.	The Officer was charge sheeted by the Central Government since he had committed the misconduct while functioning on Central deputation. The charges were held as substantially proved by the I.O. <i>vide</i> his report dated 04.10.1996. The Central Government in	This was one of the 10 cases wherein RDA proceedings for major penalty were ordered by the Central Government.

			the light of findings of I.O. and the evidence on record, in consultation with UPSC imposed on the Officer a penalty of 'Censure' <i>vide</i> Order No.104/55/92-AVD.I dated 05.05.1999.	
5.	S.K. Nanda, IAS (HY:76)	Charge sheeted by the Central Government for minor penalty proceedings on the charges of soliciting contributions from a few organisations while functioning as PS to then Union Health Minister in March, 1990. The other charge against the Officer was that he hold the Office of President of Haryana Sports Acrobatics Association, without obtaining permission of the Competent Authority.	On conclusion of the disciplinary proceedings, the case resulted in imposition of a minor penalty of Censure on the Officer <i>vide</i> DOPT's Order No.106/11/92-AVD.I dated 01.07.1996	

(B) PROSECUTION PROPOSALS UNDER THE P.C. ACT AGAINST IAS OFFICERS RECEIVED FROM THE CBI/STATE GOVERNMENTS DURING THE RELEVANT PERIOD

Sl No	Name of Officer/Cadre S/Shri	Allegations/Charges	Action taken against the Officer/Disposal position	Remarks
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
1.	B.R. Bajaj, IAS (PB:70) (F.No.107/4/86-AVD.I)	Abuse of Official position inasmuch as the Officer, while functioning as Finance Secretary, UT Admn., Chandigarh had conferred pecuniary advantage on a private party while granting contract for lottery and thereby	The Competent Authority in the light of facts and circumstances of the case, came to the conclusion that a prima facie case had been made out against him by the CBI. Accordingly, sanction for prosecution against	Pursuant to sanctioning of prosecution of the accused Officer by the Competent Authority, the CBI filed a charge sheet against him in the Court of Law, Presently, the Trial proceedings are going on.

		cheated Indian Council of Child Welfare, Chandigarh Branch.	Shri Bajaj under the P.C. Act as well as under Section 197 of Cr.P.C. by the Central Government was accorded <u>vide</u> Order No.107/4/86-AVD.I dated 29.04.1998.	
2.	D.C. Sankhla, IAS (AGMUT:69) (F.107/1/94-AVD.I)	Acquisition of assets disproportionate to the known sources of income.	The Competent Authority, in the light of facts and circumstances of the case, came to the conclusion that a prima-facie case had been made out against him by the CBI. Accordingly, sanction for prosecution against him under the P.C. Act was accorded by the Central Government <u>vide</u> Order No.107/1/94-AVD.I dated 18.10.1996.	-do-
3.	A.K. Tripathy, IAS (OR: 81) (F.No.107/9/92-AVD.I)	Acquisition of assets disproportionate to the known sources of income.	As given against column No.5 of the statement.	When the proposal under reference was being examined by the Central Government, the State Government based on the legal advice withdrew its recommendations and decided to close the case against him. However, the Central Government in the light of the facts and circumstances of the case and after consulting CVC has made a reference to the State Government in August 1999 for reconsideration of its decision, in the light of observations made

				therein. The reconsidered decision/recommendation of the State Government is awaited.*
--	--	--	--	--

* Vide D.No.124/2/94-AVD-I dated 26.09.2000 the views of the State Government (wherein the earlier decision was aciterated) were received subsequently. The case was examined further in this Department, and in their reconsidered advice the CVC has advised to initiate departmental action the Officer, instead of prosecuting him. The Government of Orissa (being competent authority) is to be advised shortly to initiate departmental action against Shri Tripathy.

RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE GUJRAL COMMITTEE

IMPLEMENTED BY CENTRAL MINISTRIES

1. Bureau for Promotion for Urdu has been converted into National Council for Promotion of Urdu Language (NCPUL), an autonomous body.
2. Facilities provided for promoting research and training of Urdu teachers through Central Institute of Indian Languages, Mysore.
3. NCERT has brought out Urdu text books.
4. Calligraphy Training Centres are being assisted by NCPUL. To promote Urdu reference and research work, NCPUL has brought out the three volumes of a 10 volume Urdu encyclopedia.
5. Urdu manuscripts and books are being published by NCPUL. Two volumes of Urdu-English Dictionary published.
6. Award for creative writing in Urdu is given by Sahitya Academy every year.
7. Urdu version of Constitution of India has been brought out.
8. Electoral rolls are being prepared in Urdu in certain constituencies.
9. Several programmes in Urdu are being broadcast in the National Channel of All-India Radio.
10. Daily Urdu news Bulletin is being telecast on Doodardarshan.

11. Time Tables of Northern Railways and North Eastern Railways printed in Urdu.
12. Census forms and other papers printed in Urdu in J&K and Delhi.
13. Name boards of post offices prepared in Urdu in certain areas like Hyderabad. Letter forms etc. written in Urdu are accepted.
14. Monthly Journal "Yojana" is published in 13 languages including Urdu. "Aajkal" a library magazine in Urdu is published monthly besides Urdu version of "Rozgar Samachar" weekly. Films made by Films Division dubbed in Urdu also.
15. Urdu Unit established at the headquarters and regional offices of the Press Information Bureau.
16. Maulana Azad National Urdu University has been established at Hyderabad.