

rehabilitation of the displaced persons. We have not got an overall survey of how much cultivable land is available.

Shri Chintamani Panigrahi: May I know whether Government are aware of the fact that the local Adibasis who are displaced have not so far been allotted even one per cent of the land which has been reclaimed so far in Dandakaranya?

Shri P. S. Naskar: That is not a fact. It is the policy of the Dandakaranya authorities that 25 per cent. of the reclaimed land will be handed over to the State Government to be given to the Adibasis. The actual distribution of the land to the Adibasis has been left to the State Government. So far as I remember, the lands that have been released in a certain portion of Pharasgaon have been distributed to the local Adibasis.

Shri Chintamani Panigrahi: They have not been distributed. Therefore, there is serious unrest among the tribals in Dandakaranya area.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Minister's information is different. He will make enquiries.

Shri Chintamani Panigrahi: The hon. Minister only said, 'I think'.

Shri P. S. Naskar: The land that has been released in Pharasgaon in Bastar district in Madhya Pradesh has been distributed to the local Adibasis.

Shri Jaganatha Rao: In Umerkote also, the land has been distributed to the Adibasis.

Public Sector

*1036. **Shri Mohan Nayak:** Will the Minister of Planning be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that an American Economist Prof. J. K. Galbraith has suggested improvements in the functioning of public sector;

(b) if so, what are his recommendations; and

(c) how far Government is going to carry them out?

The Deputy Minister of Planning and Labour and Employment (Shri L. N. Mishra): (a) In April 1959 Prof. J. K. Galbraith informally gave a note to the Planning Commission which *inter-alia* dealt with certain organisational aspects of public sector enterprises.

(b) No specific recommendations have been made by Prof. Galbraith in this note.

(c) Does not arise.

Shri Mohan Nayak: May I know whether the recommendations of this expert are proposed to be carried out in respect of heavy industries in the public sector or other industries like insurance etc. also?

Shri L. N. Mishra: He has not made any specific recommendations. These recommendations made are of a general nature, which are constantly under the consideration of the Planning Commission.

श्री म० ला० द्विवेदी : मैं जानना चाहता हूँ कि क्या मंत्री महोदय प्रो० जे० के० गलब्रेथ की रिपोर्ट को सदन की बूल पर रखेंगे यदि नहीं तो क्यों नहीं ? पब्लिक सेक्टर के बारे में सदस्य लोग जानकारी रखना चाहते हैं इसलिये इस सम्बन्ध में जो भी वाक्यात हों वे सदन को जानने चाहिएँ क्योंकि पब्लिक सेक्टर पर सदन को कोई बहस करने का अवसर नहीं है ?

Mr. Speaker: Why is the arguing? He may just put a question.

श्री ल० ना० मिश्र : उन की उस प्राइवेट रिपोर्ट को अभी तक हमने सदन के सामने नहीं रखा है और न हम उसे सदन के सामने रखना चाहते हैं क्योंकि वह उन्होंने एक एनफौरमल रिपोर्ट रखी थी और हम समझते हैं कि ग्राम पब्लिक के लिये यह चीज कोई लाभदायक नहीं है ।

Shri Braj Raj Singh: What are the difficulties?

Mr. Speaker: It is a private one.

Shri Kalika Singh: What is private about the public sector?

Shri Braj Raj Singh: On a point of order. What is private about a report which has been submitted to Government by way of recommendation? What is private about it when it is under the consideration of Government?

श्री ल० ना० मिश्र : यह उनकी निजी रिपोर्ट थी। वह यहां पर खास तौर पर इस काम के लिए नहीं आये थे। वह सोलोन जा रहे थे और तब यहां आये। उनके साथ कुछ बातचीत हुई थी। अब उनकी जो रिपोर्ट दी हुई है, उसको हम समझते हैं कि सदन के सामने रखना उचित नहीं होगा।

Shri Mahanty: On a point of order.....

The Minister of Labour and Employment and Planning (Shri Nanda): So far as this particular Note is concerned, it may be possible to place it on the Table of the House. But so far as the principle is concerned, it would be very difficult to really secure opinion in a private and informal way from eminent people if everything that they say has necessarily to be released for publication. So far as this particular Note is concerned, I do not think there can be much difficulty in placing it on the Table of the House.

Shri Raghunath Singh: When a portion of it has been published in the newspapers, why should it not be laid on the Table of the House?

श्री म० सा० द्विवेदी : पब्लिक सैक्टर के उद्योगों के बारे में किसी भी प्रकार की सूचना को छिपा करके रखने का सरकार को या मंत्रालय को अधिकार नहीं है। पब्लिक सैक्टर के बारे में पूरी जानकारी हासिल करने का अधिकार इस सदन को है और यह भी

इसको अधिकार है कि सभी कागजों की मांग कर सके।

Mr. Speaker: The difficulty arises in this way. Normally when a Minister claims any kind of secrecy or confidence on account of which he says that it is not in the public interest to disclose it or lay it on the Table, I do not press him to lay it on the Table. It is left to him to decide. But very often it is brought to the notice of the House that what is claimed as secret or confidential, which it is not in the public interest to disclose, has already received publicity in the newspapers. Therefore, Parliament seems to be the only place where the news is not available. Either the Minister must exercise greater control over the publication of these things or as soon as such a thing appears in the newspapers, courtesy must be shown to this House by placing the entire paper on the Table of the House. I do not want to encroach upon the right of the hon. Ministers to decide what is in the public interest and whether it is desirable to keep it back from the House. But the moment some kind of detail appears in newspapers, this House will naturally expect that the entire thing should be made available to it, so as to get the correct impression—and not a wrong impression on the basis of what has appeared in the papers—of the thing.

The Prime Minister and Minister of External Affairs (Shri Jawaharlal Nehru): May I have some clarity about this so that there may be no misunderstanding? I have listened respectfully to what you have said, but I have not understood on what occasions it becomes the duty of a Minister to place before the House a document that is considered confidential.

Shri Chintamani Panigrahi: This is not confidential.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Just because

newspapers, because of leakage or otherwise, get some part of it, does that make it necessary for the full document to be placed on the Table of the House?

Mr. Speaker: I am asking the hon. the Leader of the House in answer to the question that he has put to me whether it is all right—let him consider it. I am prepared to modify it; it is not a ruling that I have given—to say that the House is not entitled to know something about it when details have appeared in the newspapers. Of course, hon. Ministers are entitled to say that it is confidential and they are not prepared to lay it on the Table of the House. But when once the matter has appeared in the newspapers in some detail, I would particularly like the hon. Minister to state here on the floor of the House why it should not be placed before the House. If still he thinks that it ought not to be placed on the Table, I will allow him the discretion.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Thank you. So far as I am concerned, I think that this business of considering documents confidential and secret by our Ministries or departments is carried to an unnecessary extreme. I think it is a habit coming back from the old days, of marking all kinds of papers 'confidential' and 'secret'. Sometimes they are not so; sometimes, they are of course. That is true. I should like as many papers as possible to be placed on the Table of the House or to be made available to Members. But obviously there are some which it is not desirable to do so, and I shall suggest to my colleagues that they should examine it and not automatically have papers marked 'secret and confidential'.

Shri Mahanty: May I know whether it is a fact that Prof. Galbraith has pointed out certain inadequacies and deficiencies in the administration of the public sector? And is that the reason for the Minister to say that it is confidential and cannot be placed on the Table?

Mr. Speaker: I will not allow that question.

Shri Mahanty: It is a fact.

Shri Tyagi: May I know if Prof. J. K. Galbraith was specifically invited by the Ministry itself to examine the public sector and comment on it, or he just saw it and made comments about it of his own accord?

Shri Nanda: These were casual comments. It was not an assignment.

Shri Tyagi: How is it that our Ministries are always exposed to the comments of foreigners? How is it that they welcome any and every foreigner to come and look into the affairs and comment?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Prof. Galbraith is a very eminent economist. Whoever of eminence comes here from any country, naturally we meet him and discuss with him. May be he met the Planning Commission. Whether he has been invited or not, we want the benefit of his opinion. He was not assigned any work, but we tried to profit by his views. We discussed matters with him. I met him separately; others also met him. Apparently, he gave something in writing. I do not know what he gave. I have seen some of his articles, very interesting articles, elsewhere. Anyhow, in this particular matter, my hon. colleague has said that he will place it on the Table of the House, so that hon. Members can read what it contains.

Mr. Speaker: The paper will be placed on the Table. The matter is closed.

Shri Hem Barua: I rose three or four times, but still I could not put my question because other hon. Members prevented me from doing so. I am sorry that you did not protect me. Let me now put my question.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Member is too big to require protection.

Shri Hem Barua: May I know whether it is a fact that after a forth-

right attack on some of India's economic aspirations, Prof. Galbraith described them as 'post-office socialism'? If so, did he advance any reasons for that conclusion?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Member will read the report.

Shri Nanda: Yes. In view of that, there is no need to answer that.

Mr. Speaker: I would only ask Shri Hem Barua and other Members not to put questions which cast aspersions. The report is there. Why should he anticipate? I feel—and justly—that the hon. Member wants to put this question only to make his own aspersions on what has been said here. There should be no pleasure in denouncing Parliament and Government. After all, it is our own State. Hon. Members must wait and see what exactly the report contains. Why should the hon. Member put such words into the mouth of some other person? Let us wait and see. No impression ought to be created here that opportunity is taken in the form of questions to merely cast aspersions on Government or on any Minister.

Shri Hem Barua: May I humbly submit that whenever I make a reference to a thing, I am very sure of my facts? When I said that he described our economic aspirations as 'post-office socialism', I put it in quotation marks. This was in a newspaper article. The Prime Minister himself has said that he has read the article.

Mr. Speaker: It is premature to say anything. Even in advance of the report being placed on the Table, the hon. Member wants to castigate him by saying that he has described it as 'post-office socialism'. It is for that purpose that he has put the question.

Shri Hem Barua: These are his words. What can I do?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Member may elicit information, not make aspersions.

Profit Bonus Formula

*1037. **Shri Anthony Pillai:** Will the Minister of Commerce and Industry be pleased to state:

(a) whether Ministry invited foreign experts to give their opinion regarding the adoption of a Profit Bonus Formula; and

(b) if so, what are the main recommendations made by them?

The Minister of Industry (Shri Manubhai Shah): (a) Yes, Sir.

(b) Two experts are now in the country visiting the different Undertakings; their recommendations will be available by the middle of June, 1961.

Shri Anthony Pillai: Will these comments also be circulated to the Central organisations of labour for their comments before they are placed before the Bonus Commission?

Shri Manubhai Shah: No, Sir. We have specially invited two or three Soviet experts and two from Canada to help us in assessing the productivity of individual workers in order to evolve an incentive, that is payment by results scheme for the public sector undertakings.

Shri Anthony Pillai: Is there any proposal to send the scheme to the labour organisations for their comment?

Shri Manubhai Shah: It is not necessary at this stage. First, we have to see what recommendations they make; and then Government will examine whether they are practicable or not. Then if they are to be implemented, certainly labour will be taken into confidence.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: The hon. Minister stated that it is for evolving a payment by results scheme. May I know whether they will also take a time and motion study or any other method to be introduced by them?

Shri Manubhai Shah: These experts are being invited only in order to