

LOK SABHA

COMMITTEE ON SUBORDINATE
LEGISLATION

SIXTH REPORT

PRESENTED ON THE 22ND DECEMBER, 1956



LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT
NEW DELHI
December, 1956

CONTENTS

	PARA Nos.	PAGES Nos.
Composition of the Committee		
REPORT—		
I Introduction	1-4	1
II S. R. O. 3146 of 1954 re: Coal Mines Conservation and Safety Rules, 1954	5-13	1-3
III Rules Made under All India Services Act, 1951	14-22	3-5
IV Central Silk Board Study Leave Rules and Central Silk Board Provident Fund Rules	23-25	5
V Delay in Publication of Corrigenda to Rules etc.	26-28	5-6
VI Making of Rules after Previous Publication	29-31	6
VII Publication of Amendments made by Parliament in Statutory Rules	32-35	6-7
VIII S. R. O. 931 of 1955 amending the Mineral Concession Rules, 1949	36-39	7
IX S. R. O. 2106 of 1955 regarding Prevention of Food Adulteration Rules, 1955	40-44	7-8
X Central Silk Board Rules, 1955	45-52	8-9
XI S. R. O. 416 of 1953 making Amendment in the Central Excise Rules, 1944	53-56	9-10
XII Customs Duties Drawback Rules under the Sea Customs Act, 1878	57-59	10
XIII The State Duty Rules, 1955 (S. R. O. 556 of 1954)	60-65	10-11
XIV S. R. O. 98 of 1953 amending the Coal Mines Rescue Rules, 1939	66-70	11-12
XV S. R. O. 1673 of 1954 amending the Administration of Evacuee Property (Central) Rules, 1950	71-74	12-13
XVI Citation of Exact Statutory Authority in the Preamble to the "Orders"	75-76	13
XVII Bills or Acts delegating Rule-making Power	77-79	13-14
XVIII Laying of Rules on the Table of the House	80-81	14
XIX Delay in laying Orders on the Table of the House	82-83	14-15
Summary of recommendations		16-18
APPENDICES—		
Appendix I—Delay in Publication of Corrigenda to Rules etc.		21
Appendix II—Statement of 'orders' in respect of which there has been delay in laying on the Table		22-25
Appendix III—Minutes		29-55

COMPOSITION OF THE COMMITTEE ON SUBORDINATE
LEGISLATION
(1956-57)

1. Shri N. C. Chatterjee—*Chairman.*
2. Shri S. V. Ramaswamy
3. Shri N. M. Lingam
4. Shri A. Ibrahim
5. Shri Hanamantrao Ganeshrao Vaishnav
6. Shri Tek Chand
7. Shri Ganpati Ram
8. Shri Nāndlal Joshi
9. Shri Diwan Chand Sharma
10. Shri Hem Raj
11. Shri H. Siddananjappa
12. Dr. A. Krishnaswami
13. Shri Tulsidas Kilachand
14. Shri Hirendra Nath Mukerjee
15. Shri M. S. Gurupadaswamy.

SECRETARIAT

- Shri S. L. Shakhder—*Joint Secretary.*
Shri N. N. Mallya—*Deputy Secretary.*
Shri P. K. Patnaik—*Under Secretary.*

I

INTRODUCTION

1. The Chairman of the Committee on Subordinate Legislation, having been authorised by the Committee to submit the report on their behalf, present this their Sixth Report.

2. Subsequent to the presentation of the Fourth Report, the Committee held five sittings and considered 336 new 'orders'. The Committee also considered the 'orders' that were pending final disposal at the time of the presentation of the Fourth Report. At a sitting held on the 21st December, 1956, the Committee considered this Report and passed it.

3. The Committee at their Third Sitting held on the 11th August, 1956 considered the notices of motions tabled in the Lok Sabha for modification of S.R.Os. 1161 and 1349 of 1956 relating to the Displaced Persons (Compensation and Rehabilitation) Rules, 1955 and the Representation of the People (Preparation of Electoral Rolls) Rules, 1956, respectively and submitted a report thereon to the House namely the Fifth Report.

4. Observations of the Committee on matters of special interest, made during the course of their examination of the 'orders', matters which required to be brought to the notice of the House, as well as the recommendations of the Committee have been included in this Report.

II

S.R.O. 3146 OF 1954 REGARDING COAL MINES CONSERVATION AND SAFETY RULES, 1954

5. S.R.O. 3146 of 1954 containing the Coal Mines Conservation and Safety Rules, was examined by the Committee.

6. *Rule 15.*—This Rule lays down the procedure for appointment, dismissal etc., of the employees of the Coal Board and also their conditions of service. The Chairman of the Board has been given wide powers to suspend an employee or reduce him in rank or at his discretion even to dismiss any employee of the Board whose pay is below a certain limit. While taking such disciplinary action he is not required to follow any procedure, such as the institution of any enquiry or to afford an opportunity to the person concerned to explain his position. The Rule also does not provide for an appellate authority.

7. The Committee recommend that the rule should lay down the procedure to be followed by the Chairman before taking any disciplinary action referred to above against any employee of the Board. They further recommend that the rule should also provide for an appellate authority.

16. The Ministry of Home Affairs to whom the point was referred explained the position as under:—

“Since inter-cadre transfers of the All India Service officers in the public interest will be made only in special circumstances, the necessity for according a proper seniority to the officers so transferred is of course appreciated. However, so far as the question of consultation with the Union Public Service Commission in this matter is concerned it is felt that the State Governments concerned and the Central Government would be in a better position to assess the relative claims of the officers involved for the determination of their *inter se* seniority. Moreover no change in general principle is intended which will warrant consultation with the Commission. Where examination recruits are involved, the all India seniority will be maintained and no one can have any objection to this. In other cases, the views of the State Government to which the officer concerned is transferred may have to be given prepondering weight and a reference to the Commission in such cases may, therefore, lead to an embarrassing situation if there is a difference between the views of the Commission and those of the State Governments.”

17. The Committee have considered the Ministry's reply. The Committee are of the view that some principles should be laid down in consultation with the Union Public Service Commission which should be followed while determining the position of an officer transferred from one cadre to another and rule 7 should be amended accordingly.

All India Services (Conduct) Rules, 1954

18. *Rule 4(4)(iii)*.—Under this Rule an officer of the services can, with the permission of the Government, offer himself as a candidate for election to a local authority.

19. This provision is not in accordance with the principle that the services should be kept above local politics and should not be allowed to participate in the election controversies.

20. The Ministry of Home Affairs to whom the point was referred, explained the position as under:—

“Originally, no provision was made which conceived of permitting a member of the service to stand for or contest any election even with Government's permission. But when the draft rules were circulated to the State Governments for comments, some of them pointed out that the original draft should be modified, so as to enable Government to permit some of their officers to contest for elections to local bodies like the Municipalities, District Boards etc., which was in conformity with the accepted convention in those States. In order to meet this point an enabling provision (restrictive in its scope) was made in the Rules.

Government will naturally take into consideration the circumstances of each case and the possible repercussions on the official life of the member of the Service before granting him such permission."

21. The Committee note that whereas sub-rule (1) of Rule 4 prohibited members of the Services from taking part in political activities, proviso (iii) of sub-rule (4) of Rule 4 practically nullifies that prohibition. The Committee do not approve the idea of civil servants contesting local elections especially when the civic elections in this country are mostly run on political lines.

22. The Committee are of the view that Government may make provisions for the nomination of an officer to a local body but in no case should officers be allowed to contest elections to such bodies. The Committee recommend that the rule be amended accordingly.

IV

CENTRAL SILK BOARD STUDY LEAVE RULES AND CENTRAL SILK BOARD PROVIDENT FUND RULES

23. The Central Silk Board Study Leave Rules and the Central Silk Board Provident Fund Rules, together with the Central Silk Board Rules, 1955, were published in the Gazette under a single S.R.O. number. Since they were three separate notifications, they should normally have been published under three different numbers.

24. The Ministry of Production, to whom the point was referred, informed as follows:—

"When the Central Silk Board Rules were first published in 1949, all the three sets of rules referred to above were published under one notification and one S.R.O. number. No reference to modify the above action was received from any authority. In the absence of any such suggestion, the publication of these Rules in three separate notifications at the time of publishing them during 1955 was not considered. There, however, does not appear to be any serious objection in their being under one and the same S.R.O."

25. The Committee are of the view that the publication of three notifications under a single number is likely to cause confusion and inconvenience to everybody while making a reference to those notifications individually. The Committee, therefore, recommend that each notification should bear separate S.R.O. number.

V

DELAY IN PUBLICATION OF CORRIGENDA TO RULES ETC.

26. The Committee note that in a number of cases the Ministries have published corrigenda to statutory rules etc., after an inordinate delay, as shown in the statement given in Appendix I.

27. The Committee feel that such delayed publication may cause inconvenience both to the general public and the departments of the Government especially when numerical errors are involved.

28. The Committee recommend that the corrigenda, if any, should be published within 15 days of the publication of the rules etc., in which errors are found.

VI

MAKING OF RULES AFTER PREVIOUS PUBLICATION

29. Certain Acts provide that the rules to be made thereunder shall be made after previous publication. This means that rules are published in the first instance in draft form inviting public comments thereon. The rules are then finalised in the light of public comments received.

30. The Committee note that in certain cases, cited below, the time given to the public for sending their comments was practically nil:—

No. of Order	Draft published on	Comments invited by	Date on which Gazette containing draft was available
1. S.R.O. 2068 of 1955	24-9-55	30-9-55	1-10-55
2. S.R.O. 2081 of 1955	24-9-55	1-10-55	1-10-55
3. S.R.O. 2084 of 1955	24-9-55	1-10-55	1-10-55

31. The Committee feel that when the Acts give a right to the public to send their comments on certain draft rules, it is only reasonable that sufficient time should be given to them to study the draft rules and send their comments before they are finalised. The Committee are of the opinion that a period of not less than 30 clear days, exclusive of the time taken in publishing the draft rules in the Gazette and the despatching the Gazette copies to various parts of the country, should be given to the public to send their comments on such draft rules.

VII

PUBLICATION OF AMENDMENTS MADE BY PARLIAMENT IN STATUTORY RULES

32. In exercise of the power conferred by sub-section (3) of section 40 of the Displaced Persons (Compensation and Rehabilitation) Act, 1954 the Parliament made certain amendments in the Displaced Persons (Compensation and Rehabilitation) Rules, 1955 which were framed under sub-section (1) of the said section after they were laid before Parliament.

33. The amendments made by Parliament were published in the Gazette (S.R.O. 2104 of 1955) but the notification did not cite the authority under which the Parliament could make the amendments in the Rules.

34. While publishing any statutory rules or amendments made therein by Government, relevant authority is invariably cited in the preamble to the Rules or amendments.

35. The Committee recommend that while publishing amendments made by Parliament the authority under which amendments are made should also be duly cited in the preamble to the notification.

VIII

S.R.O. 931 OF 1955 AMENDING THE MINERAL CONCESSION RULES, 1949

36. *Rule 51A.*—This new Rule introduced in the Mineral Concession Rules, 1949 empowers the State Governments to issue directions to the parties concerned with the Mineral Concession in certain circumstances. According to section 5 of the parent Act, (Mines and Minerals Regulation and Development Act, 1948) only the Central Government is authorised to make provisions regarding the regulation of mining leases etc. Section 8 of the said Act also authorises the Central Government to delegate their power to any authority by publishing a notification.

37. The delegation of power to State Governments to issue directions under this new Rule 51A is objectionable unless a notification delegating powers to State Government under Section 8 is issued by the Central Government.

38. The Ministry of Natural Resources and Scientific Research to whom the point was referred explained as under:—

“.....the Ministry of Law have advised that new Rule 51A, in so far as it sought to confer a power on the State Government, followed the pattern of other similar provisions in the Mineral Concession Rules, 1949, for instance rules 8, 13 and 18(1). The question of amending the Rules, wherever necessary, so as to change the words “State Government” into “Central Government” and of entrusting the functions of the Central Government under the rules to the State Governments with their consent by a formal delegation under Article 258(1) of the Constitution is being considered in consultation with the State Governments and orders in this regard will be issued as soon as replies from all the State Governments are received.”

39. The Committee note the Ministry's assurance.

IX

S.R.O. 2106 OF 1955 REGARDING PREVENTION OF FOOD ADULTERATION RULES, 1955

40. The Committee have examined S.R.O. 2106 containing the Prevention of Food Adulteration Rules, 1955.

41. *Rule 1(6).*—This Rule provides that the fees payable in respect of certificates of analysis of food samples to be issued by a Laboratory shall be according to the rates to be specified by the Central Government.

42. This provision is not in accordance with Section 4(2)(b) of the parent Act which envisages that the fees for such certificates should be prescribed in the Rules.

43. The Ministry of Health to whom the point was referred explained as under:—

“.....This Ministry agree to the view expressed therein that the fees payable in respect of reports to be given by the Central Food Laboratory should have been prescribed in the Prevention of Food Adulteration Rules, 1955, instead of the existing Rule 4(6) of the said Rules. The question is already receiving attention and the matter will be considered by the Central Committee for Food Standards in its second meeting expected to be held by the end of this year or early next year.

The existing Rule 4(6) of the Prevention of Food Adulteration Rules, 1955, will be substituted by the actual schedule of fees payable for the analysis certificates to be issued by the Director, Central Food Laboratory, Calcutta, by issue of a notification under Section 4(2)(b) of the Prevention of Food Adulteration Act, 1954, as soon as the recommendation of the Central Committee for Food Standards is made available to this Ministry.”

44. The Committee note the Ministry's assurance. |

X

CENTRAL SILK BOARD RULES, 1955

45. The Committee have examined S.R.O. 662 of 1955 containing the Central Silk Board Rules, 1955.

46. *Rules 28 (3) and (4).*—These Rules sub-delegate rule-making power to the Silk Board to make Study Leave Rules and Provident Fund Rules for the employees of the Board, when the parent Act specifically authorises the Central Government to make such Rules.

47. The Ministry of Production to whom the point was referred explained the position as follows:—

“Actually Rule 28(3) does not empower the Central Silk Board to make Study Leave Rules. Similar is the position with regard to Rule 28(4) which also does not empower the Board to make the Contributory Provident Fund Rules. The opening paragraphs appearing under “Study Leave Rules” are therefore being amended.”

48. The Committee are pleased to record that the rules have since | been amended accordingly.

49. The Committee feel that Study Leave Rules and Provident Fund Rules made under Rule 28(3) and (4) of the Central Silk Board Rules should be laid before the Parliament in the same way as the Central Silk Board Rules were laid as required by Section 13(3) of the parent Act, which lays down that all rules made thereunder shall be laid as soon as may be before Parliament. The Ministry stated as follows:—

“It therefore follows that any Rules or sub-Rules made under this Section of the Act will have necessarily to be placed before the Parliament. In view of this it does not appear to be necessary to include any specific provision either under the Study Leave Rules or the Central Silk Board Contributory Provident Fund Rules which are framed in pursuance of the provisions in the Central Silk Board Rules, 1955, made under Section 13 of the Central Silk Board Act, 1948.”

50. The Committee note the Ministry's assurance.

51. *Rule 29(2)*.—This Rule lays down that procedure regarding disciplinary action obtaining in the Central Government Offices will apply to the employees of the Board with such modifications as may be necessary. It was not clear as to who would make the modifications, whether it would be the Board or the Central Government. Such modifications should not be left to be done by the Board but should be the responsibility of the Central Government. The Ministry of Production explained the position as under:—

“The intention of this rule is not to delegate any powers to the Board to modify the Central Silk Board Rules governing the procedure to be adopted in all cases of disciplinary action for adaptation to the employees of the Board. Action is therefore being taken to delete the words “with such modifications as may be necessary,” appearing in the last line of Rule 29(2) of the Central Silk Board Rules, 1955.”

52. The Committee are pleased to record that necessary action has since been taken in the matter.

XI

S.R.O. 416 OF 1953 MAKING AMENDMENT IN THE CENTRAL EXCISE RULES, 1944

53. S.R.O. 416, of 1953 amends Rule 147 of Central Excise Rules, 1944, framed under the Central Excises and Salt Act, 1944. Prior to this amendment the Central Excise Rules, 1944, empowered the collector to remit duty on goods in warehouses, lost or destroyed by unavoidable accidents. This amendment placed a limitation on this power by providing that if the goods are lost by theft, the duty will not be remitted.

54. The Committee had, in their Second Report, recommended that where such goods have been lost, it would not be fair in not remitting the duty and that the rule should be amended accordingly.

67. A question was raised, whether this time limit should not be extended to three years as under the Indian Limitation Act, 1908.

68. The Ministry of Law expressed the opinion that from the legal point of view there was no objection to the provision for a time limit of one year for refund of the duty.

69. The Ministry of Labour informed the Committee as under:—

“ In order to prevent belated claims it was, in consultation with the Ministries of Finance and Law, laid down that a time limit for preferring claims should be one year instead of the usual three years.

. there has been no complaint from the trade and the imposition of the time limit therefore does not appear to have caused any hardship to anybody. If the Committee on Subordinate Legislation still desire that the time limit should be raised to three years the question of amending the Rule will be reconsidered.”

70. The Committee have considered the above reply of the Ministry of Labour and feel that in view of the fact that no complaint has been received so far, the prescribed time limit for preferring claims may be retained. The Committee, however, desire the Ministry to watch further developments and in the event of any complaint from the trade, inform the Committee of the same.

XV

S.R.O. 1673 OF 1954 AMENDING THE ADMINISTRATION OF EVACUEE PROPERTY (CENTRAL) RULES, 1950

71. S.R.O. 1673 of 1954 amends Rule 14 of the Administration of Evacuee Property (Central) Rules, 1950.

72. The Committee felt that although legally valid, clauses (iii) to (vi) of new sub-rule (3) of rule 14 vested powers of an extraordinary character in the Custodian in the matter of cancellation of allotments of evacuee properties and that such powers should not be given through subordinate legislation.

73. The Ministry of Rehabilitation, on a reference being made, explained the position as under:—

“ The necessity for amending Rule 14(3) of the Administration of Evacuee Property (Central) Rules had arisen because certain displaced persons who had been allotted evacuee properties at one place had subsequently built or acquired other accommodation, either at the same or another place. In view of the limited evacuee accommodation available, it was incumbent upon this Ministry to ensure that it was put to the maximum possible use, and with

that end in view, to discourage and disallow multiple allotments. It was in the context of these conditions that the Rule was revised, so as to arm the Custodians of Evacuee Property with powers to deal with cases of such multiple acquisition."

* * * * *

".....The provisions of Rule 14(3) have now a very limited field of operation, as with the *en bloc* acquisition of evacuee properties, under Section 12 of the Displaced Persons (Compensation and Rehabilitation) Act, only disputed properties now vest in the Custodian. Their number is very small and it is also subject to progressive decline, since with the settlement of every disputed claim, the existing un-acquired properties will either come to be acquired or revert to the owner. In either case, it will go out of the Custodian's control and cease to vest in him."

74. The Committee feel that in view of the explanation given by the Ministry no further action is necessary.

XVI

CITATION OF EXACT STATUTORY AUTHORITY IN THE PREAMBLE TO THE 'ORDERS'

75. When any rules, regulations etc., are issued under any Act, the precise authority under which they are made should be specified *i.e.*, the particular Section of the Act giving the power to make the rules, regulations etc., should be cited in the preamble of the same. The Committee have noted that in a number of cases the authorities cited in the preamble to the rules are not specific and in a few instances no citation at all has been given.

76. The Committee consider that it is essential that the authority giving power to make rules etc., should be specifically cited in the preamble to the rules for the purpose of enabling all concerned to know under what precise authority the rules have been made.

XVII

BILLS OR ACTS DELEGATING RULE-MAKING POWER

77. The Committee in para. 36 of their Third Report had made the following recommendations:—

- (1) That in future the Acts containing provisions for making rules etc., shall lay down that such rules shall be laid on the Table as soon as possible;
- (2) That all those rules shall be laid on the Table for a uniform and total period of 30 days before the date of their final publication;

Provided that where it is not deemed expedient to lay any rule on the Table before the date of publication, such rule may be laid as soon as possible after

publication. An explanatory note should, however, accompany such rules at the time they are so laid explaining why it was not deemed expedient to lay these rules on the Table of the House before they were published; and

- (3) That in future the Acts authorising delegation of rule-making power shall contain express provisions that the rules made thereunder shall be subject to such modifications as the House may like to make."

78. Regarding this recommendation the Ministry of Law have informed the Committee that in future the Bills which seek to delegate rule making power to the Executive will contain as far as possible a provision on the following lines:—

"All rules made under this section shall be laid for not less than thirty days before both Houses of Parliament as soon as possible after they are made and shall be subject to such modifications as Parliament may make during the Session in which they are so laid or the Session immediately following."

79. The Committee accept the above suggestion of the Ministry of Law as it will meet their intention.

XVIII

LAYING OF RULES ON THE TABLE OF THE HOUSE

80. The Committee considered the following suggestions which were made by the Business Advisory Committee at their sitting held on the 24th August, 1956:—

- (1) Whenever rules framed by the Government under any Act are laid on the Table of the House a statement of Objects and Reasons and also a Statement containing explanatory notes on the rules in respect thereof should also be appended thereto for the information of Members.
- (2) When new Rules amending the original rules are laid on the Table of the House the relevant extracts from the original rules should also be attached to such rules.

81. The Committee recommend that the above suggestions of the Business Advisory Committee should be implemented.

XIX

DELAY IN LAYING ORDERS ON THE TABLE OF THE HOUSE

82. The Committee have observed that a number of 'orders' were laid on the Table of the House after considerable delay. A statement of such orders is given in Appendix II.

83. The Committee wish to draw attention to their recommendation in para 48 of their Third Report and to state once again that 'Orders' should be laid on the Table of the House within 7 days after their publication in the Gazette; and if the House is not in session at that time, the 'Orders' should be laid on the Table as soon as possible (but within 7 days) after the reassembly of the House.

NEW DELHI,

The 21st December, 1956.

N. C. CHATTERJEE,

Chairman,

Committee on Subordinate Legislation.

**SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS MADE IN THE SIXTH
REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON SUBORDINATE
LEGISLATION.**

Sl. Reference No. to para No. in the Report	Summary of Recommendations	
1	2	3
1	7	Rule 15 of the Coal Mines Conservation and Safety Rules, 1954 should lay down the procedure such as the institution of an enquiry or the giving of an opportunity of being heard to be followed by the Chairman before taking any disciplinary action against any employee of the Coal Board.
	11	The rule should also provide for an appellate authority.
2	12	The rules or principles regarding acquisition or disposal of lands and surface rights etc. should be laid down by the Central Government themselves, if necessary in consultation with the Coal Board and rule 41 of the Coal Mines Conservation and Safety Rules, 1954 should be amended accordingly. The rules framed or the principles formulated under rule 41 of the Coal Mines Conservation and Safety Rules, 1954 should be subject to the condition of previous publication and should also be laid before Parliament.
3	13	Some safeguards should be imposed before a delegate is given wide powers to sub-delegate its authority to another functionary. It is undesirable to allow sub-delegation of powers in as wide a language as has been used in Section 5(2) of the Coal Mines (Conservation and Safety) Act.
4	17	Some principles should be laid down in consultation with the Union Public Service Commission which should be followed while determining the position of an officer transferred from one cadre to another and rule 7 of the I.A.S. and I.P.S. (Regulation of Seniority) Rules 1954 should be amended accordingly.

1	2	3
5	22	The Government may make provisions for the nomination of an officer to a local body but in no case should officers be allowed to contest elections to such bodies. Rule 4 of the All India Services (Conduct) Rules, 1954 be amended accordingly.
6	25	Each notification should bear separate S.R.O. number.
7	28	Corrigenda to statutory rules etc. should be published within 15 days of the publication of the rules etc. in which errors are found.
8	31	Where rules are subject to the condition of previous publication a period of not less than 30 clear days exclusive of the time taken in publishing the draft rules in the Gazette and the despatching the Gazette copies to various parts of the country should be given to the public to send their comments on draft rules.
9	35	While publishing amendments made by Parliament the authority under which amendments are made should also be duly cited in the preamble to the notification.
10	70	The Ministry of Labour should inform the Committee in the event of any complaint from the trade with respect to the imposition of the time limit of one year under rule 19 of the Coal Mines Rescue Rules 1939.
11	76	It is essential that the authority giving power to make rules etc. should be specifically cited in the preamble to the rule for the purpose of enabling all concerned to know under what precise authority the rules have been made.
12	79	The Committee accept the suggestion of the Ministry of Law that in future the Bills which seek to delegate rule making power will contain as far as possible a provision on the following lines. <p>“All rules made under this section shall be laid for not less than thirty days before both Houses of Parliament as soon as possible after they are made and shall be subject to such modifications as Parliament may make during the Session in which they are so laid or the Session immediately following.”</p>

1	2	3
13	81	<p>Whenever rules framed by the Government under any Act are laid on the Table of the House a statement of Objects and Reasons and also a statement containing explanatory notes on the rules in respect thereof should also be appended thereto for the information of Members.</p> <p>When new Rules amending the original rules are laid on the Table of the House the relevant extracts from the original rules should also be attached to such rules.</p>
14	83	<p>'Orders' should be laid on the Table of the House within 7 days after their publication in the Gazette; and if the House is not in session at that time the 'Orders' should be laid on the Table as soon as possible (but within 7 days) after the reassembly of the House.</p>

APPENDICES TO THE REPORT

APPENDIX I

(See para 26)

Delay in Publication of Corrigenda to Rules etc.

<i>Date of Publication of original Rules</i>	<i>Date of Publication of corrigenda in Gazette</i>	<i>Period elapsed between the two dates</i>
26-3-55	16-7-55 (S.R.O. 1523 of 1955)	3½ months
28-5-55	16-7-55 (S.R.O. 1527 of 1955)	1½ months
30-4-55	16-7-55 (S.R.O. 1548 of 1955)	2½ months
2-7-55	3-9-55 (S.R.O. 1898 of 1955)	2 months
18-7-55	13-8-55 (S.R.O. 1739 of 1955)	3 weeks
25-4-55	20-8-55 (S.R.O. 1783 of 1955)	3 months
3-8-55	10-9-55 (S.R.O. 1928 of 1955)	1 month
19-3-55	17-9-55 (S.R.O. 2018 of 1955)	6 months
9-4-55	17-9-55 (S.R.O. 2021 of 1955)	5 months

—————

APPENDIX II

(See para 82)

Statement of 'Orders' in respect of which there has been delay in laying on the Table

Sl. No.	Name of 'order'	Description of 'order'	Date of Publication in the Gazette	Date of laying on the Table	Period which elapsed between the two dates	Name of the Ministry concerned	Remarks
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
1	S.R.O. 1862 of 1955	Re: Sugar Cane Control Order, 1955.	27-8-55	21-11-55	3 months	Ministry of Food and Agriculture	The inter-session periods have not been counted for delay in the case of those orders which were published when the House was not in Session and were laid on the Table during the session immediately following their publication in the Gazette.
2	S.R.O. 1863 of 1955	Re: Food Products Order, 1955 Amendments to S.R.O. 3310 of 1954. Amendments to S.R.O. 3311 of 1954.	27-8-55	21-11-55	3 months		
3	S.R.O. 1952 of 1955		14-5-55	16-9-55	3 months		
4	S.R.O. 2080 of 1955		24-9-55	15-2-56	5 months		
5	S.R.O. 1673A of 1955		3-8-55	21-11-55	3 months		
6	S.R.O. 1673B of 1955		3-8-55	21-11-55	3 months		
7	S.R.O. 3568 of 1955	Re: Cancellation of S.R.O. 2408 of 1954.	25-11-55	15-2-56	3 months		
8	S.R.O. 3569 of 1955	Re: Cancellation of S.R.O. 3311 of 1954.	25-11-55	15-2-56	3 months		
9	S.R.O. 3406 of 1955	Re: Amending the 'order' of Bombay Government Deptt. of A & F (Civil Supplies Section) No. 410(a)/11, dated the 19th March, 1955.					
10	S.R.O. 3407 of 1955	Re: Recission of certain orders under Essential Commodities Act, 1955.	5-11-55	20-12-55	1 month		
11	S.R.O. 3438 of 1955	Re: Cancellation of S.R.O. 2406 of 1954.	8-11-55	15-2-56	3 months		
12	S.R.O. 3439 of 1955	Re: Cancellation of S.R.O. 2407 of 1954.	8-11-55	15-2-56	3 months		

13	S.R.O. 768 of 1955	Amendments in the Indian Aircrafts Rule, 1937.	25-7-55	3 months	Ministry of Communications.
14	S.R.O. 1741 of 1955		7-9-55	3 weeks	
15	S.R.O. 3624 of 1955		15-2-56	2 months	
16	S.R.O. 3625 of 1955		10-12-55	2 months	
17	S.R.O. 3551 of 1955		15-2-56	2 months	
18	S.R.O. 350 of 1956		22-2-56	3 months	
19	S.R.O. 594 of 1956		18-2-56	3 months	
20	S.R.O. 925 of 1956		10-3-56	2½ months	
21	S.R.O. 851 of 1956		21-4-56	1 month	
22	S.R.O. 1524 of 1955		14-4-56	3 months	
23	S.R.O. 158 of 1956	16-7-55	1 year	Ministry of Defence.	
24	S.R.O. 1040 of 1956	21-1-56	5 months		
25	S.R.O. 244 of 1955	5-5-56	3 months		
		30-8-56	3 months		
		22-8-55	3 weeks		
26	S.R.O. 525 of 1955	Amendments to the Reserve and Auxiliary Air Force Act Rules, 1953.	5-3-55	6 months	Ministry of Labour.
27	S.R.O. 1660 of 1956	Amendments to Mysore Gold Mines Regulations, 1953.	21-7-56	2 weeks	
28	S.R.O. 561 of 1955	Amendments to the Employees Provident Fund Scheme, 1952.	12-3-55	4 months	Ministry of N.R. & S.R.
29	S.R.O. 1742 of 1955	Amendments to the Petroleum Concession Rules, 1949.	13-8-55	1 year	
30	S.R.O. 244 of 1956	Amendments to the Mineral Concession Rules, 1949.	18-2-56	5½ months	
31	S.R.O. 302 of 1956		4-2-56	5½ months	
32	S.R.O. 349 of 1956		18-3-56	5½ months	
33	S.R.O. 2840 of 1954	Re: The Public Debt (Annuity Certificate) Rules, 1954.	4-9-54	6 months	Ministry of Finance.
34	S.R.O. 2000 of 1955	Re: The Custom Duties Draw-back (Provisions) Rules, 1955.	17-9-55	2 months	
35	S.R.O. 492A of 1956	Re: The Companies (Central Government's) General Rules and Forms, 1956.	18-2-56	1 month	
36	S.R.O. 1365 of 1956	Amendments to the Estate Duty Rules, 1953.	16-6-56	2 weeks	

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
37	S.R.O. 1511 of 1955	Re: Cotton Control Order, 1955	16-7-55	26-9-55	2 months		
38	S.R.O. 1262 of 1954	Amendments to the Tea Rules, 1954.	19-4-54	5-3-56	2 years	Ministry of Commerce and Consumer Industries.	
39	S.R.O. 229 of 1955		22-1-55	5-3-56	1 year		
40	S.R.O. 1077 of 1956	Amendments to the Cotton Textiles (Control) Order, 1948.	8-5-56	1-8-56	3 months		
41	S.R.O. 1077A of 1956	Re: The Cotton Textiles (Production by Handloom), Control Order, 1956.	8-5-56	1-8-56	3 months		
42	S.R.O. 1712 of 1955	Re: Delimitation Commission Final Order No. 30.	8-8-55	12-9-55	1 month	Ministry of Law.	
43	S.R.O. 323 of 1956	Delimitation Commission Final Order No. 31.	14-2-56	24-4-56	9 weeks		
44	S.R.O. 1724 of 1956	Delimitation Commission Final Order No. 32.	30-7-56	13-9-56	6 weeks		
45	S.R.O. 1725 of 1956	Delimitation Commission Final Order No. 33.	30-7-56	13-9-56	6 weeks		
46	S.R.O. 1726 of 1956	Delimitation Commission Final Order No. 34.	30-7-56	13-9-56	6 weeks		
47	S.R.O. 1727 of 1956	Delimitation Commission Final Order No. 35.	30-7-56	13-9-56	6 weeks		
48	S.R.O. 3146 of 1954	Re: The Coal Mines (Conservation and Safety) Rules, 1954.	2-10-54	22-2-55	3 months	Ministry of Production.	
49	S.R.O. 2106 of 1955	Re: Prevention of Food Adulteration Rules, 1955.	24-9-55	22-2-56	3 months	Ministry of Health.	
50	S.R.O. 347 of 1956	Amendments to the Delhi (Control of Building Operations) Regulations, 1955.	18-2-56	3-9-56	6½ months		
51	S.R.O. 1440 of 1956		23-6-56	3-9-56	6 weeks		
52	S.R.O. 1493 of 1956		30-6-56	3-9-56	6 weeks		

2221	53	S.R.O. 1109 of 1956	Re: The Iron & Steel (Control) Order, 1956.	12-5-56	20-8-56	3 months	Ministry of Heavy Industries.
52	54	S.R.O. 224 of 1956	Re: The High Court Judges (Part A States) Rules, 1956.	4-2-56	23-3-56	3 weeks	Ministry of Home Affairs.

APPENDIX III

Minutes

*SECOND SITTING

Parliament House, New Delhi; Tuesday, the 15th May, 1956

The Committee met from 4-30 P.M. to 5-35 P.M.

2. The following were present:

Shri N. C. Chatterjee—*Chairman*.

MEMBERS

2. Shri N. M. Lingam.
3. Shri Ganpati Ram.
4. Shri Nandlal Joshi.
5. Shri Diwan Chand Sharma.
6. Shri Hem Raj.
7. Dr. A. Krishnaswami.
8. Shri Tulsidas Kilachand.
9. Shri Hirendra Nath Mukerjee.

SECRETARIAT

Shri S. L. Shakhder—*Joint Secretary*.

Shri P. K. Patnaik—*Under Secretary*.

3. The Committee considered the memoranda prepared by the Secretariat on the following 'orders' etc.:-

- (1) S.R.O. 3146 of 1954 regarding Coal Mines Conservation and Safety Rules, 1954 (Memo No. 101).
- (2) * * * * *
- (3) Rules made under the All India Services Act, 1951 (Memo No. 106).
- (4) Delay in publication of corrigenda to rules etc. (Memo No. 112).
- (5) * * * * *
- (6) Making of rules after previous publication (Memo No. 114).

*The Minutes of First Sitting are not covered by the Sixth Report.

- (7) Central Silk Board Study Leave Rules and Central Silk Board Provident Fund Rules (Memo. No. 115).
- (8) Customs Duties Drawback Rules—Ministry's views on Committee's recommendations (Memo. No. 116).
- (9) Publication of amendments made by Parliament in Statutory Rules (Memo. No. 117).

S.R.O. 3146 OF 1954 REGARDING COAL MINES CONSERVATION AND SAFETY RULES, 1954

4. The Committee examined S.R.O. 3146 of 1954 containing the Coal Mines Conservation and Safety Rules, 1954 and made the following observations:—

5. *Rule 15.*—The Committee felt that the procedure to be followed by the authority concerned before dismissing, reducing in rank or taking any other disciplinary action against, any employee of the Board should be laid down. The Committee further felt, that there should also be an appellate authority in such cases.

6. *Rule 22.*—While laying down the terms of office of the members of the Research Advisory Committee, this Rule provided a term of 3 years for the Principal of Benares Mining College. But it appeared from a scrutiny of the Rule that the Principal would always be a member of the Committee and as such the mention of any period in his case was not correct. The Ministry, to whom the point was referred, confirmed that the principal would be a permanent member of the Committee and informed that the rule was being amended suitably.

The Committee noted the Ministry's reply.

7. *Rule 41.*—Rule 41 provides as follows:—

“.....the Board may acquire any lands or other surface rights or the right to remove sand from river beds and may dispose of surplus lands or surface right or the rights to remove sand from river beds in its possession *in accordance with rules be framed by the Board with the approval of the Central Government or subject to such directions as may be given by the Central Government.*”

In other words, through this rule, the Central Government sub-delegated certain rule-making power to the Board which was conferred upon the Government themselves under section 17 of the Coal Mines (Conservation and Safety) Act, 1952. Section 5(2) of the said Act, however, permitted the Government to delegate any of their powers to the Board by a special or general order.

8. A reference was made to the Ministry of Production asking them to clarify this sub-delegation of rule-making power and they replied as follows:—

“It is not the intention that Government’s powers under section 17 of the Coal Mines (C & S) Act, 1952 should be delegated to the Board. The intention is that the Board should lay down some sort of principles which should regulate the exercise of powers conferred on it by rule 41. The Rule is, therefore, also proposed to be amended.”

9. The proposed amendment which meant that the Board would state ‘principles’ instead of making ‘rules’, did not make any material difference in the Rule. A further clarification was received from the Ministry in the matter as follows:—

“The first part of the existing rule 41 empowers the Board to acquire any lands or other surface rights or the right to remove sand from river beds. To this extent the rule is relatable to clause (d) of Section 17(2) of the Act which empowers the making of rules regarding the powers and functions of the Board. The expression “rules” in the latter part of rule 41 is somewhat loosely used. The rules contemplated are not rules to be made under section 17 of the Act. It is obvious that a rule-making power cannot be conferred by a rule when there is express provision for the making of the rules under section 17 of the Act. The latter part of rule 41 refers to the disposal of any surplus lands or surface rights to remove sand from river beds which may be acquired under the first part of the rule. This latter part of rule is intended to lay down certain principles which should regulate the disposal of the kind of property acquired by the Board under the first part so that such property may not be disposed of by the Board in an arbitrary manner. In the circumstances mentioned, there is no scope for making rules under section 17 of the Act and consequently no question of the delegation of the power of the Central Government to make rules under that section arises. It may also be mentioned that the rule provided for effective control by the Central Government. The “rules” for the disposal of surplus lands etc., which are now proposed to be called principles are to be approved by the Central Government. It is also open to the Central Government to give directions to the Board regarding the manner in which the property acquired by it under the first part of the rule may be disposed of.”

10. The Committee considered this but felt that a subordinate authority should not be called upon to lay down principles. The Committee were of the view that the rule or principles regarding the acquisition or disposal of lands and surface rights etc. should be laid down by the Central Government themselves, if necessary, in consultation with the Board and rule 41 should be amended accordingly.

11. The Committee felt that the provisions of sub-sections (1) and (4) of section 17 of the parent Act should apply to the making of rules or principles under rule 41. That is to say, the rules framed or principles formulated under rule 41 should be made subject to the condition of previous publication and they should be laid before Parliament as is the case with the main rules.

12. The Committee considered the provisions of section 5(2) of the parent Act and decided to invite the attention of the House to the wide sub-delegation provided in the section. The Committee were of the view that the sub-delegation provided in section 5(2) was somewhat inconsistent with the rule-making power conferred by section 17. In such cases there should be some safeguards imposed before a delegate is allowed to sub-delegate its authority to another functionary. The Committee thought it undesirable to allow sub-delegation of powers in as wide a language as in section 5(2).

13. *Delay in laying.*—The Committee decided to bring to the notice of the House delay in laying this order on the Table.

14. * * * * *

15. * * * * *

RULES MADE UNDER ALL-INDIA SERVICES ACT, 1951

16. The Committee considered the rules made by the Central Government under the All-India Services Act, 1951, in the light of the views of the Ministry of Home Affairs which were obtained on a number of points concerning these rules.

17. *I.A.S. & I.P.S. (Probation) Rules, 1954.*—Under Rule 10, the seniority of probationers is to be determined in accordance with the aggregate marks obtained by them in the various examinations. It was not clear as to how the seniority of the probationers getting equal aggregate marks would be determined. The Ministry explained that relative merit of such probationers would be determined by the Union Public Service Commission and the seniority of such probationers would be determined by the order of merit in which they were placed in the list by the Commission.

The Committee noted the position explained by the Ministry.

18. Rule 13 of the I.P.S. (Probation) Rules empowers the State Government to sanction advance increments to I.P.S. Probationers in certain circumstances but there is no such provision for I.A.S. probationers in the I.A.S. (Probation) Rules. The Ministry stated that the difference in the provisions in respect of increments during probation periods was due to the fact that the probation periods for the I.A.S. probationers and I.P.S. probationers were different—one year for the former and two years for the latter—and that there was a provision for advance increments to I.A.S. probationers also in their 'Pay' Rules. The Committee noted the Ministry's reply.

19. The provisions in respect of the grant of travelling allowances to I.A.S. probationers for proceeding to the place of duty after the final examination are also different from those relating to the I.P.S. probationers (Cf. Rule 14). Here also the Ministry explained that the difference was due to the difference in their periods of probation and ultimately position of the probationers of both the services in this matter also was alike. The Committee noted the Ministry's clarification.

20. I.A.S. & I.P.S. (*Regulation of Seniority*) Rules, 1954.—Under Rule 5 the seniority of officers placed in List II or List III shall be determined on an *ad hoc* basis in consultation with the State Governments concerned. It was not clear why no definite procedure had been laid down in the case of officers of List II and List III as was done in the case of other officers. The Ministry explained that due to the peculiar conditions obtaining in Part B States etc. in the matter of State services and the manner and conditions in which the States were formed by the merger of small states and the services were integrated, certain adjustments and special provisions were necessary for determining the seniority of officers of List II and List III. The Committee noted the above clarification.

21. Under Rule 7 of these Rules, if an officer is transferred from one cadre to another in public interest, his position in the gradation list of the cadre to which he is transferred, shall be determined by the Central Government on an *ad hoc* basis. It was felt that in order to prevent injustice to anybody, it was better if Union Public Service Commission was consulted before determining the new position of the transferred officer. The Ministry explained the position as under:—

“Since inter-cadre transfers of the All India Service officers in the public interest will be made only in special circumstances, the necessity for according a proper seniority to

the officers so transferred is of course appreciated. However, so far as the question of consultation with the Union Public Service Commission in this matter is concerned, it is felt that the State Governments concerned and the Central Government would be in a better position to assess the relative claims of the officers involved for the determination of their *inter se* seniority. Moreover no change in general principle is intended which will warrant consultation with the Commission. Where examination recruits are involved, the All-India Seniority will be maintained and no one can have any objection to this. In other cases, the views of the State Government to which the officer concerned is transferred may have to be given prepondering weight and a reference to the Commission in such cases may, therefore, lead to an embarrassing situation. If there is a difference between the views of the Commission and those of the State Government."

22. The Committee considered the Ministry's reply. The Committee were of the view that there should be some principles laid down in consultation with the 'Union Public Service Commission which should be followed while determining the position of an officer transferred from one cadre to another and Rule 7 should be amended to provide for this.

23. *All-India Services (Conduct) Rules, 1954*.—Under proviso (iii) to Rule 4(4), an officer of the Services can, with the permission of the Government, offer himself as a candidate for election to a local authority. It was felt that the services should be kept above local politics and should not be allowed to participate in election controversies.

24. The Ministry expressed the following views in the matter:—

"Originally, no provision was made which conceived of permitting a member of the Service to stand for or contest any election even with Government's permission. But when the draft rules were circulated to the State Governments for comments, some of them pointed out that the original draft should be modified, so as to enable the Government to permit some of their officers to contest for elections to local bodies like the Municipalities, District Boards etc., which was in conformity with the accepted convention in those States. In order to meet this point an enabling provision (restrictive in scope) was made in the Rules.

Government will naturally take into consideration the circumstances of each case and the possible repercussions on the official life of the member of the Service before granting him such permission."

25. The Committee noted that, whereas sub-rule (1) of rule 4 prohibited members of the Services from taking part in political activities, proviso (iii) to sub-rule (4) of Rule 4 practically nullified that prohibition. The Committee did not approve the idea of civil servants contesting local elections especially when the civic elections in this country were mostly run on political lines.

26. The Committee were of the view that Government might make provision for the nomination of an officer to a local body but in no case should the officers be allowed to contest elections to such bodies. The Committee recommended that the rule be amended accordingly.

27. *I.A.S. & I.P.S. (Pay) Rules, 1954.*—Rule 10 empowers the Central Government to exempt any officer of a particular category appointed to the I.A.S. or I.P.S. from the operation of all or any of the provisions of these rules, after obtaining the concurrence of the State Government concerned. The necessity of this extraordinary power and whether the Union Public Service Commission would be consulted in this matter was not clear. The Ministry stated that this provision was necessitated because of the peculiar conditions of Part B States etc. as explained in para 20 above. The Ministry also stated special circumstances due to which the Commission was not to be consulted. The committee noted the position explained by the Ministry.

28. *All India Services (Travelling Allowances) Rules, 1954.*—First proviso to Rule 3 empowers the Government to sanction railway travel by air-conditioned accommodation to a member of the Services as a special case, whereas normally they are entitled to highest class of accommodation which does not include air-conditioned accommodation. It was felt that, in the absence of any principles to guide the Government in the exercise of this power, the power might be used with discrimination which might give rise to criticism among officers. The Ministry explained that there would be no individual variation in the application of the above discretion which would be exercised in accordance with certain principles or policy to be laid down by the respective Governments. The Committee were satisfied with the Ministry's reply.

29. *All India Services (Medical Attendance) Rules, 1954.*—Rule 2(c) of these Rules defines 'family' of an officer of the Services as meaning the wife or the husband, children and step-children of the officer, wholly dependent upon him or her. The definition of 'family' in the 'Conduct' Rules is much wider so much so that any person related by blood or by marriage and wholly dependent on the officer is also included in the 'family'. First, it was not clear as to what was the justification to make the definition wider, when the officer was to be made responsible for the conduct of members of his family,

and to make it narrower when some benefit was to be given to his family. Secondly, it was felt that at least dependents' parents should be included in the family of an officer for the purpose of medical facilities as was the case under Contributory Health Service Scheme in Delhi.

30. The Ministry explained that the difference in the two definitions was deliberate. The wider definition in the 'Conduct' Rules had been laid down with this consideration that it should be possible for the officer to have an effective control over the conduct of dependent person even if the degree of relationship is not so close. While laying down narrower definition in the Medical Attendance Rules, the Government had to take into account the extent to which they could go in the matter of providing free medical attendance to officers and their families. The Ministry pointed out that the analogy of the Contributory Health Service Scheme for Delhi was not apposite for certain reasons. The Committee noted the Ministry's reply.

DELAY IN PUBLICATION OF CORRIGENDA TO RULES ETC.

31. The Committee noted that in a number of cases the Ministries had taken a long time to correct the errors in the statutory rules etc., as published in the Gazette. In some cases the corrigenda had been published after 3 to 6 months as shown below:—

<i>Date of Publication of original Rules</i>	<i>Date of publication of corrigenda in Gazette</i>	<i>Period elapsed between the two dates</i>
26-3-55	16-7-55 (S. R. O. 1523 of 1955)	3½ months
28-5-55	16-7-55 (S. R. O. 1527 of 1955)	1½ months
30-4-55	16-7-55 (S. R. O. 1548 of 1955)	2½ months
2-7-55	3-9-55 (S. R. O. 1893 of 1955)	2 months
18-7-55	13-8-55 (S. R. O. 1739 of 1955)	3 weeks
25-4-55	20-8-55 (S. R. O. 1783 of 1955)	3 months
3-8-55	10-9-55 (S. R. O. 1928 of 1955)	1 month

<i>Date of Publication of original Rules</i>	<i>Date of publication of corrigenda in Gazette</i>	<i>Period elapsed between the two dates</i>
19-3-55	17-9-55 (S. R. O. 2018 of 1955)	6 months
9-4-55	17-9-55 (S. R. O. 2021 of 1955)	5 months

32. The Committee felt that such delayed publications caused inconvenience both to the general public and the departments of the Government especially when numerical errors were involved. The Committee were of the view that corrigenda, if any, should be published within 15 days of the publication of the rules etc., in which errors were found.

MAKING OF RULES AFTER PREVIOUS PUBLICATION

33. Certain Acts provide that the rules etc., shall be made after previous publication which means that rules are published in draft form, public comments are invited on the draft rules and then the draft is finalised in the light of public comments. The Committee noted that in certain cases, cited below, the time given to the public for sending their comments was practically nil:—

<i>No. of order</i>	<i>Draft published on</i>	<i>Comments invited by</i>	<i>Date on which Gazette containing draft was available</i>
1. S.R.O. 2068 of 1955	24-9-55	30-9-55	1-10-55
2. S.R.O. 2081 of 1955	24-9-55	1-10-55	1-10-55
3. S.R.O. 2084 of 1955	24-9-55	1-10-55	1-10-55

34. The Committee felt that when the Acts gave a right to the public to send their comments on certain draft Rules, it was only reasonable that sufficient time should be given to them to study the draft and send their comments before the draft was finalised. In the opinion of the Committee a period of not less than 30 clear days, exclusive of the time taken in publishing the drafts in the Gazette and despatching the Gazette copies to various parts of the country, should be given to the public to send their comments on such drafts.

CENTRAL SILK BOARD STUDY LEAVE RULES AND CENTRAL SILK BOARD PROVIDENT FUND RULES

35. The Central Silk Board Study Leave Rules and the Central Silk Board Provident Fund Rules, together with the Central Silk Board Rules, 1955, were published in the Gazette under *one* S.R.O. number.

Since they were three separate notifications, they should normally have been published under three different numbers.

36. The case was referred to the Ministry concerned who stated as follows:—

“When the Central Silk Board Rules were first published in 1949, all the three sets of rules referred to above were published under one notification and one S.R.O. number. No reference to modify the above action was received from any authority. In the absence of any such suggestion, the publication of these Rules in three separate Notifications at the time of publishing them during 1955 was not considered. There however, does not appear to be any serious objection in their being under one and the same S.R.O.”

37. It is quite apparent that publication of three notifications under one number is likely to cause confusion and inconvenience to everybody while making a reference to those notifications individually. The Committee were, therefore, of the view that each notification should be given a separate number.

CUSTOMS DUTIES DRAWBACK RULES

38. In para 19 of their Third Report, the Committee had recommended that there should be a rule expressly providing for a reasonable period of notice to be given before withdrawing any scheme of drawback but the Ministry might, if necessary, assume power to provide for exceptional cases in the rule itself.

39. The Ministry of Finance communicated the following views of the Government on the above recommendation for being placed before the Committee:—

“The Government of India fully appreciate the need for giving reasonable notice before withdrawing a draw back scheme, but it would not be in the best interests of the industry concerned to fix a rigid period of such notice in the rules themselves. The cancellation of the rules being required to be made after previous publication, such notice as the circumstances existing at the time appear to call for would be given in every case. It is not, therefore, considered necessary to make a rule providing for reasonable notice. However, in order to make the condition of giving notice in every case of cancellation obligatory on the part of the Government, it has since been decided that instead of making the schemes inoperative by reason of cancellation of the notifications issued under sub-section (1) of section 43B of the Sea Customs Act, the rules issued under sub-section (3) of section 43B *ibid* should be expressly cancelled

simultaneously with the cancellation of the notifications under sub-section (1) of section 43B *ibid.* By following this procedure, the requirement of previous publication would apply by reason of section 21 of the General Clauses Act and thus reasonable notice of the cancellation would be given."

The Committee noted the Ministry's assurance.

**PUBLICATION OF AMENDMENTS MADE BY PARLIAMENT IN STATUTORY
RULES**

40. In exercise of the power conferred by sub-section (3) of section 40 of the Displaced Persons (Compensation and Rehabilitation) Act, 1954, Parliament made certain amendments in the Displaced Persons (Compensation and Rehabilitation) Rules, 1955 framed under sub-section (1) of the section after they were laid before Parliament. The amendments made by Parliament were published in the Gazette (S.R.O. 2104 of 1955) but the notification did not cite the authority under which Parliament could make the amendments in the Rules. The Committee noted that while publishing any statutory rules or amendments made therein by *Government*, relevant authority was invariably cited by the Ministry in the preamble to the rules or amendments. The Committee were of the view that while publishing amendments made by *Parliament* the authority under which amendments were made should also be duly cited in the preamble to the notification.

41. The Committee then adjourned *sine die*.

II

†FOURTH SITTING

Parliament House, New Delhi; Friday, the 7th September, 1956

The Committee met from 4-30 P.M. to 5 P.M.

The following were present.

MEMBERS

Shri Tulsidas Kilachand—(*in the Chair*)

Shri S. V. Ramaswamy

Shri Hem Raj

Shri M. S. Gurupadaswamy

Shri H. Siddananjappa

SECRETARIAT

Shri S. L. Shakhder—*Joint Secretary.*

Shri P. K. Patnaik—*Under Secretary.*

2. In the absence of the Chairman Shri Tulsidas Kilachand was elected to act as Chairman for the sitting.

3. The Committee considered the memoranda prepared by the Secretariat on the following subjects and orders:—

- (1) * * * * *
- (2) Delay in laying orders on the Table (Memos. Nos. 118 and 119).
- (3) S.R.O. 931 of 1955 amending the Mineral Concession Rules, 1949 (Memo. No. 120).
- (4) Prevention of Food Adulteration Rules, 1955 (S.R.O. 2106 of 1955) Memo. No. 121.
- (5) Central Silk Board Rules, 1955 (S.R.O. 662 of 1955) Memo. No. 122.
- (6) S.R.O. 416 of 1953 amending Rule 147 of the Central Excise Rules, 1944 (Memo No. 123).

†Minutes of the Third Sitting are contained in Fifth Report.

(8) Rules for the Port of Cochin (S.R.O. 2135 of 1955) Memo. No. 125.

(9)	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
4.	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
5.	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
6.	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*

DELAY IN LAYING ORDERS ON THE TABLE

7. The Committee decided that the delay in laying the following orders on the Table be reported to the House:—

<i>No. of Order</i>		<i>Delay</i>
S.R.O. 1741	} of 1955	3 weeks
S.R.O. 768		3 months
S.R.O. 3624		2 months
S.R.O. 3625		2 months
Regarding amendments in the Indian Aircraft Rules, 1937.		
S.R.O. 1862	} of 1955	3 months
S.R.O. 1863		3 months
Regarding Sugar Cane Control Order, 1955.		
S.R.O. 1052	} of 1955	2 months
S.R.O. 2080		5 months
Regarding Food Products Order, 1955.		
S.R.O. 224 of 1955 regarding Amendment in the Reserve and Auxilliary Force Act Rules, 1953		3 weeks
S.R.O. 525 of 1955 regarding Amendment in Mysore Gold Mines, Regulations 1953		6 months
S.R.O. 561 of 1955 regarding Amendment in the Petroleum Concession Rules, 1949		4 months
S.R.O. 1712 of 1955 regarding Delimitation Commission Final Order No. 30		1 month
S.R.O. 2840 of 1954 regarding the Public Debt (Annuity Certificate) Rules, 1954		6 months
S.R.O. 1673A of 1955 regarding amending S.R.O. 3310 of 1954		3 months
S.R.O. 1673B of 1955 regarding amending S.R.O. 3311 of 1954		3 months
S.R.O. 3406 of 1955 regarding amending the Order of Bombay Government, Department of A & F, (Civil Supply Section) No. 410 (a)/II dated the 19th March, 1955		1 month
S.R.O. 3407 of 1955 regarding Rescission of certain orders under Essential Commodities Act 1955		1 month
S.R.O. 1511 of 1955 regarding Cotton Control Order, 1955		2 months
S.R.O. 2000 of 1955 regarding Custom Duties Drawback (Provisions) Rules 1955		2 months
S.R.O. 3568 of 1955 regarding cancellation of S.R.O. 2408		3 months
S.R.O. 3569 of 1955 regarding cancellation of S.R.O. 3311 of 1955		3 months

S.R.O. 931 OF 1955 AMENDING THE MINERAL CONCESSION RULES, 1949.

8. This Order introduces new rule 51A in the Mineral Concession Rules, 1949, under which the State Governments are empowered to issue directions to the parties concerned with the mineral concession in certain circumstances.

Section 5 of the parent Act, Mines and Minerals (Regulation & Development) Act 1948, authorises only the Central Government to make provisions regarding the regulation of mining leases etc.

Section 8 authorises the Central Government to delegate its powers to any authority by publishing a notification.

The delegation of power to State Governments to issue directions under new rule 51A appeared to be objectionable unless a notification delegating powers to State Government under Section 8 was issued by the Central Government.

9. A reference was made to the Ministry of Natural Resources and Scientific Research to clarify the position who replied as follows:—

“...the Ministry of Law have advised that new Rule 51A, in so far as it sought to confer a power on the State Government, followed the pattern of other similar provisions in the Mineral Concession Rules, 1949, for instance, rules 8, 13 and 18(1).

The question of amending the Rules, wherever necessary, so as to change the words “State Government” into “Central Government” and of entrusting the functions of the Central Government under the rules to the State Governments with their consent by a formal delegation under Article 258(1) of the Constitution is being considered in consultation with the State Governments and orders in this regard will be issued as soon as replies from all the State Governments are received.

10. The Committee noted the assurance and decides to watch further action on Ministry's part.

PREVENTION OF FOOD ADULTERATION RULES, 1955 (S.R.O. 2106 of 1955)

11. Rule 4(6) of the above Rules provides that the fees payable in respect of certificates of analysis of food samples to be issued by a Laboratory shall be according to the rates to be specified by the Central Government.

This did not appear to be in accord with the parent Act, section 4(2) (b) of which envisaged that the fees for such certificates would be prescribed in the Rules.

12. The Ministry of Health, to whom the point was referred, stated as under:—

“...this Ministry agree to the view expressed therein that the fees payable in respect of reports to be given by the Central Food Laboratory should have been prescribed in the Prevention of Food Adulteration Rules, 1955, instead of the existing Rule 4(6) of the said Rules. The question is, already receiving attention and the matter will be considered by the Central Committee for Food Standards in its second meeting expected to be held by end of this year or early next year.

The existing Rule 4(6) of the Prevention of Food Adulteration Rules, 1955, will be substituted by the actual schedule of fees payable for the analysis certificates to be issued by the Director, Central Food Laboratory, Calcutta, by issue of a notification under Section 4(2) (b) of the Prevention of Food Adulteration Act, 1954, as soon as the recommendation of the Central Committee for Food Standards is made available to this Ministry.”

13. The Committee noted the assurances and decided to watch further action on Ministry's part.

CENTRAL SILK BOARD RULES, 1955 (S.R.O. 662 of 1955).

14. Rule 28(3) & (4).—These rules seemed to empower the Silk Board to make Study Leave Rules and Provident Fund Rules for the employees of the Board. It was not clear how the power of making such Rules could be delegated to the Silk Board when the Act specifically authorises the Central Government to make such rules.

15. The Ministry of Production stated as under:—

“Actually Rule 28(3) does not empower the Central Silk Board to make Study Leave Rules. Similar is the position with regard to Rule 28(4) which also does not empower the Board to make the Contributory Provident Fund Rules.

The opening paragraphs appearing under “Study Leave Rules” are therefore being amended.”

16. Since the Ministry have made the necessary amendments in the Rules *Vide* S.R.Os. 600 & 601 of 1956, the Committee decided that no further action is necessary regarding this.

17. It was felt that the Study Leave Rules and Provident Fund Rules made under Rule 28(3) & (4) of the Central Silk Board Rules should be laid before Parliament in the same way as the Central Silk Board Rules were laid and that there should be specific provision to require their laying before Parliament.

18. The point was referred to the Ministry of Commerce and Industry. Referring to section 13(3) of the parent Act which lays down that all rules made thereunder shall be laid, as soon as may be, before Parliament and the Ministry stated as follows:—

“It therefore follows that any Rules or Sub-rules made under this Section of the Act will have necessarily to be placed before the Parliament. In view of this it does not appear to be necessary to include any specific provision either under the Study Leave Rules or the Central Silk Board Contributory Provident Fund Rules which are framed in pursuance of the provisions in the Central Silk Board Rules, 1955, made under Section 13 of the Central Silk Board Act, 1948.”

19. The Committee noted the Ministry's reply.

20. Rule 29(2) lays down that procedure regarding disciplinary action obtaining in the Central Government Offices will apply to the employees of the Board with such modifications as may be necessary.

It was not clear as to who would make modifications; whether it would be the Board or the Central Government. It was felt that it should not be the Board but it should be the Central Government.

21. The Ministry's views were as follows:—

“The intention of this rule is not to delegate any powers to the Board to modify the Central Silk Board Rules governing the procedure to be adopted in all cases of disciplinary action for adoption to the employees of the Board.

Action is therefore being taken to delete the words ‘with such modifications as may be necessary’ appearing in the last line of Rule 29(2) of the Central Silk Board Rules, 1955.”

22. The Ministry have since made the necessary amendment in Rule 29(2) accordingly, (*vide* S.R.O. 598 of 1956).

The Committee decided that no further action is necessary.

S.R.O. 416 OF 1953 AMENDING RULE 147 OF THE CENTRAL EXCISE RULES, 1944

23. S.R.O. 416 of 1953 added the following proviso to Rule 147 of the Central Excise Rules, 1944:—

“Provided further that if any goods are lost by theft, duty shall be chargeable on all such losses.”

Whereas previously excise duty on goods in a warehouse lost or destroyed by unavoidable accident could be remitted by the Collector in his discretion, this proviso declared that duty shall be chargeable on goods lost by theft.

24. After considering this proviso the Committee, in their second Report, had recommended that "where such goods which have been lost would not be fair and that the rule should, therefore, provide for the foregoing of duty in such cases."

25. In respect of this recommendation the Ministry had intimated that there were difficulties in complying with the recommendation and had expressed their inability to accept it.

26. The Committee subsequently at their sitting held on the 10th December, 1955 examined the representatives of the Ministry, who agreed to examine the suggestion of the Committee for deletion of proviso to Rule 147.

27. The Ministry have since deleted the said proviso to Rule 147.

28. The Committee noted the deletion of the said proviso.

29. * * * *

30. * * * *

31. * * * *

✓ S.R.O. 2135 of 1955—RULES FOR THE PORT OF COCHIN

32. S.R.O. 2135 of 1955 imposing port dues under section 33 of the Indian Ports Act, 1938, was published on the 1st of October, 1955 and declared to take effect from 20th November, 1955, i.e., 51 days after its publication. The parent Act directed that there should be a 60 days interval between the date of publication and date of its coming into effect. The point was referred to the Ministry of Transport.

33. The Ministry stated as under:—

"It was intended that the notification in question should be published in the Gazette of India of 10th September, 1955 but owing to delay in this Ministry's Issue Section it was actually sent to the Government of India Press only on 23rd September and therefore published in the Gazette of India only on 1st October, 1955. At the time it was despatched to the Press it was inadvertently overlooked that the date of effect of the Notification needed to be altered.

There is, however, practically no change in the rates prescribed in this Notification from those previously in force.

In view of this and in consultation with the Ministry of Law a corrigendum has been issued bringing the notification in question into effect from the 1st December, 1955."

34. In view of the Ministry's action the committee decided that no further action was necessary.

- | | | | | |
|-----|---|---|---|---|
| 35. | * | * | * | * |
| 36. | * | * | * | * |
| 37. | * | * | * | * |

The Committee then adjourned *sine die*.

III

FIFTH SITTING

Parliament House New Delhi: Monday the 17th December, 1956.

The Committee met from 4 P.M. to 5 P.M.

PRESENT

Shri N. C. Chatterjee—*Chairman*.

MEMBERS

2. Shri N. M. Lingam
3. Shri Hanamantrao Ganeshrao Vaishnav
4. Shri Ganpati Ram
5. Shri Diwan Chand Sharma
6. Shri Hem Raj
7. Shri H. Siddananjappa
8. Shri Tulsidas Kilachand
9. Shri Hirendra Nath Mukerjee.

SECRETARIAT

Shri S. L. Shakhder—*Joint Secretary*.

Shri N. N. Mallya—*Deputy Secretary*.

2. The Committee considered the memoranda prepared by the Secretariat on the following subjects and Orders:—

- (1) * * * *
- (2) The Estate Duty Rules, 1953 (S.R.O. 556 of 1954)—(Memo. No. 127).
- (3) S.R.O. 98 of 1953 amending the Coal Mines Rescue Rules, 1939—(Memo. No. 128).
- (4) * * * *
- (5) S.R.O. 1673 of 1954 amending the Administration of Evacuee Property (Central) Rules, 1950—(Memo. No. 130).
- (6) Citation of exact statutory authority in the preamble to the Orders—(Memo. No. 131).
- (7) Bills or Acts delegating Rule-making power—(Memo. No. 137).

(8) * * * *

(9) Laying of Rules on the Table of the House—(Memo. No. 139).

(10) Delay in laying Rules etc., on the Table of the House—(Memo. No. 140).

3.	*	*	*	*
4.	*	*	*	*
5.	*	*	*	*
6.	*	*	*	*

THE ESTATE DUTY RULES, 1953 (S.R.O. 556 of 1954)

7. S.R.O. 556 of 1954 contains Estate Duty Rules, made under Section 85(1) of the Estate Duty Act, 1953.

8. Rule 13.—This rule was expressed in a single sentence running into 164 words. Consequently it was not easy to follow.

The Ministry of Finance, to whom a reference was made, appreciated the point and redrafted the rule.

9. The Committee were satisfied with rule 13 as redrafted by the Ministry.

10. Rule 21.—This rule requires that all heirs of a deceased person will have to furnish a full and complete account of the property received by them from the deceased, in cases where the deceased leaves behind more than one heir. This rule may cause harassment especially to minor and female heirs. The difficulty will be all the more in view of the requirement of rules 22 and 23 under which all the accountable persons are to furnish with the original account a certified copy of the Bill, if any, of the deceased and all codicils thereto.

11. The Ministry of Finance, to whom a reference was made, intimated the Committee as under:—

“As regards Rule 21, it applies only where any property of the deceased has been distributed. It has no application to a case where the whole of the deceased's estate remains intact in the hands of a trustee guardian, executor or any other legal representative. The purpose of the rule is to ensure that no property which should have formed part of the Estate escapes notice as may easily happen where any property of the deceased has been distributed as a gift or otherwise. Further, the rule only requires the person to whom any property has been distributed to furnish an account of the property received by him, which in effect means that the identity of the persons to whom the property

has passed being known the responsibility for payment of the duty thereon, can also be fixed. Where property passes to a legal heir either under a will or under the ordinary laws of succession, it fails to be included in the account form to be submitted by the accountable person concerned. The provisions of Rule 21 are therefore considered essential, for in the circumstances envisaged in the rule, any one or more of the heirs may have no knowledge of the details of any property that has already been distributed to a beneficiary."

12. The Committee felt that in view of the above explanation given by the Ministry no further action was necessary.

S.R.O. 98 OF 1953 AMENDING THE COAL MINES RESCUE RULES, 1939

13. S.R.O. 98 of 1953 amended Rule 19 of the Coal Mines Rescue Rules, 1939 so as to impose a time limit of one year for preferring claims for refund of excise duty leviable under these rules.

14. A question was raised, whether this time limit should not be extended to three years as under the Indian Limitation Act, 1908.

15. The Ministry of Law expressed the opinion that from the legal point of view, there was no objection to the provision for a time limit of one year for refund of the duty.

16. The Ministry of Labour informed the Committee as under:—

"...In order to prevent belated claims it was, in consultation with the Ministries of Finance and Law, laid down that time limit for preferring claims should be one year instead of the usual three years.

...there has been no complaint from the trade and the imposition of the time limit therefore does not appear to have caused any hardship to anybody.

If the Committee on Subordinate Legislation still desire that the time limit should be raised to three years the question of amending the Rule will be re-considered."

17. The Committee considered the above reply of the Ministry of Labour and decided that in view of the fact that no complaint had been received from the trade the prescribed time limit for preferring claims might be retained. The Committee, however, desired the Ministry to watch further developments and in the event of any complaint from the trade, inform the Committee of the same.

18.	*	*	*	*	*	*
19.	*	*	*	*	*	*
20.	*	*	*	*	*	*

S.R.O. 1673 OF 1954 AMENDING THE ADMINISTRATION OF EVACUEE PROPERTY (CENTRAL) RULES, 1950

21. S.R.O. 1673 of 1954 amended Rule 14 of the Administration of Evacuee Property (Central) Rules, 1950.

22. The Committee felt that although legally valid the clauses (iii) to (vi) of new sub-rule (3) of rule 14, vested powers of an extra-ordinary character in the Custodian in the matter of cancellation of allotments of evacuee properties and that such powers should not be given through subordinate legislation.

23. The Ministry of Rehabilitation, on a reference being made, explained the position as under:—

“...The necessity for amending Rule 14(3) of the Administration of Evacuee Property (Central) Rules had arisen because certain Displaced Persons who had been allotted evacuee properties at one place had subsequently built or acquired other accommodation, either at the same or another place. In view of the limited evacuee accommodation available, it was incumbent upon this Ministry to ensure that it was put to the maximum possible use and with that end in view, to discourage and disallow multiple allotments. It was in the context of these conditions that the Rule was revised, so as to arm the Custodians of Evacuee Property with powers to deal with cases of such multiple acquisition.”

* * * * *

“...The provisions of Rule 14(3) have now a very limited field of operation, as with the *en bloc* acquisition of evacuee properties, under Section 12 of the Displaced Persons (Compensation and Rehabilitation) Act, only disputed properties now vest in the Custodian. Their number is very small, and it is also subject to progressive decline, since, with the settlement of every disputed claim, the existing unacquired properties will either come to be acquired or revert to the owner. In either case, it will go out of the Custodian's control and cease to vest in him.”

24. The Committee felt that in view of the explanation given by the Ministry no further action was necessary.

CITATION OF EXACT STATUTORY AUTHORITY IN THE PREAMBLE TO THE 'ORDERS'

25. When any rules, regulations etc., are issued under any Act, the precise authority under which they are made should be specified i.e., the particular Section of the Act giving the power to make the rules, regulations etc., should be cited in the preamble of the same.

The Committee noted that in a number of cases the authorities cited in the preamble to the rules were not specific and in a few instances no citation at all had been given.

26. The Committee considered that it was essential that the authority giving power to make rules etc., should be specifically cited in the preamble to the rules for the purpose of enabling all concerned to know under what precise authority the rules had been made.

BILLS OR ACTS DELEGATING RULE-MAKING POWER

27. The Committee in para 36 of their Third Report had made the following recommendations:—

“(1) That in future the Acts containing provisions for making rules etc., shall lay down that such rules shall be laid on the Table as soon as possible;

(2) That all these rules shall be laid on the Table for a uniform and total period of 30 days before the date of their final publication:

Provided that where it is not deemed expedient to lay any rule on the Table before the date of publication, such rule may be laid as soon as possible after publication. An explanatory note should, however, accompany such rules at the time they are so laid explaining why it was not deemed expedient to lay these rules on the Table of the House before they were published; and

(3) That in future the Acts authorising delegation of rule-making power shall contain express provisions that the rules made thereunder shall be subject to such modifications as the House may like to make.”

28. Regarding this recommendation the Ministry of Law informed the Committee that in future the Bills which seek to delegate rule-making power to the Executive would contain as far as possible a provision on the following lines:—

“All rules made under this section shall be laid for not less than thirty days before both Houses of Parliament as soon as possible after they are made and shall be subject to such modifications as Parliament may make during the Session in which they are so laid or the Session immediately following.”

29. The Committee accepted the above suggestion of the Ministry of Law as it would meet their intention.

30.	*	*	*	*	*
31.	*	*	*	*	*
32.	*	*	*	*	*

LAYING OF RULES ON THE TABLE OF THE HOUSE

33. The Committee considered the following suggestions which were made by the Business Advisory Committee at their sitting held on the 24th August, 1956:—

- (1) Whenever rules, framed by the Government under any Act are laid on the Table of the House a statement of Objects and Reasons and also a Statement containing explanatory notes on the rules in respect thereof should also be appended thereto for the information of Members.
- (2) When new Rules amending the original rules are laid on the Table of the House the relevant extracts from the original rules should also be attached to such rules.

34. The Committee recommended that the above suggestions of the Business Advisory Committee should be implemented.

DELAY IN LAYING RULES ETC., ON THE TABLE OF THE HOUSE

35. In the Lok Sabha on the 30th August, 1956, the Speaker observed, while the Minister of Communications laid on the Table of the House a Notification dated the 26th April, 1956, relating to the Air Corporations Rules, 1954, as follows:—

"Hereafter hon. Ministers will kindly place all notifications as early as possible after they are issued."

36. The Committee noted the Speaker's observation.

37. The Committee decided to present their Sixth Report to the House on the 22nd December, 1956.

38. The Committee then adjourned to meet again at 4 P.M. on Friday, the 21st December, 1956.

IV

SIXTH SITTING

Parliament House, New Delhi: Friday the 21st December, 1956.

The Committee met from 4 P.M. to 4-30 P.M.

PRESENT

Shri N. C. Chatterjee—*Chairman.*

MEMBERS

2. Shri N. M. Lingam
3. Shri Hanamantrao Ganeshrao Vaishnav
4. Shri Tek Chand
5. Shri Ganpati Ram
6. Shri Diwan Chand Sharma
7. Shri Hem Raj
8. Shri Hirendra Nath Mukerjee.

SECRETARIAT

Shri N. N. Mallya—*Deputy Secretary.*

2. The Committee decided that the delay in laying the orders on the Table shown in the Annexure be reported to the House.

3. The Committee considered the draft of the Sixth Report and adopted the same.

4. The Committee authorised the Chairman to present the Report to the House.

5. The Committee then adjourned *sine die.*

ANNEXURE

Sl. No.	No. of Order and Subject	Date of publication	Date of laying	Delay (Approximately)
1	S.R.O. 1262 of 1954—amending the Tea Rules, 1954	19-4-54	5-3-56	two years.
2	S.R.O. 229 of 1955—amending the Tea Rules, 1954	22-1-55	5-3-56	one year.
3	S.R.O. 3551 of 1955—amending the Indian Aircraft Rules, 1937	26-11-55	22-2-56	3 months
4	S.R.O. 2106 of 1955—Prevention of Food Adulteration Rules, 1955	24-9-55	22-2-56	3 months
5	S.R.O. 3438 of 1955—Cancelling S.R.O. 2406 of 1954	8-11-55	15-2-56	3 months
6	S.R.O. 3439 of 1955—Cancelling S.R.O. 2407 of 1954	8-11-55	15-2-56	3 months.
7	S.R.O. 350 of 1956—amending the Indian Aircraft Rules, 1937	18-2-56	15-5-56	3 months
8	S.R.O. 594 of 1956—amending the Indian Aircraft Rules, 1937	10-3-56	23-5-56	10 weeks.
9	S.R.O. 323 of 1956—Election Commission Final Order No. 31	14-2-56	24-4-56	9 weeks
10	The Companies (Central Governments) General Rules and Forms, 1956	18-2-56	14-3-56	1 month
11	S.R.O. 925 of 1956—amending the Indian Aircraft Rules, 1937	21-4-56	23-5-56	1 month
12	S.R.O. 224 of 1956—The High Court Judges (Part A States) Rules, 1956	4-2-56	3-3-56	13 weeks.
13	S.R.O. 1524 of 1955—Amendments to the Air Corporations Rules, 1954	16-7-55	25-7-56	1 year
14	S.R.O. 1742 of 1955—Amendments to the Mineral Concession Rules, 1949	13-8-55	3-8-56	1 year
15	S.R.O. 347 of 1956—Amendments to the Delhi (Control of Building Operations) Regulations, 1955	18-2-56	3-9-56	6½ months.
16	S.R.O. 244 of 1956—Amendments to the Mineral Concession Rules, 1949	18-2-56	3-8-56	5½ months.
17	S.R.O. 302 of 1956—Amendments to the Mineral Concession Rules, 1949	4-2-56	3-8-56	5½ months
18	S.R.O. 349 of 1956—Amendments to the Mineral Concession Rules, 1949	18-3-56	3-8-56	5½ months
19	S.R.O. 158 of 1956—Amendments to the Air Corporations Rules, 1954	21-1-56	25-7-56	5 months

1	2	3	4	5
20	S.R.O. 1040 of 1956—Amendments to the Air Corporations Rules, 1954	5-5-56	30-8-56	4 months
21	S.R.O. 851 of 1956—Amendments to the Indian Aircraft Rules, 1937	14-4-56	16-7-56	3 months
22	S.R.O. 1077 of 1956—Amendments to the Cotton Textiles (Control) Order, 1948	8-5-56	1-8-56	3 months
23	S.R.O. 1077A of 1956—The Cotton Textiles (Production by Handloom) Control Order, 1956	8-5-56	1-8-56	3 months
24	S.R.O. 1109 of 1956—The Iron and Steel (Control) Order, 1956	12-5-56	20-8-56	3 months
25	S.R.O. 1440 of 1956—Amendments to the Delhi (Control of Building Operations) Regulations, 1955	23-6-56	3-9-56	6 weeks
26	S.R.O. 1493 of 1956—Amendments to the Delhi (Control of Building Operations) Regulations, 1955	30-6-56	3-9-56	6 weeks
27	S.R.O. 1724 of 1956—Delimitation Commission Final Order No. 32	30-7-56	13-9-56	6 weeks
28	S.R.O. 1725 of 1956—Delimitation Commission Final Order No. 33	30-7-56	13-9-56	6 weeks
29	S.R.O. 1726 of 1956—Delimitation Commission Final Order No. 34	30-7-56	13-9-56	6 weeks
30	S.R.O. 1727 of 1956—Delimitation Commission Final Order No. 35	30-7-56	13-9-56	6 weeks
31	S.R.O. 1865 of 1956—Amendments to the Estate Duty Rules, 1953	16-6-56	27-7-56	2 weeks
32	S.R.O. 1660 of 1956—Amendments to the Employees' Provident Fund Scheme, 1952	21-7-56	6-8-56	2 weeks