

**JOINT COMMITTEE ON OFFICES
OF PROFIT**

(FIFTH LOK SABHA)

ELEVENTH REPORT

(Presented on the 20th December, 1974)



**LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT
NEW DELHI**

December, 1974/Agrahayana, 1896 (Saka)

Price : Re. 1.00

CORRIGENDA
TO
THE ELEVENTH REPORT OF THE JOINT COMMITTEE
ON OFFICES OF PROFIT (FIFTH LOK SABHA)

<u>Page</u>	<u>Line</u>	<u>For</u>	<u>Read</u>
2	10	embit	ambit
3	17	not	note
5	16	State of India	State Bank of India
6	4	Committee	Committees
6	6	Committee	Committees
8	4 from bottom	Education	Educationists
15	1	consituted	constituted
19	2 from bottom	NEM	NEW
23	17	non	none
23	20	Heresa	Teresa
28	16	Committee	Committees
28	18	Committee	Committees
29	12 from bottom	tha	that
35	10	Chairman	Chairmen
39	2	Mailis	Majlis
40	3	consituted	constituted

-o-o-o-

CONTENTS

	PAGE NO.
COMPOSITION OF THE JOINT COMMITTEE REPORT	(iii)
I. Introduction	I
II. Committees/Boards/Corporations, etc. constituted by the Central and State Governments	I
III. Review of earlier Recommendations	9
IV. Implementation of Recommendations	13
APPENDIX	
Minutes of Thirty-first, Thirty-second, Thirty-fourth and Thirty-fifth sittings of the Joint Committee	20

**PERSONNEL OF THE JOINT COMMITTEE ON OFFICES
OF PROFIT**

(Fifth Lok Sabha)

Lok Sabha

1. Shri S. B. P. Pattabhi Rama Rao—*Chairman*
2. Shri Chandrika Prasad
3. Shri Somnath Chatterjee
4. Shri Jagannathrao Joshi
5. Shri Z. M. Kahandole
6. Shri Pratap Singh
7. Shri Ramji Ram
8. Shri Arjun Sethi
9. Shri Ramavatar Shastri
- *10. Shri Ram Shekhar Prasad Singh

Rajya Sabha

- **11. Shri Vithal Gadgil
- †12. Shri N. M. Kamble
- †13. Shri A. K. Refaye
14. Shri Venigalla Satyanarayana
- **15. Shri Yogendra Sharma

SECRETARIAT

Shri P. K. Patnaik—*Additional Secretary.*

Shri H. G. Paranjpe—*Chief Financial Committee Officer.*

-
- * Elected by Lok Sabha on the 6th December, 1973 *vice* Shri Dhanidhar Basumtari resigned from the Committee.
- ** Elected by Rajya Sabha on the 22nd May, 1972, *vice* Dr. (M^{rs.}) Mangladevi Talwar and Shri M.V. Bhadram ceased to be members of the Joint Committee on their retirement from that House.
- † Elected by Rajya Sabha on the 8th May, 1974 *vice* Sarvashri S. A. Khaja Mohideen and Sanda Narayanappa ceased to be Members of the Joint Committee on their retirement from that House.

REPORT OF THE JOINT COMMITTEE

I. INTRODUCTION

1. I, the Chairman of the Joint Committee on **Offices of Profit**, having been authorised by the Committee to present the Report on their behalf, present this Eleventh Report of the Committee.

2. The Committee held four sittings—on the 20th August, 30th September, 4th December and 17th December, 1974. Minutes of these sittings form part of the Report and are at Appendix.

3. The Committee considered the composition, character, functions, etc. of 49 Committees/Boards/Corporations, etc. constituted by the Central and State Governments and the emoluments and allowances payable to their members.

4. Detailed information regarding the composition, character, functions, etc. of the Committees/Boards/Corporations, etc. and emoluments and allowances payable to their members was furnished by the respective Ministries/Departments of the Central Government and State Governments on a request made by the Lok Sabha Secretariat.

5. The Committee also considered certain representations received from the Ministries of Labour and External Affairs for review of their earlier recommendations. They also considered Governments' replies showing action taken or proposed to be taken on certain recommendations made by the Committee in their Second and Seventh Reports (Fifth Lok Sabha).

6. The Committee considered and adopted the Report on the 17th December, 1974.

7. The observations/recommendations of the Committee in respect of the matters considered by them are given in the succeeding paragraphs.

II. COMMITTEES/BOARDS/CORPORATIONS, ETC. CONSTITUTED BY THE CENTRAL AND STATE GOVERNMENTS.

Boards of Mining Examinations for Coal and Non-Coal Mines. (Mines)

8. The Committee note that the Boards of Mining Examinations for Coal Mines and Non-Coal Mines conduct examinations and grant certificates of competency. Also, the payment admissible to the

Members in the form of honorarium (*viz.* Rs. 100/- per day) exceeds the 'compensatory allowance', as defined in Section 2(a) of the Parliament (Prevention of Disqualification) Act, 1959. As such, the Committee feel that the membership of the Boards ought not to be exempt from disqualification.

The Delhi Urban Art Commission

9. The Committee note that the Chairman of the Delhi Urban Art Commission draws a monthly salary of Rs 3,000/-, and the whole-time member a monthly salary in the scale of Rs. 2500—12/2—2750. These payments do not come within the ambit of 'compensatory allowance', as defined in Section 2(a) of the Parliament (Prevention of Disqualification) Act, 1959. Part-time members, not resident in Delhi, are paid an allowance of Rs. 75/- per day (inclusive of daily allowance), which exceeds the 'compensatory allowance'. But part-time members, resident in Delhi are paid an allowance of Rs. 50/- per day, which is marginally less than the 'compensatory allowance'.

The Committee also note that the functions of the Commission are primarily advisory. Under section 11(3) of the Delhi Urban Art Commission Act, the Commission can *suo motu* promote and secure the development, re-development or beautification of any area in Delhi. The Commission can also incur expenditure and has quasi-judicial powers in certain matters.

As such, the Committee feel that the membership (including chairmanship) of the Commission ought not to be exempt from disqualification.

Housing and Urban Development Corporation Ltd.

10. The Committee note that the non-official Directors of the Housing and Urban Development Corporation are entitled to a sitting fee of Rs. 50/- for each meeting of the Board and incidentals at the rate of Rs. 100/- for the first day of the meetings and Rs. 50/- for subsequent days. The total amount admissible to the non-official Directors per day thus exceeds the 'compensatory allowance'. Besides, the Board of Directors exercises executive and financial powers. As such, the Committee feel that the Directorship of the Corporation ought not to be exempt from disqualification.

Space Commission ✓

11. The Committee note that the non-official members of the Space Commission while on tour are eligible for boarding and lodging at Government's expense in a leading hotel, in lieu of daily allowance. In addition they are entitled to draw an allowance equal to one-half of the highest rate of daily allowance admissible to a Grade I Officer in the Central Government.

However, the Commission exercises executive and financial powers in the process of implementing Government's policy on all matters concerning space e.g. giving financial assistance to institutions/associations for furtherance of research and study in Space Science or grant of scholarships to students etc. going abroad for studies in the field of Space Science.

As such, the Committee feel that the membership of the Commission ought not to be exempt from disqualification.

Board of Directors of Hindustan Paper Corporation (P) Ltd. ✓ *Chairman*

12. The Committee note that there are at present no non official Directors on the Board of Directors of the Hindustan Paper Corporation (P) Ltd. Nevertheless, the President may appoint non-officials also on the Board of Directors who would be entitled to TA/DA, etc.

Also, the Board of Directors exercises executive and financial powers.

As such, the Committee feel that non-official Directors, if any, appointed by the President on the Board of Directors, ought not to be exempt from disqualification.

Kendriya Hindi Shikshana Mandal (*Chairman*)

13. The Committee note that the Chairman of the Kendriya Hindi Shikshana Mandal is, *inter alia* entitled to an honorarium of Rs. 500/- per month, which does not come within the ambit of 'compensatory allowance'.

However, other non-official members are entitled to TA/DA only at the rates admissible to Class I Officer of Central Government, which is less than the 'compensatory allowance'.

As such, the Committee feel that while the Chairmanship of the Mandal ought not to be exempt from disqualification ordinary membership ought to be.

Central Governing Council of Military Schools

14. The Committee note that the payment admissible to the non-official members of the Central Governing Council of Military Schools is less than the 'compensatory allowance'. However, the Governing Council exercises executive and financial powers. As such, the Committee feel that the non-official members of the Council ought not to be exempt from disqualification.

Board of Directors of Industrial Reconstruction Corporation of India Limited

15. The Committee note that the non-official Directors of the Industrial Reconstruction Corporation of India Limited are entitled to a sitting fee of Rs. 150/- for attending a Board's meeting, besides travelling and halting charges. The payment admissible to the non-official Directors thus exceeds the 'compensatory allowance'. Also, the Board of Directors exercises executive and financial powers. As such, the Committee feel that the Directorship of the Corporation (including Chairmanship) ought not to be exempt from disqualification.

Management Committee of the Nationalised Banks

16. The Committee note that the non-official members of the Management Committee of the Nationalised Banks are entitled to a sitting fee of Rs. 75/- for attending each Committee meeting along with travelling expenses. They are also entitled to a halting allowance of Rs. 30/- per diem (in case they do not stay in a hotel). As the payment admissible to the non-official members of the Managing Committee thus exceeds the 'compensatory allowance', the Committee feel that the membership of the Committee ought not to be exempt from disqualification.

(i) *Board of Directors of the Agricultural Refinance Corporation.*

(ii) *Executive Committee of the Board of Directors of the Agricultural Refinance Corporation.*

17. The Committee note that the non-official Directors of the Agricultural Refinance Corporation and the members of the Executive Committee are entitled to sitting fee of Rs. 100/- and Rs. 50/- respectively for attending each meeting of the Board and the Executive Committee. They are also entitled to travelling expenses and halting allowance of Rs. 45/- per day. The total amount admissible to the non-official Directors thus exceeds the 'compensa-

tory allowance'. Besides, the Board of Directors and the Executive Committee exercise executive and financial powers. As such, the Committee feel that the Directorship of the Corporation and the membership of the Executive Committee ought not to be exempt from disqualification.

Board of Directors of Subsidiary Banks of State Bank of India viz. State Bank of Bikaner and Jaipur/Hyderabad/Indore/Mysore/Patiala/Saurashtra and Travancore. *Amend*

18. The Committee note that the non-official Directors of the Subsidiary Banks of State Bank of India are entitled to a sitting fee of Rs. 50/- for attending each meeting of the Board plus in some cases a halting allowance of Rs. 30/- per diem. The total payment admissible to the non-official Directors may thus exceed the 'compensatory allowance'. Besides, the Board of Directors exercises executive and financial powers. As such, the Committee feel that the Directorship of the Subsidiary Banks of State of India in so far as it is an office under the Government ought not to be exempt from disqualification.

Board of Directors of the Nationalised Banks (Ministry of Finance).

19. The Committee note that the non-official Directors of the nationalised banks are entitled to sitting fee of Rs. 150/- for attending each meeting of the Board alongwith travelling and halting expenses. The remuneration admissible to them thus exceeds the 'compensatory allowance'. Besides, the Board of Directors exercises executive and financial powers. As such, the Committee feel that the Directorship of the Nationalised Banks ought not to be exempt from disqualification.

(Board of Directors of the Industrial Development Bank of India, Bombay (Ministry of Finance)

20. The Committee note that the non-official Directors of the Industrial Development Bank of India are entitled to receive Rs. 200/- as sitting fee for attending each meeting of the Board and halting allowance of Rs. 35/- per diem for the days of travel and the days of meetings. These payments admissible to the non-official Directors thus exceed the 'compensatory allowance'. Besides, the Board of Directors exercises executive and financial powers. As such, the Committee feel that the Directorship of the Board ought not to be exempt from disqualification.

Market Committees (Haryana)

21. The Committee note that the non-official members of the Market Committees are entitled to TA and DA, which is less than the 'compensatory allowance'. But the functions of the Committee are executive in nature. As such, the Committee feel that the membership of the Committee (including Chairmanship) ought not to be exempt from disqualification.

Agricultural Marketing Board, Haryana

22. The Committee note that the Chairman of the Agricultural Marketing Board is entitled to Rs. 1000/- as monthly allowance. This payment does not come within the ambit of 'compensatory allowance', as defined in section 2(a) of the Parliament (Prevention of Disqualification) Act. 1959. The other non-official members are entitled to TA and DA, which is less than the 'compensatory allowance'. However, the Board exercises executive and quasi-judicial power. For instance it has *inter alia* the power to suspend licenses. As such, the Committee feel that the membership of the Board (including Chairmanship) ought not to be exempt from disqualification.

*Advisory Board under the Maintenance of Internal Security Act, 1971
(Andhra Pradesh)*

23. The Committee note that the payment admissible to the non-official members of the Advisory Board under the Maintenance of Internal Security Act (Andhra Pradesh) viz. Rs. 100/- as sitting fee, exceeds the 'compensatory allowance'. Also, the functions of the Board are judicial in nature. As such, the Committee feel that the membership of the Board ought not to be exempt from disqualification.

24. In regard to the following bodies, the Committee note that the non-official members thereof are either not entitled to any remuneration or the payment admissible to them does not exceed the 'compensatory allowance'. Besides, the functions of these bodies were mainly advisory in nature. As such, the Committee feel that the membership of these bodies ought to be exempt from disqualification:—

1. Engineer Equipment Research and Development Panel (Ministry of Defence).
2. Electronics Development Panel (Ministry of Defence).

3. Fire Research Development and Training Panel (Ministry of Defence).
4. Aerial Delivery Research and Development Panel (Ministry of Defence).
5. Advisory Board for the Military College of Telecommunication Engineering, Mhow (Ministry of Defence).
6. Textiles and General Stores Research and Development Panel (Ministry of Defence).
7. Psychological Research Panel (Ministry of Defence).
8. Defence Food Research and Development Panel (Ministry of Defence).
- / 9. Materials Research and Development Panel (Ministry of Defence).
- / 10. Advisory Board for the Military College of Electronics and Mechanical Engineering, Secunderabad and Electrical and Mechanical Engineering School, Baroda. (Ministry of Defence).
- (11. Advisory Committee for the Institute of Armament Technology, Poona (Ministry of Defence).
- / 12. Advisory Committee for the Defence Institute of Work Study, Mussoorie (Ministry of Defence).
- / 13. Advisory Committee for the selection, review and appraisal of the ensembles under the scheme of "Financial Assistance to Professional Dance-Drama and Theatre Ensembles". (Department of Culture).
- / 14. National Radar Council (Department of Electronics).
- / 15. National Council for Training in Vocational Trades (Ministry of Labour).
16. Trade Committees of the National Council for Training in Vocational Trades (Ministry of Labour).
17. Implementation Committees on Printing, Chemical, Building Construction, Textile, Hotel and Catering and Engineering Group of Trades attached to each Regional Directorate of Apprenticeship Training (Ministry of Labour).
18. Regional (Zonal) Committee of the Central Apprenticeship Council and the National Council of Training in Vocational

- Trades for Northern, Southern, Eastern and Western Regions (Ministry of Labour).
19. Selection Committee for admission at Model Training Institute attached to Central Training Institutes (One each at CTI, Calcutta, Bombay, Madras, Kanpur, Hyderabad, Ludhiana) (Ministry of Labour).
 20. Advisory Committee for C.T.I. (One each for the C.T.Is Calcutta, Bombay, Madras, Hyderabad, Kanpur, Ludhiana, New Delhi) (Ministry of Labour).
 21. Advisory Committee for the Central Staff Training and Research Institute, Calcutta (Ministry of Labour).
 22. Committee of Direction, one each for Central Staff Training and Research Institute, Calcutta/Advanced Training Institute Madras/Foremen Training Institute, Bangalore (Ministry of Labour).
 23. The Central Advisory Board for Iron Ore Mines Labour Welfare Fund (Ministry of Labour).
 24. Central Advisory Contract Labour Board (Ministry of Labour).
 25. Consultative Council on Community Development and Panchayati Raj (Ministry of Agriculture).
 26. Hindi Shiksha Samiti (Ministry of Education).
 27. Central Advisory Board of Archaeology (Ministry of Education).
 28. National Committee on Science and Technology (Department of Science and Technology).
 29. All India Council of Sports (Ministry of Education and Social Welfare).
 30. Committee of Education and Leaders of Youth and Student Organisations (Ministry of Education and Social Welfare).
 31. Wild Life Advisory Board (Andhra Pradesh).
 32. Divisional Advisory Councils, State Transport (Gujarat).

III

REVIEW OF EARLIER RECOMMENDATIONS

- (i) Jury for Jawaharlal Nehru Award for International Understanding—Representation for review of the recommendation of the Committee made in para 12 of their Fourth Report (Fourth Lok Sabha).

25. In paragraph 12 of their Fourth Report, the Joint Committee on Offices of Profit (Fourth Lok Sabha), had observed as follows in regard to the Jury for Jawaharlal Nehru Award for International Understanding:—

“The Committee note that the non-official members of the Jury for Jawaharlal Nehru Award for International Understanding wield influence and possess power of patronage inasmuch as they make the selection for the Award of Rupees one lakh provided by the Government of India. As such, the Committee are of the opinion that even membership of the Jury ought to disqualify.”

26. In a communication addressed to the Secretariat, the Ministry of External Affairs have represented as follows:—

“That Members of Jury wield influence and possess powers of patronage because they make the selection of the Award of Rupees one lakh, is, in the opinion of this Ministry, to take a rather extreme view of the standing of the Jury. As Members of the Jury do not get any honorarium, basically, membership of the Jury should not constitute holding office of Profit. As regards patronage, so far none of the recipients of the Award has been Indian national; in fact, the high positions held by recipients—U. Thant, Martin Luther King Jr., Khan Abdul Ghaffar Khan, Yehudi Menuhin, Mother Teresa, Kenneth D. Kaunda, Josip Broz Tito, Andre Malraus and Julius K. Nyerere—will clearly indicate that the element of patronage or influence could hardly play a part here.”

27. The Committee have re-considered the matter. They agree with the Ministry of External Affairs that the membership of the Jury for Jawaharlal Nehru Award for International Understanding ought not to disqualify for membership of Parliament.

- (ii) (1) Standing Committee of the Employees' State Insurance Corporation; and
- (2) Medical Benefit Council of the Employees' State Insurance Corporation. Representation for review of the recommendations of the Committee made in paras 6—7 of their Second Report (Second Lok Sabha).

28. The Standing Committee of the Employees' State Insurance Corporation and the Medical Benefit Council of the Employees' State Insurance Corporation are included in Schedule I of the Parliament (Prevention of Disqualification) Amendment Bill, 1973. That is, in case of the enactment of the Bill, the Chairmen and Secretaries of these bodies will not be exempt from disqualification for membership of Parliament. These bodies have been included in the Bill on the recommendations of the Joint Committee on Offices of Profit (Second Lok Sabha) made in paras 6 and 7 of their Second Report, presented to the House on 9-9-1960.

29. The Ministry of Labour have represented for review of the recommendations of the Joint Committee made in paras 6—7 of their Second Report (Second Lok Sabha). In their communication dated 9-8-1974, the Ministry of Labour have urged as follows:—

“....It is felt that the Standing Committee and the Medical Benefit Council should not be included in the Schedule, for the reasons given below:—

- (1) The Employees' State Insurance Corporation is not included in the Schedule and the Chairman of the Corporation is not disqualified from being a member of Parliament, even though rules for payment of T.A./D.A., etc. to the members are the same in all the three cases.
- (2) The Chairman of the E.S.I.C. and the Chairman of the Standing Committee do not get any remuneration from the E.S.I.C., while the D.G.H.S. is the *ex-officio* Chairman of the Medical Benefit Council under Section 10 (1) (a) of the E.S.I. Act, 1948.
- (3) It is considered necessary to appoint a Minister as the Chairman of the Standing Committee for securing the co-operation of the State Governments in the administration of the E.S.I. Scheme particularly the medical care provided thereunder which is the responsibility of State Governments and in implementing the decisions taken by the Corporation. In this connection, it may be added that the Corporation is at present engaged in a crucial expansion programme, for the implementation of which the corporation is largely dependent on the State Governments. It is, therefore, all the more necessary to continue the existing arrangement.

- (4) From time to time, the States are represented on the Standing Committee by the State Ministers. At present, Dr. Rafiq Zakaria, Minister of Public Health in the Government of Maharashtra is a member of the Standing Committee of the Employees' State Insurance Corporation.

30. In reply to a query as to since when the practice to appoint the Deputy Labour Minister as the Chairman of the Standing Committee of the E.S.I.C. had been started and whether the appointment was done under some statutory rule/order, the Ministry of Labour have stated as follows:

“ . . .under Section 8(a) of the Employees' State Insurance Act, 1948, the Chairman of the Standing Committee has to be nominated by the Central Government from among members of the Corporation. At present, the Deputy Labour Minister is the Chairman of the Standing Committee. He was nominated as such with effect from 3-12-1973. In the past also, the Chairman of the Standing Committee has been either the Minister of State for Labour or Deputy Minister of Labour during the periods from the 20th November, 1964 to 15th August, 1965, 21st March, 1966 to 11th September, 1966, 11th April, 1967 to 16th November, 1967 and 1st March, 1969 onwards.”

31. In the opinion of the Committee, the Chairmanship of the Standing Committee of the Corporation does not stand on a par with the Chairmanship of the Corporation; for, while under Section 4 of the Employees' State Insurance Act, 1948, the Minister of Labour is the ex-officio Chairman of the Corporation, there is no such statutory stipulation so far as the Chairman of the Standing Committee is concerned. Under Section 8(a) of the Act, the Chairman of the Standing Committee is to be nominated by the Central Government from among the members of the Corporation; and, as the Committee observe, persons other than Ministers have, in fact, been appointed as Chairman of the Standing Committee from time to time.

In order to leave no room for any doubt, the Committee will like to make it clear that if a Minister is appointed as the Chairman of the Standing Committee, he ought to be exempt from disqualification for membership of Parliament but if a non-official (other than a Minister) is appointed as the Chairman of the Standing Committee, he ought not to be so exempt.

32. In regard to the Medical Benefit Council of the Corporation, the Committee note that the Director General, Health Services—an official—is an ex-officio Chairman of the Council. Also, the functions of the Council are mainly advisory in nature. As such, the Committee feel that the Council ought to be omitted from Schedule I to the aforesaid Bill.

(iii) Iron Ore Mines Labour Welfare Fund Advisory Committee—Representation for Review of the recommendation of the Committee made in para 17 of their Fourth Report (Fourth Lok Sabha).

33. The Iron Ore Mines Labour Welfare Fund Advisory Committee has been included in Schedule I of the Parliament (Prevention of Disqualification) Amendment Bill, 1973 (*vide* S. No. 1 under Goa, Daman and Diu—Part II). In case of the enactment of the Bill, as it stands at present, the Chairman and Secretary of the Iron Ore Mines Labour Welfare Fund Advisory Committee will not be exempt from disqualification for membership of Parliament. The body has been included in the Bill on the recommendation of the Joint Committee on Offices of Profit (Fourth Lok Sabha) made in para 17 of their Fourth Report (Fourth Lok Sabha).

34. In their communication dated 27-7-1974, the Ministry of Labour have urged as follows:

“ . . . the Iron Ore Mines Labour Welfare Fund Advisory Committee for Goa, Daman and Diu has been included at S. No. 1 under ‘Goa, Daman and Diu’ in Part I of the First Schedule to the Parliament (Prevention of Disqualification) Amendment Bill, 1973 as introduced in the Lok Sabha on 21st December, 1973. In this connection, it may be stated that such Committees have also been set up in the States of Andhra Pradesh, Mysore, Maharashtra, M.P., Bihar and Orissa. According to Rule 3(i) of the Iron Ore Mines Labour Welfare Cess Rules, 1973, Labour Ministers of the respective States are appointed *ex-officio* Chairmen of the State Advisory Committees. The Labour Ministers are, however, not being paid any salary in the capacity of their holding the office of the Chairman of the Advisory Committee. The intention in associating the Labour Ministers with the State Advisory Committees was only to enlist maximum cooperation of the State Governments in the welfare programmes of the

Iron Ore Miners. As such it cannot be said that the Labour Ministers are holding any offices of Profit under the Government and they cannot also possibly be debarred from being a member of Parliament.

The Lok Sabha Secretariat is requested to approach the Joint Committee on Offices of Profit (Fifth Lok Sabha) for deletion of the entry relating to the Iron Ore Mines Labour Welfare Advisory Committee for Goa, Daman and Diu from the First Schedule to the aforesaid Bill."

35. The Committee note that under Rule 3(i) of the Iron Ore Mines Labour Welfare Cess Rules, 1963—which are statutory rules—Labour Ministers of the respective States are appointed ex-officio Chairmen of the State Advisory Committees. As such, the Committee feel that the entry relating to the Iron Ore Mines Labour Welfare Fund Advisory Committee under 'Goa, Daman and Diu' ought to be omitted from Schedule I of the Parliament (Prevention of Disqualification) Amendment Bill, 1973.

IV

IMPLEMENTATION OF RECOMMENDATIONS

- (i) Non-supply/Delay in supply of information by Ministries/ Departments of Government of India—Action taken or proposed to be taken by Government on the recommendations of the Committee made in paras 42—46 of their Seventh Report (Fifth Lok Sabha).

36. In paragraphs 42 to 46 of their Seventh Report (Fifth Lok Sabha), presented to the House on 21-12-1973, the Joint Committee on Offices of Profit expressed distress over the instances of non-supply/delayed supply of information by the Ministries/Departments of Government of India. The Committee *inter alia* noted that information in respect of some of the bodies constituted by the Ministries/Departments of Government of India was furnished to the Committee five to eleven years after their constitution. The Committee desired that, save in exceptional circumstances, information in respect of bodies constituted by Ministries/Departments of Government of India should reach them within two months of their constitution. The Committee desired Government to evolve a suitable procedure for the purpose.

bodies constituted by the Ministries/Departments is furnished, as soon as the necessary notification or resolution, as the case may be, constituting such bodies is issued; and in no case later than the time limit prescribed by the Committee. A register indicating the date of issue of notification, etc., and the date of furnishing the necessary information to the Joint Committee on Offices of Profit should be maintained and reviewed by the Branch Officer every fortnight. The responsibility for making review of this register should be entrusted to the Officer Incharge of the Parliament Section, who should bring to the notice of the Secretary cases in which it has not been possible to furnish the information within the prescribed time limits and the reasons therefor.

According to the terms of reference of the Joint Committee on Offices of Profit, the Joint Committee is also required to scrutinise from time to time the Schedule to the Parliament (Prevention of Disqualification) Act, 1959, and to recommend any amendments in the said Schedule, whether by way of addition, omission or otherwise."

39. The Committee note with satisfaction the above measures taken by Government for supply of prompt information to the Committee. The Committee trust that the instructions laid down in the Ministry of Law, Justice and Company Affairs (Legislative Department) O.M. dated the 5th June, 1974 will be strictly complied with by all the Ministries/Departments of Government of India, who will see to it that necessary information in respect of each and every body, having non-officials, with which they are concerned, is furnished to the Committee within the prescribed time-limit of 2 months from the date of its constitution.

(ii) Legislation for giving effect to the recommendations of the Committee—Action taken or proposed to be taken by Government on the recommendation of the Committee made in para 31 of their Second Report (Fifth Lok Sabha).

40. The Joint Committee on Offices of Profit, in para 31 of their Second Report on the draft Parliament (Prevention of Disqualification) Amendment Bill, 1971, presented to the House on the 31st May, 1972 had observed as follows:—

"Another aspect to which the Committee would like to draw attention is the delay in bringing in legislation to give

effect to the recommendations of the Committee. Even though the Joint Committee in their successive Reports urged Government to bring in early legislation to give effect to their recommendations, Government forwarded the Draft Bill to the Committee only in July, 1971—nearly 11 years after the Committee originally made the recommendation. As a result, there has been inordinate delay in the implementation of the recommendations of the Committee. The Committee would, therefore, like to impress upon Government the need to bring in legislation for the purpose at shorter intervals—say five yearly."

41. Pursuant to the above recommendation of the Committee, the Ministry of Law, Justice and Company Affairs (Legislative Department) have replied as follows:—

"In view of the importance of the issues involved, the matter has been carefully considered by the Government and in order to avoid delays in the implementation of the recommendations of the Joint Committee in future, it is felt that if the Committee so desire, legislation for amending the Schedule to the Parliament (Prevention of Disqualification) Act, 1959 may be brought forward at shorter intervals, say, twice during the term of a Joint Committee, although it might entail piecemeal legislation.

It is requested that the matter may kindly be placed before the Joint Committee on Offices of Profit and their views may be communicated to this Ministry as early as may be convenient."

42. The Committee agree with the suggestion of the Ministry of Law that legislation for amending the Schedule to the Parliament (Prevention of Disqualification) Act, 1959 might be brought forward at shorter intervals, say, twice during the term of a Joint Committee so that early effect is given to the recommendations of the Committee.

(iii) Non-supply/Delay in supply of information by the State Governments/Union Territory Administrations—action taken or proposed to be taken on the recommendation of the Committee made in para 30 of their Second Report (Fifth Lok Sabha).

43. The Joint Committee on Offices of Profit, in para 30 of their Second Report on the Draft Parliament (Prevention of Disqualification) Amendment Bill, 1971, presented to the House on the 31st May, 1972, had *inter alia*, observed as follows:

“While examining a State body, namely, the Maharashtra State Warehousing Corporation, the Committee found that even though the body was constituted in 1962, necessary information in respect thereof was received from the State Government only in December, 1972.if State Governments do not furnish the information in time or at all the Committee are unable to examine whether the offices held in the relevant body ought or ought not to be exempted from disqualification. This is a serious lacuna in the existing arrangement and can lead to certain anomalies. For instance, while offices held in certain bodies in certain States may be excluded from exemption at the instance of this Committee, offices held in certain other bodies in some other States, with similar functions and powers, may escape disqualification on account of non-receipt of information by the Committee. The Committee would, therefore, like the Ministry of Law and Justice to examine as to what measures can be taken to ensure that the requisite information in respect of all the bodies constituted by State Governments is furnished to the Committee soon after they are constituted.”

44. In a letter dated 23-1-1974 addressed to the Chief Secretaries of all State Governments/Union Territory Administrations, the Ministry of Law, Justice and Company Affairs (Legislative Department) drew their attention to the above recommendation of the Joint Committee, and requested them to take *urgent* steps to supply the required information to the Lok Sabha Secretariat on a top priority basis in respect of the existing ‘committees’, if not already done, and in respect of all ‘committees’ that may be constituted in future.

45. On 4-2-1974, the Ministry of Law, Justice and Company Affairs (Legislative Department) were asked to indicate whether they propose to take any other *concrete* measures to ensure that the requisite information in respect of all the bodies constituted by the State Governments was furnished to the Committee soon after they were constituted. They were asked to advise, in particular, as to what sanctions, if any, could be applied by them in case the State Governments failed to furnish the required information.

46. On 28-5-1974, the Ministry of Law, Justice and Company Affairs (Legislative Department) addressed another letter to the Chief Secretaries of all State Governments/Union Territory Administrations, which *inter alia* reads as follows:—

“While action has been taken by the Ministries/Departments of the Government of India to furnish the requisite information to the Joint Committee on priority basis, it is necessary that urgent steps should be taken at your end also to ensure that information so far as it pertains to the bodies constituted by the State Government/Union Territory Administration is furnished to the Joint Committee as early as possible, if not already done. For that purpose, it is suggested that you may kindly nominate a co-ordinating authority at the State/Union territory's level who will be responsible to make a personal check in the matter and constantly review the position at least once in a month under intimation to you and to this Ministry.”

47. On the point as to what sanctions could be applied against the State Governments which failed to furnish information in respect of the bodies constituted by them, the Ministry of Law, Justice and Company Affairs (Legislative Department), in their letter dated 2-5-1974, have stated as follows:—

“...the matter has been carefully considered by this Ministry...relevant extracts from the Second Report of the Joint Committee on Offices of Profit (Fifth Lok Sabha) have already been forwarded to the State Governments and Union Territory Administrations for necessary action. This Ministry will continue to persuade the State Governments and Union Territory Administrations to fully cooperate with the Joint Committee on Offices of Profit and to furnish the requisite information at their earliest possible opportunity.....

Under the circumstances, the question of applying any sanctions against the State Governments/Union Territory Administrations does not arise.”

48. In a further letter dated 22-6-1974, the Ministry of Law, Justice and Company Affairs (Legislative Department) have added as follows:—

“It may be recalled that the Parliament (Prevention of Disqualification) Act, 1959, was enacted by Parliament after the whole matter had been carefully considered and

deliberated upon by the Joint Committee of both Houses of Parliament to which the Parliament (Prevention of Disqualification) Bill, 1957, was entrusted. Both the Joint Select Committee and its sub-committee experienced the difficulty then in getting full and complete material from certain Ministries of the Central Government and State Governments... a reference to the Report of the Joint Committee would show that the Committee was fully aware that in the very nature of things any Schedule of the nature now attached cannot be exhaustive or complete at any time. It is on that basis that this Ministry has continuously been persuading the Ministries of the Central Government and the State Governments to furnish the requisite information to the Joint Committee on Offices of Profit at their earliest possible opportunity."

49. The Committee are not satisfied with the above replies of the Ministry of Law. In their opinion, the measures so far taken by that Ministry are not adequate for the achievement of the end in view. They would in this connection like to point out that information in respect of nearly 100 important bodies, which, by their very nature, normally ought to exist in all States/Union Territories, (such as Khadi and Villages Industries Board, State Warehousing Corporation, etc.) was not furnished by the State Governments till they were specifically asked about the existence of those bodies. As the aforesaid figure of 100 bodies is based only on part replies so far received from the State Governments, the existence of many more such bodies cannot be ruled out. This, in the opinion of the Committee, indicates that the State Governments have not been furnishing information in respect of each and every body constituted by them. In para 42 of their Seventh Report (Fifth Lok Sabha), the Committee have already drawn attention to instances of non-supply/delayed supply of information by the Ministries/Departments of Government of India. The Committee will like the Ministry of Law to consider the question of making a provision in the Parliament (Prevention of Disqualification) Act, 1959 casting a statutory responsibility on the Ministries and Departments of the Government of India/State Governments/Union Territory Administrations to furnish information in respect of the bodies constituted by them within a period of 2 months from their constitution.

S. B. P. PATTABHI RAMA RAO,
Chairman,

Joint Committee on Offices of Profit.

NEM DELHI;
December 17, 1974.

APPENDIX

(vide para 2 of the Report)

MINUTES OF THE JOINT COMMITTEE ON OFFICES OF PROFIT (FIFTH LOK SABHA)

I

Thirty-first Sitting

The Committee sat on Tuesday, the 20th August, 1974 from 10.15 to 11-00 hours.

PRESENT

Shri S. B. P. Pattabhi Rama Rao—*Chairman*

MEMBERS

Lok Sabha

2. Shri Chandrika Prasad
3. Shri Jagannathrao Joshi
4. Shri Pratap Singh
5. Shri Ramavatar Shastri

Rajya Sabha

6. Shri Venigalla Satyanarayana

SECRETARIAT

Shri H. G. Paranjpe—*Deputy Secretary.*

2. The Committee took up for consideration Memoranda Nos. 391—404 and 406 to 414 relating to Committees/Boards/Corporations, etc. constituted by the Central Government.

Boards of Mining Examinations for Coal and non-coal mines (Memorandum No. 401)

3. The Committee noted that the Board of Mining Examinations for Coal Mines and non-coal mines conducted examinations and

granted certificates of competency. Also, the payment admissible to the Members in the form of honorarium (*viz.* Rs. 100/- per day) exceeded the 'compensatory allowance'. As such, the Committee felt that the membership of the Boards ought not to be exempt from disqualification.

The Delhi Urban Art Commission (Memorandum No. 404)

4. The Committee noted that the Chairman of the Delhi Urban Art Commission drew a monthly salary of Rs. 3,000/-, and the whole-time member a monthly salary in the scale of Rs. 2500—125/2—2750. These amounts did not come within the ambit of 'compensatory allowance', as defined in Section 2(a) of the Parliament (Prevention of Disqualification) Act, 1959. Part-time members, not resident in Delhi, were paid an allowance of Rs. 75/- per day (inclusive of daily allowance), which exceeded the 'compensatory allowance'. But part-time members, resident in Delhi, were paid an allowance of Rs. 50/- per day, which was marginally less than the 'compensatory allowance'.

The Committee further noted that the functions of the Commission were primarily advisory, but under Section 11(3) of the Delhi Urban Art Commission Act, it might *suo motu* promote and secure development, re-development or beautification of any area in Delhi. The Commission could also incur expenditure, and had quasi-judicial powers in certain matters.

As such, the Committee felt that the membership (including chairmanship) of the Commission ought not to be exempt from disqualification.

**Housing and Urban Development Corporation Ltd.
(Memorandum No. 408)**

5. The Committee noted that the non-official Directors of the Housing and Urban Development Corporation were entitled to a sitting fee of Rs. 50/- for each meeting of the Board and incidentals at the rate of Rs. 100/- for the first day of the meeting and Rs. 50/- for subsequent day. The total amount admissible to the non-official Directors thus exceeded the 'compensatory allowance'.

Besides, the Board of Directors exercised executive and financial powers.

As such, the Committee felt that the Directorship of the Corporation (including Chairmanship) ought not to be exempt from disqualification.

Space Commission (Memorandum No. 409)

6. The Committee noted that the non-official members of the Space Commission were entitled to draw the allowance equal to one half of the highest rate of daily allowance admissible to a Grade I officer in the Central Government. While on tour, they were eligible for boarding and lodging at Government's expense in a leading hotel in lieu of daily allowance.

However, the Space Commission exercised executive and financial powers in the process of implementing Government's policy on all matters concerning space e.g. giving financial assistance to institutions/Associations for furtherance of research and study in Space Science or grant of scholarships to students etc. going abroad for studies in the field of Space Science.

As such, the Committee felt that the membership of the Commission ought not to be exempt from disqualification.

**Board of Directors of Hindustan Paper Corporation (P) Ltd.
(Memorandum No. 411)**

7. The Committee noted that there were no non-official Directors on the Board of Directors of the Hindustan Paper Corporation (P) Ltd. at present. Nevertheless, the President might appoint non-officials also on the Board of Directors who would be entitled for TA/DA, etc.

The Board of Directors, however, exercised executive and financial powers and was in a position to wield influence.

As such, the Committee felt that Directorship of the Corporation (including Chairmanship), in case non-officials were appointed thereon, ought not to be exempt from disqualification.

Kendriya Hindi Shikshana Mandal (Memorandum No. 414)

8. The Committee noted that the Chairman of the Kendriya Hindi Shikshana Mandal was entitled to an honorarium of Rs. 500/- per month plus clerical charges of Rs. 1500/- per annum which did not come within the ambit of 'compensatory allowance'.

However, other non-official members were entitled to TA/DA only at the rates admissible to Class I officer of Central Government, which was less than 'Compensatory allowance'.

As such, the Committee felt that the Chairmanship of the Mandal ought not to be exempt from disqualification but membership ought to be.

**Review of recommendation of the Committee regarding Jury for
Jawaharlal Nehru Award for International Understanding
(Memorandum No. 402)**

9. The Committee considered a representation received from the Ministry of External Affairs in regard to their earlier recommendation relating to the Jury for Jawaharlal Nehru Award for International Understanding *Vide* para 12 of the Fourth Report of Fourth Lok Sabha. The Committee had recommended disqualification of membership of the Jury on the ground of influence and power of patronage.

The Committee noted that the following arguments put forth by the Ministry of External Affairs carried conviction and were based on sound reasoning:

“...As Members of the Jury do not get any honorarium, basically, membership of the Jury should not constitute holding Office of Profit. As regards patronage, so far none of the recipients of the Award has been Indian national; in fact, the high positions held by recipients—U. Thant, Martin Luther King Jr., Khan Abdul Ghaffar Khan, Yahudi Menuhin, Mother Heresa, Kenneth D. Kaunda, Josip Broz Tito, Andre Malraus and Julius K. Nyerere—will clearly indicate that the element of patronage or influence could hardly play a part here.”

As such, on reconsideration of the whole matter, the Committee felt that the membership of the Jury ought to be exempt from disqualification.

10. In regard to the following bodies, the Committee noted that the non-official members thereof were entitled to TA/DA which was less than the ‘compensatory allowance’. Besides, the functions of these bodies were mainly advisory in nature. As such, the Committee felt that the membership of these bodies ought to be exempt from disqualification:—

- (1) National Council for Training in Vocational Trades (Ministry of Labour).
- (2) Trade Committees of the National Council for Training in Vocational Trades (Ministry of Labour).
- (3) Implementation Committees on Printing, Chemical, Building Construction, Textile, Hotel and Catering and Engineering Group of Trades attached to each Regional

Directorate of Apprenticeship Training (Ministry of Labour).

- / (4) Regional (Zonal) Committee of the Central Apprenticeship Council and the National Council of Training in Vocational Trades for Northern, Southern, Eastern and Western Regions (Ministry of Labour).
- /(5) Selection Committee for admission at Model Training Institute attached to Central Training Institutes (One each at CTI, Calcutta/Bombay/Madras/Kanpur/Hyderabad/Ludhiana) (Ministry of Labour).
- / (6) Advisory Committee for C.T.I. (one each for the C.T.Is Calcutta| Bombay| Madras| Hyderabad| Kanpur| Ludhiana| New Delhi (Ministry of Labour).
- /(7) Advisory Committee for the Central Staff Training and Research Institute, Calcutta (Ministry of Labour).
- / (8) Committee of Direction, one each for Central Staff Training and Research Institute, Calcutta/Advanced Training Institute, Madras/Foremen Training Institute, Bangalore. (Ministry of Labour).
- /(9) The Central Advisory Board for Iron Ore Mines Labour Welfare Fund (Ministry of Labour).
- /(10) Central Advisory Contract Labour Board (Ministry of Labour).
- /(11) Consultative Council on Community Development and Panchayati Raj (Ministry of Agriculture).
- /(12) Hindi Shiksha Samiti (Ministry of Education).
- /(13) Central Advisory Board of Archaeology (Ministry of Education).
- /(14) National Committee on Science and Technology (Department of Science and Technology).
- /(15) All India Council of Sports (Ministry of Education and Social Welfare).
- /(16) Committee of Educationists and Leaders of Youth and Student Organisations (Ministry of Education and Social Welfare).

11. The Committee then adjourned to meet again on Monday, the 30.9 September, 1974.

II

Thirty-second Sitting

The Committee sat on Monday, the 30th September, 1974 from 10.30 to 11.15 hours.

PRESENT

Shri S. B. P. Pattabhi Rama Rao—*Chairman.*

MEMBERS

Lok Sabha

2. Shri Somnath Chatterjee
3. Shri Pratap Singh
4. Shri Ramji Ram
5. Shri Arjun Sethi
6. Shri Ramavatar Shastri
7. Shri Ram Shekhar Prasad Singh

Rajya Sabha

8. Shri N. M. Kamble
9. Shri A. K. Refaye
10. Shri Venigalla Satyanarayana
11. Shri Yogendra Sharma.

SECRETARIAT

Shri H. G. Paranjpe—*Deputy Secretary.*

2. The Committee took up for consideration Memoranda Nos. 416—435 and 441—446 relating to Committees/Boards/Corporations, etc. constituted by the Central/State Governments and Memorandum No. 448 regarding delay in respect of information from the Ministries/Departments of Government of India.

3. The Committee first took up for consideration Memorandum No. 448 regarding delay in receipt of information from the Ministries/Departments of the Government of India in respect of bodies constituted by them.

The Committee noted that the information in respect of the following eleven bodies constituted by various Ministries/Departments was furnished to the Committee more than five years after their constitution:

1. Central Board of Reserve Bank of India.
2. Local Board of the Reserve Bank of India.
3. Central Board of the State Bank of India.
4. Local Boards of the State Bank of India.
5. Board of Directors of Subsidiary Banks of State Bank of India.
6. Industrial Development Bank of India, Bombay.
7. Central Purchase Advisory Council.
8. Regional Purchase Advisory Councils.
9. Board of Directors of Sambhar Salts Ltd.
10. Cardamom Board.
11. Oil and Natural Gas Commission.

The Committee felt that the explanations given by the Ministries/Departments in support of delayed supply of information were generally unsatisfactory.

The Committee desired that the Ministries/Departments concerned might be addressed to appear before the Committee for oral evidence.

Central Governing Council of Military Schools (Ministry of Defence)—Memorandum No. 426

4. The Committee noted that the non-official members of the Central Governing Council of Military Schools were entitled to TA/DA as per Ministry of Finance rules in this regard which was less than the 'compensatory allowance'. But the Governing Council exercised executive and financial powers and appeared to wield influence. As such, the Committee felt that the non-official members ought not to be exempt from disqualification.

Board of Directors of Industrial Reconstruction Corporation of India Limited (Ministry of Finance) —Memorandum No. 429

5 The Committee noted that the non-official Directors of the Industrial Reconstruction Corporation of India Limited were entitled to a sitting fee of Rs. 150/- for attending a Board's meeting besides travelling and halting charges. The total amount admissible to the

non-official Directors thus exceeded the 'compensatory allowance'. Moreover, the Board of Directors exercised executive and financial powers. As such, the Committee felt that the Directorship of the Corporation (including Chairmanship) ought not to be exempt from disqualification.

**Management Committee of the fourteen Nationalised Banks
(Ministry of Finance)—Memorandum No. 430**

6. The Committee noted that the non-official members of the Management Committee of the fourteen Nationalised Banks were entitled to a sitting fee of Rs. 75/- for attending each Committee meeting alongwith travelling expenses. They were also entitled to a halting allowance of Rs. 30/- per diem (in case they did not stay in a hotel). As the total of these sums exceeded the 'compensatory allowance', the Committee felt that the membership of the Committee ought not to be exempt from disqualification:

- (i) **Board of Directors of the Agricultural Refinance Corporation**
- (ii) **Executive Committee of the Board of Directors of the Agricultural Refinance Corporation (Ministry of Finance)—Memorandum No. 431**

7. The Committee noted that the non-official Directors of the Agricultural Refinance Corporation and the Executive Committee were entitled to sitting fees of Rs 100/ and Rs. 50/- respectively for attending each meeting of the Board and the Executive Committee. Besides, they were entitled for travelling expenses and halting allowance of Rs. 45/- per day. The total amount thus exceeded the 'compensatory allowance'. Besides, the Board of Directors of the Corporation and the Executive Committee also exercised executive and financial powers. As such, the Committee felt that the Directorship of the Corporation and the Executive Committee ought not to be exempt from disqualification.

**Board of Directors of Subsidiary Banks of State Bank of India viz.
State Bank of Bikaner and Jaipur/Hyderabad/Indore/Mysore/
Patiala/Saurashtra and Travancore (Ministry of Finance)—
Memorandum No. 432**

8. The Committee noted that the non-official Directors of the Subsidiary Banks of State Bank of India were entitled to a sitting fee of Rs. 50/- for attending each meeting of the Board plus, in some cases, a halting allowance of Rs. 30/- per diem which exceeded the 'compensatory allowance'. Besides, the Board of Directors exercised executive and financial powers. As such, the Committee felt that the

Directorship of the subsidiary Banks of State Bank of India ought not to be exempt from disqualification.

Board of Directors of the fourteen Nationalised Banks (Ministry of Finance)—Memorandum No. 433

9. The Committee noted that the non-official Directors of the fourteen Nationalised Banks were entitled to sitting fee of Rs. 150/- for attending each meeting of the Board alongwith travelling and halting expenses. The remuneration admissible to them thus exceeded the 'compensatory allowance'. Besides, the Board of Directors exercised executive and financial powers. As such, the Committee felt that the Directorship of the Nationalised Banks ought not to be exempt from disqualification.

Market Committees (Haryana)—Memorandum No. 441

10. The Committee noted that the non-official members of the Market Committees were entitled to TA and DA which was less than the 'compensatory allowance'. But the functions of the Committee were executive in nature. As such, the Committee felt that the membership of the Committee ought not to be exempt from disqualification.

Agricultural Marketing Board, Haryana—Memorandum No. 442

11. The Committee noted that the Chairman of the Agricultural Marketing Board was entitled to Rs. 1000 as monthly allowance. This amount did not come within the ambit of the 'compensatory allowance', as defined in section 2(a) of the Parliament (Prevention of Disqualification) Act, 1959. The other non-official members were entitled to TA and DA, which was less than the 'compensatory allowance'. However, the Board exercised executive and quasi-judicial power. *Inter alia*, it had the power to suspend licences. As such, the Committee felt that the membership of the Board (including Chairmanship) ought not to be exempt from disqualification.

U.P. Bhoodan Yagna Committee—Memorandum No. 443

12. The Committee noted that a sum of Rs. 300 p.m. was payable as honorarium to the Secretary/Convener of the U.P. Bhoodan Yagna Committee which did not come within the ambit of the 'compensatory allowance'. Other non-official members including Chairman of the Committee were not entitled to get any remuneration but were paid actual expenses incurred in connection with the meetings and

Bhoodan programme. The functions of the Committee were executive in nature. The Committee was also in a position to wield influence inasmuch as one of its jobs was to distribute surplus lands. As such, the Committee felt that non-official members (including Chairman) ought not to be exempt from disqualification.

**Advisory Board under M.I.S. Act, 1971 (Andhra Pradesh)—
Memorandum No. 444**

13. The Committee noted that the payment admissible to the non-official members of the Advisory Board under M.I.S. Act (Andhra Pradesh) i.e. Rs. 100 as sitting fee exceeded the 'compensatory allowance'. Also, the functions of the Board were judicial in nature. As such, the Committee felt that the membership of the Board ought not to be exempt from disqualification.

**The Industrial Development Bank of India, Bombay (Ministry of
Finance)—Memorandum No. 446**

14. The Committee noted that the non-official Directors of the Industrial Development Bank of India were entitled to receive Rs. 200 as sitting fee for attending each meeting of the Board and halting allowance of Rs. 35 per diem for the days of travel and the days of meetings. These sums did not come within the ambit of 'compensatory allowance', as defined in Section 2(a) of the Parliament (Prevention of Disqualification) Act, 1959. Besides, the Board of Directors exercised executive and financial powers. As such, the Committee felt that the Directorship of the Board ought not to be exempt from disqualification.

15. In regard to the following bodies, the Committee noted that the non-official members thereof were entitled to TA/DA which was less than the 'compensatory allowance'. Besides, the functions of these bodies were mainly advisory in nature. As such, the Committee felt that the membership of these bodies ought to be exempt from disqualification:—

1. Engineer Equipment Research and Development Panel (Ministry of Defence)—Memo. No. 416.
2. Electronics Development Panel (Ministry of Defence)—Memo. No. 417.
3. Fire Research Development and Training Panel (Ministry of Defence)—Memo. No. 418.

4. Aerial Delivery Research and Development Panel (Ministry of Defence)—Memo. No. 419.
5. Advisory Board for the Military College of Telecommunication Engineering, Mhow (Ministry of Defence)—Memo. No. 420.
6. Textiles and General Stores Research and Development Panel (Ministry of Defence)—Memo. No. 421.
7. Psychological Research Panel (Ministry of Defence)—Memo. No. 422.
8. Defence Food Research and Development Panel (Ministry of Defence)—Memo. No. 423.
9. Materials Research and Development Panel (Ministry of Defence)—Memo. No. 424.
10. Advisory Board for the Military College of Electronics and Mechanical Engineering, Secunderabad and Electrical and Mechanical Engineering School, Baroda (Ministry of Defence)—Memo. No. 425.
11. Advisory Committee for the Institute of Armament Technology, Poona (Ministry of Defence)—Memo. No. 427.
12. Advisory Committee for the Defence Institute of Work Study, Mussoorie (Ministry of Defence)—Memo. No. 428.
13. Advisory Committee for the selection, review and appraisal of the ensembles under the scheme of "financial Assistance to Professional Dance-Drama and Theatre Ensembles" (Department of Culture)—Memo. No. 434.
14. National Radar Council (Department of Electronics)—Memo No. 435.
15. Wild Life Advisory Board (Andhra Pradesh)—Memo. No. 445.

16. The Committee noted with concern that the Parliament (Prevention of Disqualification) Amendment Bill, 1971 which was introduced in the House during the Ninth Session after a time lapse of 17 months, had not come for discussion in the House even during the Tenth and Eleventh Sessions of Lok Sabha.

The Committee desired that the Chairman might address D.O. letters to the Ministers of Law, Justice and Company Affairs and the Department of Parliamentary Affairs impressing upon them to find time for early consideration and passing of the Bill.

17. The Committee then adjourned.

III

Thirty-fourth Sitting

The Committee sat on Wednesday, the 4th December, 1974 from 10.15 to 11.00 hours.

PRESENT

Shri S. B. P. Pattabhi Rama Rao—*Chairman.*

MEMBERS

Lok Sabha

2. Shri Chandrika Prasad
3. Shri Somnath Chatterjee
4. Shri Pratap Singh
5. Shri Ramavatar Shastri.

Rajya Sabha

6. Shri N. M. Kamble
7. Shri Venigalla Satyanarayana.

SECRETARIAT

Shri H. G. Paranjpe—*Chief Financial Committee Officer.*

2. The Committee took up for consideration Memoranda Nos. 436—440, 447, 448A, 449, 450 and 476.

- (i) Action taken or proposed to be taken by Government on the recommendations of the Joint Committee on Offices of Profit contained in paras 42—46 of their Seventh Report (Fifth Lok Sabha)—*Memorandum No. 436.*

3. In paras 42 to 46 of their Seventh Report (Fifth Lok Sabha) presented to the House on 21-12-1973, the Joint Committee on Offices of Profit had expressed distress over the instances of non-supply/delayed supply of information desired by the Committee from the Ministries/Departments of Government of India. The Committee had *inter alia* noted that information in respect of some of the bodies constituted by the Ministries/Departments of Government of India

was furnished to the Committee five to eleven years after their constitution. The Committee had desired that, save in exceptional circumstances, information in respect of bodies constituted by Ministries/Departments of Government of India should reach them within two months of their constitution.

4. The matter had also come before the House on 11-3-74 when Shri H. M. Patel drew the attention of the House under Rule 377 to the failure of the Ministries/Departments of Government of India to furnish prompt information to the Joint Committee. The Speaker had taken strong exception to the lapses brought to notice by the Committee.

5. The Committee noted that in the above context Government had taken measures from time to time, pursuant to the observations/recommendations of the Committee contained in paras 42—46 of their Seventh Report (Fifth Lok Sabha):

- (1) On 14-1-1974, the Ministry of Law, Justice and Company Affairs (Legislative Department) asked the Ministries/Departments of Government of India to furnish the required information to the Joint Committee on a top priority basis.
- (2) On 15-3-1974, the Cabinet Secretary addressed a D.O. marked 'Most Immediate' to all the Secretaries of Government of India which, *inter alia*, read as follows:

* * *

The Speaker has taken strong exception to the lapses brought to notice by the Committee.

* * *

I am desired by the Prime Minister to request you to make a personal check to see that the requisite information in so far as it pertains to your Ministry/Department has already been furnished, and, in any case, to ensure that it is sent not later than 31st March, 1974.

Confirmation that the request contained in this letter has been complied with may kindly be sent to me by 1st April, 1974."

- (3) On 5-6-1974, the Ministry of Law, justice and Company Affairs (Legislative Department) addressed another O.M. to all the Ministries/Departments of Government of India which, *inter alia* read as follows:—

“The Ministry of Home Affairs, etc., are requested to take urgent steps in order to ensure that in future information in respect of the statutory and non-statutory bodies constituted by the Ministries/Departments is furnished, as soon as the necessary notification or resolution, as the case may be, constituting such bodies is issued, and in no case later than the time limit prescribed by the Committee. A register indicating the date of issue of notification, etc., and the date of furnishing the necessary information to the Joint Committee on Offices of Profit should be maintained and reviewed by the Branch Officer every fortnight. The responsibility for making review of this register should be entrusted to the Officer Incharge of the Parliament Section, who should bring to the notice of the Secretary cases in which it has not been possible to furnish the information within the prescribed time limits and the reasons therefor.

According to the terms of reference of the Joint Committee on Offices of Profit, the Joint Committee is also required to scrutinise from time to time the Schedule to the Parliament (Prevention of Disqualification) Act, 1959, and to recommend any amendments in the said Schedule, whether by way of addition, omission or otherwise. For that purpose, it may become necessary for the Joint Committee to examine the composition and character of all existing committees whose constitution, including payment of TA/DA, remuneration, etc. to the members had undergone any change since examination by the Committee in the past, or which have since ceased to exist by operation of law or otherwise. The Ministry of Home Affairs, etc., are requested to follow the procedure set out in the above paragraph in respect of all such bodies also.”

6. The Committee were satisfied with the above measures taken by Government.

- (ii) Implementation of the recommendations of the Joint Committee on Offices of Profit—*Memorandum No. 437.*

7. The Joint Committee on Offices of Profit, in para 31 of their Second Report on the draft Parliament (Prevention of Disqualification) Amendment Bill, 1971, presented to the House on the 31st May, 1972 had observed as follows:—

“Another aspect to which the Committee would like to draw attention is the delay in bringing in legislation to give effect to the recommendations of the Committee. Even though the Joint Committee in their successive Reports urged Government to bring in early legislation to give effect to their recommendations, Government forwarded the Draft Bill to the Committee only in July, 1971—nearly 11 years after the Committee originally made the recommendation. As a result, there has been inordinate delay in the implementation of the recommendations of the Committee. The Committee would, therefore, like to impress upon Government the need to bring in legislation for the purpose at shorter intervals—say five-yearly.”

8. By way of action taken on the above recommendation, the Ministry of Law on 31-5-1974 replied as follows:

“In view of the importance of the issues involved, the matter has been carefully considered by the Government and in order to avoid delays in the implementation of the recommendations of the Joint Committee in future, it is felt that if the Committee so desire, legislation for amending the Schedule to the Parliament (Prevention of Disqualification) Act, 1959 may be brought forward at shorter intervals, say, twice during the term of a Joint Committee, although it might entail piecemeal legislation.

It is requested that the matter may kindly be placed before the Joint Committee on Offices of Profit and their views may be communicated to this Ministry as early as may be convenient.”

9. The Committee agreed with the suggestion of the Ministry of Law that legislation for amending the Schedule to the Parliament (Prevention of Disqualification) Act, 1959 might be brought forward at shorter intervals, say, twice during the term of a Joint Committee, although it might entail piecemeal legislation.

- (iii) Representation for Review of recommendations of the Committee regarding (1) Standing Committee of the Employees' State Insurance Corporation and (2) the Medical Benefit Council of the Employees' State Insurance Corporation—*Memorandum No. 438.*

10. The Standing Committee of the Employees' State Insurance Corporation and the Medical Benefit Council of the Employees' State Insurance Corporation are included in schedule I of the Parliament (Prevention of Disqualification) Amendment Bill, 1973. That is, in case of the enactment of the Bill, the Chairman and Secretaries of these bodies would not be exempt from disqualification for membership of Parliament. These bodies had been included in the Bill on the recommendations of the Joint Committee on Offices of Profit (Second Lok Sabha) made in paras 6 and 7 of their Second Report, presented to the House on 9-9-1960.

11. In a communication dated 4-6-1974, the Ministry of Labour represented for review of the recommendations of the Joint Committee made in paras 6 and 7 of their Second Report (Second Lok Sabha).

12. In a further communication dated 9-8-1974, the Ministry of Labour urged as follows:

“ ...it is felt that the Standing Committee and the Medical Benefit Council should not be included in the Schedule, for the reasons given below:—

- (1) The Employees' State Insurance Corporation is not included in the Schedule and the Chairman of the Corporation is not disqualified from being a member of Parliament, even though rules for payment of TA/DA, etc. to the members are the same in all the three cases.
- (2) The Chairman of the E.S.I.C. and the Chairman of the Standing Committee do not get any remuneration from the E.S.I.C., while the D.G.H.S. is the *ex-officio* Chairman of the Medical Benefit Council under Section 10(1) (a) of the E.S.I. Act, 1948.
- (3) It is considered necessary to appoint a Minister as the Chairman of the Standing Committee for securing the co-operation of the State Governments in the administration of the E.S.I. Scheme particularly the medical care provided thereunder which is the responsibility of State Governments and in implementing the decisions taken by the Corporation. In this connection,

it may be added that the Corporation is at present engaged in a crucial expansion programme, for the implementation of which the Corporation is largely dependent on the State Governments. It is therefore, all the more necessary to continue the existing arrangement.

- (4) From time to time, the States are represented on the Standing Committee by State Ministers. At present, Dr. Rafiq Zakaria, Minister of Public Health in the Government of Maharashtra is a member of the Standing Committee. It is, therefore, more appropriate to have a Minister as the Chairman of the Standing Committee of the E.S.I.C."

13. In reply to a query as to since when the practice to appoint the Deputy Labour Minister as the Chairman of the Standing Committee of the E.S.I.C. had been started and whether the appointment was done under some statutory rule/order, the Ministry of Labour stated as follows:—

"...under Section 8(a) of the Employees' State Insurance Act, 1948, the Chairman of the Standing Committee has to be nominated by the Central Government from among members of the Corporation. At present, the Deputy Labour Minister is the Chairman of the Standing Committee. He was nominated as such with effect from 3-12-1973. In the past also the Chairman of the Standing Committee has been either the Minister of State for Labour or Deputy Minister of Labour during the periods from the 20th November, 1964 to 15th August, 1965, 21st March, 1966 to 11th September, 1966, 11th April, 1967 to 16th November, 1967 and 1st March, 1969 onwards."

14. The Committee noted that while under Section 4 of the Employees' State Insurance Act, 1948, the Minister of Labour was the *ex-officio* Chairman of the Corporation, there was no such statutory stipulation so far as the Chairman of the Standing Committee was concerned. Under Section 8(a) of the Act, the Chairman of the Standing Committee was to be nominated by the Central Government from among the members of the Corporation. In fact, persons other than Ministers had from time to time been appointed as the Chairmen of the Standing Committee. The Committee felt that if a Minister was appointed as the Chairman of the Standing Committee, he ought to be exempt from disqualification for membership of Parliament but if a non-official (other than a Minis-

ter) was appointed as the Chairman of the Standing Committee, he ought not to be so exempt. The Committee decided to ask the Ministry of Labour to examine, in consultation with the Ministry of Law, whether in view of the provisions of Section 3(a) of the Parliament (Prevention of Disqualification) Act, 1959, under which all offices held by a Minister in an *ex-officio* capacity were exempt from disqualification, any change in the proposed Bill was called for.

15. In regard to the Medical Benefit Council, the Committee noted that the Director General Health Services—an official was an *ex-officio* Chairman of the Council. Also, the functions of the Council were mainly advisory in nature. As such, the Committee felt that the Council ought to be omitted from Schedule I to the Bill.

(iv) Representation for Review of the recommendation of the Committee regarding the Iron Ore Mines Labour Welfare Fund Advisory Committee—*Memorandum No. 439*.

16. The Iron Ore Mines Labour Welfare Fund Advisory Committee had been included in Schedule I of the Parliament (Prevention of Disqualification) Amendment Bill, 1973. That is, in case of the enactment of the Bill, the Chairman and Secretary of the Iron Ore Mines Labour Welfare Fund Advisory Committee would not be exempt from disqualification for membership of Parliament. The body had been included in the Bill on the recommendation of the Joint Committee on Offices of Profit (Fourth Lok Sabha) made in para 17 of their Fourth Report (Fourth Lok Sabha).

17. In a representation addressed to the Secretariat, the Ministry of Labour have urged as follows:—

“...the Iron Ore Mines Labour Welfare Fund Advisory Committee for Goa, Daman & Diu has been included at S. No. 1 under ‘Goa, Daman & Diu’ in Part-I of the First Schedule to the Parliament (Prevention of Disqualification) Amendment Bill, 1973 as introduced in the Lok Sabha on 21st December, 1973. In this connection, it may be stated that such Committees have also been set up in the States of Andhra Pradesh, Mysore, Maharashtra, M. P., Bihar and Orissa. According to Rule 3(i) of the Iron Ore Mines Labour Welfare Cess Rules, 1973, Labour Ministers of the respective States are appointed *ex-officio* Chairmen of the State Advisory Committees. The Labour Ministers are, however, not being paid any salary in the capacity of their holding the office of the Chairman of the Advisory Committee. The intention in associating the

be taken to ensure that the requisite information in respect of all the bodies constituted by State Governments was furnished to the Committee, soon after they were constituted.

26. In a letter dated 23-1-1974 addressed to the Chief Secretaries of all State Governments/Union Territory Administrations, the Ministry of Law, Justice and Company Affairs (Legislative Department) drew their attention to the above recommendation of the Joint Committee, and requested them to take *urgent* steps to supply the required information to the Lok Sabha Secretariat on a top priority basis in respect of the existing 'committees', if not already done, and in respect of all 'committees' that may be constituted in future.

27. On 4-2-1974, the Ministry of Law, Justice and Company Affairs (Legislative Department) were asked to indicate whether they proposed to take any other concrete measures to ensure that the requisite information in respect of all the bodies constituted by the State Governments was furnished to the Committee soon after they were constituted. They were asked to advise, in particular, as to what sanctions, if any, could be applied by them in case the State Governments failed to furnish the required information.

28. On 28-5-1974, the Ministry of Law, Justice and Company Affairs (Legislative Department) addressed another letter to the Chief Secretaries of all State Governments/Union Territory Administrations, which *inter alia* read as follows:

"While action has been taken by the Ministries/Departments of the Government of India to furnish the requisite information to the Joint Committee on priority basis, it is necessary that urgent steps should be taken at your end also to ensure that information so far as it pertains to the bodies constituted by the State Government/Union Territory Administration is furnished to the Joint Committee as early as possible, if not already done. For that purpose, it is suggested that you may kindly nominate a co-ordinating authority at the State/Union Territory's level who will be responsible to make a personal check in the matter and constantly review the position at least once in a month under intimation to you and to this Ministry."

29. On the point as to what sanctions could be applied against the State Governments which failed to furnish information in respect of the bodies constituted by them, the Ministry of Law, Justice and

Company Affairs (Legislative Department), in their letter dated 2-5-1974, stated as follows:

“...the matter has been carefully considered by this Ministry...relevant extracts from the Second Report of the Joint Committee on Offices of Profit (Fifth Lok Sabha) have already been forwarded to the State Governments and Union Territory Administrations for necessary action. This Ministry will continue to persuade the State Governments and Union Territory Administrations to fully co-operate with the Joint Committee on Offices of Profit and to furnish the requisite information at their earliest possible opportunity....

Under the circumstances, the question of applying any sanctions against the State Governments/Union Territory Administrations does not arise.”

30. The Committee were not satisfied with the above replies of the Ministry of Law. They noted in this connection that information in respect of nearly one hundred important bodies, which by their nature, normally ought to exist in all States/Union Territories, had not been furnished by the State Governments till they were specifically asked to furnish information in respect of those bodies. This, in the opinion of the Committee, indicated that the State Governments had not been furnishing information in respect of each and every body constituted by them. The Committee decided to ask the Ministry of Law to make a provision in the proposed legislation casting a statutory responsibility on Central Ministries and State Governments/Union Territory Administrations to furnish information in respect of the bodies constituted by them within a period of 3 months from their constitution.

31. *The Committee then adjourned to meet again on Tuesday, the 17th December, 1974 to consider their Draft Report.*

IV
Thirty-fifth Sitting

The Committee sat on Tuesday, the 17th December, 1974 from 10.15 to 10.50 hours.

PRESENT

Shri S. B. P. Pattabhi Rama Rao—*Chairman.*

MEMBERS

Lok Sabha

2. Shri Chandrika Prasad
3. Shri Somnath Chatterjee
4. Shri Jagannathrao Joshi
5. Shri Pratap Singh.

Rajya Sabha

6. Shri Vithal Gadgil
7. Shri N. M. Kamble
8. Shri Venigalla Satyanarayana
9. Shri Yogendra Sharma.

SECRETARIAT

Shri H. G. Paranjpe—*Chief Financial Committee Officer.*

2. The Committee considered their draft Eleventh Report and adopted it.

3. The Committee decided that the Report might be presented to Lok Sabha on the 20th December, 1974 and laid on the Table of Rajya Sabha on the same day.

4. The Committee authorised the Chairman and, in his absence, Shri Jagannathrao Joshi to present the Report to Lok Sabha on their behalf.

5. The Committee authorised Shri Venigalla Satyanarayana and, in his absence, Shri Vithal Gadgil to lay the Report on the Table of Rajya Sabha.

6. The Committee then took up for consideration Memoranda Nos. 451-475 and 477-481 relating to Committees/Boards/Corporations, etc. constituted by the Central/State Governments.

**Board of Directors of the Gujarat Export Corporation
(Memorandum No. 454)**

7. The Committee noted that the payment admissible to the non-official members of the Board of Directors exceeded the 'compensatory allowance'. Also, the Board of Directors exercised executive and financial powers. As such, the Committee felt that the non-official members of the Board, ought not to be exempt from disqualification.

**Board of Directors of the Gujarat Mineral Development Corporation
Ltd. (Memorandum No. 455)**

8. The Committee noted that the payment admissible to the non-official Directors might exceed the 'compensatory allowance'. Also, the Board of Directors exercised executive and financial powers. As such, the Committee felt that the Directorship of the Corporation ought not to be exempt from disqualification.

**Board of Directors of the Gujarat Industrial Investment Corporation
(Memorandum No. 456)**

9. The Committee noted that the payment admissible to the non-official Directors might exceed the 'compensatory allowance'. Also, the Board of Directors exercised both executive and financial powers. As such, the Committee felt that the Directorship of the Corporation ought not to be exempt from disqualification.

**High Power Co-operation Committee for recruitment of higher
technical staff for Co-operative Spinning Mills of Surat, Broach and
Sabarkanta (Gujarat)—(Memorandum No. 458)**

10. The Committee desired that further information on the following points might be called from the State Government:

- (i) Number of co-operative spinning mills in Surat, Broach and Sabarkantha.
- (ii) Total Number of technical and managerial posts, carrying a pay of more than Rs. 750 p.m., in the mills specified at (i) above.
- (iii) Approximate number of technical and managerial posts carrying a pay of more than Rs. 750 p.m. filled each year.

- (iv) Whether the mills are bound to appoint the persons selected by the High Power Co-ordination Committee, or they have the discretion not to appoint them.

The Committee decided to defer the consideration of the Memorandum till the receipt of the desired information on above points from the State Government.

Khar Land Development Board, Gujarat (Memorandum No. 459)

11. The Committee noted that although the payment admissible to the non-official members of the Board was less than the 'compensatory allowance', the Board exercised financial powers in that it could incur expenditure upto Rs. 25,000 under section 34(1) of the Act. It had also the power to regulate fishing rights in any water on any tidal or khar land to which the Act applied. Further, under Section 45 of the Act, the Chairman and Members of the Board shall be deemed to be public servants within the meaning of Indian Penal Code. The Committee, therefore, felt that the membership of the Board ought not to be exempt from disqualification.

**Gujarat Cultural Performances Certificate Board
(Memorandum No. 460)**

12. The Committee noted that the main function of the Board was to scrutinise scripts for grant of certificate. Also, the TA/DA admissible to the non-official members was less than the 'compensatory allowance'. But, in addition to TA/DA, the non-official members were entitled to a monthly honorarium of Rs. 100, which did not fall within the ambit of 'compensatory allowance', as defined in Section 2(a) of the Parliament (Prevention of Disqualification) Act, 1959. In view of the foregoing, the Committee felt that the membership of the Board ought not to be exempt from disqualification.

**Hybrid Seed Production Programme State Level and District Level
Committee. (Memorandum No. 462)**

13. The Committee noted that the payment admissible to the non-official members of both the State Level and District Level Committees was less than the 'compensatory allowance'. Also, the Committee did not exercise any financial powers.

As to the functions, the Committee noted that the main function of the District Level Committee was to select the seed producers of the district and to forward its recommendations to the State Level Committee which finally selected the Seed Producers. As such, the

Committee noted that while the function of the District Level Committee was recommendatory in nature, the function of the State Level Committee somewhat partook the character of executive power. The Committee, therefore, felt that the membership of the District Level Committee ought to be exempt from disqualification but the membership of the State Level Committee ought not to.

Committee for administration of Agricultural Credit Relief and Guarantee Fund, Gujarat (Memorandum No. 465)

14. The Committee noted that the Government resolution under which the body in question had been set up did not specify the TA/DA to be paid to members. Nor had any non-official so far claimed TA/DA, or sitting fee. However, the Committee maintained and administered the Agricultural Credit Relief and Guarantee Fund, and as such, exercised financial powers. The Committee, therefore felt that the membership of the body in question, in so far as it was an office of profit under the Government, ought not to be exempt from disqualification.

Board of Governors of the Indian Institute of Management, Bangalore (Ministry of Education and Social Welfare) (Memorandum No. 477)

15. The Committee noted that the non-official members of the Board of Governors were entitled to only TA and DA, which was less than the 'compensatory allowance'. However, the Board of Governors exercised executive and financial powers. As such, the Committee felt that the non-official members of the Board, who were appointed by the Government, ought not to be exempt from disqualification.

Board of Directors of Tannery and Footwear Corporation of India Ltd. (Ministry of Industrial Development). (Memorandum No. 481).

16. The Committee noted that, according to the information furnished by the Ministry of Industrial Development, there were no non-official Directors on the Board of Directors of the Company at present. But the President could appoint non-official Directors also on the Board. In that case the non-official Directors would be entitled to TA/DA etc. which might or might not exceed the 'compensatory allowance'. However, as the Board of Directors exercised executive and financial powers and were in a position to wield influence, the Committee felt that the non-official Directors, if appointed on the Board, ought not to be exempt from disqualification.

17. In regard to the following bodies, the Committee noted that the non-official members thereof either did not get any TA/DA etc.

or the amount of TA/DA admissible to them was less than compensatory allowance. Besides, the functions of these bodies were mainly advisory in nature. As such, the Committee recommended that the membership of these bodies ought to be exempt from disqualification:—

- (1) Jail Advisory Committee for each Central and District Jail (Gujarat). (Memorandum No. 451).
- (2) State Sarvodaya Committee (Gujarat). (Memorandum No. 452).
- (3) Gujarat State Geological Programming Board (Gujarat). (Memorandum No. 453).
- (4) Baroda Regional Industrial Coordination Council. (Memorandum No. 457).
- (5) The Committee for publication of Booklets pertaining to Gujarat (Memorandum No. 461).
- (6) The State Fertilizer Advisory Committee (Gujarat) (Memorandum No. 463).
- (7) Gujarat State Soldiers, Sailors and Airmen's Board. (Memorandum No. 464).
- (8) District Soldiers, Sailors and Airmen's Boards at Ahmedabad, Baroda and Surat. (Memorandum No. 466).
- (9) Taluka Civil Supplies Advisory Committee. (Gujarat). (Memorandum No. 467).
- (10) State Planning Advisory Board (Gujarat) (Memorandum No. 468).
- (11) Committee for Balanced Development of the State (Gujarat) (Memorandum No. 469).
- (12) Gujarat State Prohibition Board (Memorandum No. 470).
- (13) State Advisory Board of Archaeology (Gujarat) (Memorandum No. 471).
- (14) Co-ordination Committee for activities of Prohibition and Excise and Police Departments (Gujarat). (Memorandum No. 472).
- (15) The State Agricultural Development Council (Gujarat) (Memorandum No. 473).

- (16) The State Council of Gosamvardhan (Gujarat) (Memorandum No. 474).
- (17) The Executive Committee of the State Council of Gosamvardhan (Gujarat) (Memorandum No. 475).
- (18) Pharmaceutical Education Committee (Ministry of Education and Social Welfare) (Memorandum No. 478).
- (19) Advisory Committee for the Revision of Gazetteers (Ministry of Education and Social Welfare) (Memorandum No. 479).
- (20) National Council of Rural Higher Education. (Ministry of Education and Social Welfare). (Memorandum No. 480).

The Committee then adjourned.