

of the Joint Committee of the Houses on the Bill further to amend the Drugs and Cosmetics Act, 1940 be extended upto the 2nd December, 1963.' "

COMMITTEE ON PRIVATE MEMBERS' BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS
TWENTYSEVENTH REPORT

Shri Krishnamoorthy Rao (Shimoga): Sir, I beg to present the Twenty-seventh Report of the Committee on Private Members' Bills and Resolutions.

12.44 hrs.

MOTIONS RE: COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC UNDERTAKINGS—contd.

Mr. Speaker: The House will now take up further consideration of the two motions on the Committee on Public Undertakings moved by the Minister of Industry. Dr. Lohia may continue his speech

डॉ० राम मनोहर लोहिया (फर्रुखाबाद): अध्यक्ष महोदय, निजी धंधों ने सरकारी धंधों से बदइतजामी सीखी है और सरकारी धंधों ने निजी धंधों से लूट सीखी है जिसका नतीजा हुआ है कि मुझे श्री बिड़ना के धंधों में और श्री नेहरू के धंधों में कोई अन्तर नहीं दिखाई पड़ता। निजी धंधों की आत्मा और उसका शरीर सरकारी धंधों के अन्दर है। खाली सरकारी धंधे एक ओढ़नी ओढ़ कर रहते हैं सार्वजनिकता की, लोकप्रियता की लेकिन इसका नतीजा बहुत खतरनाक हुआ है। मैं आपका ध्यान खींच रहा था उन उपायों की तरफ जिनसे सरकारी धंधों की आत्मा पवित्र बनाई जा सकती है।

एक उपाय मैंने समता के चित्र का बताया था और कुछ उदाहरण इसके बताये थे। मैं अर्घ्य करता हूँ कि अर्कों के अनुपात पर सोचा 1428(Ai) L.SD.—5

जाए, अर्कों पर नहीं। उन अर्कों को ज्यादा बढ़ाने के लिए अब मैं सुविधा की तरफ आपका ध्यान खींचता हूँ। कुछ लोग केवल नौकरी पर ध्यान देते हैं, सुविधा पर नहीं। लेकिन मैं आपको बताऊँ कि एक अफसर जो अढ़ाई हजार रुपये महीना कमाता है, सुविधा के रूप में साधारण तौर पर दस हजार रुपया राज्य का खर्च करता है। इसमें मैं बहुत ऊंचे जो लोग हैं, उनकी सुविधा को नहीं ले रहा हूँ। वह लाखों में मामला जाता है। यह मैं एक ओसत बात बता रहा हूँ। मैं कहता हूँ कि जब कभी गैरबराबरी की बात आप किया करें तो कम से कम हिन्दुस्तान में केवल वेतनों के फर्क की बात न किया करें। वेतनों को छोड़ कर बड़े लोग अपने लिए चीगनी और छः गुनी सुविधाएँ ले लिया करते हैं और उन सुविधाओं के रहते बहुत कुछ कानून भंग भी हुआ करता है।

अध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं उन लोगों के नाम नहीं लूंगा। खाली मैं इतना बताये देता हूँ कि किस तरह से कानून भंग होता है। एक बहुत बड़ा सरकारी अफसर है इन सरकारी धंधों वाला जो दिल्ली में काम करने लग गया। अपने कुटुम्ब के लिए उसने बम्बई में सरकारी खर्च से बंगला रखा। उसी तरह से एक और बड़ा अफसर है जो हमेशा यहाँ बम्बई से दिल्ली टेलीफोन किया करता है व्यक्तिगत मामलों में और वह अफसर हर हफ्ते एक बार हवाई जहाज में यहाँ सफर भी किया करता है।

उसी तरह से रोमानिया और हिन्दुस्तान के मामले में जो समझौतों का तोड़ हुआ, उस पर मैं आपका ध्यान खींचता हूँ। गोहाटी में जो तेल साफ होता है, वहाँ की केरोमीन इकाई जो है, वह बहुत दिनों से बन्द पड़ी है, कभी साल भर में ८० दिन काम करती है, कभी ५० दिन काम करती है। आजकल भी बिल्कुल बन्द है। मुझे इतिला मिली है कि रोमानिया और हिन्दुस्तान का जो समझौता हुआ था उस समझौते की शर्तों को तोड़ करके और जंग लगा माल ले कर

[डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया]

यह सारा कारखाना कायम किया गया है। मैं नहीं कह सकता हूँ कि कौन सी सुविधा हिन्दुस्तानी अफसरों को मिली और अगर मिली तो बड़ी खतरनाक सुविधा रही होगी। कानून बहुत ज्यादा टूट रहा है। मैं आपको और भी बहुत से उदाहरण दे सकता हूँ लेकिन इसको बन्द कर के खाली मैं इतना कहना चाहता हूँ सरकारी घंटों के सम्बन्ध में कि यह टुटि सारी दुनिया में देखी गई है कि सब अफसर कानून तोड़ते हैं और एक दूसरे को बचाने की कोशिश करते हैं। रूस को भी इसका बहुत ज्यादा सामना करना पड़ा था। ये सुविधायें बन्द करना मुश्किल है क्योंकि सरकार की एक मंशा है कि वह भी अपने अफसरों को उसी तरह रखे। जस तरह से निजी धंधे वाले अपने अफसरों को रखते हैं। मैंने सुना है कि कई बार प्रधान मंत्री ने कहा है कि अगर टाटा, बिड़ला आदि अपने अफसरों को शान से रखते हैं तो हिन्दुस्तान का राज भी अपने अफसरों को शान से रखना चाहता है। मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि यही सब से बड़ी खराबी है कि शोकीनी और फिजूल खर्ची का मन बनता चला जा रहा है, समता का मन नहीं। इसका सब से बड़ा उदाहरण स्वयं प्रधान मंत्री देते हैं। वह हमारे सरकारी घंटों का उद्घाटन करते हैं और जब वह या उनके जैसा कोई मंत्री जाता है तो वह देखें कि कितना खर्च होता है। एक बार सिर्फ उन्होंने कहा कि अब से मैं उद्घाटन नहीं किया करूंगा कोई मजदूर उद्घाटन करेगा और एक मजदूरनी ने उनके सामने उद्घाटन भी किया। वह ढोंग फिर बाद में कभी नहीं हुआ है। वह हमेशा उद्घाटन के लिए पहुँच जाते हैं और खर्च करते हैं।

मैं आपका ध्यान खींचूँ कि हीराकुंड और राउड़केला के इलाके में जो सिर्फ पचास साठ मील का इलाका है, तीन हवाई अड्डे हैं। ये किस लिये हैं? सिर्फ इसलिये कि

प्रधान मंत्री और दूसरे मंत्रियों की शान और शौकत में फर्क न आ जाए, उनकी शान और शौकत के लिए ये हवाई अड्डे बना दिये गये थे और अब उनसे कोई काम नहीं होता है, न माल ढोया जाता है और न कोई और जाता है। आप देखें कि यह शान शौकत की फिजूल-खर्ची कितनी बढ़ गई है।

अब मैं दाजी जी से कहना चाहता हूँ कि क्यों वह आरती उतारते हैं सार्वजनिक घंटों की, लेकिन उसके साथ साथ सब तर्क उसके खिलाफ देते हैं? इसका सबब यह है कि उन्होंने रूस के बारे में ज्यादा सोचा नहीं। रूस में बड़ा अत्याचार हुआ, बड़ा जुल हुआ। मैं उसको नापसन्द करता हूँ, लेकिन मैं यह भी कहना चाहता हूँ कि मैं हिन्दुस्तान की शौकीन पसन्दगी को भी बहुत नापसन्द करता हूँ और अगर यह काम रूस में हुआ होता जो कि हिन्दुस्तान में पिछले १५ वर्षों से चल रहा है, तो न जाने कितने नौकरशाह और न जाने कितने मंत्री दीवार के सामने मुँह करके उड़ा दिये गये होते। यह एक ऐसा मामला है जिस पर कि मैं

अध्यक्ष महोदय : आप इस पर कहिए कि पब्लिक अंडरटेकिंग्स के लिए कमेटी बने या न बने।

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : जी हाँ, बने। लेकिन मैं

अध्यक्ष महोदय : आपने १३ मिनट तो कल लिये थे और आज भी

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : कल तो मैंने पांच सात मिनट ही लिए थे।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : नहीं, आपने १३ मिनट लिये थे।

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : मैं सार्वजनिक धंधों पर बोल रहा हूँ, और सार्वजनिक धंधे किस तरह से चलाए जाने चाहिए इसका कमेटी को थोड़ा बहुत ज्ञान होना चाहिए ।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : मुझसेर में आप इसको कहें तो कह सकते हैं, लेकिन आप ने तो एक बहस शुरू कर दी । यह नहीं होना चाहिए ।

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : मैं जानता हूँ अध्यक्ष महोदय । मैंने केवल एक बात कह दी कि मंत्रियों और नौकरशाहों को रूस में गोली से उड़ा दिया गया होता । यह एक ऐसी चीज नहीं है कि जिस पर कि उनको आपत्ति हो सकती है । मैं उसको पसन्द नहीं करता । मैं उसको अत्याचार समझता । लेकिन मैं यह भी कहना चाहता हूँ कि यह शौकीनी बहुत खराब हो रही है और अब समता का मन कायम किए बिना हिन्दुस्तान में सार्वजनिक धंधों को चलाने से बहुत ज्यादा नुकसान होगा । यह पहली बात है जो मैंने आपसे कही ।

उसके साथ साथ जहाँ तक लोकतंत्र का हिसाब है, मजदूर और मालिक के रिस्ते के बारे में भी इतना ही कहूंगा कि निजी धंधों में मजदूर इतना असन्तुष्ट नहीं है जितना कि सार्वजनिक धंधों में है ।

और लोकतंत्र के बारे में एक विचित्र घटना आपको बताता हूँ । टाटा नगर कम्पनी नगर, करोड़पतियों का नगर है, लेकिन चित्तोजन तो ऐसा विचित्र नगर हो गया है कि उसके अन्दर घुसने के लिए परमिट लेनी पड़ती है । इस तरह का लोकतंत्र चालू है । मेरे पास उदाहरण तो सैकड़ों हैं ।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : मेरी फिर आपसे दरखास्त है कि सवाल तो इतना है कि

जिस तरह से अभी एस्टीमेट्स कमेटी देख रख करती है, इसी तरह से चलती रहे या इसके लिए एक अलाहिदा कमेटी बनाई जाए

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : अध्यक्ष महोदय, जब कोई कमेटी बनेगी और उसके सामने ये बातें नहीं होंगी तो हम लोक सभा वाले करेंगे क्या ?

अध्यक्ष महोदय : डाक्टर साहब, आपको जो कहना था आपने कह दिया और मैंने उसको सुना ।

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : मैं एक ही वाक्य में जो सार्वजनिक धंधों की कमियाँ हैं व्यापारिक दृष्टि से उनको बताये देता हूँ

अध्यक्ष महोदय : वह सारी कमियाँ अब नहीं आ सकतीं । सवाल यह है कि इस वक्त जिस तरह से अभी काम चल रहा है उसी तरह चलता रहे या एक नयी कमेटी कायम की जाए । तो उस पर आप कहिए ।

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : नई कमेटी कायम की जाए, लेकिन वह क्यों कामय की जाए, इसके बारे में तो मैं अपने तर्क दूंगा अब मैं बहुत जल्दी खत्म कर रहा हूँ । मंत्री महोदय को चाहिए कि वह खूद मुझ से वे उदाहरण ले लें जिनसे कि सार्वजनिक धंधे बिगड़े हुए हैं ।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : डाक्टर साहब, अब खत्म कीजिए । एक एक मेम्बर को १५ मिनट देने हैं । आपको कल १३ मिनट दिए और दस के करीब आज भी हो रहे हैं । आपको जो कहना हो वह मुझसेर में कह दें । अगर आप मिसालें देंगे तो बहुत वक्त लगेगा । मैं जानता हूँ कि आपके पास बहुत मसाला है और वह जरूरी मसाला है । लेकिन यह तो देखिये कि जो हमारे सामने मौका है उस पर उनको कहा जा सकता है या नहीं । अब आप खत्म कीजिये ।

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : मैं पांच मिनट में खत्म किये देता हूँ। जो मसाला मेरे पास है उसे छोड़े देता हूँ।

आज हिन्दुस्तान में जो फौलाद बिक रही है उसका दाम सस्ता होना चाहिए। क्योंकि लोहे और कोयले के मामले में हिन्दुस्तान स्वयं है। हम अपना कच्चा लोहा जापान को चार छः हजार मील दूर भेजते हैं और जापान अपना फौलाद यहाँ सस्ता बेचता है लेकिन हमारे फौलाद के दाम बहुत ज्यादा हैं। मैं समझता हूँ कि निजी धंधे वाले इस बात को पसन्द करते हैं कि सरकारी धंधों के सबब से दाम ज्यादा रहें और वह भी मुनाफा उठा सकें।

ये सारी चीजें सार्वजनिक धंधों के मामले में हो रही हैं। अगर निजी धंधों में यह होता तो उनका दिवाला निकल गया होता लेकिन सार्वजनिक धंधों में दिवाले की बात नहीं रहती है। इसलिए मैं मंत्री महोदय को एक संकल्प दे रहा हूँ कि वह अपने यहाँ लागत हिसाब जरूर जारी करें। लागत हिसाब में ये सब चीजें सामने आती रहेंगी कि कौन कहां कानून को भंग कर रहा है, कौन दोषी है। दोष के मामले में भी अच्छा हो कि सरकार ध्यान दे। जब कोई दोषी पकड़ा जाता है तो उसकी जगह दूसरा दोषी सामने आ जाता है। अब नए मंत्री आए हैं, उन्हें पता चल जाएगा। कभी वित्त मंत्री दोषी समझे जाते हैं, तो फिर पाटिल साहब दोषी समझे जाते हैं, फिर कामत साहब दोषी समझे जाते हैं और इस तरह से दोषी पकड़ा नहीं जाता। इसलिए दोषी पकड़ने के बजाए हिन्दुस्तान की सरकार का ध्यान जाना चाहिए इस तरह कि दोष को कैसे दूर किया जाए।

अन्त में मैं एक ही वाक्य कहता हूँ। जितने मंत्री लगे हैं, ये सरकार में नहीं रहेंगे तो ये सारे के सारे निजी धंधों के उपासक और हिमायती बन जायेंगे। केवल मेरा जैसा आदमी सार्वजनिक धंधों का हिमायती रहेगा।

Mr. Speaker: Shrimati Ramdulari Sinha.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy (Kendrapara): Sir, are you continuing this for the whole day?

Mr. Speaker: No, I am not. I will call the hon. Minister at 3 o'clock. I am finishing with it. Now will reduce the time limit on speeches. The same things are being repeated and certain irrelevant things are being said. I will request hon. Members that they should try to finish their speeches within ten minutes so that I will be able to call more hon. Members.

श्रीमती रामदुलारी सिन्हा (पटना) :

अध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं माननीय उद्योग मंत्री श्री कानूनगो साहब का शुक्रिया अदा करना चाहती हूँ कि, देर से ही सही, उन्होंने पब्लिक सेक्टर के क्षेत्र में पार्लियामेंट की कमेटी के निर्माण का मोशन पेश किया।

मुझे ऐसा लगता है कि इस कमेटी के निर्माण के सम्बन्ध में किसी भी सदस्य को ऐतराज नहीं हो सकता है। इस कमेटी के निर्माण का सुझाव काफी विलम्ब से आया है। आज यहाँ पर यह तर्क देना युक्तिसंगत नहीं और मौजू भी नहीं कि बरतानिया में ऐसी कमेटी के निर्माण में चार वर्ष लगे थे। आज हमारे भारत को औद्योगीकरण के क्षेत्र में योजनाओं के सहारे बढ़ी तेजी से आगे बढ़ना है और जिन तमाम लक्ष्यों को यूरोप में सदियों में प्राप्त किया गया उन्हें हमको चन्द वर्षों में पूरा करना है। ऐसा नहीं होगा तो हमारा आगे बढ़ना उतना ही विकट हो जाएगा।

आज इस कमेटी के निर्माण के सम्बन्ध में सदन के सदस्यों ने हर दृष्टिकोण से विचार व्यक्त किए हैं। मैं कहना चाहूँगी कि हमारा लोकतंत्र समाजवाद से जुड़ा हुआ है और इस लिए हम समाजवाद के प्रति वफादार सिपाहियों का यह कर्तव्य है कि हम पब्लिक सेक्टर में एकीकृती और लोकोपयोगिता

लाकर उसको उन्नति का एक खम्बा साबित करें, और इसके लिए यह जरूरी है कि इस क्षेत्र में प्राइवेट क्षेत्र के मुकाबले में एफिशेंसी, प्रोडक्शन, इंडस्ट्रियल रिलेशन्स में प्रगति दिखाई दे। हमारे देश की जनता का जीवन स्तर ऊंचा उठाने का सवाल और अन्य अनेकों सवाल इससे जुड़े हुए हैं। हमको पबलिक सेक्टर के द्वारा देश के सामने एक नमूना रखना होगा। लेकिन आज जो पबलिक सेक्टर की हालत है वही आगे भी रही तो यह इस देश का दुर्भाग्य होगा और ऐसा होने पर हमारे समाजवाद पर लोग उंगली उठा सकते हैं। तो मैं इस कमेटी के निर्माण के सुझाव का समर्थन करते हुए कोई सस्ती आलोचना यहां पर नहीं रखना चाहती। कागजात से यह स्पष्ट है कि इस क्षेत्र में सुधार की काफी आवश्यकता है।

मेरा पबलिक सेक्टर के श्रमिकों से ताल्लुक रहा है और मैं ने पबलिक सेक्टर के वर्किंग को देखा भी है। मैं ने देखा है कि वहां पर बेशुमार गड़बड़ियां हैं। करोड़ों का खर्च है जिस पर पूरा नियंत्रण नहीं है और अफसर लोग इंडस्ट्रियल रिलेशन्स के बारे में मनमानी करते हैं। तो इन पबलिक सेक्टर के उद्योगों में प्रोडक्शन बढ़ाने के लिए जिससे हमारी जनता का जीवन स्तर ऊंचा हो सके, यह अत्यन्त आवश्यक है कि इस तरह की एक कमेटी का निर्माण किया जाए। पबलिक सेक्टर में केवल पबलिक रिलेशन्स के मामले में ही नियमों का उल्लंघन नहीं हुआ है। मैं चन्द बातें इस सम्बन्ध में कहना चाहती हूँ। मैं विस्तार में नहीं जाना चाहती। हथिया और रुरकेला जैसे पबलिक क्षेत्र के उद्योगों में भी इंडस्ट्रियल रिलेशन्स टाटा के मुकाबले के नहीं हैं। और सरकारी आदेशों का पालन तो दूर रहा, जो श्रमिकों के सम्बन्ध में स्टेट्यूटरी प्रावीजन्स हैं उनका भी उल्लंघन होता है।

आज आवश्यकता यह थी कि पबलिक सेक्टर दुनिया के सामने एक माडल एम्प्लायर का नमूना पेश करता। लेकिन ऐसा नहीं हो

सका है। मैं इस कमेटी के निर्माण का समर्थन करते हुए मंत्री महोदय से यह निवेदन करना चाहूंगी कि इस कमेटी के अधिकारों पर रुकावट न लगायी जाए। यह बात सत्य है कि यह कमेटी गवर्नमेंट की मेजर पालिसी के बारे में दस्तन्दाजी न करें, लेकिन पबलिक सेक्टर के धन्धों के डे टु डे एडमिनिस्ट्रेशन का जहां तक ताल्लुक है, वहां इसके अधिकार को सीमित करना ठीक नहीं होगा। गवर्नमेंट का यह कदम बहुत ही समाजवादी और प्रगतिशील है किन्तु इसका क्षेत्र सिर्फ बड़े बड़े कारखानों तक ही सीमित न रख कर सभी सरकारी उद्योगों पर लागू किया जाये।

13 hrs.

इस कमेटी के अधिकारों को केवल चन्द पबलिक अंडरटेकिंग्स तक ही सीमित न कर उनको वही अधिकार देना चाहिए जो कि आज पबलिक एकाउंट्स कमेटी और एस्टीमेट्स कमेटी को है। मैं इन शब्दों के साथ एक बार फिर इस सुझाव का समर्थन करूंगी और कहना चाहूंगी कि आज हमारे देश का भविष्य या यूँ कहा जाये कि देश का औद्योगिक भविष्य पबलिक सेक्टर में चलने वाली बड़ी बड़ी अंडरटेकिंग्स की सफलता पर निर्भर करता है। यदि पबलिक सेक्टर में हम सफल हुए तो हमारे देश का औद्योगिक विकास सफल होगा। करोड़ों रुपयों की लागत पर हम देश को जो एक मजबूत किला बना कर दुनिया के सामने खड़ा करना चाहते हैं तो उसका तात्पर्य अच्छे उत्पादन से है, जनता के अच्छे लिविंग स्टैंडर्ड से है, एफिशिएंसी से है और उसके साथ कंज्यूमर्स के हित से है। हम चाहते हैं कि श्रमिकों के उचित व न्यायोचित अधिकार हों। इसलिए मैं उस कमेटी के निर्माण के प्रस्ताव का समर्थन करते हुए माननीय मंत्री से निवेदन करना चाहूंगी कि केन्द्र यदि राज्य सरकारों को भी इस तरह की कमेटी के निर्माण का सुझाव देता तो बहुत अच्छा होता।

Shri Morarka (Jhunjhunu): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I welcome this motion

[Shri Morarka]

that the hon. Minister has been pleased to make before this House. This motion has not come a day too soon. As a matter of fact, you will be surprised to know that this motion has taken almost ten years before it has been presented to this House.

There are two main reasons why this Committee is proposed to be constituted. One is that the public sector is growing and the Industrial Policy of the Government has assigned a definite task, an increasing task, to the public sector. As many hon. Members pointed out here, already about Rs. 1200 crores have been invested in the public sector and much more money is going to be invested. But more than that, it has been felt that the parliamentary control, the parliamentary accountability of these public sector enterprises is not adequate. For that purpose, I would like to quote that what the Estimates Committee said in 1959-60. In the 73rd report of the Estimates Committee (Second Lok Sabha), this is what the Committee had to say:

"Considering the huge investment of public funds in the public undertakings, the existing methods available to Parliament of keeping itself fully informed about these undertakings are neither adequate nor satisfactory. Under the existing arrangements, Parliament does not get a comprehensive picture of these undertakings."

Now, this is the background of why this separate Committee was recommended. Besides, the late Shri Mavalankar, the then Speaker, in his letter, to which the reference was made by the hon. Minister, had said:

"It is also clear that the Estimates Committee and the Public Accounts Committee are already over-burdened with the work assigned to them and they have very little time to go into the working of these corporations."

The reason for proposing a separate Committee was that the Public Ac-

counts Committee and the Estimates Committee were already over-burdened with other work and, therefore, a separate Committee of this House was to be constituted. It is not a sort of compromise; it is not that they wanted to do it for any other reason. But it is for practical considerations that because the Estimates Committee and the Public Accounts Committee did not have enough time to go into the working of these public undertakings, they wanted to constitute a separate committee. That is all right. Now, when a separate Committee is being constituted and this Committee is expected to take over the functions of the Public Accounts Committee and the Estimates Committee, I do not know why the constitution of this Committee is sought to be made different. First of all, as you know, the Public Accounts Committee and the Estimates Committee are constituted or elected every year by the House and there has been no difficulty at all in the election of Members to those Committees. Nothing by way of complaint has come to your notice. Then, I do not know why a separate method is suggested for this Committee. The period of three years is being suggested for the Members of this Committee. Why can't the election take place every year? What is the difficulty? The proportional representation system, if it has to succeed, has a condition precedent that the elections of the entire Committee must take place at one time. Unless all the Members are elected at one time, the different Parties are not likely to get the proportional representation. I do not see any reason why the election of this Committee cannot be put at par with the election of the Estimates Committee and the Public Accounts Committee. Since this Committee is going to be a permanent Committee of this House, I hope the hon. Minister would reconsider this and put this Committee at par with the Estimates Committee and the Public Accounts Committee so far as the election and other procedures are concerned.

Then there is the second point. What would be the functions of this Committee? Parliament says that there is a need for more control and better scrutiny of these public undertakings. Is it that Parliament should have more rights or is it that Parliament should have less rights? As it is, Parliament has full rights through its Estimates Committee and the Public Accounts Committee to go into any aspect of the public undertakings. Now those powers will be taken away and instead a new Committee is constituted to which these powers are given. Why should there be any diminution of those powers. At least the powers which are at present being enjoyed by the Public Accounts Committee and the Estimates Committee should vest in this Committee.

It has been said that these commercial and industrial undertakings must enjoy autonomy. True. They must have autonomy, autonomy for functioning. But autonomy and accountability are two different things. They are not inconsistent with each other; they do not come into conflict with one another. A concern may be fully autonomous, yet it may be fully accountable to Parliament. Autonomy means that there should be no interference in day-to-day working, that there should be no pin-pricking. That is all right. But it does not mean that it should not account for its success or failure to the House.

The hon. Minister said that many of the companies are floated under the Companies Act and since the Companies Act is a comprehensive Act—there are so many sections—they are properly regulated. I do not want to go into the details. But if you see the Estimates Committee's report, it says that the annual reports of some of these companies are placed on the table of the House in as many as 35 months after the year is closed, whereas the Company Law requires that they should be placed on the table of the House within 9 months.

The Minister of Industry (Shri Kanungo): That was before the

amendment of the Company Law that came in 1960.

Shri Morarka: The provision of the Companies Act, 1956 requires.....

Shri Kanungo: 15 months.

Shri Morarka: 9 months. It requires that the reports of these companies should be placed on the table of the House within 9 months and that only in exceptional circumstances the extension may be given. As against that, some of the companies are taking 35 months. May I enquire from the hon. Minister what action has he taken or his Company Law Department has taken against those companies which have taken 24 months or 25 months or 35 months? Had he written even one letter to them saying that such delay should not be caused?

Shri Kanungo: That situation has been corrected now.

Shri Morarka: Then, take another instance. If you incorporate a corporation, then the Bill is introduced by the Minister and Parliament gets a chance to examine the various provisions of the corporation bill and then decide whether those provisions are adequate or inadequate. But when a company is floated under the Company Law, there is no such opportunity available to us. Without any reference to this Parliament, a company can be registered and floated. For the capital of the company, only the Minister has to come to Parliament. When does he come? He comes either at the time of the general demand of the Ministry, at the time of the annual budget, or at the time of the supplementary demand of the Ministry. There are so many other big and small things that are put altogether. May I ask: Does this House really get a chance at that time to examine whether the demand of the hon. Minister or the Ministry for that company is proper or improper. The Supplementary Demands for Grants are discussed in two or three hours; so many subjects are there, so many Ministries are there,

[Shri Morarka]

and so many Members are there who want to speak that it is very difficult for anyone to apply his mind properly to the details of those provisions and to find out whether there is a justification for floating that company, whether there is a justification for giving a particular activity of Government to an autonomous corporation or not, and so on. So, from all these points of view, it is vital, in the interests of the public sector itself, in the interests of parliamentary democracy and in the interests of the Ministers that there should be a proper scrutiny and a proper examination by this House and by the committee of this House.

I was saying that there was no conflict between autonomy and accountability. These are not only my views. This is what Professor Galbraith has said. He has said:

"Though the society should be wholly tolerant of errors that are within the framework of success, it should be wholly intolerant of failures to achieve the specified goals. Indeed, the non-achievement of goals, not the individual mistake, is the meaning of failure. Autonomy does not mean less public accountability. On the contrary, it means more. But it is accountability not for method, procedure or individual action, but for results."

As long as you make the corporations or the public authorities accountable for the results, from the point of view of whether the goals have been achieved or not, I think it should not be called interference in the day-to-day management or interference in the autonomy of those concerned.

When I look at this motion, I find that it is unnecessarily lengthy. First of all, there is no necessity for prescribing the functions of this committee. It could easily have been said that the functions of the committee would be the same as those which are performed by the Public Accounts Committee and

the Estimates Committee at present. As it is, under clause 2(d) of the motion, Government have vested the power in you, Sir, as the Speaker to allot the functions. Clause 2(d) reads thus:

"such other functions vested in the Public Accounts Committee and the Estimates Committee in relation to the Public Undertakings specified in the Schedule by or under the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business of this House as are not covered by clauses (a), (b) and (c) above and as may be allotted to the Committee by the Speaker from time to time."

Why should the Speaker allot these functions from time to time? I can understand that in special circumstances and in special cases. But the functions which are already vested in the Public Accounts Committee and the Estimates Committee should automatically vest in this new committee also.

Then, there is a proviso to this clause, and I object to this proviso more vehemently. It reads thus:

"Provided that the Committee shall not examine and investigate any of the following matters, namely:

- (i) matters of major Government policy as distinct from business or commercial functions of the Public Undertakings;...."

That is, the committee will not examine and will not have the right to say whether there should be a public sector or not. That is a major Government policy decision. I quite agree. But then, what are the policies that each individual concern is following? What is the price policy? What is the profit policy? What is the purchase policy, labour policy and so on? The committee must be able to examine all these things. Otherwise, the work of the committee would be incomplete.

and the committee would exist only in name and not in substance.

Then, the proviso reads:

"(ii) matters of day-to-day administration";

What are matters of day-to-day administration? The General Manager of the Rourkela Steel Plant is now empowered to make purchases, without reference to anybody, up to Rs. 50 lakhs, of any one item. That would be a routine power for him, and that would be a matter of day-to-day administration. If this committee would not have the right to examine these purchases and to see whether that power is properly and judiciously exercised or not, then the functioning of this committee would be seriously hampered.

I now come to Parts I, II and III of the Schedule. I do not know why this is divided into three parts. This is a committee on all public undertakings, that is, public undertakings as exist today, and public undertakings as they would come into existence tomorrow. All those public undertakings must come within the framework of this committee. By putting this Schedule, Government have limited the scope of this committee. Tomorrow, if more corporations are incorporated or more companies are registered, unless you amend the Schedule, you cannot bring them within the purview of this committee. That is not a very satisfactory arrangement. I seriously and sincerely appeal to the hon. Minister to make the Schedule a simple one by saying that the list will consist of all those public undertakings the report of which is placed on the Table of this House.

As was pointed out yesterday by some of the hon. Members, so far as Part III of the Schedule is concerned, in view of the latest amendment, it has become redundant. I heard the hon. Minister's speech carefully, and the only purpose of keeping this Part III is that so far as the Defence companies are concerned, they should not be

examined by this committee like all other companies, but some sort of special procedure should be adopted or some sort of restraint should be exercised in their case, and for that purpose it has been stated that the affairs of these companies may be examined in such manner as the Speaker may direct. I quite agree with the intention of the hon. Minister, but the Schedule as it stands now requires a definite amendment. Otherwise, concerns like the Hindustan Aircraft Ltd., etc. would be completely outside the purview of this committee.

In conclusion, I would just say one word about those companies in which Government have not got 51 per cent share but 50 per cent or 49 per cent or a lesser percentage of shares. Under the scheme proposed, those companies would not be touched at all. According to me, it does not make any difference whether Government have got 51 per cent shares or 50 per cent shares. For example, take the Burmah Oil Co. The investment of Government in the Burmah Oil Co. is 50 per cent. But the Burmah Oil Co. would be completely outside the scope of this committee.

Shri Warrior: I believe my hon. friend means the Oil India Ltd.

Shri Morarka: Similarly, take the case of the TELCO. The entire production of the locomotives by TELCO is purchased by Government. The share capital also is substantial, so far as Government are concerned. Government are the single largest shareholder of that company. In regard to any company where Government are the largest single shareholder, I think that there is justification for that company to be brought within the purview of this committee.

I hope that the hon. Minister would kindly consider the few points that I have made, and the House will take note of them and do whatever is necessary.

Mr. Speaker: Now, Shri Radhelal Vyas. I would request hon. Members

[Mr. Speaker]

to be very brief now because most of the points have been made already.

श्री राधेलाल व्यास (उज्जैन) : अध्यक्ष जी, जो प्रस्ताव माननीय मंत्री जी लाये हैं, उस का मैं स्वागत करता हूँ। इस का उद्देश्य सिवाय इस के कोई दूसरा नहीं हो सकता है कि चूँकि इन पब्लिक अंडरटेकिंग्स में बहुत कुछ सरकारी पैसा लगा हुआ है, इस लिये यह बहुत जरूरी है कि उस पर पालियामेंट का कुछ नियंत्रण और देख-रेख रहे। यद्यपि पब्लिक एकाउंट्स कमेटी और एस्टीमेट्स कमेटी मौजूद है, लेकिन उन के पास इतना अधिक काम है कि वे पब्लिक अंडरटेकिंग्स के साथ न्याय नहीं कर सकते। यहाँ पर कई दफा यह सवाल उठा कि पब्लिक अंडरटेकिंग्स की जांच-पड़ताल के लिये और उन पर निगरानी रखने के लिये कोई कमेटी मुकर्रर की जाये। इस दृष्टि से यह प्रस्ताव हमारे सामने है।

सब से पहले मैं निवेदन करूँगा कि जहाँ तक मेम्बरशिप का प्रश्न है, जो दस और पांच, कुल पन्द्रह, की मेम्बरशिप रखी गई है, वह बहुत कम है, क्योंकि अध्यक्ष महोदय, खुद आप को मालूम है कि पब्लिक एकाउंट्स कमेटी और एस्टीमेट्स कमेटी भी अलग अलग विषयों के लिये सब-कमेटीज बना कर काम करती हैं। पब्लिक अंडरटेकिंग्स की संख्या दिन-प्रतिदिन बढ़ती जा रही है और बड़ी बड़ी पब्लिक अंडरटेकिंग्स हैं। अगर हमारा उद्देश्य यह है कि जो कमेटी बनाई जाती है, वह ठीक ढंग से काम करे और जिस मकसद के लिये वह मुकर्रर की जा रही है, वह मकसद हासिल हो, तो यह बहुत जरूरी है कि उस में ज्यादा मेम्बर रखे जायें, ताकि वह कमेटी अलग अलग पब्लिक अंडरटेकिंग्स के लिये अलग अलग सब-कमेटीज बना कर उन की देख-भाष

श्रीर छात्रवीन करे और पालियामेंट को समय समय पर अपनी रिपोर्ट पेश करे। इस सम्बन्ध में मेरा सुझाव है कि लोक-सभा के बीस मेम्बर और राज्य-सभा के दस मेम्बर उस कमेटी में होने चाहियें। ऐसी कमेटी अगर बनेगी, तो वह अपना काम ठीक ढंग से कर सकेगी।

एक माननीय सदस्य : राज्य सभा तो परमानेंट बाडी है।

श्री राधेलाल व्यास : तब क्या? इसकी मियाद जो रखी है, वह जब खत्म हो जायेगी तो मेम्बरशिप भी खत्म हो जायेगी।

इस कमेटी का फंक्शन जो सीये गये हैं उस में कहा गया है कि जो पब्लिक एकाउंट्स कमेटी और एस्टीमेट्स कमेटी काम करती है और उनके जो अधिकार हैं, वे भी इस कमेटी को प्राप्त होंगे। कल लामिनिस्टर साहब ने बताया था कि पी० ए० सी० और ई० सी० भी काम करती रहेगी और यह भी काम करती रहेगी। मेरी समझ में नहीं आता है कि दोनों चीजें कैसे सम्भव हो सकती हैं। इन सब कमेटियों के अगर अधिकार समान रहे और जो उनको ये तीनों कमेटियाँ देखती रहें तो क्या यह सम्भव नहीं कि जो रिपोर्ट पेश की जाय उस में मत-भेद हो? इस लिये यह जरूरी है कि इस कमेटी की तरफ केवल पब्लिक अंडरटेकिंग्स का ही काम रखा जाये और पब्लिक एकाउंट्स कमेटी और एस्टीमेट्स कमेटी का जो काम है, इनके सम्बन्ध में, वह सब इसके सुपुर्द कर दिया जाये। पब्लिक एकाउंट्स कमेटी और एस्टीमेट्स कमेटी के परब्यू से वह काम निकाल लिया जाना चाहिये। इस तरह का संशोधन होना बहुत जरूरी है।

अब एक बात मैं प्राविसे के बारे में कहना चाहता हूँ। इसका कई माननीय सद-

र्यों ने जिन्न किया है। मेरी समझ में नहीं आता है कि इस प्राविसो की क्या आवश्यकता है। इसको निकाल दिया जाना चाहिये। इस प्राविसो को रख कर मैं नहीं समझता कि यह कमेटी अपने अधिकारों का अच्छी तरह से प्रयोग कर सकेगी और ठीक तरह से काम कर सकेगी, इफैक्टिवली और एफि-शेंटली काम कर सकेगी। इससे तो जिस प्रक-सद के लिये यह कमेटी बनाई जा रही है, वह ही फीत हो जाता है, वह ही पूरा नहीं होता है। इसकी जरूरत नहीं है। अविश्वास की इस में कौन सी बात है। पार्लियामेंट सुप्रीम है, मालिक है। क्या उसको यह अधि-कार न हो कि वह आपके काम की जानकारी हासिल करने के लिये छानबीन कर सके? अगर उसको यह अधिकार है तो क्यों उसके इस अधिकार को छीना जाये और क्यों प्रति-बन्ध लगाया जाय। इससे तो जो उद्देश्य है, वह ही नष्ट हो जाता है। डे-टू-डे मैटर्ज को देखने का अधिकार होना चाहिये। मान लीजिये कि कोई जनरल मैनेजर गड़बड़ी करता है, एन्वाइंटमेंट्स में, अपने रिश्तेदारों को भर लेता है और कमेटी डे-टू-डे एडमिनिस्ट्रेशन में नहीं जा सकती है तो उसके नतीजे अच्छ नहीं निकल सकते हैं। इन सब चीजों से खराबियां पैदा होती हैं, माल एडमिनि-स्ट्रेशन होता है, एफिशेंसी पर असर प है। मैं नहीं समझता हूं कि इसके द्वारा छान-बीन किये जाने के रास्ते में किसी तरह की कोई रुकावट डाली जानी चाहिये। इस लिये मेरा निवेदन है कि यह जो प्राविसो है, इसको निकाल दिया जाना चाहिये। आपको मालूम ही है कि एस्टीमेट्स कमेटी पालिसी के बारे में विचार कर सकती है, उसको बदलने के बारे में अपने सुझाव दे सकती है। एसी सूरत में समझ में नहीं आता है कि जब उसको तथा पी०ए०सी० को अधिकार है। और वे सब अधिकार आप इसको दे रहे हैं तो फिर क्यों मंत्री महाादय चाहते हैं कि अधि-कार इस कमेटी को न रहें। यह चीज बिल्कुल

नियमों के विरुद्ध है और जो उद्देश्य होना चाहिये उसके बिल्कुल विपरीत है, बिल्कुल असंगत है। अगर पालिसी के बारे में यह सुझाव दे सकती है तो उसके लिये यह जरूरी होगा कि छानबीन करे क्योंकि वही उसके वह दे नहीं सकती है। इस में जो प्रति-बन्ध लगाया गया है और जो रुकावट डालने की कोशिश की गई है, इसको हटा दिया जाना चाहिये। इसको कतई नहीं रखा जाना चाहिये।

बन फिषथ मैम्बरजं रिटायर हों, यह बात समझ में नहीं आती है। हमने देखा है शुरू से ही कि पब्लिक एकाउंट्स कमेटी और एस्टी-मेट्स कमेटी

श्री कानूनगो : उसका एमेंडमेंट पेश हुआ है, उसको जरा पढ़ लीजिये।

श्री राजेालाल व्यास : : इयूरेशन आफ दी लाइफ आफ दिस हाउस, ऐसा आपने कर दिया है।

दूसरे मामलों में आपने कहा है कि रूल्स आफ प्रोसीजर इस हाउस के लागू होंगे। लेकिन उस में एक अधिकार आपको दिया है। मैं नहीं समझता हूं कि आप वह अधिकार लेना पसन्द करेंगे कि आप कोई वेरिअंशज या माडिफिकेशंज कर सकें। इस तरह की कोई रेस्ट्रेंट लागू हो, ऐसा आप भी नहीं चाहेंगे। मैं नहीं समझता हूं कि आप से पूछ कर यह किया गया है। आप भी इसको पसन्द नहीं कर सकते हैं कि इतना अधिकार आपको दे दिया जाये कि आप बैरी कर दें या माडिफाई कर दें। यह हमारा सौभाग्य है कि आप जैसी एक विभूति यहां मौजूद है कि जिन पर कोई प्रभाव नहीं पड़ सकता है किसी आदमी का। लेकिन कल या फिर कभी कोई कमजोर आदमी चेंबर पर आ जाये तो शासन चाहे जब उन से देरी करा सकेगा। यह अच्छी बात नहीं है। इस से डिफिकल्टीज एराइज हो सकती हैं, बाधा उत्पन्न हो सकती है।

श्री कानूनगो: रेजिडुअरी पावर्स स्पीकर की हैं। पार्लिमेंटरी कमेटी के रूल्ज पढ़ लीजिये।

श्री राधेलाल व्यास: वह ठीक है। जो रूल्ज हैं वे लागू होंगे।

प्रध्यक्ष महोदय: उनको दीहराया गया है।

श्री राधेलाल व्यास: जो रूल्ज हैं वे तो हैं ही, फिर मेशन करने की जरूरत नहीं थी। शैड्यूल का जो पार्ट २ है, उस के बारे में मैं कुछ कहना चाहूंगा।

Public Undertakings which are Government Companies formed under the Companies Act.

इसके नीचे जो इबारत लिखी हुई है

Every Government Company whose annual report is place etc.

इसको डिलीट करने की जरूरत है। इसकी क्या जरूरत है, यह मेरी समझ में नहीं आया है। इतना ही काफी है

Public Undertakings which are Government Companies formed under the Companies Act

जितनी भी कम्पनियां हैं उनको अपनी रिपोर्ट रूल्ज के मुताबिक सदन में रखनी ही पड़ती हैं। अगर कम्पनी एक्ट के तहत कोई कम्पनी रजिस्टर होती है तो उसके लिये यह लाजिमी है। हमारे मुरारका जी ने कहा कि अगर पब्लिक अंडरटेकिंग्स कोई अपनी रिपोर्ट नहीं रखता है तो क्या हम उस अंडरटेकिंग को डिसकस नहीं कर सकेंगे? मैं, आपको बतलाना चाहता हूँ कि मशीन टूलज फैक्टरी शुरू में जब कायम हुई, उस में प्रोडक्शन शुरू हुआ, उसकी एनुअल रिपोर्ट आनी शुरू हुई, उससे पहले वहां पर बड़ी गड़बड़ी सी रही और काम की शुरुआत बड़ी देरी से हुई। आज उसने बहुत काम कर लिया है, बहुत तरक्की कर ली है। अब तो तीन चार

मशीन टूलज फैक्ट्रीज और बनाने में वह समर्थ हो गई है। लेकिन प्रारम्भिक स्टेज के उसके इतिहास को देखें तो वह अच्छा नहीं रहा है। अगर पब्लिक एकाउन्ट्स कमेटी या एस्टीमेट्स कमेटी शुरू से उसको देखती जिसका उसको अधिकार था तो मैं समझता हूँ कि जितनी गड़बड़ी शुरू में हुई, जितनी डिले शुरू में हुई जितना पैसे का दुरुपयोग हुआ, अधिकारों का दुरुपयोग हुआ ...

श्री कानूनगो: रुकावट नहीं थी।

श्री राधेलाल व्यास: यह ठीक है। लेकिन पब्लिक एकाउन्ट्स कमेटी और एस्टीमेट्स कमेटी के पास अधिक काम था और वह हर एक के लिये समय नहीं निकाल सकती थी। अब मैं चाहता हूँ कि इस कमेटी के अधिकार क्षेत्र में यह चीज आये और उसको केवल इसी का अधिकार रहे और यह जरूरी नहीं होना चाहिये कि रिपोर्ट आये, उसके बाद ही वह देख सके। शुरू से ही उसको देखने का अधिकार होना चाहिये। जैसे ही वह कम्पनी रजिस्टर हो, जैसे ही प्रोजेक्ट रिपोर्ट तैयार हो रहा हो, जैसे ही ट्रेनिंग प्रोग्राम शुरू हुआ हो, मशीनरी आ रही हो, कांटेक्ट्स दिये जा रहे हों, बिल्डिंग बन रही हो, उसको देखने का अधिकार होना चाहिये। जितनी भी गड़बड़ी होती है, जितनी भी खराबी होती है, प्रारम्भिक स्टेज पर ही होती है और बाद में कुछ चैक उस पर लग जाता है। अगर इसको इस तरह से रखा गया तो मैं समझता हूँ कि पब्लिक अंडरटेकिंग्स कमेटी जो है, वह प्रारम्भिक कार्रवाई को देख नहीं सकेगी और उन पर अपना नियंत्रण नहीं रख सकेगी।

ये जो जोड़े से सुझाव मैंने दिये हैं, इन पर गम्भीरता से विचार होना चाहिये। माननीय सदस्यों ने काफी इस में संशोधन दिये हैं और उन सब पर विचार करके ऐसी कमेटी बनाई जानी चाहिये जिससे वाक में जो उद्देश्य है, वह हासिल हो और ठीक तरह से काम चले।

Dr. L. M. Singhvi (Jodhpur): Mr. Speaker, the only explanation for the delay in constituting this Committee on the part of the administration is that they are accustomed to procrastination and slow thinking. It appears quite evident that the Committee is being constituted now in response to a sustained and clamorous demand in the House. You would recall that week after week, session after session, year after year, many of us had to repeat this demand for the constitution of a Public Sector Undertakings Committee. I am glad that officially the Government have conceded the demand and have also proceeded to actualise the concession.

I am, however, sorry that I am not in a position to welcome the Committee as officially proposed, although I am strongly in favour of the principle of constituting a separate Public Sector Undertakings Committee in order to secure effective accountability of public sector undertakings to Parliament. I would say that the Minister and the Government have taken too long to conceive, and then this Motion had to be brought out, it appears, by a Caesarian section. The many surgical thrusts which have been applied in the process appear to have deplorably distorted the appearance and the body of Shri Kanungo's Motion which is before the House. This brain child of the present Minister, it appears, suffers from congenital defects and disabilities and in my humble submission, if these defects and disabilities are not cured before it is finally delivered, this institution is not likely to thrive, whatever the care the paediatricians and the progenitors may want to bestow later on. I think something ought to be done at this stage to rescue this Motion from the many maladies with which it is sought to be delivered.

Mr. Speaker: From the observations he has made, the hon. Member appears

to be a good doctor. He should suggest the remedy.

Dr. L. M. Singhvi: I am thankful to you. Though I am not really a medical doctor, I have pretensions to be a legislative physician....

Mr. Speaker: He should help in the right and correct delivery of the child.

Dr. L. M. Singhvi: As a matter of fact, this Parliament is supposed to be a good doctor because it has quite often to conceive and equally often to deliver, the goods to this country.

Mr. Speaker: For the present, the hon. Member has been called to deliver!

Dr. L. M. Singhvi: The motion is so wholly unsatisfactory that I had to bring forth a full-fledged substitute motion. There are unexplained departures in the official motion. There are indefensible innovations and omissions in this motion.

I would like, in this context, to refer to the two drafts which came up before the House on earlier occasions. The draft of Shri K. C. Reddy, the then Minister, though not wholly unexceptionable, was far superior, it provided very clearly that the joint committee would have powers to send for persons, papers and documents, though this power was sought to be somewhat restricted. I do not see any reason why this power should not have been expressly incorporated in the motion which Shri Kanungo has now brought before us. The draft of Shri Reddy also provided that the members of the joint committee shall hold office for a period of five years.

13.32 hrs.

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER in the Chair]

The draft as originally moved by Shri Kanungo in this House provided that

[Dr. L. M. Singhvi]

the tenure of this committee would be five years, but that election to this committee would be each year and by rotation. I am very glad that the Minister has finally made a concession to commonsense in agreeing to have the tenure of this committee coterminous with Parliament and not to insist on retirement by rotation and election each year of one-fifth of the membership, because, if that had been permitted, I am quite sure that it would have been quite contrary to the principles of parliamentary democracy. The basic tenet of parliamentary democracy is that the opposition should not be oppressed, that there should be an effort to secure a proper interchange of ideas and views. If by the device of retirement by rotation and election every year of one-fifth of the membership, Government had intended to secure ultimately the elimination of all Members of the Opposition, it was certainly a sinister design.

The present Motion also seems to be a concession to obduracy and intransigence on the part of the other House. I do not intend to cast any aspersions or reflections, but it does appear quite clearly that the Minister had agreed to this only because the other House refused to consider in utter intransigence the earlier drafts which had been placed before this House. What other reason can possibly be attributed to this change which has been brought about? It had been a matter of prolonged discussion in this House, and I would only cite before you some of the observations made in 1961 when a similar motion for the constitution of a committee on public undertakings was brought before the House. At that time it was clearly stated by the hon. Speaker:

"The second point is whether the Rajya Sabha should be associated or not. He (the Law Minister) says that already the Rajya Sabha Members are asso-

ciated in the Public Accounts Committee. Now he wants them to be associated in this Committee also. The other objection raised is that they have the right to vote. He says they will be associate Members, because the Rajya Sabha also has a right to discuss these matters. They will be here, they will merely discuss and give advice. They will not vote so far as this matter is concerned. Is it not so?"

I would pose the same question and would like to have an affirmative reply to this question from the Minister once again to reassure us in the enjoyment of powers which have been customarily ours.

Now I shall pass on to the various limitations sought to be enacted in this motion. The first limitation inherent in this motion is that it seeks to constitute a committee only of 15 Members, out of whom only ten Members would be elected from this House. Business, economic and industrial matters are complex. There is coming into existence in this country a vast framework of public undertakings. At all strategic points the public sector proceeds to intervene and to occupy the pivotal position. In such circumstances it is incumbent upon Parliament and the administration which proclaims its commitment to democracy, that there should be effective machinery for securing adequate accountability from these public undertakings. A committee consisting merely of 15 Members would again suffer from the same defect of insufficiency of time, of insufficiency of expertise and of relative want of resources and inclinations to probe into many undertakings, because it is impossible, in the nature of things, for a small committee to really exercise its functions over the vast framework of public undertakings which have been brought into existence in this country.

I have, therefore, suggested that there should be as many as 21 Members, and I would here cite the substitute motion brought forward at one time by Shri Dasappa—it had not been moved in the House, though it had been circulated—wherein he also suggested that there should be a committee of 21 Members. I need hardly say that Shri Dasappa has rendered distinguished service as Chairman of the Estimates Committee and has had occasion to look into these matters from close quarters. His advice as contained in his substitute Motion is surely valuable, and I do hope that Government would not bypass it in such a casual manner. But, in spite of the demand which has been made repeatedly, and by almost every single Member who has spoken in the House, that the committee should be enlarged, I see no signs, unfortunately, of the Minister resigning from the position which he has taken in the Motion that he has moved.

The second limitation inherent in the Motion is the Schedule. I do not understand why certain public undertakings have been excluded from the purview of this Committee. I would cite the example of the Employees State Insurance Corporation, the Khadi and Village Industries Commission, the State Bank of India, the Reserve Bank of India, the Bombay Port Trust, the Calcutta Port Trust and the Madras Port Trust, which I have sought to incorporate in Part I of the Schedule annexed to my substitute motion. I am also unable to understand why Government is not willing to bring under the purview of this Committee the departmental industrial and commercial undertakings of the Government of India. I suggest that Government should further agree to bring under the jurisdiction of this Committee all undertakings in which the Government of India hold 25 per cent or more of equity capital, in order to secure effectively the accountability of such undertakings.

Clause (d) of the Motion makes confusion worse confounded because of the proviso which has been appended to it which says that this Committee shall not examine and investigate matters of major governmental policy, shall not investigate matters of day-to-day administration, shall not investigate matters for the consideration of which machinery is established by any special statute under which a particular public undertaking is established. I do not see any reason or rhyme for this blanket exclusion, unless the intention is to procreate a child which will not grow to its full stature. It appears that the progenitor of this Motion, Shri Kanungo, is not concerned about the effectiveness and the health of the institution which he seeks to bring into existence, and which, under the official resolution, would be hamstrung at every step. It would be fettered by every conceivable limitation, and, indeed, it would have been composed on a pernicious, partisan and unparliamentary basis if we were to accept the principle of election each year and retirement by rotation. I am glad the Minister has accepted at least one reasonable principle in the amendment while constituting the committee which does go a long way in making this committee a properly constituted body.

This committee will have to have a very strong secretariat and it should have a wholetime officer of the status of the Comptroller and Auditor-General to assist it. This brings me to the question of expert assistance to this committee; it should be properly considered by the Parliament and provided for in the instrument of instructions of the committees. I also want to raise the question of desirability of having efficiency audits under this committee so that there may be a real assessment of the functioning of public sector undertakings. It is manifest that because of lack of sufficient information and lack of sufficient expertise any committee of

[Dr. L. M. Singhvi]

any legislature cannot be effective. It is because of these two reasons that we have proceeded to constitute this committee although these functions were being performed by the Estimates and the Public Accounts Committees. So, we should create sufficient expertise in this House so that the goal of accountability may be adequately reached. In this respect there is thinking now-a-days that there should be a sort of a third chamber ultimately responsible to this House which would consist of industrial and economic planners and those who have to do something with industrial and economic management so that sufficient expertise is available. It is axiomatic that if you want to exercise full control, you must have experts who know as much about these matters as the managers themselves whom you seek to control. Government should also think about a separate public service commission for these undertakings in order that complaints as those voiced by Mr. Daji may not arise. Government should consider these suggestions in a spirit of rational re-assessment; the Minister should not yield to smug acquiescence or muddled thinking or absent-mindedness. Much of what has gone on in respect of constituting this committee is an example of muddled thinking. The Minister has never been sure, if he has had any idea, it was only very tentative, and the House is still at a loss to understand as to what the precise status of this committee would be and whether the Members of Rajya Sabha associated with this Committee would be able to exercise their functions, and whether such exercise of functions would be in accordance with the Constitution. I hope that the Minister will rationally reconsider this motion in the light of what many of us have said, particularly in respect of the size of this committee and the limitations which are sought to be placed on its working.

Shri V. B. Gandhi (Bombay Central South); Mr. Deputy-Speaker, the

motion which the Minister of Industry has moved is a welcome measure; it has been long overdue. It was delayed because there was some controversy over the respective spheres of authority between the two Houses of Parliament, Raja Sabha and Lok Sabha. I will not go into it; I am content to accept the very lucid explanation of the Law Minister yesterday on the constitutional question. Incidentally, I may add, I am a firm believer, personally, and an almost unrepentant supporter of the theory that the two Houses should be treated on an equal footing.

The central problem before this House today is parliamentary accountability. The principal issue is that of parliamentary responsibility and how that responsibility can be discharged properly by Parliament on matters relating to the working of the public undertakings. There shall be no difficulty in accepting the provision made in this Motion that the new committee will not interest itself or consider matters of day-to-day administration. Also it will not consider matters of major Government policy. But it is quite clear that it will not be precluded from considering matters of commercial policy. Considerable thinking has been done on the subject of limits of public undertaking in relation to matters that parliamentary committees can consider. The limits have been well defined in this country as well as in other countries particularly in the United Kingdom, a country which has had very valuable experience in this regard. I would like to make one suggestion here. The comptroller and Auditor-General should be more directly associated with this committee. After all this committee will be taking over the functions of the PAC and I hope it will be considered with due regard to the importance of the matter. We know that both the Public Accounts Committee and the Estimates Committee have been

burdened with rather more work than they could reasonably be expected to carry and it is only proper that they should be relieved of some of this burden. Parliament should see that the tasks which they used to carry are now distributed between the new committee and the old committees. This new committee does not necessarily have to be a fault finding body. It does not have always to be a critic of the management. It has more important tasks to do. It has to keep Parliament informed and it also has another important task to do, and that is, it has to present a proper image of public undertakings to the public, to the tax-payers, who in some way, as we will all agree, are interested in the conduct of public enterprises.

Much has been said about the attitude of the private sector towards public undertakings or the public sector. I think it is high time that we recognised that there has been a gradual change on the part of the private sector and there has been an effort towards reconciliation to the existence and growth of the public sector in this country.

In this connection, I may quote the words of Shri Bharat Ram, the Chairman of the Federation of Indian Chambers of Commerce and Industry, at a seminar held in Delhi recently. He said:

"Till lately there has been an unnecessary and fruitless controversy over the position and share of the two sectors, private and public."

He went on to say that the responsibility for the development of industries in this country should be shared in terms of capacity and ability. We should accept this change and it is an important indication in this case. After all everybody knows that there is hardly any country which does not have some kind of a public sector, barring none, not even the United States of America which of course is

1428(Ai) LSD—6.

probably considered as a country overwhelmingly capitalistic. As early as 1932, President Roosevelt began his New Deal ideas; within a few years after that, one of the most important public undertakings was accomplished in America: I am referring to the Tennessee Valley Authority. It is a massive monument to the ideals and interests that the President took in the public sector to meet the exigencies of the time. Then of course we know that the United Kingdom has a very significant public sector thanks to the Labour Ministry which began the foundation of this public sector in the United Kingdom. France, Germany and other countries are no exceptions. The public undertakings in this country have given a fairly good record, a record of progress. They have been very particular about providing depreciation reserves. They have been paying interest to Government on loans taken, and they have been paying considerable amounts in taxation. Actually, in the public undertakings, the latest figures that we have show that there were accumulated reserves of almost Rs. 18.6 crores in 1959-60 and in 1960-61 the reserves went up to Rs. 24.3 crores. We also know that the Third Plan expects to draw something like Rs. 450 crores from the surpluses of public enterprises. It is a very important aspect of the good work or the value of the public enterprises to the Community.

Much has been said about the profitability of these enterprises. I think we should give some more time for these enterprises to show results.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The hon. Member's time is up. There are still a large number of Members waiting to speak.

Shri V. B. Gandhi: I would not take more than two minutes. We should give some more time to these undertakings to show results in the proper

[Shri V. B. Gandhi]

way. These undertakings have been performing a very valuable task in supplying what we call the internal resources for the future growth of industries in this country. We have read about the Hindustan Machine Tools and the offer that they recently made that they would go on providing a new plant every year which would be capable of producing a thousand machines annually. We have also read about the Fertilizers and Chemicals (Travancore) Ltd., and we know the story as to how new fertilizer plants are being built up or created in this country; one at Trombay, another at Namrup and the third at Gorakhpur. So, this is a kind of heartening tale. It is not as bad as is sometimes made out about the results of public undertakings. It is not only heartening; I think it is sometimes as good as a stirring tale of progress.

Shri Warior (Trichur): Sir, I do welcome the suggestions contained in the statement about the formation of this Committee, but, at the same time, it has even now come out with a more confused thinking than deliberate planning for a truncated committee like this. The question is very simple. The public sector industries have become a wide empire. These cannot be covered by the ordinary routine work of the Estimates Committee or the Public Accounts Committee. The Estimates Committee have got arrears for the last so many years; there are certain departments into which the Estimates Committee have never gone into after 1952. By the time the Estimates Committee cover all this work, it will find it difficult to go into these public undertakings and probe into all the different aspects of this question.

My hon. friend Shri Daji pointed out that there are certain very bad or unhealthy aspects already entrenched in the public undertakings. At once, some people came to the conclusion that that means the public undertakings themselves must be

scrapped. I think that is a remedy which is much worse than the disease. If that is so, then the private undertakings must also be scrapped because the private undertakings have much more defects in their day-to-day administration and in their policy, in their production and, in fact, in everything. That does not lead us anywhere. There are certain inherent defects in them, or, so to say, there are problems of growth. I do not visualise that they are leading these industries to utter collapse.

Not only that. The most important certificate for the public undertakings has come from the private sector itself in their demand for a share in the equity capital of the public undertakings and also in the management. In the recent seminar, they wanted that the management itself should be given to them, so that public money may be invested in the undertakings and the profits may be appropriated into the private sector. That itself shows that public undertakings are worth-while, but unless timely steps are taken to rectify the many defects that are inherent in such undertakings, I think they will accumulate and it will be difficult afterwards to clear off this Aegean Stable.

14 hrs.

If this committee is to handle matters which till now have been handled by the Estimates Committee and the PAC, what is the harm in giving to this committee the powers which have been enjoyed by the Estimates Committee and the PAC? If Parliament has confidence in an elected committee like the Estimates Committee or the PAC, why cannot this Parliament have confidence in a third committee like this? I cannot understand where the confusion lies. I do not want to impute any motive, but maybe such a probe into the details aspects of the public undertakings is not welcome in the minds of those sitting at the top of these undertakings. I do

not say categorically that that is the reason, but that is the only probable reason. Otherwise, if today the Estimates Committee takes it into its head to go into the detailed working of these undertakings, who is there to stop it? Then all the black spots in the public undertakings will be coming to light. I think Government must rethink over this and come forward boldly to place the public undertakings in a way which will be accessible to the committee of Parliament.

If the management or those who are handling the affairs of the public undertakings come to know that this committee is a truncated committee and does not have the same powers and status as the Estimates Committee or the PAC, I am sure many of them will not pay any respect to this committee. Because so much powers have been given to the Estimates Committee and the PAC, they are respected everywhere and no official dares to stand against their demands. But once they know that this is only an ornamental committee, they will say, "Don't worry; they will come and go. The Minister is there to look after us." So, this committee will not be able to do anything substantial.

This committee must be given the same powers as the Estimates Committee and the PAC. The only question there is that we are jealous that our powers may be partly taken away by the Upper House. I also have the same anxiety to preserve our own prerogatives, but I do not feel that sharing these prerogatives with the Upper House will do much harm to this House. Anyhow, since we are all following the British parliamentary traditions, I do not know how much prejudice and jealousy can prevail in this.

Dr. L. M. Singhvi: In England, they have a committee which consists only of Members of the House of Commons. The House of Lords do not participate in it.

Shri Warior: We always look to the House of Commons only. We have not begun to think in terms of our own House of the People.

Dr. L. M. Singhvi: What about the provision in our Constitution?

Shri Warior: The Constitution can be changed; it is not a big impediment to have a full-fledged committee like the Estimates Committee or the PAC. Even about the PAC, this question has come earlier in this House and as a *via media*, it was suggested that they can be incorporated as Associate Members. That was after some time, not in the beginning. The report of the Comptroller and Auditor General is the rail on which the PAC moves. There is a confusion which must be cleared by the Government. Yesterday the hon. Law Minister said that part of the work will be done by the new committee and a part will be done by the Estimates Committee. I do not know where the clear line of demarcation lies. Actually, it is overlapping. Why not then allow the Estimates Committee itself to look after it? As Mr. Morarka rightly pointed out from his personal experience where is the line of demarcation? The policy is determined by one committee and the implementation of that policy is examined by another committee. Why should there be duplication of work like that? Leave alone this committee and allow the Estimates Committee itself to look after it. This talk has been going on, since 1953 when Dr. Lanka Sundaram introduced a private motion. Even now if the Government cannot make up its mind and take a firm decision in this matter, then better leave it alone than create a mockery of a committee like this.

We are not told whether this committee will be doing exactly the same work as the PAC, because, as I said, the PAC is travelling on the rail set by the Audit Report. If that is so, the assistance of such an eminent

[Shri Warrior]

personality, independent of the executive, must be there to guide the deliberations of this committee also. Otherwise it would be futile, because it will be difficult to pinpoint the really important issues. Usually the audit department complains that if younger auditors are sent to an undertaking, bulky things are thrown before them and by the time they check up those things and blue-pencil them, the time is up and the really important things are hidden and they are not looked into. So, the most important points should be pinned down and highlighted in the audit report. The heaps of material should be thoroughly scrutinised by the Auditor General and after correspondence between the undertaking and the Auditor General, the pertinent things should be taken out and presented to the committee. Then only the committee can effectively function. So, that assistance must be given.

Coming to the List, what is the difficulty in including all the public undertakings? Why should there be a distinction? Empires have been created under certain ministries like the Commerce and Industry Ministry, they are big empires. Even the Atomic Energy Commission has got its own industries and reactors coming into operation. So, I do not think the PAC and the Estimates Committee can handle all these in time. These things must be looked into urgently. Hence, I think that the list must be widened.

Anyhow, I welcome this new daughter-in-law introduced into this family by the bride's father. Naturally she will be very shy, but as time passes, she will pick up more and more courage and her shyness will be shed. And then, this daughter-in-law will be a full-fledged woman in the family.

श्री सिंहासन सिंह (गोरखपुर) :
उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, यह जो प्रस्ताव सदन के

सामने है, इसका स्वागत हुआ है, मैं भी इसका स्वागत करता हूँ। लेकिन मुझे इसके बारे में कुछ कहना है।

हम पब्लिक ग्रंडरटेकिंग्स की देखभाल करने के लिए इस कमेटी का निर्माण कर रहे हैं। सदन के कई सदस्यों ने कहा है कि समिति की संख्या इतनी अल्प है कि वह पूरी तरह से देखरेख नहीं कर सकेगी। लेकिन मुझे यह समझ में नहीं आता कि क्या कारण है कि यह समिति केवल उन्हीं उद्योगों की देखरेख करेगी जिनमें सरकार की ५१ प्रतिशत से अधिक पूंजी लगी है पर उन उद्योगों की देखरेख नहीं करेगी जिनमें ५० प्रतिशत या उससे कम सरकार की पूंजी लगी हो। आपने जो फाइनेन्स कारपोरेशन बनाया उससे निजी उद्योगों ने बहुत सारा धन लिया और सरकार का धन ले कर वे आज उद्योग कायम किए हुए हैं। उनको तो धन का नाम ही नहीं है। जिन उद्योगों में सरकार का धन शयरो के रूप में ५० प्रतिशत लगा है उनकी यह समिति देखरेख नहीं करेगी। यह सरकार कम्पनी ला के अनुसार कर रही है। कम्पनी ला में यह कमी बहुत दिनों से है। क्या सरकार कम्पनी ला में कोई इस तरह का परिवर्तन या परिशोधन करेगी जिससे यह समिति दूसरे उद्योगों की भी देखरेख कर सक जिनमें सरकार का धन लगा है।

मुरारका जी निजी उद्योगपति हैं। लेकिन उनकी यह बात सुन कर मुझे बड़ी प्रसन्नता हुई कि जिन कम्पनियों में सरकार का ५० प्रतिशत या उससे कम रुपया लगा है उनको भी क्यों इस समिति की परिधि के बाहर रखा जाए। उनकी भी देखरेख इस समिति को करनी चाहिए। जहां कहीं भी सरकार का धन लगा हो उन सब कम्पनियों पर इस समिति का अधिकार देखरेख कहने का होना चाहिए ताकि यह समिति देख सके कि उस धन का सही तरीके से उपयोग हो रहा है या नहीं।

बहुत सी कम्पनियां सरकार के धन से चल रही हैं। उन्होंने मिसालन तैलको का नाम लिया। तैलको में सब से बड़ी हिस्सेदार

सरकार है लेकिन उसके मालिक टाटा साहब हैं। और उनके बनाए माल का खरीदार कौन है? सरकार। सरकार का ही रूपया उद्योग में लगा है, और सरकार ही उसके माल की खरीदार है, लेकिन उसके मालिक और मुनाफा उठाने वाले दूसरे हैं। उस कम्पनी पर भी इस समिति को देखरेख करने का अधिकार नहीं होगा।

हम जो इस समिति का निर्माण कर रहे हैं उसका मूल उद्देश्य ही यह है कि सरकारी धन जिन व्यावसायों में लगा है उनको यह देखे और उसकी रिपोर्ट सदन के सामने आवे कि वह रूपया ठीक तरह से काम में लाया जा रहा है या नहीं। सरकार का वह धन, जिसको हम जनता से करों के रूप में उगाहते हैं, इन पूंजी-पतियों को दिया गया है। जिन कम्पनियों में का तीस या चालीस प्रतिशत रूपया लगा है या जिनमें ५० प्रतिशत तक है उनको यह समिति नहीं देख सकेगी। ५१ प्रतिशत तक की कम्पनियों को यह समिति देख सकती है, लेकिन १ परसेंट कम करके आपने उनको मालिक बना दिया। यह सरकारी धन का सदुपयोग नहीं हो रहा है।

मैं तो इससे भी आगे जाने के लिए तैयार हूँ। मैं चाहता हूँ कि निजी कम्पनियों की भी देख रेख सरकार करे। निजी कम्पनियों को आप तब देखने जाते हैं जब उनकी कोई रिपोर्ट हो और तब उनकी जांच करते हैं और रिपोर्ट सदन के सामने आती है जैसे कि विवियन बोस कमेटी की रिपोर्ट सदन के सामने आयी थी। उस पर सदन में बहस हुई थी। उससे आपने देखा होगा कि निजी कम्पनियों में किस तरह की गड़बड़ियाँ और गोलमाल होता है। क्या आप इस तरह के गोलमाल को रोकने के लिए बार बार कमेटियाँ बनायेंगे? ऐसा करना ठीक नहीं होगा। अगर एक ही कमेटी को यह अधिकार हो तो अच्छा होगा। मेरे ख्याल में जो आज प्राइवेट सेक्टर है उसकी भी देखभाल इस समिति द्वारा होनी चाहिए।

मैंने कुछ समय पहले एम्बेसेडर कार के निर्माण के सम्बन्ध में इस सदन में एक बहस उठायी थी। वहाँ दोनों का मुकाबला किया था, टाटा सरसिडीज का और हिन्दुस्तान मोटर्स की एम्बेसेडर कार का। उस समय मैंने बतलाया था कि दोनों में दक्ष और अदक्ष्य काम करने वालों की संख्या क्या है। इसमें जो अन्तर है वह बहुत बड़ा है। टाटा में जहाँ काम करने वालों की संख्या चार हजार है उनमें "अदर्स" की संख्या १९ है। ये भाई भतीजे हो सकते हैं जिनको लिया गया हो। मगर हिन्दुस्तान मोटर्स में जहाँ पांच हजार आदमी काम करते हैं वहाँ "अदर्स" की संख्या ६९९ या ६९७ है जिनके बारे में कुछ पता नहीं कि वे क्या काम करते हैं, और कितना रूपया ले जाते हैं। इस सम्बन्ध में बताया गया कि वहाँ बड़ा गड़बड़घोटाला है। इस पर बहस में हमारे ही इंडस्ट्रीज मिनिस्टर ने यह कह कर संतोष का अनुभव किया था कि प्राइवेट सेक्टर में भी तो इतनी गड़बड़ियाँ हैं। यह संतोष लेने का विषय नहीं है तो मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि जिन कम्पनियों में सरकार का रूपया शेयर कैपिटल के रूप में लगा हो या पूंजी के रूप में लगा हो, वह जनता का धन है और करों द्वारा आता है। और इसलिए इन सब कम्पनियों पर पालियामेंट का नियंत्रण रखना चाहिए। इसलिए मेरा आपसे निवेदन है कि आप इस कमेटी को उन सारे पब्लिक अंडर-टेकिंग्स को देखने का अधिकार दें जिनमें सरकार का पैसा लगा है।

अन्त में मैं एक बात और अर्ज करना चाहता हूँ। इस समय जो काम आंकलन समिति और लोक लेखा समिति जो करती है वह काम आप इस कमेटी को सौंप रहे हैं, हालांकि, इसके सुपुर्द केवल व्यावसायिक क्षेत्र ही है। उन समितियों के अधिकार में अन्य क्षेत्र भी हैं। अब यह हांगा कि वे समितियाँ भी व्यवसाय के क्षेत्र में जायेंगी और यह समिति भी उम क्षेत्र में जायगी। इममे

[श्री सिंहासन सिंह]

तो अच्छा होता कि कोई नई कमेटी न होती। अब तीन तीन समितियां एक चीज में जायेंगी और उनकी रिपोर्टें सदन में आयेंगी। अभी भी अधिकारी कहते हैं कि इन कमेटियों की रिपोर्टें से क्या होता है। इसके अलावा तीन कमेटियां तीन तरह की बात एक ही चीज के बारे में कह सकती हैं। इस लिये मेरा सुझाव है कि आप यह निर्धारित कर दें कि जिन कामों को यह नई समिति देखेगी उनमें प्राक्कलन समिति और लोक लेखा समिति नहीं जायगी। इस तरह उन समितियों का काम भी हलका हो जायगा और वे दूसरी चीजों को ज्यादा अच्छी तरह देख सकेंगे। अभी हालत यह है कि सारे काम को दो समितियां अच्छी तरह नहीं देख सकीं इस लिये यह तीसरी समिति बनायी जा रही है। इस लिये अच्छा ही कि पुरानी समितियों से कह दिया जाय कि जिस काम को नई समिति देखे वे अपना हाथ खींच लें। अगर दो समितियां एक ही बारे में रिपोर्टें देंगी तो सदन के सामने घपला हो सकता है कि जिसकी रिपोर्टें को मानें। जिस काम को दो अधिकारी देखते हैं उसकी देखरेख ठीक नहीं हो पाती ऐसा करने से गोलमाल और घपला ज्यादा हो सकता है। इस लिये मैं आपका ध्यान दिलाना चाहता हूँ कि इस पर विचार करें।

तीसरी बात जो मैं आपसे कहना चाहता हूँ वह यह है कि इस कमेटी की अवधि आप कम रखें। अभी आपने पांच साल से घटा कर तीन साल रखी है। हम देखते हैं कि प्राक्कलन समिति और लोक लेखा समिति के चुनाव एक वर्ष में होते हैं। बसे ही इसका भी होना चाहिये। हम देखते हैं कि लोक लेखा समिति में और प्राक्कलन समिति में दोबारा भो वे ही मेम्बर आ जाते हैं। मेरा सुझाव है कि इस समिति की अवधि आप दो साल कर दें। तीन या चार साल करने से वेस्टेड इंटरैस्ट पैदा हो जाते हैं। इस लिये इस संसदीय कमेटी की अवधि इससे अधिक बढ़ाना उचित न होगा

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय : दो मिनट हो गए हैं।

श्री सिंहासन सिंह : जैसी आप की इच्छा। मैं अभी बन्द किये देता हूँ।

दूसरी चीज में तो इसमें यह देखो कि मंत्रियों के लिये इस में कोई रोक नहीं है कि वह इन पब्लिक अंडरटेकिंग्स के लिये बनने वाली संसदीय समिति में नहीं रह सकेंगे। उचित यह है कि जो कुछ कानून हम यहां बनावें वह साफ और स्पष्ट होना चाहिये। प्राक्कलन समिति और लोक लेखा समिति के विधान में लिखा हुआ है कि उनका कोई मंत्री सदस्य नहीं होगा। अगर इन समितिओं का कोई सदस्य मंत्री बन जाता है तो मंत्री बनने के बाद तुरन्त उसकी सदस्यता हट जायेगी। लेकिन इस संसदीय समिति के अन्दर कोई इस तरह का विधान देखो तो नहीं मिलता है। इस लिये नियम बनते समय अभी इस बात को देख लिया जाय और स्पष्ट कर दिया जाय कि कोई मंत्री इसका सदस्य नहीं होगा और इसका कोई सदस्य अगर मंत्री बन जायेगा तो वह इस समिति का मेम्बर नहीं रहेगा और वह इनसे हट जायेगा।

इसमें चुनाव की जो प्रथा रखी है वह वटिपूर्ण है, सही नहीं है

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय : माननीय सदस्य अब तो समाप्त ही कर दें।

श्री सिंहासन सिंह : दो, तीन बार घंटी बज चुकी है। मैं उसका सम्मान करने वाला हूँ इस लिये और अधिक न कह कर अपना स्थान लेता हूँ हालांकि मैं यह कहे वगैर नहीं रह सकता कि कभी कभी घंटी जल्दी बज जाया करती है।

Shri Gajraj Singh Rao (Gurgaon):
Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir

कुछ माननीय सदस्य : आज तो हिन्दी में ही बोल दीजिये। इस पर हिन्दी घड़ाघड़ चलती आ रही है।

श्री गजराज सिंह राव : भाई मैं हिन्दी भी बोल सकता हूँ और उर्दू भी बोल सकता हूँ लेकिन मैं हिन्दुस्तानी में बोलूंगा। मैं हिन्दुस्तानी हूँ और हिन्दुस्तानी ही रहूंगा इस लिये मैं हिन्दुस्तानी में ही बोलूंगा।

जहाँ तक इस कमेटी का ताल्लुक है यह बेहतर तौर पर जायज जांच के बाद और सही मायनों में सुधार के लिये शायद यह तजवीज पेश हुई है। लेकिन मैं यह कहे बगैर नहीं रह सकता कि इन कमेटियों का आमतौर पर जो हथ देखने में आया है, यहाँ का तो मेरा थोड़ा सा ही तजुर्गी है लेकिन पंजाब का भी मुझे इस बारे में तजुर्गी है और उसकी जिना पर मैं यह कह सकता हूँ कि अगर किसी मामले को टालना हो तो उसे कमेटी के सुपुर्द कर दो। यह एक तरीका रहा है। इस लिये मैं मिनिस्टर साहब को आगाह करूंगा कि इस बारे में सावधानी बतें और यह टालने वाली बात इस कमेटी में न आये दें। अगर एक तजवीज इस तरह की पार्लियामेंटरी कमेटी बनाने की बहाने लाये हैं तो इमका सख्ती के साथ अमल में लयें और इनकी सब तरह से एह्तियात रखें कि यहाँ टालने वाली बात न आने पाये।

जैसा कि यहाँ धार धार कहा गया अगर इन का अतौर एडमिनिस्ट्रेटिव कंट्रोल कमेटी के चलाया जाय और सख्ती के साथ इंतजाम को ठीक शकल दी जाय और ज्यादा बेहतर तौर पर इसके जरिये चलाया जाय तब तो यह बेहतर और स्वागत करने लायक चीज है बनिस्वत इसके कि इस संसद में पड़ कर कि पब्लिक एकाउंट्स कमेटी के या एस्टिमेन्ट्स कमेटी के फंक्शंस इसको दिये जायें तो यह चीज बेहतर हो जायेगी, यह चीज जरूरी नहीं है। पिछले दो साल से मैं पब्लिक एकाउंट्स कमेटी में हूँ। मैंने इस कमेटी की निम्नले मामलों की रिपोर्टें भी देखी हैं। भले ही वहाँ सख्त से सख्त और कड़े से कड़ा अपोजीशन हो लेकिन पब्लिक अन्डरटेकिंग्स के ओवरहेड चार्जेंज कम नहीं होते हैं। इन

ओवरहेड चार्जेंज को लेकर पब्लिक एकाउंट्स कमेटी में कितना ही क्रिटिसिज्म क्यों न हो लेकिन अभी तक उसका कोई असर होता नहीं दिखाई देता है। पब्लिक अन्डरटेकिंग्स में काफी स्टाफ रहता है। एक डायरेक्टर, एक डिप्टी डायरेक्टर और इसी तरह न जाने कितने अफसर भरे रहते हैं। किसी भी पब्लिक अन्डरटेकिंग को उठा कर देख लें आप उसमें ओवरहेड चार्जेंज बहुत ज्यादा पायेंगे।

इसके अलावा एक चीज उनमें यह भी पाई जाती है कि कुछ प्राइवेट कम्पनियों के साथ मिलावट का सौदा चल जाता है। इनको फेल कर दो और प्राइवेट कम्पनी को सही तौर पर और उसको एक इशारा देकर कामयाब कर दो। यह दो क्लैटर्स पब्लिक एकाउंट्स कमेटी में सामने आये हैं। यह चार्जें उनमें मौजूद हैं और उन्होंने की हैं। असल नुक्स कहां है? पब्लिक एकाउंट्स कमेटी की रिपोर्टों पर अगर सख्ती के साथ डाइरेक्टोरेट लेवल पर, मिनिस्ट्रियल लेवल पर और सेक्रेटरी लेवल पर अमल किया जाता तो इस प्रस्ताव को लाने की जरूरत ही नहीं थी। आपके सामने रेकार्ड है आप देख लीजिये कि ५५-५६ तक के पब्लिक एकाउंट्स कमेटी के रिमाक्स और सिफारिशों पर क्या अमल हुआ है। कहीं पता नहीं चलता कि उन पर कोई अमल किया गया। अमल होना चाहिए था लेकिन दरअसल हम देखते हैं कि उन पर कोई अमल नहीं हुआ।

मैं कानूनी तौर पर अर्ज करूंगा कि आप ३०८ क्लस आफ प्रोसज्योर ऐंड कंडक्ट आफ बिजनेस और डाइरेक्शंस आफ दी स्पीकर १६ से लेकर २०१ तक मुलाहिजा फ़रमा लीजिये कि यह कांस्टीट्यूशनल पोजीशन किस तरीके से रही है। यह पार्लियामेंटरी कन्वेंशन और प्रैक्टिस पर ही नहीं बल्कि कांस्टीट्यूशन के आर्टिकल १४८

[श्री गजराज सिंह राव]

से लेकर १५२ तक, जो कि कम्पट्रोलर
एंड औडीटर जनरल के मुताल्लिक हैं,
जो कि एक इंडिपेंडेंट शख्सियत है और
फाइनेंस के मुताल्लिक आर्टिकल ११२
और उससे आगे जो आर्टिकल हैं, उनको किसी
पालियामेंटरी सिस्टम में अमलदरामद कराने
के लिए यह जरूरी है कि उनकी रिपोर्ट हो
और पालियामेंट जो कि सुप्रीम बौडी है,
उस रिपोर्ट पर गौर करे और तमाम की तमाम
वह रिपोर्ट हाउस में पेश हो और मिनिस्टर का
फर्ज है कि वह उस पर अमल करे। अगर
उस पर मिनिस्टर द्वारा अमल नहीं होता
है तो हाउस को हक है कि वह यह दरियापत
करे कि उस चीज पर अमल क्यों नहीं हुआ ?

पी० ए० सी० और एस्टीमेट्स कमेटी
यह कांस्टीट्यूशनल कमेटियां हैं। इनके
कामों को और इनके दायरे को कम करना,
मैं कल जो लीगल ऐडवाइस गवर्नमेंट की
तरफ से दी गई उससे मुत्तफिक हूँ कि इससे
उनके फंक्शंस कम नहीं हो सकते। अगर
उनके फंक्शंस खत्म करना है, कम करना है
तो यह रूल्ज और बिजनेस के मुताबिक सीधे
तरीके पर एक रेजोल्यूशन लायें कि यह खत्म
किये जाते हैं। फिर हर मिनिस्ट्री के लिए
आ जायेगा कि हर एक मिनिस्ट्री की एक
अलहदा पी० ए० सी० बनाई जाय और इसी
तरह एक अलग से ऐस्टीमेट्स कमेटी बनाई
जाय और फिर उससे आगे बढ़ कर हर सीगे
की एक एक बना दी जाय। अभी एक
सुझाव दिया गया कि एक कम्पट्रोलर
एंड औडीटर जनरल और मुकरर किय
जाय। इस तरह से कांस्टीट्यूशन के भी
अमेंडमेंट की तजवीज पेश कर दी गई।
इस तरीके से एक दूसरा बन जाना चाहिए।
अभी सिधवी साहब ने फरमाया कि एक
कम्पट्रोलर एंड औडीटर जनरल और
इता अमला है। मैं इस चीज को
बेलकम करता हूँ। पालियामेंट में क्या
मिनिस्टर को यह अस्तियार नहीं है ?

क्या यह चीजें नहीं होती रही हैं
कि अगर उन्हें कोई शुबहा हो, तो उसके लिए
वह एक इस तरह का स्पेशल आडिट का
आर्डर कर सकते हैं। वह कह सकते हैं कि
फलां फलां चीज का स्पेशल आडिट किया
जाय। क्या उनको यह अधिकार नहीं है कि
फलां फलां करप्ट प्रैक्टिसेज हैं, बेहूदा तरीके
की चीजें किसी जगह हो रही हैं तो उनके
लिए पालियामेंट के तीन या पांच मेम्बरों
पर मुश्तमिल एक कमेटी बना कर भेज
दी जाय और वह उसको देखे। मैं अर्ज करूंगा
कि यह प्रस्ताव वेस्ट आफ दि मोटिव्स से
लाया गया है कि पब्लिक अंडरटेकिंग्स का
कंट्रोल होना चाहिए लेकिन वह कंट्रोल
तो अगर कम्पट्रोलर एंड
औडीटर जनरल ऐगिजस्ट करता है तो
पालियामेंटरी प्रैक्टिस और कन्वेंशन का
जो रोल है वह कानूनी रोल कह सकते हैं
उसके बराबर है। उसको इफ्रेस न किया
जाय। धार बार स्पीकर के पास जायें कि
यह काम दे दिया जाय या थोड़ा सा दे दिया
जाय और यह फंक्शन उस कमेटी का न रहे
इससे तो कन्फ्यूजन वर्स्ट कनफाउंडेड होगा।
आप बड़ी खुशी के साथ हर मुहकमे पर
ऐडमिनिस्ट्रेटिव कंट्रोल रखें। वह तमाम
रिपोर्टें पब्लिक एकाउंट्स कमेटी की स्क्रुटिनी
के लिये भेजें, सम्बन्धित रूल्ज पढ़ने का वक्त
मेरे पास नहीं है, लेकिन उनको देखने से
मालूम होगा कि वह उनको हक होगा कि
हर रिपोर्ट को वह कौल कर सकते हैं, वह
देख सकते हैं और उस कमेटी का एक तरह से
फाइनल से होता है। उसकी रिपोर्ट हाउस
के सामने पेश होगी। मैं अर्ज करूंगा कि अगर
इसको आप एक सूपर कमेटी बना रहे हैं
और उसके लिए यह स्टेप ले रहे हैं तो इस
पर निहायत गम्भीरता के साथ सोचिये कि
अगर इसको दूसरी कमेटी पब्लिक एकाउंट्स
कमेटी और एस्टीमेट्स कमेटी जिनके कि साथ
मैंने बतलाया कि कम्पट्रोलर एंड औडीटर
जनरल उनके फंक्शंस के साथ पाबन्द है,
अगर आप इसको एक अलहदा कमेटी की

शकल समझते हैं तो वह एक गलत रूप है। हां अगर इसको एक एडमिनिस्ट्रेटिव रूप देते हैं उसको स्पेशल आडिट का रूप दिया है और वह स्पेशल रिपोर्ट दे और पब्लिक एकाउंट्स कमेटी और एस्टीमेट्स कमेटी जो कि पार्लियामेंट की सुप्रीम कमेटियां हैं, तो मैं समझूंगा कि यह सही है और हाउस के सामने भी एक सही चीज पेश होगी। जो लीगल एडवाइस दी गई है कि पब्लिक एकाउंट्स कमेटी और एस्टीमेट्स कमेटी अपने फ्रंक्शन बदस्तूर करती रहेंगी, उन के सामने ये रिपोर्टें भी पेश होंगी और वे स्कूटिनाइज हो कर हाउस के सामने पेश होंगी, मैं उस से इत्तिफाक करता हूं। अगर पब्लिक एकाउंट्स कमेटी के बारे में शिकायत है कि उसने काम नहीं किया, तो क्या हाउस के सामने यह बात आई कि उस ने काम नहीं किया? शिकायत है तो यह कि डिपार्टमेंटम सही तौर पर, सही वक्त पर, कागजात पेश नहीं करते और सही तौर पर जवाब नहीं दिया जाता और आठ आठ साल तक उस की रिकमेंडेशन पर अमल नहीं होता है। मैं अर्ज करना चाहता हूं कि अगर पब्लिक अंडरटेकिंग के फ्रंक्शन फेल हो गए तो हमारी सारी पालिसी फेल हो जायगी। इस लिए इस कमेटी को एडमिनिस्ट्रेटिव कंट्रोल कमेटी कहा जाय और वह फिनांसिज को भी देख सकती है और देखे।

जिस नियत से यह प्रस्ताव लाया गया है, मैं उस को वैलुम करता हूं, लेकिन कांस्टीट्यूशन पर और कांस्टीट्यूशन की पार्लियामेंटरी प्रैक्टिसिज पर हमला नहीं होना चाहिए।

मैं जनाब का बहुत मश्कूर हूं।

Shri Khadilkar (Khed): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, the strategy of economic development that our Government has adopted in expanding the public sector will certainly be in keeping with the proposal that they have brought before this House to constitute a committee of this Parliament to see that the public sector is

properly functioning. Because, the public sector is a vital sector of our economy, and in the final analysis the key to the success of our planning as well as the achievement of our objective of social reconstruction of our society lies in the success of the public sector.

While discussing and supporting the motion before the House to set up a committee for this purpose, I fully realise—because I have been a Member of the Estimates Committee—what my hon. friend Shri Morarka said when he quoted certain conclusions of the Estimates Committee, suggesting that that such a committee should keep a watch over our public undertakings was one of the recommendations made by the Estimates Committee when I was a member. I am at present a Member of the Public Accounts Committee as well. There is a demand here that the number of Members proposed for this Committee should be increased. My personal experience is that out of thirty Members on the Estimates Committee—and I am not disclosing some secret here—hardly half the number of Members take any interest. And so far as the Public Accounts Committee is concerned the story is not different. Particularly in this respect I would like to have a very compact body so as to cast the onus on them. Therefore, while welcoming this move, I do not want an expansion of the Committee.

On some of the other aspects of the matter, I will not devote much time, but I will say why such a committee has become necessary after the experience of a few years. I have no time, otherwise I would have quoted from Prof. Hanson's recent publication where the debate in the House of Commons relating to this committee has been extensively quoted to show what is the impact that some of its reports had produced on Parliament.

In this country, when you take the corporate sector there is equity capital. And if I am an equity-share holder

[Shri Khadilkar]

my only concern is to look at the declared dividend, and the managing director and the directors are more or less holding the monopoly of management and administration. But when we have got an expanding public sector with public moneys invested in it, we must change that attitude. We cannot continue to adopt an attitude of dividend-mindedness, simply looking to what the return is. Therefore, this House must take interest from the point of view of management and other aspects of economic development as well. What are the tasks necessary in order to make public sector a success and whether they are fulfilled or not—that must be looked into by this Committee, because this is in healthy competition with the private sector. When we claim that the public sector should reach a commanding height, it must have certain tasks before it, and this committee's business should be to see that these tasks are fulfilled.

As my time is short, I will just read out in brief what I consider to be the tasks before our public undertakings. They are:

Firstly, to prove more efficient in administration and in operational efficiency than the private sector;

Secondly, the surplus arising out of produce should be used for the good of the nation as a whole and not for the benefit of a single individual or a group of individuals;

Thirdly, there should be easy repayment of foreign loans from the profits of the undertakings as a guarantee of our independent economic development;

Fourthly, to increase the rate of capital formation in the country to accelerate the rate of economic growth; and

Fifthly, to cultivate a spirit of co-operative feeling among the employees and establish the concept of industrial

democracy as a part of our economic policy.

These, as I have tried to summarise, are the five tasks before our public sector undertakings. And it should be the primary task of this body, constituted jointly by both Houses of Parliament, to see how far these tasks are fulfilled. Unless such scope is given to this Committee I do not think any useful purpose will be served. There is the Estimates Committee, there is a post-mortem Committee known as the Public Accounts Committee. But their functions are very limited. So I would urge that if these tasks are to be fulfilled and the health of the public sector and its growth is to be ensured, then the scope of this should be a little widened.

Coming to the other aspects of the matter I feel that unfortunately in this country there is lack of fixation of responsibility. An eminent economist like Prof. Galbraith, while analysing our economy, has said some pertinent things. I will quote in brief what he has said, because the time is short. He has said:

"I think it extremely important that the modern plan set firm targets for this invisible achievement. As valuable as firm targets for steel output are firm targets for man-hour productivity, costs and returns. Goals so set become binding on all concerned. All are challenged to meet them. All have a sense of failure if there is a shortfall in performance. And there is, in addition,—

And this is more important—

"the highly practical fact that failure can be identified with those responsible. If there are no standards then no one fails the examination."

And in this context, there are no standards for the Government at present, and therefore there is no possi-

[Shri Khadilkar]

reached and payment of debts will begin slowly but increasingly. At that time we will find that our public sector economy is more dependent because it will not be able to discharge its foreign obligations and from its own surplus will not be able to meet its own growth requirements. This aspect also should be taken into consideration.

There is a good deal of waste and this committee should go into this also. I may quote the instance of the Heavy Electricals. Waste is there. Among the management there is quarrel and machinery worth millions is lying in the open. Some of the officials—I do not want to name them; I have got a document here which I do not want to place on the Table of the House and I do not know whether you will permit it...

Shri Brij Raj Singh (Bareilly): He should be asked to place it on the Table.

Shri Khadilkar: Please let me finish.

Some of the management people foster private undertakings in partnership. In Bhopal some people, engineers and others, in this Heavy Electricals have got private companies established. They are flourishing and doing well. For purchases also they establish companies. Are these things not to be looked into by this Committee? Are these limitations to remain? This is a serious aspect in our present affairs. These must be looked into.

A last word about industrial relations. The human relations should be better relations. We should be model employers. I know from my own experience that the management is bureaucratic. They are litigation-minded. When the final award is made, they go to the Supreme Court. These practices must be stopped. Therefore the committee's functions from all sides must be comprehensive-ly redefined.

With these words I conclude.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Shri Mathur.

Shri Harish Chandra Mathur (Jalore): I do not want to speak.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Shri Sham Lal Saraf.

श्री कछवाय (देवास) : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, विरोधी पक्ष के लोगों को क्या इतना समय दिया जाएगा ?

Shri Sham Lal Saraf (Jammu and Kashmir): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, I welcome the setting up of this committee though it is being set up at a belated hour. I have heard my hon. friends speak on it for the last three days and though I am a newcomer to this House—I am very glad to know that my hon. friends from all sides have been taking a constant interest in this very important matter that has come up before the House now.

In our Industrial Policy Resolution all the sectors have been defined mostly. In a common man's language I will say that basic and key industries can certainly go to the public sector; as far as the producer industries are concerned, mostly they also may go to the public sector but selectively and as far as the consumer industries are concerned, they should certainly be left to the private sector. Keeping in view the mixed economy as a basis of our economy and of economic growth in our country, I think, we should benefit also from people who have learnt by experience in other parts of the world. Therefore I will say that if this committee is being set up now, I will welcome it even if it is at a belated hour.

With regard to defence industries, certain secrecy has to be observed and I absolutely agree with the proposal that is before us that it should be left to the hon. Speaker as to how he would conduct their being

gone into and reported upon as also other matters that may be connected with it.

It is not a mere incident, as I understand it, that a committee like this is being set up and Members of Parliament are being associated with it. To me it is not only an incident. It has a very great significance, in the sense that sometimes it becomes difficult, firstly, to know the mind of the people as a whole and then to reflect that mind upon the working of the Government. Often we find when we hear hon. Members speak on a particular subject—hon. Members coming from different parties and from different regions—that a number of angles come up before us. Even today, this afternoon, in a few speeches that have been delivered a number of things have come up; a number of ideas have come up; a number of angles have come up. So, it is absolutely essential in the interest of the country and in the interest of our developing economy that in regard to the public sector undertakings also people's representatives like those of this august House are not only taken into confidence but are entrusted with the job set out in this motion. That will certainly help in translating, and very correctly, the aspirations of the people with regard to the developing economy of the country.

As far as the constitution of this committee is concerned, I respectfully disagree with my hon. friend, Shri Khadilkar, who said just now that some hon. Members having been elected to some committee are not taking interest. I would say that it is very unfortunate if that is so. I would urge upon hon. friends that when members for a committee like this are taken we should only elect or take the right men, men with experience, men who can certainly contribute in devising policies and ways and means for running the public sector industries in a proper manner and form. It is a sort of a challenge before all such Members who may come to be elected to this committee.

I know, from all quarters these public sector industries have come under the fire of criticism—some rightly and some wrongly. Therefore, I would submit to my hon. friends that once they are elected to the committee they will take interest in it in right earnest and see that all that all of us desire and all that is the desire of the Government in bringing forward this motion before us is achieved.

As far as the number of members of this committee is concerned, I would submit that the number is too small and the number may be increased because, as the hon. Minister has explained the other day and as we see also from the very purport of this proposal, a number of things have to be kept in view. If a comparatively larger section is represented, a larger number of views are represented. Not only that, having a little experience in this line I would say that this committee may tomorrow have to set up a number of sub-committees. The hon. Minister might have an impression in his mind that we are simply transferring the functions of the Public Accounts Committee and the Estimates Committee to this committee. But I feel from the very description of the powers that are being handed over to this Committee that there are a number of new things that are coming before it. After all, all these industries are not of one pattern. There are a number of patterns. Some belong to one group and some belong to the other. Keeping that in view, it may become essential on the part of this Committee to set up sub-committees for different purposes. At that time it may be very difficult for this Committee to handle the enormous work that may come before it. Therefore, I would strongly urge and support the amendment that has been moved that the number of Members to be elected to this Committee may be increased from 10 to 15 from Lok Sabha and from 5 to 7 from the other House, as has been suggested.

[Shri Sham Lal Saraf]

Then, the powers of the Estimates Committee and the Public Accounts Committee have been delegated to this Committee. That is quite all right. But certainly I have not been able to follow what the hon. Law Minister said yesterday. How can there be duplication in the work of the Estimates Committee? There is no line of demarcation as has been pointed out by many hon. Members. I would submit that the Minister may make it clear when he replies to the debate. Actually, this Committee, as I understand, has to function like a watch-dog, but not like a policeman as some of my friends have expressed themselves in a way as if it was going to work like a policeman. They are not to go with a suspicious mind that this is wrong or that is wrong and all that. They have to go with a mind for learning and understanding and then functioning like a watch-dog to see that the things are done in a correct way.

Now, it has been provided that major policies are not to be gone into by this Committee. I quite agree there. For instance, the present basic policy of the Government is the socialist pattern of society. Major policies have been drawn from that point of view. It may be that some Members may not agree with that policy. Therefore, do you want that those Members should be free to interfere into that aspect of the policy matter? I quite agree there that the major policies of the Government are not going to be gone into by this Committee.

With regard to other functions of the Committee, this Committee will certainly go into all those things. I also quite agree with what the Minister has said that this Committee may not go into the day-to-day functioning of the public undertakings. But what I feel is, the mentioning of that may not be necessary here. After all, when a Committee like this is to be set up, it will certainly go into their

policies and programmes and how they are being implemented. What little day-to-day work is there has got to be gone into. That also may be kept in view.

Then, there is the question of decentralisation. Decentralisation is very very necessary. If today our public sector industries suffer, it is mainly because of the fact that there is no proper decentralisation at the top management, mid-management and lower management. What happens? There is the centralisation of power, both administrative and financial. During the last session or the session before last, it was announced that certain powers had been delegated to the management of the public sector industries. My submission would be that financial powers or financial arrangements must be made in such a manner that the public undertakings may not have to go from door to door, from place to place, month after month, to get things done. This Committee, I hope, will certainly see that there is proper delegation of both administrative and financial powers not only at the top management level but at all levels.

It will be equally necessary to provide facilities for training of persons in business management at all levels, top level, mid-level and lower level. Unless that is done, the setting up of this Committee will have little meaning because today, as I find, there is dearth of managers and the persons who know things about business management. Therefore, it is very very necessary that these things are kept in view.

I would like to remind the hon. Minister about one thing more. I have been a member of the Central Silk Board. Last year, I had moved an amending Bill and in that Bill I tried to explain the entire position of the silk industry. That speech of mine is there on the record. Certain assurances were given by the hon. Minister and I got a letter saying that some meeting will be called. I might res-

perfectly remind the hon. Minister that ten months have passed and still no meeting has been held so far. Personally, I do not feel about that. But there is one thing. If this bureaucratic approach is still there, I can assure you that this Committee will do nothing. Once you set up these committees, it is your duty, it is the duty of the Government to see that these committees are made to function thoroughly at all levels.

With these three suggestions, I conclude. Firstly, I would submit that the Members selected should be those—my friends will excuse me—can make a good contribution and who have got a little experience in this line. Secondly, we have to create facilities for training of persons in business management. Thirdly, the bureaucratic approach should not be there.

With these suggestions, I support this motion.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The hon. Minister.

श्री यशपाल सिंह (कैराना) : प्वाइंट ऑफ आर्डर । चेंबर ने तीन बजे का वायदा किया था लेकिन अभी तो तीन बजने में पांच मिनट हैं ।

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: There is no point of order. The hon. Minister. I have already called him.

Shri Kanungo: There has been a full debate on the motion spread over three days and that is as it should be. 25 Members have participated in it. Possibly, the diagnosis of Dr. Singhvi is correct that I am muddle-headed.

Shri Daji (Indore): Muddle-headed?

Shri Kanungo: Mr. Daji should agree with it.

Shri Radhela Vyas: But he is not a doctor of medicines.

Shri Kanungo: Still more accurate because it is not the physical elements that are being diagnosed, but it is the mental capacities. I fully understand that my acumen is not as high as it should be. But one point which has been universally acknowledged by all speakers is the urgency and importance of setting up this Committee. 28 amendments have been tabled including one substitute motion by Dr. Singhvi. The largest number of amendments relate to paras 1 and 3 of the motion dealing with the manner of composition, duration and numerical strength of the Committee. I believe, most of the amendments are now unnecessary in view of the amendment to para 3 of the motion which I have made, according to which the life of the Committee should be till the life of the Lok Sabha. We have got a precedent for that. On 8th June, 1962, a motion was moved by the Deputy Minister in the Ministry of Law for the setting up of a committee of both Houses of Parliament on the matter of Offices of Profit. There the duration was mentioned as follows:

"The Members of the Committee shall hold office for the duration of the present Lok Sabha."

That is what I have mentioned in my amendment No. 26.

I beg to move:

That in the motion,—

for paragraph (3), substitute—
“(3) That the members of the Committee shall hold office for the duration of the present Lok Sabha.”

Shri Hanumanthaiya (Bangalore City): May I know whether it is a temporary committee envisaged only for three years?

15 hrs.

Shri Kanungo: I am coming to that.

Consequently, the question of rotation and other factors mentioned in the original draft is out. I presume that following the acceptance of this

[Shri Kanungo]

motion, necessary changes in the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business will be made in due course. In other words, it means that it will be a permanent committee of this House. Of course, with each session of the House, the personnel of the committee will change.

Shri Indrajit Gupta: Session of the House?

Shri Kanungo: With each Lok Sabha, because the motion clearly says that the duration of this committee will be the duration of the Lok Sabha. Naturally, it will have to be incorporated in the rules, but there is a certain procedure for the amendment of the rules, and all that will be taken care of in due course.

Certain doubts have been expressed that the membership of this House is for five years, whereas the membership fluctuates in the other House; that means that every two years, some Members retire there, and supposing somebody is elected to this committee and he ceases to be a Member of the Rajya Sabha after some time, then the question arises as to what will happen to him. The rules are clear about it. The rules regarding parliamentary committees provide that if a person ceases to be a member of the other House, he ceases to be a Member of the committee also. So, that part of it is clear.

The amendments to the effective part of the motion, that is, paragraph 2, are more substantial. The main thing which most of the Members have suggested is to drop the proviso to the second paragraph. I would very respectfully draw the attention of hon. Members to the debates of this House on the 10th December, 1953, 3rd and 17th December, 1954 and the 14th April, 1956. I would particularly draw the attention of the House to the debate on the 10th December, 1953 on the motion of Dr. Lanka Sundaram and the reply of the then Finance Minister, Shri C. D. Deshmukh.

A large literature on the subject of parliamentary accountability of public undertakings, not only in the U.K. but in many other countries like the U.S.A. and France and Italy has grown, and standard books on the subject have been published. All of them agree that the committee, in order that its functions may be effective as a parliamentary committee as against a committee for specific purposes, should inevitably have the limitation which has been suggested in the proviso.

I do not want to take the time of the House by quoting various passages, but it is clear that the function of this committee is primarily to help the House in having an effective debate on the annual reports of the public undertakings, and that has been so, particularly because the functions of the Estimates Committee and the Public Accounts Committee have been delegated to them.

We have to realise that the object of setting up these public undertakings is the industrial and economic advancement of the country. The undertakings are for industrial production and trading, and the results have to be judged by their efficient operation and profitability. This requires a special talent which has to be specially nursed. Therefore, the executive government, by setting up the corporations and companies which are autonomous, has, with the approval of Parliament, divested itself of powers for supervision of the day-to-day administration. If we are to go into the day-to-day administration, then the very purpose of the policy of setting up these trading and production units will be defeated. The operation of these undertakings needs taking decisions on the spot as situations arise without waiting for directions or approval from above, and also taking calculated risks all the time. As a witness in the course of examination by a Select Committee in U.K. said:

"The mere fact that I felt someone was looking over my shoulder all the time and was going to examine these things at any time later, the less I will be inclined to take a decision and the less decisive I would become."

I am merely quoting this, because, subsequently, from the many debates in the various legislatures it has been found that Parliament can be best served by concentrating attention on major matters and not minor matters.

Again, it is curious that the Labour Party in the U.K. were not agreeable, in the first instance, to the setting up of such a parliamentary committee, and they had hesitations, because they had doubts that it might lead to slowing down of the activities and persons in management not taking the calculated risks which were necessary for the efficient running of an industrial or trading unit. In fact, Mr. Morrisson, while speaking on the setting up of a committee, had on one occasion said:

"...and would make them (Board of Directors) always nervous at the prospect of appearing at any time before a half-circle of Members of Parliament all having their pet views....".

It is equally true, as Shri S. M. Banerjee mentioned, that labour-management relations develop for better or for worse, not all of a sudden on one day but grow over a period of time.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: Is this also a quotation?

Shri Kanungo: This is not exactly a quotation, but I am saying this from memory.

I believe that the collective wisdom of the Members of the committee will be able to devise ways and means by which they can take a view on essentials of management without inhibiting their initiative and enterprise. In other words, there will be areas

1428(Ai)LSD-7.

where there might be doubts as to what day-to-day administration is, and how far it impinges upon the major policy decisions or the policies of a particular undertaking. It is expected that the Chairman of the Committee will be able to resolve that, and in the last resort, the Speaker will have to do that. In other words, by experience it can be known where the areas of doubt occur. We cannot anticipate them.

I would draw the attention of the House to the earlier drafts of the Motion where certain labour-management relations were excluded from the purview of the Committee. But Government have dropped that clause. In other words, the particular question of labour-management relations should be gone into by the Committee.

Regarding the last item in the proviso, I would only mention that it does not need any argument to justify the avoidance by the Committee of consideration of matters for the consideration of which machinery is established by any special statute under which a particular public undertaking is established. Parliament enacts statutes after due consideration and when an undertaking is established by special statute, it is because it has special features. That is why this particular item has been incorporated.

Shri Hanumanthaiya: Could he give some specific instances of establishments which come under this proviso?

Shri Kanungo: The LIC, for one.

Shri Hanumanthaiya: LIC is included within the purview of the Committee.

Shri Kanungo: All the undertakings which are mentioned in Part I and which are established by special statute.

Shri Hanumanthaiya: What I ask is—please name one or two establishments covered by the third item of the proviso. He said, LIC, but LIC is specifically included in Part I.

Shri Kanungo: I am sorry. The proviso says—matters for the consideration of which machinery is established by any special statute under which a particular public undertaking is established.

Shri Hanumanthaiya: What are they?

Shri Kanungo: All the 7 enumerated in Part I have been established by special statute.

Shri Hanumanthaiya: Are they excluded?

Shri Kanungo: No. But I am trying to justify the proviso here.

Shri A. C. Guha (Barasat): Will all the 7 be excluded under the third proviso?

Shri Kanungo: No, no. But the point is that when a special machinery is provided with regard to a particular matter, it is excluded. For example, the point regarding investment in LIC or distribution of reserves in, say, the Warehousing Corporation. There are special provisions for these. So they are excluded, as naturally they should be.

Shri A. C. Guha: Why?

Shri Kanungo: Because it has been done by statute.

Shri A. C. Guha: May be. All these 7 have been established by special statute. If the Committee can look into the working of these authorities, why should it not be allowed to go into those matters also?

Shri Kanungo: They can look into them, but not the special provisions which are incorporated in those statutes. What remains is No.(i) of the proviso in para 2—regarding major Government policy. It has not been

possible to define this term or to enumerate the matters. Therefore, its interpretation has been left to the Chairman of the Committee, and in the last resort, to the hon. Speaker.

To give an example—we tried certain exercises in enumerating them—the general policy of an undertaking, whether the affairs of the undertaking are being managed in accordance with sound business principles or prudent commercial practices, the financial outcome of the operation of the undertaking, the working of the undertaking with reference to devolution of authority, the working of the undertaking with reference to technical and managerial efficiency, recruitment and training of technical and managerial staff, relations with the public and so on and so forth; but it could not be exhaustive. Therefore, the present draft from (a) to (d) is wide enough. It covers all these and possibly more. You cannot think out all the contingencies. Therefore, it has been left as wide as possible.

Shri Daji: Why not leave it as wide as in England?

Shri Kanungo: No. Perhaps it was due to my incapacity to get my idea through. In my opening speech, I said that the position in U.K. was entirely different. There all the public undertakings have been taken by special statutes of Parliament; they were working for quite a long time.

Shri A. C. Guha: No, they were not. They were established only after the last war when the Labour Ministry came into power.

Shri Kanungo: Let him please give me some credence for some knowledge.

Shri Daji: If he wants credence from us, he should also give us some credence.

Shri Kanungo: I certainly do. That was why in my opening speech, I referred to Shri Daji. But I frankly admit that my I.Q. is inferior to his.

Shri Indrajit Gupta: But you are the Minister. What can be done?

Shri Kanungo: I was referring to England, and saying that the comparison was not correct. Take, for example, coal. Coal was a running business in UK for hundreds of years. Then it was taken over by Government. All the undertakings in UK are governed by special statute of Parliament, and the ministerial responsibility there is far wider, than it is here I have mentioned earlier in my opening speech that the powers of the Minister to interfere with the operations of a company or corporation are strictly limited and have been written down in the statutes. After all, the Minister is responsible to the House. Where does the necessity of a Committee come in? It is because of the peculiar circumstances. There are certain areas where the Minister has no powers. Yet Parliament has got to keep itself informed. That is one of the major justifications for a Committee. In other words, the Committee will be servicing the House and not anybody else.

Therefore, I humbly submit that the paragraph read as a whole gives wide enough scope for the examination by the Committee of the undertakings. In any case, we have to see how the Committee functions. In other words, the House has got to see—not the Government—whether the work of the Committee facilitates discussion in the House. I have already spoken about the limitations in a debate in a big House; the effort of this Committee would be to pinpoint important points which require the attention of the House. Therefore, I consider that the provisions in paragraph 2, as they are, are very much necessary and are wide enough.

The last portion, where the Speaker has been given the power to direct the Committee to look into anything which the House desires or he thinks necessary in the course of working of the Committee, is perhaps the widest. I have not found any such wide provi-

sion in any legislature or its committees in any other country.

Some of the amendments, particularly the one by Shri Daji and Dr. Singhvi, refer to the procedures regarding examination of witnesses etc. I submit these are not necessary as the rules relating to parliamentary committees in Chapter XXVI of the Rules of Procedure are ample and exhaustive.

The Law Minister has made it categorically clear that the two motions do not in any way offend the Constitution. The House can set up any agency to help its deliberations, even with men from outside: its membership. Matters relating to public undertakings which go into the estimates, and the moneys to be spent from the Consolidated Fund by way of investment in the capital of an undertaking or as a loan to it, are all items which are entered in the estimates. The Lok Sabha votes on the estimates, and depends on the services of the Estimates Committee to examine those estimates. I submit that the House would be more adequately served by a special committee which will confine its function to public undertakings only. The committee, as I envisage, will digest the annual report and accounts of each undertaking and its report will help both Houses to have a more fruitful debate, and the Estimates Committee will, in course of time, feel relieved of this aspect of their work, and will find the reports useful to their Members. We cannot envisage all the circumstances where there would be overlapping in working as also the types of enquiry which may be necessary from time to time. The provision in (a) of para 2 empowers the Speaker, as I said earlier, to take care of these circumstances.

Here I would submit that there is a little verbal change. I do not know if you would direct me to move a formal amendment, or you will take my verbal

[Shri Kanungo]

statement for that. Part II of the Schedule reads:

"Every Government Company whose annual report is placed before the Houses of Parliament under sub-section (1) of Section 619A of the Companies Act, other than the Public Undertakings included in Part III hereof."

I would like to take off the words:

"other than the Public Undertakings included in Part III hereof."

I had earlier anticipated in my speech that we would invoke the powers of the Speaker in this respect, but as it stands Part III is completely washed out.

There have been some amendments in which it has been said that, as I have mentioned in my earlier speech, Part III has got security aspects and therefore certain prohibitions ought to have been imposed on it. Reading through the rules of parliamentary committees, I find that the Speaker has ample powers to give directions regarding the examination and the reporting on the security aspects, taking care of the security aspects. If this is taken into account, the doubts expressed by my friend Shri Morarka will vanish.

Shri Kashi Ram Gupta (Alwar): Sir, the Minister is asking your permission to delete certain words in the motion, and whether a formal amendment by him is required. That should be clarified.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: If the House agrees, no amendment is necessary.

Shri Kanungo: I am formally moving an amendment that these words be dropped

Dr. Singhvi has suggested the inclusion of more than six corporations including banks to be added to the Schedule to Part I. Apart from the special nature of banks, I would submit that we must start with the Schedule as it is. As it is, it is big enough. As my hon. friend from Kashmir mentioned, the Committee might

find it difficult to examine all the corporations and companies, which are quite large in number. Therefore, we have deliberately omitted certain corporations like banking and financing corporations; because they are rather sensitive spots, and we do not want them to go in for special enquiries other than what Parliament is entitled to. In course of time, I suppose there will be more corporations coming in under Part II and Part III, and as we gain experience, I think the Committee will be able to justify itself.

Here I would submit that the experience of U.K. has been rather unique in the sense that for five years they had doubts about the efficacy of a committee, and ultimately, after another four years, they found that the committee, by experience, had been really helpful to the House discussing matters. I would suggest hon. Members reading an article by Sir Toby Low on "Select Committee on Nationalised Industries" in the *Public Administration Magazine* of 1962. Owing to shortage of time I cannot read large extracts, but I would like to quote one extract:

"Thirteen Members of Parliament may seem an odd kind of committee to be charged with the investigation of activities of widely differing industries, many of them with highly technical activities, but, in fact, this committee of 13 has worked very well. Each one of us had varying experience and came with a different approach to the problem we were considering. It is important, I think, that some Members on such a Committee should themselves have had experience of management of the financial and technical side of industry, and that some should have a good understanding of general economic and financial questions. Inevitably it falls upon the Chairman of this Committee to take the lead in choosing what are to be the most important points and cross-examining the witnesses. In this it is greatly helped by two Clerks who

are allotted to the Select Committee. We used to have only one. It is not generally appreciated how high is the intellectual standard of the Clerks of the House of Commons or how broad their ability. The Committees of the House of Commons depend to a very large extent on their Clerks, but of no Committee is this more true than the Select Committee on Nationalised Industries. These Clerks are not trained economists, they are not trained accountants, but they do have highly trained minds, and they know and really understand good House of Commons procedure, which is most important for such a Committee. They have one other advantage, at least my Clerks had, bright enjoyable English."

Perhaps in our House they should know how to write bright Hindi.

The point I am trying to make out is that this Committee for a couple of years floundered and tried to have the services of accountants, economists and various other specialists, but by experience they found that help which they got from the Secretariat, as we call it in our parlance here, was the most useful they could get. I would humbly submit from my experience of working in some of the committees here that I do think that our Secretariat has got plenty of talent in this matter. The most important thing, as I have emphasized, is the point of view of the House. An economist can be brilliant; and accountant can be brilliant. But the Secretariat of Parliament knows the mind of Parliament much better than anybody else. After all this Committee is meant to serve the House.

Shri Kashj Ram Gupta: How will the Secretariat help the committee?

Shri Kanungo: I suppose it requires experience to know it. At least I have had my experience. I will take an hour to elucidate that.

Shri Daji: Please do not.

Shri Kanungo: You will say it will bore you.

I beg to move:

That in the motion,—

in Part II of the Schedule,—

omit "other than the Public Undertakings included in Part III thereof." (27)

An Hon. Member: What about the membership?

Shri Kanungo: I would submit that in the first instance when you are launching upon a new type of parliamentary activity, it should be as small as possible: it should be a compact committee. Even in the House of Commons with a membership of about 640, there are only 13 members in the committee.

Shri Sham Lal Saraf: In Great Britain there are only a few nationalised industries. Here the number is more; the diversified nature should also be considered.

Shri Kanungo: We have considered it thoroughly. At one stage, the Select Committee of the House of Commons consisted of less than ten members. Let us start with this and let us have a couple of reports. Once it is launched, we will know what changes are needed.

About the rights and privileges of members of the other House, the phraseology here is 'to associate'; that is the usual phraseology; it was accepted by the hon. Speaker and the hon. Chairman. It means that the Members of the other House will have equal and same rights and privileges as the Members of this House. I hope that when this motion is accepted by this House and the other House we will be able to set up a committee very soon, possibly in this session and by next year we will have the first report of the committee.

Shri K. C. Reddy (Chikballapur): With regard to the amendment which the hon. Minister moved a little while

[Shri K. C. Reddy]

ago, I may say that four units are mentioned in Part III. If you are omitting those words in Part II, there is no need to retain Part III at all in the body of the Resolution.

Shri Kanungo: It is not necessary.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: There is no reference to Parts I and II also.

I will now put Dr. Singhvi's substitute motion No. 25 to the vote of the House.

The motion was put and negatived.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Are any of the other amendments withdrawn?

Shri A. C. Guha: I shall mention my amendment to each para. I think I am entitled to place the amendments before the House.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: All the amendments have been treated as moved.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: There are several paragraphs and I think it is better for us to proceed as we do in the case of Bills. Let us take para by para.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I am taking amendment by amendment, not para by para.

Shri A. C. Guha: Am I not entitled to speak on my amendments?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Not after the hon. Minister has replied. The resolution has been debated all these days. All the amendments have been placed. We cannot have another debate.

Dr. M. S. Aney (Nagpur): Members would not be in a position to understand as to what the amendment is. That can be done only if the person moving the amendment explains it with reference to the clause to which it is moved.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: All the Members had their chance. Member who have tabled amendments have also spoken. I am now asking every member who has tabled amendment whether I should put it to vote.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: When we spoke, we spoke generally on the motion and not on the specific amendments as such.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: When the hon. Members were speaking, the motion and the amendments had already been placed before the House.... (Interruptions.)

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: Amendments are to be explained, one by one. Otherwise, you can as well say that the motion has been passed.

Shri A. C. Guha: In that case, I would like to ask the hon. Minister if he is willing to accept any of these amendments. I would appeal to him at least to accept the deletion of 'major policy matters and the matters of day-to-day administration'. Because otherwise it would be curtailment of the rights already enjoyed by the Committees of this House. These concern the prerogatives of the Lok Sabha.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: He has made it clear that he is not accepting any of the amendments. So, I am asking each Member whether he is pressing his amendment or not.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: Does he not accept this particular amendment?

"Provided that a Minister shall not be elected a member of the Committee, and that if a member, after his election to the Committee, is appointed a Minister, he shall cease to be a member of the Committee from the date of such appointment."

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I am asking each Member about his amendment, and I am taking each amendment by itself. I am coming to that amendment. I shall now put amendment No. 1 to the vote.

The amendment was put and negatived.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Amendment No. 2 Shri S. N. Chaturvedi—he is not here.

Shri Kanungo: I do not accept it.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I shall now put amendment No. 2 to the vote.

The amendment was put and negatived.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Amendment No. 3. Is Shri Guha pressing it?

Shri A. C. Guha: My amendments are before the House, and if the Government have a closed mind, I am helpless. But I am not going to withdraw the amendment.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

That in the motion, in paragraph (2),

after clause (c), insert—

“(cc) to suggest alternative policies in order to bring about efficiency and economy in administration;

(ccc) to examine whether the money is well laid out within the limits of the policy implied in the estimates;” (3).

Shri A. C. Guha: These are extracts from the powers enjoyed by the Estimates Committee under the Rules of Procedure of the House.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: He has spoken already.

Shri Kanungo: I had also explained it.

The Lok Sabha divided.

Division No. 2]

15.49 hrs.

AYES

Aney, Dr. M. S.
Banerjee, Shri S. M.
Daji, Shri
Dwivedy, Shri Surendranath
Gayatri Devi, Shrimati
Ghosh, Shri P. K.
Gokaran Prasad, Shri
Guha, Shri A. C.
Gupta, Shri Indrajit
Gupta, Shri Kash; Ram
Himmatsinhji, Shri

Jha, Shri Yogendra
Kachhavaiya, Shri
Kakkar, Shri Gauri Shankar
Kapur Singh, Shri
Kar, Shri Prabhat
Mahtab, Shri
Maurya, Shri
Mehta, Shri Jashwant
Mukerjee, Shri H. N.
Nair, Shri Vasudevan
Pattnayak, Shri Kishen

Ranga, Shri
Reddy, Shri Narasimha
Singhvi, Dr. L. M.
Sinhasan Singh, Shri
Swamy, Shri M. V.
Swell, Shri
Trivedi, Shri U. M.
Tvagi, Shri
Utitya, Shri
Verkaiah, Shri K. a
Vishram Prasad, Shri
Wadja, Shri

NOES

Abdul Wahid, Shri T.
Alva, Shri A. S.
Anjanappa, Shri
Bal Krishna Singh, Shri
Basumatari, Shri
Bera, Shri
Bhagat, Shri B. R.
Bhakt Darshan, Shri
Bhatkar, Shri
Bhattacharyya, Shri C. K.
Bist, Shri J.B.S.
Borooh, Shri. P. C.
Brahm Prakash, Shri
Brajeshwar Prasad, Shri
Chakraverti, Shri P. R.
Chuni Lal, Shri
Das, Shri B. K.
Das, Shri Sudhanau
Deo Bhanj, Shri P. C.

Dighe, Shri
Gahmari, Shri
Gajraj Singh Rao, Shri
Gandhi, Shri V. B.
Ganga Devi, Shrimati
Gupta, Shri Shiv Charan
Hajarnavis, Shri
Hanumanthaiya, Shri
Hazarika, Shri J. N.
Hem Raj, Shri
Jadhav, Shri M. L.
Jamunadevi, Shrimati
Jedhe, Shri
Jyotishi, Shri J. P.
Kedaris, Shri C. M.
Khanna, Shri Mehr Chand
Kinder Lal, Shri
Kripa Shankar, Shri
Krishna, Shri M. R.

Krishnamachari, Shri T. T.
Lakshmikanthamma, Shrimati
Laskar, Shri N. R.
Laxmi Bai, Shrimati
Mahadeva Prasad, Dr.
Malaichamj, Shri
Malhotra, Shri Inder J.
Mallick, Shri
Mandal, Dr. P.
Marandi, Shri
Masuriya Din, Shri
Mirimata, Shrimati
Mirza, Shri Bakar Ali
Mishra, Shri Bhabhuti
Mohanty, Shri G.
Mohiuddin, Shri
Morarka, Shri
More, Shri K. L.

Murti, Shri M. S.
Muthiah, Shri
Naik, Shri D. J.
Nehru, Shri Jawaharlal
Paliwal, Shri
Panna Lal, Shri
Pant, Shri K. C.
Patel, Shri Chhotubhai
Patel, Shri P. R.
Patil, Shri D. S.
Patil, Shri I. S.
Patil, Shri S. B.
Patnaik, Shri B. C.
Pratap Singh, Shri
Rajdeo Singh, Shri
Ram Sewak, Shri
Ram Swarup, Shri

Rane, Shri
Rao, Shri Muthyal
Rao, Shri Ramapathi
Rao, Shri Thirumala
Reddy, Shri K. C.
Roy, Shri Bishwanath
Samanta, Shri S. C.
Saraf, Shri Sham Lal
Saryahama Devi, Shrimati
Sen, Shri P. G.
Shashi Ranjan, Shri
Sheo Narain, Shri
Shree Narayan Das, Shri
Shyam Kumari Devi, Shrimati
Sidheshwar Prasad, Shri
Singh, Shri D. N.
Sonavane, Shri

Soy, Shri H. C.
Swamy, Shri M. P.
Thimmiah, Shri
Tiwary, Shri D. N.
Tiwary, Shri K. N.
Tiwary, Shri R. S.
Tombji, Shri
Tula Ram, Shri
Uikey, Shri
Varma, Shri Ravindra
Veerabasappa, Shri
Venkatasubbiah, Shri P.
Verma, Shri Balgovind
Wadiwa, Shri
Yadav, Shri Ram Harkh
Yadava, Shri B. P.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The result of the division is: Ayes 34; Noes 106.

The amendment was negatived.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: No. 4.

Shri U. M. Trivedi (Mandsaur): Sir, on a point of order. You have decided that we should not be allowed to speak on amendments. If we do not speak on the amendments, how can vote be taken? I have not understood it. We must be allowed to speak on our amendments and then the question may be put.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: This point was already raised. I have given a ruling that there was no point of order. There is no point of order here, because the motion and the amendments were taken together in the House and the debate has taken place on both the motion and the amendments. This is not like a Bill. There cannot be a third debate on each amendment. So, I am putting the question.

Division No. 3]

Banerjee, Shri S. M.
Daji, Shri
Dwivedy, Shri Surendranath
Gayatri Devi, Shrimati
Gupta, Shri Indrajit
Gupta, Shri Kashi Ram
Himmatsinhji, Shri
Jha, Shri Yogendra

Kachhavaia, Shri
Kapur Singh, Shri
Kar, Shri Prabhat
Maurya, Shri
Mehta, Shri Jashvant
Mukerjee, Shri H. N.
Nair, Shri Vasudevan
Ranga, Shri
Reddy, Shri Narasimha

Singhvi, Dr. L. M.
Sinhasan Singh, Shri
Swamy, Shri M. V.
Tiwary, Shri K. N.
Trivedi, Shri U. M.
Utiya, Shri
Vishram Prasad, Shri
Warior, Shri

• •

AYE

[15.52 hrs.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: So, when they have already been moved, whether the Mover is present or not, it does not matter? These have to be put to the vote. The House is in possession of the amendments.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I am putting every amendment to the vote. Even if the Member is not here, I am putting it. I am asking every Member who is present here to say whether he withdraws it or not. If he wants to press his amendment, I will put it to the vote. I shall now put amendment No. 4 to the vote. The question is:

That in the motion, in paragraph (2),

after clause (d), insert—

“(e) to exercise general supervision and control of those industries in which Government has whole or partial interest either financial or otherwise.”(4).

The Lok Sabha divided.

NOES

Abdul Wahid, Shri T.

Alva, Shri A. S.

Aney, Dr. M. S.

Anjanappa, Shri

Bal Krishna Singh, Shri

Becra, Shri

Bhagat, Shri B. R.

Bhakt Darshan, Shri

Bhattacharyya, Shri C. K.

Bist, Shri J. B. S.

Borooh, Shri P. C.

Brahm Prakash, Shri

Brajeshwar Prasad, Shri

Chakraverti, Shri P. R.

Chuni Lal, Shri

Das, Shri B. K.

Das, Shri Sudhansu

Deo Bhanj, Shri P. C.

Dighe, Shri

Gahmari, Shri

Gajraj Singh Rao, Shri

Gandhi, Shri V. B.

Ganga Devi, Shrimati

Gupta, Shri Shiv Charan

Hajarnavis, Shri

Hanumanthaiya, Shri

Hazarika, Shri J. N.

Mem Raj, Shri

Jadhav, Shri M. L.

Jamunadevi, Shrimati

Jedhe, Shri

Jyotishi, Shri J. P.

Kedaria, Shri C. M.

Khanna, Shri Mehr Chand

Kindar Lal, Shri

Kripa Shankar, Shri

Krishna, Shri M. R.

Krishnamachari, Shri T. T.

Lakshmikanthamma, Shrimati

Laskar, Shri N. R.

Laxmi Bai, Shrimati

Mahadeva Prasad, Dr.

Mahtab, Shri

Malaichami, Shri

Malhotra, Shri Inder J.

Mallick, Shri

Mandal, Dr. P.

Marandi, Shri

Masuriya Din, Shri

Minimata, Shri

Mirza, Shri Bakar Ali

Mishra, Shri Bibhuti

Mohanty, Shri G.

Mohiuddin, Shri

Morarka, Shri

More, Shri K. L.

Murti, Shri M. S.

Muthiah, Shri

Naik, Shri D. J.

Nehru, Shri Jawaharlal

Paliwal, Shri

Panna Lal, Shri

Pant, Shri K. C.

Patel, Shri Chhotubha

Patel, Shri P. R.

Patil, Shri D. S.

Patil, Shri J. S.

Patil, Shri S. B.

Patnaik, Shri B. C.

Pratap Singh, Shri

Raghunath Singh, Shri

Rajdeo Singh, Shri

Ram Sewal, Shri

Ram Swarup, Shri

Rane, Shri

Rao, Shri Muthyal

Rao, Shri Ramapathi

Rao, Shri Thirumala

Reddy, Shri K. C.

Roy, Shri Bishwanath

Samanta, Shri S. C.

Saraf, Shri Sham Lal

Satyabhama Devi, Shrimati

Sen, Shri P. G.

Shashi Ranjan, Shri

Sheo, Narain, Shri

Shree Narayan Das, Shri

Shyam Kumari Devi, Shrimati

Sinha, Shrimati Ramdulari

Sonavane, Shri

Soy, Shri H. C.

Subramanyam, Shri T.

Swamy, Shri M. P.

Thimmaiah, Shri

Tiwary, Shri D. N.

Tiwary, Shri K. N.

Tiwary, Shri R. S.

Tombi, Shri

Tula Ram, Shri

Tyagi, Shri

Ujkey, Shri

Varma, Shri Ravindra

Veerabasappa, Shri

Verma, Shri Balgovind

Wadiwa, Shri

Yadav, Shri Ram Harkh

Yadava, Shri B. P.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The result of the division is as follows:

Ayes 26; Noes 108.

The motion was negatived.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Amendment No. 5. Does Mr. Guha press it?

Shri A. C. Guha: Yes, Sir.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

"That in the motion,—

omit proviso to paragraph (2)".

(5).

Those in favour shall say 'Aye'.

Some Hon. Members: Aye.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Those against shall say 'No'.

Some Hon. Members: No.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The Noes have it.

Some Hon. Members: Ayes have it.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Division.

Shri Sonavane (Pandharpur): The lobbies may be cleared again, Sir. Some Members are waiting outside.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Lobbies have been already cleared.

The Minister of Finance (Shri T. T. Krishnamachari): Some Members are waiting outside.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: All right; let the lobbies be cleared. The lobbies have been cleared now. The question is:

"That in the motion,—

omit proviso to paragraph (2)".

(5).

The Lok Sabha divided.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Any corrections? 2 more for Ayes.

Division No. 4

[15.57 hrs.

AYE

Banerjee, Shri S. M.
Chaudhuri, Shri Tridib Kumar
Daji, Shri
Dwivedy, Shri Surendranath
Gayatri Devi, Shrimati
Ghosh, Shri P. K.
Gokaran Prasad, Shri
Guha, Shri A. C.
Gupta, Shri Indrajit
Gupta, Shri Kanshi Ram

Himatsingka, Shri
Jha, Shri Yogendra
Kachhavaiya, Shri
Kakkar, Shri Gauri Shankar
Kapur Singh, Shri
Kar, Shri Prabhat
Lahri Singh, Shri
Maurya, Shri
Mehra, Shri Jashvant
Mukerjee, Shri H. N.

Nair, Shri Vasudevan
Ranga, Shri
Reddy, Shri Narasimha
Sen, Dr. Ranen
Singhvi, Dr. L. M.
wamy, Shri M. V.
Trivedi, Shri U. M.
Utiya, Shri
Vishram Prasad, Shri
Warior, Shri

NOES

Abdul Wahid, Shri T.
Alva, Shri A. S.
Aney, Dr. M. S.
Anjanappa, Shri
Azad, Shri Bhagwat Jha
Balakrishnan, Shri
Barkataki, Shrimati Renuka
Basumatari, Shri
Becra, Shri
Bhagat, Shri B. R.
Bhakt Darshan, Shri
Bhatkar, Shri
Bhattacharyya, Shri C. K.
Bist, Shri J. B. S.
Borooah, Shri P. C.
Brahm Prakash, Shri
Brajeshwar Prasad, Shri
Brij Raj Singh, Shri
Chakraverti, Shri P. R.
Chanda, Shrimati Jyotsna
Chandrasekhar, Shrimati
Chavda, Shrimati
Chuni Lal, Shri
Das, Shri B. K.
Das, Shri Sudhansu
Dass, Shri C.
Deo Bhanj, Shri P. C.
Dighe, Shri
Gahmari, Shri
Gajraj Singh Rao, Shri
Ganga Devi, Shrimati
Gupta, Shri Shiv Charan
Hajarnavis, Shri
Hanumanthaiya, Shri
Hazarika, Shri J. N.
Hem Raj, Shri
Jadhav, Shri M. L.
Jamunadevi, Shrimati
Jedhe, Shri
Joshi, Shrimati Subhadra

otshi, Shri J. P.
Kamble, Shri
Kedaria, Shri C. M.
Khanna, Shri Mehr Chand
Kindar Lal, Shri
Kripa Shankar, Shri
Krishna, Shri M. R.
Krishnamachari, Shri T. T.
Lakshmikanthamma, Shrimati
Lalit Sen, Shri
Laskar, Shri N. R.
Laxmi Bai, Shrimati
Mahadeva Prasad, Dr.
Malaichami, Shri
Malhotra, Shri Inder J.
Mallick, Shri Ram Chandra
Mandal, Dr. P.
Mantri, Shri
Masuriya Din, Shri
Minimata, Shri
Mirza, Shri Bakar Ali
Mishra, Shri Bibhuti
Mohanty, Shri G.
Mohiuddin Shri
Morarka, Shri
More, Shri K. L.
Murti, Shri M. S.
MuMuthiah, Shri
Naik, Shri D. J.
Nayar, Dr. Sushila
Nehru, Shri J. waharlal
Panna Lal, Shri
Pant, Shri K. C.
Patel, Shri P. R.
Patil, Shri D. S.
Pattu, Shri J.
Patil, Shri S. B.
Patnaik, Shri B. C.
Pattabhi Ramar, Shri . R.
Pratap Singh, Shri

Raj Deo Singh, Shri
Ram Sewak, Shri
Ram Swarup, Shri
Rane, Shri
Rao, Shri E. Madhusudan
Rao, Shri Muthyal
Rao, Shri Ramapathi
Rao, Shri Thirumala
Reddy, Shri K. C.
Roy, Shri Bishwanath
Samantha, Shri S. C.
Saraf, Shri Sham Lal
Satyabhama Devi, Shrimati
Sen, Shri P. G.
Shankaraiya, Shri
Shashi Ranjan, Shri
Sheo Narain, Shri
Shree Narayan Das, Shri
Shyamkumari Devi, Shrimati
Singh, Shri D. N.
Sinha, Shri Satya Narayan
Sinha, Shrimati Ramdulal
Sinhaan Singh, Shri
Sonavane, Shri
Subramanyam, Shri T.
Swamy, Shri M. P.
Thimmaiah, Shri
Tiwary, Shri D. N.
Tiwary, Shri K. N.
Tiwary, Shri R. S.
Tombl, Shri
Tula Ram, Shri
Uikey, Shri
Varma, Shri Ravindra
Veerabasappa, Shri
Venkatasubaiya, Shri P.
Verma, Shri Balgovind
Wadiwa, Shri
Yadav, Shri Ram Harkh
Yadava, Shri B. P.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The result of the division is Ayes 31; Noes 120.

The motion was negated.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Amendment No. 6.

Shri B. K. Das (Contai): I do not press the amendment.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Does he have the leave of the House to withdraw his amendment?

Some Hon. Members: Yes.

Division No. 5]

[16.02 hrs.]

AYES

Aney, Dr. M. S.
Bane rjee, Shri S. M.
Chaudhuri, Shri Tridib Kumar
Daji, Shri
Dwivedy, Shri Surendranath
Gayatri Devi, Shrimati
Ghosh, Shri P. K.
Gokaran Prasad, Shri
Gupta, Shri Indrajit
Gupta, Shri Kanabi Ram

Himatsingka, Shri
Jh a, Shri Yogendra
Kachhaviya, Shri
Kakkar, Shri Gauri Shanker
Kapur Singh, Shri
Kar, Shri Prabhat
Lahri Singh, Shri
Maurya, Shri
Mehta, Shri Jashvant
Mukerjee, Shri H. N.

Nair, Shri Vasudevan
Ranga, Shri
Reddy, Shri Narasimha
Sen, Dr. Ranen
Singhvi, Dr. L. M.
Swamy, Shri M. V.
Trivedi, Shri U. M.
Utiya, Shri
Vishram Prasad, Shri
Warior, Shri

NOES

Abdul Wahid, Shri T.
Alva, Shri A. S.
Anjanappa, Shri
Azad, Shri Bhagwat Jha
Balakrishnan, Shri
Barkatki, Shrimati Renuka
Basumatari, Shri
Bera, Shri
Bhagat, Shri B. R.
Bhakt Darshan, Shri
Bhatkar, Shri
Bhattacharyya, Shri C. K.
Bist, Shri J. B. S.
Borooh, Shri P. C.
Brahm Prakash, Shri
Brajeshwar Prasad, Shri
Brij Raj Singh, Shri
Chakraverti, Shri P. R.
Chanda, Shrimati Jyotsna
Chandrasekhar, Shrimati
Chavda, Shrimati
Chuni Lal, Shri
Das, Shri B. K.
Das, Shri Sudhanu
Dass, Shri G.
Deo Bhanj, Shri P. C.
Dighe, Shri
Gehmari, Shri
Gajraj Singh Rao, Shri
Gandhi, Shri V. B.
Ganga, Devi, Shrimati
Gupta, Shri Shiv Charan
Hajarnavis, Shri
Hanumanthaiya, Shri
Hazarika, Shri J. N.
Hem Raj, Shri
Jadhav, Shri M. L.
Jamunadevi, Shrimati
Jedha, Shri
Joshi, Shrimati Subhadra

Jyotishi, Shri J. P.
Kamble, Shri
Kedaria, Shri C. M.
Khanna, Shri Mehr Chand
Kindar Lal, Shri
Kripa Shankar, Shri
Krishna, Shri M. R.
Krishnamachari, Shri T. T.
Lakshminthamma, Shrimati
Lalit Sen, Shri
Laskar, Shri N. R.
Mahadeva Prasad, Dr.
Malaiachami, Shri
Malhotra, Shri Inder J.
Mallick, Shri Ram Chandra
Mandal, Dr. P.
Mantri, Shri
Masuriya Din, Shri
Minimata, Shri
Mirza, Shri Bakar Ali
Mishra, Shri Bibhuti
Mohanthy, Shri G.
Mobiuddin, Shri
Morarka, Shri
More, Shri K. L.
Murti, Shri M. S.
Muthiah, Shri
Naik, Shri D. J.
Nayar, Dr. Sushila
Nehru, Shri Jawaharlal
Paliwal, Shri
Panna Lal, Shri
Pant, Shri K. C.
Patel, Shri Chhotubhai
Patel, Shri P. R.
Patil, Shri D. S.
Patil, Shri J. S.
Patil, Shri S. B.
Patnaik, Shri B. C.
Pattabhi Raman, Shri C. R.
Pratap Singh, Shri

Raghunath Singh, Shri
Rajdeo Singh, Shri
Ram Sewak, Shri
Ram Swarup, Shri
Rane, Shri
Rao, Shri E. Madhusudan
Rao, Shri Muthyal
Rao, S r i Ramsapathi
Rao, Shri Thirum
Reddy, Shri K. C.
Roy, Shri Bishwanath
Samanta, Shri S. C.
Saraf, Shri Sham Lal
Satyabhama Devi, Shrimati
Sen, Shri P. G.
Shankaraiya, Shri
Shashi Ranjan, Shri
Sheo Narain, Shri
Shree Narayan Das, Shri
Shyam Kumari Devi, Shrimati
Singh, Shri D. N.
Sinha, Shri Satya Narayan
Sinha, Shrimati Ramdulari
Sonavane, Shri
Soy, Shri H. C.
Subramanyam, Shri T.
Swamy, Shri M. P.
Thimmaiah, Shri
Tiwary, Shri D. N.
Tiwary, Shri K. N.
Tiwary Shri R. S.
Tombi, Shri
Tula Ram, Shri
Tyagi, Shri
Uikey, Shri
Varma, Shri Ravindra
Veerabasappa, Shri
Venkatasubhaiah, Shri P.
Verma, Shri Balgovind
Wadiwa, Shri
Yadav, Shri Ram Harkh
Yadava, Shri B. P.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The result of the division is: Ayes 31; Noes 123.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Then we come to amendment No. 15.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: The Government may accept my amend-

The motion was negatived.

**One name could not be recorded.

ment, Sir, that a Minister should not be a member of the Committee.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: No.

The amendment was, by leave, withdrawn.

Shri Daji: The rules of a House Committee will apply.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

Shri Kanungo: In the Estimates Committee no member of the Government is a member.

That in the motion,—

in paragraph (2), after clause

Shri Ranga: You may preside over that also.

(c) insert—

“(cc) to suggest measures for better and efficient functioning in such Public Undertakings;” (16).

Shri Kanungo: No.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Is he pressing it to a vote?

The Lok Sabha divided.

AYES

Division No. 6]

[1505

Banerjee, Shri S. M.
Cbaudhuri, Shri Tiridib Kumar
Daji, Shri
Dwivedi, Shri Surendranath
Gayatri Devi, Shrimati
Ghosh, Shri P. K.
Gokaran Prasad, Shri
Gupta, Shri Indrajit
Gupta, Shri Kanshi Ram
Himmatsinhji, Shri

Jha, Shri Yogendra
Kachhavaia, Shri
Kakkar, Shri Gauri Shanker
Kapur Singh, Shri
Kar, Shri Prabhat
Lahri Singh, Shri
Maurya, Shri
Mehta, Shri Jashvant
Mukerjee, Shri H. N.
Nair, Shri Vasudevan

Ranga, Shri
Reddy, Shri Narasimha
Sen, Dr. Ranen
Singhvi, Dr. L. M.
Swamy, Shri M. V.
Trivedi, Shri U. M.
Utiya, Shri
Vishram Prasad, Shri
Warior, Shri

NOES

Abdul Wahid, Shri T.
Alva, Shri A. S.
ney, Dr. M. S.
Anjanappa, Shri
Azad, Shri Bhagwat Jha
Bal Krishna Singh, Shri
Barkataki, Shrimati Renuka
Basumatari, Shri
Bawa, Shri
Bhagat, Shri B. R.
Bhakt Darshan, Shri
Bhatkar, Shri
Bhattacharyya, Shri C. K.
Bist, Shri J.B.S.
Borooh, Shri P. C.
Brahm Prakash, Shri
Brajeshwar Prasad, Shri

Brij Raj Singh-Kotah, Shri
Chakraverti, Shri P. R.
Chanda, Shrimati Jyotsna
Chandrasekhar, Shrimati
Chavda Shrimati
Chuni Lal, Shri
Das, Shri B. K.
Das, Shri Sudhansu
Dass, Shri G.
Deo Bhanj, Shri P. C.
Dighe, Shri
Gahmari, Shri
Ganga Devi, Shrimati
Gupta, Shri Shiv Charan
Hajarnavis, Shri
Hanumanthaiya, Shri

Hazarika, Shri J.N.
Hem Raj, Shri
Jadhav, Shri M. L.
Janundevi, Shrimati
Jedhe, Shri
Joshi, Shrimati Subhadra
Jyotishi, Shri. J. P.
Kamble, Shri
Kedarla, Shri C. M.
Khanna, Shri Mehr Chand
Kindar Lal, Shri
Kripa Shankar, Shri
Krishna, Shri M. R.
Krishnamachari, Shri T. T.
Lakshminakthamma, Shrimati
Lalit Sen, Shri
Laskar, Shri N. R.

Laxmi Bai, Shrimati
Mahadeva Prasad, Dr.
Malajchami, Shri
Malhotra, Shri Inder J.
Mallick, Shri
Mandal, Dr. P.
Matri, Shri
Masuriya Din, Shri
Minimata, Shrimati
Mirza, Shri Baker Ali
Mishra, Shri Bibhuti
Mohanty, Shri G.
Mohiuddin, Shri
Morarka, Shri
More, Shri K. L.
Murti, Shri, M. S.
Muthiah, Shri
Naik, Shri, D. J.
Nayar, Dr. Sushila
Nehru, Shri Jawaharla
Paliwal, Shri
Panna Lal, Shri
Pant, Shri K. C.
Patel, Shri Chhotubhai
Patel, Shri P. R.

Patil, Shri D. S.
Patil, Shri J. S.
Patil, Shri S. B.
Patnaik, Shri, B. C.
Pattabhi Raman, Shri C. R.
Pratap Singh, Shri
Raghunath Singh, Shri
Ram Sewak, Shri
Ram Swarup, Shri
Rane, Shri
Rao, Shri Muthyal
Rao, Shri RamaDathi
Rao, Shri Thirumala
Reddy, Shri K. C.
Roy, Shri Bishwanath
Samanta, Shri S.C.
Samnani, Shri
Saraf, Shri Sham Lal
Satyabhama Devi, Shrimati
Sen, Shri P. G.
Shankaraiya, Shri
Shashi Ranjan, Shri
Sheo Narain, Shri
Shree Narayan Das Shri

Shyam Kumari Devi, Shrimati
Singh, Shri D. N.
Sinha, Shri Satya Narayan
Sinha, Shrimati Ramdulari
Sinhasan Singh, Shri
Sonavane, Shri
Soy, Shri H. C.
Subramanyam, Shri T.
Swamy, Shri M. P.
Thimmaiah, Shri
Tiwary, Shri D. N.
Tiwary, Shri K. N.
Tiwary, R. S.
Tombi, Shri
Tula Ram, Shri
Uikey, Shri
Varma, Shri Ravindra
Veerabasappa, Shri
Venkatasubbaiah, Shri P.
Verma, S. Balgovind
Wadiwa, Shri
Yadav, Shri Ram Harkh
Yadava, Shri B. P.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The result of the division is: Ayes 29; Noes 123.

The motion was negatived.

Shri Prabhat Kar (Hooghly): They do not want efficient functioning.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

That in the motion,—

in clause (d) of paragraph (2), omit—

“and as may be allotted to the Committee by the Speaker from time to time” (17).

The motion was negatived.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Amendments Nos. 18, 19, 20 and 21 are barred in

view of the Government amendment already accepted. I shall now put amendment No. 22 to the vote of the House.

The question is:

That in the motion,—

in paragraph (3), after the existing proviso, insert,—

“Provided further that the Chairman of the Committee be from amongst the members of the Opposition Party.” (22).

The Lok Sabha divided.

**One name could not be recorded.

AYES

Division No. 7]

16.09 hrs

Aney, Dr. M. S.
Banerjee, Shri S. M.
Chaudhuri, Shri Tridib Kumar
Daji, Shri
Dwivedy, Shri Surendranath
Gayatri Devi, Shrimati
Ghosh, Shri P. K.
Gokaran Prasad, Shri
Gupta, Shri Indrajit
Mamatsinhil, Shri

Jha, Shri Yogendra
Kachhavaia, Shri
Kakkar, Shri Gauri Shanker
Kapur Singh, Shri
Kar, Shri Prabhat
Lahri Singh, Shri
Maurya, Shri
Mehta, Shri Jashvant
Mukerjee, Shri H. N.
Nair, Shri Vasudevan

Ranga, Shri
Reddy, Shri Narasimha
Sen, Dr. Ranen
Swamy, Shri M. V.
Trivedi, Shri U. M.
Utiya, Shri
Vishram Prasad, Shri
Wadiwa, Shri
•

NOES

Abdul Wahid, Shri T.
Alva, Shri A. S.
Anjanappa, Shri
Azad, Shri Bhagwat Jha
Bal Krishna Singh, Shri
Barkataki, Shrimati Renuka
Basumatari, Shri
Bera, Shri
Bhagat, Shri B. R.
Bhakt Darshan, Shri
Bhatkar, Shri
Bhattacharyya, Shri C. K.
Bist, Shri J. B. S.
Borooh, Shri P. C.
Brahm Prakash, Shri
Brajchshwar Prasad, Shri
Brij Raj Singh-Kotah, Shri
Chakraverti, Shri P. R.
Chanda, Shrimati Jyotana
Chandrasekher, Shrimati
Chavda, Shrimati
Chuni Lal, Shri
Das, Shri B. K.
Das, Shri Sudhanau
Dass, Shri G.
Deo Bhanj, Shri P. C.
Dighe, Shri
Gahmari, Shri
Gandhi, Shri B.
Ganga Devi, Shrimati
Guha, Shri A. C.
Gupta, Shri Shiv Charan
Hajarnava, Shri
Hanumanthaiya, Shri
Hazarika, Shri J. N.
Hem Raj, Shri
Jadhav, Shri M. L.
Jamunadevi, Shrimati
Jedhe, Shri
Joshi, Shrimati Subhadra
Jyotishi, Shri J. P.
Kamble, Shri
Kedaris, Shri C. M.

Khanna, Shri Mehr Chand
Kindar Lal, Shri
Kripa Shankar, Shri
Krishna, Shri M. R.
Kishnamchhari, Shri T. T.
Lakshmikanthamma, Shrimati
Lalit Sen, Shri
Laskar, Shri N. R.
Laxmi Bai, Shrimati
Mahadeva Prasad, Dr.
Malaichami, Shri
Malhotra, Shri Inder J.
Mallick, Shri
Mandal, Dr. P.
Mantri, Shri
Masuriya Din, Shri
Minimata, Shrimati
Mirza, Shri Bakar Ali
Mishra, Shri Bibhuti
Mohanty, Shri G.
Mohiuddin, Shri
Morarka, Shri
More, Shri K. L.
Murti, Shri M. S.
Muthiah, Shri
Naik, Shri D. J.
Nayar, Dr. Suahila
Nehru, Shri Jawaharlal
Paliwal, Shri
Panna Lal, Shri
Pant, Shri K. C.
Patel, Shri Chhotubhai
Patel, Shri P. R.
Patil, Shri D. S.
Patil, Shri J. S.
Patil, Shri S. B.
Patnaik, Shri B. C.
Pattabhi Raman, Shri C. R.
Pratap Singh, Shri
Raghunath Singh, Shri
Raj Deo Singh, Shri

Ram Sewak, Shri
Ram Swarup, Shri
Rane, Shri
Rao, Shri Muthyal
Rao, Shri RamaPathi
Rao, Shri Thirumala
Reddy, Shri K. C.
Roy, Shri Bishwanath
Samanta, Shri S. C.
Samtani, Shri
Saraf, Shri Sham Lal
Satyabhama Devi, Shrimati
Sen, Shri P. G.
Shankaraiya, Shri
Shanki Ranjan, Shri
Sheo Narain, Shri
Shree Narayan Das, Shri
Shyan Kumari Devi, Shrimati
Singh, Shri D. N.
Sinha, Shri Satya Narayan
Sinha, Shrimati Ramdulari
Sinhaan Singh, Shri
Sonavane, Shri
Soy, Shri H. C.
Subramanyam, Shri T.
Swamy, Shri M. P.
Thimmaiah, Shri
Tiwary, Shri Do. N.
Tiwary, Shri K. N.
Tiwary, Shri R. S.
Tombi, S
Tula Ram, Shri
Tyagi, Shri
Ujkey, Shri
Varma, Shri Ravindra
Veerasasappa, Shri
Venkatasubbalah, Shri P.
Verma, Shri Balgovind
Yadav, Shri Ram Harkh
Yadava, Shri B. P.

*One name could not be recorded.
on. There are

... and
allowance of a development rebate to

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The result of the division is:

Ayes 29; Noes 124.

The motion was negatived.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Regarding amendment No. 23 the Minister has already made it clear that the rules will apply. I hope the hon. Member is not pressing it.

The amendment was, by leave, withdrawn.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Amendment No. 24 has already been covered.

The amendment was by leave, withdrawn.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Amendment No. 25 has already been disposed of. We have, also, already accepted amendment No. 26. Then, there is a Government amendment to the Schedule. I shall put it to the vote of the House. The question is:

That in the motion,—

in PART II of the Schedule, omit "other than the Public Undertakings included in Part III hereof". (27).

The motion was adopted.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I shall now put the motion, as amended, to the vote of the House. The question is:

1. "That a Committee of this House to be called the Committee on Public Undertakings be constituted with ten members who shall be elected from among the members of this House according to the principle of proportional representation by means of the single transferable vote.

(2) That the functions of the Committee shall be:

(a) to examine the reports and accounts of the Public Undertakings specified in the Schedule;

(b) to examine the reports if any, of the Comptroller and Auditor-General on the Public Undertakings;

(c) to examine, in the context of the autonomy and efficiency of the Public Undertakings, whether the affairs of the Public Undertakings are being managed in accordance with sound business principles and prudent commercial practices; and

(d) such other functions vested in the Public Accounts Committee and the Estimates Committee in relation to the Public Undertakings specified in the Schedule by or under the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business of this House as are not covered by clause (a), (b) and (c) above and as may be allotted to the Committee by the Speaker from time to time:

Provided that the Committee shall not examine and investigate any of the following matters, namely:

(i) matters of major Government policy as distinct from business or commercial functions of the Public Undertakings;

(ii) matters of day-to-day administration;

(iii) matters for the consideration of which machinery is established by any special statute under which a particular public undertaking is established.

(3) That the members of the Committee shall hold office for the

duration of the present Lok Sabha.

(4) That in other respects the Rules of Procedure of this House relating to Parliamentary Committees shall apply with such variations and modifications as the Speaker may make.

SCHEDULE

(List of Public Undertakings)

PART I

(Public Undertakings established by Central Acts)

1. The Damodar Valley Corporation
2. The Industrial Finance Corporation
3. The Indian Airlines Corporation
4. The Air India International
5. The Life Insurance Corporation
6. The Central Warehousing Corporation
7. Oil and Natural Gas Commission.

PART II

(Public Undertakings which are Government Companies formed under the Companies Act)

Every Government Company whose annual report is placed before the Houses of Parliament under subsection (1) of Section 619A of the Companies Act, 1956.

PART III

1. Hindustan Aircraft Ltd., Bangalore
2. Bharat Electronics Ltd., Bangalore
3. Mazagon Docks Ltd., Bombay
4. Garden Reach Workshop Ltd., Calcutta."

The motion as amended, was adopted.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Then we come to the next motion. There are 1428(Ai) L.S.D.—8.

some amendments to it. Is anybody pressing his amendment?

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: I am not pressing it.

Amendment No. 3 was, by leave, withdrawn.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Shri Guha is not pressing his amendment.

Amendment No. 1 was, by leave, withdrawn.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Shri Chaturvedi is not here. I shall put his amendment to the vote of the House. The question is:

That in the motion,—

for "five members" substitute "six members". (2)

The motion was negatived

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I shall now put the original motion to the vote of the House. The question is:

"That this House recommends to Rajya Sabha that Rajya Sabha do agree to nominate five members from Rajya Sabha to associate with the Committee on Public Undertakings and on the constitution of the said Committee to communicate to this House the names of the members so nominated by Rajya Sabha."

The motion was adopted.

16.10 hrs.

INCOME-TAX (AMENDMENT) BILL

The Minister of Planning and Minister in the Ministry of Finance (Shri B. R. Bhagat): Sir, I beg to move:

"That the Bill further to amend the Income-tax Act, 1961, be taken into consideration."

As hon. Members would be aware, the Income-tax Act provides for the allowance of a development rebate to