

LOK SABHA DEBATES

(Part II—Proceedings other than Questions and Answers)

25486

Date: 12.12.2014

15673

LOK SABHA

Thursday, 29th September, 1955

The Lok Sabha met at Eleven of the Clock.

{MR. SPEAKER in the Chair}

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS (See Part I)

12-5 P.M.

PAPERS LAID ON THE TABLE MINUTES OF SITTINGS OF COMMITTEE ON PRIVATE MEMBERS' BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Shri M. A. Ayyangar (Tirupati): I beg to lay on the Table the Minutes of forty-two sittings of the Committee on Private Members' Bills and Resolutions held so far. [Placed in Library, See No. S-351/55.]

DISPLACED PERSONS COMPENSATION AND REHABILITATION RULES, AS MODIFIED BY PARLIAMENT

The Deputy Minister of Rehabilitation (Shri J. K. Bhonsle): I beg to lay on the Table, under Rule 355 of the Rules of Procedure, a copy of the Displaced Persons Compensation and Rehabilitation Rules, 1955, as modified in accordance with the amendments passed by the Houses of Parliament. [Placed in Library. See No. S-249-A/55.]

ESTIMATES COMMITTEE SIXTEENTH REPORT

श्री श्री० जी० बेहता (गोहिलवाड) मैं राष्ट्रीय उद्योगों के संगठन और प्रशासन पर एस्टिमेट्स कमेटी की सोलहवीं रिपोर्ट पेश करता हूँ।

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. Speaker: The Committee on Absence of Members from the Sittings of the House in its Eleventh Report has recommended that leave of absence may be granted to the following Members for the periods indicated in the Report:

374 L.S.D.—1.

15674

Shri Bhajahari Mahata, Shri Sitaram Asthana, Shri R. Velayudhan, Shri Kanety Mohana Rao, Shri Debeswar Sarmah, Shri Hari Ram Nathani, Shri K. Ananda Nambiar, Shri Muchaki Kosa, Shri S. C. Balakrishnan, Shri Beli Ram Das, Shri Krishnacharya Joshi, Shri N. Somana, Shri Harindranath Chattopadhyaya, Shri G. R. Damodran, Rt. Rev. John Richardson, Shri Tridib Kumar Chaudhuri, Shri Dasaratha Deb, Pandit Lingaraj Misra and Shri Sofi Mohd. Akbar.

I take it that the House agrees with the recommendations of the Committee.

Several Hon. Members: Yes.

Shri Kamath (Hoshangabad): May I request you to throw some light on one aspect of the matter? It is this. There are many hon. colleagues of ours who have been given only leave of 59 days in the first instance, and the latter part of their absence has not been considered so far as this Report is concerned. Another aspect is about the Rt. Rev. John Richardson, our colleague from the Andamans. He has again complained. Reports say—and I mentioned it the other day also—that he has been unable to attend because of transport difficulties....

Mr. Speaker: All such questions are really to be referred to the Committee. The Committee takes into consideration all factors that affect each individual case and then it recommends whatever leave it thinks ought to be given to the Members. If he wants, I shall forward his remarks to the Committee...

Shri Kamath: All right Sir.

Mr. Speaker: ...and it may dispose of that matter.

[Mr. Speaker]

So the Members will be informed that they have been granted leave as recommended by the Committee.

STATEMENT RE CERTAIN TRANSACTIONS REFERRED TO IN FOURTEENTH REPORT OF P.A.C.

The Minister of Defence (Dr. Katju): On the 21st of December, 1954, my colleague, the Minister of Finance (Shri C. D. Deshmukh) made a statement before the House in regard to certain comments made in the 9th Report of the Public Accounts Committee on matters arising out of certain orders placed for some jeeps in London and for certain defence stores on the Continent in 1948 for the Defence Services. My colleague mentioned the action which the Government had taken upon criticism levelled on these transactions and stated that the matters had been fully enquired into in 1952 by a high level committee presided over by the Prime Minister himself, and that that committee had come to the conclusion that while there had been technical and procedural irregularities no particular officer was in any way blame-worthy, and, therefore, Government did not propose to take any further action in the matter, nor to appoint a Committee of Inquiry as suggested by the Public Accounts Committee in their 9th Report.

When the Finance Minister made the statement before the House, Government also laid on the Table of the House a copy of the statement sent earlier to the Public Accounts Committee in this connection.

Government now note that the Public Accounts Committee have referred to these transactions again in Chapter V of their 14th Report and have stated that they are unable, in spite of the views of the Government of India, to deviate from the conclusions to which they had given expression in the 9th Report. Naturally, Government attach the greatest weight to any observations made by the Public Accounts

Committee and treat them with the greatest respect. Nevertheless, I submit that in the 14th Report the Public Accounts Committee have disclosed no new facts or figures nor have they given any new reasons. They have merely reiterated their views as expressed in the 9th Report. Government have already considered these views on the previous occasion with the utmost care and it was after the fullest deliberations that they had come to their own conclusions. The matter is now seven years old and as no new facts have come to light either through the Public Accounts Committee or otherwise, Government feel unable, under the circumstances, to alter their previous decision not to re-open this matter. They feel that any further independent enquiry will, under the circumstances, be of no use whatsoever. The matter has been fully investigated at the highest level and should, in the public interest, be now considered closed.

Government have conveyed their decision to the Public Accounts Committee in a Note of which I beg to lay a copy on the Table. [See Appendix XI, annexure No. 75].

Shri Kamath (Hoshangabad): Has not this House the last word on the subject? You will remember, Sir, that when the statement was made last year, you said that it was rather improper for Government to have made a statement without sending it to the Public Accounts Committee first. Will Parliament not have a discussion on this matter?

Mr. Speaker: I think that that question really does not arise at all. When the Public Accounts Committee has submitted a Report to the House, the Government is making a statement of its position. That is the only thing now. Whatever the procedure or other things may be, I think the matter will be referred to the Speaker finally. A copy of the statement has already been sent to the Public Accounts Committee. Whatever the Government says about the procedure will