

for candles to be brought so that the business of the House may continue undisturbed because if the world were to end there is nothing we can do about it, we should proceed with the legitimate business of the House.' (*Interruptions*). Sir, I appreciate your decision.

would at least meet these objections that are raised from the point of view of the rule of law and equity and would not insist on pushing through a measure which will do no credit to this House if it is passed.

Shri Naushir Bharucha: Mr. Chairman, as I said before, I am really surprised why my hon. friend Shri Masani is afraid of special audit. He has been advancing three arguments. He desires that before any special audit could be ordered by the Government, the Government should give a hearing to the party; it should issue a sort of a show-cause notice as to why special audit should not be ordered. Secondly, when there is a report made by the auditor to the Government, that report should be handed over to the company. Thirdly, he wants that there should be provision for appeal in case Government, against the wishes of the company, orders an audit.

16.20 hrs.

COMPANIES (AMENDMENT)
BILL—*contd.*

Shri M. R. Masani: Sir, I was saying that the right to ask for any information was something that was extremely oppressive. If a crime is being committed then you can go to a magistrate or a Court of law and obtain a search warrant or a document which entitles you to burst into the safes and cupboards and almirahs of a particular party and take possession of those documents. But until somebody is in a position to go to a Magistrate and there is a *prima facie* case that a crime is being committed, these are not powers that we in free countries or democracies are accustomed to. This way and in many others, this Government is introducing totalitarian techniques into our economic and social life. I am not saying that the intention is to use them in the same brutal way as in Russia or in China but we should be very wary of how we allow the minions of the bureaucracy to be armed with powers against private citizens. This is an objectionable thing and even a chartered accountant should not be allowed to pry into matters which he would not be normally allowed to pry, unless a Magistrate had been satisfied that a crime had been committed.

My submission is that this provision is very necessary as a preliminary study to investigation by the police or prosecution. If the Government has got *prima facie* reasons to believe that the affairs of the company are not being managed in a way which would serve the best interests of the investors or if there is reason to believe that there is misapplication of funds, then I do not understand in what other manner than by a special audit can the position be cleared up. Rather than the Government, on information from different parties, maybe, disgruntled shareholders, plunging into prosecution, it is much better that special audit is ordered so that the company would be in a position to explain the points against it. I do feel that in all cases it may not be possible for the Government to issue show cause notice because that would put the miscreants on guard and enable them to do away with the evidence against them. I also feel that wherever it is possible, Government should give an informal hearing and the Company Law Administration may be directed that such a procedure should be adopt-

These are some of the obnoxious features of this clause and, now that the principle of the clause seems to be acceptable to the majority of the House, some of us are trying to see that it becomes a little more reasonable and a little more civilised. I do wish that when the Government have this provision of special audit, they

[Shri Naushir Bharucha]

ed unless such a procedure tends to defeat its own end.

It is true that provision has been made in the clause, as it has emerged from the Joint Committee, that if the Central Government does not take action within four months, it shall send a copy of the auditor's report to the company—either the whole of it or extracts—and require the company to circulate those extracts. I submit that four months is too long a period and once the report is made, Government should be in a position to make up its mind quickly one way or the other. While these provisions may remain in tact, I do hope that the hon. Minister will issue administrative directives to the Company Law Administration that in all cases where no action has to be taken, the report should be sent to the company immediately and the period of four months must not be allowed to expire just because four months are provided for in this Bill.

Thirdly, with regard to the question of appeal to the court, I am of the opinion that if such a right is given then litigation can easily be protracted from anything between six months to two years and the purpose of this provision will be defeated. My hon. friend, Shri Masani, has taken objection to the auditor being given special powers calling for additional information. I do not understand how this particular sub-clause 5, which is a corollary to the main provision, could be eliminated altogether. What is the use of placing before a special auditor books and accounts, when he seeks explanation of a particular entry which may be equivocal and that explanation is not forthcoming? If such an explanation is not forthcoming, I submit that the special audit will have no meaning. I submit that sub-clause (5) is only a corollary to the main provision. But I do wish that the hon. Minister gives an assurance to this House that he will see to it that by way of administrative practice, all these difficulties will be eliminated,

namely, that the companies, wherever possible, will have a reasonable chance of saying why a special audit should not be there and they should have the auditor's report as quickly as possible where there is nothing to be done in the matter.

There is a further provision that relates to sub-clause 7 which says that expenses incidental to special audit shall be determined by the Central Government and paid by the company and in default shall be recoverable from the company as arrears of land revenue. I think that clause is a little bit hard on the companies in a manner. Suppose a special audit has been ordered as a result of information received on affidavit from, let us say, half a dozen shareholders and they say that such and such items are erroneous or there had been misapplication of funds and the Government orders a special audit and it ultimately transpires that the complaint was false or frivolous, even then the company must bear the expenses of special audit. Why? In such cases, the expenditure shall be borne either by the Government or by those who complained, if at the instance of some particular party a special audit has been ordered. I think it would be equitable because even if a company emerges from special audit unscathed, if it has to incur an expenditure of Rs. 10,000 or thereabouts every time, that hardly helps the company. It may simply encourage frivolous people coming forward and lodging complaints. I think this point requires careful consideration.

Shri Morarka: Sir, I support this clause 70 which makes provision for the special audit. As I said at the time of general discussion, I think it is a very desirable provision. Between the two extremes one not to have the powers with the Government at all and on the other extreme to give the powers of investigation to the Government the power of special audit was a very desirable *via media* and whenever the Government receives complaints which are serious enough

to be looked into but not so serious to be investigated, then special audit is the remedy which the Government can resort to.

The hon. Member, Shri Masani, in his Minute of Dissent has objected to this clause on certain grounds. First, he says that the powers given are very vague. Then he says that this is a greater inroad on the autonomy of the joint stock enterprise. He also says that these Joint Stock Companies are a plant of delicate growth and also that this power of special audit would be a slur on the company auditors and finally he feels that this power is completely unnecessary as the powers of investigation already exist.

So far as the vagueness of the power is concerned, this wide scope is deliberately given to the Government to ascertain out whether or not it is desirable to order a special audit. What are the conditions to be fulfilled before a special audit can be ordered by the Government? They are:

“(a) that the affairs of any company are not being managed in accordance with sound business principles or prudent commercial practices; or”

Now, it is difficult to enumerate what are sound commercial principles or prudent commercial practices. But, at the same time, when complaints are made to the Government and when the Government examines the case, surely the Government can judge whether a particular enterprise, whether a particular company is not conducted in accordance with those principles.

Then it is provided that the Government can order a special audit if the Government feels:

“(b) that any company is being managed in a manner likely to cause serious injury or damage to the interests of the trade, industry or business to which it pertains; or”

It is not said “serious injuries which are likely to be caused to any individual”, but the wordings are: “to the trade, industry or business”, to the entire field of that industry or business.

The third thing provided here is:

“(c) that the financial position of any company is such as to endanger its solvency.”

At this stage, Sir, I wish to invite your attention to section 237 which deals with the powers of Government about investigation of a company's affairs in certain cases. Section 237 reads like this:

“Without prejudice to its powers under section 235, the Central Government—

(a) shall appoint one or more competent persons as inspectors to investigate the affairs of a company and to report thereon in such manner as the Central Government may direct, if—

(i) the company, by special resolution, or

(ii) the Court, by order declares that the affairs of the company ought to be investigated by an inspector appointed by the Central Government; and

(b) may do so if, in the opinion of the Central Government, there are circumstances suggesting—

(i) that the business of the company is being conducted with intent to defraud its creditors, members or any other persons, or otherwise for a fraudulent or unlawful purpose, or in a manner oppressive of any of its members, or that the company was formed for any fraudulent or unlawful purpose; or”.

It is said: “in a manner oppressive of any of its members”. How wide it is! If the Government has powers of

[Shri Morarka]

investigation in such cases where the affairs of a company are conducted in a manner which is oppressive to any of its members, surely, Sir, the powers that we are giving for special audit, the scope that we are providing here, are not wider than that.

Then it is said:

“(ii) that persons concerned in the formation of the company or the management of its affairs have in connection therewith been guilty of fraud, misfeasance or other misconduct towards the company or towards any of its members; or”

If any manager of a company, managing agent, partner, associate, secretary, treasurer or any one connected with the affairs of the company is guilty of a fraud towards any member of the company—there may be even 20,000 members—then the Government may order an investigation.

Then the third condition is:

“(iii) that the members of the company have not been given all the information with respect to its affairs which they might reasonably expect, including information relating to the calculation of the commission payable to a managing or other director, the managing agent, the secretaries and treasurers, or the manager, of the company”.

Now, Sir, I have read this section at length only to point out to my hon. friend, Shri Masani, that the powers of investigation which the Government has under section 235 already are so wide and in a way vague that by providing these powers for special audit you are not giving any additional powers to the Government; on the other hand, you are providing weapon to the Government which is less dangerous than the weapon of investigation and the Government instead of resorting to that extreme weapon of investigation may have the matter looked into by a special auditor.

Then, it was said that it would be a slur on the existing auditors. To this there are two answers. Firstly, the Government has in this section taken power to appoint the company's own auditors as the Government special auditors. Secondly, the very existence of this provision would embolden many of the auditors and there would be no necessity for the Government in many cases to appoint any special auditor. In many cases the auditors feel helpless and are forced to favour the management because they have no excuse. But now the auditors would know that there would be other auditors who would sit in judgment over them—auditors of auditors. So they would be more watchful, more careful and, in any case, they are likely to be less negligent. Therefore, I feel that on reconsideration Shri Masani would feel that, after all, this clause, clause No. 70, is not so dangerous or so vague as he imagined it to be. After all, it is much less pernicious than the clause under which powers of investigation already exists. In the absence of this clause 70, the only remedy which the Government has is to order an investigation.

Then, the reputation of a company, which Shri Masani has called 'a plant of delicate growth', is likely to suffer more if you order an investigation than if you order a special audit. Shri Masani has no objection to the powers of investigation being left with the Government.

Shri M. R. Masani: When charges are made.

Shri Morarka: But he has objection to the power of special audit being given.

Shri M. R. Masani: Without charges.

Shri Morarka: I think, Sir, just as there is danger of a company's reputation suffering if a special audit is ordered by the Government, there are

equal chances of the company's prestige being enhanced if the company comes out with flying colours after the special audit. The company can say that the government auditors found nothing wrong, everything is clean and the company's reputation would go up. The company's reputation would suffer only if the government auditors find something which the company's auditors had hidden so far. If the company's auditors do not hide anything, the Government auditors are not likely to discover anything. If they do not discover anything they have to give a certificate in support of the management. Therefore, looking at it from whichever point of view you may like, I think there cannot be any objection to this particular clause.

Talking about the safeguards that he has suggested, well, I do not agree with two safeguards suggested by Shri Masani. I think there is some merit in one of his suggestions, that in certain cases an opportunity may be given to the company to show cause why special auditors should not be appointed in a particular case. It may not be possible in all cases because the circumstances of the case may be such that they may require immediate action, prompt action, action without any intimation or warning. But in most of the cases the special audit may not be of that extreme nature of investigation. In such cases I think you can with advantage give a warning to the company and ask the company to show cause why a special audit should not be ordered.

As I said in the Joint Committee, and I wish to repeat here, there is a distinction between investigation and special audit. You have to order an investigation in very serious cases. So far as special audit is concerned, if you feel there is a *prima facie* case, there are certain irregularities and the auditors are not discharging their duties properly, only then the Government can order a special audit. I was a little bit disappointed, Sir, at

the opening remarks of the hon. Minister, Shri Kanungo, when he said that the government auditors would function more like inspectors. That was not the impression given in the Joint Committee. These auditors, as the clause itself says, will have the same power as the company auditors. They will function in the same way as company auditors. But wherever the company auditors have failed in their duty these auditors will bring it to their notice and report to the Government.

Then, Sir, there is ample safeguard. It is provided that within four months a report or the relevant extract from the report has to be supplied to the company and then it may be circulated to the shareholders. If the Government has to take some action and the Government for reasons of expediency etc. cannot give the report immediately one can understand; because, after all, in certain cases, the Government may have to take action and in such action, it may not be desirable that a copy of the auditor's report should be given to them.

I wish to underline the point by reading sub-clause (3) which says:

"The special auditor shall have the same powers and duties in relation to the special audit as an auditor of a company has under section 227:"

Therefore, it is co-extensive and almost parallel to the powers of the company auditor. So, I would request the hon. Minister also to clarify his statement when he said that they would function as inspectors. I think he did not mean investigations but only as auditors to find out things which, due to the inaction or negligence of the company auditors, were not found out.

श्री हेम राज (कांगड़ा) : सभापति महोदय, क्लज ७० के जरिये कम्पनी एक्ट में जो सेक्शन २३३ ए शामिल किया जा रहा है, मैं उस को सर्पोट करता हूं।

[श्री हेम राज]

दरअसल कम्पनियों का जो हाल है, जिस के छोटे छोटे शेयरहोल्डर्स हैं, जोकि बहुत दूर दूर से छोटे छोटे शेयर लेते हैं, उस में मैनेजिंग डायरेक्टर या डायरेक्टर्स उस कम्पनी की असली असली हालत का पता, उन शेयरहोल्डर्स को नहीं लगने देते। जब कभी छोटे छोटे शेयरहोल्डर्स कोई शिकायत करते हैं तो गवर्नमेंट की ओर से जवाब दिया जाता है कि ३६७ और ३६८ की जो दफात हैं कम्पनी ला को वह कहती है कि अगर किसी को कोई शिकायत हो तो वह जा कर कोर्ट का दरवाजा खटखटाये। ऐसी सूरत में जो एक, दो, तीन या चार शेयर के मालिक हैं, उन के लिये अदालत में जाना और वहां पैसा खर्च करना, खास तौर से जब वे मुस्तलिफ जगहों फँसे हुए हों, उन को इकट्ठा कर के ऐसा करना, जरा मुश्किल सा काम हो जाता है। मसमझता हूँ कि गवर्नमेंट ने जो यह स्पेशल आडिट का प्राविजन किया है उस से जिन लोगों को आम तौर पर शिकायत होती है उन को राहत मिल सकती है। इस के लिये दो ही सूरतें थीं या तो सेक्शन ३६७ और ३६८ या सेक्शन ४०८, जिस के मुताबिक गवर्नमेंट को अख्तियार है कि वह शेयरहोल्डर्स में से दो आदमियों को डाइरेक्टर बना दे। लेकिन जैसा अभी माननीय सदस्य ने कहा कि सेक्शन २३७ में इन्स्पेक्शन को जो पावर्स दी गई हैं, उस में काफी ज्यादा देर लग जाती है और फिर सरकार कोई कार्रवाई नहीं कर सकती। इस लिये जरूरी चीज है कि जो छोटे छोटे शेयरहोल्डर्स हैं, जिन के पास इतना सरमाया नहीं है, इतना वक्त नहीं है, कि अदालतों का दरवाजा खटखटा सकें, अगर उन की शिकायत गवर्नमेंट के पास पहुंचती है तो वह स्पेशल आडिट मुकर्रर कर दे। इस से लाजिमी तौर पर वह सारी इन्फार्मेशन ला सकता है। इस सेक्शन के लिये जो प्रोवाइजो रक्खा गया है उस में स्पेशल आडिटर को अख्तियार होगा कि वह जो इन्फार्मेशन चाहे ले सकता है। उस में

लिखा हुआ है :

"The Central Government may by order direct any person specified in the order furnish to the special auditor within such time as may be specified therein such information or additional information as may be required by the special auditor in connection with the special audit; and on failure to comply with such order such person shall be punishable with fine which may extend to five hundred rupees."

इस में बहुत ज्यादा अख्तियार दिये गये हैं। अगर कोई चीज आडिटर नहीं करता है और गवर्नमेंट के पास उस की शिकायत पहुंचती है या कोई इन्फार्मेशन पहुंचती है तो जो चीज कम्पनी स्टॉक का आडिटर नहीं कर सकता, उसे स्पेशल आडिटर कर सकता है। वह सारी की सारी रिपोर्ट ज्यादा बजाहत के साथ गवर्नमेंट के पास भेज सकता है। ऐसी सूरत में गवर्नमेंट कोई न कोई सेक्शन कम्पनियों के खिलाफ ले सकती है, ताकि जो छोटे शेयरहोल्डर्स हैं उन का पैसा, उन की गाढ़ी कमाई कहीं डाइरेक्टर्स या मैनेजिंग डायरेक्टर्स हजम न कर जायें।

एक सवाल अभी श्री मोरारका ने उठाया और कहा कि कम्पनी को नोटिस हो जाना चाहिए। अगर इस में हम पड़े तो लाजिमी तौर पर जो कम्पनियां हैं उन का पाले से पता लग जायेगा और कम्पनी ऐक्ट के इस सेक्शन की सारी की सारी मंशा फेल हो जायेगी। इस लिये मैं समझता हूँ कि जो सेक्शन २३३ए है वह नहायत जरूरी है और छोटे छोटे शेयरहोल्डर्स के हक को हिफाजत के लिये इस से बेहतर रास्ता नहीं हो सकता।

इन शब्दों के साथ मैं क्लॉज ७० का
अनुमोदन करता हूँ ।

Shri Nathwani: The scope and the necessity of this clause have been explained very lucidly by my hon. friend Shri Morarka. I want to add only a few words. My hon. friend Shri Masani said that no reasons were given as to why this power was necessary. But he himself suggested the reasons when he referred, though briefly, to the existing provisions in the Act. His arguments seem to be this: that there are ample provisions in the Act under which Government can take action. But during one of his interruptions, if I may say so, he said that Government can investigate on the basis of some evidence. For instance, there are powers of investigation. There are sections 235, 237 and others as well under which power has been given to the minority shareholders to go to a court of law or even to move the Central Government for necessary relief. But the basis of all this kind of action is certain evidence and certain allegation to be made.

If we look to sections 235 and 236, it has been provided that the shareholders must substantiate their allegations by evidence. The difficulty is to have access to this kind of evidence. Unless, therefore, the accounts are properly audited and a dependable and authoritative report is available, it is not possible to substantiate charges though there are strong rumours to that effect. Though there might be a feeling existing among the public that something is wrong with the affairs of a certain company, it will be difficult to substantiate it unless we have got access to its books of account and unless you have seen how their accounts have been kept. Therefore, it becomes necessary to have a power like this.

Then, it has been said that there is one very abnoxious feature in this clause. My hon. friend Shri Masani proceeded to read sub-clause (5) under which the Central Government

may order any person to furnish to the special auditor such information or additional information as may be required by the special auditor. He tried to show that this gave unlimited power to the special auditor to ask for any kind of information. If he has cared to read further on, in sub-clause (5), he will find that the scope of information which may be required by the special auditor has been defined very clearly. It says:

“...such information or additional information as may be required by the special auditor in connection with the special audit.”

It must relate to his work as special auditor.

Shri M. R. Masani: Special audit itself is a roving enquiry, without any specific allegation being made. It is a probe, which is a roving enquiry.

Shri Nathwani: I disagree with what my friend suggests. He is emphatic, but emphasis does not change the fact. Whether it is ordinary audit or special audit, whatever information can be asked by an auditor, that much information could be called for by the special auditor; nothing more. A special auditor cannot pry into the personal affairs of any individual or anything which has nothing to do with the work with which he is entrusted. The work he is entrusted with is the work of an auditor; nothing more, nothing less. So, let there be no misapprehension as regards the scope of the enquiry and calling for information required under this clause.

Then, it is said that this clause casts a slur on the profession of auditors. I do not agree with that view. On the contrary, according to us who have championed the provisions like this, that it would strengthen the independence of the auditors in this connection.

I may, with reluctance, refer to one of the proceedings during the last

[Shri Nathwani]

session. I speak subject to correction. An extract of a report made by a Government auditor in respect of two respectable insurance companies was laid on the Table of the House.

Shri Braj Raj Singh (Ferozabad): On a point of order, Sir. In the circumstances which have been created near about the precincts of the House. The business of the House, cannot be carried on, because in the lobbies, our eyes are being injured due to the tear gas shells fired outside.

Mr. Chairman: I have ruled it out. Only 5 minutes are left. Let the hon. Member finish.

Shri Braj Raj Singh: My submission is, you are here to conduct the business of the House in a manner in which we can go on unhindered. As a matter of fact, we cannot study in the library. We cannot sit in the Central Hall which is part of the lobby.

Shri Raghunath Singh (Varanasi): We are sitting everywhere.

Shri Braj Raj Singh: Our eyes are being injured due to the tear gas.

Mr. Chairman: There is no point of order in this.

Shri Nathwani: That extract revealed a very sorry state of affairs. It created an impression that the auditor of those companies had not carried out his duties as he ought to have done. Therefore, a provision like this is likely to strengthen the position of the auditor.

It was stated that opportunity should be given to the company concerned. I am in favour of this proposal, but, of course, I do not accept the form in which the amendment is framed. But I do think that if there is a provision inserted in this clause to the effect that the Central Government, if after making such enquiry as it thinks fit, is of the opinion that

notice may be given to the other side, they may give notice. As pointed out by Shri Hem Raj, sending a notice like this might fore-warn them and they may hush up the irregularities, etc. That is one aspect. But, I find there may be valid reason. The information that may be at the disposal of the Government may not be correct, may not be full. So, if such power of giving notice or seeking an explanation from the company is provided for, it would be a wholesome thing. On the whole, I support the clause as it stands.

श्री राज सिंह भाई वर्मा : श्रीमान्, क्लाज ७० में जो स्पेशल आडिटर का प्रवृत्ति रखा है मैं उस का समर्थन करता हूँ। मैं नहीं समझता कि मेरे साथी श्री मसानी जी इस क्लाज के खिलाफ इतना आग्रह या दुराग्रह क्यों प्रकट कर रहे हैं। और क्यों इतने परेशान होते हैं। वह क्लाज रखने से कोई बड़ी बात होने वाली नहीं है। इस का उन्हे बहुत ज्यादा अनुभव है। अभी मौजूदा कम्पनी ला के अन्दर भी गवर्नमेंट को कुछ ऐसे अधिकार हैं, लेकिन गवर्नमेंट ने उन को कभी परेशान नहीं किया, बल्कि कुछ हद तक उनकी मदद ही हुई है।

मैं ने जनरल डिस्कशन में एक दो नहीं मिसमेनेजमेंट और गड़बड़ियों के आधे दरजन उदाहरण दिए थे और कुछ कोर्टों के उदाहरण भी मैं ने पेश किए थे। स्पेशल आडिटर मुक़रर करने से तो आपकी प्रेस्टिज बढ़ने वाली है, क्योंकि जिस कारखाने में या जिस कन्सर्न में गवर्नमेंट स्पेशल आडिटर मुक़रर नहीं करेगी उसके लिये यह माना जाएगा कि उसमें कोई गड़बड़ी नहीं है। सच बात तो यह है कि बेचारे छोटे छोटे शेयरहोल्डर्स के साथ आप लोगों ने क्या कोई इन्साफ किया है। आपने उनकी बात को कितनी प्रधानता दी है। उनकी बात कभी नहीं सुनी गयी। यह पहला मौका है कि गवर्नमेंट ने उनको यह

संतोष दिलाया है कि अगर किसी कन्सर्न में कोई ऐसी बात होती है जिसके कारण उद्योग या व्यवसाय में जबरदस्त हानि होने की संभावना है उस हालत में स्पेशल आडिटर गवर्नमेंट मुकर्रर कर सकती है। और मैं श्री मसानी जी से निवेदन कहूँ कि आप बहुत जानते हैं, और आप यह भी जानते हैं कि आप के कुछ साथी कैंपे हैं और आज वहाँ क्या चल रहा है। जहाँ कहीं भी गवर्नमेंट ने एन्क्वायरी कमेटी मुकर्रर की है वहाँ उन के सामने अनेक ऐसी चीजें आयी हैं जिनके कारण से उद्योग व्यवसाय को हानि पहुँचती है, और गवर्नमेंट के पास ऐसा साधन नहीं था कि उसकी जांच की जा सके। तो इस प्रावोजन के खिलाफ आपको क्यों आबजेशन होना चाहिए। किसी किसी मैनेजमेंट में ऐसे लोग होते हैं जो जान बूझ कर गड़बड़ियाँ करते हैं। अगर गवर्नमेंट उसकी जांच कराती है तो वह चीज आपके सामने भी आएगी। आपको तो यह सोचना चाहिए कि अगर उद्योग और व्यवसाय को ईमानदारी से एफीशेंटली चलाने के लिए गवर्नमेंट हमको आडिटर देती है तो कोई हानि नहीं है, और आज नहीं तो कल वह चीज आने वाली है। अगर मौजूदा हालत बनी रही और मैनेजमेंट में इसी तरह गड़बड़ी होती रही जिससे सारे देश की इकानामिक हालत पर बुरा असर पड़े, तो गवर्नमेंट चुप रहने वाली नहीं है। और मैं तो मानता हूँ कि एक दिन जितने भी आडिटर होंगे

उनका राष्ट्रीयकरण होने वाला है। इसलिये मैं यह निवेदन करूँगा कि जो यह काम धीरे धीरे हो रहा है उसके प्रति आपको खुशी प्रकट करनी चाहिए। गवर्नमेंट ऐसी नहीं है कि चाहे जिस के कहने पर स्पेशल आडिटर मुकर्रर कर दे। हम तो गवर्नमेंट की पार्टी के हैं। और दिन रात अपने को रगड़ते हैं और दिन रात चिन्लाते हैं और कहते हैं लेकिन हमारी कोई सुनवायी नहीं होती, आपकी सुनवायी तो फौरन हो जाती है। आपको विश्वास करना चाहिए कि इस से आप को कोई कष्ट होने वाला नहीं है। अगर आपके कन्सर्न में स्पेशल आडिटर मुकर्रर न किया गया तो आप की तो प्रेस्टिज बढ़ने वाली है।

इसलिए जो मूल क्लोज है उसका मैं समर्थन करता हूँ और जो मसानी जी ने अमैंडमेंट रखा है उसकी मैं विरोध करता हूँ।

Mr. Chairman: Shri G. D. Somani.

Shri G. D. Somani: Are we going to continue after 5 O'Clock?

Mr. Chairman: No, we will adjourn now.

17 hrs.

The Lok Sabha then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock on Friday, November 25, 1960/Agrahayana 4, 1882 (Saka).