

**COMMITTEE  
ON  
PAPERS LAID ON THE TABLE  
(1978-79)**

**(SIXTH LOK SABHA)**

**ELEVENTH REPORT**

*(Presented on 9-4-1979)*



**LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT  
NEW DELHI**

*April, 1979 (Chaitra 1901 (Saka))*

*Price : Rs. 0.90*

2. 54A  
L8

CORRIGENDA

to

ELEVENTH REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON  
PAPERS LAID ON THE TABLE

(Presented on 9.4.1979)

<u>Page</u>	<u>Para</u>	<u>Line</u>	<u>For</u>	<u>Read</u>
3	1.7	5	(Fifth Lok Sabha(	(Fifth Lok Sabha)
7	2.6	6	irrigation	Irrigation
9	2.13	2	Commissions	Commission
15	Appendix S.No.8 para 2.13	6	Part	Parts
16	Appendix S.No.11 para 2.16	14	occured	occurred

## CONTENTS

	PAGE
COMPOSITION OF THE COMMITTEE . . . . .	(iii)
INTRODUCTION . . . . .	(v)
CHAPTER I. Delay in laying Annual Reports of the Rehabilitation Industries Corporation Limited, Calcutta . . . . .	1
CHAPTER II. Delay in laying before Parliament Hindi version of (i) Interim Report of National Commission on Agriculture on certain important aspects of Marketing and prices of Cotton, Jute, Groundnut and Tobacco, and (ii) Final Report, 1976 of Wakf Inquiry Committee Parts I and II . . . . .	6
APPENDIX	
Summary of Recommendations/Observations contained in the Report . . . . .	12

**PARLIAMENT LIBRARY**  
(Library & Reference Service)  
Central Govt Publications  
Acc. No.                       
Date 25.5.79

325.5.79  
L8

**COMPOSITION OF THE COMMITTEE ON PAPERS LAID  
ON THE TABLE**

(1978-79)

**Shri Kanwar Lal Gupta—*Chairman.***

**MEMBERS**

2. Shri Faquir Ali Ansari
3. Shri G. M. Banatwalla
4. Shri Chandan Singh
5. Shri K. B. Chettri
6. Shri Sudhir Ghosal
7. Shri M. Kalyanasundaram
8. Shri Annasaheb Magar
9. Shri Hari Shankar Mahale
10. Shri C. R. Mahata
11. Shri Mangal Deo
12. Shri Laxmi Narain Nayak
13. Shri Dwarikadas Patel
14. Shrimati B. Radhabai Ananda Rao
15. Shrimati Shanti Devi

**SECRETARIAT**

**Shri K. K. Saxena—*Chief Examiner of Bills and Resolutions.***

**Shri P. C. Chaudhry—*Senior Table Officer.***

## INTRODUCTION

I, the Chairman of the Committee on Papers laid on the Table of the House, having been authorised by the Committee to present the Report on their behalf, present this their Eleventh Report.

2. On examination of certain papers laid during the Second, Fourth and Fifth Sessions (Sixth Lok Sabha), the Committee have come to certain conclusions in regard to delay in laying (a) Annual Reports of the Rehabilitation Industries Corporation Limited, Calcutta and (b) Hindi version of (i) Interim Report of National Commission on Agriculture on certain important aspects of Marketing and prices of Cotton, Jute, Groundnut and Tobacco and (ii) Final Report, 1976 of Wakf Inquiry Committee Parts I and II.

3. The Committee wish to express their thanks to the Ministry of Supply and Rehabilitation, the Ministry of Agriculture and Irrigation and the Ministry of Law, Justice and Company Affairs for furnishing information desired by the Committee.

4. The Committee considered and adopted this Report at their sitting held on 2 April, 1979.

5. A statement giving summary of recommendations/observations of the Committee is appended to the Report (Appendix).

NEW DELHI;  
April 4, 1979.

KANWAR LAL GUPTA,  
Chairman,

Chaitra 14, 1901 (Saka)

Committee on Papers laid on the Table.

## CHAPTER I

### DELAY IN LAYING ANNUAL REPORTS OF THE REHABILITATION INDUSTRIES CORPORATION LIMITED, CALCUTTA.

Annual Reports for 1974-75 and 1975-76 of the Rehabilitation Industries Corporation Limited together with 'Review' on the working of the Corporation were laid on the Table of Lok Sabha on 1-8-1977 and 20-3-1978 respectively under Section 619A(1) of the Companies Act, 1956, which reads as under:—

“619A(1) Where the Central Government is a member of a Government Company, the Central Government shall cause an annual report on the working and affairs of that company to be:—

- (a) prepared within three months of its annual general meeting before which the audit report is placed under subsection (5) of section 619; and
- (b) as soon as may be after such preparation, laid before both Houses of Parliament together with a copy of the audit report and any comments upon, or supplement to the audit report, made by the Comptroller and Auditor-General of India.”

1.2. While laying the above reports the Ministry of Supply & Rehabilitation (Department of Rehabilitation) did not lay any statement showing reasons for delay in laying the reports.

1.3. On 12-9-1977 the Ministry of Supply & Rehabilitation (Department of Rehabilitation) were asked to furnish reasons for delay in laying the annual report for 1974-75, reasons for not laying the delay statement, steps taken by the Ministry to implement the recommendation of the Committee made in para 4.16 of their Second Report (Fifth Lok Sabha) which prescribed the time limit for laying reports of Government Companies before Parliament, whether the question of delay was taken up with the Corporation; and if so, the reasons given by the Rehabilitation Industries Corporation.

1.4. In their reply dated the 2nd January, 1978 the Ministry of Supply & Rehabilitation (Department of Rehabilitation), explained the position as under:—

“The delay in presenting the Annual Report is very much regretted.

The Management of the Corporation was required under the standing instructions to send a statement of reasons for not

laying the report in time. In addition to these instructions, the Corporation was also specifically requested by this Department to send a statement explaining the reasons for the delay in presenting the Annual Report 1974-75 to the Parliament. As the requisite information was even then not furnished by the Corporation and the submission of the report would have been further delayed, the report was laid in the Lok Sabha/Rajya Sabha without waiting for the statement of reasons of delay from the Rehabilitation Industries Corporation.

The recommendations of the Parliamentary Committee on Papers laid on the Table were duly communicated to the Chief Executive of the Rehabilitation Industries Corporation (by name) for information and strict compliance. The importance and urgency of the matter was duly stressed by this Department. The Bureau of Public Enterprises had also issued instructions on this subject to all Chief Executives of Public Sector Undertakings (by name). In the annual general meetings of the Corporation in which accounts are placed before the share holders, the officers of this Department attending the meetings as share holders have continuously expressed concern over the delays which occur in the submission of the Annual Reports to the Parliament and have urged that every endeavour should be made to avoid delays and to submit the report each year within the prescribed time limit. In the latest annual general meeting held on the 30th July, 1977, the Joint Secretary of this Department had once again reiterated that the reports together with the reasons for delay, if any, should be presented to the Parliament through the Department with utmost promptitude.

It would thus be observed that the recommendations of the Parliamentary Committee have been duly brought to the notice of the Management for strict compliance not only by this Department but also by the Bureau of Public Enterprises. Steps were also taken from time to time to ensure that these delays were avoided.

The delay has also occurred in the submission of the Report for 1975-76 which would be presented to the Parliament soon, alongwith the statement of reasons for delay. The Management has been advised to expedite their submission of annual reports although some delay is likely to occur in laying the annual report for 1976-77 by the prescribed date viz. 31st December, 1977."

1.5. The Annual Report for 1976-77 together with the 'Review' on the working of the Corporation and a statement showing reasons for delay in laying the Annual Report were laid on the Table of Lok Sabha on 28.8.1978. In the statement the Ministry have advanced the following main reasons for delay in laying the report:—

- “(1) Some delay occurred in appointing Statutory Auditors in respect of which necessary orders were issued in August, 1977.
- (2) The Statutory Auditors completed the audit of the accounts and returned the audited accounts to the Corporation only in February, 1978.
- (3) Some time was taken by the representative of the Comptroller and Auditor General of India to send his comments.
- (4) There was some time lag in holding the Annual General Meeting for presenting the audited accounts to the shareholders, translating the Annual Report from English into Hindi, printing the English and Hindi versions and despatching requisite number of copies by the Corporation to the Department of Rehabilitation.

The delay in laying the Report is, however, regretted and every effort would be made to avoid it in future.”

1.6. The Annual Report for 1977-78 which was required to be laid on the Table by 31st December, 1978 (i.e. within 9 months of the close of the accounting year) has not so far been laid.

1.7. The Committee are concerned to note that the Annual Reports of the Rehabilitation Industries Corporation Limited, Calcutta for the years 1974-75 and 1975-76, which were required to be laid on the Table by 31-12-1976 as per recommendation of the Committee made in Para 4.16 of their Second Report (Fifth Lok Sabha), were laid on 1.8.1977 and 20.3.1978, respectively. i.e. 7 months and 15 months after the completion of the prescribed period. The Committee further note that the Annual Report for 1976-77 was laid on 28.8.1978, after 8 months of the expiry of the stipulated period of 9 months.

1.8. The Committee are constrained to observe that despite the clear guidelines laid down by them for laying reports of Government Companies on the Table the prescribed time schedule has not been adhered to by the Ministry of Supply and Rehabilitation in laying the above reports.



1.9. The Committee also note that neither the Ministry cared to lay alongwith the reports for 1974-75 and 1975-76 any statement explaining the reasons for delay in laying those reports nor any statement informing Parliament why it was not possible for the Ministry to lay the reports within the stipulated period mentioned in para 4.16 of the Second Report (Fifth Lok Sabha).

1.10. The Committee are not at all convinced with the reasons advanced by the Ministry that despite the standing instructions to the Corporation to send a statement of reasons for not laying the report in time, the Management of the Corporation did not furnish any delay statement and to avoid further delay the Ministry had to lay the reports without the delay statement. The Committee are of the view that the Ministry had failed to get the Annual Reports and delay statements from the Corporation in time due to laxity on their own part in exercising proper control over the Corporation. The Committee feel that the Ministry ought to have been more vigilant and should have pursued the matter more vigorously with the Corporation. Since the Ministry of Supply and Rehabilitation are administratively responsible for the affairs of the Corporation they cannot absolve themselves of the responsibility for delay in laying the reports of the Corporation.

1.11. Taking all the factors into consideration the Committee cannot but come to the conclusion that their recommendations are being paid scant attention both by the Corporation and the Ministry of Supply and Rehabilitation by not implementing them in letter and spirit. The Committee take a serious note of it. The Committee need hardly stress that in order to give timely information to the Parliament about the working and performance of the Company, it is the duty of the administrative Ministry to see that the Company's annual and audit reports are laid within 9 months of the close of the accounting year as recommended in para 4.16 of their Second Report (Fifth Lok Sabha) and where it is not possible for any reason whatsoever, the Ministry should lay before Parliament a comprehensive statement explaining the reasons that led to delay in laying the report within the stipulated period and when the report is expected to be laid before Parliament. The Committee would like to emphasise once again that in case it is not possible for the administrative Ministry to lay the report of any company in time, they should invariably lay on the Table the delay statement within 30 days from the expiry of the prescribed period of nine months and if Parliament is not in session at that time, then the delay statement should be laid within seven days of the commencement of the next session.

1.12. From the delay statement laid on the Table on 28.8.1978 in respect of Annual Report of the Corporation for 1976-77 the Committee find that the Statutory Auditors were appointed in August, 1977 and they made the audited accounts available to the Corporation in February, 1978. Thereafter the Corporation took six months (February to August, 1978) for holding the Annual General Meeting, translating the report into Hindi and for printing English and Hindi versions of the Report. The Ministry have not given complete details about the different stages through which the report passed, such as dates of completion of accounts, appointment of Statutory Auditors, auditing of accounts, resolution of audit objections, clearance of accounts by the Auditors, holding of Annual General Meeting etc., before it was laid on the Table on 28.8.1978. In the absence of these details the Committee is not in a position to pin-point as to where the delay had actually occurred. The Committee, therefore, recommend that in the statement of reasons for delay Government should invariably furnish complete details about the various stages of finalisation of the Report and accounts in order to apprise Parliament of the correct position and to identify the areas of delay. This will enable Parliament to suggest correct remedial measures, where necessary.

1.13. The Committee note that despite the assurance given by the Ministry in the delay statement laid with the Annual Report for 1976-77 that 'every effort would be made to avoid delay in laying the Report in future' the Annual Report for 1977-78, which was required to be laid by 31.12.1978, has not so far been laid. The Committee trust that the Annual Report for 1977-78 would be laid without any further delay and in case the Ministry expects any delay in laying the Report, it would lay the statement explaining the reasons thereof before Parliament promptly indicating the date by which expected to be laid.

## CHAPTER II

**DELAY IN LAYING BEFORE PARLIAMENT, HINDI VERSION OF (i) INTERIM REPORT OF NATIONAL COMMISSION ON AGRICULTURE ON CERTAIN IMPORTANT ASPECTS OF MARKETING AND PRICES OF COTTON, JUTE, GROUNDNUT AND TOBACCO AND (ii) FINAL REPORT, 1976 OF WAKF INQUIRY COMMITTEE PARTS-I AND II.**

2.1. Hindi version of (i) Interim Report of National Commission on Agriculture on certain important aspects of Marketing and prices of Cotton, Jute, Groundnut and Tobacco and (ii) Final Report, 1976 of Wakf Inquiry Committee Parts I and II were laid on the Table of Lok Sabha on 13.3.1978 whereas the English version thereof had been laid on 13.7.1975 and 16.8.1976, respectively.

2.2. When the aforesaid reports were being laid on the Table of the Lok Sabha, the attention of the House was invited to the inordinate delay on the part of the Ministries concerned in laying the Hindi version of Reports after the English versions thereof were laid.

2.3. "Handbook of Orders" issued by the Ministry of Home Affairs regarding use of Hindi for official purposes of the Union contains the following instructions:—

"It is necessary to ensure that the Hindi version of all official papers are prepared and invariably laid on the Table of either House of Parliament simultaneously with the English version. If, however, in any particular case, due to some very special reasons, it is not possible to lay the Hindi version simultaneously with the English version, then while placing the English version, a brief statement explaining the reasons why the Hindi version could not be simultaneously laid may also be laid on the Table of the Rajya Sabha/Lok Sabha. This will apply to statutory rules also."

[O.M. No. 6|23|70 OL dated 16-5-70, O.M. R.S. 14(5) 68-Com dated 8.1.69 O.M. No. R.S. 14(73) 69-Com dated 26.11.69]

2.4. On 13.7.1975 while laying on the Table of Lok Sabha the English version of the Interim Report of National Commission on Agriculture on certain important aspects of marketing and prices of Cotton, Jute, Groundnut and Tobacco, the requisite statement explaining reasons why the Hindi version thereof could not be laid simultaneously was not laid by the Minister concerned.

2.5. On 16 August, 1976, the then Minister of Agriculture and Wakf (Shri Shah Nawaz Khan) while laying the English version of the Final Report, 1976 of the Wakf Inquiry Committee, had also laid a statement showing reasons for not laying the Hindi version of the Report, on the Table of the House. The statement reads as under:—

“The Report of the Wakf Inquiry Committee was submitted in English only. The same has been got printed and is being laid on the Table of the House. Steps are being taken to have the Hindi translation prepared and the same will be laid on the Table of the House as soon as it is ready.”

2.6. With a view to knowing the extent of time taken in translation of the reports, time taken thereafter by the Ministries concerned in laying the Hindi version of those reports on the Table of the House and the difficulties faced by them in translating, printing and laying before Parliament the Hindi versions of reports, the Ministry of Agriculture and irrigation and the Ministry of Law, Justice and Company Affairs were asked to furnish requisite information.

2.7. The Ministry of Agriculture and Irrigation in their communication dated the 6th May, 1978 while furnishing the requisite information stated that the translation work on the interim report of National Commission on Agriculture on certain important aspects of marketing and prices of cotton, jute, groundnut and tobacco was taken up on 7.6.1975 and completed on 8.7.1976.

2.8. Regarding the reasons for not following the recommendation of the Committee on Papers Laid on the Table made in para 2.15 of their First Report (Fifth Lok Sabha) regarding laying of Hindi and English versions of Reports/documents, etc. simultaneously on the Table of the House, the Ministry of Agriculture and Irrigation stated that necessary action was being taken against those responsible for the delay.

2.9. The Ministry of Law, Justice and Company Affairs, while furnishing the information in respect of reasons for delay in laying the Final Report, 1976 of the Wakf Inquiry Committee Parts-I and II, have, in their communication dated 10 April, 1978 stated:

“We have no separate arrangements for translation of reports in Hindi. The Official Languages Commission (Legislative Department) was, therefore, requested on 7th August, 1976, to translate the Wakf Inquiry Committee Report 1976 in Hindi.

The Hindi translation of the report was received from the Official Languages Wing on 27.4.1977. It may be mentioned that the Official Languages (Legislative) Commission was abolished on 1.10.76 and the work was entrusted to the newly set up Wing in the Legislative Department.

The translated version of the report was sent for printing on 10.5.1977 to the Director of Printing, Ministry of Works and Housing.

Printed copies of the Hindi version of the report were received in two groups; part II of the report was received on 28.9.1977 and part-I on 30.1.1978.

As the Official Languages Wing of the Legislative Department was newly set up on 1.10.1976 and was having a heavy programme of work relating to translation of Bills, Acts, Rules, Regulations, etc. and there was shortage of staff due to non-filling of vacancies, the translation of the Wakf Inquiry Committee Report 1976 could not be attended to promptly."

2.10. The Ministry of Law, Justice and Company Affairs were then asked to furnish further information about the arrangements made by them to ensure timely translation, printing and laying of Hindi versions of the Reports and about the reasons for not following the recommendation made in para 2.14 of the Third Report (Fifth Lok Sabha) of the Committee on Papers Laid on the Table, which reads as under:—

"The Committee has no objection to the Ministry's suggestion that cyclostyled copies of the Report might be laid on the Table in order to cut delay, provided this does not become a regular feature and the printed copies are made available to Members as early as possible, in no case later than a month after the submission of cyclostyled Report."

2.11. In their communication dated 12 October, 1978 the Ministry of Law, Justice and Company Affairs stated:—

".....adequate arrangements have been made for the translation of the Reports of the Committees/Commissions into Hindi and for the translations being laid before Parliament without delay. The arrangements, *inter alia* include the filling up of vacant posts of Hindi translators/draftsmen and the streamlining of the methods of work in the Translation Wing."

2.12. Explaining the reasons for not following the recommendation of the Committee contained in para 2.14 of Third Report (Fifth Lok Sabha), the Ministry of Law, Justice and Company Affairs stated that they were aware of the recommendation and had considered it possible that the work relating to translation into Hindi and printing of the translated version could be completed without delay. The Ministry also expressed regrets for the delay and assured that every attempt would be made to observe the recommendation of the Committee.

2.13. The Committee note that the Hindi version of Interim Report of National Commissions on Agriculture on certain important aspects of marketing and prices of cotton, jute, groundnut and tobacco and the Final Report, 1976 of Wakf Inquiry Committee Parts I and II were laid on the Table of Lok Sabha as late as 32 months and 19 months respectively after their English version had been laid.

2.14. The Committee further note that in complete disregard of not only the instructions issued by the Lok Sabha Secretariat in 1962 and repeated from time to time through brochure on 'Procedure to be followed by Ministries in connection with Parliamentary work' that "Whenever there is undue delay in laying a document (including the statutory rules etc.) on the Table of the House, the concerned Ministry should also arrange to lay on the Table alongwith such document a statement giving reasons for delay", but also the instructions (which are contained in the 'Handbook of Orders' issued by the Ministry of Home Affairs regarding use of Hindi for official purposes of the Union) issued by the Ministry of Home Affairs as early as in 1969 that where, due to some very special reasons it is not possible to lay the Hindi version simultaneously with the English version, a brief statement explaining the reasons why the Hindi version could not be simultaneously laid, may also be laid on the Table of the Rajya Sabha/Lok Sabha, the Ministry of Agriculture and Irrigation did not care to lay the requisite statement while laying the English version of Interim Report of National Commission on Agriculture on certain important aspects of marketing and prices of cotton, jute, groundnut and tobacco, on the Table on 13-7-1975.

2.15. The Committee also note that even after the presentation of their First Report (Fifth Lok Sabha) to the House on 8-3-1976, the Ministry of Agriculture and Irrigation did not make any earnest effort to comply with the recommendation contained in para 2.15 of that Report in order to ensure that no further delay was caused in laying the Hindi version of the Interim Report of National Commission on Agriculture. Instead the Ministry took 24 months in laying that

report on the Table of Lok Sabha after the presentation of the First Report (Fifth Lok Sabha) to Lok Sabha. This leads to the obvious conclusion that the recommendations of the Committee were not taken seriously by the Ministry and scant attention was paid towards their implementation. As the Ministry of Agriculture and Irrigation have stated that action was being taken against those responsible for the delay, the Committee trust that adequate steps will be taken by them to avoid such delays in future.

2.16. From the information furnished by the Ministry of Law, Justice and Company Affairs, the Committee note that 8½ months time was taken in translating the Final Report, 1976 of the Wakf Inquiry Committee Parts I and II and then 4½ months time and 8½ months time was taken in printing parts I and II thereof respectively. Even considering the factors for delay like abolition of the Official Languages Commission and setting up of a new wing i.e. Official Languages wing, shortage of staff in that wing and heavy translation work with the Wing etc., the Committee cannot help taking the view that the delay which had occurred at printing stage was inordinate and could be avoided.

2.17. The Committee feel that if the Ministry, had taken proper note of the recommendation contained in para 2.14 of the Third Report (Fifth Lok Sabha) presented to Lok Sabha on 30-8-1976 it could have laid the report in the cyclostyled form. The Committee would, therefore, like to reiterate their aforesaid recommendation that in order to avoid delay, cyclostyled copies of the Reports should be laid, provided this does not become a regular feature and the printed copies are made available to Members as early as possible, in no case later than a month after the submission of a cyclostyled Report.

2.18. The Committee need hardly stress their earlier recommendation made in para 2.15 of their First Report (Fifth Lok Sabha) that ordinarily both the English and Hindi versions of Reports/documents should be laid on the Table simultaneously. However, in exceptional cases, where it is not possible to lay both the versions simultaneously, Ministry/Department while laying one version should invariably lay a statement explaining the reasons for not laying the other version. In such cases the other version should be laid on the Table either in the same session or at the most by the end of the next session.

2.19. The Committee note with satisfaction that the difficulties explained by the Ministry of Law, Justice and Company Affairs in

their communication dated 10-4-1978 have since been overcome by them and adequate arrangements have since been made for the translation of reports of the Committees/Commissions into Hindi as stated by them in their subsequent communication dated 12-10-1978. The Committee hope that in future both versions of reports/documents etc., which are required to be laid before Parliament, would be laid by the Ministry of Law, Justice and Company Affairs simultaneously and in time.

2.20. The Committee need hardly stress that all the Ministries and Departments of Government of India should draw up a phased programme for completing translation of reports/documents into Hindi within a specified period so that both English/Hindi versions are laid on the Table of the House simultaneously without delay.

NEW DELHI;  
April 2, 1979.

KANWAR LAL GUPTA,  
Chairman,

Chaitra 12, 1901 (Saka)

Committee on Papers laid on the Table.



## APPENDIX

### *Summary of Recommendations|Observations contained in the Report*

S. No.	Reference to para No. of the Report	Summary of Recommendations  Observations
1	2	3
1.	1.7	The Committee are concerned to note that the Annual Reports of the Rehabilitation Industries Corporation Limited, Calcutta for the years 1974-75 and 1975-76, which were required to be laid on the Table by 31-12-1976 as per recommendation of the Committee made in para 4.16 of their Second Report (Fifth Lok Sabha), were laid on 1-8-1977 and 20-3-1978, respectively, i.e., 7 months and 15 months after the completion of the prescribed period. The Committee further note that the Annual Report for 1976-77 was laid on 28-8-1978, after 8 months of the expiry of the stipulated period of 9 months.
2	1.8	The Committee are constrained to observe that despite the clear guidelines laid down by them for laying reports of Government Companies on the Table, the prescribed time schedule has not been adhered to by the Ministry of Supply and Rehabilitation in laying the above reports.
3	1.9	The Committee also note that neither the Ministry cared to lay alongwith the reports for 1974-75 and 1975-76 any statement explaining the reasons for delay in laying those reports nor any statement informing Parliament why it was not possible for the Ministry to lay the reports within the stipulated period mentioned in para 4.16 of the Second Report (Fifth Lok Sabha).
4	1.10	The Committee are not at all convinced with the reasons advanced by the Ministry that despite the standing instructions to the Corpora-

1

2

3

---

tion to send a statement of reasons for not laying the report in time, the Management of the Corporation did not furnish any delay statement and to avoid any further delay the Ministry had to lay the reports without the delay statement. The Committee are of the view that the Ministry had failed to get the Annual Reports and delay statements from the Corporation in time due to laxity on their own part in exercising proper control over the Corporation. Since the Ministry of Supply and Rehabilitation are administratively responsible for the affairs of the Corporation they cannot absolve themselves of the responsibility for delay in laying the reports of the Corporation.

5

1.11

Taking all the factors into consideration the Committee cannot but come to the conclusion that their recommendations are being paid scant attention both by the Corporation and the Ministry of Supply and Rehabilitation by not implementing them in letter and spirit. The Committee take a serious note of it. The Committee need hardly stress that in order to give timely information to the Parliament about the working and performance of the Company, it is the duty of the administrative Ministry to see that the Company's annual and audit reports are laid within 9 months of the close of the accounting year as recommended in para 4.16 of their Second Report (Fifth Lok Sabha) and where it is not possible for any reason whatsoever, the Ministry should lay before Parliament a comprehensive statement explaining the reasons that led to delay in laying the report within the stipulated period and when the report is expected to be laid before Parliament. The Committee would like to emphasise once again that in case it is not possible for the administrative Ministry to lay the report of any company in time, they should invariably lay on the Table the delay statement within 30 days from the expiry of the

---

1

2

3

---

prescribed period of nine months and if Parliament is not in session at that time, then the delay statement should be laid within seven days of the commencement of the next session.

6

1.12

From the delay statement laid on the Table on 28-8-1978 in respect of Annual Report of the Corporation for 1976-77 the Committee find that the Statutory Auditors were appointed in August, 1977 and they made the audited accounts available to the Corporation in February, 1978. Thereafter the Corporation took six months (February to August, 1978) for holding the Annual General Meeting, translating the report into Hindi and for printing English and Hindi versions of the Report. The Ministry have not given complete details about the different stages through which the report passed, such as dates of completion of accounts, appointment of Statutory Auditors, auditing of accounts, resolution of audit objections, clearance of accounts by the Auditors, holding of Annual General Meeting, etc., before it was laid on the Table on 28-8-1978. In the absence of these details the Committee is not in a position to pin-point as to where the delay had actually occurred. The Committee, therefore, recommend that in the statement of reasons for delay Government should invariably furnish complete details about the various stages of finalisation of the Report and accounts in order to apprise Parliament of the correct position and to identify the areas of delay. This will enable Parliament to suggest correct remedial measures, where necessary.

7

1.13

The Committee note that despite the assurance given by the Ministry in the delay statement laid with the Annual Report for 1976-77 that 'every effort would be made to avoid delay in laying the Report in future' the Annual Report for 1977-78, which was required to be laid by 31-12-1978 has not so far been laid. The Committee trust that the Annual Report for 1977-78

---

---

1	2	3
		would be laid without any further delay and in case the Ministry expects any delay in laying the Report, it would lay the statement explaining the reasons thereof before Parliament promptly indicating the date by which it is expected to be laid.
8	2.13	The Committee note that the Hindi version of Interim Report of National Commission on Agriculture on certain important aspects of marketing and prices of cotton, jute, groundnut and tobacco and the Final Report, 1976 of Wakf Inquiry Committee Part I and II were laid on the Table of Lok Sabha as late as 32 months and 19 months respectively after their English version had been laid.
9	2.14	The Committee further note that in complete disregard of not only the instructions issued by the Lok Sabha Secretariat in 1962 and repeated from time to time through brochure on 'Procedure to be followed by Ministries in connection with Parliamentary work' that "whenever there is undue delay in laying a document (including the statutory rules etc.) on the Table of the House, the concerned Ministry should also arrange to lay on the Table alongwith such document a statement giving reasons for delay", but also the instructions (which are contained in the 'Handbook of Orders' issued by the Ministry of Home Affairs regarding use of Hindi for official purposes of the Union) issued by the Ministry of Home Affairs as early as in 1969 that where, due to some very special reasons it is not possible to lay the Hindi version simultaneously with the English version, a brief statement explaining the reasons why the Hindi version could not be simultaneously laid, may also be laid on the Table of the Rajya Sabha/Lok Sabha, the Ministry of Agriculture and Irrigation did not care to

---

---

1	2	3
---	---	---

---

lay the requisite statement while laying the English version of Interim Report of National Commission on Agriculture on certain important aspects of marketing and prices of cotton, jute, groundnut and tobacco, on the Table on 13-7-1975.

10            2.15        The Committee also note that even after the presentation of their First Report (Fifth Lok Sabha) to the House on 8-3-1976, the Ministry of Agriculture and Irrigation did not make any earnest effort to comply with the recommendation contained in para 2.15 of that Report in order to ensure that no further delay was caused in laying the Hindi version of the Interim Report of National Commission on Agriculture. Instead the Ministry took 24 months in laying that report on the Table of Lok Sabha after the presentation of the First Report (Fifth Lok Sabha) to Lok Sabha. This leads to the obvious conclusion that the recommendations of the Committee were not taken seriously by the Ministry and scant attention was paid towards their implementation. As the Ministry of Agriculture and Irrigation have stated that action was being taken against those responsible for the delay, the Committee trust that adequate steps will be taken by them to avoid such delays in future.

11            2.16        From the information furnished by the Ministry of Law, Justice and Company Affairs, the Committee note that 8½ months time was taken in translating the Final Report, 1976 of the Wakf Inquiry Committee Parts I and II and then 4½ months time and 8½ months time was taken in printing parts I and II thereof respectively. Even considering the factors for delay like abolition of the Official Languages Commission and setting up of a new wing i.e., Official Languages wing, shortage of staff in that wing and heavy translation work with the Wing, etc., the Committee cannot help taking the view that the delay which had occurred at printing stage was inordinate and could be avoided.

---

---

1	2	3
12	2.17	<p>The Committee feel that if the Ministry had taken proper note of the recommendation contained in para 2.14 of the Third Report (Fifth Lok Sabha) presented to Lok Sabha on 30-8-1976 it could have laid the report in the cyclostyled form. The Committee would, therefore, like to reiterate their aforesaid recommendation that in order to avoid delay, cyclostyled copies of the Reports should be laid, provided this does not become a regular feature and the printed copies are made available to Members as early as possible, in no case later than a month after the submission of a cyclostyled Report.</p>
13	2.18	<p>The Committee need hardly stress their earlier recommendation made in para 2.15 of their First Report (Fifth Lok Sabha) that ordinarily both the English and Hindi versions of Reports documents should be laid on the Table simultaneously. However, in exceptional cases, where it is not possible to lay both the versions simultaneously, Ministry Department while laying one version should invariably lay a statement explaining the reasons for not laying the other version. In such cases the other version should be laid on the Table either in the same session or at the most by the end of the next session.</p>
14	2.19	<p>The Committee note with satisfaction that the difficulties explained by the Ministry of Law, Justice and Company Affairs in their communication dated 10-4-1978 have since been overcome by them and adequate arrangements have since been made for the translation of reports of the Committees Commissions into Hindi as stated by them in their subsequent communication dated 12-10-1978. The Committee hope that in future both versions of reports documents, etc., which are required to be laid before Parliament, would be laid by the Ministry of Law, Justice and Company Affairs simultaneously and in time.</p>

---

---

1	2	3
15	2.20	The Committee need hardly stress that all the Ministries and Departments of Government of India should draw up a phased programme for completing translation of reports documents into Hindi within a specified period so that both English Hindi versions are laid on the Table of the House simultaneously without delay.

---