SHRI S. M. BANERJEE (Kanpur): Are we discussing it?

भी रिव राय (पूरी) : तो इस पर पूरी बहस हो जाये। मध्यक्ष महोदय, म्राप इस पर पुरी बहस के लिए इजासत दीजिए।

MR. SPEAKER: As Chairman of the PAC I have permitted him.

SHRI M. R. MASANI: The old Committee adjourned this matter in 1966 the Sarkar Committee made its report. That report has been made. Only in the last few days action-taken notes have been received from the Ministry. Now the Committee, at present in existence, will report on this matter in an 'Action taken' Report by the 30th of April. It is at that time that this motion would be in order in the light of that Report. I would, therefore, suggest that the correct procedure would be, when the PAC is seized of the matter, to let it make its report before the end of its term on 30th April. At that time we will also consider what Shri Limave has said in his statement and if it is found to be true we ourselves will report about it.

SHRIS. M. BANERJEE: Let it go to the Privileges Committee. It has nothing to do with the 'Action taken' report. I also am a Member of the PAC.

THE MINISTER OF STEEL AND HEAVY ENGINEERING (SHRI C. M. POONACHA): Sir, Shri N. N. Wanchoo, ICS, former Steel Secretary, appears to have committed certain errors in furnishing information to the Public Accounts Committee about certain matters of 1960, five or six years later. It has, however, to be pointed out that Shri Wanchoo took an early opportunity to bring the error to the notice of the PAC when the first action report on the recommendations of the PAC was sent to that Committee. During the investigation by the Committee of Enquiry on Steel Transactions headed by Shri A. K. Sarkar, Shri Wanchoo referred again to the errors and made no attempt to conceal them. The Sarkar Committee did not draw any adverse inference against Shri Wanchoo. One of the members of the Committe, however, in his dissenting note expressed

the view that Shri Wanchoo had been misled by Shri Mukherji but even that dissenting member did not make any observation against Shri Wanchoo.

I refer to these facts to give the House rough idea of the circumstances of the Adverse Case observation made by a dissenting having been member of the Sarkar Committee against Shri Mukherji and the matter raised being one of privilege, it is in the interest of all concerned that possible doubts about Shri Mukherii's conduct should be looked into by the Privileges Committee. The case of Shri Wanchoo does not contain even this element of doubt but since his case is interlinked with that of Shri Mukheriee. Government would have no objection to the cases against both of them being referred to the Committee of Privileges.

MR. SPEAKER: Since it is accepted by Government also, I shall put the motion to the vote of the House. The question is :

"That the question of privilege against Shri N. N. Wanchoo, former Department of Iron and Secretary, Steel, and Shri S. C. Mukherjee, then Deputy Iron and Steel Controller, for allegedly giving false evidence before the Public Accounts Committee, be referred to the Committee of Privileges."

The motion was adopted.

12.59 hrs.

PAPERS LAID ON THE TABLE

Statement of action taken on recommendations contained in the report of the Committee on Broadcasting and Information Media on 'Radio and Television'

THE DEPUTY MINISTER IN THE MINISTRY OF FOOD, AGRICULTURE. COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT AND COOPERATION (SHRI D. ERING): On behalf of Shri Gujral, I beg to lay on the Table a statement of action taken on the recommendations contained in the report of the Committee on Broadcasting and Information Media on 'Radio and Televi-

228

[Shri D. Ering]

sion'. [Placed in Library See. No. LT-211/69].

Reports under Companies Act, etc.

SHRI D. ERING: On behalf of Shri Amasahib Shinde, I beg to lay on the Table—

- (1) A copy each of the following reports under sub-section (1) of section 619A of the Companies Act, 1956:—
 - (i) Annual Report of the Punjab Agro-Industries Corporation Limited, Chandigarh, for the year 1968 along with the Audited Accounts and the comments of the Comptroller and Auditor General there-
 - (ii) Annual Report of the Madras Agro-Industries Corporation Limited, Madras, for the year 1967-68 along with the Audited Accounts and the comments of the Comptroller and Auditor-General thereon. [Placed in Library. See No. LT-212/69].
- (2) A copy of the Prevention of Cruelty to Draught and Pack Animals (Amendment) Rules, 1968, published in Notification No S. O. 4486 in Gazette of India dated the 21st December, 1968, under sub-section (4) of section 38 of the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals Act, 1960. [Placed in Library, See No. LT-213/69].
- (3) A copy of the U.P. Land Revenue Provisions (Extension to Rampur) Act, 1969 (Hindi and English versions) (President's Act No. 5 of 1969) published in Gazette of India dated the 4th February, 1969, under sub-section (3) of section 3 of the Uttar Pradesh State Legislature (Delegation of Powers) Act, 1968. [Placed in Library. See No. LT-214/69]

Indian Telegraph (Second [Amendment)
Rules

THE MINISTER OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS AND SHIPPING AND

TRANSPORT (SHRI RAGHU RAMAIAH): On behalf of Shri Sher Singh, I beg to lay oh the Table a copy of the Indian Telegraph (Second Amendment) Rules, 1969, published in Notification No. G.S.R. 247 (Engiish version) and G.S.R. 248 (Hindi version) in Gazette of India dated the 8th February, 1969, under sub-section (5) of section 7 of the Indian Telegraph Act, 1885. [Placed in Library. See No. LT-215/69].

13.(0 hrs.

The Lok Sabha adjourned for Lunch till Fourteen of the Clock.

The Lok Sabha re-assembled after Lunch at three minutes past Fourteen of the Clock

[Mr. Deputy-Speaker in the Chair]

GENERAL BUDGET—GENERAL DISCUSSION

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: We shall now take up the General Discussion on the Budget (General) for 1969-70.

SHRI P. K. DEO (Kalahandi): On a point of order, Sir.

भी मधु लिमये (मुंगेर): फ्राब्यक्ष महोदय, मैंने स्पीकर साहब को पहले से लिखकर दियां है भीर उन्होंने मुक्ते इजाजत दी है।... (अथवधान)...मैंने तो पहले से ही नोटिस दिया है। मैं तो सोच ही रहा था कि भ्राप मुक्ते बुलाएंगे।

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: So far as Mr. P. K. Deo is concerned, I have got some communication from him. Be very brief.

SHRI P. K. DEO: Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, the whole discussion on the Budget proposals is ultra vires of the Constitution because it contravenes item No. 86 of List I of Seventh Schedule. The item No. 86 reads:

"Taxes on the capital value of the