

Bill

Shri M. C. Shah: I introduce* the Bill and beg to move:

"That the Bill to authorise payment and appropriation of certain further sums from and out of the Consolidated Fund of India for the service of the financial year 1954-55, be taken into consideration."

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

"That the Bill to authorise payment and appropriation of certain further sums from and out of the Consolidated Fund of India for the service of the financial year 1954-55, be taken into consideration."

The motion was adopted.

Shri Mohluddin (Hyderabad City): May I know whether the copies of the Bill have been circulated?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Yes. Notice had been given in advance. Whoever wanted a copy, could have taken it from the Notice Office.

Shri A. M. Thomas (Ernakulam): But they were not circulated as usual.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: It is on the Order Paper. Contingent notice has been given already. Hon. Members could have taken copies. Even now, they can do so. There is not much difference between the two.

The Schedule was added to the Bill.

The Title and the Enacting Formula were added to the Bill.

Shri M. C. Shah: I beg to move:

"That the Bill be passed."

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

"That the Bill be passed."

The motion was adopted.

COMMITTEE ON PRIVATE MEMBERS' BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

EIGHTEENTH REPORT

Shri Aitekar (North Satara): I beg to move:

"That this House agrees with the Eighteenth Report of the Committee on Private Members' Bills and Resolutions presented to the House on the 15th December, 1954."

This is in connection with the allocation of time as set out in the Report. I commend the motion for the acceptance of the House.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

"That this House agrees with the Eighteenth Report of the Committee on Private Members' Bills and Resolutions presented to the House on the 15th December, 1954."

The motion was adopted.

RESOLUTION RE: STATUTORY BODY TO CONTROL AND SUPERVISE GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL UNDERTAKINGS

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The House will now take up further discussion of the Resolution moved by Shri K. S. Raghavachari on the 3rd December, 1954.

Shri Raghavachari was in possession of the House.

Regarding time, Shri Raghavachari who spoke for four minutes had not concluded his speech when the House adjourned for the day. Out of two hours allotted, 1 hour and 56 minutes are left for further discussion. Shri Raghavachari will continue his speech.

Shri T. B. Vittal Rao (Khammam): We are starting Private Members'

*Introduced and moved with the recommendation of the President.

control and supervise
Government Industrial
Undertakings

business seven minutes later. The House may sit after five o'clock for seven minutes.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Yes. The hon. Members will please ensure quorum in the House. On all Private Members' business days, as far as possible, each private Member will gather at least ten Members and keep them together.

Shri T. B. Vittal Rao: There is quorum.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Not now. At the end of the day, after five o'clock the hon. Member will wait and see whether there is quorum or not.

Shri Raghuvaran (Penukonda): I moved this Resolution last time and had just begun. My submission before the House is this. It is an important Resolution in which most of the Members, I dare say, are interested, because this is a matter which concerns not any particular Party, but it concerns the whole House irrespective of the Party to which a Member may belong. It is purely a matter relating to public finances and when public money is invested or utilised in all sorts of undertakings, it is the concern of Parliament to discharge its constitutional and other responsibilities, particularly of retaining and exercising its control over the utilisation of these funds. What we have been seeing is that in fact the whole industrial policy of the country in the modern set-up is bound to be more and more the special concern of the nation. That is, the public funds will have to be invested and public utility concerns will have to be started and particularly our country being a backward country so far, we have to exist not only peacefully, but also safely in the modern world. We must not only produce all things that we need in a welfare State for the requirements of the people from day to day, but we may also have to provide for the defence of the country and other public utility purposes. Therefore, the need for industrialisa-

tion on a large scale is beyond question, and the Government, aware of this responsibility and the need, have also started the First Five Year Plan and are preparing for the second. It is a welcome thing that they are thinking of it. But the real point now is when they have started certain undertakings to reach this objective, we have read from the reports, on the material that was made available, of the Public Accounts Committee and the Auditor-General's reports, that the affairs are not being managed satisfactorily.

I do not want to take the time of the House in detailing particulars about the quantum of money that is actually invested and the various projects which the Government has undertaken. My hon. friend Shri M. L. Dwivedi who has actually given notice of and has even introduced a Bill called the Public Finance (Industries Control Board) Bill, has given his thoughts a concrete form; we find the quantum of money that is invested in these public concerns is given in the Progress Report of the Plan at pages 151 to 169. It goes upto hundreds of crores of rupees of public funds.

When last time this subject came up before the House in the form of a discussion raised by Dr. Lanka Sundaram, the Government's point of view was indicated. The Finance Minister practically, I take it, conceded the right for parliamentary control but he seemed, in substance, to say that parliamentary control may be not really pressed as desirable at the present stage, and he addressed himself only to the limited purpose of examining the jurisdiction or the competence of the Auditor-General to scrutinise and audit the accounts of these concerns. And then he seems to have expressed there quite plainly that in a way this authority of the Auditor-General is complied with, and in a way parliamentary control also is a reality; but in the real interests of efficient management of these concerns, the time had not yet come when parliamentary control must be

more than what it is now, and that we must be satisfied with preparing ourselves to renounce this responsibility or the exercise of this responsibility for some time. That is his argument in substance—the attitude that was taken by him.

I shall examine all these things, and then submit why it is that that attitude is not perfectly justified and we will not be satisfied with that attitude at all.

The first point he made was that as the amounts that go into these industries come out of the Consolidated Fund of India, the control of the Auditor-General to audit and satisfy himself was statutory and paramount, and it cannot be taken away; the Auditor-General in his report has pointed out—it may not be quite necessary to read the whole thing—but it is essential to point out the main things which really matter. I summarised the attitude of the Government: They say that it is not absent there. It is there in a way, that is how the Finance Minister put it. And the Auditor-General gives his own reactions in the report which he has submitted and which has been quoted in *extenso* in the last year's debate. I will also summarise the argument and then read the thing. The thing is this. In the private concerns in which our moneys are sunk, the name of the President or some department's name is there as shareholders; and in fact, the essence of it is that when money comes out of the Consolidated Fund of India, the whole Parliament, the whole nation is the shareholder. The Department is not only a shareholder; because it contributes public funds it is also the representative of the consumers, everybody in whose interests these undertakings are run. So, we represent not only the financiers but also the consumers, and therefore, it is our absolute responsibility, and the Auditor-General under the Constitution has the responsibility to satisfy himself that the funds that we contribute are properly utilised; and the Finance Minister's contention

was that he can even now examine those accounts. A private company or a private concern is largely guided by its bye-laws, and unless the bye-laws make it permissible for an outsider to audit the accounts, or in the bye-laws it is included that the Auditor-General of India will audit these accounts, he cannot do so. We know in private companies, under the Companies Act, it is the directors...

Shri A. M. Thomas (Ernakulam): In all the bye-laws of the private companies we have provided for audit by the Auditor-General.

Shri Raghavachari: So, it is by courtesy that you have provided. But, is there any legal obligation for you to so provide? Therefore, what I am submitting is that it is purely at the volition of the company, it is controlled by the bye-laws of the company. Generally, it is with the consent of the Board of Directors that the auditors are determined or chosen year after year in all private companies. It is open to them to change. My hon. friend points out in almost all these bye-laws.....

Shri A. M. Thomas: In all?

Shri Raghavachari: In all it is found. Even then, it is not under the statutory authority which makes the Auditor-General exercise this right. It is the permissive bye-law that is incorporated. Surely, that is not consistent with the statutory responsibility of the Comptroller and Auditor-General. I just refer to columns 1915 and 1916 of the Parliamentary Debates dated the 10th December 1953, where in the course of the discussion on this matter what the Comptroller and Auditor-General had stated has been quoted in *extenso*. There it is pointed out that this way of dealing with public funds was a fraud on the Constitution and the company law. Of course, the word 'fraud' need not necessarily make us all feel rather enraged, for it simply means that it is a violation of the constitutional provisions or that the constitutional provisions are not honoured. The

[Shri Raghavachari]

Hon. Finance Minister also said that in substance the Comptroller and Auditor-General's observations were correct.

As regards the other point on which the control was agitated for, the hon. Finance Minister's point of view was that there is control even now by Parliament, and he has put it this way. Whenever these things are undertaken by the different Ministries as part of their activities and funds are invested in them, they indirectly come in the budget every year before Parliament; and therefore, when Parliament sanctions or passes these grants, there is an opportunity and occasion for it to discuss these things and thus exercise its control. So, there is an indirect way in which Parliament is exercising actually its control. This is what he stated. He also stated that when the Railway Budget or the General Budget comes up before Parliament, involving as they do hundreds of crores of rupees, we spend every year weeks and even months over the criticism of these budgets on almost every single item, and thus parliamentary control is exercised in an indirect way. I should submit that this is no satisfaction to Members of Parliament that they are discharging their duties satisfactorily.

The Finance Minister also stated that there is one other way in which control is exercised by Parliament, and that is through the Public Accounts Committee and the Estimates Committee. We know that the Public Accounts Committee is overworked, and it invariably holds only a post mortem examination, sometimes years after the event. And as it is working now, possibly one or two Ministries only can be taken up in one year, and its hands are full. So, the examination is post mortem, the Committee has not got sufficient time, and it cannot make a complete and proper scrutiny as well. Even after the little scrutiny that they have been able to make—as has already been pointed out in the other discussion—they have

had very hard things to say on the way in which these things are being worked. Therefore, the existing machinery for the indirect scrutiny and control by Parliament, both when the Ministry's budgets come for discussion as well as when they are scrutinised by the Public Accounts Committee and the Estimates Committee and other institutions that are meant today for that purpose, are unsatisfactory, and they cannot be expected to discharge this duty very efficiently. It is thus essential that the control of this Parliament through another body is to be seriously considered. I for one feel that the question of what form it should take is another matter, but in principle it is conceded, and the law requires it to be there, surely, such a body should be constituted. Government's point of view was, let us gather some more experience, you will increase your control gradually in the light of our experience. I personally think that we have waited sufficiently, and the experience that we have gained has indicated that huge sums are not properly accounted for. Why should we wait for further experience, for in the meanwhile more horses may be stolen out of the stable? Is it contended that we should gain experience by suffering ourselves and not take advantage of the experience of other countries? What has been done in the U.K., U.S.A. and other countries for instance? They have a special body constituted by Parliament to control these things.

The Minister of Production (Shri K. C. Reddy): Has such a body been constituted in the U.K.?

Shri Raghavachari: In the House of Commons, it is there.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The hon. Member wants a statutory corporation here.

Shri Raghavachari: I was only saying that there is a body there which controls these things, and which has been entrusted with the responsibility of doing that.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Does he mean a Committee of Parliament?

Shri Raghavachari: I shall just refer to the report and say what it is.

**Shri M. S. Garupadaswamy (My-
sore):** Probably, he has in mind the Board of Trade in England, not a body of Parliament.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The Board of Trade is there only in name; there is only one individual in that, and there is no Board.

Shri Raghavachari: I have taken it out from one of these reports, and I shall just point out which report it is.

The Minister of Finance (Shri C. D. Deshmukh): It is not quite clear as to what the hon. Member wants. Does he want that there should be a statutory corporation to administer all Government enterprises which are outside the ordinary routine administration of Government? Or is he re-arguing the case for another Parliamentary Committee to supervise or scrutinise the administration of these enterprises?

Shri Raghavachari: Let me make it clear.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I thought he was invoking the analogy of a Parliamentary Committee, but he wants a statutory body.

Shri K. C. Reddy: There is no Parliamentary Committee there, so far as we know.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The hon. Minister wants to know what exactly the hon. Member wants.

Shri Raghavachari: My Resolution wants that there should be a statutory body to supervise and control these concerns. When Parliament enacts a statute relating to the composition, powers and other details necessary, of the statutory body to ensure the safe investment and management of these affairs, then parliamentary control is complete, because Parliament has by an enactment constituted a body which functions on behalf of itself. Therefore,

to say that the statutory body is something that takes away the control of Parliament is a thing which I am unable to understand.

All these arguments that I have been advancing were just to state the case and show that the arguments advanced by Government, saying that the present kind of control that is being exercised is enough, are not satisfactory. That was the reason why I was referring to the whole case as put already.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Is it also an autonomous body? If it is a statutory corporation, is it to be autonomous or not?

Shri Raghavachari: I only want..

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Hon. Members must know exactly what the proposition is, and what it is that the hon. Member wants. There seems to be some confusion. How is it possible to have a statutory body with the powers of Parliament intact?

Shri Raghavachari: My proposition is that there should be a statutory body set up to exercise a general supervision and control over these undertakings, and I say that the existing method of control which is so indirect and watered down is not satisfactory in the interests of the nation's funds, and therefore, another body created by Parliament is absolutely necessary.

Shri C. D. Deshmukh: May I seek one clarification? A statutory body created by Parliament will not necessarily be a body which will exercise Parliament's delegated functions. It will merely mean that instead of the executive looking after these matters from day to day some other body will exercise control, which may contain other people, besides the members of the executive Government. Now, that is one proposition. If that is sought to be justified by saying that there should be greater parliamentary control, that is what I cannot reconcile.

3 P.M.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: That is what I also wanted to say. Firstly, do we want to associate others? Secondly, if it is a statutory body, will there be one statutory body to control another statutory body? For instance, DVC is a statutory corporation. Now, similar corporations may come into existence; joint stock companies and various other methods of management have been provided for by the Government. Will there be a super statutory body sitting over these displacing the executive government and the direct authority of Parliament over them? Is that what is meant?

Shri Raghavachari: I would make myself perfectly clear....

Shri Dhulekar (Jhansi Dist.—South): Will it be within the Constitution?

Shri Raghavachari: I started with the premise that the present control of Parliament which is so indirect over these matters, leaving the whole thing to the executive, has not worked satisfactorily. Therefore, there must be a statutory body. My Resolution is for a statutory body. I am perfectly prepared to say that the statutory body cannot consist, and must not consist, of Members of Parliament, because we must not have any kind of interfering authority in these matters. I am not at all anxious that any Member of Parliament should be on that body. We do not want it. I am against it. But we should statutorily create a body to exercise these functions; we will certainly think out the details of the way in which this statutory body has to function. That can certainly function as created, as composed and as conceived by Parliament in the statute. Therefore, it cannot necessarily be any violation or any abrogation of the powers of Parliament. They can be asked every year to submit their report about these matters. They can be asked to satisfy us about how the

policies laid down by Parliament are worked, how the programmes are adhered to, how the thing has been done every year and whether it has resulted in profit or loss or it has functioned as a utility concern or not so far as the country is concerned. It is perfectly open to be so determined; all these details can be incorporated into that statute. Under that statute, that body can work.

Shri C. D. Deshmukh: May I ask a question? What will be its relation to the executive?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: And to the Parliament.

Shri C. D. Deshmukh: No. In regard to Parliament, I understand any law can be passed and you can create any kind of corporation. That corporation will have to work under the general policy guidance of a Ministry of Government. Therefore, it will, in effect, be exercising some functions which otherwise Government will be exercising. If so, how does it bring it nearer to parliamentary control?

Shri Raghavachari: It is this way....

An Hon. Member: He is confusing.

Shri Ghaswan Singh (Gorakhpur Dist.—South): If this body is formed and there is a difference of opinion between the Ministry and that statutory body as to the manner and method of control and as to the effect of the control, whose decision will be final—the Ministry's or the statutory body's?

Shri Raghavachari: I will answer the query of the Finance Minister. It is possible that in that statutory body that is created the executive also may have a place. It is not that it must necessarily be excluded. In fact, the whole purpose of exercising additional or greater control over these organisations or these enterprises is to feel satisfied that things are not working as they are working now—inefficiently and not to the advantage of the country. Therefore,

control and supervise
Government Industrial
Undertakings

the executive may well have a place there; it is not that it will be excluded from the new set-up that might be contemplated. I am not now discussing, nor is it possible to go about, the clauses and the contents of the provision relating to this statutory body. I am only concerned with this, that you must start seriously thinking about the necessity and the need of immediately starting a statutory body. Then the matter must be finally decided on the floor of this House and that body must be constituted. That is the purpose. It is not intended that the executive control should be entirely taken away; it is only intended that the powers are exercised in such a way that Parliament can feel satisfied that the money is well spent and well utilised.

Pandit K. C. Sharma (Meerut Dist. —South): Should it be a substitute for the financial adviser?

Shri Raghavachari: The only point is that we are not satisfied that the present state of indirect control is a just exercise of Parliamentary responsibility under the Constitution. This attitude is not justifiable and not satisfactory. My Resolution, and my purpose, is that Government's attention must be diverted and riveted to the need and the necessity of bringing into existence another body which will certainly exercise the scrutiny and control satisfactorily.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Resolution moved:

"This House is of opinion that Government should immediately set up a Statutory Body to exercise general supervision and control of such industries where the Government has whole or substantial interest, either financial or otherwise."

Shri B. K. Das (Contai): I beg to move:

That for the original Resolution, the following be substituted:

"This House is of opinion that a Statutory Body be set up to advise Government in the matter of exercising proper control and supervision over the industrial undertakings owned and financed by the State either wholly or partially and run as joint stock companies."

Shri S. N. Das (Darbhanga Central): I beg to move:

That for the original Resolution, the following be substituted: —

"This House is of opinion that Government should immediately appoint a Committee consisting of Members of Parliament with power to co-opt others to consider the desirability, necessity and feasibility of having a statutory body to exercise supervision and control of such industries where the Government has whole or substantial interest, either financial or otherwise."

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Amendments moved:

(1) That for the original Resolution, the following be substituted:

"This House is of opinion that a Statutory Body be set up to advise Government in the matter of exercising proper control and supervision over the industrial undertakings owned and financed by the State either wholly or partially and run as joint stock companies."

(2) That for the original Resolution, the following be substituted:

"This House is of opinion that Government should immediately appoint a Committee consisting of Members of Parliament with power to co-opt others to consider the desirability, necessity and feasibility of having a statutory body to exercise supervision and control of such industries where the Government has whole or substantial interest, either financial or otherwise."

[Mr. Deputy-Speaker]

The Mover has taken half an hour. Now we have 1½ hours left. As far as the hon. Minister is concerned, which Minister is going to speak?

Shri K. C. Reddy: Both the Ministers.

Shri T. B. Vittal Rao: Which Minister is going to speak?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Both of them will speak.

Shri K. C. Reddy: I may take 15 to 20 minutes.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: What about the Finance Minister?

Shri A. M. Thomas: He has made his position clear.

Shri C. D. Deshmukh: There is no need for me to intervene except for the fact that the hon. the Mover has constantly referred to what I said on the last occasion. Ten minutes will be sufficient.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Between the two Ministers, half an hour is allotted. The Mover has taken half an hour. Now one hour is left. At the rate of 10 minutes to each hon. Member, we can provide for six hon. Members, the two who have moved amendments and then four other Members.

Shri T. B. Vittal Rao: We have still 1½ hours, because there are 2½ hours.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Two hours had been allotted for this Resolution. Now, I need not ring the bell. Hon. Members must stop of their own accord; they have got clocks all round—in front and in the rear.

Shri B. K. Das: The amendment that I have moved seeks to ensure that the body that is proposed should be of an advisory character and also that its scope should be confined to the companies registered under the Indian Companies Act. I want that our industrial undertakings of this nature should be under one Ministry and I want that if any advisory body is formed, that must work with one Ministry only. However, I beg to point out that because we have got

different kinds of industrial undertakings which are run departmentally, which are run under corporations and which are also run under the Companies Act, there might be different bodies for different sort of corporations, as they have got different characteristics, but my purpose for the present is that there should be one body at least for these undertakings which are run as joint stock companies. I have already pointed out that this advisory body should not itself control or supervise the undertakings. They should act as an adviser to the Government. In order to illustrate my point, I may point out that in 1950 there was established a Development Committee on Industries. For the information of the House, I may point out that the functions of the Committee were set down like this.

"The functions of the Committee would be—

(1) To review the working of industries and to suggest measures to secure—

(a) a full and efficient utilisation of installed capacity including the fixation of targets where necessary, and

(b) reduction of costs of production to a reasonable level while providing conditions in which workers can put forth their best efforts.

(2) To suggest measures for improving or increasing the productive capacity of industries.

(3) To advise on special problems such as the treatment of uneconomic units.

(4) To advise generally on the future development of industries including planning and regionalisation."

[**SHRI BARMAN** in the Chair]

This body was set up with a specific purpose of assisting the Govern-

ment in running the industries efficiently. Of course, the personnel of the Committee is entirely non-official. I do not know whether any official is there; at least there are no Members belonging to the Parliament. I think if such a Committee—I do not know whether the personnel has been changed now—was for the purpose of advising industries in general and this was under the Ministry of Industries and Supply, such an advisory body may be useful for the purpose of the joint stock companies that I have proposed.

My second point is that as we have seen and it was discussed last time also, regarding these joint stock companies or private limited companies—we have so many like the Fertilisers, Hindustan Cables, Hindustan Shipping etc.—Parliament is not able to supervise or exert its control in a proper way, or if it is doing so, it is doing it in a remote way. My purpose is that, if a Parliamentary Committee is associated with the Ministry, then they will be in closer association and they will be able to exercise a closer supervision. They will also be able to advise the Government how to control and how the Parliament also can control these industries.

Last time when this matter was discussed, pointed attention was drawn to several aspects of this matter. We wanted to see what could be the controlling organs; what would be the method of control; what would be the scope of control and what would be the quantum of control. Of course, there may be differences of opinion regarding these, but, for the present I should think, if there be an advisory body associated with the Ministry, the purpose would be served.

The Finance Minister, last time, cautioned this House saying that the time is not yet opportune for setting up any body which might try to con-

trol or to do something in the nature of control which might defeat the very purpose for which this autonomy and this flexibility has been given to these undertakings by setting them up as joint stock companies. I also agree with him that, for the present, at the outset, we should take care that we do nothing which may hamper the progress of these undertakings and for the present we should be satisfied with a Board which will act in an advisory capacity.

What will be the exact scope of the work of this Board, I need not go into much details about that. But, I think if an advisory body under the chairmanship of the Minister of Production is set up, then the budget, policy matters, the management and the method of expenditure, all these things can be discussed from time to time and Parliament also may be satisfied that a body consisting of its Members is there.

Formerly there were Standing Committees associated with several Ministries. Also, we find now that the Planning Commission has set up a Standing Committee. There was a Development Council which met from time to time and they also advised the Planning Commission regarding matters of development. But, as that has not been found very satisfactory a Standing Committee has recently been set up. I think, for our purpose also, if this Advisory Board takes the shape of a Standing Committee, then the purpose will be served.

I think I need not say more because the time is nearly up and my purpose is that for the present we should take a cautious step. An Advisory Board may be set up to advise the Government on matters of proper control and supervision of these industrial undertakings which are being run as limited companies and which may be in future set up as joint stock companies.

बी एच० एन० पास : हमारा माननीय सदस्य ने इस सभा के सामने जो प्रस्ताव रखा है मंजूर स्थान है कि प्रस्ताव के पीछे जो भावना है, उसमें से वह भावना प्रकट नहीं होती। यह बात सही है कि जब हमारी सरकार दिनों दिन उद्योगों को अपने हाथ में ले रही है और यह भी सम्भव है कि कुछ दिनों के बाद हमारा देश में जो दूसरे उद्योग अभी प्राप्त हैं उनका राष्ट्रीयकरण भी हो जाए। इसलिए वह आवश्यक प्रतीत होता है कि जल्दी से जल्दी सरकार इस बात का निर्णय करे कि जो उद्योग इस समय सरकार के हाथ में हैं और आगे जिन उद्योगों को सरकार अपने हाथ में लेना चाहती है उनसे प्रबन्ध का क्या रूप होगा।

जब तक समय समय पर जो बहस इस संबंध में इस सदन में हुई है और सदस्यों ने अपने जो विचार प्रकट किए हैं और समय समय पर हमारा बिल मंत्री जी ने जो विचार प्रकट किए हैं उनसे जमी तक वह स्पष्ट नहीं हो पाया है कि सरकार ने इस सम्बन्ध में अपनी नीति निर्धारण की है या नहीं की। हमारा माननीय सदस्य ने अभी कहा कि कम्प्यूटर एंड ऑडिटर जनरल ने सरकार की इस नीति की कड़ी आलोचना की है कि प्राइवेट लिमिटेड कम्पनियों बनाकर राज्य के उद्योगों को चलाया जाए। माननीय सदस्य को शायद मालूम नहीं कि यह विषय सरकार द्वारा जटॉरनी जनरल के पास भेजा गया था और उससे पूजा गया था कि क्या कंट्रोल्स एंड ऑडिटर्स जनरल का यह विचार कि इस तरह की प्राइवेट लिमिटेड कम्पनियों बनाना हमारा विधान पर एक झट्ट है सही है? मुझे मालूम है कि जटॉरनी जनरल ने कम्प्यूटर एंड ऑडिटर जनरल की राय के खिलाफ अपने विचार प्रकट किए हैं और कहा है कि प्राइवेट लिमिटेड कम्पनियों बनाकर सरकार द्वारा उद्योगों को चलाया जाना विधान के खिलाफ नहीं है। फिर भी यह बहुत ही महत्व का विषय है और जैसा कि विधु मंत्री जी ने एक मौके पर जब कुछ ही

के लिए सभा में यह प्रश्न उठाया गया था कहा था कि सरकार इस पर विचार कर रही है कि दरअसल में किन उद्योगों को सरकार किस संगठन के अंतर्गत से चलाना चाहती है। वरिष्ठ उनके एक बक्तव्य से यह भी प्रकट हुआ था कि अभी जो कम्पनी बिल इस सभा के सामने आने वाली है उसमें इस तरह का एक अध्याय जोड़ा जा रहा है कि प्राइवेट लिमिटेड कम्पनी के प्रबन्ध में राज्य के उद्योग धन्य किस प्रकार चलाये जायेंगे। मालूम नहीं कि जो प्रश्न सीमित बैठे हैं उसमें इस विषय में कहां तक बर्ताव हुआ है। मुझे इस समय इतना ही कहना है कि सरकार के ऊपर जो उद्योगों के संचालन की जिम्मेदारी और बचावदंडी आ रही है उसके सम्बन्ध में सरकार को जल्दी से जल्दी अपनी नीति का निर्णय करना चाहिए।

दो तीन दिन हुए जब मैंने एक प्रश्न उठाया मंत्री यशोधर से किया था और इस सम्बन्ध में मैंने कई प्रश्न दूसरे अधिवेशन में भी किए थे कि क्या सरकार केन्द्र में कोई ऐसा संगठन स्थापित करने का विचार कर रही है जिसके बिन्दुओं में हमारे पास उद्योग हैं उन पर निगरानी रखने का काम हो। बयाप में उत्पादन मंत्री ने बतलाया है कि अभी तक सरकार इस निर्णय पर नहीं पहुँच सकी है। मैंने कहा इतना ही है कि जब राज्य की जिम्मेदारी बढ़ती जा रही है और हम कई-कई उद्योगों का संचालन कर रहे हैं तो हमें जल्दी से जल्दी इस बात का निर्णय करना चाहिए कि किन किन उद्योगों के संचालन के लिए हम किस किस प्रकार की संस्थाओं का निर्माण करेंगे। हम जानते हैं कि रंतबंध उद्योग का संचालन रंतबंध संचालन कर रहा है। हम जानते हैं कि पोस्टल विभाग का संचालन कम्प्यूटरीकरण में निरन्तर कर रही है। लेकिन साथ ही साथ हम यह भी जानते हैं कि जो सिद्धी का कौटिल्लाइन का कारखाना है उसके संचालन के लिए एक प्राइवेट लिमिटेड कम्पनी बनायी गयी

हैं। हम यह भी जानते हैं कि बंगलोर में जो टेलीफोन इंस्टीट्यूट चालू है उसके संचालन के लिए भी एक प्राइवेट लिमिटेड कम्पनी बनायी गयी है। इन संस्थाओं में सरकार ने काफी रुपया लगा रखा है। सवाल यह है कि इन संस्थाओं के संचालन में कितना अधिकार सरकार को है, कितना अधिकार संसद को है, कितना अधिकार मंत्री को है, और इनकी निगमानी और नियंत्रण में किस हद तक सरकार का हाथ रहेगा यह निर्णय नहीं हुआ है।

इस समय देश में जो विचार धाराएँ चल रही हैं। एक विचारधारा तो यह है कि एक बात यदि किसी उद्योग का संचालन भाग किसी संस्था को दे दिया जाए तो फिर उसके कार्य में सरकार की तरह से कम से कम हस्तक्षेप होना चाहिए। दूसरी तरफ यह विचारधारा है, जो इस संसद के बहुत से माननीय सदस्य दूसरी विचारधारा के मानने वाले हैं, कि जब तक किसी संस्था में या किसी उद्योग में स्पष्ट तन्त्रा है तो उसका कार्य है कि वह उस पर सरकार और संसद के द्वारा प्रभावित निगमानी, निरीक्षण और नियंत्रण रखे। एक दिल्‍लिवासी हमारी यह है कि हम टेलिफोन के प्रीतीनीध हैं और उस हीनियत में हमें यह अधिकार है कि हम देखें कि जो ठपया हम किसी संस्था को उद्योग चलाने के लिए देते हैं वह संस्था उस उद्योग को ठीक प्रकार से और प्रितन्त्रयता के साथ चलाती है या नहीं। दूसरी ओर हम उपभोक्ता के भी प्रीतीनीध हैं और उस हीनियत से हमारा यह कर्तव्य होता है कि हम यह देखें कि उस उद्योग के द्वारा जो माल तैयार होता है वह ठीक प्रकार का है या नहीं और प्रितन्त्रयता के साथ तैयार किया जाता है या नहीं। इसीलिए यह विषय बड़ा महत्वपूर्ण है और मैंत रूपत है कि शासक सरकार को जिसना ध्यान इस पर देना चाहिए उसना यह नहीं है रही है, अथवा यह यह नहीं सांच पा रही है कि इस बदती हुई जिम्मेदारी को निभाने के लिए किस प्रकार का संगठन कायम किया जाय। एक सवाल है संगठन को कायम करने का। दूसरा सवाल यह है कि उस

संगठन पर सरकार का, संसद का नियंत्रण किस तरह का हो और तीसरा सवाल यह है कि जो सरकारी विभाग है उसका नियंत्रण और निगमानी उस संगठन पर कैसे होगी। यह इतने महत्वपूर्ण सवाल हैं कि जिन पर जल्दी में निर्णय कर लेना भी अच्छा नहीं। इसीलिए हमने जो बंसाधन रखा है उसका अन्वय है कि राष्ट्रीय उद्योग और व्यवसायिक संस्थाओं के कार्य पर नियंत्रण और निगमानी रखने के लिए एक सीपीएच संस्था निर्माण करने की आवश्यकता पर संसद की एक समिति द्वारा विचार किया जायगा। साथ ही यह भी अच्छी है कि राष्ट्रीय उद्योगों को चलाने के लिए किस तरह का संगठन होना चाहिए, उसके अधिकार और उत्तरदायित्व क्या होंगे और उसका कितना अधिकार छूट होगा। कहाँ तक वह संगठन सरकार के नियंत्रण में काम करेगा, कहाँ तक उस पर संसद का और संसद के द्वारा मंत्री का उस पर अधिकार होगा।

इसीलिए जो मैंने बंसाधन रखा है उसकी भावना यह है कि इन सब प्रश्नों पर यदि सरकार विचार कर रही है तो अच्छी बात है लेकिन संसद के सदस्यों को भी मौका देना चाहिए कि वे इस सारे प्रश्न पर सब टिप्पणियों से विचार करके अपने विचार सरकार और देश के सामने रखें कि उनका तात्कालिक उद्योगों को चलाने के बारे में क्या विचार है, कहाँ तक उन उद्योगों पर संसद का और संसद के द्वारा मंत्री का अधिकार होना चाहिए और जो संस्था उद्योग को चलाने के लिए बनायी जायगी उसके अधिकार का दायर क्या होगा और उसकी जवाबदेही क्या होगी, उनका एक दूसरे से क्या सम्बन्ध होगा। इन सारी बातों के सम्बन्ध में जानकारी हमिलत करके संसद के सामने रिपोर्ट पेश करने के लिए एक समिति बनायी जाय और यदि ऐसा किया गया तो मैं समझता हूँ कि इस सम्बन्ध में जो अन्वकार सा मान्य होता है और जो यह विचारधारा साफ नहीं मान्य होती वह साफ हो जायगी और अन्वकार नहीं रहेगा। मैं चाहता

[श्रीरस० एन० दास]

हूँ कि संसद के सदस्यों की यह सीमित बने जो इस सम्बन्ध में सारं पहलुओं पर विचार करके संसद के सामने अपनी रिपोर्ट पेश करें और उस रिपोर्ट पर फिर हम सरकार के साथ विचार करें। इस प्रकार हम समझते हैं कि इस कल्याणकारी राज्य के अन्तर्गत जो बड़े बड़े उद्योग हम अपने दिमाग में लेने वाले हैं उनके विषय में हमारा विभाग साफ हो जाएगा। अगर इस विषय में हमारा विभाग साफ नहीं रहेगा तो आगे हम उद्योगों के उत्तरदायित्व को ठीक से निभा नहीं सकेंगे। इसलिए संसद के सदस्यों की एक कमेंट्री बनाना हमारे लिए बहुत ही आवश्यक है। मैं समझता हूँ कि सरकार को इस प्रस्ताव को मान लेना चाहिए ताकि संसद के सदस्यों को अपने विचार प्रकट करने का और दूसरे लोगों के विचारों को, जो कि उद्योगों का अनुभव रखते हैं, समझने का अवसर प्राप्त हो, और हम दूसरों के अनुभव से लाभ उठा सकें।

Shri A. M. Thomas: I regret my inability to agree to the Resolution that has been moved by my friend Shri Raghavachari. According to me, the Resolution is ill-timed and ill-conceived. The Deputy-Speaker, while he was in the Chair, has raised some doubts, as also the hon. Finance Minister, and my friend Shri Raghavachari has not been able to dispel the doubts on the floor of the House. What exactly is the pattern that he contemplates in this Resolution? In moving the Resolution and in speaking upon it, he has raised some doubts which were raised nearly a year and seven days ago when Dr. Lanka Sundaram raised a discussion on parliamentary control of public corporations with his usual, "tremendous sense of urgency." I think the speech then made by the hon. Finance Minister was calculated to dispel the doubts which have been raised by my friend, Shri Raghavachari, while speaking on this Resolution. The Resolution is wide enough, as he contemplates the con-

trol of industries not only in the public sector but even in the private sector. The Resolution says:

"...Government should immediately set up a Statutory Body to exercise general supervision and control of such industries where the Government has whole or substantial interest, either financial or otherwise".

So, the word "otherwise", I think, will take in all sorts of interests, and the Government, I need not say, has got interest even in private enterprises. But I do not want to enter upon any hair-splitting argument to oppose my friend's Resolution. My friend made it clear what he intends. What he intends is the setting up of a corporation to control industries run in the public sector, that is, state-managed concerns. After all, apart from taking over the railway concerns and communications, it is a matter of recent growth that the State has begun to enter into the industrial sector and set up concerns of its own. We know that the full-fledged resources of the Production Ministry were being mobilised for the creation of new production units only in 1952. The real problem had been, what exactly should be the type of management of these industries, how utmost efficiency is to be assured, having regard to the rigidity and red-tapism of State administration. We all say that for running industrial undertakings on a commercial basis there should necessarily be some sort of flexibility and freedom of action and also quickness of action. We get these features in the private sector and we have to import these healthy features into the management of the public sector by the State. One has also to concede that the irksome and inquisitorial procedure that are usually adopted in Government departments have also to be avoided in the management of these industries. You know that private interests have to be

associated with the management of these industries. We have to requisition foreign capital and technical skill and we have to utilise their services. So, having regard to these circumstances, what exactly is the sort of management that the Government has to undertake in respect of the management of these industrial concerns has been a matter of considerable thought as far as the Government is concerned. And I should think that the form of management that has now been devised combines in itself what is best in business with what is best in public service, that is the State-owned private limited liability companies. We know that for managing our various industrial undertakings private limited companies have been formed; for the convenient administration of the Sindri factory, a State-owned private limited company known as the Sindri Fertilisers and Chemicals was registered in 1951. To control and manage the Telephone Cable Factory there is the Government's private limited company named the Hindustan Cables, Limited. That has also been registered under the Indian Companies Act. The control and management of the Machine Tool Factory has been transferred to the Hindustan Machine Tools, Ltd., Bangalore. I do not wish to enumerate the various companies which have been registered under the Indian Companies Act for running these various industrial concerns.

Now, what are the doubts that have been raised by my hon. friend Shri Raghavachari? I have already stated that the same doubts were raised by my hon. friend Dr. Lanka Sundaram in 1953. While analysing the points that he has raised, to me it appears that he exhibits an anxiety that Parliament should have full opportunities of examining how these concerns work, and Parliament should also have the right to discuss the working of these institutions without interfering in their day to

day working. In short, he wants supervisory powers over these concerns. He pleaded that the management should have the liability to account to the State.—the State is the shareholder in these concerns—just as a joint stock company has the liability to account to its shareholders. Now, what we have to see is whether because of the company form of management effective and desirable—I deliberately use the word desirable—control, have been taken away from Parliament.

We know that in the United Kingdom nationalised industries are mostly run by statutory corporations. Sir, I submit that because of the formation of these concerns into private limited companies, the authority which Parliament can exercise on the working of these concerns is more than what Parliament in the United Kingdom is able to exercise over concerns which have been incorporated into statutory corporations.

Sir, what is it that we require. As things stand, the position is this. All the funds required are brought before Parliament for sanction; withdrawal of money from the Consolidated Fund takes place only with the approval of Parliament; it is obtained in the form of Demands for Grants. Then, how does Parliament usually exercise control? That is by questioning the Minister, by a debate on the Budget and then by discussion over the annual reports and statements of accounts. I think all these things are being done now although these concerns are registered as private limited companies. Apart from rules and regulations, that is the convention that we really lay down in these matters that is more important. I do not think the Production Minister has shirked the responsibility of answering any questions concerning these undertakings which have been tabled. If at all he has not given any information with

[Shri A. M. Thomas.]

regard to anything that information will not have been given in the interest of the public, even if these concerns had not been incorporated into limited concerns.

Then my hon. friend asked: What exactly is the control of the Auditor-General? I have got the relevant paragraphs—I do not want to read them—in the Articles of Association of these companies investing the Auditor-General with the power to have an independent external audit, in addition to the audit which is prescribed under the Companies Act and which is being done. In the case of the Sindh Fertilisers and Chemicals, Ltd., paragraph 118 of the Articles of Association provides for that. In the case of the Hindustan Shipyard, paragraph 183 provides for that. I do not want to catalogue the various articles which empower the Auditor-General to audit their accounts. We have considered the pros and cons and I should think if at all there are any drawbacks in this company from management, they are outweighed by the various advantages that we obtain by this sort of management. We have got the advantage of normal rules and regulations of commercial undertakings being worked in these undertakings; and a reasonably high standard of efficiency can be ensured only if these institutions are managed on commercial lines and commercial forms of accounting is maintained.

Shri M. S. Guruswamy: The hon. Member who preceded me said that the Resolution is misconceived and ill-timed. The hon. the Finance Minister also a few minutes ago interrupted and said that he did not understand what the Mover of the Resolution meant. This shows that in this matter of exercising supervision and control, all of us, including the Finance Minister, are groping in the dark. We have no proper conception of control and supervision over State enterprises. We have still to

evolve a system, of proper and effective system of control and supervision.

What are we having today? There is a Planning Commission. It makes a plan. There is the executive which carries out the plan. Then there is Parliament which occasionally passes a few comments or criticisms on the plan. And there is no body today for exercising effective supervision or control over the industries.

Some hon. Members have confused between control and supervision and management of the industries. We are not concerned here with the actual day to day management of industry, or the setting up of industries, or policy making. These questions are irrelevant to the present occasion. The hon. the Finance Minister said that every enterprise should be run according to plan, according to the policy enunciated by Government. We agree. But how to do it? After we decide upon the policy, the question of running the industry on proper lines would assume importance. Today there is woeful lack of proper machinery for exercising effective control and supervision over State enterprises. State enterprises are not having a uniform pattern in India. There are different types of managements adopted. There are enterprises directly under the Ministry or the Departments. There are enterprises under the public corporations. And there are enterprises run by the private limited companies. Further, there are enterprises in the defence sector and in the non-defence sector. You will see that we have no uniform system of management and uniform pattern of public enterprise here. We have adopted two or three kinds of systems and that is why it makes all the more necessary for us to have an independent statutory body for exercising overall control and supervision over all these wide areas of State enterprise.

Mr. Chairman: May I ask: what would be the nature of control by this statutory body vis-a-vis Ministerial control?

Shri M. S. Gurupadaswamy: I will come to that. So far, Government or Parliament has got some control or supervision over those enterprises which are not in the defence sector. But in the matter of defence most of the Members are under a handicap. We do not know whether the defence industries are run on proper lines. On the ground of secrecy much of the material is kept away from us. We do not know what is happening in the defence installations. We do not know whether the money that is being spent there is being spent well or not.

Shri C. D. Deshmukh: In the defence installations, there are no corporations or companies working. If the hon. Members are not getting information, it may be that in certain respects, for reasons of secrecy, it is denied. Otherwise, every kind of information is available to Parliament from the executive.

Shri M. S. Gurupadaswamy: As I said, on the ground of secrecy we are denied of much information. I am not making it a grievance against the Minister. What I want to say is that if there is a statutory board like this to exercise control and supervision over both the civilian public sector and defence sector, it would be better.

Shri M. L. Dwlvedt (Hamirpur Distt.): I rise on a point of order. The hon. Finance Minister had just said that the information might not be available for Members on account of secrecy. I want to submit that when we discussed the Budget here which involves an expenditure of Rs. 400 crores, we got all kinds of information for the public sector. We are spending crores of rupees. But no information is being given to Parlia-

ment. There is no opportunity for discussing the matter except these two hours. Therefore, I wanted to tell you that this sort of secrecy should not be maintained in these cases where public money is involved.

Mr. Chairman: That is another matter altogether. It is not a point of order. When the hon. Finance Minister says that some information might be kept back because of secrecy, that is a ministerial privilege rather. There could be no point of order in regard to that.

Shri C. D. Deshmukh: The only reason why I intervened was that the hon. Member based an argument on this that in defence installations, Parliament is not aware of how the administration is run and therefore, we want a corporation. All I said was that so far as defence is concerned, it is the direct responsibility of the executive and if some information is not received, that is for other reasons and not for the absence of a statutory corporation.

Shri S. N. Das: On a point of order, Sir. The Chair had not given a ruling on the point of order raised by the hon. Member.

Mr. Chairman: I have already said that it is a Ministerial privilege to keep back from this House certain information which they consider to be secret. That is my ruling.

Shri Gurupadaswamy: The responsibility of running defence industries will not be taken away by merely setting up a statutory body like this. On the other hand, what I want to say is that the setting up of such a body would improve the working of defence installations without coming in the way of secrecy. If such a body is established there will be greater facility and scope for supervision and control.

Shri C. D. Deshmukh: By whom?

Shri M. S. Gurusadaswamy: By the statutory body.

Shri C. D. Deshmukh: Who will supervise the statutory body?

Shri M. S. Gurusadaswamy: It is a statutory body and it has got to function as such. Parliament has to decide what functions and responsibilities that this statutory body should exercise. Government should come forward with a Bill for that purpose.

There is another reason why I say that there should be a statutory body. Private enterprise is old and established but State enterprise is rather new and still is in experimental stage. Moreover we have various types of management under the public sector. It is better that there is an independent, overall controlling body to assess and compare which type of management is better than the rest. For instance, we do not know whether Corporation management or departmental management is better. Opinion is equally divided on this matter. Some hon. Members feel strongly that autonomous public corporations are ideal. Others feel that the departmental management is better. Some say that if there is no departmental management, it is no nationalisation at all. So opinion is very much divided. But if we are able to compare the results of various managements, we may perhaps be able to come to a definite conclusion as to which type of management is better than the other. To know this, it is desirable to have a statutory body.

Some hon. Members are thinking that this Resolution has no meaning. It is full of meaning. We are creating a new way. There is no such parallel in England. It is completely original. If you set up such a body as this, I feel that we will be in a better position to know the relative merits of various types of management for the public sector and also will be able to

control and supervise these enterprises in a much more effective way.

श्री एम० ए० गुरुकर (मंडार)---रीडर---
अनुचित जाणियां) : मेरा इतना नहीं था कि इस प्रस्ताव पर मैं अपनी तब जाहिर करूँ लेकिन मैं सम्झता हूँ कि वह उचित ही होगा कि नागपुर शहर में नागपुर इलेक्ट्रिक लाइट एंड पावर हाऊस कंपनी के संचालकों और कर्मचारियों में चल रही एक लड़ाई जिसको कि मैं छोड़कर बहाना जाया हूँ उसके बारे में मैं अपने अनुभव पार्लमेंट के सामने रखूँ। नागपुर में एक इलेक्ट्रिक लाइट एंड पावर हाऊस कंपनी है, जो कि इलेक्ट्रिसिटी सप्लाई एक्ट, १९४८ के नियमानुसार चलनी चाहिये। इस एक्ट के मुताबिक ५ फीसदी से ज्यादा डिबिटेंट नहीं दिया जा सकता लेकिन इस कंपनी के मैनेजिंग डाइरेक्टर और दूसरे लोगों ने वह सब कर लिया है कि ५ फीसदी नहीं, १० फीसदी और १५ फीसदी डिबिटेंट देना चाहिए और वह ऐसा करता भी रहे हैं। यह सब कुछ बल्लेंटा शीट में माँद है। बल्लेंटा शीट से पता चलता कि इस कंपनी में कितनी थॉपल काजी चल रही है। अब उस कंपनी के मांतिकों ने वह सब किया है कि मजदूरों को निकाल दिया जाए। और १२० कर्मचारियों को नौकरों से हटा दिया गया। इस पर हम उन को भित्तन भए और मजदूरों की तकलीफें उन के सामने रखीं और कहा कि वह बिचारें भूलें मर रहे हैं, इन को न निकाला जाए। मैं ने देखा है कि १९४८ का इलेक्ट्रिक सप्लाई एक्ट होने हुए भी उस की मांविजन को कंटावीन किया जाता है और गवर्नमेंट इस तरह कोई ध्यान नहीं देती। नागपुर इलेक्ट्रिक लाइट एंड पावर हाऊस कंपनी के बारे में ही देख लीजिए कि वहाँ पर जब मजदूर कितनी तकलीफ में हैं और किस तरह से इस कंपनी के मांतिक इस एक्ट की प्राविजंस को कंटावीन कर रहे हैं। इस कर्त एक एंसी बाड़ी की बड़ी जरूरत है जो कि यह देखे कि मजदूरों को बिना किसी वजह के न निकाला जाए और मांतिक अपनी मन मानी न कर सकें।

इस बाड़ी को यह बंधनकार होना चाहिए कि वह दलें कि कारोबार ठीक तरह से चलता रहे और उत्पादन भी बढ़े। इन सब चीजों की देखभाल करने के लिए मैं यह वादागत कि एक कंट्रोलिंग बाड़ी बना दी जाए बिनाका काम यह भी देना हो कि हमारा देश की उपाय बढ़े।

दूसरी बात जो मैं कहना चाहता हूँ वह है एग्जिस्यूटिव टैलेंट्स मिल के बारे में जो कि नागपुर में कपड़े का एक बहुत बड़ा कारोबार कर रही हैं। वहाँ भी मजदूरों को निकाला जाता है और वहाँ अफसरों को भर्ती किया जाता है। यह तरीका भी ज़रूरत मुक्त है।

श्री एस० एम० शिंदे : यह सब प्राइवेट मिल की बातें कर रहे हैं जो कि इस रोज़गार के स्कार्प से बाहर हैं।

श्री एन० ए० बोरकर : मद्रास नहीं, गवर्नमेंट का भी इसमें इंटरैस्ट है।

Shri Gadhwal Vyas (Ujjain): All this is private undertaking.

Shri C. D. Deshmukh: This seems to be covered by the word "otherwise" in the resolution, because Government has an interest otherwise. I think, therefore, that the hon. Member is in order.

श्री एस० ए० बोरकर : मैं ज्यादा न कहते हुए इतना ज़ब्त करना चाहता हूँ कि यह जो प्रस्ताव इस सदन में पेश किया गया है यह बहुत ही जरूरी है और एक ऐसे बाड़ी बनाई जानी चाहिए जो कि यह सब कि इन कम्पनियों वगैरह में काम ठीक ढंग से चलता रहे और मजदूरों को किसी तरह का नुकसान न होवे पाए उन पर अत्याचार बंद हो जाय, और उत्पादन भी बढ़े।

श्री एस० एम० शिंदे : वहाँ तक पब्लिक सैक्टर का सवाल है मैं सरकार को इस बात के तौर पर ध्यान देना चाहता हूँ कि उसने एक ऐसा कदम उठाया है जिस से देश को उन्नत करने में बड़ी भारी सफलता मिलती है। मैं सम्मति हूँ कि इस सैक्टर को वहाँ तक मुक्ति हो

सके बढ़ाना चाहिए और मद्रास सैक्टर के लिए पब्लिक ही लिमिटेड स्कोप होना चाहिए। यह मैं इस वक़्त कहता हूँ कि जब कभी देश में संकट आता है या तबाही पड़ जाती है या चीजों की कमी हो जाती है तो उस वक़्त मद्रास सैक्टर कंपस अपन फायर के लिए और लोगों को एक्सप्लॉइट करने के लिए ही काम करता है और उसको चीजों के उत्पादन को बढ़ाने की इच्छा नहीं होती और न ही वह यह चाहता है कि इस में ज्यादा धन लगाया जाय जिस से कि देश का भला हो; इसलिए वहाँ तक पब्लिक सैक्टर को बढ़ाने का सवाल है मैं इसका स्वागत करता हूँ। अब जो मूल्य प्रश्न हमारा सामने है वह उसके प्रबन्ध का है। हम यह देख रहे हैं कि जितने भी उद्योग हमारा देश में खोलें जा रहे हैं उन में काम करने वाले कर्मचारियों की शर्तें भिन्न भिन्न हैं और भिन्न भिन्न तरीकों से वहाँ का काम चलाया जाता है। इसके बजाय रुपये की बहुत हीन हो रही है, क्योंकि देखभाल करने के लिए जो व्यवस्था इसने की है वह ठीक नहीं है। यह सब सरकारी कर्मचारियों पर निर्भर करता है कि वे इस रुपये को जो कि उनकी डिसपेंडेंस पर रख दिया जाता है किस प्रकार इस्तेमाल करते हैं। एक सैक्टरी महोदय जो कि लिमिटेड कम्पनी के सेवरमेंट बन जाते हैं उनके पास इतना उपकाश नहीं होता कि वह तमाम चीजों का सुपरविजन कर सकें या देखभाल कर सकें। करने को तो कहा जाता है कि तमाम देश भर में वगैरह जगह काम हो रहे हैं, उनमें बड़ी भारी प्रगति हो रही है और देश बहुत उन्नति कर रहा है, लेकिन मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि रुपये का ठीक ढंग से उपयोग नहीं किया जा रहा है और बहुत सा रुपया फूट ज्वब किया जाता है। मैं ने एक बार वित्त मंत्री महोदय से यह पूछा था कि इन सब उद्योगों में फिलनी एंटी लगाई गई है और पब्लिक महोदय ने वापस किया था कि वे यह इन्फ्लेमेशन हाउस को सफाई करेंगे। लेकिन अभी तक उन्होंने ने कोई एंटी इन्फ्लेमेशन सफाई नहीं की। मैं

(श्री एम० एन० द्विवेदी)

मंत्री महोदय से पूछता चाहता हूँ कि अभी तक उन्होंने ने वह इन्फर्मेशन सप्लाई क्यों नहीं की ? क्या ईश को और इस सदन को यह चीज पूछने का हक हासिल नहीं है ? क्या ईश को और इस सदन को यह जानने का हक नहीं है कि यह सब उद्योग किस ढंग पर चल रहे हैं, क्या इन में कोई नफा हो रहा है या नुकसान हो रहा है, सालाना बिलियन आंकड़ें क्या हैं इत्यादि ? मैं ने अपने आंकड़ें इकट्ठा किये हैं और उनके अनुसार पंचवर्षीय प्लान के अन्दर आप ने प्रोग्रेस रिपोर्ट में लिखा है कि उद्योगों में आप लौं करोड़ रुपये खर्च कर रहे हैं और अगर सभी सरकारी उद्योग आप ले लें तो उस में तकरीबन दो हजार करोड़ रुपये व्यय होंगे। लेकिन मैं विच मंत्री जी से पूछता हूँ कि वह यह सब आंकड़ें अभी तक हमें क्यों सप्लाई नहीं कर सके हैं ? ४०० करोड़ रुपये को आप बजट में दिखाते हैं और इस पर आप इस सदन में वाद-विवाद करते हैं, लेकिन यह बतलाने की तकलीफ ग्वाता नहीं की जाती कि इन उद्योगों में कितनी पूंजी लगाई गई है और इन का काम किस ढंग में चल रहा है और आगे क लिए आप किस ढंग से चलाने का विचार कर रहे हैं। यह सब बातें सदन के सामने जरूर आनी चाहिए। मैं यह सब बातें जानने के लिए मंत्रियों से भी जाकर मिला हूँ और जब एक बात पूछने के लिए मैं एक मन्त्री के पास जाता हूँ तो वह कहते हैं कि यह किसी दूसरे मन्त्री का महकमा है और आप उनके पास जाइये और जब उनके पास जाता हूँ तो वह कहते हैं कि तीसरे के पास जाइये। मैं इन्डियन टेलीफोन इंडस्ट्री की ही बात करता हूँ। जब इसके बारे में मैं विच मंत्री जी से पूछने गया तो उन्होंने कहा कि यह कम्प्यूनिफिकेशन मिनिस्टर का महकमा है आप उनके पास जाइये और जब मैं उन के पास जाता हूँ तो वह कहते हैं कि आप विच मंत्री के पास जाइये। तब मैं कहने का प्रयत्न यह है कि आज कोई एग्जिक्टिव मंत्री नहीं है कोई कोऑर्डिनेशन नहीं है।

आज बहरत इस बात की है कि इन सब इंडस्ट्री का काम सुचारु ढंग से चले और उनमें कोऑर्डिनेशन हो। आज यह दोनों ही नहीं हैं। इन्डियन टेलीफोन इंडस्ट्री में मैं ने देखा कि एक बड़े जफसत ने अपना सात नौकर करवा लिया और उसको भात खरीदने की जगह पर लगा दिया। जब भी कोई माल टैंकर के जरिये उसे खरीदने को कहा जाता था तो वह कागजात को दबा कर बँट जाता था और जब डिमांड बहुत एम्बेड हो जाती थी तो वह कहता था कि बाजार से खरीद कर ली जाए और चूकि टैंकर के जरिये वह चीज इतनी जल्दी मंगाई नहीं जा सकती थी तबतनी उल्ती उस चीज की बहरत होती थी इस वारते उस चीज को बाजार से तोकली खरीद करने की ही इजाजत दी जाती थी और वह मन माले दामों पर ही खरीद कर ली जाती थी। इस तरह से उसने काफ़ी रुपया कमाया। आसिरकार जब पब्लिक एकाउंट्स कमिटी ने इस चीज को हिट्टेड किया तो उसे नौकरी से निकाल दिया गया। इस कमिटी के पास इतना बक्त नहीं है कि वह इन सब चीजों में जाए और यह अधिकारियों का ही फर्ज होना चाहिए कि वे इन को दस्त दें। इतना ही नहीं जै इन्फर्मेशन सप्लाई की जाती है वह भी गलत सप्लाई की जाती है। आई० टी० आई० की ही मिसाल ले लीजिए। मैं वहाँ पर गया और मैं ने उनसे पूछा कि कितनी एसी चीजें हैं जो कि आप भारत में ही बना लेते हैं और कितनी एसी चीजें हैं जो कि आप बाहर से मंगाते हैं। मुझे बताया गया कि २० फसदी चीजें बाहर से मंगाई जाती हैं और ८० फसदी चीजें वहीं पर तैयार की जाती हैं। मैंने पूछा कि कुल उत्पादन में कितनी चीजें लगती हैं तो मुझे बताया गया कि ५००। फिर मैंने पूछा कि हिट्टुस्तान से कितनी चीजें मिलती हैं तो उन्होंने कहा कि ५०। अब आप बदायल लगाइये कि उन्होंने कितनी गलत और कंफ़ीडिस्टरी इन्फर्मेशन इन्ने सप्लाई की। पहले तो उन्होंने कहा कि सिर्फ २० बी सदी

वीजें बाहर से मंगाई जाती हैं और बाद में कहा कि ५० वीजें हिन्दुस्तान में पैदा होती हैं और ४५० बाहर से मंगाई जाती हैं। इन सब चीजों को देखते हुए किस तरह से परीक्षक का दिनामा ठीक ढंग से काम कर सकता है और किस तरह से संसद सदस्य ठीक तरह से सांच सकते हैं। तो जरूरत इस बात की है कि इन सब चीजों को आब ठीक तरह से जैन करें और देखें कि इन में ठीक ढंग से सर्व किया जा रहा है। जब इन उद्योगों में हम बड़ी बड़ी रकमें खर्च कर रहे हैं तो हमारा यह कर्ज भी हो जाता है कि हम देखें कि यह ठीक ढंग से खर्च हो रही है। कोई साल भर हुआ मैंने एक बिल पेश किया था जिसमें मैंने एक खोजना बना कर रखी है कि हमें चाहिए कि हम एक कंट्रोल बोर्ड की नियुक्ति करें जिस में बहुमत अधिकारियों का न हो बल्कि जनता के प्रतिनिधियों का हो। वह बोर्ड हो जनता के प्रतिनिधियों का। जो उन कार्यों को सम्भालें जो उनका उसमें प्रतिनिधित्व हो। जबतक किसी काम में एक्सपर्ट भाग नहीं लेते तबतक वह अच्छी तरह से नहीं चल सकता। तो मैं चाहता हूँ कि एक कंट्रोल बोर्ड बनाया जाय और वह उनकी जिम्मेदारी रखी जाय कि वह देखें कि जो हमारा उद्योग है उनकी किस तरह से जगें बढ़ाया जाय, कैसे उनकी उन्नति की जाय और कैसे उनमें एक रूपता लायी जाय। अगर इंग्लैंड अभी तक इस मसले को हल नहीं कर पाया है तो इसका यह मतलब नहीं है कि भारत में भी ऐसा करने की प्रयत्न नहीं है। वहाँ एक से एक बॉय आदमी मौजूद हैं। जाय उनको जपान विदेश में तें तमी आपके उद्योग धर्म उन्हें बढ़ सकेंगे। और वीज आब बोर्ड से ब्यूरोकेट लोगों के हाथ में सार अधिकार रखेंगे तो आपकी बड़ी बढ़नामी होगी। जनता में अभी भी इस बात पर चिन्ता है कि इस बात पर सरकार गलती नहीं कर रही है। इसलिए मैं प्रार्थना करता हूँ बिल मंत्री और प्रोटेक्शन मंत्री से और भी मंत्रियों से बिल के पास सरकारी उद्योग हैं कि वे इन प्रश्नों को संसद के सामने

सार्य ताकि इस चीज को सफलतापूर्वक आगे बढ़ाया जा सके।

Shri R. K. Chaudhuri (Gauhati): The Mover of this Resolution has, in spite of his Party leanings, always held the House beholden to him. Whatever he says is heard with great respect. I personally have very great regard for him. All the same, I am compelled to disagree with him and I must wholeheartedly oppose this Resolution.

I consider that we have had too much control in this country over industries.

Shri M. S. Gurupadaswamy: No self control.

Shri R. K. Chaudhuri: We are still in a formative stage. The less the State or any statutory body has a right to supervise and control, the better it would be for industry and for the country as a whole. Such a sort of Resolution may come a few years later when we will be on a firm footing so far as industries are concerned. I am afraid my words will carry little weight. (Some Hon. Members: No, no). I think the hon. Finance Minister is already half inclined to support this Resolution. I say there is another reason for which I feel that I am out of place. It is as if we are praising a king when there is no kingdom. Sometimes, we have to praise kings even when there is not even a single kingdom. We have no industry in Assam. We are in the 7th year of freedom and the fourth year of my hon. friend's guidance of this country. We have practically no industries of a major nature, either financed by the Government or otherwise, in Assam.

By the way, I do not really understand the meaning of the word 'otherwise'. In our rent bills, as you must have seen, there are headings, so much for furniture, so much for flower bed, so much for this and that, and so

{Shri R. K. Chaudhuri}

much for other services. I have always wondered what sort of other services we are getting. Some Members may be more fortunate in getting other services in their houses

Hon. Members: None.

Shri R. K. Chaudhuri: I have no idea of this word 'otherwise' in this Resolution.

I come from Assam and I was speaking of Assam. In Assam, we have no industries. Of course, we have a lot of cottage industries. In the memo issued by the Government of India about industrial policy, it is said that in Assam, there is improvement in the tea industry, improvement in silk rearing and other industries. I do not know how far we have improved these industries. But, the credit for the improvement in the tea industry does not go to the Government at all. Although I boast of the tea there and want to induce my hon. friends to drink more tea for their own benefit, it is no credit to me nor to the credit of the people of Assam that the tea industry in Assam is what it is today. We have not contributed anything either towards its upkeep or its improvement. What that memo says and what each Member should read with great pain is that a sugar mill, a jute mill, and a paper mill are going to be shortly established in Assam. I have tried to understand the meaning of the word 'shortly'. So far as the Government is concerned, whenever that word is used, it means indefinite delay, nothing less than indefinite delay. I want to ask frankly what the Government of India has done so far for furtherance of industries in that State.

In 1946 when the people had money in their hands,—particularly after the war, some people in Assam had some money in their hands—they wanted to start a textile mill, they wanted to start a jute mill and also a paper mill. As it is known to the

hon. Minister, there are very great facilities for the establishment of a paper mill in Assam, far greater than are available in any other State in India. Bamboo grows in abundance. The bamboo pulp is either exported or wasted there. There is no chance of large scale exportation on account of the communications bottle-neck. Will this House believe that for four months in a year, we have no railway communication with outside Assam? There is no railway communication absolutely. Therefore, all the bamboo pulp is completely wasted and there is no chance of having a paper mill there.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. Member's time is up.

Shri R. K. Chaudhuri: I shall finish in two minutes. About the textile mill, actually some spindles were purchased and some private enterprise was about to be started in 1947. Down came the Government of India saying, no private enterprise, we shall finance the entire enterprise. But, no capital was issued and no company was allowed to work. The whole thing was entirely stopped. Two years afterwards, the Government of India said that they are not going to nationalise any of these industries.

I say that I should not like to have any Resolution which might fetter the hands of the Government at the present stage which might interfere with the inward working of the industrial organisation. The least we could do is to establish industries where such industries are urgently needed. I would appeal to my hon. friend....

Mr. Chairman: Order, order, I cannot allow the hon. Member to go on. His time is up.

Shri R. K. Chaudhuri: May I finish the sentence?

Mr. Chairman: It should not be a complex sentence.

Shri E. K. Chaudhuri: A simple sentence. It is this. I would appeal to the hon. Mover of this Resolution to withdraw this Resolution and come forward with a similar Resolution when Assam has become a big industrially organised State.

Shri C. D. Deshmukh: Contrary to the half-hearted apprehension of the speaker who spoke last, I rise to oppose both the main Resolution as well as the amendments moved to it.

So far as the Mover of the Resolution is concerned, I must protest against the somewhat vague terms in which he has made reference to the observations made by me. He says that the Finance Minister has made certain observations in respect of this problem and he appears to my mind to have practically conceded the case for such a body. I have re-read my speech, and I cannot find anything in support of this observation. Anyway, he is welcome to draw whatever inference he can from the words which I uttered on that occasion.

Shri Raghavachari: rose—

Shri C. D. Deshmukh: I have got no time, Sir.

Then, he said that the Finance Minister in his own language put it "in good time". I have again failed to discover in my speech the words "in good time". At one place I have used the words "at the proper time", and in another place I have used the words "in fullness of time", but I have never used the words "in good time", and those words have been used in quite a different context.

In re-reading my speech I discovered that so far as the general issue of management of Government concerns is concerned, I said:

"So far as the general issue is concerned, it is that of the efficient conduct of State enterprises, and I myself think it

would have been desirable had we had full-dress debate on the general issue of how to manage State enterprises".

And therefore in a sense I welcome this discussion that has been initiated by this particular Resolution, although I am very disappointed both by the content of the discussion and the form in which this recommendation has been couched. It would have been very much better and greatly to our advantage had we first studied the different forms that are in existence in this country, that are in existence in other countries and gleaned what their experience in the matter has been, waited for, as I suggested, a certain amount of further experience on our part and then undertaken this debate in order to clear our ideas. It would not then have been necessary to express our conclusion in one particular form. What I mean is, we might easily have come to the conclusion that in some cases a departmental management is best, in other cases perhaps a company form of management would be preferable, and in certain other cases, again, perhaps some form of corporation would be the most suitable form in which to manage a Government enterprise.

Anyway, we are here in the midst of this discussion, and I have to answer now the few points that have been raised. Before I do so, I should like again to draw attention to what would be regarded as a constitutional platitude, viz., that so far as distribution of power is concerned, there is nothing mid-way between Parliament and the executive. Parliament has its own defined functions, and the executive has its own functions and any other kind of body that is set up must either be a Parliamentary body or must be subordinate, finally, in some respect or the other, or subject to the policy and direction of the executive, and therefore I cannot understand how

[Shri C. D. Deshmukh]

merely the setting up of a statutory corporation to supervise would solve the difficulties which some hon. Members have experienced in this matter. Because, even if we were to set up such a body, the operations of that body would have to be related to the operations of some particular Ministry and a particular Minister would have to be responsible to Parliament in his individual capacity, and may be also as a member of the Cabinet. Moreover, if Government itself, as an executive body, is unable to exercise the proper kind of supervision, what hope is there for any other statutory body to be created by Parliament—not by the Constitution, but by Parliament—to be able to exercise such authority? Because, a time will soon come when we shall have such a large number of enterprises that no single body will be able to direct their policies or to supervise their operations. And in any case, that function is a function which belongs properly to the executive Government.

Now, since that last debate took place, a few developments have taken place to which I should like to refer. One is that a Production Committee of the Cabinet has been formed. That consists of Ministers—apart from the Prime Minister and the Finance Minister—who have something to do with Government enterprise; may be Railways, Defence, the Production Minister, the Commerce and Industry Minister, the Communications Minister, the Rehabilitation Minister, and one or two other Ministers who have anything to do with a Government enterprise, is a member of that Committee. Therefore, there is a certain amount of specialisation inside the Cabinet for purposes of supervising and controlling the operations of Government enterprises.

Secondly, you will remember, Sir, I said that in so far as the company form was concerned, we were con-

sidering whether something should not be introduced into the Company Law (Amendment) Bill in order to provide for either some special concessions or some special responsibilities so far as Government enterprises are concerned, that is to say the companies in which the Government has a majority share. Now, I have here a draft of a Chapter which we wish to bring before the Select Committee in course of time, and I do not think—and I apologise beforehand—I am committing any breach of privilege, but as the matter is relevant, I should like to give an indication so far as audit is concerned of the direction in which our mind is running. Now, here is a draft:

“In the case of a Government company, the following provisions shall apply:

“Notwithstanding anything contained in sections 209 to 218, the Comptroller and Auditor-General of India shall have the power to direct the manner in which the company's accounts shall be audited by the auditor....”

and so on and so forth.

What I say is it is open to Parliament to ensure—whatever the form of the company may be, whether it is a private limited company or not—that it is subjected to the audit of the Comptroller and Auditor-General. Now, with that effected, if Parliament approves of that, a great deal of the uncertainty which surrounds this subject will have disappeared.

Then there was a complaint by an hon. Member that he was not able to get information from the Finance Minister. Unfortunately, the Finance Minister is not the collecting agency of all the information required by hon. Members.

Shri M. L. Dwivedi: But you promised.

Shri C. D. Deshmukh: I may have promised. I may have been very imprudent, but what I said was that the information with regard to these Production Ministry's enterprises would be available from the Production Minister. A great many balance sheets have since been published, and it will be open to the hon. Member to collect them and then draw his own conclusions. Therefore, I do not think that his charge that he is unable to get information from Government spokesmen is justified. The result has come about because he followed the wrong method.

Shri M. L. Dwivedi: I went to him and requested him to supply the information and be agreed, I also wrote a letter to him.

Shri C. D. Deshmukh: I may have been over-anxious to oblige the hon. Member, but I think that the labour I had undertaken was too much for me and that was information which he should have collected. I should like now only to refer to one more matter, and that is: in certain countries there are Commercial Corporation Acts or Crown Corporation Acts. Those Acts are of a general nature outlining the main incidence of Government corporations, if that is the form in which we wish to operate Government enterprises, and I have a specimen here which relates to Canada. There is a State called Saskatchewan which is rather socialist in its outlook, and therefore with a large number of undertakings of this kind, and there, apart from the usual provisions—there is a provision for acquisition of property and the rights and so on—there is this provision:

"For the purposes of the duties and exercise of the powers imposed or conferred upon a Corporation by or pursuant to the provisions of this Act, the Corporation shall be responsible to such Member of the Executive Council as may be designated by the Lt.-Governor in Council".

My point is that no matter what kind of corporation you create, that corporation must finally be subject to the general direction and guidance of some limb of the executive, and there is no way of getting over the position.

Now, the only other matter left is that of a Parliamentary Committee which should go into some of these matters, that is to say on behalf of Parliament. That is entirely a different issue which has not been argued here by the hon. Member.

As I said, we ought to wait for a little more experience before we consider this and if we find that the Estimates Committee and the Public Accounts Committee cannot deal with these matters, then we might consider this aspect of the case in the fullness of time.

Shri K. C. Reddy: So far as the main issues that have emerged from this debate are concerned, my hon. colleague the Minister of Finance has sufficiently answered those points. It remains for me to refer to some general aspects that have been the subject matter of criticism or comment by some of the hon. Members who have participated in this debate. I entirely agree that the State will have to play an increasingly greater role in the industrialisation of this country. In recent times, several State undertakings have been established, and they are running, I should say, by and large, in a very satisfactory manner. There seems to be an impression that State undertakings, by their very nature are not capable of being managed and supervised in a sufficiently efficient way. I for one would take exception to such an observation for my experience of the working of the State industrial undertakings, and also on the basis of experience of others who are in charge of some of these State industrial undertakings, I am in a position to say that there is nothing on which we should feel disappointed as regards the manner or the way in

[Sri K. C. Reddy]

which the State undertakings are being worked now.

The second point is this. There seems to be an assumption on the part of several Members who have spoken, and also in the minds of some others that there is not a proper mechanism for the supervision and control of these State undertakings, and that something should be done in order to tighten the supervision and control, in order to safeguard the public funds that have been invested in the building up of these State undertakings.

As has been pointed out already, there are three or four different patterns of management of State undertakings. There are what are known as departmental undertakings, like the Railways, the Posts and Telegraphs Department, the Chittaranjan Locomotive Workshop, the Integral Coach Factory, etc. So far as those undertakings are concerned, Government manage them departmentally, and Parliament has got absolute powers of control over the working of those undertakings.

Then, there are corporations which have been set up by statutes. Parliament itself has laid down in the specific Acts which have created these corporations, as to what extent Parliament could control the work of such undertakings, and in what way those corporations have to be administered; and in accordance with those statutes, the supervision and control of Parliament is prescribed.

Then, we have these new undertakings that have come into existence, for which management has been secured by the establishing of companies under the company law. It is with regard to these that there seems to be a certain amount of apprehension in the minds of Members. It has been pointed out already that this form of management has been decided upon with a view to securing, in the course of the working of these undertakings, a certain flexibility, and

also in order to ensure that the initiative of the management is not hampered in any way by undue restrictions or by unnecessary supervision and control. It is for the purpose of running these concerns on commercial lines, and in a business-like manner that this form has been thought of and decided upon, by Government. We have yet to see how this method will work, and we have got to feel our way and then try and find out if any other form of management is more satisfactory. As the hon. Minister of Finance pointed out, we are not in a position now to take any fresh decision. We have got to feel our way, and we have got to find out how these industrial undertakings are being worked. We have also to find out the experience of other countries, and then we have to come to a conclusion as to whether there is any necessity for making a departure from the present practice that we are following.

A reference was made to the practice prevailing in the U.K. I think the hon. Member who moved his Resolution said that a decision has been taken there to set up a special committee of Parliament or a Parliamentary Committee of the kind that he is advocating here. In respect of that, I am in a position to state that the Government of U.K. have not taken any decision so far on the lines that he indicated. It is true that about three or four years ago, a special committee was set up by Parliament to go into this very important, and if I may say so, complicated question. That Committee of Parliament did recommend that a special Committee of Parliament should be constituted in order to go into certain aspects of the working of these State undertakings. It was not for the purpose of supervising and controlling all State undertakings that this was suggested. It was specifically stated that no control of any such kind could be vested in a special committee of the kind

that was in view. It was only with a view to have a sort of general review of the working of these concerns, to get the annual reports, and the other statements regarding the working of these companies, and to discuss them in a general sort of way, and to concentrate their attention mainly on questions of policy, etc. It was not the intention to vest that Select Committee that was proposed with any powers of supervision and control. Even that restricted proposal that emerged from out of the deliberations of Parliament has not been approved as yet by the U.K. Government, and the position in U.K. is still at that stage. Even in the other countries, there is no special committee of the kind, that is now proposed, to supervise and control industrial undertakings. So, here is something which is being suggested at a time when we are still in the beginnings of the industrialisation of our country, and when the State has decided to play an increasing role in the establishment of these undertakings.

So far as the existing method of supervision and control is concerned, in respect of these companies which have been constituted, the hon. Member Shri A. M. Thomas has pointed out certain aspects of the matter. The Boards are constituted by the Ministries concerned. It is not as if the industrial undertakings managed by the State are in the control of one Ministry. They are under the control of several Ministries. But that is a different question. The Boards are constituted by the Ministries concerned, and they are in charge of the management of these concerns. So far as Government are concerned, they have got general powers of supervision and control over the working of these Boards. So, it is not as if there is no supervision or control over the working of these Boards; Government are ultimately responsible to Parliament. So, this is the mechanism that we have got.

The articles of association of the various companies that have been constituted provide for certain checks and balances with regard to the working of these companies. As already pointed out, the money required for setting up a State industrial undertaking has got to be voted by Parliament, and any further addition of capital has also got to be voted by Parliament. And in recent times, we have been placing the annual reports, the profit and loss accounts and the balance sheets of the various companies on the Table of Parliament or in the Library. There are sufficient opportunities for Parliament to discuss, if they so choose, the working of these concerns. They can raise debates of this kind, they can raise half an hour debates, and as the House is aware, a number of questions is being asked on several aspects of the working of these company form of State undertakings. In fact, if I may say so, there are more questions in respect of this type of undertakings than in respect of, for example, the Ordnance Factories or other Government undertakings, which are departmentally managed. So, it is not as if Parliament has no opportunity to focus its attention on the working of these State undertakings. They have got plenty of opportunities, and it is also open to them to ask for a debate on the working of these concerns, when the annual reports and the balance sheets are placed on the Table of the House. So, I submit that the House has got sufficient opportunities to go into the working of these concerns. There is hardly any necessity for any special body of the kind that is proposed to be set up now and here, or as the Resolution says, immediately. Also, it has been pointed out that the Resolution is very wide in its scope. In fact, literally interpreted, this Resolution will bring within its orbit all industries, not merely State undertakings, but also industries in the private sector. That is one defect of the Resolution as it is worded. But the speeches that followed, at

[Sbri K. C. Reddy]

any rate, the speech of the hon. Member who moved this Resolution, seemed to indicate that he had in mind more specially these new undertakings that have come into existence, and for which companies have been formed. I may be wrong, but that is the inference that I gathered from his speech. But other Members who followed seemed to think that other industries also should be subjected to this overall control and supervision of the statutory body. For example, the hon. Member Shri M. S. Gurupadaswamy, who spoke, said we have no control over the defence industries. Some other Member said, we have no control over the Chittaranjan Locomotive Workshop.

Some others referred to certain industrial undertakings. So it seems to me that there is a lot of divergence of opinion amongst Members themselves as to what exactly they want. Their intention is one thing; their expression, the language in which the Resolution is worded, is a different thing, and there is no clarity so far as the purpose of the hon. Member is concerned. So it seems to me that it is not possible to accept either the Resolution or the amendments that have been moved in substitution of the Resolution.

I would like to say a word about the amendments. Sbri B. K. Das wants only an advisory committee to advise the Government or the Ministry concerned with regard to matters of supervision and control. During the course of his remarks, he also said that in the past we had parliamentary Standing Committees, which are no longer functioning. Why were these Standing Committees abolished? At the time when the Standing Committees were functioning, there was, if I may say so, no democratic Government functioning. Now we have got a responsible Government which is responsible to Parliament. That was one of the main reasons why the Standing Committees were abolished on the basis that

they were no longer necessary. So his suggestion practically amounts to a revival of the constitution of these parliamentary Standing Committees in so far as the Ministries which are in charge of industrial undertakings are concerned. I would like to point out also that recently Government have taken a decision to constitute informal Consultative Committees. These informal Consultative Committees have begun to function since the last few weeks and it is just possible that the working of these Committees will proceed in such a manner as to fulfil the function he has perhaps in view. So in the light of that also, it is not necessary to go in for a separate advisory committee of the kind that he has suggested.

The other amendment refers to a Committee to be constituted for the purpose of studying this question, for the purpose of going into this question, and then reporting to Parliament. I do not think there is any necessity for that also, because debates have taken place on the floor of this House once or twice and there are other ways also of making known the opinions of the Members with regards to this very important question. The time is not opportune for setting up a Committee of the kind that is suggested by that amendment.

So on all these grounds, I do not think it is possible for Government to accept either the Resolution or the amendments that have been moved to substitute that Resolution.

Shri B. K. Das: I beg leave to withdraw my amendment.

Shri S. N. Das: I also wish to withdraw my amendment.

The amendments were, by leave, withdrawn.

Mr. Chairman: The question is:

"This House is of opinion that Government should immediately set up a Statutory Body to exercise general supervision and control of such industries where the

Government has whole or substantial interest, either financial or otherwise."

The motion was negatived.

RESOLUTION RE DEPARTMENT
OF WELFARE FOR SCHEDULED
CASTES AND SCHEDULED
TRIBES

Shri Brohmo-Choudhury (Goalpara Garo Hills—Reserved-Sch. Tribes): I beg to move:

"This House is of opinion that a Department of Welfare be created forthwith to function under a separate Ministry for appropriate measures to be taken for ameliorating the conditions of the Scheduled Tribes, Scheduled Castes and other Backward Classes."

There are 51 million Harijans, that is, Scheduled Castes, 19 million Scheduled Tribes and 20 million other backward classes in the country. The tribals, Scheduled Castes and backward classes are all backward people; they are backward educationally, economically and socially. We have given a solemn pledge in the Constitution that we shall improve the lot of these people. Article 46 of the Constitution lays down the directive principle of State policy in this respect. It says:

"The State shall promote with special care the educational and economic interests of the weaker sections of the people, and, in particular, of the Scheduled Castes and the Scheduled Tribes, and shall protect them from social injustice and all forms of exploitation".

A special reservation of seats in the State Legislatures and in Parliament has been given to the Scheduled Tribes and Scheduled Castes for a period of ten years since the commencement of the Constitution. Al-

ready three years are over and now it is expected that within the next seven years we shall have to improve the lot of these backward classes, Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes. But let us examine how we are going to fulfil this solemn pledge. The tribal people generally live in the hill regions and in the forests. They are very poor and they are cut off from all civilisation. If you travel over the tribal area, you will find that there are practically no roads, and though after independence a few roads have been constructed, the conditions of these roads are not good. More roads should be constructed in these areas, but Government have not paid full attention to these people. We have to see that we fulfil our solemn pledge to improve the lot of these people. These people cannot get the markets for their products; they cannot get the opportunity to mix up with our advanced brothers; our advanced people, those who want to work amongst them, cannot get the opportunity to go there. Therefore, the difference is growing up. Adequate amounts should be granted so that roads are constructed in the tribal areas and also in areas where the Scheduled Castes and other backward people live, because what is true in the case of the tribal people is also true in the case of the Scheduled Castes and other backward people. They are also very poor and proper attention is not paid to these people by the Government. These tribal and other backward people generally live in interior areas where they cannot get the opportunity of educating their children in schools. These people are very poor and therefore they cannot send their children to far distant places for education as they cannot afford the huge expenses. Therefore, adequate number of schools should be opened in the tribal areas and other backward areas. Adequate scholarships should be given to the children of these backward people. The inadequate amounts that are granted do not serve the purpose at all.