

(b) Review by the Government of the working of the above Corporation.

[Placed in Library. See No. LT-3395/61].

Shri T. B. Vittal Rao: (Khammam): Mr. Speaker, with regard to the Neyveli Lignite Corporation Annual report, the Corporation authorities sent us a copy a month ago. I do not know why the Government took such a long time in laying on the Table of the House this Annual report.

Sardar Swaran Singh: They should be placed on the Table of the House within three months after the reports are adopted at the Annual General Meeting. Then, a review by the Government is also to be prepared. It takes some time, because we must prepare the review carefully when we present it to Parliament.

Some Hon. Members rose—

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. Originally, the reports were always placed on the Table of the House and then alone given to the public or to newspapers. A letter was written to me by some of the Ministers—I remember Shri Manubhai Shah or some others—that they may be permitted to send copies of the report to hon. Members here for the reason that they need not wait, that they have Board meeting and that they give these reports to the public and also to the press. For that reason, instead of allowing hon. Members to learn this matter only after they come to Parliament, long after it is issued to the public and the press, copies are made available to hon. Members. It is to enable them to circulate to hon. Members and the press whatever is placed before the Board of management that permission was granted by me. What difficulty can there be in placing copies of the report immediately as soon as they are received or in the first week of the session which comes after the publication of the report? Hon. Members evidently

want to suggest that if it had been placed earlier, they would have taken the earliest opportunity to have a discussion on this matter in this House. This does not apply to this case where they make it already available to the public and the press.

Sardar Swaran Singh: There is no difficulty. If that is the desire of the hon. Members, it can be done: that is, supply a copy as soon as the report has been approved by the Board of directors. But, there is this difficulty. A review by the Government on this report has also to be prepared and presented to the House when these reports are presented. If it is the desire of the Chair or of the House that the reports should be placed on the Table of the House as soon as they are received, even without the Government review, we can adopt that practice.

Mr. Speaker: Very well.

Shri Naushir Bharucha (East Khandedsh): It should be adopted.

CERTIFIED ACCOUNTS OF THE INDIAN INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY, KHARAGPUR FOR 1959-60 AND AUDIT REPORT THEREON

The Minister of Scientific Research and Cultural Affairs (Shri Humayun Kabir): I beg to lay on the Table a copy of the certified Accounts of the Indian Institute of Technology, Kharagpur, for the year 1959-60 along with the Audit Report thereon, under sub-section (4) of section 23 of the Indian Institute of Technology (Kharagpur) Act, 1956. [Placed in Library. See No. LT-3396/61].

Shri T. B. Vittal Rao: This annual report relates to 1959-60. I think the 1960-61 report is overdue. How is it that we are getting this report after one year?

Mr. Speaker: Are the accounts of 1960-61 available?

Shri Humayun Kabir: As soon as they are available, they are placed before the House.

Shri T. B. Vittal Rao: Why are they not available?

Mr. Speaker: What is the difficulty? We are now in December. Eight months are over.

Shri Humayun Kabir: Reports come to us from the Auditor General. At that stage we lay it on the Table of the House. If questions are put, I shall answer why there is delay.

Mr. Speaker: I will ask the Office to write to the Auditor-General and find out why there is delay.

AMENDMENTS TO REGISTRATION OF ELECTORS RULES, 1960.

The Deputy Minister of Law (Shri Hajarnavis): I beg to lay on the Table a copy of Notification No. S.O. 2791 dated the 24th November, 1961 making certain amendments to the Registration of Electors Rules, 1960, under sub-section (3) of section 28 of the Representation of the People Act, 1950. [Placed in Library See No. LT-3397/61].

Shri Braj Raj Singh (Firozabad): Mr. Speaker, these rules were published on 24-11-61. At the fag end of the session, we find that they are being placed on the Table of the House. If we want to look into the rules or move any amendments, we have no opportunity. This is something important concerning the next general election. Why were they not placed earlier in the Table of the House so that we could have an opportunity to move any amendments if we so wished?

Mr. Speaker: Twenty-fourth of November: even then, would there be time?

Shri Hajarnavis: I do not think there has been such a delay.

Shri Braj Raj Singh: We do not have an opportunity to move any amendments.

Shri T. B. Vittal Rao: They should have been placed on the 24th of November.

Mr. Speaker: Particularly in view of the coming election, there being no opportunity to discuss these rules, I think, on the 24th itself it should have been placed on the Table of the House. We will have 6 plus 14 days, which is the time allowed under the rules. Even now, I have no objection. Hon. Members may look into it.

The Minister of Law (Shri A. K. Sen): These rules were framed in consultation with all the parties, after several consultations with representatives of the different parties.

Shri Braj Raj Singh: What of that?

Shri A. K. Sen: The reason why I mention this is because of the fact that at that time, if any suggestion had been made by the different parties, the Chief Election Commissioner would have certainly paid attention to them. I mention this fact in order to show that there was more or less no controversy over these rules.

Mr. Speaker: Are not these rules placed on the Table of the House under an obligation imposed by the Act?

Shri A. K. Sen: Of course. I am not saying that they are not to be placed or that amendments are not to be moved. I am not saying that at all. But since the point was raised that they would not have enough time to move amendments...

Mr. Speaker: Their point is that they would not have the opportunity of tabling amendments now.

Shri A. K. Sen: Of course, they have.

Mr. Speaker: They would not have fourteen days' time for the purpose.

Shri Prabhat Kar (Hooghly): We are adjourning on the 8th December, 1961.

Mr. Speaker: Under the rules, hon. Members are entitled to have fourteen days' time, and within that