

# Alleged Failure To Submit Auditor-General's Report

## M. B. OPPOSITION BID FOR PRIVILEGES MOTION

"The Times of India" News Service

INDORE, September 19.

THE 25-member Opposition in the Madhya Bharat Assembly on Friday sought leave to move a motion of breach of privilege of the House stated to have been committed by the Government in failing to submit the reports of the Public Service Commission and of the Auditor-General.

The motion, which stood in the name of Mr. R. V. Bades, read: "Submission of the Public Service Commission's report to the Assembly is essential under Article 324 (2). Similarly the presentation of the report of the Comptroller and Auditor-General of India to this House is essential under Article 151 (2). The Government has failed to submit the P.S.C.'s report for 1952-53 and has omitted to submit to the Assembly the report of the Comptroller and Auditor-General for the years 1951 to 1953.

"The Government has thus deprived this House of these two constitutional rights, thereby committing a breach of privilege of the House."

### NOT A PRIVILEGE ISSUE

Opposing Mr. Bades's plea for leave to move the motion, the Law Minister, Mr. Sitaram Jajoo, said that the subject sought to be discussed in the motion was not at all an issue of privilege. The submission of reports of the P.S.C. and the Auditor-General was a constitutional responsibility of the Government and if the Government failed in its duty other measures might be taken against it. Under no circumstances, however, this could be the subject of a breach of privilege motion.

Besides, even on technical grounds, the motion deserved to be ruled out. The Rules of Procedure demanded that only one issue could be made the

subject of a breach of privilege motion at a time and the issue should be brought before the House at the earliest opportunity, after the alleged breach had been committed.

In the motion under discussion, he pointed out, two issues, namely, failure of submit the P.S.C.'s report and the omission to present the Auditor-General's report had been sought to be discussed. The issues were not brought to the notice of the House at the earliest opportunity, he said, and therefore, the present motion was out of order.

The Speaker, Mr. A. S. Patwardhan, deferred his ruling.

Mrs. Manjula Bai Wagle (Congress) criticised the Government for its "reactionary attitude" towards the welfare of women speaking on the Women's and Children's Institutions Licensing Bill. She said that the present Government had done nothing for the amelioration of women. Even minor measures like the introduction of the National Cadet Corps in girls' institutions had not been undertaken and the Social Welfare Board had only recently been set up in the State.

Mrs. Wagle said that she had not introduced any measures in the Assembly because she knew the fate of non-official Bills in general.

Criticising Clause 3 of the Bill, which empowers the Government to exempt any specified institution or class of institutions from the provisions of the measure, she said that this discriminatory power was "unintelligible".

Mrs. Wagle urged the Government to accept the note of dissent on the Bill, submitted by herself and Mrs. Yamuna Bai (P.-S.P.)

Mrs. Yamuna Bai also suggested the deletion of Clause 3 from the Bill. The debate was inconclusive.

The Assembly then adopted the Madhya Bharat Usurious Loans Bill, as amended.