

should be members of Boards of Management. The overwhelming weight of considerations must be against it. Such membership even if it carries no emoluments (carries much power and patronage). The Member of Parliament concerned is part of the organ of Public control and is the exponent of public criticism in Parliament. As a Director or part of a concern's administration he is responsible for the very conduct and affairs which Parliament, and therefore, he is called upon to examine, criticise and judge. Having specialised and inside knowledge, he can use it in Parliament and elsewhere, when he has disagreements with his colleagues on the Hoard and wishes to take a line apart from the team of which he is a Member. His colleagues who are not members of Parliament like himself cannot reply. They are "officials"—employed in State Undertakings. His Parliamentary colleagues are also at a disadvantage because he purports to speak from expert and inside knowledge. The Minister finds himself in a very embarrassing position when the matter is debated in the House.

13. There is also the further consideration for whom does he speak? (1) If he speaks for the industry in Parliament he takes the place of the Minister; (2) if he speaks for the Board as Managing Director or Chairman, being one himself, then he has greater facilities which other MPs do not have; (3) if he turns critic, he places ever} one including the industry in an adverse position.

11. It will be understood that such a Member of Parliament, who is not a member of Government, cannot take over the functions and duties of a Minister. He cannot be a critic for the reasons stated above. Thus, he can neither defend nor criticise, for as Chairman or a Director of the Company concerned he has access to Information which others do not have and which he should not use. Therefore, if a Member of Parliament is Chairman or even a Director, he would disqualify himself for participation in discussions in regard to the concern he is associated with, and there would be severe limitations in regard to his participation in debates on similar concerns or State concerns as a whole. On the other hand, he cannot be obliged to sit in Parliament unconcerned, when the

matter is on matters of which he has knowledge. This, in effect, would prevent him from functioning fully as a Member of Parliament. If, on the other hand, he uses his position and his knowledge, then he places the concern of which he is an active and responsible part and the Board at a great disadvantage as well as in a position of embarrassment. His colleagues and the concern are not represented in Parliament except through the Minister. Conflicts will arise as to whom the Minister represents. In the result, therefore, appointment of Members of Parliament in Corporations, is altogether an unhealthy practice and is difficult to justify".

Government Decision on the above Id commendation

"Members of Parliament should not be appointed to Boards of Directors".

Raid by Income tax Officials in Yeoma District in Maharashtra

1370. SHRI DEORAO PAUL:

SHRI N. M. KAMBLE:

SHRI R. D. J. AVERGOANKAR:

Will the Minister of FINANCE be pleased to state:

whether the income-tax on any other authorities recently raided some residences in Yeoma District in Maharashtra;

(if so, what are the details in this regard; and

(i) what action has been taken against the persons found in possession of unaccounted money and valuable?

1111. MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF FINANCE (SHRI K. R. GANESH): (a) to (c) On 7-8-74 officers of the Central Excise Department searched a residential premises in Yeoma resulting in the seizure of articles and ornaments of gold valued at Rs. 1,22,000 and Indian currency worth Rs. 3,05,530.10. Action as provided in the law will be taken on completion of the investigations which are in progress. The Income Tax Department is also looking into the matter.