

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER The question is :

"That clause 1, as amended, stand part of the Bill".

The motion was adopted.

Clause 1, as amended, was added to the Bill.

Enacting Formula

Amendment made :

Page 1, line 1,—

for "Twentieth" substitute—

"Twenty-first"(1)

(Shri Swaran Singh)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER The question is :

"That the Enacting Formula, as amended, stand part of the Bill".

The motion was adopted.

The Enacting Formula, as amended, was added to the Bill.

The Title was added to the Bill.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : I beg to move :

"That the Bill, as amended, be passed".

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : The question is :

"That the Bill, as amended, be passed".

The motion was adopted.

15.05 hrs.

MOTION RE: REPORT OF COMMITTEE OF INQUIRY (COUNCIL OF SCIENTIFIC AND INDUSTRIAL RESEARCH)

THE MINISTER OF EDUCATION AND YOUTH SERVICES (DR. V. K. R. V. RAO) : I beg to move :

"That the Report (Part I) of the Committee of Inquiry (Council of Scientific and Industrial Research), laid on the Table of the House on the 10th March, 1970, be taken into consideration".

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी (बलरामपुर) : इसके लिए कितना समय है ?

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Three hours have been allotted for this.

DR. V. K. R. V. RAO : I do not want to take up the time of the House in making two speeches, I would like to listen to the discussion before taking any comments or replies that may become necessary.

Sir, I move that the report be taken into consideration.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Now, Shri K. M. Koushik.

SHRI SAMAR GUHA (Contai) : It was agreed and the Hon'ble Speaker has told me that since it was at my instance that the hon. Minister had agreed to this discussion, I should initiate the debate on behalf of the Members, because direct charges were brought against me. I met the Speaker in the morning...

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : He has not told me anything about it.

SHRI RABI RAY (Puri) : Shri Madhu Limaye is not feeling well.

So, he may be given a chance.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : If Shri K. M. Koushik agrees, I have no objection.

SHRI K. M. KOUSHTIK (Chanda) : I have no objection.

SHRI SAMAR GUHA : In the morning, I had met the Speaker, and the Secretary was also there, and he agreed that I should initiate the discussion.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Now, it is between Shri Samar Guha and Shri Madhu Limaye to settle it between themselves. Shri K. M. Koushik has agreed to give chance to Shri Madhu Limaye in view of the fact that he is not well. I would now like Shri Madhu Limaye and Shri Samar Guha to settle it between themselves.

श्री मधु लिमये (मुंगेर) : मैं कोई कगड़ा नहीं चाहता हूँ।

श्री रवि राय : सेंटलमेंट का कोई सबान नहीं है। समय लिमये जी को कुछ देना।

SHRI SAMAR GUHA : I stand on the dock. Charges have been levelled against me and the blame is on me.

SHRI MADHU LIMAYE : He is the accuser. He is not in the dock.

SHRI SAMAR GUHA : All India Radio has mainly blamed me.

श्री मधु लिमये : इस रिपोर्ट पर इतना बड़ा विवाद नहीं होता यदि जिस ढंग से यह रिपोर्ट पेश की गयी और उसके सम्बन्ध में यहां पर आलोचना किये जाने पर कमेटी ने अपनी प्रतिक्रिया व्यक्त न की होती। मेरा ख्याल है कि यह एक अनोखी चीज होगी है। कई बार जांच समितियां और जांच कमिशन नियुक्त किये जाते हैं। उनकी रिपोर्टों की आलोचना खुल कर होती है। सरकार उन कमेटियों और कमिशनों की रिपोर्टों पर विचार करती है और सभी पहलुओं को देखने के बाद वह अपना दिमाग लगाती है। अगर समिति की सिफारिशों की आलोचना गलत या अनुचित हो तो इसका उत्तर देने का सरकार को पूरा अधिकार है। यदि इस समिति ने कुछ सदस्य पार्लियामेंट के भी सदस्य है तो वे भी बहस के दौरान अपनी बातों को रख सकते हैं। लेकिन सबसे पहले मुझे इस बात पर आपत्ति है और मैं सख्त एतराज करता हूँ कि यहां पर आलोचना वगैरह किये जाने के बाद समिति की बैठक बुलाई गयी और समिति ने इस आलोचना का उत्तर देने वाला प्रस्ताव कहिये, वक्तव्य कहिये, पारित किया। सबसे पहली बात तो मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि कमेटियों और कमिशनों के इतिहास में कभी भी पहले ऐसी घटना नहीं घटी है।

जो इनका बयान है, इसमें ये लोग लिखते हैं :

"The allegations made by the Members of Parliament were considered by the Committee of Inquiry (CSIR) at its meeting held on 25 th April, 1970 and the comments of the Committee which

have been adopted unanimously at the above meeting are quoted below."

उसके बाद कमेटी ने कहा है :

"The Committee would like that these views expressed by the Committee unanimously should be publicised widely because the allegations have already received wide publicity".

मैं एक उदाहरण देना चाहता हूँ। अभी-अभी हल्दिया बरौनी पाइपलाइन के बारे में एक कमीशन आफ एनक्वायरी नियुक्त किया गया। उस समय के विजिलेंस कमिश्नर, श्री नेटूर श्री निवास राव, को उसमें नियुक्त किया गया। उसके बाद वह विजिलेंस कमिश्नर के पद से निवृत्त हो गये और मंत्रालय के सेक्रेटरी, श्री पी० आर० नायक, ने अपनी जिम्मेदारी पर, बिना सरकार से पूछे, उनसे कहा कि वह जांच के कार्य को चालू रख सकते हैं। दो साल हो गये, लेकिन उनको रिपोर्ट का पता नहीं चला। जब यहां पर इस बारे में हल्ला किया गया, तो अब यह रिपोर्ट आई है। श्री नेटूर, श्री निवास राव कमीशन के काम-काज के तरीके बारे में और उनकी नियुक्ति के बारे में मैंने यहां पर जो आरोप लगाये, और डा० त्रिगुण सेन को लिखे गये पत्र में मैंने जो कुछ कहा, उसकी पुष्टि पब्लिक इन्डरकिंग कमेटी ने की है।

ऐसी हालत में मैं मंत्री महोदय से इस बात का साफ उत्तर चाहता हूँ कि क्या सरकार किसी भी कमीशन आफ एनक्वायरी को यह अधिकार देती है कि पार्लियामेंट में उसकी रिपोर्ट पर जो चर्चा होगी, उसकी जो आलोचना की जायेगी, उसका उत्तर स्वयं सरकार द्वारा या पार्लियामेंट में मौजूद उस कमीशन या कमेटी के सदस्यों द्वारा नहीं दिया जायेगा, बल्कि उस कमीशन या कमेटी की एक विशेष बैठक बुलाई जायेगी और उसमें आलोचना के सम्बन्ध में एक प्रस्ताव पारित किया जायेगा। यह बहुत गम्भीर मामला है। अगर सरकार समझती है कि हमारे आरोप

गलत या निराधार हैं, तो सरकार के प्रवक्ता प्रधान मंत्री या शिक्षा मन्त्री उनके बारे में उत्तर दे सकते हैं। यदि सरकार इस मामले में इस प्रक्रिया को बर्दाश्त करती है, तो भविष्य में किसी भी जांच कमीशन या समिति की आलोचना करना असम्भव हो जायेगा, क्योंकि वे तुरन्त अपनी बैठक बुलायेगे और स्वयं जवाब देंगे। पहली बात तो मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि यह बहुत गलत काम हुआ है।

अक्सर सभी कमेटियों में यह होता है—पब्लिक अन्डरटेकिंग कमेटी के चेयरमैन मौजूद हैं—कि कमेटी के काम-काज के वाद सेक्रेटेरियट रिपोर्ट का एक मस्विदा पेश करता है और अगर उसमें कोई गलत निष्कर्ष नहीं निकाले गये हैं, कोई गलत या असत्य बातें नहीं रखी गई हैं, तो साधारण तौर पर उसमें से महत्वपूर्ण बातों को छांटने की कार्यवाही नहीं की जाती है। लेकिन इस कमेटी की रिपोर्ट में ऐसा किया गया है। मेरा बुनियादी आक्षेप यही है। मैं सभी केसिज में नहीं जाना चाहता हूँ, दो ही केसिज को आप ले लीजिये।

एक डा० दातार का केस है। इसके बारे में सुबूत के तौर पर जो बुनियादी बातें मस्विदे में रखी गई थीं, जिनके आधार पर कमेटी ने अपने निष्कर्ष निकाले थे, उन सुबूत वाली बातों को अन्तिम रिपोर्ट में से गायब कर दिया गया है। मूल रिपोर्ट और अन्तिम रिपोर्ट का तुलनात्मक अध्ययन और उसके बारे में विवरण मैंने प्रधान मंत्री के पास भेजा है। क्या प्रधान मंत्री इस बात का खुलासा करेगी कि सुबूत के तौर पर जो बातें मूल रिपोर्ट में रखी गयी थीं,...

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : The hon. member should conclude now.

श्री मधु लियये : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, अभी तो मैंने प्रारम्भ भी नहीं किया है।

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : His time is up.

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, इस तरह तो यह चर्चा एक मजाब बनकर रह जायेगी। पांच मिनट में कोई भी सदस्य नहीं बोल सकता है। आप समय बढ़ा दीजिये।

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : I fully appreciate his difficulty. I myself am apprehensive about it. Shri Samar Guha says that since the Sarkar Committee has passed a resolution against him, he wants to defend himself. Obviously he cannot do it in five minutes.

श्री मधु लियये : तो उनको आप ज्यादा समय दीजिये।

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : I do not want to fight with every member.

SHRI SAMAR GUHA : It should be extended by two hours.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Three hours have been allotted and according to that each party has been given its time. I have to stick to that or increase the time.

श्री रवि राय : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, यह बहुत महत्वपूर्ण विषय है। मेरा प्रस्ताव है कि इसके लिए समय बढ़ा दिया जाये।

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, एक घंटा आप बढ़ा सकते हैं और एक घंटा सदन अपनी राय से बढ़ा सकता है। अगर इस चर्चा में सदस्यों को अपने मुद्दे रखने का समय न मिला, तो चर्चा का कोई मतलब नहीं है। माननीय सदस्य अभी पांच मिनट बोले हैं और आप ने घंटी बजा दी—उन्होंने दातार का नाम लिया है और आपने घंटी बजा दी।

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Members should come forward with concrete suggestions as to what I should do. If the House wants that the time should be extended, let there be a concrete proposal how much time ?

SHRI NAMBIAR (Tiruchirappalli) :
Two hours.

DR. V. K. R. V. RAO : One hour.

SHRI SAMAR GUHA : We have to
defend ourselves ; we have been charged.

SHRI S. KANDAPPAN (Madurai) : I
move that the time be extended by two
hours.

SHRI NAMBIAR : I second that moti-
on... (Interruptions)

THE PRIME MINISTER, MINISTER
OF FINANCE, MINISTER OF ATOMIC
ENERGY, AND MINISTER OF PLAN-
NING (SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI) : I
have no objection. But what about the
other business ?

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : We extend
it by two hours. Even so. I request hon.
Members to be brief.

श्री मधु लिमये : मैं उन दो केंसिज के बारे
में और भी संक्षेप से कह देता हूँ।

दातार के केस के बारे में यह सुबूत आया
था कि इस पद के बारे में कोई विज्ञापन नहीं
दिया गया : दूसरी बात यह आई थी कि जब
उनको डिप्युटी डायरेक्टर नियुक्त किया गया,
उसी समय इन लोगों ने यह तय किया था
कि दो साल के बाद उनको डायरेक्टर बनाया
जायेगा। इस सम्बन्ध में जितने नियम हैं, उन
सभी नियमों का उल्लंघन किया गया है।
मस्विदे या मूल रिपोर्ट में इन सारी बातों को
अच्छे ढंग से रखा गया था, लेकिन न जान किन
लोकों के दबाव में आकर समिति ने बुनियादी
बातों और बुनियादी तथ्यों को ही छोट देने
की कार्यवाही की है, जिसका साफ मतलब
यह है कि वह किसी तरह से भूतपूर्व डायरेक्टर-
जेनेरल को बचाना चाहती थी।

मैं प्रधान मंत्री से एक बात पूछना चाहता
हूँ। इतना तो वह मानेंगी कि अल्पसंख्यकों के
बारे में, वे चाहें मुसलमान हों या हरिजन,
आदिवासी या ईसाई हों, भेरे जैसे लोगों के

मन में सहानुभूति की कमी नहीं है। लेकिन
भूतपूर्व डी० जी० कहते हैं कि उन की आलो-
चना इसलिए की गई है कि वह मुसलमान हैं।
क्या प्रधान मंत्री ने उनका बयान पढ़ा है ?
पहले तो मुझे पता नहीं था, लेकिन तथ्य यह
है कि जिन एपाटमेंट्स के बारे में मैं बोल
रहा हूँ, उन सबका सम्बन्ध हिन्दुओं से है ;
उनमें कोई भी मुसलमान नहीं है। प्रधान
मन्त्री ने माननीय सदस्य को हिटलर का
अवतार बताया है। लेकिन अगर इस तरह
हर एक बात में साम्प्रदायिकता का समावेश
किया जायेगा, और प्रधान मंत्री उसका समर्थन
करती हैं, तो मैं कहूँगा कि वह स्वयं भी हिटलर
का अवतार है।

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी : हिटलरानी।

श्री मधु लिमये : यह तो ये दोनों आपस
में बैठकर तय करें।

क्या किसी भी बहस को चलाने का यह
कोई तरीका है कि जाति और मजहब में जाया
जाये ? भूतपूर्व डी० जी० ने जो बात कही है,
मैं प्रधान मंत्री से उसका खुलासा चाहता हूँ।
अगर भेरे जैसा आदमी भूतपूर्व डी० जी० के
बारे में कोई आलोचना करेगा, तो निश्चित
रूप से इस बुनियाद पर नहीं करेगा कि वह—
या कोई अन्य व्यक्ति—मुसलमान है या किसी
और जाति का है। ऐसा करने से सार्वजनिक
जीवन में शुद्धता कैसे आयेगी ? इसका मतलब
तो यह है कि भविष्य में अपनी जाति के अलावा
किसी भी दूसरी जाति के आदमी के किसी
कर्म के बारे में किसी को नहीं बोलना चाहिए।
यह बहुत गलत बात है।

श्री जगन्नाथ राव जोशी (भोपाल) :
बहुत दिनों से यह गलत बात चल रही है।

श्री मधु लिमये : जो नियुक्ति करने वाली,
चयन करने वाली कमेटी है, उसकी सदस्यता में
तब्दीली की गई। उसकी बैठकों के बारे में पूरा
नोटिस तब नहीं दिया गया।

उसी तरह बलदेव सिंह का केस ले लीजिए । इस बलदेव सिंह के केस में स्पष्ट रूप से कहा गया है कि जब दोबारा विज्ञापन दिया गया तो उसमें जिन गुणों की, क्वाली-फिकेशंस की आवश्यकता पहले बताई गई थी वह हटाकर कहा गया कि सिर्फ डिग्री होनी चाहिए । क्यों होनी चाहिए ? क्योंकि कमेटी के सामने जो कई पी० एच० डी०, डाक्टरेट जिन्होंने प्राप्त किया है ऐसे काबिल श्रादमी श्राप थे, उनको छांटकर, पैरवी के आधार पर इनको नियुक्त करना चाहते थे, इसलिए दूसरा विज्ञापन देते समय जो आवश्यकतायें थीं उनको भी तब्दील किया गया । इसके बारे में भी सारी तफसील मैं भेज चुका हूँ । इसके ऊपर भी वह जवाब दे सकते हैं ।

अब एक बात मैं श्राौर कहना चाहता हूँ । क्या यह बात सही नहीं है कि उनके पास जी० एस० सिधू, पारपिश्ना, हरनारायण, श्रायंगर श्राौर चौधरी इन डायरेक्टरों के इस्तीफे एक श्रारसे से पड़े हैं ? इन इस्तीफों पर विचार नहीं किया है । जहां तक पारपिश्ना का सवाल है, उनके बारे में सेंट्रल ब्यूरो श्राफ इन्वेस्टि-गेशन की रपट भी श्रा चुकी है । उसके ऊपर भी विचार नहीं किया जा रहा है । तो मैं श्राौर अन्य बातों को नहीं छेड़ना चाहता हूँ । इन बातों पर स्पष्टीकरण चाहना हूँ क्यों कि प्रधान मन्त्री जब मैं पहले श्रापनी बात रख रहा था तो नहीं थी, इसलिए मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि समिति के बारे में जो श्रालोचना होगी अगर वह गलत है तो उसका जवाब सरकार दे, मन्त्री दें या पार्लियामेंट के सदस्य दें, मुझे कोई एनराज नहीं है, लेकिन समिति की बैठक बुलाकर समिति के द्वारा प्रस्ताव कराना या वक्तव्य दिलाना यह बिलकुल अनुचित बात है । भविष्य में ऐसा होगा तो ऐसी एन्वार्यूरियों से कोई बात निकलने वाली नहीं है । अब समय नहीं है, इसलिए दूसरों का समय मैं क्यों बिगाड़ूँ ?

श्री मु० श्रा० श्राँ (कासगंज) : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय...

एक श्राानवीय सदस्य : श्राप श्रापना पेन्फ-लेट पढ़ दीजिये न ।

श्री मु० श्रा० श्राँ : आपने उसको पढ़ लिया होगा । उसकी जरूरत नहीं है । मैं श्राौर बातें सदन के समक्ष रखूंगा ।

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, ऐसा मालूम होता है कि मौजूदा ऐडमिनिस्ट्रेशन किसी तरीके से कोशिश यह कर रहा है श्राौर करता रहा है कि श्रापने नुक्सों को श्राौर श्रापने ऐबों को कुछ सदस्यों को श्रापने हाथ में लेकर छिपाए रखे श्राौर मुझे माफ कीजिएगा, इस सरकार कमीशन की रिपोर्ट को जिस तरीके से कि यहां बदनाम करने की कोशिश की गयी है उससे ऐसा मालूम होता है कि कुछ लोगों की ऐसी श्रावाहिश है कि इस कमीशन की जांच के लिए भी एक कमीशन मुकर्रर किया जाय...

श्री समर गुह : जरूर ।

श्री मु० श्रा० श्राँ : तो फिर रोज यही होता रहेगा कि कोई कमीशन मुकर्रर होगा श्राौर उसके बाद किन्हीं श्राोगों को अगर किसी खास दिलचस्पी की वजह से उससे सहमति नहीं होगी तो फिर मांग की जायेगी कि दूसरी बार उस कमीशन की जांच हो । यह तरीका मुनासिब नहीं है । यह श्राज कोई नया काम नहीं हो रहा है जो इस सदन में हो रहा है । इससे पहले भी जब यह कमीशन मुकर्रर किया गया था तो बहुत सी चीजें एजूकेशन डिपार्ट-मेंट के जरिये से सदन के सामने ऐसी गलत लाई गयी जिनको कि कमीशन ने स्कूटिनाइज किया है और साफ किया है । मैं सबसे पहले आपकी तबज्जह दिलाऊंगा सरकार कमीशन रिपोर्ट के सफा 22-23 की तरफ जिसमें कि 245 मुलाजिमा के सिलसिले में एक इन्फार्म-शन दी गई थी सदन को, जिसमें कि मिनिस्ट्री

[श्री मु० अ० खां]

की तरफ से यह कहा गया था कि यह अण्व्वा-इंटमेंट्स जो किये गये हैं यह सही नहीं किये गये हैं और यह एकाईडिंग दू रूल्स नहीं है। हालांकि जब इसको कमीशन ने स्कूटिनाइज किया तो बड़े साफ लफ्जों में उन्होंने कहा है, मैं सफ़ा 23 से कोट कर रहा हूँ...

एक माननीय सदस्य : किसके बारे में ?

श्री मु० अ० खां : 245 अण्व्वाइंटमेंट्स जिसके सिलसिले में सदन में इन्फार्मेशन दी गई थी कि यह रेगुलर नहीं हैं, उनके सिलसिले में जो स्कूटिनाइज किया है कमीशन ने 23 सफ़ा पर उसमें यह कहा गया था :

"According to item (i) of the Committee's terms of reference, they are to state whether the appointment of these 245 persons constituted a violation of the rules and regulations then in force. According to the CSIR headquarters it would appear that this is so."

"They have started in a letter dated 28. 12. 1968 addressed to the Committee that the reply given to the Parliament question can *prima facie* be interpreted that these appointments were not quite regular. "In face, on 15th November 1967 a circular was issued to all the laboratories by the Secretary, CSIR" etc.

अब जो वडिक्ट है कमेटी का इस सिलसिले में, वह मैं कोट करता हूँ :

"However, the Committee are not aware of any express rule or regulation or bye-law prescribing a degree/diploma in science or technology as an essential qualification for the scientific/technical posts under the CSIR. It can, therefore, be stated that no rule, regulation or bye law of the CSIR was violated so far as the qualifications of these persons are concerned."

तो मुझे यह अर्ज करना है, मैंने आप के सामने एक मिसाल दी कि जिसमें जिस तरीके से हाउस को मिसगाइड किया गया और जब जानकारी की गई तो सरकार कमीशन ने सारे अण्व्वाइंटमेंट्स को रेगुलर करार दिया।

इसके अलावा मैं इस रिपोर्ट के पेज 79 की तरफ आप की तबज्जह दिलाऊंगा जिसमें डा० सूरी के केस को रेफर किया गया है और उसमें बहुत कुछ कहा गया। उसमें जो इन्फार्मेशन दी गई हाउस में उसके खिलाफ भी इसमें वडिक्ट है सरकार कमीशन का। इसमें लिखा है :

"The committee, therefore, think that he was fully qualified to hold the post of the Director and full facts, should have been brought to the notice of the House by the minister to correct this erroneous impression."

इससे साफ जाहिर है...

एक माननीय सदस्य : यह किसके बारे में है ?

श्री मु० अ० खां : डा० सूरी के सिलसिले में जो हाउस को इन्फार्मेशन दी थी मिनिस्टर ने उसके लिए साफ कहा गया है कि मिनिस्टर ने सही इन्फार्मेशन नहीं दी हाउस को। वह उस पोस्ट के लिये सही क्वालीफाइड थे। तो इस किस्म की कोशिश जो मैंने अभी कोट किया, आज नई नहीं है। कहा गया, मैंने सुना है, कि एक ग्राम्पुमेंट यह आया कि अक्रबर अली खां ने कोई चिट्ठी लिखी है चेयरमैन साहब सरकार कमीशन को कि जिसमें उन्होंने यह कहा है...(व्यवधान)...मैंने तो अभी शुरुआत भी नहीं की। मैं जल्दी-जल्दी अपनी बात रखे देता हूँ।

मैं अर्ज कर रहा था कि उसमें कुछ एतराज किया जायगा हालांकि सही बात यह है कि इससे पहले जो ड्राफ्ट रिपोर्ट तैयार की गई उसमें डायरेक्टर जनरल को मौका नहीं दिया गया था कि वह कमीशन के सामने आकर अपनी पूरी बात रख सकें। यह कोई तरीका नहीं है, यह कोई इंसाफ नहीं है, कोई इंसाफ की अदालत यह नहीं करेगी कि जो मुलजिम हो उसको मौका न दिया जाय और उसकी पूरी बात

सुने वगैर फंसला कर दिया जाय। उसके ऊपर चेयरमैन ने इत्तफाक किया। जब डा० जहीर को मौका दिया गया कि वह कमीशन के सामने पूरी बात रखें तो उनको बुलाया गया और उनके बयान की रोशनी में जो कुछ देखा गया, उस पर यह रिपोर्ट तैयार की गई।

अब मैं इन चीजों को छीड़ूंगा। मैं एक तरफ खास तवज्जह दिलाऊंगा। इस कमेटी की जो पहली मीटिंग हुई उसमें यह तय किया था कमेटी ने कि वह सन् 58 से लेकर 68 तक के सी० एस० आई० आर० के अफेयर्स को स्कूटिनाइज करेगी। मगर हुआ यह कि मुमकिन है मौका न मिल सका हो कमेटी को उन्होंने सिर्फ 66 तक के वाक्यांत सी० एस० आई० आर० के देखें। उसमें हिसाइड यह किया था :

"It was decided at the first meeting held on 27-7-68 that the committee would review policies followed by the CSIR between 1958 to 1964."

अगर 1 68 तक स्कूटिनाइज करने की तकलीफ कमेटी गवारा करती तो हमारे सामने सही पिक्चर आ जाती कि जहीर पीरियड में क्या-क्या काम हुए और जहीर पीरियड के बाद जो मौजूदा डी० जी० हैं वह किस तरह से मनमानी फेब्रिटेज्म और डिस्क्रिमिनेशन बरत रहे हैं। बहुत जल्दी पांच मिनट में मैं अपनी बात समाप्त करता हूँ।... (ध्यवधान)...

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं अर्ज कर रहा था कि किस तरह से मौजूदा डाइरेक्टर जनरल प्राइम मिनिस्टर और गवर्निंग साडी की पालिसी के खिलाफ अपनी पालिसी सी०एस०आई०आर० पर ठूसने की कोशिश कर रहे हैं। मैं आपकी तवज्जह प्राइम मिनिस्टर साहिब के एक स्टेटमेंट की तरफ दिलाता हूँ जो उन्होंने कस्टेशिया की मीटिंग में दिया था—

"We are conscious that growth cannot be sustained on borrowed or even adapted technology. True Self-reliance can come only as we develop the ability to solve our technological problems."

लेकिन, उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, उसी मीटिंग में डाइरेक्टर जनरल डा० आत्मा राम कहते हैं—

"In developing countries where time is of the essence, adaptation work should be an important function of scientific institutions."

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, जहाँ प्राइम मिनिस्टर और गवर्निंग साडी की पालिसी है कि डिजाइनिंग और इंजीनियरिंग फंसिलिटीज बढ़ें और पार्लेट प्लान्ज पर ज्यादा खर्च किया जाय और आप देखें कि जहाँ हमारी प्राइम मिनिस्टर ने कहा है—

"The machinery for utilising his research findings through the process of development, design and manufacturing has been rather crude."

जहाँ हमारी प्राइम मिनिस्टर चाहती हैं कि डिजाइनिंग और इंजीनियरिंग के काम को बढ़ावा दिया जाय, लेकिन इन्होंने बिलकुल उस के खिलाफ काम किया। मिसाल के तौर पर डा० जहीर के पीरियड में 1964 28 पायलट प्लान्ज थे, 1965 में 36 और 1966 में 35 थे, लेकिन जहीर पीरियड के बाद यानी डा० आत्मा राम के अमाने में 1967 में 22, 1968 में 28 थे। इसका मतलब है कि इन्होंने बेसिकली प्राइम मिनिस्टर और गवर्निंग साडी की जो पालिसी थी, उससे इन्तलाफ किया और अपनी पालिसी को सी०एस०आई०आर० पर ठूसने की कोशिश की।

अब मैं यहाँ पर दो कैसेज आपके सामने रखना चाहता हूँ जिनसे साबित होगा कि डा० आत्मा राम किस तरह से फेब्रिटेज्म कर रहे हैं। इनके यहाँ दो अडिस्टेट डाइरेक्टर्स थे— डा० बालाकृष्णन और डा० कुरेशी। इन दोनों साहबान की क्वालिफिकेशन और मरिट्स भलेहूदा-भलेहूदा मैं सदन के सामने रखूंगा और उसके बाद सदन फैसला करे कि किस तरह से डिस्क्रिमिनेशन और फेब्रिटेज्म वहाँ पर चल रहा है। डा० बालाकृष्णन के फादर किसी इन्स्टीचूशन के इंचार्ज थे, जहाँ से उन्होंने पी०एच०डी० किया।

[श्री मु० प्र० खा]

Dr. S. Balakrishna

Dr. M. N. Qureshy

Degrees	Ph. D. in Geology under his own father	D. Sc. in Geophysics which is not only desirable but also an essential qualification for a research institute in Geophysics
	M. Sc. by research only Intermediate after failing once	M. Sc. through regular examination Intermediate in First Division
Place of Degree	Ph. D. from a university whose Vice-Chancellor was his own father and where at that time even provision for M.Sc. was not there.	D. Sc. from the Colorado School of Mines, Golden, Colorado, USA—school of high international repute which was the first to offer course in geophysics in the USA as far back as 1928.

अगर आप, उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, इन क्वालिफिकेशन का मुकाबला करें तो आपको मालूम होगा कि डा० कुरेशी की क्वालिफिकेशन डा० बालाकृष्णन की क्वालिफिकेशन के मुकाबले कहीं ऊंची थी। उसके बाद यह तय हुआ कि जिन जिन को कन्फर्मेशन मिलना है, उन सबके केसेज कमीशन को रेफर किये जाय। प्राइम मिनिस्टर साहबा, जो इसकी प्रेसिडेन्ट है, उन्होंने ऐसा तय किया। डा० बालाकृष्णन के केस के मामले में उनके डाइरेक्टर इंचार्ज ने उनके कन्फर्मेशन को अपोज किया और डा० कुरेशी के केस में फेबरेबिल रिपोर्ट दी, लेकिन डा० आत्मा राम ने क्या किया। डा० बालाकृष्णन को कन्फर्म कर दिया। यह फेबरेटिज्म और डिस्क्रिमिनेशन का क्लिअर केस है। मैं चाहता हूँ कि इसके अन्दर जा कर देखा जाय, इसकी जांच की जाय, तब आपको मालूम होगा कि वहां पर किस तरह से फेबरेटिज्म और डिस्क्रिमिनेशन बढ़ता जा रहा है।

मैं एक और केस भी आपके सामने कोट करना चाहता हूँ—एक मि० सिगल हैं, जो डाक्टर आत्मा राम के रिलेशन हैं। इनको पेट्रोलियम रिसर्च इंस्टीट्यूट में ट्रेनिंग के लिए भेजा गया था। डा० आत्मा राम ने वहां के आफिसर से कहा कि इनको डिग्री दे दी जाय। उस आफिसर ने अपोज किया और कहा कि डा० सिगल को डिग्री नहीं दी जा सकती। उसके बाद इन्होंने अपने खुद के इनीशियेटिव

पर अपने दफतर को डिग्री देने के लिये हुकम जारी किया और उनको डिग्री दे दी गई—इस तरह से यहां पर फेबरेटिज्म हुआ।

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, इन सब बातों से जाहिर होगा कि डा० आत्मा राम प्राइम मिनिस्टर और गर्वनिंग बाडी की पालिसी के खिलाफ अपनी खुद की पालिसीज को सी० एस० आइ० आर० पर ठूसने की कोशिश कर रहे हैं। जहीर पीरियड की जांच हो चुकी है, मेरी मांग है कि डा० आत्मा राम के जमाने की भी जांच कराई जाय।

अभी अभी हमारे बाजपेयी जी ने कहा कि मैं अपनी किताब भी पढ़ कर सुना दूँ। उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, इस वक्त मौका है, अगर इजाजत दे तो यह किताब, जिसमें मैंने डा० आत्मा राम के निजाम के खिलाफ क्लिअर आरोप लगाये हैं, सभा पटल पर रख दूँ। मैं चाहता हूँ कि इसकी एक एक आइटम की जांच की जाय, मैं खुला हुआ चैलेज देता हूँ और चाहता हूँ कि एक कमीशन मुकर्रर किया जाय, तब आपको मालूम होगा कि फेबरेटिज्म बेइमानी और इस कान्सिल की पालिसीज की मुखालिफत कौन कर रहा है।

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मेरे पास और भी बहुत सी मिसालें हैं, जिससे मैं साबित कर सकता हूँ कि डा० आत्मा राम किस तरह से अपनी पालिसीज को कान्सिल पर ठूसने की कोशिश कर रहे हैं। लेकिन चूँकि वक्त नहीं है, इसलिए

इन्हीं अलफाज के साथ अपनी तकरीर खत्म करता हूँ।

SHRI SAMAR GUHA (Contd.) : Mr. Speaker, Sir, on 15th May a report appeared in "The Statesman" in which during their representation by the Scientific Workers Association to the Prime Minister they accused the C. S. I. R. Inquiry Committee for failing to inquire into the Hyderabad Laboratory. The Association complained :

"That distorted answers were sent by the Director of the Laboratory to the queries made by the Sarkar Committee ; files have been burnt and are being tampered with to destroy any evidence of irregularity."

A memorandum has been submitted to the Prime Minister by that Scientific Workers' Association in which they have complained against the C S I R Inquiry Committee in which it has said :—

"Unfortunately, the Committee of inquiry did not care to ascertain from the working scientists in this laboratory the truth about the various complaints regarding the acts of favouritism, nepotism and corruption."

This memorandum contains such sweeping accusations against Dr. Sidhu, who is a creature of Dr. Zaheer, and is also responsible in many ways for denigration of the Hyderabad laboratory, that if a part of it is true, Dr. Sidhu should not only be sacked immediately but should be prosecuted. I will place this, with our permission, on the Table of the House.*

In a sense the Prime Minister has made my task of charging against the C S I R Enquiry Report easy because she has asked for a fresh inquiry on the activities of Hyderabad Laboratory on the complaints that have been made by this Scientific Workers' Association.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE : Are you sure ?

SHRI SAMAR GUHA : Yes, the paper report goes like that.

If it is so, what does it mean ? It means an indirect censure of the C S I R Inquiry Committee, because both in the draft report as also in the final report the Hyderabad

laboratory was described as "the focal point of inquiry". If the C S I R Inquiry Committee discharged its duty, as was expected of it, why should a fresh inquiry be held regarding the irregularities of the Hyderabad laboratory ? As I have already said, I am thankful to the Prime Minister that she has made the task of defending myself very easy now.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : You can afford to be brief now.

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI : I think, the hon. Member is mistaken about any fresh inquiry.

SHRI SAMAR GUHA : The Prime Minister is very alert in every other sphere. This report appeared in the *Statesman* in double column. It was her duty to contradict it immediately. When I quote it on the floor of the House, she contradicts it. It does not speak very well of the Prime Minister.

About the accusation that I made in this House, there was an impromptu meeting of the C S I R Inquiry Committee which was presided over not by Shri Sarkar but by another gentleman, and it passed a resolution accusing me of making "utterly untrue, thoroughly irresponsible and uncharitable allegations". Then it asked that that resolution "should be given wide publicity". Immediately, within a few hours of this resolution being passed, it was given wide publicity by A I R and the press all over India.

The C S I R Inquiry Committee has set up an extraordinary precedent. If any Committee, which is nothing but a creature of this House, can pass a resolution of this type about any discussion held in this House censuring the Member who made the speech in this House, it will make relations between Parliament and any committee appointed by this House untenable in future. I want to know from the Education Minister directly whether it was the C S I R Inquiry Committee that gave that resolution to the A I R and also to the press or whether it was sent to the Prime Minister, who is the President of the C S I R, or to the Vice-President, who is the Education Minister himself, and if it was so, whether it is they who gave it to the A I R and also to the press ; if so,

*The Speaker subsequently not having accorded the necessary permission, the paper was not treated as laid on the Table.

[Shri Samar Guha]

on what authority, without making any reference to the House of that resolution, they had given it to the A. J. R. and the press. This amounts to defamation not only of myself, Shri Madhu Limaye and Shri Prakash Vir Shastri but the defamation of this House. It is a contemptuous resolution which amounts almost to a breach of privilege of this House. I want a straight answer from the Education Minister about this.

I said, that report was a draft report and it was meant for final adoption in the month of December. In that Resolution, what they said was—I quote :

"It is totally incorrect to describe as the original report a draft which was really a working paper meant for discussion to enable the Committee to arrive at final conclusions. In the normal course of the working of any Committee, a number of drafts are always prepared, discussed, debated, modified, by additions or deletions before the Report is finalised.

I want to know from the Government whether in any of the communication that was sent by the Secretary of the Committee to the Members of the Committee any word like "working paper" was used.

I read out one of the letters—I can read more—which the Secretary of the Committee addressed to the members of the Committee :

"Kindly refer to my d. o. of even number dated... I enclose the Chapter 11 of the Part I of the draft report which ends with this Chapter."

Again, I want the Education Minister to place before this House the letter of Dr. Kelkar who is a member of this Committee. I read out that letter of Dr. Kelkar addressed to the Chairman of the Committee :

"I am making some observations about the interim report to be finalised shortly."

He says about the interim report to be finalised for adoption of the Committee.

There was only one report, and only one draft, and no other draft, no other working paper. If there was a working paper, can the Committee say that there were a number of working papers, a number of discussion

papers? There was only one single draft that was to be finalised and that too after a sub-Committee considered it. Just when the signatures of the members were to be put, then something happened which I will tell afterwards. Therefore, a ridiculous word "final conclusions" has been adopted in the resolution. Conclusions always lead to finality. It was not a tentative recommendation or a tentative conclusion and can you say that in any draft of any Committee that can be found? There are conclusions or recommendations in the original draft. In Chapter VI and Chapter XI, there were conclusions and there were recommendations. In a draft paper which is meant for discussion and for debate, can there be any such conclusions and recommendations. These conclusions and recommendations were there. Nowhere the words "tentative conclusions" or "tentative recommendations" were there. Therefore, when you say, for final conclusions...

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : The hon. Member may try to conclude now

SHRI SAMAR GUHA : That won't be. You should allow me at least 15 minutes more. I have to defend myself. I have been called thoroughly irresponsible. You must allow me more time. Sir, you know, I have been called thoroughly irresponsible. I have to discharge my duty to the nation by exposing the C.S.I.R. Committee. Do you think I will take it lying down? *(Interruption)*

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : I can understand your feelings about it. But my problem is to control the time of the House. Unless other Members in the House agree to give you their time. *(Interruption)*

SHRI NAMBIAR : We will not give him our time... *(Interruption)*

SHRI SAMAR GUHA : You must give me time or you will have to throw me out of this House. I have a lot of material with me. I will quote the draft and the final report to show who is right and who is wrong... *(Interruption)* I will show you who has tainted and twisted the original report. You have to give me time or you will have to throw me out of this House today.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : There is no question of throwing out anybody

SHRI SAMAR GUHA : I am boiling with anger. I have been called as thoroughly irresponsible. That word "thoroughly irresponsible" has been used. It has gone deep into my marrow, into my whole sense of existence.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : I would like you to cooperate with me and understand that other Members also have got important submissions to make. Everything has to be finished within the time allotted for it. Now, in spite of that I will give you five minutes more. Kindly co-operate and conclude. If you don't, I will call Mr. Vajpayee now.

SHRI SAMAR GUHA : Then you will have to throw me out. I challenge you. You will have to throw me out. I have been called irresponsible. I have never in my life done anything irresponsible.

SHRI NAMBIAK : Is this the way a Member should behave giving a threat to the Chair that you will have to throw him out.

SHRI SURENDRANATH DWIVEDI (Kendrapara) : Let him try to put forward his submission within the time.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : He is so emotional that he would not listen to anything. I am giving him five minutes more and am making a request to him to kindly conclude. In spite of it, he holds out a threat that I will have to throw him out of the House. This is not the way to behave.

SHRI SAMAR GUHA : I humbly submit, Sir, I never exercised in my political life any right irresponsibly. When the report was going to be adopted in the month of December, some news was leaked out in which one gentleman, who was the junior to the lawyer uncle of Dr. Zaheer, rushed to Dr. Zaheer and Dr. Zaheer rushed to Delhi and had discussions with the higher-ups and had discussions with the Chairman and then he had managed three sittings with CSIR Inquiry Committee. These are the reports of the three sittings on the basis of the 37 questions that were put to him. Is it not

the honesty of the Committee that a summary of this report should be included in the final report? Why was Dr. Zaheer singled out? Mr. Gaagla, who was the Vice-President of CSIR objected to many of the appointments and many of the irregularities. Why was Mr. Chagla not asked to give evidence?

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA (Alipore) : He was asked to give evidence.

SHRI SAMAR GUHA : Why were the other Directors and those members of the Selection Committee of experts not asked to give evidence? Why was one gentleman singled out? After that what happened? The final draft underwent a metamorphic change—as a student of chemistry I will say it underwent almost alchemical change. I will just quote a few words from the original draft and the final draft. Ignoring the claims of the 28 national laboratories of India and ignoring the claims of the talented scientists Dr. Zaheer planted eight of his associates in a surreptitious manner within four months in different high posts of the different national laboratories ignoring, violating all the rules, without advertisement, with dubious tactics and without caring a little to the opinion of the Selection Committee of experts. About Dr. Datar the final report says :

"No specific allegation was made to the Committee against the appointment of Dr. Datar."

This is the draft report. There is no necessity for me to say anything. I compare the two drafts :

"No advertisement was issued. No Selection Committee was constituted. No interview was held. In fact no other person was considered."

Then Dr. Narewala, an expert made a devastating remark :

"I consider Dr. Datar who is at present Deputy Director in charge as completely out of touch with this institute. He is not in a position to make any contribution in the discussion that took place. I think he is inadequate for the job and in my opinion he will not do as a Director. I have not found a scientific worker who is so ineffective as

[Shri Samar Guha]

Deputy Director. Dr. Datar is not an expert."

The name of Dr. Datar for the post of Director was proposed by Mr. Kamdar of the Bhavnagar Industrial Works Private Ltd. Shri Kamdar became a member of the executive council of a certain committee after four months.

SHRI SAMAR GUHA : Then, Sir,...

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : If you go on quoting you will never come to an end.

SHRI SAMAR GUHA : Dr. Datar's original report says he was given an advance increment and this brought him at par with some others ; but, Sir, these facts have been suppressed. I have got here the comparative merits of these different candidates. Sir, it is shown that he was an ordinary B.A. claims of so many other M Scs and First Class qualified people were ignored.

There is another man, Dr. Siddhu. The final report says and I quote.

"As the Committee did not think that the appointment of Dr. Datar in CSIR was intended to make room for Dr. Siddhu..."

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Please conclude.

SHRI SAMAR GUHA : I am concluding now.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : You cannot hold the whole House to ransom. You have got to cooperate somewhere ; you have to put a limit somewhere. I am concerned with the time of the House and the right of the other Members to make their submissions too. I have to defend your right and at the same time the rights of the other Members also. You cannot speak for half an hour.

SHRI SAMAR GUHA : I am concluding. In the case of all the Members, here, the final report says : 'No allegation, no allegation'. But in the draft report what do you find ? Not only allegation, but serious charges. They doubted the *bonafides* ; they said this was wrong. You go through every line. The Education Minister is here. The

Prime Minister is the President of the C.S.I.R. If she has any trust in this House, if she has any honesty in the judgement of the other Members, let the two drafts, the original draft and the final draft be compared. Let an enquiry committee be formed. Let all the papers, all the documents, all the materials, all the evidences, all the passages, be gone into. There is no necessity whatsoever for other things, no commentary, no argument, no logic, no debate, nothing is necessary. You just compare the remarks, the conclusions and the recommendations, made in the original draft and which have been metamorphically changed in the final draft.

I come to Chapter XI. In every para there is a devastating indictment of Dr. Zaheer. These are fact and figures and concrete examples. These have been suppressed, concealed, tainted, twisted, and white-washed in the final report. I don't care for any Dr. Atma Ram or Dr. Zaheer.

I care for the future development of science and technology in this country. Rs. 200 crores have been spent for this organisation. This year Rs. 20½ crores is being spent.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Please conclude.

SHRI SAMAR GUHA : My final request is this. These committees should be dissolved. A fresh committee should be there. All the materials which are there go to show that Shri Sarkar has allowed his image to be tarnished enough. He should not allow his image to be tarnished more by continuing as Chairman.

And, lastly, the Prime Minister is the President of the C.S.I.R. and the Education Minister is the Vice-President of the C.S.I.R. Who is to control CSIR ? This dyarchical control must go. A new Ministry has to be formed : the Ministry of Science and Technological Development. A new Ministry should be entrusted with this job. All these irregular appointments should be regularised. It should be made an Institute for only applied work, nothing else. I am making this constructive suggestion.

My concluding remark is this that I shall not be charitable to those people who indulge in utter falsehood and in suppress-

ing and concealing the facts, the data and documents that were incorporated in the draft report and who turned this highest scientific organisation into a corrupt one showing nepotism and favouritism and creating a group rivalry relegating it to an organisation of a mediocre size.

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी (बलरामपुर) : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, जब हम सरकार कमेटी की रिपोर्ट पर विचार कर रहे हैं तब स्वाभाविक रूप से हमारा ध्यान श्री पी० एन० काटजू की ओर जाता है, जो राज्य सभा के सदस्य हुआ करते थे, और जिन्होंने सी० एस० आई० आर० के सम्बन्ध में सबसे पहले संसद में जांच की मांग की थी। उस मांग को टाला गया, लेकिन अन्ततोगत्वा सरकार को एक जांच कमेटी बनाने का फैसला करना पड़ा। जांच कमेटी के अध्यक्ष श्री सरकार हैं, जो सुप्रीम कोर्ट में रह चुके हैं, चीफ जस्टिस के रूप में कार्य कर चुके हैं। संसद के सदस्य और वैज्ञानिक भी उस कमेटी में शामिल हैं। हम आशा करते थे कि कमेटी की रिपोर्ट विवाद का विषय नहीं बनेगी, ऐसी रिपोर्ट आयेगी जो तथ्यों को सामने रखेगी, अनियमितताओं पर प्रकाश डालेगी, जो गलतियां हुई हैं उन पर अंगुलि-निर्देश करेगी और सी० एस० आई० आर० के काम काज को, उसके अन्तर्गत चलने वाली लेबोरेट्रीज को किस तरह से ठीक से चलाया जा सकता है, विज्ञान और टेकनालोजी की उन्नति में वह किस प्रकार योगदान दे सकती है, इसके सम्बन्ध में ठोस उपाय सुझायेगी लेकिन बड़े खेद की बात है कि सरकार कमेटी की पहली रिपोर्ट विवाद का विषय बन गई।

इससे कोई इन्कार नहीं कर सकता कि पहले ड्राफ्ट रिपोर्ट तैयार हुई थी। उसको कोई बकिंग पेपर कहने की गलती न करे। बकिंग पेपर अलग होता है, ड्राफ्ट रिपोर्ट अलग होती है। हम लोगों को भी कमेटियों में काम करने का मौका मिला है। फाइनेंस रिपोर्ट मंजूर करने से पहले ड्राफ्ट रिपोर्ट आती है। बकिंग पेपर लग बीज है, और जैसा श्री समर गुह ने कहा

किसी बकिंग पेपर में कन्क्लूजन्स नहीं दिये जाते और जो सदस्यों को पत्र लिखे गये कमेटी के सेक्रेट्री की तरफ से, उनमें भी यह बात साफ कर दी गई है कि पार्ट 1 की रिपोर्ट इंटरिम रिपोर्ट है, इस अर्थ में कि यह पहली रिपोर्ट है, दूसरी रिपोर्ट बाद में आयेगी। यह ड्राफ्ट है जो सदस्यों की मंजूरी के लिए भेजा गया। प्रश्न यह है कि यह ड्राफ्ट बदला क्यों गया और किस के दबाव में आकर बदला गया? क्या यह सच है कि ड्राफ्ट रिपोर्ट तैयार होने के बाद डा० जहीर कमेटी के सामने पेश हुए? मैं पूछना चाहता हूँ कि डा० जहीर कमेटी के सामने पहले नहीं आये थे? क्या कमेटी के सामने उन्हें पहले नहीं बुलाया गया था? बुलाया जाना चाहिये था। ड्राफ्ट रिपोर्ट तैयार हो गई तब उन्हें बुलाया गया। मैं जानना चाहूंगा कि डा० जहीर की एविडेंस में क्या था। उसको मभा-पटल पर रक्खा जाये। क्या वह एविडेंस ऐसी थी जिसके प्रकाश में सारी रिपोर्ट बदली गई? जो रिपोर्ट सर्वसम्मत होने वाली थी वह रिपोर्ट मैजस्ट्री रिपोर्ट बन गई? पार्लियामेंट के चार मंत्रियों को नोट आफ डिसेंट देना पड़ा। क्यों देना पड़ा? उन्होंने अपने नोट आफ डिसेंट में लिखा है— यह बात ध्यान देने लायक है कि :

"Firstly, we find that the statements made by Dr. Zaheer before the Committee have been given an uncritical credence and an unmerited prominence."

बाद में जो रिपोर्ट तैयार हुई उसका सारा आधार डा० जहीर का बयान था। किसी भी कमेटी के काम करने का यह ढंग मैंने आज तक नहीं देखा है। इससे मन में सन्देह होना स्वाभाविक है और शिक्षा मंत्री महोदय या प्रधान मंत्री महोदय, जो प्रेजिडेंट हैं, इन सन्देहों को निराकरण करें कि ड्राफ्ट रिपोर्ट और बाद की रिपोर्ट में जो अन्तर है वह किसी दबाव में आकर किया गया।

मुझे आश्चर्य है कि कमेटी के मंत्री प्रस्ताव पास करते हैं मगर आरोप लगाया गया था

[श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी]

प्रधान मन्त्री पर और श्री सरकार पर। प्रधान मन्त्री ने इस बात का खण्डन नहीं किया कि उन्होंने दबाव डाला है, न श्री सरकार ने खंडन किया है कि उनके ऊपर कोई दबाव डाला गया। कमेटी ने प्रस्ताव पास कर दिया। कमेटी अगर इस तरह से प्रस्ताव पास करेगी तो कोई कमेटी काम नहीं कर सकती। पार्लियामेंट की पब्लिक एकाउंट्स कमेटी है। उसमें हम कोई निर्णय करें, कोई चर्चा करें कोई रिपोर्ट लायें और उस कमेटी की रिपोर्ट की सदन में बैठे हुए संघस्य आलोचना करें, फिर कमेटी के मम्बर जाकर सदन के बाहर उस कमेटी में आलोचना का खंडन करें, तो कोई भी कमेटी इस तरह से काम कर सकती है। मेरा निवेदन है कि जो भी एविडेंस आई है उसको सभा-पटल पर रखना जाये और सदन को विश्वास में लिया जाये।

मैंने एक अंग्रेजी दैनिक में पढ़ा था कि डा० जहीर ने कहा कि उन्हें दो अफसर मिलने चाहिये सी. एस. आई. आर. की तरफ से जिसके द्वारा वह अपना पक्ष रख सकें। मैं नहीं जानता कि उन्हें अफसर दिया गया या नहीं। वह अब डाइरेक्टर जनरल नहीं हैं, लेकिन शायद अभी भी वह अपने को डाइरेक्टर जनरल समझते हैं। दो अफसर देने की मांग क्यों की गई? डाक्टर जहीर ने एक और बड़ी गम्भीर बात कही है कि उनकी आलोचना इसलिए की जा रही है कि वह नेहरू परिवार के मित्र हैं। क्या नेहरू परिवार का मित्र होना सब पापों पर परदा डालने का कारण बनेगा? वह नेहरू परिवार के मित्र हो सकते हैं, लेकिन अगर उनके कार्य काल में कोई अनियमिततायें हुई हैं, नियमों का उल्लंघन हुआ है, पक्षपात हुआ है, भेदभाव हुआ है, तो इसकी आलोचना की जायेगी।

आपको रिपोर्ट पढ़कर आश्चर्य होया कि सरकार कमेटी की रिपोर्ट में माना गया है कि नियमों का पालन नहीं किया गया है, मगर आगे कहा गया है कि यह भेला फाइली नहीं है

सरकार कमेटी को चाहिये था कि पहले भेला फाइली की परिभाषा तय करती। नियम बनाये जाते हैं पालन करने के लिये या उल्लंघन करने के लिए? एक कमेटी ने माना है कि नियमों का उल्लंघन हुआ है, मगर यह कहकर साटि-फिकेट दे दिया है कि भेला फाइली नहीं है। कमेटी विभाग में किस तरह से गई, इंटेसन में किस तरह से गई? जो नियम बनाये गये उनका उल्लंघन हुआ, पदों का विज्ञापन नहीं किया गया, सेलेशन कमेटीयां ठीक तरह से नहीं बनीं, हैदराबाद लेबोरेट्री में जिसको देखो वह बड़ा बन गया। ऐसा लगता है कि हैदराबाद लेबोरेट्री बिल्कुल हीरों की खान है। किसी कोयले पर हाथ रखो वह हीरा निकला; किसी कंकर को पकड़ो वह शंकर बन गया। ऐसी लेबोरेट्री मैंने आज तक नहीं देखी। स्पष्ट है कि नियमों का उल्लंघन करके पक्षपात किया गया और अपने लोगों को आगे लाने की कोशिश की गई।

यह देश में विज्ञान बढ़ाने का तरीका नहीं है। हम शिकायत करते हैं कि नौजवान वैज्ञानिक विदेशों में जा रहे हैं, उन्हें देश के भीतर काम करने का अवसर नहीं है। प्रश्न वेतन का नहीं है, प्रश्न सुविधाओं का भी नहीं है, नौजवान वैज्ञानिक काम करने का अवसर चाहते हैं और जो भी काम वह करते हैं उसका रिकग्निशन चाहते हैं, लेकिन जब कम योग्यता वाले व्यक्ति आगे बढ़ा दिये जाते हैं और अच्छी योग्यता वाले व्यक्ति पीछे फेंके दिये जाते हैं तो उसमें हताशा पैदा होती है, निराशा पैदा होती है, और यह स्थिति विज्ञान की प्रगति में सहायक नहीं हो सकती।

देश में एक नई पद्धति चल पड़ी है। मेरे मित्र श्री मुशीर अहमद सां यहां बोले। उन्होंने और श्री अर्जुन अरोड़ा ने मिलकर एक पैम्पलेट निकाला है। यह पैम्पलेट सी० ए० आई० आर० के विरुद्ध निकाला गया है। सी० ए० आई० आर० की प्रिजेंट प्रधान मन्त्री हैं।

भगर डा० आत्मा राम कोई गलती कर रहे हैं तो प्रधान मंत्री उनको रोक सकती हैं, भगर डा० आत्मा राम सरकार की नीति के विरुद्ध भाचरण कर रहे हैं तो प्रधान मंत्री उनसे जवाब तलब कर सकती हैं लेकिन सरकारी पार्टी के मेम्बर इस तरह से पैम्पलेट प्रकाशित करें यह देश की राजनीति का एक नया तरीका है। डा० संजीव रेड्डी के खिलाफ प्रकाशित पैम्पलेट में नाम नहीं हैं, इसमें नाम हैं। बड़ी हिम्मत के साथ बात कही गई है, लेकिन मैं पूछना चाहता हूँ कि क्या यह भ्रष्टाचारों के मनोबल को तोड़ने का तरीका नहीं है? पार्लियामेंट के मेम्बर सदन में बात उठा सकते हैं। पैम्पलेट छापकर बांटना और फिर तुलना करना प्रधान मंत्री की और डा० आत्मा राम की, मैं नहीं समझता हूँ कि इसमें प्रधान मंत्री की प्रतिष्ठा कम की जा रही है या बढ़ाई जा रही है या डा० आत्मा राम को प्रधान मंत्री के स्तर पर रखा जा रहा है और आरोप लगाया जा रहा है कि डा० आत्मा राम सरकार की नीति पर नहीं चल रहे हैं। मैं आशा करता हूँ कि शिक्षा मंत्री महोदय इस प्रकार के आरोपों का टढ़ता-पूर्वक उत्तर देंगे। डा० आत्मा राम इस सदन में जवाब नहीं दे सकते हैं। उन पर जो आरोप लगाए गए हैं, उनका उत्तर देना शिक्षा मंत्री महोदय का काम है।

श्री सु० धं० खां० : मैं एक दरखास्त करना चाहता हूँ।

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी : मैं दरखास्त सुनने के लिए तैयार नहीं हूँ। मैंने आपका पैम्पलेट पढ़ लिया है, वह काफी है।

एक ही उदाहरण मैं दूंगा। वैसे कई मामले हैं लेकिन समय नहीं है सब उदाहरणों को देने का। श्री कमलेश राय की नियुक्ति किस ढंग से हुए है? कोई विज्ञापन नहीं दिया गया, अच्छे लोग नहीं आ सके, प्रतियोगिता नहीं हो सकी।

श्री स० मो० बनर्जी (कानपुर) : ऐसा ही पार्लियामेंट में भी हुआ है। अच्छे लोग आ नहीं सके हैं।

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी : कानपुर से तो अच्छे आए हैं।

एक दूसरे साहब हैं श्री भारत भूषण। मैं उन्हें व्यक्तिगत रूप से नहीं जानता। उनके साथ मेरी कोई शत्रुता नहीं है। लेकिन कमेटी की रिपोर्ट कहती है कि वह थर्ड क्लास बी० एन सी० हैं और उनके सिनीपसिस में लिख दिया गया है कि वह पी एच० डी० हैं। यह बड़ा गम्भीर मामला है। सचमुच में वह भ्रष्टाचार भारत के भूषण मालूम होते हैं। फाइनल रिपोर्ट में इसको सपरैस कर दिया गया है। लेकिन तथ्यों को छिपाया नहीं जा सकता है! सिनीपसिस में पी एच० डी० लिख दिया। क्या यह घोस्राधड़ी नहीं है? क्या यह सरकार की आंखों में धूल भोंकना नहीं है? इस पर तो मुकदमा चल सकता है। जो व्यक्ति बी० एस सी० है और भ्रगर वह दावा करे कि वह पी एच० डी० है तो उसे कटपड़े में लड़ा किया जा सकता है। यह बात झूठ रिपोर्ट में थी लेकिन फाइनल रिपोर्ट में से निकाल दी गई। इसलिए मेरा कहना है कि जो नियमों का उल्लंघन किया गया है और अपने व्यक्तियों को आगे बढ़ाने के लिए किया गया है वह बीनाफाइड नहीं है, बीनाफाइड है, उसका उद्देश्य लोगों के साथ पक्षपात करना था। इसलिए मैं मांग करता हूँ कि शिक्षा मंत्री महोदय सारे एविडेंस को सदन के सामने रखें। नियमों को तोड़कर जो भी नियुक्तियाँ हुई हैं वे रद्द की जानी चाहियें, नियमों का उल्लंघन करके जो भी लोग आगे बढ़े हैं, उनको अपनी पुरानी जगहों पर वापिस भेजा जाना चाहिए।

हर लैबोरेटरी के साथ फाइनेंशियल एड-वाइजर लगा हुआ है। वह क्या करता है? क्या उसकी राय की कोई कीमत है? अब तो प्रधान मंत्री बिना मंत्री भी हैं। लेकिन यहां

[श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी]

फाइनेंशल एडवाइजर कहीं तस्वीर में नहीं है नियुक्ति करते समय, रुपया व्यय करते समय। पब्लिक एकाउंट्स कमेटी ने भी अपनी एक रिपोर्ट दी है सी० एस० आई० आर० के बारे में और हैदराबाद की लैबोरेटरी के बारे में। हमने जो कुछ लिखा है, वह पढ़ने लायक है। उस रिपोर्ट में बताया गया है कि किस तरह से जनता की गाढ़े पसीने की कमाई के पैसे को कोल गैसीफिकेशन प्लांट में बहाया गया है। इन सारे मामलों की जांच होनी चाहिए। जो नियुक्तियां गलत ढंग से हुई हैं वे रद्द की जानी चाहिए। फाइनेंशल एडवाइजर को अपनी बात कहने का मौका दिया जाना चाहिये, उनकी राय पर काम किया जाना चाहिये। यह भी आवश्यक है कि प्रधान मंत्री महोदय यह तय करें कि वह सी० एस० आई० आर० के लिए पूरा समय दे सकती हैं या नहीं दे सकती हैं? प्रेजीडेंट का काम कोई पार्ट टाइम काम नहीं है यह तरीका पंडित जी के जमाने से चला आ रहा है। परिस्थितियां बदल गई हैं। प्रधान मंत्री की जिम्मेदारियां बढ़ गई हैं, उसके सिर दब बढ़ गए हैं। सरकारें तोड़ने, सरकारें बनाने, इसी से उन्हें फुसंत नहीं है। विज्ञान और टेक्नोलोजी की उपेक्षा नहीं होनी चाहिए। सी० एस० आई० आर० के लिए होल टाइम प्रेजीडेंट की आवश्यकता है। ऐसे व्यक्ति की आवश्यकता है जो पूरा समय दे सके। अगर वह कोई वैज्ञानिक हो तो बहुत अच्छा होगा। देश में विज्ञान और टेक्नोलोजी की उन्नति के मार्ग में जो बाधाएँ हैं और जो बाधाएँ सरकार कमेटी की रिपोर्ट से प्रकाश में आ गई हैं, उन बाधाओं को हड़तापूर्वक दूर करने का यत्न होना चाहिए, प्रश्न साम्प्रदायिकता का नहीं है। यह ताजुब की बात है कि श्री मधु लिमये ने यह बात कही, हम डा० जहीर की आलोचना करेंगे तो हमें सम्प्रदायवादी समझा जाएगा और श्री एम० ए० खां डा० आत्मा राम की आलोचना करेंगे तो क्या वह भी सम्प्रदायवादी समझे जायेंगे ?

प्रश्न साम्प्रदायिकता का नहीं है। प्रश्न सी० एस० आई० आर० को ठीक तरह से चलाने का है। लैबोरेटरीज में जो गड़बड़ियां हो रही हैं उनको रोकने का है। जो गलत ढंग से नियुक्तियां हुई हैं उनको रद्द करने का सवाल है। मुझे विश्वास है कि सरकार कमेटी की ड्राफ्ट रिपोर्ट और फाइनेल रिपोर्ट दोनों की तुलना करके केन्द्र सरकार निष्कर्ष निकालेगी और ऐसे कदम उठायेगी जिससे जनता के मन में जो शंकाएँ पैदा हुई हैं, उन शंकाओं का निराकरण हो।

श्री शशि भूषण (खारगोन) : हमारे देश में सार्वजनिक क्षेत्र में काम करने वाले अधिकारी कम से कम ऐसे होने चाहियें जो सार्वजनिक क्षेत्र की फिलोसोफी में विश्वास करने वाले हों। जब भी इस प्रकार के अधिकारियों की नियुक्ति की जाती है जैसे डा० आत्मा राम जी की या दूसरे अधिकारियों की जो हिन्दुस्तानी सार्वजनिक संस्थानों को प्रायः प्राइवेट सेक्टर के इशारों पर चलाते हैं और उनकी ऐसे महत्वपूर्ण स्थानों पर नियुक्ति होती है तो उससे सार्वजनिक क्षेत्र का नुकसान होता है। इस प्रकार के लोग जिनको पब्लिक सेक्टर पसन्द नहीं, उनकी ऐसे महत्वपूर्ण स्थानों पर जब नियुक्ति होती है तो सार्वजनिक क्षेत्र को नुकसान होता है और दुष्प्रा है। इतना ही नहीं। सी० एस० आई० आर० के जितने भी अनुसन्धान हुए हैं इस बात की कोशिश उसके बाद की गई है कि वे प्राइवेट सेक्टर को दे दिये जायें, अनुसन्धान करने के बाद उसके परिणामों के लिये चैम्बर आफ कामर्स के इशारों पर चला जाए।

16.17 hrs.

[Shri K. N. Tiwary in the Chair]

वैज्ञानिकों को पूरा काम करने का जो मौका मिलना चाहिये था वह भी उनको नहीं मिला। मैं श्री एम० एम० सूरी की बात ही

आपके सामने रखता हूँ। उन पर भारत को गर्व है। उन्होंने डीजल इंजन में नई ईजाद दी और ट्रैक्टर के इंजन और दूसरे इंजन बनाने की वह व्यवस्था कर रहे थे। हिन्दुस्तान के पब्लिक सैंक्टर में काम करने वालों को वह पसन्द नहीं आया। डा० आत्मा राम जी ने उनको अपने साथ रखना मुनासिब नहीं समझा और श्री सूरी जैसे इंजीनियर और वैज्ञानिक को जो सारे संसार में महाहूर है, सी० एस० आई० आर० से निकाल दिया गया। डा० सूरी हो या डाक्टर कुरैशी हो, सबके अपने-अपने क्षेत्र हैं। कोई थोड़ा काम करता है, कोई ज्यादा करता है। जो कुछ भी उन्होंने काम किया, चूंकि डाक्टर आत्मा राम उससे संतुष्ट नहीं थे, इसलिए उनके खिलाफ सारी कार्रवाई पिछले दिनों की गई। सरकार कमेटी की रिपोर्ट से साफ जाहिर हो गया है कि कोई खास ऐसा मकसद नहीं था जिससे प्रेरित होकर डा० जहीर ने ऐसे वैज्ञानिक रखे हों जिनके उनके साथ व्यक्तिगत सम्बन्ध हों। लेकिन एक चीज साफ जाहिर होती है। जो लोग डा० आत्मा राम के समर्थक हैं वे लोग हैं जो हमेशा पब्लिक सैंक्टर के विरोधी रहे हैं। डा० आत्मा राम की बाहर जो अब सपोर्ट कर रहे हैं, वेस्टिड इंटेरेस्ट्स को जो सपोर्ट करते रहे हैं उससे साफ जाहिर होता है कि डा० आत्मा राम की नियत क्या रही है। इन सब घटनाओं को देखते हुए मैं यह कहूंगा...

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी : डा० आत्मा राम की चर्चा हो रही है या रिपोर्ट की चर्चा हो रही है? जो विषय विचाराधीन है, उस पर आप बोलें।

श्री शशि भूषण : जब भी कभी इस सदन में पब्लिक सैंक्टर की सरकार की करने की बात की जाती है तो वेस्टिड इंटेरेस्ट रखने वाले लोग, प्राइवेट सैंक्टर के गुलाम हमेशा इस बात की कोशिश करते हैं कि—

समापति महोदय : जो रिपोर्ट है, उसी पर आप ज्यादा जोर दें।

श्री शशि भूषण : अभी जो चर्चा यहां पर हुई है और जिन बातों को कहा गया है उनको शायद आपने सुना नहीं है। तब शायद आप यहां नहीं थे। इस बात की चर्चा की गई कि सैंट्रल हाल में कोई पर्चा बांटा गया वह तो सरकार कमेटी से ताल्लुक नहीं रखता था। उस पर्चे के पीछे कौन लोग थे?—जो आज उस पर्चे का जिक्र कर रहे हैं। मालूम होता है कि वे उससे ज्यादा वाकिफ हैं। अगर सरकार कमेटी पर ही चर्चा होती, तो शायद मैं यह बात आपके सामने न रखता कि ये जो वेस्टिड इंटेरेस्ट्स के लोग हैं, या उनके जो अखबार हैं, जो यहां पर राजा-महाराजाओं के प्रिवी पासिज का समर्थन करते हैं, जो लोग बिड़ला के खिलाफ एनक्वायरी का विरोध करते थे, जो लोग जब राष्ट्रीय सुरक्षा की बात करते हैं, तो विदेशी छतरी की बात करते हैं, वही डा० आत्मा राम का समर्थन कर रहे हैं। (व्यवधान)

यह साफ साफ कहा गया है कि डा० जहीर के वक्त में जितनी भी नियुक्तियां हुई हैं, उनमें ऐसी कोई अनियमितता नहीं की गई, जिसके बारे में बार-बार जिक्र किया जाता है। यह सही बात है कि डा० आत्मा राम सी० एस० आई० आर० को बिल्कुल बन्द करके सारा रिसर्च का काम प्राइवेट सैंक्टर को देना चाहते हैं। उन्होंने कई बार ऐसे सुझाव भी दिये हैं। पब्लिक सैंक्टर के बारे में उनकी नीयत बिल्कुल साफ नहीं है। इसलिए मैं सरकार से दरखास्त करूंगा कि जब वह सैंक्टर में किसी आफिसर को मुकदर करे, तो वह यह ठोंक-बजाकर देख ले कि क्या उसे पब्लिक सैंक्टर की फिलासफी में विश्वास है या नहीं। अगर डा० आत्मा राम को पब्लिक सैंक्टर में थोड़ा भी विश्वास होता, अगर वह चाहते कि पब्लिक सैंक्टर में वैज्ञानिक अनुसंधान

[श्री षशि भूषण]

का काम सही तौर पर चले, तो कोई भी उन का विरोध न करता।

मैं नहीं समझता हूँ कि इस मामले में हिन्दू और मुसलमान की बात लाई जानी चाहिए। लेकिन जो लोग कभी भी मुसलमान को फूटी झांख से नहीं देख सकते हैं, चाहे मुसलमान देश भक्त हो, चाहे वह देश के लिए अपनी जान भी देता हो और चाहे वह बड़ा वैज्ञानिक हो, जब वे इस प्रकार की बात करते हैं, तो सन्देह होता है कि आखिर किस वजह से वे ऐसा कर रहे हैं।

मैं चाहूंगा कि डा० आत्मा राम ने सी० एस० आई० आर० के काम को खत्म करने के लिये, हमारी राष्ट्रीय प्रगति को रोकने के लिए वेस्टिड इन्ट्रेस्ट्स, प्राइवेट सेक्टर और चेम्बर आफ कामर्स के साथ मिलकर जो देश का करोड़ों रुपया बर्बाद किया, उसके बारे में सी० बी० आई० द्वारा जांच होनी चाहिये।

जब सरकार कमेटी इस सदन की सम्मति से मुकर्रर हुई है, तो हमें उसकी सराहना करनी चाहिये और उसकी सिफारिशों को मानना चाहिये। वेस्टिड इन्ट्रेस्ट्स के लोगों को यह एक करारा जबाब होगा।

अगर हम चाहते हैं कि सी० एस० आई० आर० प्रगति करता रहे, तो उसको प्लानिंग कमीशन के मातहत रखा जाये और प्रधान मन्त्री को उसे अपने ही चार्ज में रखना चाहिए, क्योंकि आज देश की प्रगति विज्ञान पर निर्भर करती है।

इस बात का जबाब मिलना चाहिए कि डा० एम० एम० सूरी जैसे देशभक्त इंजीनियर को क्यों निकाल दिया गया। मेरी डिमांड है कि डा० आत्मा राम के बारे में सी० बी० आई० द्वारा इनक्वारी होनी चाहिए।

SHRI SAMAR GUHA : On a point of order. My submission is this. Our discus-

sion today is concerned with the first part of the Report which deals with personnel policy with regard to the different scientists employed in the CSIR, and in that personnel policy, Dr. Atma Ram, Dr. Zaheer and other directors are all included. So, I want that the Education Minister should clarify whether Dr. Atma Ram's case was also examined by the CSIR Committee; and, if so, what is the report of that Committee?

MR. CHAIRMAN : There is no point of order. Mr. Koushik.

SHRI K. M. Koushik : Sir, there has been a lot of adverse criticism in the press and on various occasions by both Houses of Parliament and by the PAC recently with regard to the affairs of the CSIR. It pains us very much. We are not concerned with Dr. Atma Ram or Dr. Zaheer. We are concerned with CSIR primarily. We want it to do the work for which it is intended. We have invested Rs. 146 crores which is a huge amount, even though we cannot afford it. What is the tangible thing we have got out of it? Out of Rs. 5,000 crores of gross national product, the contribution of CSIR is absolutely meagre if not nil. That is why it has assumed so much importance and a committee was set up. The reason is only this. I am not referring to Dr. Atma Ram or Dr. Zaheer. The reason is, the people who have been taken up for important posts with regard to scientific research have been absolute mediocres. The destiny of science and scientists has been in the hands of people who themselves have not contributed anything so far as scientific investigation is concerned. Therefore, the real trouble is, with such people at the helm of affairs, really there has been no contribution at all. Mediocres have been recruited and they have not contributed anything, with the result there is no contribution to the gross national product of Rs. 5,000 crores.

I would now draw the attention of the House to Appendix XI of the report. Barring S. No. 12, in the case of the all the other 11 persons, the rise in pay has been meteoric. A man getting Rs. 375 in 1956 rose to draw a pay of Rs. 1600 in nine years. If the Sarkar Committee had taken pains to find out why such a rise has been given to these persons and if in juxtaposition they had

given another table showing the number of persons in the same cadre, their qualifications and the work they have done and the scientific papers they had produced and what is their pay, it would have shown very clearly that these 11 persons have been favoured. Absolute favouritism and nepotism and nothing else would have been the inference. But the Sarkar Committee have not taken any pains to do that.

For lack of time, I will take up only one case, that of Shri Baldev Singh. For this man, the D.G. has gone absolutely out of the way to find out how he can be put in the Rs. 1600—Rs.1900 grade. This man was actually drawing Rs. 375 in 1956. His qualification is simple B.Sc. Even I am better; I am an M.Sc. But his qualification is simple B.Sc., with either prefix or suffix to his name.

At this stage Dr. Hussain takes charge of the office and he takes up the case of Shri Baldev Singh. The files start moving. He says "we want to revive the post of Industrial Liaison Officer". While doing so, this man conveniently suppresses one fact, which is very important, and that is that his predecessor, Dr. Thacker, had said that the Industrial Liaison Officer's job is absolutely useless, he had not done any work and, therefore, the post must be kept in abeyance and it should not be revived at all. Even though this is what Dr. Thacker had written, because of his anxiety to help Shri Baldev Singh, he suppresses what Dr. Thacker has written and props up this man and suggests the revival of this particular post. This very clearly shows that he was quite inclined to see that this man is helped. Therefore, after he came here on 19.62, in the month of October he was made the Industrial Liaison Officer on a salary of Rs. 750.

Again, consider this aspect. There were three regional officers who were serving as industrial liaison officers. The case of none of these officers was considered and this man who was new to this type of work—he was only a senior scientific officer—he was propped up and appointed in this post, ignoring those three people who were already working as regional industrial officers. The Sarkar Committee has suppressed this fact. In fact, if we see the draft report this fact is actually mentioned there but it is not mentioned in the final report,

The story does not end there. As an Industrial Liaison Officer he could get only Rs. 750. But he has to be appointed in the Rs. 1600—1900 scale. So, the Director-General suggests that the post should be advertised. At the same time, the Director-General does not want any qualification to be mentioned in the advertisement. I cannot understand how a post could be advertised without mentioning the qualification. It is something beyond my comprehension. No qualification was mentioned because Shri Baldev Singh had to be helped and he was only a simple B.Sc. So, the Director-General issued express orders that no qualification should be prescribed in the advertisement and, therefore, the advertisement mentioned nothing with regard to the qualifications for the post of Industrial Liaison Officers at the headquarters.

When this post was advertised previously a very high qualification was prescribed either in physics or chemistry which is related to industrial research. But, in the present case, on the orders of the Director-General, no qualification was prescribed so that it could help Shri Baldev Singh who was a pet man of his. I can very definitely say that the Director-General wanted to show favouritism and help Shri Baldev Singh and that is why no qualification was prescribed in the advertisement. No other inference is possible in this case.

Dr. Atma Ram was one of the members of the Constitutional Committee. Two other important members were Dr. Lokanathan and Dr. Kane.

This D.G. could not manoeuvre. He wanted to help Baldev Singh and in order to help him he must have a Committee of his own which would be amenable to him and since Dr. Atma Ram, Dr. Lokanathan and Dr. Kane were not amenable he changed the entire Committee. What is the constitution of the new Committee? In order to recruit a man of scientific knowledge he puts in the Committee Dilip Mukherji of Economic Times. You can understand the intention. Then Fazalbhoy a radio dealer was one of the Members of the Committee. I do not know how. Another Mr. Prasad from Secunderabad where the ex-D.G. was serving. These are the persons. No reasons have been given to change the previous Members. All this will show that he wanted to help Baldev Singh and that is why he

[Shri K. M. Koushik]

changed the Committee and brought in these persons who knew nothing of science so that he could manoeuvre with these people.

There were ten persons called for interview. Was the interview fair? Out of these ten candidates six persons were Ph.Ds and three had post-graduate qualifications. He did not want any of them. It was sure he wanted Baldev Singh and all this went for Baldev Singh and Baldeo Singh was selected out of six Ph.Ds and three post-graduates. What more could there be to prove favouritism and nepotism. How could there be any tangible results coming out of CSIR if medicores are recruited by CSIR.

Now he has got a job of Rs. 1300-1600 as Industrial Liaison Officer. He is not satisfied. D.G. wants that he should get the grade of Rs. 1600-1900 and, therefore, tried to revise the scale of Rs. 1300-1800 to Rs. 1600-1900 but the financial Advisor does not agree. In 1964 it was proposed to create a post of Research Coordinator in the scale of Rs. 1600-1900, proposing Baldev Singh for the appointment. It is very important. D.G. says, "The post of Industrial Liaison Officer will be abolished provided Baldev Singh is appointed for this new post of Research Coordinator." That means he is out and out for Baldeo Singh. He wants to help him at all costs. After that he again contacts the Financial Advisor and the Financial Advisor said, "Please, close the chapter. I am not prepared to agree to this scale."

In 1965 he tries for the post of 'F' scientists in the scale of Rs. 1600-1900 for Baldeo Singh and suppresses the fact that on two previous occasions the proposal was rejected. The D.G. did not bring it to the notice of the Financial Advisor and said that this post should be created. The post was advertised and with D.G.'s express orders no qualification was prescribed. Only four out of thirteen Members—this is very important—were present at the committee meeting. They were D.G. himself and his Secretary and two others. When was the notice sent for the meeting? Telegrams were sent on 28th when the Selection Committee meeting is on the 31st.

This is the way he was manoeuvring all the time in order to see that his own men

are helped. Dr. Maheshwari, F.R.S. objected. He said, "You want a man; you have not advertised the qualifications for the post. It is rubbish. We cannot do that." Therefore, the matter was given up. The Financial Advisor also advised that no selection should be made and, therefore, no selection was made.

When he could not create the post of an 'F' Scientist, his next attempt was to equate the post of Industrial Liaison Officer to that of an 'F' Scientist. Here again, he suppressed the fact that creation of such a post was rejected in the past twice by the FA. The Vice-President asked him to consult the Financial Advisor. The Financial Advisor did not agree. He said, "No, such a thing is not possible; you should not do it." Then he wrote to the Vice-President saying, "Please over-rule the Financial Advisor and equate this post to that of an 'F' Scientist." Thus, he gets him appointed in the grade of Rs. 1600-1900.

Taking all these things into consideration, it only means that this man was out for nepotism and favouritism. It is on account of this that the CSIR has come to this bad reputation. Such follows are responsible for all this.

With regard to the irregularities and violations of the rules and bye-laws, there were two or three points of reference made to this Committee. Dr. Datar was made the Director of the Hyderabad Laboratory though there was no such post. Is it not a violation? Was the Committee blind? Were the members of the Committee blind? I cannot understand this. My colleagues are there but I am sorry I am making a remark against them. When there was no post of a director, how could there be a director? Dr. Datar was made a director even though there was no post. Is it not against the rules? It was against the rules but they wanted to overlook it. They wanted to deceive people. That is the only inference that could be drawn from it.

Then, bye-law 29 had been violated in the case of appointment of Dr. Datar. Provisions of bye-laws 58 and 59 were violated in the case of appointment of Dr. Datar. The Selection Committee had suggested Dr. Datar working as a deputy director for a period of two years and Dr. Datar was

appointed to work as Deputy Director for two years. But within two years this man wanted him to be pushed up; therefore, he makes a proposal to make Dr. Datar a director after one year. Does it not show favouritism? The inference is obvious.

Therefore my humble submission is that the Director-General who did all this was a man of evil genius. Shri Chagla, as the Vice-President, could and did control him as it shows but, unfortunately, the late Humayun Kabir could not control him probably because he was very much busy in his own work. He left the entire thing to him and okayed whatever he suggested.

This has given rise to a lot of internal feud and, therefore, I request the hon. Minister, as some of my hon. friends suggested, that unless you are able to spare a lot of time over this, please do not accept the post; otherwise, you will also come into disrepute.

This report is a garbled report. The draft report and evidence tendered before the Committee should be placed on record so that Members should know what violations of the rules and bye-laws were made and what were the reasons for which they were blind to them. It is not that they were unable to decipher it.

I have said it in my speech on the Demands of the Ministry of Education and I repeat it. Sir C. V. Raman said in Delhi:

"Shahjehan built the Taj to bury one of his favourite wives and Dr. Bhatnagar built the national laboratories to bury the scientific instruments. Any defence of the CSIR is meaningless. It is indefensible."

There are the words which I am quoting from Sir C. V. Raman. I have actually got it by rote. No greater credential can be had than these words of Sir C. V. Raman. I say this because they are not competent people. Competent people have not been recruited and mediocres have been recruited, with the result that nothing tangible is received by the general public. They are wasting the money of the general public.

श्री मृत्युञ्जय प्रसाद (महाराजगंज) : सभा-पति महोदय, सबसे पहले मैं जिस बात की ओर सदन का ध्यान दिलाना चाहता हूँ—मुझे अफ-सोस है प्रधान मंत्री जी यहां मौजूद नहीं हैं,

इसलिए मैं आशा करता हूँ कि जो कुछ मैं यहां कहूंगा, वे बातें उनके पास पहुंचा दी जायेंगी। प्रधान मंत्री जी इस काउन्सिल की पदेन अध्यक्ष हैं। इसमें विद्यता अथवा बैज्ञानिक योग्यता का प्रश्न नहीं है, वे इसलिए अध्यक्ष हैं कि उनके पहले के प्रधान मंत्री इसके अध्यक्ष हुआ करते थे। किन्तु प० जवाहर लाल नेहरू खुद बैज्ञानिक थे, विज्ञान के बड़े वेत्ता थे, उनकी बात भ्रमण थी, लेकिन उनके बाद जितने प्रधान मंत्री हुए—चाहे थोड़े दिन के लिए या अधिक दिन के लिए, उनके लिए यह दावा करना गलत होगा, वे न विज्ञान वेत्ता थे और न हैं। इसलिए प्रशासन की दृष्टि से अगर वे अध्यक्ष हैं तो यह बात भी याद रखने की है कि वे केवल नीति निर्धारित करने के लिए ही अध्यक्ष नहीं हैं, बल्कि एकजीक्यूटिव हेन्ड भी हैं, प्रशासन की भी अध्यक्ष हैं और जब प्रशासन की अध्यक्षता है तो वहां जो भूलें और बुराइयां होती हैं—उन दोनों की जिम्मेदारी भी उन पर है। ऐसी हालत में जो जांच समिति बनाई जाये इस काउंसिल की कार्यवाहियों की जांच के लिए, वह समिति उनके द्वारा न बनाई जाये। क्योंकि यदि वह उस समिति को बनाती है तो उस समिति से यह आशा करना गलत होगा कि वह सी फीसदी सही रिपोर्ट दे सकेगी, क्योंकि अगर काउन्सिल की कोई शिकायत होगी, तो प्रधान भी उसमें शामिल हैं, कोई तारीफ होगी तो उसमें भी वह शामिल हैं। ऐसी स्थिति में जो भी जांच कमेटी प्रधान मंत्री बनायेंगी एन्क्वायरी कमेटी या कमीशन बनायेंगी, उस पर विश्वास करना कठिन होगा कि वह इस बात को भूल जायगा कि उन्हीं के द्वारा बनाया हुआ वह कमीशन है। इसके भ्रमावां जब इतनी बातें यहां पर कही गई हैं, तो उनका यह कहना कि भ्रमखारों में जो बात निकली थी, वह गलत थी, वे दूसरी जांच कराने नहीं जा रही हैं—घोर भी विनता में डाल देता है।

सभापति महोदय, मेरे साथ एक बड़ी सुविधा है और अनुविधा भी हैं। सवाल यह है

[श्री मृत्युंजय प्रसाद]

कि जितनी बातें मेरे मित्रों ने कही हैं उनमें से अधिकांश बातें मुझे पहले से नहीं मालूम थीं। मुझे जो कुछ पता है, वह इसी किताब से है इसके बाहर मेरे पास कुछ नहीं है। जैसा मैंने सुना—मैं यह भी नहीं जानता कि पहली रिपोर्ट क्या थी, दूसरी रिपोर्ट क्या है—मेरे सामने तो जो छपी हुई रिपोर्ट है, वही है।

श्री रवि राय : दोनों में जमीन आसमान का फर्क है।

श्री मृत्युंजय प्रसाद : मैं खुद इसी बात को कह रहा हूँ। मैं तो इसी रिपोर्ट पर अपने को रखूंगा, इससे बाहर नहीं जाऊंगा। और यदि थोड़ी देर के लिए हम मान लें कि न्यायिक रूप से सब बातों की जांच पड़ताल की गई है तब भी मैं इस कमीशन के सम्बन्ध में एक बात कहूंगा—इसके अध्यक्ष एक जज साहब थे। जज साहब की शिक्षा-दीक्षा यही रही है कि जब तक कोई जुर्म प्रमाणित न हो जाये, तब तक किसी को दोषी न मानो। लेकिन कचहरी में प्रमाण का अर्थ कुछ और होता है। प्रशासन में प्रमाण का अर्थ कुछ और ही होता है। प्रशासन में यह नहीं माना जाता है कि जब तक 16 आने किसी का दोष सिद्ध न हो जाये, तब तक वह दोषी नहीं है। प्रशासन में तो दो-चार भूलों के बाद चाहे वे छोटी हों या बड़ी हों, आशंका होने लगती है, उसकी नीयत पर शक होने लगता है और जब वे भूलें बढ़ने लगती हैं तो फिर उस अधिकारी पर विश्वास नहीं किया जा सकता। इस दृष्टि से उन्होंने विचार नहीं किया है—16 आने जज की दृष्टि से विचार किया है और जज की दृष्टि से विचार करने में सबसे बड़ी कठिनाई यह है कि जो शिकायतें उनके सामने गईं, उन फैक्ट्स को बहुत हद तक उन्होंने मान लिया, बहुत से केसज में तो वे सब कुछ मानते हैं—यह भी मानते हैं कि विज्ञापन नहीं निकाला गया, यह भी मानते हैं कि नये काम के

लिए चारों तरफ इस बात का प्रचार नहीं किया गया है कि ऐसे आदमी की जरूरत है और उसकी यह योग्यता होनी चाहिए। फिर भी शिकायत को सिद्ध नहीं माना है। उसके बाद से जितने लोग प्राये उनके बारे में तरह-तरह के तमारे किए गए। इसका खयाल नहीं किया गया कि यह आदमी हमारे यहां फिट होगा या नहीं। अपने मन से जो लिस्ट बनाई गई है बिना दरखास्तों के, उसमें उनके नाम भी रख लिए गए जिन्होंने दरखास्त नहीं दी थी और जिनके बारे में एम्-नायर्स ने यह नहीं कहा था कि हम इनको छोड़ेंगे, ये काम पर जा सकते हैं। केवल दिखलाने के लिए हो गया कि 5-6 आदमी हैं और उनमें से आप एक को चुनते हैं और उसी को चुनते हैं जिसको कि एम्प्लायर छोड़ने के लिये तैयार नहीं हैं। इस तरह से वाई प्रोसेस आफ एलिमिनेशन आप उसी पर आ जाते हैं जिसको कि आप रखना चाहते थे।

श्री जी० मा० कृपालानी (गुना) : यह कोई नयी बात है क्या ?

श्री मृत्युंजय प्रसाद : लेकिन मुझे अफसोस है कि ये चीजें हम यहां समझ सकते थे, सेक्रेटेरियट में समझ सकते थे लेकिन हमने इस चीज की अपेक्षा वैज्ञानिकों से नहीं की थी। उनसे तो हम किसी दूसरी चीज की आशा रखते थे। लेकिन वहां भी यही है तो क्या कहा जाये ?

अब इस सिलसिले में मैं दो तीन बातें कहूंगा। थोड़ी देर के लिए मान लीजिये कि सब कुछ सही है तो क्या हमारे मन्त्री जी इससे संतुष्ट होंगे कि कानून का पालन शब्दों में हो गया है। नियुक्ति के लिए निर्धारित जो मिनिमम क्वालिफिकेशन्स थी, उसके अनुसार कम से कम योग्यता वाले आदमी को आपने रख लिया लेकिन इससे तो विज्ञान का काम नहीं चलेगा। मिनिमम क्वालिफिकेशन्स फार एलिजिबिलिटी

ही काफी नहीं है बल्कि आपको यह देखना चाहिए कि बेस्ट क्वालिफाइड धादमी मिलता है या नहीं इस देश में। अगर बेस्ट क्वालिफाइड न मिले तब आप दूसरे दर्जे या तीसरे दर्जे पर जो कोई हो उसको रख लीजिये। यह नहीं होना चाहिए कि मिनिमम क्वालिफाइड मिला तो उसको ले लिया और बाकी सभी को छोड़ दिया या बुलाया ही नहीं या ऐसा बन्दोबस्त किया कि दरल्वास्त दे ही न सके।

हमारे मित्रों ने ऐसे पक्षपात के, गड़बड़ के यहां पर कई उदाहरण दिये हैं इसलिए मैं अधिक उदाहरणों में नहीं जाऊंगा। किस तरह का दबाव वहां डाला गया है, उसके एक दो उदाहरण देकर और भागे इसको नहीं बढ़ाऊंगा। यह भी कोशिश करूंगा कि जो चीजे यहां पर हमारे मित्र कह गए हैं उनके नाम न लूं, दूसरे ही नाम आपके सामने रखूंगा। मालूम होता है कि यह गन्दगी का भंडार है इसलिए अभी इसमें कितने कोने साफ किए गए? एक दो कोने साफ हुए लेकिन अभी तो गन्दगी भरी हुई है। मैं तो नाम लेने की आवश्यकता भी नहीं समझता हूँ। आप पेज 82-83 देख लें।

श्री जी० भा० कृपालानी : इस गन्दगी को निकालोगे तो तुम्हारे ऊपर भी छीटें पड़ जायेंगे।

श्री मृत्युंजय प्रसाद : पढ़ने दीजिये। मैं चाहता हूँ कि जांच ठिकाने से हो ताकि इस देश में विज्ञान की उन्नति और तरक्की हो और छोटे-छोटे भगड़ों में ही हम फंसे न रहें।

एक प्रसिद्ध वैज्ञानिक को 64 वर्ष की उम्र में नेशनल फिजिकल सेबोरेट्री का डायरेक्टर तीन वर्षों के कंट्राक्ट पर बनाया गया। 29-10-63 को एम्पाइंटमेंट लेटर दिया गया। उसके बाद 28-1-64 को डायरेक्टर जनरल ने (मैं नाम नहीं ले रहा हूँ) उनको एक पत्र लिखा कि अमुक पद के लिए आप अमुक का नाम देने बड़ाइये। वह राजी नहीं हुए और

दबाव से आजिज होकर उन्होंने इस्तीफा दे दिया। वह इस्तीफा भी समझा-बुझा करके रोक लिया गया और मंजूर नहीं किया गया। किन्तु यह चीज तो डायरेक्टर जनरल की भ्रांति पर चढ़ गई थी। अब जरा यहां पर आप तारीख को गौर करें। 11-6-64 को डायरेक्टर जनरल साहब ने कहा कि 6 महीने बाद आप 65 साल पूरे कर लेंगे इसलिए आप (तीन वर्ष का कंट्रैक्ट रहते हुए भी नौकरी नहीं कर सकते हैं। अब आप गौर करें, जहां तक मुझे स्मरण है, 27-5-64 को पं० जवाहर लाल नेहरू का स्वर्गवास हुआ। इसलिये उन 14-15 दिनों के बीच में या तो नन्दाजी केयरटेकर प्राइम मिनिस्टर थे या शास्त्री जी आ गये थे और वे ही केयरमैन बने थे लेकिन अभी उन्होंने इस काम को कितना समझा था? इसलिए वही समय था उस बीच में कि जो चाहें करा लें। तो उस वक्त एन० पी० एल० के डाइरेक्टर साहब को हटाने की कोशिश की गई। हालांकि डायरेक्टर जनरल ने कबूल किया है कि हमारा मतलब यह नहीं था कि डाइरेक्टर हमारे कहे मुताबिक रेकमेंडेशन करें, हमने उन पर दबाव नहीं डाला था, लेकिन फिर भी दांब-पेंच लगाकर तीन वर्ष का कंट्रैक्ट रहते हुए भी डायरेक्टर सन् 1964 के दिसम्बर में हटा दिया गया।

अब आप दूसरा उदाहरण लीजिये। मैं इसमें भी नाम नहीं ले रहा हूँ। आप पृष्ठ 69 देखें कि एक आदमी को ऊपर बढ़ाने के लिए क्या नहीं किया गया। इसके बारे में मिनिट प्राफ डिसेन्ट में भी कुछ चीजें लाई गई हैं जो कि मूल रिपोर्ट में नहीं है। उसमें विस्तार-साया गया है कि :

The Committee sent one of its members Dr. C. R. Rao a few reprints of papers brought out by Shri Rahman and testimonials from eminent persons on his work which were sent to them by Shri Rahman. Dr. Rao has given his comments as quoted below :

There is no evidence from the type of work Shri Rahman was doing in the different

[श्री मृत्युंजय प्रसाद]

laboratories before he was brought to the CSIR h. q. or from his published papers that he has the necessary abilities to occupy a high level post in Operational Research. Many of his articles are of a general nature indicating the usefulness of O. R. which could be written by non specialist. There has been no attempt to study any live problem and arrive at a solution. I agree with the views expressed by Prof. Mahalanobis about the quality of work done by the Research, Survey and Planning Unit.

इसके बाद से उनको 1600-1900 के स्केल में रखा जाता है लेकिन किस हालत में ? आप इसके बारे में पृष्ठ 72 भी देखें :

The Constitution of the selection committee was approved by the Vice President on 10.6.64 and it met on 18.8.64...

10-6-64 बहुत ही महत्वपूर्ण तारीख है जिसका मैं पहले भी जिक्र कर चुका हूँ ।

Shri Rahman was the only candidate who did not appear for the interview.

The Selection Committee recommended him for the post with a higher start of Rs. 1800/- p. m.

4 अगस्त को इस प्रकार उनकी गैर-हाजिरी में भी उनका चुनाव होता है और 5 अगस्त को वे अपनी जगह पर जाकर के बैठ जाते हैं । इस तरह से जो दांव-पेंच हुआ, मुझे उसकी शिकायत है । अब आज कहा जाता है कि डा० आरमाराम बुरे हैं या भले हैं लेकिन मुझे इससे क्या मतलब है ? मुझे इससे कोई मतलब नहीं है । डा० आरमाराम के समय में क्या हो रहा है उसकी भी जांच होनी चाहिए और खूब ठिकाने से जांच होनी चाहिए और उनके पहले की भी खूब ठिकाने से जांच होनी चाहिए ।

लेकिन एक बात मैं जरूर कहना चाहता हूँ । जिस तरह से मैं जानता हूँ और जान पाया हूँ तीन साल में और जिस तरह से सदन जान पाया है, माननीय सदस्य श्री शशि भूषण को, उससे तो यह साफ मालूम होता है कि जिसकी वह शिकायत करें वह अपना अग्रहोभाग्य माने,

जिसे गोली दें वह अग्रहोभाग्य मानें और जिसका तारीफ करें उसके बारे में दुनिया शक्ति हो जाये क्योंकि जो उनका स्वभाव है, जिस तरह का वह बताव करते हैं उससे सभी परिचित हैं इसलिए अगर उन्होंने अमुक की तारीफ की हैं, अमुक की शिकायत की है, इसके माने स्पष्ट हैं, सभी उसको समझ लेंगे और उसका सही अर्थ भी लगा लेंगे, उसमें कोई झंझट नहीं होगा— इससे अधिक मैं कहना नहीं चाहता हूँ । इसकी जांच हो, ठिकाने से जांच हो । लेकिन साथ-साथ दो-तीन बातें कहना चाहता हूँ । मैं यह कहना चाहता था कि अभी एक मित्र ने एक आदमी का नाम लिया और कहा कि 375 से लेकर 1600 रु० तक नौ साल के भीतर उसका वेतन पहुंच गया । यह एक ही उदाहरण नहीं है, अप्रैडिक्स 11 में अन्तिम पृष्ठ में 12 आदमियों के नाम हैं । मैंने हाल ही में एक प्रश्न पूछा था और मुझको उत्तर मिला कि साहब, उन सबके कामों के बारे में कोई मूल्यांकन नहीं हुआ है । मैं बहुत नम्रता से निवेदन करना चाहूंगा कि अगर यह सच है कि यह लोग बहुत ही लायक थे, फाजिल थे और जो पद उन्हें दिये गये उनके सर्वथा योग्य थे और हैं, तो जरूर उन्होंने अच्छा काम किया होगा । ऐसी हालत में उनके कामों का मूल्यांकन ठिकाने से कराया जाये, वैसे योग्य विद्वानों के जरिये जो उनके विषयों को जानते हों और वह बता लें कि उन्होंने पिछले सात-आठ वर्षों में कौसा काम किया है और कर रहे हैं । जो लोग चले गये हैं उनके बारे में भी मूल्यांकन किया जाये ।

17.00 hrs.

साथ ही साथ एक चीज और भी स्पष्ट हो जानी चाहिए । हमें इससे कोई भगड़ा नहीं है कि पुराने डाइरेक्टर जनरल साहब क्या थे और क्या नहीं । वह तो रिटायर होकर चले गये,

उनकी शिकायत करें या तारीफ करें, उससे कुछ बनता बिगड़ता नहीं, लेकिन उन्होंने क्या किया, कैसे किया, इसके बारे में कुछ सोचने का अवसर मिलना चाहिए। सोचने का क्या आधार है यह हमको देखना पड़ता है। पहला आधार तो यह है—यह बातें कहां तक सही हैं और कहां तक गलत हैं यह तो मन्त्री जी बतलायेंगे—कि सुनने में भ्राया है, बहुत ही विश्वसनीय व्यक्ति के मुँह से सुना है कि जब वह यहां भ्राये तो उन्होंने अपने दफ्तर की साज सज्जा में, उसकी फरनिशिंग में इतना खर्च किया जितना किसी एक मन्त्री ने भी अपने दफ्तर की साज सज्जा में खर्च नहीं किया, बल्कि दो मन्त्रियों ने भी उतना नहीं किया होगा जितना उन अकेले ने किया।

श्री रवि राय : 1961 के पहले लोक सभा में यह सवाल उठ चुका है।

श्री मृत्युंजय प्रसाद : मैं नहीं जानता। मुझे फिगर्स नहीं मालूम। मगर आगे से हमको यह देखना है कि हम को फर्नीचर पर पैसा खर्च करना है या रिसर्च इंस्ट्रूमेंट्स पर, लेबोरेट्रीज पर खर्च करना है।

दूसरी बात यह है कि क्या उनके भाई साहब पाकिस्तान कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी के सेक्रेटरी रहे हैं या हैं। अगर है तो बात खरम हो गई। मैं तो जना देना चाहता था, भले ही आप इससे इंकार करें या बाजब समाधान करें।

एक माननीय सदस्य : क्या कम्युनिस्ट होना पाप है ?

श्री मृत्युंजय प्रसाद : हिन्दुस्तान की नहीं, पाकिस्तान की कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी की बात है।

तीसरी बात यह है कि डा० भाल्दाराम की भी उम्र हो चली। उन्हें भी बरस दो बरस में जायना है। इसलिए उनके व्यक्तित्व के बारे में मुझे कुछ नहीं कहना है। अगर वह बुरा करते हैं तो उनको ज़रूर हटा दिया जाये, समय से पहले हटा दिया जाये। अगर भला करते

हैं तो वह प्रशंसा के साथ जायें, किन्तु इस चीज के बारे में हमें निश्चय करना होगा कि हमारे जितने नौजवान, यंग साइंटिस्ट हैं, उन्हें पूरा प्रोत्साहन मिलता है या नहीं। उनके ऊपर वैसे लोग तो नहीं बैठ जाते हैं कि काम तो करे कोई दूसरा, लेकिन हर किताब में, हर रिसर्च पेपर पर नाम निकल जाये ऊपर वाले का नीचे वाले के साथ-साथ। मैं नाम लेना नहीं चाहता लेकिन मैं अधिकार के साथ यह कह रहा हूँ कि अगर इसकी खोज की जाय तो आपकी लेबोरेट्री की धोर से जितने साइंटिफिक पेपर्स निकले हों, आप देखेंगे कि डाइरेक्टर के कोलेबोरेशन के बिना शायद ही कोई पेपर निकलेगा, जिनमें जूनियर साइंटिस्ट शामिल हो। ऐसा भी होता है कि एक ही डाइरेक्टर पांच-पांच विषयों में कोलेबोरेट कर रहा है, जो सम्भव नहीं है। हर विषय में वही हालत है। इसके माने यह है कि यश वह लूटते हैं जो बड़े हैं, जो सीनियर हैं। नाम तो ऊपर वालों का आता है, बाकी भारे जाते हैं। मुझको भविष्य की चिन्ता है। भूत जो गया वह तो भूत हो गया। मुझे इस बात की चिन्ता है, और आप उसकी व्यवस्था करें कि देश में हमारे होनहार नवयुवकों को काम करने का पूरा अवसर मिल सके और वह भागे बड़ सकें। उनके काम में बाधा न पड़े, कोई उनके सिर पर न बैठ जाये जो स्वयम् कम जानते हैं, इसलिए अपने नीचे योग्य व्यक्ति को देख नहीं सकते हैं, उसे बर्बाद नहीं कर सकते हैं, अपने से योग्यतर व्यक्ति को भागे बढ़ने नहीं दे सकते। इसलिए मैं यह चाहता हूँ कि योग्यतम व्यक्ति भागे धायें। इस प्रक्रिया में भले ही डा० भाल्दाराम को अलग होना पड़े, मुझको उसमें उच्च नहीं होगा क्योंकि मैं तो उनको जानता पहचानता नहीं। मैं व्यक्तिगत बातों में अज्ञान नहीं चाहता। मैं पहले ही कह चुका हूँ कि जितने लोगों के नाम धाये हैं उनमें से मैं किसी को पसन्द नहीं करता। डा० भाल्दाराम को दूर से ज़रूर पहचानता हूँ, वैसे उनसे कोई मेरा व्यक्तिगत परिचय रहे, ऐसी बातें

[श्री मृत्युंजय प्रसाद]

नहीं है। उनको भी हटा दिया जाये अगर वह अयोग्य साबित हों, लेकिन अयोग्य साबित न हो तो उन्हें जो प्रशंसा मिलनी चाहिए जो प्रतिष्ठा उनको प्राप्य हो, वह उनको प्राप्त हो।

श्री सीताराम केसरी (कटिहार) : सभापति महोदय, श्री मृत्युंजय प्रसाद ने सबसे पहले यह बात कही कि प्रधान मन्त्री को हक नहीं है कमेटी बनाने का। मेरा ख्याल है कि उनकी सही बात की जानकारी नहीं है।

श्री मृत्युंजय प्रसाद : हक तो है, लेकिन औचित्य की बात है।

श्री सीताराम केसरी : उन्होंने कहा कि विश्वास की बात है। यह गलत बात है। प्रधान मन्त्री को ही हक है कोई इन्क्वायरी कमेटी बनाने का। यह बात उनको जानना चाहिए।

दूसरी बात आदरणीय श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी ने कही कि डा० जहीर का अखबार में स्टेटमेंट निकला है कि नेहरू परिवार के साथ वह सम्बन्धित हैं, उनकी जान पहचान है...

एक माननीय सदस्य : नजदीकी है।

श्री सीताराम केसरी : मेरा मतलब वही है। इसलिए उन्होंने उन पर आक्रमण किया और उनकी भाड़ में नेहरू परिवार पर भी कुछ आक्रमण किया। तीसरी बात यह हुई कि डा० जहीर मुसलमान हैं और डा० आत्मा राम हिन्दू हैं। यहां भी उनको साम्प्रदायिक भावना की बू मिल गई। मेरा ख्याल है कि यहां पर किसी व्यक्ति या इंडिविजुअल पर डिस्कशन या डिबेट नहीं होना चाहिए।

मैं कह रहा था कि सरकार कमेटी का जो रूप था उसमें वहां चोटी के व्यक्ति आये, सात इस सदन के सदस्य आये, चार जो चोटी के विद्वान थे और प्रतिभा-सम्पन्न व्यक्ति थे उनको भी उसमें इन्क्लूड किया गया। इतनी पावर-

फुल कमेटी का निर्माण हुआ, उसने निर्णय किया है और अपनी रिपोर्ट दी है, उसके बावजूद यह चाहते हैं कि अलग से कमेटी बने और उसकी छान-बीन हो। मैं समझता हूँ कि इसका कोई औचित्य नहीं है।

माननीय सदस्य ने कहा कि कमेटी के चार सदस्यों ने निर्णय से मतभेद व्यक्त किया है। जिन चार सदस्यों ने मतभेद व्यक्त किया है उन्होंने सिर्फ 10 प्रतिघटत कैंसेज में किया है, जबकि बाकी सारे निर्णयों में उन्होंने साथ मत दिया है।

तीसरी बात यह है कि हैदराबाद के अफसरों के सम्बन्ध में कमेटी ने जो अपना निर्णय दिया है उसमें स्पष्ट कहा है कि जो प्रमोशव हुए हैं उनमें कोई गलत बात नहीं है और वह जस्टिफाइड हैं। इन सब चीजों को देखते हुए मेरा खयाल है कि सरकार कमेटी की जो रिपोर्ट यह आपके सामने है और मेरे टिप्पण से अब दूसरी कमेटी की कोई जरूरत नहीं है।

श्री रवि राय : ड्राफ्ट भी आपके सामने है।

श्री सीताराम केसरी : एक चीज और मेरे ख्याल में है कि अगर हम यहाँ पर इंडिविजुअल कैंसेज पर डिस्कशन करते हैं तो कभी भी शायद सत्र का अन्त नहीं होगा। यह इतना बड़ा प्रतिवेदन है। इसमें चार्ज और ऐलिंगेन्स हैं। सारी चीजों को इतने डिटेल् में कहने की जो प्रवृत्ति है, मेरे ख्याल से वह ठीक नहीं है। कमेटी ने जो फैसला दिया है उसके बावजूद एक चीज में जाना ठीक नहीं है।

कमेटी ने कुछ और बातें भी कही हैं। कुछ लैप्सेज भी दी हैं। आप जानते हैं कि शोध के कार्य में विशेषकर साइंटिफिक रिसर्च में या इन्स्ट्रियल डेवलपमेंट रिसर्च में सिर्फ प्रतिभासम्पन्न लोगों को ही काम करना पड़ता है। यदि आप देखें, गहराई में जाकर देखें तो आपको पता चलेगा

कि डिप्लोमा-धारी या डिग्रीधारी, चाहे उसने बड़े से बड़े डिप्लोमा या डिग्री ली हुई हों, रिसर्च का काम सम्पन्न करने में असमर्थ रहता है।

श्री रामावतार शास्त्री (पटना) : नकली डिप्लोमा भी लोग ले लेते हैं।

श्री सीताराम केसरी : नकली डिप्लोमे भी हैं। लेकिन देखने वाली बात यह होती है कि उसमें काबलियत है, योग्यता है, या नहीं है। बहुत से लोगों को हम देखते हैं कि उनके पास कोई डिप्लोमा नहीं है, डिग्री नहीं है लेकिन फिर भी वे बड़े-बड़े डिग्री और डिप्लोमाधारियों से कहीं ज्यादा शोध कार्य को करने में काबिल समर्थ होते हैं। काबलियत का और योग्यता का मापदंड कोई सर्टिफिकेट नहीं होता है। शोध करने के लिए जरूरत योग्यता की होती है, प्रतिभा की होती है। वास्तव में यह जो चीज है यह प्रकृति प्रदत्त है। जिसको यह प्राप्त हो वही इसको कर सकता है, सर्व साधारण की यह चीज नहीं है। डिबेलेपमेंट के कामों के लिए, भारत की उन्नति के लिए, अनुसंधान की बहुत आवश्यक है और ऐसे जो व्यक्ति हैं उनकी रिसर्च कमेटी ही इस तरह के कार्य को सम्पन्न कर सकती है।

इन शब्दों के साथ मैं कहूंगा कि सरकार समिति जो पावरफुल समिति थी, चोटी के लोगों की समिति थी, उसने जो निर्णय दिया है, जो रिपोर्ट दी है, उसके बाद अब कोई दूसरी रिपोर्ट किसी अन्य समिति से प्राप्त करने की आवश्यकता नहीं है।

SHRI H. N. MUKERJEE (Calcutta-North-East) : Mr. Chairman, I am afraid I have followed this debate with a sense of distress as well as of a certain disgust because when I expected that we should discuss on this occasion the great expectations which the country has had of the CSIR, an organisation which, in some respects, has failed us so that the late Prof. J. B. S. Haldane nicknamed it 'Council for the Suppression of Independent Research', I wished we would have some serious

discussion ; but instead of that, I found when it began, particularly when my friends who decorate this side of the House to my left went on talking in the most disparaging terms about a Committee set up not by ourselves—I do not know if we could demean ourselves by condemning a committee which we appoint ourselves—but by the President of the CSIR, and that Committee, and particularly its highly distinguished Chairman had come in for a kind of obloquy of which any decent body of representatives of the people should have been ashamed. I say this because I notice continuously in this House a lack of a sense of proportion and propriety in regard to almost everything we discuss.

The Sarkar Committee includes not only some seven Members of this House, but also four eminent scientists whose opinion on the matters discussed in this interin report should at least carry as much weight as the uninformed opinion, I must say, of members of this House. I have known Mr. Justice Sarkar since 1936 when I joined the High Court Bar at Calcutta and have found him a person who reached the highest judicial office in the country and yet retaining a certain unostentatious character and a fearlessness of quality which we should cherish. But we find, on the contrary, this House upbraiding him and the Committee of which he happens to have been the leader. Members of Parliament have their honour ; I have been told so many times. We have all been listening to that sort of thing. The honour of Mr. Madhu Limaye and Mr. Samar Guha is very important. Of course it is important. But the honour of other persons who are not here to defend themselves is just as important, if not more important, than the honour of the Limayes and Guhas of creation. They are here to defend themselves any time they are attacked. But here they get up and say all kinds of things about persons who are not here at all to defend themselves and I am very uncertain about the kind of defence which is going to be put up by the Government. The position becomes complicated because of the pusillanimous character of the Government which at the time when the Sarkar Committee was being castigated in terms which I shudder even to contemplate, kept quiet and nothing was said about it. I do not understand so many of these things which go on.

[Shri H. N. Mukerjee]

My friend Mr. Atal Bihari Vajpayee whom we all appreciate for his sterling qualities told us that it was not a working paper but a draft. There is controversy over whether it was a working paper or a draft. I discover that Members of Parliament who have signed a note of dissent to this interim report are themselves signatories to a statement which was unanimously adopted in a meeting of the committee where they say it was a working paper. What do I do about it? Mr. Sunderlal Bhandari, as good a Jan Sangh leader as Mr. Vajpayee, was, I am told, a participant in a resolution which says that it was a working paper and not a draft. I should also like to ask Mr. Vajpayee under whose graceful chairmanship I have had the privilege and pleasure of serving on the Public Accounts Committee this question. I have every respect for him. I should like to know from him: would any Member of the PAC or any parliamentary committee let out to the public a draft of the committee and after that appear before the public as a paragon of virtue as against the other people concerned? I do not understand this kind of unsavoury business. I am always ready and willing to believe when anybody disavows the least little idea of communalism; I am ready to believe my friend Mr. Vajpayee when he told us a little while ago that there was nothing communal about this talk because Dr. Zaheer happened to be a Muslim by birth and Dr. Arma Ram happened to be a Hindu by birth. I wish I could take it at its face value. I have noticed in this Parliament—unfortunately I do happen to be somewhere about in this Parliament for quite a long time—and I have seen the vendetta against Dr. Hussain Zaheer ever since the days when Mr. Chagla was the Minister of the Education. Therefore, I do not understand why this kind of thing goes on and why this kind of thing is allowed to pass muster.

As I said earlier, the Sarkar Committee includes apart from Members of Parliament who can defend themselves in their own way, four eminent scientists whose opinion in these matters should carry at least as much weight as the opinion of largely uninformed Members of Parliament. I also repeat that the Sarkar Committee was not set up by Parliament but by the President of the C.S.I.R. Therefore I can imagine that

the feelings of Justice Sarkar and his non-Parliamentary colleagues are likely to be. Most of us in Parliament may get lured to all sorts of things and we develop the hide of the rhinoceros because of the kind of attack which we have to resist from time to time. But other people are not like that. They do not have that kind of a hide developed. Therefore I do not know what they are going to feel about it when the kind of allegation which was made against the Sarkar Committee was made in this House by people who are supposed to be among the most accomplished Parliamentarians in this country, then I wonder how the reaction of Mr. Justice Sarkar is likely to be. The Committee's findings can be contested on their merits but the Committee has every right to defend itself against the slander of having been pressurised by the Prime Minister into changing its report. I would ask you, if you were the Chairman of the Committee, and you were told when the Committee was in the process of continuing its work, an interim report was a product of certain changes being brought about by the pressurisation of the Prime Minister or whoever else, what would have been the kind of reaction that you would show. We do not seem to think of all that sort of thing. We think of the honour of Members of Parliament like those Members who were "holding the House to ransom" a little while ago, to quote the words of the Deputy Speaker who was in the Chair at that particular point of time. (*Interruption*)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, order.

SHRI H. N. MUKERJEE: I am not yielding. It was absolutely incumbent on the Committee at the point of time when that kind of charge was made against them in Parliament, it was absolutely incumbent on them to come out with the rebuttal of it and they did come out with a unanimous resolution to which all the Note of Dissent signatories were parties, to which all the four eminent scientists of this country were parties. This is exactly what happened. Therefore, I feel that what we are doing—I cannot go into the details of the matter—is not correct. I find that this is a very judicial document.

I do not find it a very adequate document. It has not gone comprehensively into many

matters, but it says so openly, it says at the end of it, that after all so many complaints have been put up before the Committee that it recommends an officer independent of the CSIR should be selected by the Government of India to enquire into these complaints. It tells us also about the committees of selection which were appointed from time to time in regard to certain jobs when they had to be filled, and those committees did their job. We remember also that scientists in this country have their self-respect. Let us not expect scientists to apply for any footling little job ; those scientists who are specialists in their subjects would claim that they should be invited by Government on Government's own behalf. That is why perhaps occasionally selections have to be made not out of the list of applicants because some people would not have even cared to apply for and kind of job. They have their pride as scientists and that is a kind of thing which must have happened from time to time.

I would also like to say that I have nothing against Dr. Atma Ram. I have known him personally though not too intimately. I have respect for him that is his due. But I discover—and I do not mind referring to it because Mr. Vajpayee also referred to it—in this pamphlet written by Shri Arjun Arora and Shri M. A. Khan, both Members of Parliament, something which shows that something is very wrong. My friend Shri Vajpayee's Committee—the PAC—has produced its 122nd report and in it, it has made observations in regard to the CSIR which have to be looked into properly; properly speaking, I hope the Government does apply its mind to that sort of thing. In this pamphlet, points are brought out which show that between the present Director-General of the CSIR and the Government of the day, if the Government is represented actually by the Prime Minister and the formulation of views that she makes from time to time, there is a dichotomy, a contradiction. While the Prime Minister wants a kind of scientific development which would like this country to be self-reliant, while the Prime Minister wants fundamental research with a view also to the development of practical patterns of achievement in technology, while the Prime Minister wants to go ahead with the public sector in mind as a basic factor, as the sector which commands the heights of the economy and the

life of this country, Dr. Atma Ram, on the other hand, does not wish for that sort of thing. He wants to get the know-how from abroad. He wants to follow the policy of adaptation of scientific and technological knowledge from elsewhere and he goes about making speeches from time to time which show that his sympathies are entirely with the public sector. (*Interruption*) I find, for example, a quotation given, which shows that Prof. Satyen Bose, National Professor, "expressed himself against the import of know-how from other countries and Dr. Atma Ram favoured a larger inflow of foreign know-how for technical development. I do not want to go into this matter in any detail.

It is very unfair to Dr. Atma Ram ; it is unfair to the scientific community, if we discuss these things. In this House, with impunity, things may continue to be said about scientists : it has got to be stopped. With impunity things have been said about Sarkar Committee. That has got to be stopped. Parliament ought to make amends. The Government of this country should make amends and the Prime Minister, as President, and the Education Minister as Vice-President, of the Council of Scientific and Industrial Research, should answer the questions raised in this pamphlet, about the contradiction of views as between the Government of the day, and the Director General, and because of this contradiction, the suspicion arises that there are other interests at work ; and because of that, when we find the composition, the political characterisation of the members who signed the note of dissent, we begin to suspect as if the vendetta against Dr. Zaheer is mixed up with the vendetta against the public sector and against independent scientific activity. I hate to refer to individual cases. I know some of these scientists who are concerned. I know how they have their pride. I know also how their pride is sought to be broken by the apparatus of bureaucracy which has grown in this country. If Parliament also assists the apparatus of bureaucracy in breaking the pride and spirit of our scientists, surely CSIR would justify the name given to it by Prof. J. B. S. Haldane : "Council for the Suppression of Independent Research."

We want the CSIR to develop. When Mr. Chou En-lai came to this country, he

[Shri H. N. Makerjee]

was asked what impressed him most, and he said, the National Physical Laboratory and the National Discipline Scheme. Both are going down the drain and that is why China sends a satellite into space, while we sulk and shout and do nothing about it. That is the measure of the difference between the two countries, which has taken place because of our inability to follow up scientific work, whose foundations were laid when the great chain of National Laboratories were set up. Now this attack on our scientists—4 of them are represented on this committee—this attack on independent members of the judiciary who have held the highest office in the country and this attack on whoever goes against certain pettiest of petty partisan interests is symptomatic of something which Parliament should spurn with the contempt it deserves. I do hope that the Government has the gumption to come forward with some courage in defence of the Sarkar Committee and the way it has tried to work, in defence of the whole tribe of independent scientists, in defence of the idea that we shall get the CSIR to work properly for the sake of the country. Follow up the recommendations of the PAC before you and you will see the results. I am sorry I cannot go into any details, but the kind of thing said here wanted a sort of rebuttal. I do not know how much the Government will do or not do in this matter.

SHRI G. VISWANATHAN (Wandiwash): Sir, in the discussion on the CSIR, it is unfortunate to find in this House members taking sides either in favour of a certain gentleman or another. We have seen in this House American lobby and anti-American lobby, but I am surprised to see that there is a Zaheer lobby and anti Zaheer lobby, a pro-Sarkar lobby and anti-Sarkar lobby. CSIR is already in a muddle and I request hon. members not to make it worse by extending their political influence into the scientific laboratories. Dr. C. V. Raman is so disgusted with the working of the laboratories that he says :

"Central research laboratories are modern Taj Mahals with wonderful architecture which are nothing but mausoleums housing useless and dead apparatuses."

Instead of discussing, after two and a half decades of CSIR, its achievements and glory, we are discussing the conduct and misconduct, regularities and irregularities of CSIR. It is unfortunate that such a situation should exist in this country. I do not want to go into details of the allegations and counter-allegations. The allegation has been made that the Prime Minister brought pressure on the working of the Sarkar Committee. So long as the member of the Sarkar Committee do not say that pressure was brought upon them, I do not believe it whoever may say it. At the same time, I want to point out what 4 members of Parliament have said in their minute of dissent :

"Several facts which strongly suggest that Dr. Zaheer may have unduly favoured his earlier associates from the RRL, Hyderabad have been either completely omitted or mentioned very casually."

By and large, the Committee have done a very good job. But my only complaint against the Committee is that at the conclusion they have tried either to soft-pedal the issues or water down serious irregularities and violations of the rules and regulations and bye-laws. No doubt, they have pointed out these things in the Report. I will come to that later on.

The Committee have concentrated their attention mainly on certain issues. For example, they devoted much time on the appointment of Dr. Zaheer as the Director-General of CSIR. The allegation was that at the time of his appointment he was 61 years' old and so his appointment was against the rules and regulations of CSIR. What does the Committee say about it ?

"According to the CSIR, the Government of India rules on the subject are applicable to the officers of the CSIR by virtue of Bye-law 75(b). The various decisions taken by the Governing Body and the President, CSIR since 1956 regarding the age of superannuation and grant of extension involved departure from the Government's rules on the subject."

This clearly shows that there were violation and the Committee puts into the dock all the Prime Ministers starting from Pandit

Jawaharlal Nehru up to Shrimati Indira Gandhi and Minister starting from Professor Humayun Kobir up to Dr. V. K. R. V. Rao.

DR. V. K. R. V. RAO : The Committee's report does not cover the period beyond 1963. I became Education Minister only in 1969.

SHRI G. VISWANATHAN : Then I exclude Dr. Rao.

What do the Government rules say about the age of superannuation or appointment after retirement ? The relevant portion of fundamental rule 56(cc) says :

"...a workman referred to in clause (b) or a ministerial government servant referred to in clause (c) may be granted extension of service under very special circumstances, to be recorded in writing, after he attains the age of sixty years with the sanction of the appropriate authority."

Deliberately or otherwise, this Government rule regarding the age of superannuation or appointment after retirement has been violated by the CSIR ; whether it was done by the Governing Body, Vice-President, President or the Director-General is immaterial. According to CSIR, they accept that there was a mistake. But, what does the Committee say ? The Committee says :

"Dr. Zaheer's appointment as the Director General was a valid appointment because the Government rules do not preclude the appointment or extensions beyond the age of 60 years and his appointment was approved by the Government."

If the Government rules say that extension beyond sixty years of age should be in very special circumstances where the reasons should be recorded in writing, it is common sense that nobody should be appointed if he is above 60 years of age. I do not know how Justice Sarkar and the members of the Committee missed this point.

SHRI NAMBIAR : In that case, the present Director-General should also retire.

SHRI G. VISWANATHAN : From Dr. Bhatnagar to Dr. Atma Ram, whoever it is, if his age is above 60, it is a violation. So, I think this conclusion of the Committee is against common sense.

Regarding the general allegations, the Committee says on page 127 :

"The Committee have noted that in several cases out of about 270 cases studied by them, the CSIR have not followed their rules and regulations. It is not suggested that violation of the rules has been mala fide ; it may have happened because the authorities lost sight of the rules. In some cases, departures were made from the rules because of a belief"

I underline the word 'belief'

"that the existing rules were defective."

If the CSIR felt that the rules or bye-laws were defective, they should have come forward for the amendment of the bye-laws instead of deliberately violating them. Not only that, the Committee says :

"... posts were created to provide higher pay to the existing incumbents." These are not my inventions ; I am reading from the report :

"... posts were kept vacant for a long time..."

of course, with a motive.

"Posts were transferred from one Laboratory to another."

I find from this report instead of transferring the person from one laboratory to another the post was transferred from one laboratory to another to provide him another important job.

Regarding advertisements, all posts should have been advertised according to bye-law 58 but the Committee did not follow it. This was to suit the convenience of CSIR. This particular bye-law was amended in 1963. According to bye-law 82 it should have been approved by Government of India but it was not done immediately but approved on 3-6-1965. In the mean time CSIR took advantage of this and acted on it without the Government's approval. What is the defence of D G. ? He says in his evidence that not only he but even his predecessors did not

[Shri G. Vishwanathan]

follow this bye-law. It does not exonerate him. It means even the previous D.G's. should be called before Inquiry Committee whether he is Dr. Bhatnagar or Prof. Thacker.

Regarding the qualifications prescribed in the advertisements, several shortcomings have been found by the Committee. I quote :

"...lower qualifications were prescribed for higher posts and higher qualifications for lower posts."

Then regarding the preparation of panels to go before the Selection Committee the D. G. was able to influence and omissions and additions were done according to the whims and fancies of the D. G. I quote :

"In a few cases the screening of applications was made in such a manner that a particular candidate emerged as an obvious choice."

What does it mean ? Is it not a charge against the mismanagement of CSIR ? Names were put up for consideration of Selection Committee without even consulting the employer. I quote :

"The inclusion of such names gave an unreal picture of the number of candidates available for consideration. In effect the field of choice remained limited even though it looked wide."

Not only that : even regarding the constitution and operation of the Selection Committees I find in a particular case—it has already been quoted by Mr. Koushik—that the D. G. omitted three names from the Selection Committee. The names omitted were Dr. P. S. Lokanathan, Dr. Atma Ram and Dr. Kane. When the Committee asked, "why did you omit these names", he said, "In order to have more progressive and forward looking people, I have omitted these names." I do not think he is a competent person to decide whether one is a forward looking man or a reactionary.

Further, a Selection Committee constituted for one post made selection for another post and even for post which did not exist. For favouritism and nepotism the shining example is the case of Baldeo Singh. I want to deal with another important case, that is, of Mr. Suri. The allegation was that even though private consultancy was not

allowed for him he went on continuing anyhow private consultancy. He applied for it and the Railway Board which is the parent body did not approve of it and rejected. In spite of it CSIR allowed it and he continued to practise. The Committee says :

"If at all there is anywhere it lies on CSIR and not on Mr. Suri."

Ignorance of law is no excuse. Every Government servant ought to know that his parent body must permit but both are in the docks and both should be punished.

Even in the case of classification where they have nothing to do with scientists they are called scientists. I quote :

"Out of 245 posts studied by the Committee they have come to the conclusion that 116 posts, that is, around 47%, should not have been designated as scientific or technical."

They have been designated as technical.

To give an example, posts in departments concerned with purchase, stores, publicity, publications, library, information, extension services etc., etc., were given scientific designations. Taking this as a qualification, out of 50 crores of people in the country 25 crores can be called scientists.

The Committee have made certain recommendations. In one recommendation it says that since the Vice-President is not able to devote most of his time in the selection committees, he should appoint an eminent person to preside over the selection of directors and other candidates. Again, suggestions have been made that these laboratories should be given to the concerned ministries or that they should be disbanded or something like that. Various newspapers have made many suggestions. My suggestion is that since the Committee is already working on it and has to produce the other part of its report, let us not do anything now and wait for the second part of the report.

Since so many allegations have been made and have partially been accepted by the Committee also, Dr. Zaheer, who is working as Chairman of the National Research Development Corporation, has to be relieved of this post.

THE PRIME MINISTER, MINISTER OF FINANCE, MINISTER OF ATOMIC ENERGY AND MINISTER OF PLANNING (SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI) : I had no intention of speaking but since Shri Vajpayee and some others have made various allegations against me I should like to say a few words.

Firstly, we all know that the progress of our country and the well-being of our people are largely dependent on the progress of Indian science and also on the well-being and the feeling of involvement of Indian scientists in the great tasks which face our country. Therefore India's future cannot be divorced from the future of Indian science.

We are discussing today a very serious matter. We should discuss it without any prejudice or bias. Unfortunately, I do see traces of prejudice in this discussion. Various, rather intemperate and unfortunate, allegations have been made. As Prof. Mukerjee said a while ago, some of us have become thickskinned because we have got used to these baseless allegations thrust on us day after day, but this does not, therefore, give any more credence to those allegations.

I would, first of all, like to deal with myself and would like to deny categorically that I put any pressure on the Chairman or any member of the Committee, that I sent any message to them or that I met any of them. Of course, I may have met one or two Members of Parliament during this period but not concerning this business. If they met me, they did not mention anything about the meetings of this Committee. So far as I am concerned, certainly there was no direct or indirect message for me, nor did I even know what the Committee was doing until I received the final report.

Allegations have also been made about the integrity and impartiality of the Chairman and indirectly against the Committee as a whole. Prof. Mukerjee spoke just now about his personal knowledge of Justice Sarkar.

SHRI MADHU LIMAYE : That is irrelevant. Let us go by the action, the report of the Committee.

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI : You are perfectly entitled to have your views and the hon. Member, Shri Hiren Mukerjee, is

entitled to his views. I am at this moment referring to something which he said. I was going to say that I myself did not know Justice Sarkar except that I may have met him on one or two formal occasions. But certainly his reputation in his sphere of activity has been an exceedingly high one. Also, his work, whether it was in the Supreme Court or wherever he has functioned, has one which has upheld the dignity of the whole Indian judiciary. Therefore I am very sorry that such insinuations were made. I think that it was right of the members of the Committee to say something about it.

The hon. Member took objection to this. I think, the members of the Committee did not object to criticism of the work of the Committee. It is the right of Parliament to have such a discussion, and to criticise but not to doubt the integrity or the *bona fides* of a person. Therefore, I think, the members of the Committee were perfectly within their rights when they expressed their own great respect for Justice Sarkar and complete faith in his impartiality and detachment. I should like to re-affirm the Government's respect for him and also their regard for his impartiality and the manner in which he has dealt with an extremely difficult task in the public interest and has approached it without bias.

This is evident in the Report which does not hesitate to mention every relevant fact, whether favourable or unfavourable. I am sorry that instead of appreciating the Committee's objectivity, some hon. Members seem to have espoused factionalism, which unfortunately, has prevailed in the C.S.I.R. I have no hesitation in admitting that all is not well with the C.S.I.R. All has not been well with the C.S.I.R. That is why this Committee had to be appointed. We are fully aware that much needs to be done. Although this factionalism is regrettable, as I have said on a previous occasion, this is not an exclusively Indian monopoly. It is everywhere amongst scientists (*Interruption*.)

श्री रवि राय : मालूम होता है कि घाब जस्टीफाई कर रही हैं, दूसरी जगह भी ऐसा है...।

श्रीमती इन्दिरा गांधी : मैं जस्टीफाई नहीं कर रही हूँ।

I am just saying, let us see things in their perspective. Scientists are also human

[Shrimati Indira Gandhi]

beings. This is what I am trying to say. We should not think that only other people can quarrel and disagree and that scientists belong to another species and are above that sort of thing. Although we greatly respect their work, which is very essential for modern life, they are also human beings and they also suffer from emotions, rivalries and so on which other human beings have.

Hon. Members will recall a bitter, an almost vicious, personal, controversy between Oppenheimer and Teller in U.S.A. and also the British scientific row between Lindeman (later Lord Cherwell) and Sir Henry Tizard, the Chairman of the Aeronautical Research Committee.

SHRI SAMAR GUHA : That was on a big policy matter, not on appointments, it was on whether Hydrogen Bomb should be made or not and Dr. Oppenheimer opposed Hydrogen Bomb (*interruption*.)

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI : I am not at all encouraging that. Although appointments and so on have come in, that is not the whole of the story. There are differences in outlook and differences in the methods of working and so on.

The Members of the Sarkar Committee included eminent Members of Parliament and also some of our most distinguished scientists. Hon. Members are aware that the M.P's. who were in this Committee were not drawn from a single political party, but they represented a wide range of opinion in both Houses of Parliament. The scientific members were also chosen from different disciplines and institutions and they are all renowned figures in the international scientific community. Two of them are Fellows of Royal Society. The Government have taken particular care to exclude anyone connected, in any way, with the C.S.I.R. or with its governing body.

The Committee of Enquiry have shifted a vast mass of documentary evidence and representations both from C.S.I.R. employees and others and they had personal discussions with many people. As hon. Members know—I think, this is where Prof. Samar Guha got confused—the Committee have recommended that an officer independent of the C.S.I.R. should be appointed to look into the allegations and to make a thorough investigation

into such of the complaints as disclosed a *prima facie* case as a result of preliminary examination. The Government accept this recommendation and propose to implement it speedily. This is what we have accepted and not a separate committee enquiry as Prof. Samar Guha thought. When we formed this Committee, it was not the intention either of the Government or of Parliament that Justice Sarkar or the Committee should waste their time in the negative pursuit of witch-hunting. Some witch-hunting we had witnessed earlier on in various debates in both Houses.

17.50 hrs.

[Mr. Deputy-Speaker in the Chair.]

The Committee's terms of references were framed in a constructive spirit and so far as I remember, nobody ever protested that these terms were inadequate or contrary to the general sense of the House.

The re-organization of Indian science is a very serious matter. We have to make every effort to enthuse our scientists by creating an atmosphere which is congenial to scientific pursuits. We must not do or say anything which may demoralise them. We can certainly discuss their work but not their individual histories. Our purpose in appointing the Sarkar Committee was to improve the CSIR, not to destroy it, to find a way in which talent, creativity and initiative could be allowed to flourish, not to strangle them, to give our scientists, young and old, a genuine sense of participation in India's progress, not to alienate or fragment them further. These larger considerations formed the basis of the Committee's terms of reference and will, I presume, form the focus of their recommendations in Part II of their report which is still awaited.

There was a dissenting note but it was confined to 8 of the 270 cases which were examined by the Committee. In all other cases the Committee's recommendations were unanimous. Where the Committee have recorded an adverse verdict, the Government propose to institute the necessary inquiry. I can assure the House that the Government are acutely conscious of the problems and frustrations of our scientists. Some of these are world wide problems like the brain drain

which affects even advanced countries such as England and Germany. Some of them are peculiar to India and stem from the hierarchical consciousness which is so deeply ingrained in our society. There are others which derive from the imposition of patterns of general administration on the entirely different requirements of scientific administration.

The Hon. Member who spoke just before me spoke about certain rules. Now, I do not say that we should break rules. But I do think that we should have different rules for scientists.

SOME HON MEMBERS : Change the rules.

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI : That is why the whole matter has been gone into. I am not defending CSIR. As I said, I am myself deeply conscious of all that was wrong and still is wrong. The Committee is going into this and at our level, we are ourselves trying to look into the matter and see how we can help the scientific community to work together. I mention this because the question of age and so on were raised. Well, generally, I am not in favour of giving extensions and so on. But there are cases where a person with some special knowledge or experience may be more helpful. Another thing is that many of these young men who are disappointed here and do not fit in with our rules or whatever terms we have put in, go abroad and get very fine jobs, not merely junior jobs, some of them are put in charge of the whole department. So there must be something wrong here where we are unable to fit these young people, and the same people do well elsewhere. They are not rejects. They do not take some low down jobs. They get excellent posts and responsible jobs abroad. I know a number of cases like this to which my attention has been drawn.

All this shows that human beings are such, that no matter how much you try to have an egalitarian society, some kind of a hierarchy does grow up. To-day, scientific work comes in one of the top strata, if not the top class, in the most countries but, unfortunately not in our own. This may be one of the reasons why our young brilliant scientists feel discouraged. We must certainly see how we can help to change this situation and make it more congenial for them.

I have nothing against our older scientists who have done brilliant work, excellent work. But, the world of science is constantly changing and advancing. Therefore we have to see that the younger people are not shut off and that they get ample opportunities for expressing themselves and working freely.

Whatever constructive suggestions Hon. Members may make are always welcome. But we should resist the temptation of reckless criticism and sweeping condemnation of an institution such as the C.S.I.R. Because, while it has had many defects, it has also got notable achievements to its credit and in varying degree, each one of its laboratories has made a distinctive contribution to our progress in the last two decades.

Our endeavour should be to function in such a way that we invigorate and strengthen all that is good in it for the common benefit of our people.

श्री रवि राय : किसी सवाल का जवाब नहीं मिला।

श्री मधु लिमये : मैं प्रधान मंत्री जी से दो प्रश्नों की सफाई चाहता हूँ क्योंकि उनका इससे सीधा सम्बन्ध है।

एक तो यह कि कमेटी के कामकाज की कार्यपद्धति की या रिपोर्ट की जो प्रालोचना की जा रही है उसका जो भी आपको जवाब देना है उसके बारे में कुछ नहीं कहना चाहता हूँ लेकिन आप गलत परिपाटी और गलत परम्परा डाल रही हैं कि कमेटी स्वयं इसका जवाब दे जो कि आज तक कभी नहीं हुआ।

श्रीमती इंदिरा गांधी : कमेटी ने इसका जवाब दिया ही नहीं।

श्री मधु लिमये : कमेटी की ओर से आया है... (व्यवधान)... उनके निष्कर्ष से आप सहमत हैं तो कहिए लेकिन कमेटी स्वयं इसका जवाब दे, इसके ऊपर हमारी आपत्ति है। उसका आप खुलासा कीजिये।... (व्यवधान)

दूसरी बात यह है कि सरकार जब अपना अन्तिम निर्णय करेगी तो क्या पूरे सत्र को और मिनिट आफ डिसेंट को भी ध्यान में रखेगी? इन बातों का खुलासा कीजिये।

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI : Since Shri Madhu Limaye raised the point, may I say that we do take into account the Minute of Dissent, even before...

SHRI RABI RAY : Evidence also ?

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI : Government certainly cannot go into all the evidence but if something very relevant is there...

SHRI NAMBIAR : rose—

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Now, Dr. Sushila Nayar made a special request as she has to go. If you are not in a particular hurry, I will call you after her.

SHRI NAMBIAR : I have all respect for Dr. Nayar. Another Member of the party had already spoken ; she is the second speaker from her party. I am the first speaker from my party. Nobody from my party has spoken so far. I must get my chance. I am prepared to sit here till 12 O'clock. But, I must get my right.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : I will allow you presently. Dr. Sushila Nayar.

DR. SUSHILA NAYAR (Jhansi) : I am thankful to you for giving me the time and I am thankful to Mr. Nambiar for agreeing to let me have a chance now in view of the fact that I have to go away very soon. Otherwise I would have taken my chance after everybody has spoken.

Sir, I wish to say with full sense of responsibility that what all of us are concerned with here in this House, is not destructive criticism. Our views are not motivated by any feeling of ill-will towards any individual and there is no wish to be little the scientific work done in our country. The whole debate, on the other hand, is motivated to create a sense of confidence, a sense of security, amongst our scientists. And, we, the representatives of the people are here to see that things go on in a way and affairs are so conducted, that proper methods are followed, so that every thing is above suspicion.

18.00 hrs.

Sir, it is well known that there is an acute dissatisfaction, amongst the scientists

in this country. Why ? I agree with the Prime Minister that the rules for selection of scientists should be different from the ordinary rules for other services. But, once those rules are made, it is very necessary and it is very important that those rules are followed and the rules are not changed for the sake of individuals. I can very well understand that a bright young scientist is groomed for a higher responsibility. It is the people with whom a young scientist is working who are far more aware of the potential, of the capabilities of that scientist, than anybody else. I can also understand that a senior post is kept in abeyance till the junior man is groomed up for the higher post, provided there is nobody who is fit and competent and capable of filling that higher post at that particular time. I think it is necessary that either there should be a clear-cut policy that they are going to fill up certain posts by promotion or there should be a clear-cut policy that posts will be advertised and pending the advertisement, no particular selections will be made.

It is stated that there were only eight or ten posts for which there is a note of dissent. It is not the number of posts on which there is a note of dissent that matters. It is the fact that there is a note of dissent. And that note of dissent has clearly brought out the irregularities that have been committed which are the causes of concern for the Members of Parliament.

It was stated how Shri Suri was allowed consultancy rights for a long period against the rules and regulations. At the same time, there is another case of Shri M. S. Krishna wherein though he was considered the most suitable person but because he asked for some limited consultancy, his name was not even forwarded to the Selection Committee. This type of double standards upsets the scientists. Either there should be no consultancy for anybody or it should be allowed on an even basis and nobody should be rejected because that person wants certain consultancy rights.

It is said that the Committee has, by and large, given a unanimous report True. But, the Committee have themselves said that on some occasions posts were created to provide higher pay to the existing incumbents. Then they have said that in some other cases, posts were kept vacant for a long

time or they were filled up despite the fact that the purposes for which they were created did not exist. This is in the unanimous report of the Committee.

Then, the Committee gave instances where qualifications prescribed in the advertisements were not adhered to and they were changed for certain persons. On page 131, the Committee stated :

'For instance, for two out of three posts of Senior Scientific Officers (Grade I) advertised for the Structural Engineering Research Centre, Roorkee, in 1967, the essential qualification was a First-Class Degree in Civil Engineering whereas for the remaining post, it was "good qualifications in Civil Engineering."

Why for same type of posts, the qualification was a First Class degree in Civil Engineering for two and for one post it was good qualification in civil engineering? It is something that is extremely difficult to understand.

Then, they say :

"The Committee have come across instances where, in the same advertisement and for posts in the same Institute, lower qualifications were prescribed for higher posts and higher qualifications for lower posts."

These are things that are difficult to understand and accept and naturally, they are the sources of considerable dissatisfaction amongst the scientists in the country.

It is most unfortunate that Dr Husain Zaheer happens to be a Muslim and Dr. Atma Ram happens to be a Hindu and it has given an opportunity to people to bring communalism into this whole affair. I have great respect and regard for both these eminent scientists of our country.

I feel that it is a grave injustice to them as well as to the nation to think of them in terms of Hindus and Muslims. There is no such thing as Hindu science and Muslim science. Science is science and scientists are scientists. In the undivided Punjab, we used to have at the railway stations Hindu *paani* and Muslim *paani*. The type of talk that some of my friends have indulged in when they tried to bring in communalism into this affair is reminiscent of those unfortunate days. Similarly, the attacks

made on scientists who are not present here to defend themselves are deplorable, and similarly also, the attacks on judges and eminent people are equally deplorable, and we should not indulge in them. At the same time, if there are certain things that distress us, certain irregularities that have come to our notice, we should bring them to light but in a temperate and sober language.

It is said that the draft report was a working paper. I do hope that the Education Minister will clarify this position. Was it a draft report? Was it circulated to the members of the Committee as draft report? Or was it a working paper? Working paper and draft report, we all know, are completely different things. We want a clarification on this.

I find that while some of the details might have been omitted, the charges of irregularities have been included in the report that has been given by the committee in a sober and temperate language, so that there is no denying by anybody that certain irregularities have taken place in the methods of selection, in the methods of filling up of posts etc. I think we should think about this and get to the bottom of it. Our object is to try and improve the situation and create a climate in which science can flourish in this country. For that purpose, it is necessary that everyone is absolutely certain that things are above board and there is no hanky-panky anywhere.

It is very unfortunate that some hon. Members tried to bring in the ideology of public sector and private sector etc. into this debate. The CSIR was created not only to help the public sector with technological researches but also to help the private sector. In fact, some of the pilot plants set up by the CSIR, I know, were taken over by the private sector, and some others that were not so very remunerative, were not taken up by the private sector. I myself have been one of those who have pleaded that the public sector should take up some of those pilot plants which produced small amounts of certain chemicals and certain reagents that are necessary for research workers, although they are not remunerative and the private sector is, therefore, not interested in them. Therefore, it is important to bear in mind that the work of the CSIR is of interest to all techno-

[Dr. Sushila Nayar]

logy in the country and to all science in the country, irrespective of whether it is exploited by the private or the public sector. Let us accept it that the private sector will come forward only when they can make profits and the public sector has to come forward in more remunerative projects in the interests of science. Therefore, let us not introduce this controversy of ideology into this and try to abuse our scientists by saying that one is interested in the private sector and the other is interested in the public sector. They are interested in science and technology and that is all. They are interested in science and they are interested in seeing that the products of their researches are utilised for the good of the country and for the progress of the country.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee took very strong objection to the fact that the report had leaked out. When a draft report is circulated and some 20 or 25 copies are prepared, depending upon the number of members of the committee and sent out, it is, natural and it is very easy for that report to get into the hands of others. So, we should not be surprised at that; particularly when we know that several hon Members have brought confidential files of the Government of India and quoted from them here in this House. How can we say that the draft report should not have got out or should not be discussed by those who have access to it.

Then this question of trying to bring out a contradiction of views between the Prime Minister and the present Director General of the CSIR, was a very unfortunate thing. The D G is under the Prime Minister. He has to obey the orders of the Prime Minister. How can he say or do things contradictory to the Prime Minister's views? But so far as I am concerned I do not see any contradiction in what was stated. The Prime Minister says she wants self-reliance. Of course, we all want it in the scientific field. At the same time, self-reliance does not mean that we should try, experiments and discover each and every process for ourselves. I have seen a small thing in the Community Development, what is known as smokeless *choola*. I found in every State they were making experiments for building a smokeless *choola* whereas in Gandhiji's Ashram a thing called *Magan*

Choola was discovered 50 year ago on which one could cook without smoke nuisance. But here was this research going on which there was a good deal of waste of our energy and resources.

Therefore, if the D G says that we should take technology and adapt it, what is wrong about it? Japan has made tremendous progress on this very basis. They got certain prototypes, certain ideas; they have improved upon them and built upon them. Therefore, for anyone to suggest that there is a contradiction in these two ideas or ideologies, is completely wrong and beside the point.

May I come to one or two constructive suggestions? I would like to commend, as other members have done, the recommendations of the P A C for the consideration of Government. Moreover, it is true that irregularities have been committed. Scientists are not necessarily the best administrators and to expect them to know all the rules and regulations is to expect too much. They should have somebody under them who knows and points out these rules and regulations and they should have the humility to accept the advice of these non-technical administrators who are there to help them.

I agree it is not right to give scientific terminology to posts in the purchase and stores departments. But non scientific administrative assistance should be available to the D G and he should have the good sense to go by that advice and not ignore it in a haphazard manner.

Straightforward, true, honest and complete presentation of all the facts before the select committees is essential. Even after following all the rules, it is possible to select those whom the D G thinks most suitable without giving any opportunity to anyone for complaints of any kind.

Finally, if the former Director General, Dr. Husain Zaheer has made some mistakes or irregularities, occurred during his tenure, I do not see why we should go after his blood. I would find fault with the President and Vice-President of the CSIR. Were they sleeping? Why did they not look into these things? I know all the reports come to the President and Vice-President. They should go through them. If they had done

so in this case, they would have discovered that these things had happened. But they have no time. If they have no time. If they have no time, why do they want to stay on this job? Why not give it to somebody who is interested and has the time to go into these matters? The time has come when the CSIR work should be taken more seriously than treating it as a part-time job by the President and Vice-President, as has been the case in the past.

SHRI NAMBIAR : We have got to look into the circumstances and conditions under which the Committee was appointed. One of the purposes was to look into the allegations brought to the notice of Parliament and also to review the overall functioning of the CSIR. It is wrong to say that we are here to look into complaints of appointment during the last several years. There were allegations about 245 appointments. These allegations were brought in the Rajya Sabha and repeated here. Then this Committee was formed, but the other question of review of overall functioning of the Council also came in.

When we are looking into the report, we should keep this in view and see what is the purpose of our discussion, whether what was done previously by way of appointments is to be rectified or those people should be dismissed or otherwise dealt with.

That is not the question. Unfortunately some Members have brought the debate to such a low level that they thought that it was the business of Parliament to look into the appointments of persons in the Council. The Prime Minister has just now stated that there is a difference of opinion in the Council about the approach. I want to know what it is. I want to draw the attention of the House to this matter. There can be two approaches. One approach is to build up self reliance in the country and develop the country through our scientists and technologists. There is the other approach which was mentioned just now by the hon. lady Member. She was quoting something about chimney smoke or something like that. Why do you want to go in for the imported know-how. I have no objection, we can import whatever we want even locomotives as we are doing. That is a different point. If you always go in for imported know-how, there is no stress on self reliance and building up our

own scientific cadres. He is not a competent Director General if he is of the view that know-how and technology should be imported from outside or borrowed from outside. I submit with all respect to him that in that case he is unfit to hold the post. I do not care for the name. But I have got a quotation of what the Director General has said. "Professor Satoen Bose, national Professor expressed himself against the import of the know-how from other countries. Dr. Atma Ram, the Director General of the C. S. I. R. favoured the inflow of foreign know-how for technical development. "This is what the *Economist Times* reported on 2nd April, 1970. What is his attitude? Does he agree with the policy accepted by this Parliament? I want the hon. Education Minister to tell us what he thinks about it because in reply to one hon. Member he said that all these things happened before he became the Education Minister. Now he is holding that portfolio. He finds that the Director General is talking some what differently from what has been accepted by us. Therefore the issue has to be clinched. The hon. Minister must state his view. He must tell us whether there is difference between the Prime Minister and the Education Minister and the Director General in this matter or whether there is any line-up between the Education Minister and the Director General on the one side and the Prime Minister on the other side. I want that to be decided because what is involved is the future and the well-being of the country. We want scientific technology to develop in our country. Many hon. Member referred to appointments of Mr. Datar here or Baldev Singh there. If those appointments are wrong dismiss those people. We have not much time to think in terms of individual employees in every public undertaking as if we have no other business. As Professor Mukerjee has said if a scientist is required for a particular research work and if you advertise the post a competent scientist may not apply. To say that he was appointed without an advertisement is no argument at all. We are concerned with building up our scientific talent in this country of fifty crores of people. It is a big sub-continent. You cannot object to appointment of scientists who are found fit and say the administrative rule 95 or 72 was not strictly adhered to, as if they were class III or IV

[Shri Nambiar]

employees. When Mr. Viswanathan was speaking I intervened and asked what is the qualification of the present incumbent in the post of the Director General. The report says when he was appointed the Government knew that within five years he would go beyond sixty and will reach upto sixty four. It was the Cabinet Committee that decided it and accepted him. He was formerly in the Glass Reserch Laboratory as its director. What has that glass research got to do with scientific research here is a different point. Even granting it, he was shown favouritism at the time of his appointment. That is my contention, because, I should like to make my humble submission that I have gone through the qualifications his qualifications do not suit the post of Director-General of the CSIR. However, I submit that the gentleman who is now occupying the post had started trouble also in the initial stages of the appointment. That does not go well with him for the post that he occupies. For the first nine months he did not receive his salary on the ground that he was not put on a par with a Secretary of the Ministry. A Director-General posted in Delhi, and who had been working in a glass research laboratory some where in Calcutta, started striking against the very Government which appointed him, saying "I do not receive my salary since I am not placed on a par with a Secretary of a Ministry." This is job-hunting. If I were to do something in the Government, I would have asked him to quit the next day. Why? Because "you start with a strike. You have to head a scientific research organisation in this country and you come and say you would not receive your salary unless you are placed on a par with a Secretary to the Government of India." In the report, it is said that he was unable to receive his salary as if salary was not paid to him. This sort of approach by the dignitaries who are to head scientific research will not do. I want a thorough overhaul of scientific research institutions. I want not only the present incumbent, the Director-General, to explain to the nation about his behaviour like this; I want every other staff member not only Class III and Class IV people but the top Executive heads and the scientists to rise equal to their task. If we have got scientists worth the name, with a certain record, take

them in We do not grudge paying them Rs. 2,000 or more.

SHRI SAMAR GUHA : Mr. Ayyangar was an ordinary M. Sc. Do you treat him as a genius for which the law can be violated? Many cases are there.

SHRI NAMBIAR : We are not to leave things to somebody. If they were not good, you or I can write to the hon. Minister that such and such appointment is wrong. But why should it be the genesis for an inquiry and why should a Committee after giving their findings undergo this kind of an agony? Why should a retired Chief Justice be called in to enquire whether 245 people were properly appointed or not? Is it worth?

SHRI SAMAR GUHA : It is personnel policy.

SHRI NAMBIAR : We can argue it in any way. But I want to point out one main thing. That is about the policy to be followed in future in respect of the CSIR. That must be given the main consideration. If a report is given by a Committee, and that report is not satisfactory to me, can I begin to tear it into pieces and take one sentence here and another sentence there, point out some appointment here and some appointment there and ask whether these appointments are made properly or not? Is this the way our Parliament should be have? It is its job? Therefore, about the policy for appointment of the scientists, the method of advertisement has to be given up and for that purpose, the Director General must be a person of high calibre, not of the calibre or the type that we have today unfortunately. I may be excused for being a little frank, because the scientific research Institutes must grow. Scientists may come and go. Dr. Zaheer came and went. Shri Atma Ram in the same way will have to go; otherwise also, age will have to take him away. Anybody will have to go. But research must continue and research must grow.

I know the brain drain is there and many of our boys are not working in India. But the CSIR must be in a position to enthuse them and say, "We will encourage you." It is not a question of salary. I

have discussed this question with many engineers and scientists. They all say it is not a question of salary that counts. "We know that if we go abroad we will get much better salary. We do not worry about the salary. But we want to have recognition of what we do. We do not want to be bullied, nor to be subjected to enquiries by the CBI." It should not be as if, if the CSIR hierarchy likes some persons, they will be put into so many committees and they will be encouraged, and those whom they do not like will be asked to submit before the C. B. I. and face so many enquiries.

This nepotism and factionalism, as the Prime Minister said, must be ended. But the Prime Minister should not try to escape under the guise that scientists are also quarrelling like other people. This is not a quarrel between scientists. There is politics behind it, namely, that this country of more than 50 crores of people should not have our own know-how and we must be subservient to a foreign country for our scientific development. There are two opinions on every issue in this country. We are seeing differences of opinion every day with regard to import and export, foodgrain policy, agriculture policy, industrial policy and so on. In science, dirty politics has come into scene that we are made subservient to a foreign power. It will do harm to our country. Therefore, the whole working has to be reviewed. Let us wait for the second report. I would request the committee to go through the speeches made in this House before they write the second report. They must also know that there are genuine people in this Parliament who want CSIR to flourish. We are not here for spoils or a little bit of crumbs. There are some people who want crumbs, posts and promotions. But we want the CSIR to flourish. It is for that purpose that we want the committee to go into the whole thing and do a good job.

SHRI TENNETI VISWANATHAM (Visakhapatnam): Sir, I share the views of Mr. Nambiar that we should reply upon ourselves and go forward in the field of scientific research relying upon our own capacity. He was sorry that our speeches related to a few appointments whereas the whole field of science, like entire space is still before us. But unfortunately, the

minister, whom I congratulate, placed before us for discussion only a report about posts and therefore we have nothing else to speak excepting posts. So, Mr. Nambiar will kindly excuse us.

A few days ago, I put a question whether rumours that are published in newspapers about two reports were correct or not, whether there was a previous report from which certain passages were removed when the report was finalised. The Minister was good enough to say on 1st May that it is not correct that there was a draft, but there was a working paper described as a draft report. It is a new method of answering questions. This paper was considered by the committee a number of times and in the light of discussions, the final draft was approved. But whether it is a working paper or not would be seen from this paragraph 6.2:

"Facts relating to the appointments of these officers as gathered from the files made available to the committee are set out below."

This is from the so-called working paper. If it was a working paper, then the language is not appropriate because it says:

"The facts relating to the appointment of these officers as gathered from the files made available to the Committee are set out below."

That is all what I want to say. Therefore, it is quite clear that it was intended to be the draft report but because there was discussion in the newspapers this distinction between tweedledum and tweedledee is being made.

The Prime Minister was good enough to say that we must give a chance to our young scientists. All of us want to. We are all sorry for the brain drain; the scientists are going away. But it is nearly some months, four to nine months, since five Directors have sent their resignations. Why are the resignations not accepted? When I put an interpollation an answer was given on the 1st May that they were considering them. Then I asked another question: are there not qualified scientists in our pool of scientists to replace those who have offered their resignations or are we suffering from want of talent? Of course, there was no adequate answer for that. But these resignations have not been accepted at all. Naturally, people who are still out or who

[Shri Tenneti Viswanatham]

are expecting promotion are getting frustrated. In fact, if one man who should get a job does not get it, ten others are frustrated and they say that this is the kind of thing which is happening in this country. Therefore, I would request the Minister to look into the question and see whether they can accept these resignations or they cannot accept them. In any case, things should not be kept in suspended animation. The subordinates do not exactly know whether their officers will continue there tomorrow or not and, therefore, whether they should take their orders or not. Therefore, in the interest of good administration it is quite necessary that some decision should be taken.

The Draft Report, the so-called working paper, discloses one thing. Several things have been already adverted to by the speakers who preceded me and, therefore, I shall not tread that ground. I am referring only to paragraph 6.43 in Chapter VI of the so-called working paper, where it is stated :

"The post of Director was not advertised. It was stated in reply to Lok Sabha question No. 1761 dated 23rd December, 1964 that the vacancy was widely publicised. According to the information received from the CSIR, the post was not advertised/notified or publicised in any manner."

This is in the so-called working paper, draft report. Why should this not find a place in the final reports? I can refer to so many paragraphs—paras 6.39, 6.40, 6.41, 6.42, 6.43, 6.44 and 6.55 in Chapter VI, all relating to facts which are omitted in the final report. No wonder there was so much controversy in the newspapers and there were reports that some facts were suppressed or were not fairly stated. It is stated even in the Minutes of Dissent that all the facts were not fairly stated.

There was the criticism that it was done under pressure. Probably, that is not correct. I do not think the Prime Minister is the type of person to pressurise the Chairman of a Committee, particularly when he happens to be a retired Supreme Court Judge of the standing which he has. Also, I do not think she has ever any time to do such things, as she has other work to attend to.

Now chapter 11 of the Report summarises the great number of faults, the great

number of omissions, the great number of violations and all these things. I take up paragraph 2 which was modified :

"We expect a record of research work which is unquestionably recognised by the peers of scientific community and is manifestly of a much higher order than this is for a PH.D. But however the Committee said it is all right. The Committee was not aware of any express rules, regulations or bye-law prescribing a degree in science or technology as an essential qualification for the scientific technical posts under the CSIR."

Mr. Deputy Speaker, you will see with regard to the posts of CSIR the Committee says that they are not aware of any express rule, regulation or bye-law prescribing a degree or diploma in science. Now, in the same chapter paras 7, 8, 9, 10, 12, and several other paras all contain great indictments—'rule faulty' it was not advertised, 'interview not done properly' etc. I would like the Minister to go through these. Then he will find the reason why this complaint is made. The final report is not a fair summary of the original report or working paper as it is described. Therefore, I believe with the Prime Minister that we are discussing a very serious matter and that we should not do anything to denigrate the CSIR. Much money has been spent on it. Several big people have held offices and, I believe, in future it has got a great role to play when we are expanding our economy on the basis of self-reliance particularly in the scientific field. We are now living in a world around which science is developing by leaps and bounds and we certainly want our scientific institutions to be manned by good people, by able people, by devoted people and where nepotism, favouritism and jobbery do not find any place. It is not a question of politics. Unfortunately, when a report is placed for discussion and the report contains several things about jobs and the way it was managed by the ex. D.G., naturally speeches are concentrated on that, but that should not create the impression that this Parliament is going into petty-fogging matters. The Parliament also knows that we have to develop our science and we have to give a great place to our scientists, and in fact the future of India depends upon the scientific advance which we make in the near future.

Our object when we discuss these things, when we show all these violations of rules and administration, is to see that the scientists who are engaged there, the scientists who expect a place in it and the students who wish to become future scientists should all have a better idea of scientific instructions. They should not have a frustration that scientific institutions and the biggest institutions in India are all hotbeds of jobbery or nepotism. The discussion today will have, I believe, very good tonic effect upon the institution and what has been said against Dr. Zaheer will be a guidance for those who are in charge of the institution and those who will hereafter man the institution. Now, it is a lesson to those scientists who, unfortunately, are placed in the posts of administration as to how to behave, how to adjust their scientific pursuit together with these administrative responsibilities. The administrative responsibility, unfortunately, cannot be divorced even from the biggest of scientists once they are placed at the top of administration. But it is necessary that they should draw some lessons from what has happened, and let not the Minister feel, from the speeches from this side, that the speakers have got any bitter feelings towards one officer or another. All that we want is that we should take a lesson from what has happened so far and hereafter see that these institutions are manned better, run better and administered better, and also they should be in a position to command the respect of everybody in this country. Thank you, Sir.

श्री सरजू पाण्डेय (गाजीपुर) : सभापति महोदय, लखनऊ बोटिनिकल गार्डन के बारे में भी बहुत गम्भीर आरोप लगाये गये थे और इस कमेटी ने भी उस के बारे में कहा था। मैंने शिक्षा मंत्रालय की ग्रांट पर भी इस प्रश्न को उठाया था और मन्त्री महोदय ने कहा था कि वहाँ के डायरेक्टर से जवाब मांगा गया है। मुझे मालूम है कि उन्होंने जवाब भेज दिया है। मैं जानना चाहता हूँ कि जो आरोप लगाये गये थे, उन के बारे में सरकार क्या कार्यवाही कर रही है?

DR. V. K. R. V. RAO : It is under consideration.

श्री सरजू पाण्डेय : कब तक अपहर-कन्सीडरेसन रहेगा।

DR. V. K. R. V. RAO : Sir, I do not envy myself my task, but it has been made very much simpler and easier by the intervention of the Prime Minister, who is the President of the CSIR, and also by the general feeling that I have got that what Members of Parliament are interested in is not so much any witchhunting or laying the blame on A or B or C or going into personalities. The impression that I gathered I hope, I am right in this impression—was that they were concerned with the fact that something was wrong with the CSIR, which was admitted and which, in fact, was stated by the Prime Minister herself in her capacity as the President of the CSIR. I sensed in the House the feeling that something has got to be done to set things right. I would like to take the debate on that particular note.

I do not think it will be appropriate for me to go into the details of the various cases which have been cited before this House. I do not have before me the evidence. I have listened with great respect to the points of possible inconsistencies or otherwise which have been drawn attention to by hon. Members of this House. But I do not think it will be appropriate for me—quite honestly, I do not feel confident—that I should sit in judgment on these individual cases. They have been examined by a committee presided over by a very distinguished jurist of this land, who has brought to bear to his task of chairing this committee impartiality, objectivity and a great deal of hard work. He has been assisted by Members, who embraced all shades of opinion in Parliament—it is not that they have been drawn from one particular section or another—whom we know and for whom we have got respect. On the top of that the Committee also included a number of very distinguished scientists, some of whom are men of international reputation and have in fact, received the award of membership of the Royal Society.

This committee went into the whole question. As far as I can see they took, what I would call, a constructive view, a large view of the whole matter rather than a very small view by going into each individual case and finding fault. In other words,

[Dr. V. K. R. V. Rao]

broadly I would say that they have not been functioning bureaucratically. I mean no offence to bureaucrats. I think, bureaucracy is an essential part of administration when there are a large number of people. But while I recognise the inescapable necessity of bureaucracy in any organisation, with which I am familiar now for some time not only as a Minister but as an educational administrator myself, the bureaucratic approach always means you go literally for rules and regulations, you get very excited when a particular rule has been violated and you do not go into the motivations behind the failure of a particular rule and any kind of background which might have been there and which might have justified breaking or not acting up to a particular rule or otherwise. There is, I think, such a thing as bureaucratic approach and there is such a thing as a broader approach. I am one of those people who believe in the broader approach as compared to bureaucratic approach. I do not question the bureaucratic apparatus which has got to exist. But, I think, when a person occupies a high office, whether he is a Minister or the members who constitute a very important committee, who are there not merely to go into personal allegations as to who has been favoured and who has not been favoured but also to go into the fundamental task of looking into the whole subject of the C.S.I.R. on which Members pointed out a great deal from both sides of the House.

SHRI SAMAR GUHA : But, unfortunately, in Part I of the Report, there was a particular reference of personnel policy. Therefore, Part II will relate to general policy matters. The point of reference was mainly to the personnel policy with regard to appointments and other things.

DR. V. K. R. V. RAO : I am a little sorry. Prof. Samar Guha is a very persistent person and you cannot divert him from the objective set out for himself. Though I was trying to do so, I was not good enough in that. I yield and I admit it is not so easy to tackle Prof. Samar Guha.

What I was really trying to say was that what has happened. Take even the minority report. Let us take the majority report and the minority report. By and large, the controversy is about a series

of appointments, 8-9 appointments, associated with the name of the ex-Director General because he happened to be the Director of the Laboratory in Hyderabad and these people had some connection either in the present or in the past with the laboratory. This has been the subject of controversy between the minute of dissent and the majority report. There is no other controversy. The only controversy is about these 8-9 appointments on which a number of things have been stated in the majority report and in the minority report. I have got a complete analysis of what the majority report has said and what the minority report has said and so on.

If you read the last paragraph of the minute of dissent, paragraph 17, you will find—I quote :

“We are making these observations with the hope that at least in future the appointing authorities of CSIR will bear in mind the dictum that JUSTICE should not only be done but appear to be done.”

I agree with it. You will find that, broadly speaking, while there might have been mistakes here and there—I am not saying no mistake has been made; I am not saying every rule was observed both in spirit and letter—as I told you before, I think, when we are dealing with the scientific matters, when we are dealing with the expansion of scientific research, there is no question whether Dr. Zaheer favoured this man or that man. The majority report gives the verdict and the minority report also expresses an opinion. I knew Dr. Zaheer personally when I was a Member of the Planning Commission and he was activated by the desire to take Indian scientific research forward in the direction of establishing in this country a self-reliant technology. I remember he held a very big conference and he summoned industrialists from various parts of the country. In this 3-days conference, it was discussed how in different fields, in different subjects, we could undertake research which will be oriented towards industry and which will lead to self-reliance in our technology. I must say that the work that Dr. Zaheer started is being followed both in letter and spirit by Dr. Atma Ram, the present Director-General. If any hon. Member wants to know, I can give

him proof as to how much follow-up discussions have been held by the present Director-General with various representatives of industry and how meetings have been held, how ideas have been exchanged and how the same policy which emerged for the purpose of establishing a self-reliant technology is also now being followed by the present Director-General. Therefore, when I said what, Dr. Guha got up and rightly said that the whole thing is unfortunate. I am not ignorant of that fact. I was very much aware of it. What I wanted to say is that the CSIR is very important. Everything is not all right with the CSIR and there has been a lot of denigration, lot of public controversy, lot of factionalism, issue of press statements and I dare not say lobbying in Parliament because they may bring me under breach of privilege or something. I am such an ignorant of man of the rules of and regulations of the House that I am scared that if I say something, I may be perhaps hauled up for breach of privilege. What sort of things has happened? I am a scientist, I also call myself a scientist though my scientific colleagues will not grant me that title because I am only an economist. I am not a physicist or chemist or metallurgist. I am at least a social scientist. As a scientist I very much regretted the Prime Minister knows much more than anybody else in this House—how much I have regretted the kinds of things that have been happening, how unhappy I have been feeling at the kinds of things because it does not fit in with my bone, it does not fit in with my structure, and I have dealt with academic matters in all my life. I had been a Professor. I have founded an institution. I had been Vice-Chancellor. Even to-day I am proud to call myself a member of the academic profession. I am a class-conscious teacher. I am a class-conscious scientist. I don't say class-conscious except in an intellectual sense. Unlike many other friends, the only class that I recognize is teachers and scientists. I have been unhappy at the way things are happening and I do not want to proceed further in the matter. All that I wanted to do in this particular debate is: let us take it out of this. (*Interruptions*) After all, even the minority report has not said, 'Throw these fellows out'. The minority report has not said, 'Find so—and-so guilty and condemn him'. They expressed their

difference with the majority. The majority has taken one view and the minority has taken another view. Therefore, they differed on what should be the assessment that should be made about Dr. Zaheer. The minority has not said, 'Condemn so-and-so and take action against those who have been appointed'.

From the point of view of future scientific research from the point of view of putting science on a proper footing in this country, this report has come all right. In regard to various other complaints and so on the Prime Minister has already announced on the floor of the House that we have accepted the recommendation of the Committee. We will appoint an officer independent of the CSIR. He will not be from my Education Ministry. I have already told the Prime Minister that I cannot have him from the Education Ministry because the Secretary of the Department of Scientific Research is the Director-General of the CSIR and you cannot have one Department of the Ministry sitting in judgement on the work of another Department. Therefore, we will have an officer of independent status who will go into the various allegations made by the personnel of the various laboratories and various things including, I suppose, the point which my hon. friend, Mr. Samar Guha, referred to. All these will be gone into in detail and examined.

In this meeting I would like to send out from this House a feeling to the scientific world that while we in the Parliament are of course a little distressed at the kind of things that have been happening, but as the Prime Minister said—we are not going to defend what is happening in the country—but these things are happening in the scientific world, it is a fact. Sometimes we forget that scientists sometimes can be more excitable—I dare not look at Prof. Samar Guha—sometimes we forget the fact that scientists can be more excitable than non-scientists.

AN HON. MEMBER : Like professors.

DR. V. K. R. V. RAO : I myself know it. In the World Statistical Congress session in Washington held 20 years ago. I know that one person who was chairing the session walked out because somebody came to read a paper which was opposed to his

[Dr. V. K. R. V. Rao]

particular point I know a great deal about this. When the Prime Minister said that, it was not in justification. She said: let us have a sort of broad human liberal approach. There may be faults. There may be faults of personalities. There may be faults of human failings. We want scientists. We want to get the best out of them. We want to encourage them. We want to stimulate them because it is from the scientist, as far as I can see as an economist, if this country is within the end of this century going to come any way near the standard of living of even the least developed among the developed countries, we cannot do it merely on capital and labour. We have not got enough capital and our labour is not sufficiently trained and skilled. We must have science and we must have technology and we must have the scientist. That is the reason why the Prime Minister took that line and I am in full agreement with her. I am sure the House will agree with both of us. Let us agree to take a broad view of these things and let us not go into all the small things. Let us forget about this.

But, as far as the future is concerned, a point which Mr. Tenneti Viswanathan and some other Members raised, I think, the House will be glad to know that the Committee has unanimously recommended a series of measures, measures which will meet all the criticisms as far as the future is concerned. There must be proper selection committees. Also, I am very glad, Mr. Deputy Speaker, when they recommended that the Vice-President need not sit in the selection committees. I have to sit in a number of selection committees, for scientists, for deputy directors, directors and so on and I do take the task rather seriously, and therefore, I was very glad when it was suggested that an eminent scientist should be asked to preside over the selection committee meetings and that the Vice-President need not be trouble.

Apart from that recommendation, they have recommended that advertisement must be there; they have recommended that qualifications must be mentioned; they have said, there should be no transfer of posts from laboratory to laboratory; they have mentioned that there must be a proper reclassification of posts, somebody must go into thoroughly and have these reclassification of posts.

These recommendations were unanimous. Somehow in this battle about this lobby and that lobby, this man and that man, pro-this or anti-this, we have lost sight of the most important contribution of the Sarkar Committee. These are the constructive suggestions and recommendations which they have made for the working of the organisations of the CSIR which, I have no doubt, if implemented, would go a long way in creating conditions for better results being achieved from the C.S.I.R. and not lead to the kind of dismal conclusion which I think my hon. friend Mr. Hiren Mukerjee pointed out, who sometimes gets carried off—I sometimes get carried off myself with the flow of eloquence. He is much better, Sir, because his language is much chaster mine, but yet there is this habit, and if we start, sometimes the words carry us away.

Sir, there is no question of anybody being buried; there is no question of suppression of science or burial of science. The CSIR is a body which has Indian scientists, Indian laboratories, I have met many of them. I have gone to the laboratories; I have been in the Selection Committees; I have discussed very many things with them. I am highly impressed by the wealth of talent that we have got. Somehow we have not yet got the key to make all that scientific talent which is potential become real. Somehow we are not able to convert all that scientific talent into bread and butter, machinery and equipment, increased rate of growth etc.

This is the problem with which we are concerned and the recommendations made by the Sarkar Committee are recommendations which—I am pleased to announce on the floor of the House in the name of the President of the C.S.I.R.—we accept. Sir, we accept all the recommendations. Apart from the independent officer, we accept the recommendations regarding reclassification of all existing posts, recommendations regarding minimum qualifications being prescribed, and we also accept the recommendation regarding non-transfer of posts from laboratory to laboratory and between laboratory and headquarters. And we accept all the recommendations regarding scrutiny for creation of new posts and selection procedures and such modifications of the rules and by-laws as are required will be made by the C.S.I.R.

I would like this House to end this debate not on the note of which particular person has done harm. I very much regret some of the statements made from my side of the House. I very much regret them. About the Committee of enquiry, I have not the ghost of a doubt in my mind that Dr. Atma Ram will be the first person to accept such a committee of enquiry to investigate or go into this. What I want to say is this, that some kind of a smoke screen has been created over this. The hon. Member referred to certain pamphlet.

AN HON. MEMBER : What is that pamphlet ?

DR. V. K. R. V. RAO : From various sides they were quoting ; I have not seen it.

SHRI NAMBIAR : I will give it to you, Sir. (*Interruption*)

DR. V. K. R. V. RAO : You need not give it to me.

SHRI NAMBIAR : It is a thing which I want you to read, Sir. It is a very good document. Please read it.

DR. V. K. R. V. RAO : I know Mr. Anandan Nambiar very well and he is a good friend of mine. He need not take the trouble. We have come to a sad stage if a leading Member of the Communist (Marxist) party has to give me a Memorandum written by two Members of my political party.

I do not have to take it from him. I shall get copy myself ; I shall get it from my party. I do not want Shri Nambiar's intervention here.

19.00 hrs.

SHRI NAMBIAR : It is worthreading.

DR. V. K. R. V. RAO : I know it. What I want to say is this that I have read some of the statements of Dr. Atma Ram as also the statements of Professor Blackett. I also know something of this particular subject on Science and Technology for purposes of economic development. I am prepared to say this that I do not mind how much I am accused. I am also prepared to make a categorical statement that I have done some reading as a developmental economist for the

last twenty or twenty-five years and if you say that the entire research must be on new things and that we should not accept anything which has been done outside or that we should re-discover everything which has been done outside and we should re-manufacture and refabricate things that have been done outside, I cannot accept. (*Interruption*)

SHRI NAMBIAR : Nobody will be a fool to say that.

DR. V. K. R. V. RAO : I did not say that you said so. But, why are you putting a cap on yourself.

SHRI NAMBIAR : You don't imagine like that.

DR. V. K. R. V. RAO : Don't put on caps which do not belong to you.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA : Don't get excited like Professor Guha. Please keep cool.

DR. V. K. R. V. RAO : Mr. Gupta knows very well that I am as cool as he is at the particular moment. He knows this. What I wanted to say was this. Sometimes an impression is created that there is some rift. And Shri Nambiar asks me 'Is there some gang-up—Prime Minister on one side and the Vice-President on the other side ?' Another thing which shocked me was this. He asked 'Is there a rift with the Director General and Education Minister on the one side and the Prime Minister on the other ?' I shall convey the remarks of my hon. friend to the Prime Minister. And it is open to the Prime Minister to do what she likes. I do not know if she is impressed by the reasoning of my friend, the hon. Member from the Communist Party. But I want to say that the C.S.I.R. tries to do both kinds of research actually. The complaint has been that there has been not enough liaison between the science and industry. If I may say, somebody said that if I do not find time to work, I should not keep on the job. I do not want to keep on the job in the C.S.I.R. at all. I can tell you honestly that I have put in more work on the C.S.I.R. files and problems than anything else. In fact it has occupied something like 35 to 36% of my working time and I have tried my best.

[Dr. V. K. R. V. Rao]

In fact I came with great enthusiasm; I have been trying my best to restore that kind of scientific confidence. We talk of younger people. I have been saying that there should be an Academic Council in the National Laboratories. I have been saying that the young scientists and the old scientists should meet and discuss scientific problems and I have been saying that there should be representation of scientists on the Executive Council and the laboratories. I have been saying that the director of the laboratory should be the Vice-Chairman of the Executive Council; I have also been saying that there should be much greater liaison between the university departments and the laboratories and there should be frequent interchange of personnel. I want a very big, a very close and intimate liaison between industry and science.

As a matter of fact, I have also appointed a Committee under the Chairmanship of Shri Venkataraman of the Planning Commission to examine the whole question of how we can bring about relationship between these two in an intimate way. They have taken up three or four industries and they are making concrete recommendations.

I can tell this House, that to some extent, my freedom to do anything has been circumscribed (a) because I am not the ultimate authority and (b) because of the Sarkar Committee. The Sarkar Committee has been entrusted with the task of recognising the whole thing. I made a statement that I called all the directors and made a number of suggestions which were very much welcomed. It appeared in the papers. There was an enquiry from the Sarkar Committee, "We would like to have the minutes of the meeting." In fact the minutes of the meeting was sent to the Sarkar Committee. I want to have the final report of the Sarkar Committee. Because of this, the whole of the reorganisation of the C.S.I.R. is held up.

SHRI RABI RAY : When will the final report come ?

DR. V. K. R. V. RAO : I do not know. You should ask the Members of the House who belong to this Committee. I do not have the jurisdiction and I do not have the report of the Committee. Sir, the House will be interested to know that the report

of the Committee was not even sent to me. Not only that.

SHRI RABI RAY : That was the first report.

DR. V. K. R. V. RAO : It was sent to the President and not to me. The House will also be interested to know that the resolution was signed by the acting Chairman, Shri Akbar Ali Khan when I made an enquiry from that Committee as to what are their comments on it.

The reply did not come to me. I read about it in the newspapers. Therefore, let not my hon. friends ask me to do these things. As far as I know, as Minister in charge, I hope...

SHRI NAMBIAR : Now, it is very clear that there is a rift between the vice-president and the president.

DR. V. K. R. V. RAO : I am sure my hon. friend would be prepared to see differences cropping up between the vice-president and the president. Unfortunately, the ruling Congress Party does not intend to oblige the Communist Party (Marxist). We have got confidence in ourselves. The wishful thinking of my hon. friend is not going to help him.

All that I want to say is that we are waiting for the final report of the committee, because we want to reorganise the CSIR as quickly as possible, and we want to democratise it, and we want to give much more freedom and initiative not only to the directors *vis-a-vis* the headquarters, but we want to give a lot of freedom and a lot of sense of participation and stimulated the genius and ability of the younger scientists in these laboratories, and we are to wait for all this till we get the recommendations.

In view of the various remarks that I have made, I hope the House will not press this problem of getting into the details of the report. So much time was spent on whether it was a working paper or a draft report. Surely, Sir, you have served on many committees and you know very well the various stages through which a report goes. So, what does it matter whether it was a working paper or a draft report? All that we are concerned with is the final

report. I must say quite categorically that it was very unfortunate. I am sure no Member really meant it, if any suggestion was made that pressure was brought on this committee. I know my hon. friend Shri Indrajit Gupta; it is not very easy to bring pressure on him. He is as difficult as Professor Guha when it comes to bringing intellectual pressure...

SHRI SAMAR GUHA: I had never used the word 'pressure'.

DR. V. K. R. V. RAO: The hon. Member was a member of the committee himself.

What I want to say is that Mr. Justice Sarkar is not the type of person on whom pressure could be brought. I know he is thin and slim and he does not look very

strong, but I can assure you that he is the last person on whom any pressure can be brought. These are things which were said in the heat of the moment. I want this House to agree with me that what we want is implementation of the recommendations of the Sarkar Committee, expedition of the receipt of the second part of the Sarkar Committee's report and a vote of confidence by this House in our young scientists in our laboratories and our giving them a message that we want them to go ahead and help the country towards self-reliance.

19.08 hrs.

The Lok Sabha then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock on Wednesday, May 20, 1970 (Vaisakha 30, 1892 (Saka)).