

अनाज बिखर जाता है जिसमें अधिकांश विजातीय पदार्थ और धूल होती है और अच्छे और दूटे अनाज बहुत ही कम मात्रा में होते हैं। अगस्त, 1969के शुरू में भारी वर्षा के दौरान ऐसे ही कुछ बिखरे अनाज भीग गये थे। उन्हें सुखाने और उनमें से अच्छे अनाज प्राप्त करने के लिए ढके शेडों में ले जाया गया था। जब से बम्बई गोदी में मशीन से उतराई का कार्य चालू किया गया था तभी से अच्छे अनाज प्राप्त करने हेतु बिखरे अनाज को इकट्ठा करने और बाद में उसे साफ करने की एक सामान्य प्रक्रिया रही है।

उपर्युक्त बातों के अतिरिक्त, 3 स्टीमरों से 53 मीटरी टन गेहूं क्षतिग्रस्त हालत में उतारा गया था और उसके संबंध में स्टीमर एजेंटों के विरुद्ध दावा दायर किया जा रहा है।

(ख) कुछ बिखरे अनाज के भोगने के कारण जो कुछ भी क्षति हुई है, उसका अनुमान लगाया जा रहा है परन्तु वह नगण्य ही होगा।

(ग) श्रमिकों की ओर से घाट पर छिद्रों और नालियों में पड़े अनाजों से आ रही दुर्गन्ध के संबंध में कुछ शिकायतें प्राप्त हुई थीं। पत्तन-क्षेत्र में सफाई की व्यवस्था के लिए बम्बई पत्तन अधिकारी उत्तरदायी हैं और वे पत्तन क्षेत्र को साफ रखने के लिए नियमित रूप से सफाई करने वालों को नियुक्त करते हैं।

(घ) प्रश्न ही नहीं उठता।

Extension of term of Cow Protection Committee

**4497. SHRI KANWAR LAL
GUPTA:**

**SHRI RAGHUVIR SINGH
SHASTRI:**

Will the Minister of **FOOD AND AGRICULTURE** be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that the term of the Cow Protection Com-

mittee has been extended to March, 1970;

(b) if so, the reasons therefor; and

(c) the reasons for serving one month's notice on the staff of the Committee?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF FOOD, AGRICULTURE, COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT AND COOPERATION (SHRI ANNASAHIB SHINDE):

(a) Yes.

(b) The term has been extended to enable the Committee to resume its deliberations and submit its report to the Government.

(c) Out of the 17 posts sanctioned by the Government, 7 posts (including that of Secretary to the Committee) will be continued till 31st March, 1970 i.e. the date up to which the term of the Committee has been extended for the present. The remaining 10 posts, have been held in abeyance from 1st August, 1969 and will be revived as soon as the Cow Protection Committee is reactivated. Excepting one retired official, who had been re-employed to work for the Committee and who has been given one month's notice of termination of his services, all the remaining 9 officials have been transferred to other posts in the Ministry, from where they were originally deputed to work for the Committee.

12.35 hrs.

CALLING ATTENTION TO MATTER OF URGENT PUBLIC IMPORTANCE

Resignation of Directors of some National laboratories

SHRI N. SHIVAPPA (Hassan): I call the attention of the Minister of Education and Youth Services to the following matter of urgent public importance and request that he may make a statement thereon:—

“Reported resignation of some Directors of National Laboratories due to policy differences with the Director-General of the Council for Scientific and Industrial Research.”

THE MINISTER OF EDUCATION AND YOUTH SERVICES (DR. V. K. R. V. RAO): Shall I read the statement. . . .

MR. SPEAKER: It is a long statement consisting of six pages. The hon. Minister can lay it on the Table of the House.

SHRI N. SHIVAPPA: Without knowing the contents of the statement, what questions can we put?

SHRI S. K. TAPURIAH (Pali): It can be laid on the Table of the House now and the questions can be asked tomorrow.

MR. SPEAKER: The questions may be asked tomorrow. . . . (Interruption) If the members want, I can ask him to read, but it has already been circulated.

श्री रघुबीर सिंह शास्त्री (बागलत) :
अध्यक्ष महोदय, जैसा कायदा है कि इस तरह के वक्तव्य सदन की मेज पर रख दिये जाते हैं वैसे ही इस में भी किया जाय। हमारे पास उस वक्तव्य की कاپियां हैं तब उसे पढ़ने पर जोर देकर सदन का समय क्यों बर्बाद किया जा रहा है ?

SHRI N. SHIVAPPA: The convention that has hitherto been followed has been that the Minister makes the statement and then questions are asked. (Interruption)

MR. SPEAKER: The copies are already available with the members. The hon. Member has given notice of the call-attention; he could have come to the Table and collected a copy. Why should the other members suffer for that?

SHRI N. SHIVAPPA: The hon. Minister may be directed to make the statement now.

SHRI PILOO MODY (Godhra): Let him summarise the statement.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister.

DR. V. K. R. V. RAO: The Calling Attention Notice refers to the reported resignation by some Directors of the National Laboratories due to policy differences with the Director-General, Council of Scientific and Industrial Research. May I inform the House that there are only two Directors who have sent letters of resignation and no reasons have been mentioned by them in their letters.

The two Directors I have referred to are Dr. Hari Narain, Director of the National Geophysical Research Institute, Hyderabad, and Dr. G. S. Sidhu, Director of the Regional Research Laboratory Hyderabad.

Dr. Hari Narain wrote to the Director-General on 22nd July, 1969 saying that he was giving 6 months' notice from that date. Dr. Hari Narain who is on contract for a period of 6 years from 31-3-1964 (A.N.) could normally be completing his contract period on 31-3-1970. Dr. Sidhu in his letter dated 7-8-1969 has requested that the resignation may be accepted from 6th February, 1970. His appointment is not on contract as he holds a permanent post in the organisation.

During the last few days, there have been a number of press reports relating to the resignation of these two Directors. In regard to the Director of the National Geophysical Research Institute, mention has been made about certain programmes in which there is some difference of opinion at a scientific level with members of the Executive Council, the Geological Survey of India and the Air Borne Mineral Survey Exploration. I understand that opinions have been expressed by (a) members of the Executive Council (b) a meeting of experts in the Planning Commission under the Chairmanship of Member (Science) (c) a Committee in the Ministry of Mines & Metals presided over by Dr. D. N. Wadia, "that any large scale undertaking of air-borne surveys for mineral exploration will not be a function of the Institute". The Institute will concentrate its

[Dr. V. K. R. V. RAO.]

attention on development of instrumentation and techniques which it might test out in the field commercial surveys being left to organisations like the Geological Survey of India and the Air Borne Mineral Survey Exploration. A reference has also been made to differences in the Institute between the administrative and scientific wings. I have also seen a press report by the Director contradicting that there are any such differences.

In regard to Dr. Sidhu, the Director-General, on receipt of his letter of resignation, wrote to him saying that he would not like him to resign and that there was no question of his recommending his resignation to the Vice-President or President, CSIR. In reply to this letter, Dr. Sidhu has stated.

"I do not appear to enjoy your confidence as important decisions adversely affecting major projects of this laboratory, have been taken without consideration of my expressed views and in some cases keeping me completely in the dark."

SHRI RANGA: That is the real trouble.

DR. V. K. R. V. RAO: There is some Press interview given by Dr. Sidhu in regard to the Coal Gasification Plant. This project which was originally approved at an estimated cost of Rs. 21.00 lakhs has gone up to Rs. 107.00 lakhs in capital expenditure and Rs. 82.20 lakhs in recurring expenditure over a period of 6 years. On the decision of the Governing Body of the CSIR, an Expert Committee consisting of 6 members including Dr. G. P. Kane as Chairman was constituted. Dr. Sidhu was a member of this Committee. He attended all the three meetings of this Committee and signed the report also. Later on, he sent a note which, according to the Chairman, practically reopened the report which the Chairman did not accept. All these matters were placed before the then

Vice-President, CSIR, and the original report was accepted. In accordance with the recommendation of the report, the Fertilizer Corporation of India was contacted if they would be interested in taking over the plant. The Corporation was interested only in parts of the plant. Instead of writing individually to various other parties it was decided with the approval of the Vice-President CSIR, that the availability of the plant may be advertised to elicit interest. The draft advertisement was sent to Dr. Sidhu but he was not agreeable to the advertisement. Subsequently, the Chief Minister, Andhra Pradesh, wrote a letter to Dr. Triguna Sen on 21st January, 1969 offering to take over the plant for working at the Singareni Collieries. In reply I wrote to the Chief Minister and offered the plant along with the technical guidance and assistance of the Regional Research Laboratory, Hyderabad. I have not got any reply from the Andhra Pradesh Government in response to this offer which is still open. The entire report was placed before the last meetings of the Board of Scientific & Industrial Research and the Governing Body of the CSIR held on 12th and 14th May, 1969. These bodies suggested that since three coal-based fertilizer plants were being planned under the auspices of the Ministry of Petroleum and Chemicals, the Coal Gasification Plant in the Regional Research Laboratory, Hyderabad, may be offered to them. This offer has been made. This is where the matter stands. Whatever action has been taken by the Director-General is on the basis of the decisions made by the Governing Body of the CSIR on the advice of an Expert Committee.

A mention has also been made in newspaper reports to the resignation of two other Directors: Dr. B. R. Nijhawan and Shri M. M. Suri. Dr. B. R. Nijhawan left the National Metallurgical Laboratory, Jamshedpur on 23-8-66 to take up a post in

ment Organisation. He was given two years deputation terms. He wanted to stay on for a longer period of 2½ years. My predecessor took the view that Dr. Nijhawan should either come back to the National Metallurgical Laboratory as the laboratory was without a Director for a long period or he should make way for the appointment of a new Director. Dr. Nijhawan was not willing to come back. In regard to Shri M. M. Suri, he was an official of the Railway Board on deputation with the Council of Scientific and Industrial Research from 15-6-1964. Since he expressed a desire not to continue in the CSIR after the expiry of his deputation period to the CSIR, his services were replaced with the Railway Board and he handed over charge of the post of Director, Central Mechanical Engineering Research Institute, Durgapur on 14-12-1968. Shri Suri, it is learnt, has since resigned from the Railway Board.

During the last three years, six new Directors have been appointed, namely, Shri K. D. Sharma (Central Glass & Ceramic Research Institute, Calcutta) Dr. R. N. Chakravarti (Indian Institute of Experimental Medicine, Calcutta), Prof. S. J. Areceivala (Central Public Health Engineering Research Institute, Nagpur), Dr. Bh. Subbaraju (Central Road Research Institute, New Delhi), Prof. A. R. De (Central Mechanical Engineering Research Institute, Durgapur) and Prof. V. A. Altekar (National Metallurgical Laboratory, Jamshedpur). All these appointments were made after advertisement and through expert selection committees presided over by the Vice-President, CSIR. These Directors are young, having bright academic and research career. I have personal knowledge of at least two of these selections as I presided over them. These two Scientists who replace Shri M. M. Suri and Dr. B. R. Nijhawan are less than 45 years of age and represent the best talent in our country.

At the last Session of the Parliament, I mentioned in the other House

that I will meet the Sarkar Committee which, you all know, was appointed by the Prime Minister in her capacity as President of the CSIR to look into the working of the CSIR. In terms of what I mentioned in the other House. I met the Committee and have given my views in regard to the organisation of the C.S.I.R. and how best it could be improved and made into a more efficient body. I have placed various suggestions for their consideration and have also requested them to expedite consideration of the organisational aspects.

While I am anxious to ensure freedom of work for all scientists in the C.S.I.R. Laboratories, I have to make it clear that in a public organisation like the CSIR, decentralisation of power and authority has to go with accountability and that all have to work within the ambit of the broad policies and programmes laid down by the Executive Councils of the laboratories and the Governing Body of the C.S.I.R.

I am also keen to ensure that the younger scientists get their due share in any dispensation and enjoy full sense of participation in the working of the laboratories. Accordingly I propose to call a representative meeting of young scientists in the laboratories to discuss with them their points of view.

I may also inform the House that I have invited Dr. Hari Narain for a discussion with me today. I have also asked Dr. Sidhu to meet me along with some other Directors for a discussion a few days later. I may add that Dr. Hari Narain met me this morning and I spent nearly an hour discussing this problem.

I apologise for the length of this statement.

SHRI N. SHIVAPPA: The country was awaiting an industrial revolution and hoping that the outcome of it would benefit our progress in all fields. This was promised by the late the United Nations Industrial Develop-

[Shri N. Shivappa.]

Prime Minister Nehruji. Lakhs and lakhs of rupees have been invested on this institution. But what is the outcome? This institution has not succeeded. This CSIR has actually become a factional centre of the Congress, as is so well-known now. About this gentleman, Shri Atma Ram, various complaints have come like nepotism, corruption, dictatorial behaviour and interference in administration of various central institutions but what has the Minister's statement revealed? It has not revealed any action. He has not stated anything as to what action he is going to take except giving out a big story from the beginning to the end in volumes. I want to know how the Minister who is in charge of punishing the wrong-doers of the institution can make suggestions to this House or to any other body and I want that he should take a bold step as head of the administration. He has made so many other references to the Geological survey and all that. But what is the benefit?

The reason is the innumerable complaints—I do not know to what extent—regarding nepotism, corruption, dictatorial behaviour and interference in the administration of various central institutions by this particular chairman who is a boss over all the Central institutions the democratic set-up that we have. He has taken for granted all these officers and he wanted to create factions amongst the officers and among some of the directors, and he wanted to have his own scheme and have his chance, without any asker and any teller; I do not know why he has been permitted to do.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member should come to his question now.

SHRI N. SHIVAPPA: The hon. Minister's statement was so long that it took nearly fifteen minutes, and I have also to touch on points raised on it here and there because this is a matter of public importance. I seek

the protection of the Chair in this regard.

Already, there is a high-powered committee. In reply to the question put by my hon. friend Shri Lobo Prabhu some time past on the floor of the House, I am glad that the hon. Minister had accepted that no improvement had been made and this is absolutely a useless institution under the leadership and administrative control of Mr. Atma Ram. May I know whether the hon. Minister has got the capacity and the courage to see that Dr. Atma Ram is removed immediately or else he is suspended immediately, pending inquiry by the high-powered committee or by any other committee that may be appointed at the discretion of the hon. Minister or the Government at any time in the future?

We are more concerned with the work which has been completely hampered and the money that is being lost. Who is to be held responsible for this? May I know whether the hon. Minister will accept that somebody should be brought to book in this regard after inquiry by the Ministry or by the high-powered committee or any other committee which may constitutionally be set up? May I know whether the hon. Minister is going to take some serious steps in this regard?....

SHRI UMANATH (Padukkottai): I hope you will apply the same standard to the others also on calling-attention-notice.

SHRI N. SHIVAPPA:.... I want to categorically ask the hon. Minister whether he is going to remove him from there immediately and shift him to some other department where he can easily have his way. May I know whether the hon. Minister is going to take serious action by investigating reasons for these differences between him and the other directors and whether he is going to request those officers who have already resigned not to press their resignations?

May I also know whether he will find out the reasons and place them on the Table of the House at any time in any prescribed manner for the information of the Members of Parliament ?

DR. V. K. R. V. RAO: I am sorry the hon. Member should have made such observations about a respected senior scientist of this country

SHRI RANGA: The other directors also were respected scientists.

SHRI N. SHIVAPPA: It is a question of money

DR. V. K. R. V. RAO: I did not interrupt the hon. Member when he was speaking

SHRI N. SHIVAPPA: Let him not shield the officers.

DR. V. K. R. V. RAO: I seek your protection, Mr. Speaker, Sir.

I should like to say categorically that I am not in the habit, even if I had the power, to remove officers merely because some Member in this House gets up and says 'Remove him; no inquiry, no examination and nothing'. It is very difficult to run scientific institutions or any other institutions for that matter if a Minister is asked to remove somebody just because a Member of the House has come to a considered judgment in his own mind that some person should go. So, I am not prepared to give any such assurance.

With regard to the second question about the difficulties and problems that have arisen in the Geophysical Institute, I came to know first about it through a copy of a letter that I received, which had been sent to Dr. Atma Ram. Immediately I got that letter, I examined it, and I have taken action. Regarding the difficulties mentioned, I may take the House into confidence. One difficulty was that an ex-director of the institute is on the Executive Council and this creates some difficulties. I completely accept

that. I do not think that any ex-vice-chancellor or ex-director should be on the Executive Council body of the institution after he has left it. That is a matter that I shall take up. In any case, the composition of the present Executive Council is only up to November. I am going to have it reconstituted in November, and I shall see that when it is reconstituted, proper arrangements are made.

The other question that has been raised was the difference between the Geological Survey of India which is supposed to be in charge of the air-borne operations and the institute which is conducting research in instrumentation and conducting research for better interpretation of these air-borne surveys.

There has been a serious difference of opinion regarding what should be the proper function of this Institute and what should be the proper function of the Geological Survey. All opinions expressed so far including that of a Committee appointed under the Chairmanship of Dr. D. N. Wadia and the conclusion that emerged in discussion with the Planning Commission point to this that while the Geophysical Institute should be given every facility to do research in regard to instrumentation and equipment as also facilities for developmental pilot projects and demonstration and application of these improvements, the actual large air-borne surveys for commercial or semi-commercial purposes should be the responsibility of the Geological Survey. This is a matter on which I have told the Director that I am prepared to call a meeting with the Director General of the GSI and himself and have a thorough discussion, and if I find that no agreement is possible, I shall refer the matter to the Prime Minister with the request that a committee of Secretaries may go into it and let us know what the proper respective jurisdiction should be.

This morning when I met Dr. Hari Narayan—he is a very nice young man

[Dr. V. K. R. V. RAO.]

he handed over to me a very long memorandum about 30-40 pages. I have not gone through it. In this he has mentioned a number of details. I told him that I would get all this looked into and I was not prepared to accept his resignation, that I was prepared to call for these details and, as suggested by my hon. friend opposite, if it is found that some kind of inquiry is necessary, I shall consider the matter after going through these papers myself and having another discussion with that gentleman.

SHRI RANGA: Against Dr. Atma Ram also.

DR. V. K. R. V. RAO: If he is involved, certainly. Anybody involved will come into it. I shall consider the desirability of having an inquiry into this matter once I am satisfied on reading all these papers that a *prima facie* case exists.

SHRI N. SHIVAPPA: I seek your protection. I asked not for the removal of Dr. Atma Ram alone but his transfer to some other department.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA (Alipore): It is rather a delicate matter for me to put a question as I happen to be a member of the Sarkar Committee. But as he has said just now that he is taking certain steps to see that the grievances and complaints put forward by Dr. Hari Narayan will be looked into and in the meantime his resignation is not being accepted, will he do the same thing in the case of Dr. Sidhu so that his resignation is not accepted and an attempt will be made to see that such an eminent scientist is retained and not lost?

DR. V. K. R. V. RAO: The resignation of Dr. Sidhu is not being accepted. I am having a meeting of the Directors including Dr. Sidhu and some other Directors who, I understand, have complaints about the central office. I am calling a meeting of

7-8 of them in order to have a heart-to-heart discussion. I have sent them letters already.

SHRI SAMAR GUHA (Contai): The CSIR has become a cockpit and caucous of intrigue resulting in a mess, bungling and bottleneck in the matter of scientific researches. I have some personal experience also of this. Unfortunately this Government did not consider taking the help of at least the one student of science represented in this House in going into the affairs of the CSIR. I know Dr. Sidhu has become a victim of jealousies and politics. I can give another instance, Dr. D. K. Ray, one of the Professors in the Institute of Experimental Medicine in Calcutta had discovered a very valuable medicine for the cure of cancer which he named Jawaharin after the late Pandit Nehru. He was begging only Rs. 70,000 for a project in connection with that. But he could not get it. He has received offers from so many American Institutes who are inviting him. This scientist was disillusioned to such an extent that he had to quit that Institute, and Dr. Triguna Sen provided him an asylum in Jadavpur University.

13 hrs.

As I said, the CSIR has become a cockpit of caucous and intrigue. It is no good just asking Dr. Atma Ram or somebody else to resign, because the trouble is inherent in the concept of this organisation. The CSIR has to serve many masters many Ministries while it is being guided by one single Ministry. There are so many institutions, the Road Research institute, National Physical Laboratory, Central Health Engineering Institution, Planning and Agricultural School navigation, oceanography and so many things. What will happen? Each of this had been kept by the Education Ministry and this Council had to furnish the perquisites of the different ministries such as Mines and Metals,

Health, Shipping, Road Transport, etc. In the very concept of the CSIR trouble is inherent. My question, therefore, whether the Government will make a recommendation to have a Ministry of Science to deal with all these scientific institutions or at least split up the CSIR and allow the Road Research Institute to the Transport Ministry, Health Engineering to the Health Ministry and so on?

DR. V. K. R. V. RAO: I shall be glad to pass on the suggestion of the hon. Member to the President of CSIR who is also the Prime Minister.

श्री रघुवीर सिंह शास्त्री (बागपत) :

श्रीमान् जैसा कि मंत्री महोदय ने अपने स्टेटमेंट में बताया है, जो कमेटी श्री जी पी. काने की अध्यक्षता में बिठाई गई थी, डा० सिधू भी उसके मेम्बर थे। उन्होंने माना है कि उस की रिपोर्ट पर उन्होंने दस्तखत किये। उन्होंने यह भी माना है कि उस की रिपोर्ट पर दस्तखत करने के बाद उन्होंने एक नोट आफ डिसेंट भेजा इस के बाद उन्होंने एक प्रैस इन्टरव्यू भी दिया, जिस में इन सब कामों की आलोचना की गई। मैं यह जानना चाहता हूँ कि डा० सिधू का यह व्यवहार कहां तक ठीक था कि पहले तो उन्होंने रिपोर्ट पर हस्ताक्षर किया, उसके बाद नोट आफ डिसेंट भेजा और उसके बाद प्रैस इन्टरव्यू दिया, जब कि ये सब मामले पी० ए० सी० के पास भी पोंडिंग पड़े हुए हैं और वह उन पर विचार कर रही है? डा० सिधू ने सी०एस०आई०आर० की सर्विस में रहते हुए ऐसा कार्य किया, जो सर्विस के नियम के विरुद्ध है। मैं यह जानना चाहता हूँ कि डा० सिधू के इस व्यवहार के बारे में मंत्री महोदय क्या कार्यवाही करेंगे।

उन्होंने बताया कि कोल गैसीफिकेशन प्लांट का आरम्भिक अनुमान 21 लाख रुपये थे, जो बढ़ते-बढ़ते 189 लाख रुपये तक पहुंच गया। इस सदन के लिए यह बहुत आश्चर्य की बात है। मंत्री महोदय ने यह नहीं बताया है कि किन कारणों और

परिस्थितियों के आधार पर आरिजनल एस्टीमेट नौ गुणा बढ़ गया। क्या मंत्री महोदय आरम्भिक अनुमान के बढ़ने के कारणों पर प्रकाश डालेंगे ?

जब वह रिपोर्ट आ गई है, तो सरकार इस बारे में किस की जिम्मेदारी निश्चित कर रही है। क्या यह ठीक है कि इस से पहले जो चेयरमैन थे—श्री जहीर, उन्होंने इस प्लांट का आर्डर दिया था, जब कि हमारे पास धनबाद में पहले ही इसी प्रकार का प्लांट था, जिसमें हम सब एक्सपेरिमेंट कर सकते थे? क्या उन्होंने धनबाद में इसी प्रकार का कोल गैसीफिकेशन प्लांट होते हुए भी दूसरे प्लांट का आर्डर दिया था। कमेटी ने अपनी रिपोर्ट में कहा है कि यह प्लांट न इंडस्ट्री के लिए गैस दे सकता है और न डामेस्टिक परपजिज के लिए; यह प्लांट बकार है। मैं यह जानना चाहता हूँ कि इस प्लांट के लिए जो दुर्लभ विदेशी मुद्रा खर्च की गई, उस की जिम्मेदारी किस पर है। क्या इससे पहले के चेयरमैन, श्री जहीर, ने इस का आर्डर दिया था? क्या यह ठीक है कि इस के बीच में उन का कुछ आर्थिक हित भी था, अर्थात् कुछ कमीशन वगैरह की बात थी ?

मैं यह भी जानना चाहता हूँ कि इस प्लांट पर अब तक कितना खर्च हो चुका है और इसका कितना सामान आ चुका है और इसको बन्द कर देने से हम को कितनी हानि होगी।

DR. V. K. R. V. RAO: Sir, regarding the first question, I think that Dr. Sidhu, when he signed the report, had also indicated to the Chairman that he would send some kind of a minor note expressing some of his views, so that he was perfectly within order in sending a note to the Chairman. The Chairman found that the note that came from him was not concerned with minor matters but went through the whole subject covered by the Committee's report.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA: Was it a note of dissent?

DR. V. K. R. V. RAO: Well, I do not know if it can be called a note of dissent. It was a note with which the Chairman was in complete disagreement, and he was not prepared to accept it. Now, the report, along with the note, was considered by the Technical Committee of the CSIR. The report was accepted; it did go to the various bodies, and we know the results.

One grievance that Dr. Sidhu has got, if I may say so, there was legitimacy in that grievance was this. When these matters were considered by the Technical Committee of the Board of Scientific and Industrial Research, Dr. Sidhu was not given an opportunity to be present there and explain his point of view. His views were contained, of course, in that note, but he was not given an opportunity to come and explain it to the Committee. To that extent, I think there is some grievance as far as this is concerned.

The second question was, why the estimate has gone up. It is very difficult to give all the reasons; it went up partly because the original designing of the project did not take into account all the necessary factors which should have been taken into account; then partly because the prices went up, and partly because of devaluation and so on. In any case, the expenditure incurred so far, recurring and non-recurring . . .

SHRI SAMAR GUHA: It took six years to understand this.

MR. SPEAKER: Please do not interrupt.

SHRI SAMAR GUHA: Why did you allow the purchase of the equipment worth Rs. 70 lakhs from France and West Germany?

DR. V. K. R. V. RAO: Well, I am answering the questions of Shri

Raghuvir Singh Shastri. The expenditure incurred so far is Rs. 35 lakhs, and the remaining commitment is Rs. 37.88 lakhs. The figure of Rs. 1.80 crores that he referred to probably related to the work on the plant which was put forward by a committee appointed by the Regional Laboratory at Hyderabad, by Mr. Nargundkar. That was considered by the Fourth Plan Committee of the CSIR and at that time, the Committee said that it was very large and therefore, "We want an expert committee to go into the whole thing." In the meanwhile, if I mistake not, the Public Accounts Committee. I am speaking from memory . . .

SHRI SAMAR GUHA: What about the equipment worth Rs. 70 lakhs?

DR. V. K. R. V. RAO: I do not understand why the hon. Member is keeping on interrupting.

MR. SPEAKER: What is wrong with you, Mr. Samar Guha? Every time you get up without my permission.

DR. V. K. R. V. RAO: I am answering the other hon. Member's questions.

SHRI SAMAR GUHA: He is avoiding the crucial point.

DR. V. K. R. V. RAO: Because the estimates went up,—and this Rs. 1.80 crores which includes the recurring expenditure for six years from 1966—the Governing body of the CSIR also felt that the thing needed to be re-examined. And they said that till the examination is completed, no further action should be taken on the project. This was in 1967. An expert committee was appointed, and as you know, I have already told the House what conclusions were arrived at: the conclusions came to us that we should not proceed with this. Then came the question as to how to cut the losses and what to do with the equipment.

SHRI SURENDRANATH DWIVEDI (Kendrapara): He can continue his speech after lunch.

MR. SPEAKER: If you are prepared to sit a little late, we can finish it now.

SHRI NATH PAI (Rajapur): What about Prof. Haldane's Report for a Council for Separate Independent Research?

DR. V. K. R. V. RAO: That is what I call an inaudible question regarding the fixing of responsibility and so on, the responsibility for all these various matters, a suggestion has been made. In the meanwhile, Dr. Sidhu, an eminent scientist, had sent in his resignation. He was upset over the proposed disposal of the coal gassification plant. Hon. Members in this House and elsewhere have been very exercised about the resignation, and they want the head of the Director-General of the CSIR on a plate, because of the reported resignation of Dr. Sidhu.

SHRI M. L. SONDHAI (New Delhi): This violent language was not expected from my distinguished teacher. It was not cannibalism; we want to help you; MPs make suggestion to help the Minister.

DR. V. K. R. V. RAO: I am extremely grateful and much obliged to them.

SHRI HEM BARUA (Mangaldai): There is nothing in the head. Who wanted it? Nobody.

SHRI M. L. SONDHI: I am, moreover, a vegetarian.

DR. V. K. R. V. RAO: I am very much obliged to the hon. Member, who has given starting examples of non-violent language during the course of many of his interventions. So far as this case is concerned, we will try and find out whether an investigation is required and how the responsibility is to be fixed. I think I have answered all the questions.

श्री रघुबीर सिंह शास्त्री : मेरे सवाल का जबाब नहीं आया । मैंने यह पूछा कि जब 1937 (Ai) LS—10.

धनबाद में एक प्लांट लगा हुआ है तो दूसरा प्लांट बेकार क्यों मंगाया ? जैसा कि कमेटी ने अपनी रिपोर्ट में कहा है यह दूसरा प्लांट बिल्कुल बेकार मंगाया गया । इस का उत्तर नहीं दिया ।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : इस का जबाब वह दे चुके हैं ।

श्री रघुबीर सिंह शास्त्री : धनबाद का तो जबाब नहीं दिया ।

DR. V. K. R. V. RAO: We have to go into great detail. One of the complaints is that there was a plant of this type already in Dhanbad and, therefore, there is no necessity for another plant to be brought. It is a very long story. As I have already explained, the expert committee have made their recommendations and the CSIR have accepted them. But the Director of the Institute did not like them. He has submitted his resignation. I am going to meet him for a full discussion of this matter and for trying to see what the problems are.

SHRI S. S. KOTHARI (Mandsaur): I am in the unfortunate position of standing between the hon. Members and their lunch. For the present state of affairs of the CSIR who is to be blamed, the present Director-General or his predecessor, it is for the Sarkar Committee to decide and let us hope they will throw some light on it. The fact is that CSIR is today in an unenviable position.

SHRI NATH PAI: According to Mr. Haldane it is the Council for Suppression of Industrial Research.

SHRI S. S. KOTHARI: One very serious charge against them is the suppression of talent. When a young scientist makes a good discovery or invents something, other people in the CSIR who are not scientists try to take advantage of that discovery; not only that, even the credit for that discovery is not given to him. At a time when we are having a train

[Shri S. S. Kothari]

drain, when the scientists are migrating to other countries, we have the spectacle of young and talented scientists migrating from the CSIR. I will read only one sentence from Dr. Sidhu's letter:

"I do not appear to enjoy your confidence. Important decisions affecting major projects of this laboratory are taken without consideration of my views and, in some cases, keeping me completely in the dark."

If the Director-General is not getting the co-operation of all Directors, how can he function effectively. The state of affairs in CSIR appear to be very bad. We are told that 245 persons who have no scientific background, or scientists who have not enough attainment and stature, have been taken in this Council. A consequence of this is that they try to boss over the scientists instead of producing anything worthwhile. Besides, there are considerable irregularities in the accounts; I would not like to go into the details. It seems that lakhs of rupees have been given as advance which are irrecoverable. All these facts should be gone into by the Sarkar Committee.

Now I come to my questions, which are specific. Firstly, when would the Sarkar Committee submit its report? Why does the Minister not insist upon the Sarkar Committee to submit its report by the 31st December, 1969?

Secondly, what steps are the government taking to clean the Augean stables of this Council and to ensure that an atmosphere which is congenial to research is brought about or created within this Council so that scientific talent is not stultified or suppressed? Thirdly, would the Minister see to it that all appointments to the Council in future are routed through the Union Public Service Commission so that favouritism is not done, as has been done in the past? Finally, why has the CSIR decided to give up the coal gasification plant, which is half way through,

which is the immediate cause for the resignation of Mr. Sidhu in protest?

DR. V. K. R. V. RAO: As to when the Sarkar Committee would submit its report, I have requested them to expedite the submission of their report but I have no power, nor do I think it is desirable for me to have such a power, a power, to compel, as the hon. Member says, a committee on which hon. Members of this House and of the other House are also represented to give their report by a particular date.

SHRI S. S. KOTHARI: What is the estimate? When is it expected—one year, two years, three years?

DR. V. K. R. V. RAO: I am afraid, I am not in a position to answer that question because in these matters the terms of reference of the committee are wide. They are going into a large number of personal cases. But as I have said, I have requested them to expedite their report on reorganisation of the CSIR and they have kindly agreed to take up the matter. I hope, they will submit an interim report on the reorganisation of the CSIR.

About the atmosphere, I am trying my best to create the right kind of atmosphere, which the hon. Member is anxious to see created. But this cannot be done in the course of a day. I do hope that in the course of the next few months, by the time the Budget Demands come up before the House, I will be able to give a full and comprehensive statement of what we are trying to do over the reorganisation of the CSIR, the involvement of every scientist, freedom of academic research, and planned utilisation of scientific research. All this I am hoping to get done by the time we come with the Budget Demands some time in April or May next year.

Regarding the suggestion that all appointments should be routed through the UPSC, this is one of the suggestions which are being considered. I have made this suggestion

alongwith other suggestions to the Sarkar Committee because I do believe that the procedure for appointment has got to be such that nobody can have any complaint and I myself think that the procedure of appointments needs some change. This matter is now in the court of the Sarkar Committee.

His last question has already been answered.

MR. SPEAKER: Now we adjourn for Lunch.

SHRI HEM BARUA: Sir, may I enquire about Shri Khadilkar, who was the Deputy-Speaker? We are worried about him. There are disturbing reports about him. As soon as you were ushered in this Chair, he went out of the House. He did not even have the courtesy to be present in the House to join in the offerings of thanks that we made you. Since then he has evaporated from the House like anything. May I know from you whether he has actually resigned or he proposes to resign or whether he is ill or whether he does not propose to come to the House?

MR. SPEAKER: Shri Khadilkar, as you know, informed the House—a letter was read out from him—that he was not keeping fit. He has gone for rest. He is coming back very soon.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE (Kanpur): His brother was very seriously ill.

SHRI RANDHIR SINGH (Rohtak): But we miss him very much.

SHRI H. N. MUKERJEE (Calcutta North-East): How can such observations be made about the Deputy-Speaker? Does this become a part of the proceedings of this House?

SHRI HEM BARUA: The Deputy-Speaker, Shri Khadilkar, hits me and I hit him too. It is personal relationship. I want to show that here is a man who is not discharging his duty

and is getting his salary.... (Interruption).

MR. SPEAKER: We adjourn for Lunch to re-assemble at Fifteen past Two of the Clock.

13.20 hrs.

The Lok Sabha adjourned for Lunch till a Quarter past Two of the Clock.

The Lok Sabha re-assembled after Lunch at eighteen minutes past Fourteen of the Clock.

[SHRI M. B. RANA in the Chair]

RE. DEVELOPMENTS IN CZECHOSLOVAKIA

श्री कंवर लाल गुप्त (दिल्ली सदर) : सभापति महोदय, मेरा एक सबमिशन है। चेकोस्लोवाकिया की आजादी पर जो आघात रूस ने किया था, आज उसको एक साल हो रहा है। अभी-अभी खबर आई है कि चेकोस्लोवाकिया में रूसी फौजें फिर घुस आई हैं...

SHRI VASUDEVAN NAIR (Peer-made): What is the item on the agenda? What are we discussing now?

श्री कंवर लाल गुप्त: वे लोग आजादी के लिए लड़ रहे हैं। वहाँ पुलिस दबाव डाल रही है, उनका गला घोटा जा रहा है, प्रेस का गला घोटा जा रहा है। हम डेमोक्रेटिक कन्ट्री हैं, हमने अपने देश की आजादी के लिये और दूसरे देशों की आजादी के लिये लड़ाई लड़ी है, हम रूस की इस कार्यवाही को हेट करते हैं। जो डेमोक्रेटिक कन्ट्रीज हैं, जिनका डेमोक्रेसी में थोड़ा भी विश्वास है, उनको चेकोस्लोवाकिया को हेल करना चाहिये और रूस को, जो दुनिया में डिक्टेटरशिप पैदा करना चाहता है, दुनिया के लोगों का गला दबाना चाहता है, उनकी आजादी पर कुठाराघात करना चाहता है, मैं प्रार्थना करना चाहता हूँ कि हम सब लोग मिलकर एक बार फिर डेमोक्रेसी के लिये क्लैप करें।