

[श्री शिव चन्द्र झा]

प्रधानमंत्री जो यह साफ करे कि भारत की सुरक्षा के लिये वे क्या कर रहे हैं क्योंकि पाकिस्तान को बड़े बड़े आधुनिक हथियार मिल रहे हैं। इसलिये मैं सदन का, आपका तथा सरकार का ध्यान खींचना चाहता हूँ।

MESSAGE FROM THE LOK SABHA

The Beedi workers welfare cess (Amendment) Bill, 1981

SECRETARY-GENERAL: Sir, I have to report to the House the following message received from the Lok Sabha, signed by the Secretary of the Lok Sabha:

"In accordance with the provisions of rule 96 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in the Lok Sabha, I am directed to enclose herewith the Beedi Workers Welfare Cess (Amendment) Bill, 1981, as passed by the Lok Sabha, at its sitting held on the 26th November, 1981.

The Speaker has certified that this Bill is a Money Bill within the meaning of article 110 of the Constitution of India."

Sir, I lay a copy of the Bill on the Table of the House.

श्री उपसभापति : सदन की कार्यवाही सवा दो बजे तक स्थगित की जाती है।

The House then adjourned for lunch at twenty minutes past one of the clock.

The House reassembled after lunch at twenty minutes past two of the clock, Vice-Chairman (Shri Dinesh Goswami) in the Chair.

Motion re. Twenty-ninth and Thirtieth Reports of the Union Public Service Commission—Contd.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI DINESH GOSWAMI): Shri V. B. Raju.

SHRI V. B. RAJU (Andhra Pradesh): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, a discussion on the U.P.S.C. Reports has become merely a ceremonial observance...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI DINESH GOSWAMI): Order please.

SHRI V. B. RAJU: ...purely a formal presentation and some sort of a debate which may not be very helpful either to the House, or to the Commission itself, or to the Government. There has been a committee for going into the matters of UPSC relating to recruitment. That is popularly known as the Kothari Committee, which submitted its report in 1976. The Committee made recommendations on various matters like method of examination. That is, a study was made of the various types of examinations that were being held till then to see if a new pattern, a new kind of examinations should be introduced. Then it studied the various tests, training and other ancillary matters. Fifty-five recommendations were made by that Committee. I do not think the Government has informed this House—I do not remember, but the Home Minister will be in a position to say and I hope he will check up on that—what recommendations have been accepted, what were not. In fact, in the last one century, there has not been much change in the pattern of recruitment.

It was good that a committee was set up in 1974 and they gave a very valuable report. But the House will be interested to know what have been the findings, what have been the suggestions, what have been accepted and what have not been accepted. It is always good for the Government to keep the House in-

formed and to intimate it about all these things. In fact, if I could lay my hand on the Government's response to this report, I would have been in a position to say more than I shall now be able to. I would very much desire the Minister, when he replies to the debate, to throw some light on its various recommendations.

Recruitment is done to, what you call, the public services, where the Government of India, the Delhi administration and the State Governments at the State capitals pay from the Consolidated Fund of India. We should have an idea of the various types of services that are now being handled by different agencies. For instance, recruitment for the public sector enterprises' industrial and commercial activities, under public management and public investment, is being done by a separate agency. Whichever agency it may be, the House is interested to know what is happening there. And as I have already mentioned, nearly 20,000 crores of rupees of public investment is there and nearly 2 million people are being recruited there. Similarly about many of the railway services. They have their own recruitment agencies which do it. Then there is the banking organisation. Even though bank monies are not Government monies, banks are nationalised and Government is responsible for the efficient working of the banking system. But we are ignorant of this, and when we get an opportunity to discuss all those things when Government will be benefited by public opinion reflected through Members of Parliament of both the Houses, how Government denies to itself what the field experience is! Therefore, this is my suggestion that the Minister—he is an energetic Minister—will take the trouble to see—though it is not under his own Ministry and though it might be tackled by the different Ministries but it is paid from the public exchequer and it is for public purpose and, in fact, on the efficiency and integrity of the public services

the performance rests and the progress rests and the civil services, particularly, what you call, the bureaucracy, in the right sense—that the bureaucratic apparatus in every organisation or in every activity is efficient. That is the instrument through which we translate our policies. Therefore, I would desire that the recruitment policy and the methods of examination and recruitment and the standards that are prescribed are uniform—through whichever agency it may be done. So, on this also I would like the Minister to throw some light—if he can, at this moment. I know that it is difficult for him. Government is a large employer, Mr. Vice-Chairman, and, particularly, in a Welfare State where the State has taken up the economic and social functions on its shoulders... I think Mr. Sharma will permit the Minister to just lend his ear to me because, even though he has got two ears, he is unable to concentrate.

(Interruptions)

THE LEADER OF THE HOUSE (SHRI PRANAB KUMAR MUKHERJEE): One is not for him.

SHRI V. B. RAJU: One ear that is actually lent to me is deaf; it cannot hear. That is the trouble. He himself is feeling the difficulty; I can watch it. It is only because I wanted the debate to be a bit more purposeful, a bit more useful for the Commission, for the Government and, actually, for our youngmen who are seeking employment.

Mr. Vice-Chairman, can't we build up a nexus between our educational institutions and recruitment agencies? In fact, at three points it is very necessary that we concentrate our attention. One is the employment exchanges which recruit people for various types of jobs in the public sector and the joint sector. The employment exchanges sometimes recommend people for jobs in the private sector also. The second one is these commissions which are now recruiting for civil services. The

[Shri V. B. Raju]

third is our educational institutions. For instance, we have got more than 110 universities. Now, whether their training methods, their examination methods really meet the market requirements is the point. The unfortunate situation in India is that there is not that harmony, that nexus between the training institutions and the market requirements. That is why we have to make a study of the situation when a young man who ultimately wants to get into a job has to pass so many tests and has to go through so many examinations. I think the hon. Minister himself might have experienced that attitude of mind at the time of going to the examination. In fact, the most unpleasant situation I have found was in the morning when I had to go to an examination. It is really a very arduous job. Here we are sitting in a cooler atmosphere, a non-tense atmosphere compared to what a young man is exposed to when he has to sit in a test or examination. The whole idea is to filter and get the best out of the lot while rejecting the unwanted. That is true, but the point is whether that is being done through the examinations that are held and the training that is given in the educational institutions. That is why, I think, I have not been able to go thoroughly into the systems obtaining elsewhere. But I think the French system is one which is built up something like that in the matter of institutions for training. That is to say, before they go for a job, before they appear before the recruiting agencies, they must have passed through an ordeal in the training institutions. And there also they have got a filtering process. The educational institutions have got the same filtering method. Therefore, I put it in a general way. I do not think that the Kothari Commission has gone into this matter thoroughly. Friends like Dr. Malcolm Adiseshiah and others associated with university education will be able to throw more light on this. The Kothari Commis-

sion does not seem to have gone into this question, namely, how to make a better use of our educational institutions and universities. I have not got all the recommendations which have been accepted by the Government. But one recommendation which seems to have been accepted, which the Union Public Service Commission has also mentioned, is in respect of combining the examinations for Civil Services, combining three examinations into one and then pooling up and breaking up. First the preliminary test, then the main test and then the interview. These are the three stages. I think you have the experience of the new system for the past one or two years. What is the new experience *vis-a-vis* the earlier experience? I find that the number of the candidates has been going up. The figures are colossal. Take for instance, 1978. In that year, the number of applicants was 1,24,407. In 1979, the number was 1,39,794. After that, I think, the change came in the examination pattern, with pooling up or whatever it is, as I have said. The number bulged to 2,33,548 in one year, meaning 93,754 more applicants. If that is the scale of progression, you do not know, Mr. Minister, the volume of the problem. We want you to throw light on this, as to why in one year there was such a large increase in the number of applicants. In the earlier year there was an increase of 4,391 and in this year it came to 93,754. The aggregate of the applicants was 2,33,548 and the number of those finally selected was 3,684. See the number of candidates who applied and ultimately the number of vacancies filled. How much time and energy must have been wasted in the examination process. Mr. Minister, you are for the poor people. Why do you punish the unemployed candidates by asking them to pay the fee of Rs. 50 or Rs. 30 when they are to be nowhere getting the posts. Why don't you return the fee to them? It is almost a taxation, a tax on unemployment. Therefore, this application fee as such must be recon-

sidered, whether it should be there or not. Then you might say that if the application fee is not there, many more would apply. But I do not think that will be the right response to such a request.

Now take the examining body itself. In spite of the work-load, when the number of the candidates is bulging, the strength of the Commission is the same. There are eight Members. They have requested the Government to increase the number to ten. I do not know whether this request has been considered and conceded. The Commission must be strengthened. With growing unemployment, the number of the candidates is bound to bulge. As I said before, you have got to explain to the House why this large number suddenly after a change in the pattern of examination, or whatever it is. Then I will come to some of the points on which the Commission has thrown light, and I would like to conclude because there is no scope for a much longer debate for the reason that we do not have the theoretical, ideological, political and other aspects of this.

What has been the experience of the Commission? The educational institutions have been communicated what the Commission's experience has been with the type of elements that came for examination, their standards and response to new thinking and all that. It is being communicated. Why does it not come in the Report? If that is done, Parliament would be able to know about the type of element and whether the standards are going down or not. It is an opportunity for us to know about the standard of education that is being maintained in our educational institutions. This is the test. Therefore, we would like to know this. The report could have given a chapter on that. I wish that the report had been actually a bit weighty, not in the sense that it should be bulky mainly giving statistics. Any clerk can prepare a report. It is a statistical report, simply appending tables, giving appendices and so on. That can be done by anybody.

That is not what we want. We want much more than this. What is it that they have communicated to the universities, to the educational institutions in the country on their experience about the talent that is available for them for being tested for recruitment? That is very necessary because there is a general feeling that our educational standards are going down, that the present system in the universities is not the right system that the country needs today and that the frustration the young man are getting is the main cause for all the student unrest. We cannot wholly condemn the students saying that the students are an indisciplined community. The society owes it to the students. They are a part of the society. Mr. Vice-Chairman, this is one thing we would like to know, the knowledge of the Commission about the working of our educational institutions in the matter of preparing talent for recruitment.

There are delays in the finalisation of the cases of confirmation of officers. For promotion the Commission is consulted. The Commission's Member is there. The Commission makes some recommendations. So, the confirmation of the officers is accepted or recommended by the Commission. The confirmation is not taking place within time.

Then, about the matters exempted from the purview of the Commission, let the Government re-examine the list consisting of the matters which are exempt from examination by the Commission or being referred to the Commission. The Government should have faith on the *bona fides* of the Commission, the integrity of the Commission, the sense, the wisdom, of the Commission. Why do you exclude some categories for that purpose? I have gone through the list. Many things could be easily deleted from the list. They can be sent back. The Government says that the Commission could recommend on those things also. Let the Government not have diffidence in the wisdom and integrity of the Commission. That is not good. After all, our democratic system will

[Shri V. B. Raju]

be sustained by these bodies Constitutionally provided for, an independent judiciary, the Election Commission, the Union Public Service Commission and others. These are, what you call the checks on the vagaries of the executive, and we should welcome their independent functioning and their effective functioning.

Then, let the Minister examine the number of vacancies that are announced for each recruitment and ultimately, after the process of the examination, the number that is sought to be filled up. This is very disproportionate. I will give one case of 1979 when it had notified that 1,751 vacancies would be filled up, but ultimately the recruitment went up to 3,186. The same thing in 1980; 1,630 vacancies were announced by the Commission, but ultimately the number went up to 2,868. Why? Between the number at the time of notification and that at the time of filling up, why is this gap? It is nearly 70 to 80 per cent more. Why don't you announce it? Why don't you take time and announce the correct number for the Commission to recommend to you? They themselves have complained on this point.

So, Mr. Vice-Chairman, these are some of the points which I wanted to bring before the Minister. In fact, one of the major considerations before the Commission is to ensure that the recruitment policies and selection practices are socially relevant and technically reliable. Now the Kothari Committee went into it. I do not remember any debate having taken place on it. At least by the time of the next report—the Government would have had a second opportunity to consider all those recommendations—let the House be given an opportunity to throw more light than we can afford to do today. Thank you very much.

SHRI P. N. SUKUL (Uttar Pradesh): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, the Union Public Service Commission is

a constitutional institution which owes its existence to the provisions of article 315 of the Constitution. The functions of the UPSC are contained in article 320, and it has to be consulted by the Government for practically all matters concerning civil services, right from recruitment to retirement, including methods of recruitment, principles to be followed in making appointments, all disciplinary matters etc. Thus, but for the posts falling in Groups C & D, with the sole exception of the posts of Assistants and Stenographers in the Central Secretariat, the UPSC deals with the service matters of the entire executive. And since the executive is the most important organ of our State, or at least it tends to be so, the overwhelming institutional importance of the UPSC can well be imagined in our administration.

In the Reports under consideration, we find that there is only one item of non-acceptance of the Commission's advice by the Government, and it is mentioned in para 33 of the Thirtieth Report of the UPSC. This particular case relates to appointment to the post of Advisor (Production) in the Bureau of Public Enterprises under the Finance Ministry. The person recommended by the UPSC was one Shri Kasy Aiyar an officer of the Railways, on deputation. Shri Aiyar, who had already been on deputation till December 1977, had to serve the Railways for three years before proceeding on another deputation. And since he had not completed this minimum required time—he had not served for three years—his case was not considered for deputation. On a further reference, the UPSC suggested another name, number one in the reserved list, in place of Shri Aiyar. Thus it will be seen that the Government have accepted practically the entire recommendations of the UPSC. It is no doubt a very good thing because it shows that our Government have acted in an entirely democratic manner in matters concerning the civil services, as revealed by a perusal of the Reports under consideration. It

is also a matter of satisfaction that candidates belonging to the Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes are being regularly selected as per the reserved quotas and it is only in connection with posts requiring technical and professional examinations that the number of Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes candidates is less than the requisite number. However, I hope that the Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes students will in due course of time be equally attracted towards these examinations and their reserved quotas will be duly filled up in such services as well.

One particular aspect of these Reports is rather noteworthy. It seems that in a large number of cases the number of vacancies is initially much less, as pointed out by my predecessor just now, and by the time the necessary selections are made by the UPSC, the number of final vacancies is much more. This complicates matters from the viewpoint of the candidates and should be avoided by the Government as far as possible.

While inaugurating the Conference of Chairman of the Union and State Public Service Commissions in November 1980 our beloved Prime Minister, Mrs. Indira Gandhi, has laid great stress on providing more equitable opportunities for candidates from rural areas in the administrative services. This shows how keen our Government is for instilling rural blood into the administrative services. This recruitment philosophy regarding treatment to be given to rural candidates in matters of selection forms part of the recommendations of the Conference, and it is a very welcome sign. However, the recommendations of the Kothari Committee and the Backward Classes Committee should also be studied and implemented.

Another recommendation of the Conference pertains to the expansion of the functions of the Commission to include the public sector undertakings as well. In this connection also it is gratifying to note that a committee has been formed to study the matter in all its aspects.

One recommendation pertains to raising the age limit for retirement of members and chairmen from 62 to 65 and also a tenure of six years for chairmen of State Public Service Commissions. In this connection it may be submitted that since the same age limit holds good for our judges also, there is no reason why the retiring age of PSC members or chairman should be further increased.

Another recommendation of the Conference relates to parity in pay scales of the staff of the State Public Service Commissions and Secretariats in the States. In many States this parity already exists. I know about U.P. In U.P. there has been total parity in pay scales of the Public Service Commission employees and the Secretariat employees right from the beginning. So, there should be no objection to this parity being granted in other States as well.

In para 15(ii) of the Thirtieth Report, the UPSC suggested separate examinations for Indian Forest Service. This suggestion is in keeping with the formation of a separate All-India Service—Indian Forest Service—which has necessitated a separate examination for the same because of the technical nature of the job and the difference in the terms of selection. In para 15(iii) the UPSC recommended to continue the existing separate examinations of IES and ISS. This recommendation is also quite acceptable especially because the number of candidates to be recruited in a year has been very small, less than 10 per year, and a simplified scheme of examination having papers of objective type separate examination may continue to be held for these services.

I am making two suggestions. The first suggestion is that the number of persons called for interview by the State Public Service Commissions should not be very large. At the most three to four persons should be called for interview for one post; otherwise, people will only lose money by way of travelling expenses and gain nothing except disappointment. Also,

[Shri P. N. Sukul]

as Mr. Raju just said, the strength of the Commissions should be increased suitably so that there is no avoidable delay in finalising recruitment, etc.

The UPSC suggested there should be an increase in the dearness allowance as also pension of the chairmen and members of the Commissions. Personally I do not see any reason because dearness allowance is also now being given to them.

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF HOME AFFAIRS (SHRI YOGENDRA MAKWANA): What was your second suggestion?

SHRI P. N. SUKUL: My second suggestion is that the strength of the Commissions should be increased. The number of members should be increased so that there is no avoidable delay in making recruitment and finalisation.

Sir, with these suggestions I commend the report for the acceptance of the House.

श्री शिव चन्द्र झा (विहार) उप-सभाध्यक्ष जी, यह जो दो रपटें हैं यू० पी० एस० सी० की इन पर चर्चा एक तरह से अच्छा ही है। रपट नहीं बल्कि यह जो संस्था है इस पर गौर करने का हमको मौका मिला है। सर्विसेज का पैटर्न जो है वह पुराने समय से चला आ रहा है और इस बदलती हुई परिस्थिति में एक और संस्था की जरूरत है। यू० पी० एस० सी० की एक रेकमण्डेशन हुई जिसके कारण लैंग्वेज को भी उसकी परीक्षा का आधार बना दिया है। पहले ऐसी बात नहीं थी लेकिन यह जो नया रास्ता निकाला गया है इसका हम लोग स्वागत करते हैं। लेकिन फिर भी अभी भी पब्लिक सर्विस कमीशन में जो परिस्थिति है, जो वहां का एडमिनिस्ट्रेशन है उसका अंदाजा इस बात से लगाया जा सकता है अभी भी वहां अंग्रेजी का बोर्ड लगा हुआ है। मंत्री जी बतायें कि जितने

कंडीडेट्स पिछले साल अपायर हुये थे उनमें से कितनों ने अपनी भाषाओं में इम्तिहान दिया, क्वेश्चन पेपर्स के उत्तर दिये और उनमें से कितने कंडीडेट उतीर्ण हुए, पास हुए।... (अवधान)

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI DINESH GOSWAMI): Order, order. Your conversation disturbs others.

श्री शिव चन्द्र झा: किन भाषाओं में कितना परसेंटेज उनका था अपनी भाषा में अपायर होने वालों का और अंग्रेजी में इम्तिहान देने वालों के मुकाबले उनका अनुपात क्या था? उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, अपनी भाषा को ज्यादा कंडीडेट्स इस लिये नहीं ले रहे हैं क्योंकि उन पर अंग्रेजी का भूत सवार है। इंटरव्यू में जायेंगे तो अंग्रेजी में सवाल होंगे और अंग्रेजी ज्यादा अच्छी तरह जान लेंगे तो सबसेसफल होने की ज्यादा संभावना होती है। यह जो अंग्रेजी का भूत है इसको खत्म करने की जरूरत है। यूनिशन पब्लिक सर्विस कमीशन की रपट में है कि अभी भी 300 अंकों का अंग्रेजी में इम्तिहान देना जरूरी है। मैं रामझता हूँ कि इसकी आज कोई जरूरत नहीं है। मैं तो बल्कि कहूंगा कि अंग्रेजी को खत्म कर दें, इसकी कोई जरूरत नहीं है। लेकिन अगर इतना एकदम नहीं खत्म कर सकते हैं तो कम से कम इसको दम तोड़ने का हालत में ले आये और 300 की जगह पर 100 मार्क्स पर ले आये। 100 इधर रहे और 200 मार्क्स अपनी भाषाओं के लिये रखे जायें। उपसभाध्यक्ष जी, अपनी भाषा में जब कोई कंडीडेट्स लिखता है तो अपने को ज्यादा अच्छी तरह से एक्सप्रेस कर सकता है। मेरा तो यह भी कहना है कि संविधान की अष्टम अनुसूची में जिन भाषाओं का जिक्र नहीं है उन भाषाओं में भी अपायर होने का मौका दिया जाना चाहिये। ऐसी भाषायें काफी धनी हैं। जैसे मैं मैथिली के बारे में कहना चाहता हूँ। मैथिली जो भाषा है

उसे तीन करोड़ से ज्यादा लोग बोलते हैं। मैथिली भाषी जो हैं वे बहुत आई० सी० एस०, आई० ए० एस० और आई० पी० एस० रहे हैं। उनको मैथिली मिलना चाहिये मैथिली में इम्तिहान देने के लिये। मंत्री महोदय कहेंगे कि वह भाषा संविधान में नहीं है। यह ठीक है। पर आप उसको संविधान में ले आइये। मैथिली को संविधान की अष्टम सूची में 3 करोड़ से ज्यादा लोग चाहते हैं और वे इसकी मांग कर रहे हैं कि मैथिली को अष्टम सूची में ले आइये और उनको मौका दें कि मैथिली में वे लिखें। इसलिये यह जो संशोधन है कि अपनी भाषा में परीक्षा दे सकने हैं यह ठीक है लेकिन अंग्रेजी का जो भूत है, हीवा है कि इंटरव्यू में अगर अंग्रेजी में नहीं बोलेंगे तो पास नहीं होंगे, यह जो माहौल है खत्म होना चाहिये। क्यों कि आजकल लोग समझते हैं कि अगर इंटरव्यू में हिन्दी में दूंगा अंग्रेजी में नहीं दूंगा तो वह समझता है कि वह इनफिरियर हो जायेगा इसलिये ऐसा प्रावधान होना चाहिये कि 60 प्रतिशत इंटरव्यू जो हैं वे हिन्दी में होने चाहिये और उनको इस तरफ जाने के लिये प्रोत्साहन दिया जाना चाहिए। इस तरह का प्रोत्साहन देने से उनके अन्दर यह जो भावना है वह खत्म हो सकती है यह सब सुधार करने की जरूरत है। एक और बात मैं कहना चाहता हूँ। आजकल जो आई० ए० एस० सर्विस वाले हैं, पहले इनकी जगह आई० सी० एस० सर्विस कहा जाता था। इस आई० सी० एस० सर्विस में आने के लिये बाकी परीक्षाओं के साथ-साथ परसनल्टी टेस्ट भी होता था। परसनल्टी टेस्ट में घुड़ सवारी करना होता था। घुड़-सवारी करने का भी इम्तिहान लिया जाता था। इसी कारण से अरविन्दु आई० सी० एस० में फेल कर गये क्योंकि उनको घुड़सवारी करना नहीं आता था। इस

लिए वे इस परीक्षा में सफल न हो सके। लेकिन आज जो बदलती हुई परिस्थिति है उनको देखते हुए उसके अनुरूप यह मांग रही है कि परसनल्टी टेस्ट में एक पेपर होना चाहिये। वह क्या होना चाहिये? वह सोशल सर्विस का। पहले घुड़सवारी की परीक्षा ली जाती थी क्योंकि उस समय परिस्थिति कुछ ऐसी थी। अंग्रेजी सांप्रज्य था, उसको कायम करना था। इसलिये वे घुड़सवारी हर आदमी के लिये आवश्यक समझते थे। उनको तो लोगों पर राज्य करना होता था लेकिन आजकल जो आई० ए० एस० सर्विस काडर में आएं उनको समाज सेवा की भावना के साथ कार्य करना है। इसलिये समाज सेवा की परीक्षा होनी चाहिये। यह मैं इस लिये कह रहा हूँ बावजूद इस परिवर्तन के फिर भी अभी वे अपने को लाट साहब समझते हैं। चाहे प्लाक का अधिकारी हो, चाहे इस विल्डिंग का अधिकारी हो, यूनिजन सर्विस का अधिकारी हो, सब अपने को लाट साहब समझते हैं और कहते हैं खुल कर कहते हैं कि एम० पी० और एम० एल० ए० तो केप्युल लेबरर्ज है लेकिन वह जो है परमानेंट लेबरर्ज है स्टेबल आदमी है। यह बात ठीक है उन में स्टेबिलिटी है कान्टीन्यूटी है लेकिन मैंने कहा उनमें डायनामिज्म नहीं है। डायनामिज्म न होने की वजह से नतीजा क्या होता है? नतीजा यह होता है कि वे समाज को आगे बढ़ाने के बजाय वे समाज में रुकावट बन जाते हैं। तो हमें इस प्रकार के दृष्टिकोण को तोड़ना है। मेरा यह सुझाव है कि अधिकारी यूनिजन सर्विस के लिये परीक्षा पास करता है उसके साथ-साथ यह पद्धति भी बना देनी चाहिये उस परीक्षा के जरिये उसको यह बता दिया जाना चाहिए कि तुम समाज के सेवक होने जा रहे हो, उन पर डोमीनेट करने नहीं जा रहे हो, अफसरशाही दिखाने नहीं जा रहे हो। पहले की

[श्री शिव चन्द झा]

बात और थी। इस प्रकार की कोई चीज मैं यू० पी० एम० सी० की रिपोर्ट में नहीं देख रहा हूँ। लेकिन सरकार को इसके बारे में सांचना चाहिए। वही आई० ए० एम०, आई० एफ० एस्० अरवा यूनियन सर्विस में जाएगा जिसके पास समाज सेवा का सर्टिफिकेट हो, जो गांधी-गांध में गया है, जनता के बीच में रह चुका है, बाढ़ के वक़्त, साइक्लोन के वक़्त में, अकाल के समय में काम करने कर थोड़ा बहुत, 6 महीने या एक साल का जिसको अनुभव प्राप्त हो। सभी परिधाओं के साथ-साथ यह भी एक योग्यता उसमें होनी चाहिए। यदि हो सके तो उसको देहात में भेजा जाना चाहिए तब उसका फाइनेल डिसेकशन होना चाहिए। उसमें इस तरह की भावनाएं इनकलेक्ट की जानी चाहिए। हम लोग बराबर कहते हैं, इन लोगों ने हमारी बातें होती हैं। हम कहते हैं कि तुम भी समाज को बना रहे हो और हम भी समाज सेवा में लगे हैं, समाज को बना रहे हैं। तुम लोग पेंड सर्वेंट हो और हम लोग अनपेंड सर्वेंट हैं। कहने का तात्पर्य यह है कि तुम लोग तो रेगुलर सर्विस करते हो लेकिन हम आज हैं तो क्या नहीं हैं लेकिन समाज बनाने की जिम्मेदारी दोनों की है मैं यह नहीं कहता कि जनता के प्रतिनिधि केवल एम० पी० या एम० एल० ए० हैं, वे भी हैं। लेकिन उनके साथ एक पुरानी ऐतिहासिक बीमारी रह गई है। वे समझते हैं कि हम लट माहब हैं। पूछेंगे उनसे इधर तो वे मुंह घुमा लेंगे उधर। कामज की फाइल को दबा कर रखे रहेंगे आगे नहीं बढ़ायेगे। उनको हमें कहना है, सिखाना है कि तुमको वार फुटिंग पर काम करना होगा चाहे वह मुई की तरह से छोटा कामज हा चाहे न्युक्लिअर ट्रीटी के विषय में कामज हो। आपको वार फुटिंग पर काम करना है। जनता के सेवक की भावना से तुम्हें

काम करना है। उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, अब मैं थोड़ा-सा पूंजीवादी समाज धर्म, का के विषय में कहना चाहता हूँ। वहां के सर्वेंट हम लोगों जैसे नहीं है। यह सिस्टम जो हमारा है, यह तो ट्रांसफर आफ पावर में ब्रिटिश से मिला है। इसकी ऐतिहासिक खूबी यह रही कि जब ट्रांसफर आफ पावर हुआ तो इन लोगों ने बड़ी खुशी से आगे कंधे पर प्रशासन को उठा लिया लेकिन डच क्लोनोज जहां ईस्ट इंडीज में थी वहां पर ऐसा नहीं हो सका, वहां ऐसी परिस्थिति नहीं थी, वहां सारा सिस्टम बिगड़ गया। तो इसमें यह खूबी है कि इसमें स्टेबिलिटी की बात होता है जो कि होना चाहिए। सोशल सर्विस की की भावना आगे से डायनामिज्म आएगा, वार पुटिंग पर मुस्तदों से काम करने की भावना आएगी। हमारे यहाँ यह डायनामिज्म पहले नहीं रहा। अमरीकी सिस्टम कुछ दूसरा है। वहां कोई भी दफ्तर ही, मेजिस्ट्रेट ही, यूनियन सर्विस का जज हो चाहे किसी भी दफ्तर में बगैर पूछे आप चले जा सकते हैं। यदि व्यस्त है तो वहां का उन्होंने जो सेक्रेटरी रखा हुआ है वह उसको दूसरा टाईम दे देगा। व्यस्त नहीं हैं तो बगैर किसी के पूछे वह अन्दर जा सकता है। वहां का अफिसर फिर उसको स्माईलिंग डंग से कहेगा। यही इम्प्रेशन होगा। ऐसा मालूम होता है कि जैसे हम परिवार के एक सदस्य से मिल रहे हो। जो करना होगा करेगा, जो नहीं कर सकता होगा, कह देगा नहीं कर सकता हूँ। तो यह भावना जो अपनेपन की भावना है, फारमैलिटी की भावना है वह वहां पर व्याप्त है। अतः जैसे मैंने आपको कहा कि जब सोशल सर्विस की भावना आप जगायेंगे तब ही जाकर यह भावना आयेगी कि हम समाज सेवक हैं।

डोमिनेशन, जो आम जनता है, साधारण जनता है, देहाती है, आम लोग हैं,

वे इत डोमोनेशन से भयभीत रहते हैं कि वह आफिसर हैं, हाकिम हैं। आपको इसको खत्म करना होगा लेकिन इसके बारे में मैं रिपोर्ट में कुछ नहीं पाता हूँ। रिपोर्ट में मैं नहीं देखता कि यूनियन पब्लिक सर्विस कमिशन को गौर करना पड़ेगा, इन सब मुद्दों पर। लेकिन यह इग्जामिनेशन को जो बात है तो इम्तिहान अपनी भाषा में होना चाहिए। इसमें मजे में आप अंग्रेजी में जो होते हैं उसको हटाकर अपनी भाषाएं ला सकते हैं। वे भाषाएं भी जिनको मान्यता नहीं है जैसे मैथिली उसको भी आप एलाऊ करें। एक सोशल सर्विस को भावना होनी चाहिए।

अब प्राइम मिनिस्टर के एडवाइजर की बात है (समय की घंटी) अब आप घंटी बजा रहे हैं। इस पर मुझे ज्यादा नहीं कहना है। वह उन्हीं के साथ खत्म हो जायेगा ऐसा नहीं होना चाहिए। मैं समझता हूँ कि कोई अफिसर हो, अगर वह भी एडवाइजर हो तो ऐसा शगभंगुर नहीं हो। किसी सर्विस का एक आदर्श हो, स्टैंडलाइज हो जब तक वह प्राइम मिनिस्टर के साथ रहता है, वह रहे फिर प्राइम मिनिस्टर नहीं रहता या नहीं रहती है तो फिर दूसरी जगह चला जाय क्योंकि उसको तजुर्बा रहता है और वह सहाह देने में सक्षम होगा, ऐसा मेरा ख्याल है।

जहां तक शिड्यूल कास्ट और शिड्यूल ट्राइब की बात है। वीकर सेक्शन का आप ढोल पीटते हैं, सुबह से शाम तक ढोल पीटते हैं कि हम वीकर सेक्शन के मसीहा हैं, महापुरुष हैं, क्या-क्या हैं, क्या नहीं हैं। आप बताएं कि कितनी प्रगति वीकर सेक्शन की इन इम्तिहानों में हुई है, वह रेखा आप बतायें? मैं नहीं देखता कि कोई खास तरक्की हुई। आप उनके लिए रिजर्वेशन कर दें; 60 परसेंट और 40 परसेंट के हिमाब से। डिफेंस में मैं नहीं कहता हूँ।

श्री जयबन्त सिंह (राजस्थान) :
क्यों नहीं?

श्री शिव चन्द्र भा. : इसलिए नहीं कहता हूँ कि वैसे तो हर महकमा इम्पार्टेंट में यह नहीं कहना कि और महकमे अनइम्पार्टेंट हैं लेकिन उसका एक अलग काम है, अलग ढंग है। उसको छोड़ कर बाकी सब जगह एडमिनिस्ट्रेटिव सर्विस में, आई० पी० एस०, आई० एफ० एस०, आई० ए० एस० में शिड्यूल कास्ट और शिड्यूल ट्राइब के लिए आज ही रिजर्वेशन कर दें कि 60 परसेंट आफिसर्स इनमें से लिए जायेंगे, 40 परसेंट बाकी और से। अब बात हो जायेगी उतने आ पाते हैं या नहीं, ये सब समस्याएं आ जाती है लेकिन पोस्ट तो वेकेन्ट होनी चाहिए तब तो कही जायेंगे। इसलिए इसके पीछे जो दर्शन है उसको आप मान लें कि इनका 60 परसेंट तथा बाकी का 40 परसेंट होना चाहिए। यदि ये नहीं एर्पायर होते हैं तो दूसरों से भर दिया जाये। लेकिन फिलास्फो में, दर्शन में, आप फैसला कर लें कि 60 परसेंट यूनियन पब्लिक सर्विस कमिशन और स्टेट सर्विस कमिशन शिड्यूल कास्ट और शिड्यूल ट्राइब के लोगों को रखेंगे। इस वीकर सेक्शन में महिलाओं को भी जोड़ लिया जाये, यह मत समझिए कि एक महिला प्रधान मंत्री है इसलिए महिलाओं का कोटा पूरा हो गया। यह बात कह सकते हैं कि एक महिला सबसे बढ़कर पोस्ट लिए है इसलिए महिलाओं को पोस्ट की जरूरत नहीं, यह नहीं बल्कि 60 परसेंट महिलाओं, शिड्यूल कास्ट और शिड्यूल ट्राइब के लिए रिजर्वेशन कर दें। और यदि 60 परसेंट में ये लोग नहीं आते तब दूसरों के लिए जाये। इन सब बातों के अलावा मुझे बाहर देखने का भी मौका मिला। उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय आई० एफ० एस० वालों को आई० एफ० एस० नौजवानों को, जब मैं बाहर गया था।

[श्री शिव चन्द्र झा]

मैं इतना जरूर कहूंगा कि हमारे जितने रिक्त हैं, सब छटे-छटाये हैं मैंने जिस रूप में मैनर वगैरह में देखा। सबको देखा जेनेवा में देखा, काहिरा में देखा। जो हमारो एम्बेसीज के लोग हैं, आई० एफ० एम० के हम लोगों ने, आपस में बात की कि कोई किसी से कम नहीं है, इतना मानना पड़ेगा कि सब दृष्टिकोण से किसी से कम नहीं हैं। सब सक्षम हैं। स्क्रीनिंग उनकी बहुत ठीक से हुई है? लेकिन इतना होने के बाद जो मैंने कहा कि डाइनामिज्म लाने के लिए वह अग्रजों का भूत सवार होने की वजह से वह डाइनामिज्म की बात चीत और सब बातों में ठीक है, लेकिन वह चीज नहीं है। आपको समाजवाद कायम करना है। उसके लिए सोशल सर्वेंट बनाना है। सोशल सर्विस को उस दृष्टिकोण से बनाना है।

इन्हीं शब्दों के साथ जो अच्छाइयाँ हैं, उनको रिचमैंड करें। इम्तहान वगैरह में मैथिली को अष्टम सूची में मान्यता दें। आप अभी यहाँ से जायें और प्रधान मंत्री को कह दें और अबिलम्ब कर दें, तभी आपका काम ठीक से चलेगा।

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: Mr. Vice-Chairman, do I have permission to speak from here.

Mr. Vice-Chairman, even at the cost of annoying my esteemed colleague, Shiva Chandra Jhaji, I chose to speak in English not that...

श्री शिव चन्द्र झा : आप तो हिंदी में बोल सकते हैं, बोलिए ना ... ।
(व्यवधान)

श्री जसवंत सिंह : कल को आप कहें कि मैथिली में बोलिए ।

Sir, I will not take much time. I chose deliberately to speak in English not because I am unable to talk in

Hindi—I am proud of the language—but, I think, there is a point established in my doing so. Sir, I welcome this opportunity to debate and discuss the two-year's Reports of the UPSC. We have in front of the House, the Reports of the year 1978 and the year 1979. I shall make only four points. The first point that I wish to make, and which I would through the medium of hon. Shri Makwana like to bring to the notice of the Government, is an extremely serious point. This is not a point which is of my own origin. It is a point which is contained in both the Reports, and it relates to the recruitment to the Defence Services. If the hon. Minister would refer to the Chapter relating to the recruitment of Defence Services, he would observe that in both these years, there is a mention of deficiencies of qualified personnel to fill up the available vacancies. And the mention there is that we have been experiencing this deficiency for the past many years. It is my own estimate, though a mention is there in 1978-79, that the deficiency has in effect been continuing since the year 1974. Now, this is an extremely serious situation that if in the Defence Services we are unable to fill up the vacancies that we need to fill up ... Sir, I do take some objection to this. I have all respect for hon. Mr. Sharma...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI DINESH GOSWAMI): Order, please.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: I would request that if there is to be a debate then...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI DINESH GOSWAMI): Please continue. He has taken note of your objection.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: Sir, since 1974, if there is a deficiency existing in the Defence Services, I think, it is an extremely serious matter and the deficiency is on account of the fact that we have not been able to find sufficient number of qualified people. The qualifications that are necessary

to join the Defence Services are considerably lower than the qualifications that are expected of a candidate that comes for any Central Service. And, yet, of the two years that are mentioned here, in the year 1978, out of 150 vacancies, only 102 were filled up because there were not sufficient number of candidates that came forward to join the Defence Services. In the year 1979, out of 160 vacancies, only 150 were able to be filled up. Has the UPSC or the Government carried out an investigation or an in depth study as to what is the reason behind the right people not coming forward to join the Defence Services? Because if an investigation is carried out and if we go in this direction, we will come to one of the most serious situations which is being faced by the Defence Services today. It is a loss of morale leading to insufficient number of people coming forward to join the Army or the Defence Services further leading to a total decline in the country's defence preparedness. I make this statement with a considerable sense of responsibility. Now, I think we have the world's largest voluntary army, voluntary forces. Given the kind of unemployment situation that the country has, given the kind of absence of avenues of employment that there are in the country, if young people are not coming forward to join the Defence Services, then, I think, it is a matter which is of extremely serious nature and if the UPSC has been drawing the attention of the Government to this particular matter since about year 1974 onwards, it means that for the last seven years we have not been able to fill up the vacancies in the officer cadre of the Defence Services. Then I think it is time that we took a serious note of it. What has the Government done about it? The UPSC takes note of it and it makes extremely sad reading because the UPSC says that when it mentions this to the Government, namely, how the deficiency is to be made good, the Government says, make good the deficiency by admitting the left-overs. These are the words used by the

UPSC itself "make good the deficiency by admitting the left-overs". Now, Sir, we are not running a canteen, in which we take over the left-overs of the last meal and serve them during the next meal. This is an extremely serious matter and I would enjoin the Government to take note of this because you cannot have a situation wherein you fill in your defence services requirements by admitting left-overs.

There was another step taken by the Government. In the year 1978, a simplified procedure was adopted. If the mountain would not come to Mohammad etc., the examination process was taken to the centres of recruitment instead of expecting candidates to come up to be examined, to be tested and then selected. This simplified procedure involved that you took the examination process to the areas where you could possibly get candidates to join the Defence Services. It was a dismal failure. We tried it for one year in the year 1978 and in the year 1979 we scrapped it. Now, it is demonstration of a kind of adhocism, a panicky adhocism. If the people would not come to us we would go and examine them there. It is a kind of compromise and I submit, through you, that this is the sort of compromise which my colleague just mentioned, that it is a sensitive service, that it is an area of great sensitivity and you cannot keep on compromising on that. What did the UPSC do? What else did the UPSC do?

Before I come to that, I would like to very briefly, make a point through you, Sir, to the hon. Minister on the question of 'specialisation'. There is a mention in this report about introducing, what is called a Central Tourism Service. Now, if the UPSC has felt the need to introduce a Central Tourism Service, with a view to bringing in certain specialisation, a certain element of additional knowledge on to a certain specified field, then why should you not have such a service here? You have the Administrative Service, you have the Foreign

[Shri Jaswant Singh]

Service, you have the IPS, you have the Central Excise and Customs Service, etc. etc. It is only the Ministry of Defence which is without a Service. This is a matter worth your consideration. It is only the Ministry of Defence in which you rightly expect a certain specialisation from the services yet the entire edifice of the Ministry of Defence is managed by the generalist IAS officer. This is a matter which we have discussed on different occasions and I have had the good fortune to bring it to the notice of the hon. Prime Minister also. It is meriting of your consideration. Please think of it. If you think in terms of specialisation in an innocuous field like tourism, whereby, you wish to introduce a Central Tourism Service, why not a degree of specialisation when it comes to the Ministry of Defence?

There is a mention here in this Report about examination reforms. I do not think I am adequately qualified to talk on examination reforms. I have not had the good fortune of being an educationist like some of my esteemed colleagues here. Hence, my comments on examination reforms will be the comments of an amateur or a dilettante so to speak. But I do wish to, even as an amateur, make two or three points on the question of examination reforms. One is the question of 'criteria'. Now, let me attempt to make a differentiation. There is criterion, the physical aspect of the criterion. Out of so many marks, you have to obtain so much percentage. This constitutes the physical aspect. I think it is vital for us to go beyond this physical criterion, to the philosophy of establishing those criteria. This point, perhaps, has been made by my esteemed colleague, Mr. Raju, also. The question is, what is the philosophy, what is the total philosophy of employment we are employing as far as the civil service and other services are concerned? There is a mention here, in this Report, which I found incongruous. The mention in this Report is that Members of the

UPSC went to the UK and to the USA. I have no moral objection whatsoever. I have no objections on moral or any other grounds, if Members of the Commission go to the UK or Europe or anywhere else. I think, this is a very good thing. It is good that Members of the Commission are exposed to different opinions, different view points and different cross currents flowing across the world. The windows of the world should be opened to the Members of the Commission because they are charged with a very serious and onerous responsibility. They may go to the U.S.A. or the U.K. to attend what has been called a workshop. They may go to the U.S.A. or to the U.K. to see what is being done there with a view to applying it here. Possibly, you can find something there which can be applied here. But I think, we should look at it a little more seriously. Please try to understand the thrust of what I am trying to say. I have no serious objection to the Members of the Commission going anywhere in the world to see what their methods of recruitment are.

Just one final point before I conclude. The UPSC is the mother of the 'steel frame'. This 'steel frame' is your executive. It is through the agency of the U.P.S.C. that you structure the 'steel frame'. If we give importance to the Legislature, as indeed we ought to and we should, if the judiciary is an integral part of the national fabric the then 'steel frame', indubitably, is the executive and it is through the motherhood of the U.P.S.C. that this 'steel frame' can come into being. I would enjoin the Government: please endow this mother with such capabilities and with abilities as would enable it to produce such offsprings that this nation, our country, would indeed have a steel frame of the executive.

Thank you, Sir.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI DINESH GOSWAMI): Mr. Santosh Mitra. He is not here. Dr. Sarup Singh.

DR. SARUP SINGH (Haryana): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, Mr. Jaswant Singh has described the U.P.S.C. as the mother of the steel frame. Unfortunately, the mother has been neglected for a long time, and the view seems to be that only those people should be sent to the U.P.S.C. as Members who could not be used for anything worthwhile in the country. Consequently, once, when I raised the question of better emoluments and better conditions of service, one of the Deputy Secretaries sent a note to the U.P.S.C. saying that in any case they were retired people who were in search of some kind of employment and, therefore, why should we consider this. Therefore, Mr. Jaswant Singh, do not have any illusions about the matter. As far as the steel frame is concerned, I can assure that whatever the U.P.S.C. has been doing, well, it has been doing as well as it could. It has not damaged the steel frame. We have ourselves damaged the steel frame. The fact is, everywhere the morale is going very low, in all the services. Surely, all that the UPSC does is, it holds an examination, goes through the papers and gives a list to the Government and says all right, these are the people fit to be officials of the Government, appoint them. After they are appointed there is the question of training. Now Mr. Raju, you mentioned about the Kothari report. This report laid great emphasis on training and the Government quietly rejected that and accepted only a marginal change in the examination system because we had suggested that the Mussoorie Institute should be reorganised. Reorganising it would mean that it should have some experts in various fields. Some outstanding men and women should be there to train our youngmen to become suitable officials in the new conditions in which now they have to work. But presumably, the Government of India felt that reorganising the Institute at Mussoorie would create all kinds of difficulties. So, that matter was more or less dropped. So, Mr. Raju, do not have any

disillusion about the Kothari report. However, Sir, I will confine myself only to the UPSC and make two points. One is, Mr. Sukul mentioned the speech of the Prime Minister in 1980. Incidentally, she had said exactly the same thing in 1976 when I was a Member of the UPSC. She mentioned about rural bias in our services. But how do you introduce rural bias? My friend Jha Saheb said about Hindi and so on and so forth. I want to bring to his notice, when I was a member of the UPSC, we said to the candidates, all right you can talk to us in Hindi and you will not suffer in comparison to those who speak in English. But you know. Mr. Jha, something else happens, the quality of education the people receive in their own language is unfortunately inferior to the quality of education that they receive through English. What do we do about that? I am not suggesting that their mind is superior. What I am suggesting is, the instructions imparted to them are superior, the books available to them are superior and consequently their mind is developed. So, when they come to the UPSC, what can the UPSC do. I myself belong to a village. I can say, Mr. Vice-Chairman, it does not really mean anything. If I say today that I am a great believer in rural upliftment and all that, it will be nonsense and it will be hypocrisy. I can say I am sympathetic to people who come from villages, from rural sections of the society. But what am I to do. I cannot say, simply because he comes from a lower society you must give him more marks, even though obviously he is inferior in intelligence and also whatever other qualities I can judge. So, Mr. Jha, it is not the question of Maithli or any other language. Bring in Maithli. I am not opposed to it. But when you are discussing the UPSC, please remember the quality of education that they receive. It is naturally reflected in the written test, in the interview, and everywhere else. What do we do? So, Mr. Vice-Chairman, in 1976 we made one minor suggestion to the Government of India.

[Dr. Sarup Singh]

which I am afraid has never been considered seriously. We said, let there be a national merit test. After all, all universities have different standards. There are problems of admissions to medical colleges, to engineering colleges, to post-graduate courses and so on and so forth. Also the number of candidates is increasing every year. So, we made a suggestion that we might have, what we call, a national merit test. Not one test, but more tests. In the United States there is in Princeton what they call, the educational testing services. It is a national organisation. The university takes advantage of it. Government takes advantage of it. I am told even the private companies take advantage of it. It is a national merit kind of a scheme. You conduct an examination on a national level. Forget these normal kind of examinations that we hold for the IAS. See who are the best candidates available in the country and then somehow rope them in wherever you can. You can utilise that scheme also for medical and engineering colleges and all that. The idea was very much to have some kind of a national intelligence test, because now in your medical education, in your engineering education, in your post-graduate education, there is a remarkable kind of variation—so much variation that a B.A.(Hons) student of one university is better than a M.A. student of another university. And yet all universities are alike. So what does one do? Surely the country needs some kind of a system whereby we assess it at the national level. Luckily we have the UPSC which is a national organisation. Since it is given the responsibility of selecting the best people available for Government jobs, we thought we could also use this for that and, maybe, there could be some interaction between us and the universities. Unfortunately, nothing happened. So Mr. Raju don't have any illusions about this. UPSC has nothing to do with the universities and can't have anything to do with

the universities. Universities will go on as they are going on, and the UPSC, as it is constituted, will also go on as it is going on. I am sure the Government is not interested in it. All that the Government is interested in is, you send a list of people who can be appointed. If the list is not as much as we need them, you bring in more left-overs and there the matter ends, which is a pity. But what does not do? UPSC is helpless there.

Now, Sir, I want to say one thing to the Minister and I want him to take me seriously. It is a question that will sooner or later disturb all of us. You know that the UPSC has only one strength—its impartiality. That is its only strength, that people are impartial and fair-minded and everybody in the country thought that they are impartial and fair-minded. As long as this credibility was there, the UPSC could go on merrily without doing much and doing naturally the routine job which was entrusted to them. But, unfortunately, the Government has made some serious mistakes in the last two years. I would not mention specifically because I do not want to cause embarrassment to certain individuals. However, even a whispering—not a campaign but a slight whispering—can destroy the UPSC. UPSC is a very fragile organisation. If people start talking about lack of integrity in the UPSC, then you have had it. UPSC selects only 2.1/2 per cent candidates are year; 97.1/2 per cent candidates are rejected. Luckily, those who are rejected have accepted the decision cheerfully because they feel that they have been rejected in an honest and impartial manner; so there is no complaint. Once the community comes to feel that the UPSC is no more impartial, then you will be in trouble. I will tell the Minister privately what I have actually in mind. It is shameful to know, Mr. Minister, that a Member of the UPSC goes abroad and smuggles goods, your customs department catches him and a report appears in the press, yet you take no notice

of it. You should take notice of it. I was a Member of the UPSC. I also went abroad during that period. But all the while I was conscious that I am like Caesar's wife; nobody should raise even a little finger towards me—no politician or non-politician. Now I think you have become somewhat too cynical about public reaction. For God's sake don't do that. If necessary, bring it to the notice of the Prime Minister and then examine the case. And Government should never have brought anybody to the UPSC against whom there were cases. Why can't you realise that these institutions can be immediately destroyed by a simple mistake. You may be somebody's friend. But friendship should be kept apart from this. UPSC is not a place where friendship should be brought in. It is a place for outstanding men and women not only with integrity but ability also. Ability and integrity—both are needed. And such persons should be brought in. Therefore, I make a personal request to the Minister to bring it to the notice of the appropriate people in the country because, I have a feeling that the matter is beyond his Ministry. In any case, he should mention that a Member of the UPSC has done it. He should deliberately not mention the name of the person concerned. He should, however, bring it to notice; it is something which is very serious. When I was a Member of the UPSC, if such a thing were to happen to me, I would have resigned the very day; I would not have stayed for two days there.

This brings me to the last point which I am going to make. If UPSC has to be retained as a very important organisation and if it is to be entrusted with a very important task, then you have no option but to improve the conditions of service of the Members of the UPSC. In 1977 the Prime Minister herself accepted a recommendation which referred to some kind of a parity between the conditions of service of the Members of the Union Public Service Commission and the High Court Judges. Unfor-

tunately the Government changed and no decision could be taken on that. Later on the matter has been pending and nobody has taken notice of that again. I think it is very important that you should do something about it because if you attach importance to the UPSC, then bring good people there. And when you bring good people there, also pay them very well, look after them very well and show them proper respect.

One thing more, Mr. Vice-Chairman, and I will have done—and that is very important again. In a situation where even a whisper starts, what is the practical answer to that? In India today everybody is losing credibility. From the Prime Minister down to the ordinary M.P., no credibility anywhere. What does he do in such a situation? Politicians may not mind their integrity but Members of the UPSC will have to mind their integrity. What do you do then I suggest—it is a very practical suggestion which is quite capable of being taken up by the Government and by the UPSC—review the role of the Adviser. Members are there. You know, Mr. Vice-Chairman, that 85 per cent of the posts are of a kind where the appointment is made on the basis of an interview.

[The Vice-Chairman (Dr. Rafiq Zakaria) in the Chair]

I am not sure whether it is only 85 per cent; the percentage may be higher. The people who are appointed through an examination like that of the IAS, IPS, Railway Services and Defence Services and so on, their number is very small compared to the total number of people who are taken in Government service every year by the UPSC, and most of the appointments are through, what you call, direct interview where I am the Chairman, let us say, as a Member of the UPSC, I have two or three Advisers. One Adviser goes from the Government and two come from outside; they are experts. Now, it is not their responsibility, ultimately, to make the selection. They give advice.

[Dr. Sarup Singh]

I may not accept it, I may accept it. They may all say, 'A' is better. They leave my room. Then I prepare the minutes where I say, "No, 'B' is better". If you think I am dishonest, then the system collapses. Then what do I do? I wish you could do like some of the universities where the minutes are signed by all the Members present. Let the Advisers also sign the minutes. I was Vice-Chancellor of the Delhi University and I did not have a single appointment where the selection was not unanimous. But even if, by any chance, there was a difference of opinion, then let it be recorded; let everything be recorded so that nobody can say in public that this Member has been unfair or dishonest or anything of the kind. When I raised this question in 1976 in a meeting of the Chairman of all the Public Service Commissions in the country, I was told that constitutionally we are responsible for selection and not the Advisers. I say yes, constitutionally we are responsible. But there is some kind of a moral responsibility and, Mr. Vice-Chairman, when there is a question of moral responsibility then I think we should go all out to convince the public that here is an organisation where no lack of integrity will be tolerated and we are introducing this new system where the Advisers will sign the minutes so that it is not merely the decision of one individual but it is the decision of half a dozen or three or four or five people. If you are told by your legal luminaries, "No, this is irregular because the Constitution says it is the constitutional responsibility of the UPSC and, therefore, only a Member will sign it", then I may suggest a mild reservation. In that case let a separate note be kept of the recommendations of the Advisers. Only, my fear is that if you do that, that note can also slip away and only the recommendation made by the Member may be there. So I leave it to you because, let me tell you, you are in trouble. Once people start talking about the UPSC as they are talking about Par-

liament, Parliament can stand this but not the UPSC. So I think you should go into the question of what kind of Advisers you should have, look at the list of Advisers, get the best men from all over the country, see that they represent the various regions in the country, the various language groups, various disciplines and so on. See whether they are really eminent in their fields. Let a list of experts be prepared because there is no dearth of experts in the country. You invite them and have their opinion recorded in the minutes itself so that you can be sure that nothing has gone wrong.

Thank you very much.

SHRI M. KALYANASUNDARAM (Tamil Nadu): Sir, we are called upon to discuss the Reports of the Union Public Service Commission for two years. I do not know whom to blame for this. It is a constitutional duty of this House to review the report of the Commission every year and offer its comments and see whether the Union Public Service Commission has done its duty properly or not and whether the Government has respected the recommendations of the Union Public Service Commission properly. It is a very important function that the Union Public Service Commission is called upon to perform. They are responsible for the building up of the administration of the country. Whichever party may be in power, whatever may be its policies, ultimately the guarantee of implementation of policies and fair administration depends on the quality of administration. As was explained by some of the previous speakers, the morale of the administration is very low. Who is responsible for this? Are we to blame the Union Public Service Commission for the method of recruitment or are we to blame the politicians for this state of affairs? In the first place, according to me, the blame must be borne by the politicians who come to power.

We are discussing a period of two years when a different party was in

power. At that time also, there were many irregularities committed by the politicians who were in power in dealing with the officers. Again, after a political change, the officers, men of integrity, are in tenterhooks. They do not know what will happen to them. Nobody is sure as to how to behave under a particular Minister or under a particular party. That seems to be the plight of the administration in the country. When men like Nehru or Rajaji were in power, they advised the politicians, MPs and MLAs not to touch the corridors of officers and keep the administration free from political interference. Now that principle has been given a go-by. In the States also, that is the position. So you will have to examine it very carefully if the integrity and independence of the administration is to be preserved. There are reports of transfer from various States, whether ruled by Congress (I) or non-Congress (I). In Bihar, Madhya Pradesh and Rajasthan officers of very important positions have been transferred from their posts. If any officer misbehaves or commits mistakes or commits any act of serious indiscipline, the best thing and the fair course will be to issue a charge-sheet and book him. That is the method and not that you send him away from that post to a less important post or, if that is not possible, promote him and transfer him. A case from Bihar has come to notice, where the Secretary of the Transport Corporation has been promoted. (*Time bell rings*). A few minutes more. I have to add a few more points. Sir, we are discussing the Reports for two years. Kindly be considerate to the Members. After all, it is not...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (DR. RAFIQ ZAKARIA): Come on. Do not waste time.

SHRI M. KALYANASUNDARAM: I was telling you about the fate of the Transport Secretary, a highly reputed man as an officer. He was promoted. He refused the promotion because he took it as an indirect punishment. In-

direct methods are resorted to. Earlier there was a Chief Secretary in Tamil Nadu. He was pushed to a very unimportant position. He went to the Supreme Court. Finally he himself ended up by resigning the post. It happens irrespective of the party in power. Another Chief Secretary, considered to be a very reasonable man, a very fair man, as an officer, was sent out as a Planning Board Chairman in a State in order to promote others. Some three or four persons were promoted to the same grade of Chief Secretary in order to give promotion to a junior man. If these irregularities happen, how can the people accept that the administration is fair? So, that is a very important point which they should bear in mind; especially the Home Ministry and the ruling party should bear it in mind.

Coming to the method of recruitment and the performance of the Union Public Service Commission, the previous speaker, I am glad, spoke with some personal experience and knowledge, and he did not even spare a Member of the institution, the institution to which he belonged, who committed a mistake; he criticised him openly. Very good. Similarly, I am bringing to the notice of this House how they commit mistakes. I am one who will suggest...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (DR. RAFIQ ZAKARIA): Please wind up now.

SHRI M. KALYANASUNDARAM: One more point and I finish it. I will support the point with regard to their emoluments and their status, that they should be treated on par with the Supreme Court Judges and that their independence must be respected. I would support such a proposal not only from the point of remuneration but from the point of authority; their independence should be preserved and respected. They should also behave independently, without fear or favour. That is why their term is six years. After their retirement, they are not to seek any other appointment. The

[Shri M. Kalyanasundaram]

post of the Member of a Public Service Commission is very respectable. They must also behave properly. I can give you several cases in which intelligent students, intelligent candidates, with very high meritorious marks, were not even called for interview. Here is a case: One M.Sc. student who passed his M.Ss. examination with 83 per cent. . .

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (DR. RAFIQ ZAKARIA): Please wind up now. I am sorry. I have given you double the time.

SHRI M. KALYANASUNDARAM: He was not even called for an interview. It should be examined, why it is so. After six months he gets a letter saying that his application has been rejected, even without calling him for an interview.

One more point, Sir.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (DR. RAFIQ ZAKARIA): I am sorry, I cannot allow you to go on.

SHRI M. KALYANASUNDARAM: The Government also by passes the Public Service Commission by the method of the *ad hoc* appointments. Why are the *ad hoc*, temporary, appointments continuing year after year for three years and four years? Afterwards they call upon the Public Service Commission to regularise the services of these people. The Government also should not bypass the Public Service Commission, and the Public Service Commission also must behave in a responsible manner and in a way so as to wield the confidence of the candidates and of the nation.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (DR. RAFIQ ZAKARIA): The Minister.

SHRI M. KALYANASUNDARAM: There was so much time. Why were you ringing the bell so often?

SHRI YOGENDRA MAKWANA: Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I am thankful to all the hon. Members who have participated in the debate on the Twenty-ninth and Thirtieth Reports of the Union Public Service Commission. Sir, some hon. Members raised certain points and some Members have answered them also. So my burden is lessened to that extent. However, some hon. Members, particularly the last speaker and the first speaker had taken objection regarding delay in the laying of the Reports on the Table of the House, as also about the discussion of the Reports at a very late date. Sir, I verified from my office and it was found that the Twenty-ninth Report was received by the office on the 27th January, 1981 and it was placed on the Table of the House on the 26th January, 1981 and it was placed on the matich, the session started from the 16th February, 1981. Therefore, it was a delay of ten days only. In the case of the Thirtieth Report, it was received on 8-9-81 and was placed on the Table of the House on 18-9-81. So it is a question of ten days again. So, there was no delay actually.

Now, I would refer to article 323 of the Constitution. Article 323 (1) says:

"It shall be the duty of the Union Commission to present annually to the President a report as to the work done by the Commission and on receipt of such report the President shall cause a copy thereof together with a memorandum explaining, as respects the cases, if any, where the advice of the Commission was not accepted, the reasons for such non-acceptance to be laid before each House of Parliament."

Sir, there is no provision about discussion of the report. It is a report which is submitted by the Commission to the Government and the Government has to lay it on the Table of the House, along with a memorandum if there is any recommendation which is not accepted. In the instant case, there is only one recommendation which has not been accepted, and an

explanatory memorandum was also submitted before the House while laying the report on the Table of the House. So, there is no necessity for coming with either one report for a discussion or two reports for a discussion before the House. However, when the Members demand, it can be discussed in the House. We have evolved a practice where the Government itself comes before the House for discussion of the report. And it is entirely up to the House to provide time for a discussion on the reports. We have approached the House on various occasions, and when we were given time we have come before the House for a discussion on the report. So there is no fault on the part of the Government so far as discussion of the report is concerned and nobody can say that it has been delayed by the Government.

Sir, the first speaker, hon. Mr. Raju made certain observations regarding the Kothari Committee. For the information of the hon. Member—he is not here—the Kothari Committee was appointed by the Union Public Service Commission, and its recommendations which number nearly 55, were submitted to the Union Public Service Commission. Sir, it is not with the Government of India because, as you know and as the entire House knows, the Union Public Service Commission is an autonomous body and it is for that body to consider the recommendations given in that report. So, how can the Member say that the Government has not brought the report to the notice of the House? It is entirely for the Union Public Service Commission to consider it because it is their own committee and it was submitted to them by the Kothari Committee. It is not with the Government, it is with the Commission itself.

DR. SARUP SINGH: On a point of order. I mentioned that one part of the recommendation which related directly to what the Government could do was the reorganisation of the

institution at Mussoorie. The UPSC cannot do that reorganisation.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (DR. RAFIQ ZAKARIA): This is no point of order.

SHRI YOGENDRA MAKWANA: Let me reply to the hon. Member. I was replying to the points raised by the hon. Member, Mr. Raju. I was not referring to the hon. Member, Dr. Sarup Singh. Your point is a suggestion and I have taken note of your suggestion. But I was discussing the recommendation of the Kothari Commission. The honourable Member said that it has also to be laid on the Table of the House. It is not necessary because it is an internal matter of the UPSC and it is an internal report of the Commission. It is for them and wherever it is considered necessary, they can refer to the Government as in the case of Mussoorie Institute, etc. and the Government will take necessary action.

The honourable Member, Mr. Raju, also made a point regarding fees. The fees were fixed long, long back and there is no increase in the fees. A number of candidates are coming before the UPSC and examination of their answer books, etc. also involves a lot of expenditure. So it is not possible to totally abolish the fees which the candidates are paying. The honourable Member went to the extent of saying that it is a penalty on the unemployed. That is not the point, that is not the correct point. If there is no fee fixed for the examination, then there will be no seriousness on the part of the examinees, and a great number of candidates will come forward without any seriousness on their part. Therefore, fee is absolutely necessary.

One other honourable Member, Mr. Shiva Chandra Jha, wanted to know about the local languages offered as medium. The honourable Member is not present here. But since he made a point, I have to reply to it so that the record can be kept straight. He

[Shri Yogendra Makwana] made a point regarding the local, regional, languages, and he was particularly insisting why examination is not conducted in Maithili, why students are not allowed to write their examinations in Maithili. He wanted to know how many answered their examination papers in the local languages, particularly, the fourteen languages mentioned in the Eighth Schedule of the Constitution. For the benefit of the honourable Members I would like to read out the chart that is with me. In 1979 the number of candidates who appeared in Assamese was only 3 and in 1980 the number was 4 and one candidate qualified. In Bengali in 1979 the number was 18 and in 1980 17. In Gujarati it was 13 in 1979 and 19 in 1980. In Hindi it was 803 in 1979 and 983 in 1980. In Kannada it was 1 in 1979 and in 1980 it was 4. In Malayalam it was 4 in 1979 and 6 in 1980. In Marathi it was 13 in 1979 and 14 in 1980. In Oriya—I am giving figures for all languages because nobody should raise a question later on about his own language again—it was 2 in 1979 and it was 2 again in 1980. In Punjabi in 1979 it was 15 and in 1980 it was 14. In Sanskrit in 1979 it was 1 and in 1980 there was none who opted for Sanskrit as the medium. In Tamil in 1979 it was 10 but in 1980 it was 7. In Telugu in 1979 18 and in 1980 24. In Urdu in 1979 there was none and in 1980 it was 1. The total comes to 901 in 1979 and 1095 in 1980. Now, let us compare it with the English medium. In English in 1979 5914 candidates appeared while in 1980 the number of candidates who appeared in English was 7271. So there is a tendency on the part of candidates to reply in English. Probably the reason may be, as Dr. Sarup Singh was saying ...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (DR. RAFIQ ZAKARIA): In Hindi is it on the increase?

SHRI YOGENDRA MAKWANA: I said in Hindi it was 803 in 1979

and in 1980 it was 983. Probably the reply is given by the previous Member of the UPSC when he said that it is because of the non-availability of different books of knowledge in different languages. That is probably the reason he gave and he is right to a certain extent.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (DR. RAFIQ ZAKARIA): The tragedy is that while more students are taking to English, the standards are falling and nothing is being done to see that they are properly educated in that language. I hope Dr. Sarup Singh agrees with me.

SHRI YOGENDRA MAKWANA: I was referring to another point made by him which I wanted to highlight.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (DR. RAFIQ ZAKARIA): That is all right. I want you to give some attention to this aspect.

SHRI YOGENDRA MAKWANA: I will pass it on to the Education Ministry.

Another thing which I want to bring before the House is that when a candidate appears for interview, he is allowed to speak in any language mentioned in the Eighth Schedule.

Coming to the number of vacancies—a point raised by Mr. Raju and some others—I would say that these are generally calculated carefully. But these occasionally undergo changes due to unforeseen circumstances. Sometime they have to be increased to avoid shortage of officers as otherwise these additional vacancies will be filled up only after one year when the next examination takes place. This is the reason why the number of vacancies is less in the beginning and why we increase it later on. Now about the procedures of the State Public Service Commissions. I think this was referred to if I do not mistake—by Mr. Sukul. Procedures adopted by the State Public Service Commissions are mat-

ters within the purview of the State Governments. We only forward the recommendations for their consideration.

Thereafter it is up to them to bring about changes in procedures they desire.

Some hon. Members mentioned about the need to increase the number of members of the Public Service Commissions. As far as the need for more members in the UPSC are concerned, this aspect is regularly examined by the Government. The necessary strength is always maintained. Whenever the need is felt to increase their strength, it is done. But at the present moment we do not feel it is necessary.

So far as the interview is concerned, it is the aptitude and the potential of the candidate that are tested and judged. The background knowledge or the candidate's knowledge of English is not the main thing that is tested. His overall knowledge and general intelligence are the things that are tested in the interview.

SHRI M. KALYANASUNDARAM:
Could a candidate be rejected even without interview? I have 4 P.M. quoted a case. Will you kindly get it examined? I am prepared to forward the details mentioned in the paper.

SHRI YOGENDRA MAKWANA:
Sir, I can request the honourable Member, if he has a particular complaint about a particular instance, to pass it on to me and I will get it examined.

SHRI M. KALYANASUNDARAM:
I can give you now itself.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (DR. RAFIQ ZAKARIA): No; not in the House here. You can write to him later.

SHRI YOGENDRA MAKWANA:
Yes, you can write to me later and I will get it examined.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (DR. RAFIQ ZAKARIA): You can write to him later.

SHRI YOGENDRA MAKWANA:
Then, Sir, another honourable Member, Shri Jaswant Singh referred to the shortfall in the Defence Services. The shortfall in the Defence Services has become less over the years. In 1978-79, Sir, 159 candidates were available against 160 vacancies. So, this is not a big number. Against 160 vacancies, 159 candidates were available. However, the UPSC has carried out some special recruitments for Navy and Air Force in 1978 and, whenever necessary, such steps will continue to be taken.

Then, Sir, about the criteria and the examination standards, to which also the honourable Member, Shri Jaswant Singh referred, I would like to tell that the criteria for qualifying in various examinations and interviews are determined by the UPSC itself under the autonomy given to it under the Constitution and the Government has never interfered with it. Since it has the responsibility for selecting the best available persons, the criteria must be dependent on the availability of good quality candidates.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (DR. RAFIQ ZAKARIA): I think you have covered all the points.

SHRI YOGENDRA MAKWANA:
Yes, Sir. I think I have covered almost all the points.

SHRI M. KALYANASUNDARAM:
What about the irregularities?

SHRI YOGENDRA MAKWANA:
Sir, regarding Mr. Sarup Singh's speech, he was mentioning about the integrity of the Members of the UPSC.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (DR. RAFIQ ZAKARIA): That is an important point.

SHRI YOGENDRA MAKWANA:
It is a very important point and I agree with you, Sir. But, Sir, I cannot agree with the honourable Member when he makes an allegation against the Members of the UPSC regarding their integrity. It is very difficult . . .

DR. SARUP SINGH: I say it with the fullest responsibility as a former Member of the UPSC and as a former Vice-Chancellor. I did not name any man. I request you to examine this. That is all. But you are not even prepared to examine it. I say that there is no integrity.

(Interruptions)

SHRI YOGENDRA MAKWANA:
I have not said that I will not examine it.

DR. SARUP SINGH: You have said that you do not agree with what I said. (Interruptions). You have said that you do not agree with me when I say that there is no integrity? What is it then?

SHRI YOGENDRA MAKWANA:
I simply said that I did not think that there was any lack of integrity. I say this because I am not in a position to level any allegations against any Member of the UPSC. But, Sir, if he has got any grievances . . .

DR. SARUP SINGH: No. I have no grievance at all. (Interruptions). I have no grievance at all.

SHRI M. KALYANASUNDARAM:
He has no grievance as such. Don't treat it as a grievance.

SHRI YOGENDRA MAKWANA:
If he has any specific allegation to make, he can pass it on to me and I will get it examined.

DR. SARUP SINGH: I have no specific allegation.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (DR. RAFIQ ZAKARIA): What the Minister meant was that he was surprised that there should be such an allegation from Dr. Sarup Singh.

SHRI M. KALYANASUNDARAM:
Why should it be surprising?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (DR. RAFIQ ZAKARIA): Because the presumption is that the Members of the UPSC should be men of integrity. That is the presumption.

SHRI YOGENDRA MAKWANA:
Yes, Sir. No doubt about it.

SHRI K. K. MADHAVAN (Kerala):
That is why this allegation has come. The presumption is that they should be men of integrity. That is why this allegation has come. (Interruptions).

SHRI SYED SHAHABUDDIN (Bihar): What happens if the Members are selected for lack of integrity only? (Interruptions).

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (DR. RAFIQ ZAKARIA): I am sorry, I am not able to hear any of you because both of you are talking at the same time.

SHRI SYED SHAHABUDDIN: I asked what would happen if the Members were selected only for lack of integrity.

SHRI SANKAR PRASAD MITRA (West Bengal): Sir, you are replying on behalf of the Minister?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (DR. RAFIQ ZAKARIA): I am sorry. I am not replying on behalf of the Minister. You are a new Member and you do not know what is a reply and what is not a reply. Kindly sit down. I am only helping the Minister understand it better. Therefore. Please do not interrupt. Kindly sit down.

SHRI YOGENDRA MAKWANA:
Sir, if the Members are not in a position to understand what I have said, the Chair has often explained it to the Members.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (DR. RAFIQ ZAKARIA): That is what I say.

SHRI YOGENDRA MAKWANA: And, Sir, there is nothing wrong if the Chair explains a thing and I don't think that it is the complaint of the honourable Member that the Chair is explaining.

SHRI K. K. MADHAVAN: Sir, the honourable Member has levelled certain allegations and he has mentioned certain cases. Why does not he say that he will get them examined? (Interruptions). We do not want all these things. Why should not he say that he will get them examined?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (DR. RAFIQ ZAKARIA): Mr. Madhavan, this is what I said. Whatever the Minister has said, it is a question of expression. What the Minister said was: I do not believe that the Members of the Union Public Service Commission would be men without integrity. Dr. Sarup Singh says: I am saying it with all the authority as an ex-Member, as an ex-Vice-Chancellor. To that what he said perhaps was that he was surprised to hear such things.

SHRI K. K. MADHAVAN: He said in very plain words which do not require interpretation on your part.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (DR. RAFIQ ZAKARIA): It is my job to help...

SHRI K. K. MADHAVAN: Here is a specific issue which you cannot escape.

SHRI YOGENDRA MAKWANA: Sir, I can point out to the hon. Members that whatever they have said I have taken note of.

As regards parity with the Judges, the conditions and terms of service of various constitutional authorities are decided independently with due regard to their functions. As such, the pay and other conditions of service of the Members of the Union Public Service Commission are always under review.

So far as the system which Dr Sarup Singh suggested regarding the sending of the minutes, etc. by the Advisers is concerned, Sir, I can point out to the hon. Member that this is a matter which the Union Public Service Commission itself has to decide because the Government never interferes in the working of the UPSC.

Sir I am thankful to all the Members who have participated. I have replied to almost all the points raised by the hon. Members. Once again, I thank you all.

SHRI M. KALYANASUNDARAM: Except the one raised by me. (Interruptions).

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (DR. RAFIQ ZAKARIA): We will now go on to the next item.

THE AIR CORPORATIONS (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1981

THE MINISTER OF TOURISM AND CIVIL AVIATION (SHRI A. P. SHARMA): Sir, I beg to move:

"That the Bill further to amend the Air Corporations Act, 1953, be taken into consideration."

Sir, the Air Corporations Act, 1953, was enacted about 28 years ago. Under section 35(a) of this Act a limit of Rs. 40 lakhs was prescribed for any capital expenditure for the purchase or acquisition of any immovable property or aircraft. This has been found inadequate because of all-round increase in costs. The Government have separately prescribed a limit on expenditure by public undertakings at Rs. 5 crores in respect of public enterprises with a capital outlay of more than Rs. 200 crores. This does not automatically apply to the Indian Airlines and Air-India as specific provisions regarding the limit have been laid down in the Act itself. Most of the projects of the two Corporations and for acquisition of aircraft which