

# ESTIMATES COMMITTEE (1967-68)

## TWENTY-SEVENTH REPORT

(FOURTH LOK SABHA)

MINISTRY OF DEFENCE

Action taken by Government on the recommendations contained in the Ninety-Fourth Report of the Estimates Committee (Third Lok Sabha) on the Ministry of Defence (Defence Research and Development Organisation)—Defence Metallurgical Research Laboratory, Hyderabad.



LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT  
NEW DELHI

February, 1967/Magha, 1889 (Saka)  
Price : Re. 0.65 p.

**LIST OF AUTHORISED AGENTS FOR THE SALE OF LOK SABHA  
SECRETARIAT PUBLICATIONS**

Sl. No.	Name of Agent	Agency No.	Sl. No.	Name of Agent	Agency No.
<b>ANDHRA PRADESH</b>			11.	Charles Lambert & Company, 101, Mahatma Gandhi Road, Opposite Clock Tower, Fort, Bombay.	30
1.	Andhra University General Cooperative Stores Ltd., Waltair (Visakhapatnam).	8	12.	The Current Book House, Maruti Lane, Raghunath Dadaji Street, Bombay-1.	60
2.	G. R. Lakshminpathy Chetty and Sons, General Merchants and News Agents, Newpet, Chandragiri, Chittoor District.	94	13.	Deccan Book Stall, Ferguson College Road, Poona-4.	
<b>ASSAM</b>			<b>RAJASTHAN</b>		
3.	Western Book Depot, Pan Bazar, Gauhati.	7	14.	Information Centre, Government of Rajasthan, Tripolia, Jaipur City.	38
<b>BIHAR</b>			<b>UTTAR PRADESH</b>		
4.	Amar Kitab Ghar, Post Box 78, Diagonal Road, Jamshedpur.	37	15.	Swastik Industrial Works, 59, Holi Street, Meerut City.	2
<b>GUJARAT</b>			16.	Law Book Company, Sardar Patel Marg, Allahabad-1.	48
5.	Vijay Stores, Station Road, Anand.	35	<b>WEST BENGAL</b>		
6.	The New Order Book Company, Ellis Bridge, Ahmedabad-6.	63	17.	Granthaloka, 5/1, Ambica Mookherjee Road, Belgharia, 24 Parganas.	10
<b>MADHYA PRADESH</b>			18.	W. Newman & Company Ltd., 3, Old Court House Street, Calcutta.	44
7.	Modern Book House, Shiv Vilas Palace, Indore City.	13	19.	Firma K. L. Mukhopadhyay, 6/1A, Banchharam Akkur Lane, Calcutta-12.	82
<b>MAHARASHTRA</b>			<b>DELHI</b>		
8.	M/s Sunderdas Gianchand, 601, Girgaum Road, Near Princess Street, Bombay-2.	6	20.	Jain Book Agency, Connaught Place, New Delhi.	1
9.	The International Book House (Private) Limited, 9, Ash Lane, Mahatma Gandhi Road, Bombay-1.	22			
10.	The International Book Service, Deccan Gymkhana, Poona-4.	26			

CORRIGENDA

to

Twenty-Seventh Report of the Estimates Committee  
(Fourth Lok Sabha) on the Ministry of Defence  
(Defence Research and Development Organisation) -  
Defence Metallurgical Research Laboratory.

Page	Line	For	Read
vii	24	II	III
4	31	119 3	1193
20	19	1967	1966

## CONTENTS

	PAGE
COMPOSITION OF THE COMMITTEE . . . . .	(iii)
COMPOSITION OF STUDY GROUP 'E' OF ESTIMATES COMMITTEE . . . . .	(v)
INTRODUCTION . . . . .	(vii)
CHAPTER I Report . . . . .	1
CHAPTER II Recommendations which have been accepted by Government . . . . .	2
CHAPTER III Recommendations which the Committee do not desire to pursue in view of Government's reply . . . . .	27
<b>APPENDIX</b>	
Analysis of action taken by Government on the recommendations contained in the 94th Report of the Estimates Committee (Third Lok Sabha) . . . . .	29

**ESTIMATES COMMITTEE**  
**(1967-68)**

**CHAIRMAN,**

**Shri P. Venkatasubbaiah**

**MEMBERS**

2. Shri Panna Lal Barupal
3. Shri Onkarlal Berwa
4. Shri Maharaj Singh Bharti
5. Shri Bibhuti Mishra
6. Shri R. K. Birla
7. Shri Jyotirmoy Bosu
8. Shri Tridib Chaudhuri
9. Shri Hardayal Devgun
10. Shri Y. Gadilingana Goud
11. Shri J. N. Hazarika
12. Shri J. M. Imam
13. Shri Tulshidas Jadhav
14. Shri Dhireswar Kalita
15. Shri S. Kandappan
16. Shri Baij Nath Kureel
17. Shri Yashwant Singh Kushwah
18. Shri K. Lakkappa
19. Shrimati Sangam Laxmi Bai
20. Shri J. M. Lobo Prabhu
21. Shri Inder J. Malhotra
22. Shri Yamuna Prasad Mandal
23. Shri Dhuleshwar Meena
24. Shri F. H. Mohsin
25. Shri Chintamani Panigrahi
26. Shri Rajdeo Singh
27. Shri Gajraj Singh Rao

28. Shrimati Jayaben Shah
29. Shri Shantilal Shah
30. Shri P. Sivasankaran.

**SECRETARIAT**

Shri B. K. Mukherjee—*Deputy Secretary.*

Shri K. D. Chatterjee—*Under Secretary.*

STUDY GROUP 'E' OF ESTIMATES COMMITTEE  
(1967-68)

---

CONVENER

Shri J. M. Lobo Prabhu

MEMBERS

2. Shri Panna Lal Barupal
3. Shri Onkarlal Berwa
4. Shri Maharaj Singh Bharti
5. Shri Bibhuti Mishra
6. Shri R. K. Birla
7. Shri Hardayal Devgun
8. Shri J. N. Hazarika
9. Shri Tulshidas Jadhav
10. Shri Dhireswar Kalita
11. Shri Yashwant Singh Kushwah
12. Shrimati Sangam Laxmi Bai
13. Shri Inder J. Malhotra
14. Shri Chintamani Panigrahi
15. Shri Rajdeo Singh.

## INTRODUCTION

I, the Chairman, Estimates Committee, having been authorised by the Committee to submit the Report on their behalf, present this Twenty-Seventh Report of the Estimates Committee on action taken by Government on the recommendations contained in the Ninety-Fourth Report of the Estimates Committee (Third Lok Sabha) on the Ministry of Defence (Defence Research and Development Organisation)—Defence Metallurgical Research Laboratory, Hyderabad.

2. The Ninety-Fourth Report of the Estimates Committee was presented to the Lok Sabha on 24th March, 1966. Government furnished replies indicating action taken on the recommendations on 27-8-66, 12-9-66 and 25-11-66. Further information on Government's replies to some of the points was called for from the Ministry on different dates in 1966 to 1967 and the last communication furnishing such further information was sent by Government on the 2nd April, 1967. Government's replies were considered by the Study Group 'E' of the Estimates Committee on 28th July, 1967. The Draft Report was considered by the Study Group 'E' on 29th November, 1967 and adopted by the Committee on 7th December, 1967.

3. The Report has been divided into the following Chapters:—

I. Report.

II. Recommendations which have been accepted by Government.

III. Recommendations which the Committee do not want to pursue in view of Government's reply.

4. An analysis of the action taken by Government on the recommendations contained in the Ninety-Fourth Report of the Estimates Committee (Third Lok Sabha) is given in the Appendix. It would be observed therefrom that out of 31 recommendations made in the



( viii )

Report, 29 recommendations i.e., 94 per cent have been accepted by Government and the Committee do not desire to pursue two recommendations i.e., 6 per cent in view of Government's reply.

P. VENKATASUBBIAH,  
*Chairman,*  
*Estimates Committee.*

NEW DELHI;  
The 26th December, 1967/Pausa 5, 1889 (Saka).

## CHAPTER I

### REPORT

The Committee are glad to observe that the recommendations contained in their Ninety Fourth Report (Third Lok Sabha) on the Ministry of Defence—(Defence Research and Development Organisation)—Defence Metallurgical Research Laboratory, Hyderabad have been replied to by Government in time and to the Committee's satisfaction.

## CHAPTER II

### RECOMMENDATIONS WHICH HAVE BEEN ACCEPTED BY GOVERNMENT

#### **Recommendation (Serial No. 1, Paragraph No. 10)**

*The Committee would like it to be noted that while the expenditure on research and development relating to defence, expressed in terms of the total defence expenditure in USA, UK and USSR is 15 per cent, the corresponding figure for India is only 1 per cent. They feel that to make defence research really effective and useful, the budget allotment for research should be augmented to the extent required for reaching the take off level.*

#### REPLY OF GOVERNMENT

While comparing percentages of expenditure on R&D to total Defence Expenditure in USA, UK and USSR with India, it is submitted that it should be borne in mind that expenditure on R&D in other countries like USA, UK and USSR includes expenditure on research and development work on nuclear devices, satellite and space research and vehicles to cover inter-continental distances etc. As far as India is concerned, it is accepted that 1 or 1½ per cent of the Defence Budget is not adequate for research and development. At the same time the expansion should be such as to ensure that the increasing number of scientists required are available to fill the posts and the increased expenditure thus results in legitimate expansion of activities. Our efforts are and will continue to be towards expanding R&D activities as fast as possible. The table below gives:

the expenditure incurred for the last 4 years, and the foreign exchange component and expansion of scientific manpower:—

Year	Total Expenditure (Rs. in lakhs)	F.E. (Rs. in lakhs)	Strength of Scientific/ technical personnel
1962-63	5,24.00	46.06	1061
1963-64	7,36.13	71.25	1136
1964-65	8,39.31	103.88	1165
1965-66	9,72.86	86.55	1193

Ministry of Defence u. o. No. 15 (21)/66/D (R&D), dated 31st October 1966.

#### FURTHER INFORMATION CALLED FOR BY THE COMMITTEE

*Government's reaction to the last portion of the recommendation that "the budget allotment for research should be augmented to the extent required for reaching the take off level" may be indicated in clear words.*

[Lok Sabha Secretariat O.M. No. 5/5(1) 66-EC II, dated 2/3 February 1967]

#### FURTHER REPLY RECEIVED FROM GOVERNMENT

Government accepts in principle that the budget allotment for research should be augmented to the extent required for reaching the take off level. The time during which this can usefully be done, however, depends on the availability of qualified scientific manpower and adequate industrial and technological base. These factors are not uniformly good in all areas of activity. Moreover, the need for augmentation of research in certain areas like radar and guided weapons is more urgent than in others. Availability of foreign exchange is also a limitation. The Government, therefore, agree to a steady augmentation of the R&D Budget, till the take-off level is reached, but this will be achieved over years of time consistent with the conditions prevailing in the country at present.

2. With regard to the table showing figures of total expenditure and foreign exchange expenditure given below the earlier reply, it may be stated that final figures have since been available from Controller General Defence Accounts final compilation/D.F.A.(B)'s

registers. The previous table may be substituted by the following:—

Manpower\*

Year	Total expenditure (Rs. in lakhs)	Foreign exchange (Rs. in lakhs)	Strength of scientific/ technical personnel
1	2	3	4
1962-63	524·01	55·97	1061
1963-64	736·14	67·37	1136
1964-65	840·32	101·97	1165
1965-66	973·10	86·16	1193

In addition to what has been shown above, there are development programmes financed out of L.A.F. budget like HF-24 development project and other programmes financed out of the research and development budgets of public sector undertakings like Hal, BEL etc. If necessary, expenditure figures relating to such projects will be collected and sent to the Estimates Committee.

[Min. of Def. O.M. No. Admin/RD-30/0104/66/3827/D (R&D), dated 24th April, 1967.]

\*At the time of factual verification, the Ministry of Defence vide their letter No. 15(22)/67/D(R&D) dated the 8th December, 1967 have furnished the following figures:—

Manpower

Year	Total ex- penditure (Rs. in lakhs)	Foreign ex- change (Rs. in lakhs)	Strength of scientific technical personnel (Gazetted)
1	2	3	4
1962-63	524·01	56·39	1061
1963-64	736·14	68·81	1136
1964-65	839·32	103·72	1165
1965-66	973·10	90·34	1193

NOTE—The changes in the FE figures is due to the inclusion of NCR amount also. The figures now shown correspond those shown in Page 5 of the 12th Report of the Estimates Committee.

**Recommendation (Serial No. 2, Paragraph No. 16)**

*The Committee are not fully convinced with the reasons advanced for shifting the Laboratory from Ishapore to Hyderabad. They realise that the accommodation then available at Ishapore was inadequate particularly for the needed expansion and development of the Laboratory. Yet the Committee feel that before deciding the change hastily and before shifting the equipment from Ishapore, the Government should have considered among other things (i) the locational advantage likely to be achieved from the proximity of metal and metallurgical industries, (ii) the dislocation to be caused in the research and development work undertaken in the Laboratory, (iii) benefits rendered to and to be derived from Ordnance Factories near Ishapore, (iv) the availability of proper accommodation at Hyderabad for putting the equipment and machinery to use and to avoid keeping these idle for a pretty long time, and (v) provision of power, water, residential quarters etc.*

*The Committee consider that in locating the Defence Metallurgical Research Laboratory at Hyderabad the Government should have ensured the prompt provision of the pre-requisites of the Laboratory e.g. proper accommodation, power, water etc. This deserved special consideration because of the shifting taking place after the Chinese aggression which made it imperative to avoid any suspension of and dislocation in the work of defence research. At any rate, if the Defence Metallurgical Research Laboratory had been allowed to remain at Ishapore, the dislocation of work during the emergency consequent upon the shifting of the laboratory would have been avoided during the emergency. The Committee, however, recommend that in future Government should give careful thought and consideration to all aspects and also lay down definite criteria before finally deciding upon the location of the Defence R&D Laboratories/Establishments.*

**REPLY OF GOVERNMENT**

Noted.

[Ministry of Defence O.M. No. 15(21)/66/D (R&D), dated 12-9-1966].

**Recommendation (Serial No. 3, Paragraph No. 21)**

*The Committee consider it unfortunate that the Government had not given due consideration to these important matters at the time when the decision was taken to retain a Defence Metallurgical Research Laboratory Cell at Ishapore. They feel that if the Cell is ex-*

pected to fulfil the tasks assigned to it, the question of providing the necessary equipment and facilities as also the authority and status may be examined by Government at a very early date. The Committee hope that Government would examine the whole matter without further delay as assured by the Scientific Adviser so that the Cell at Ishapore is of real help to the users.

#### REPLY OF GOVERNMENT

The Government have already approved the purchase of equipment and machinery at a total cost of approximately Rs. 1 crore, with a foreign exchange element of Rs. 84 lakhs for the expansion of the Defence Metallurgical Research Laboratory. The requirements of the Ishapore Cell will be met from these.

As regards the vesting of authority to the Cell, Government orders have been issued declaring the Cell at Ishapore a self-accounting unit and authorising the Director, DMRL, Hyderabad to re-delegate his financial and administrative powers to the Officer-in-Charge of the Cell. As regards the status, the Cell is already headed by an officer of the rank of Director Grade II who is on the pay-scale of Rs. 1600—1900.

In view of what is explained above, the Cell at Ishapore will now be in a position to fulfil the tasks assigned to it.

[Ministry of Defence O.M.. No. 15 (22) /66/D (R&D), dated 11-10-66].

#### Recommendation (Serial No. 4, Paragraph No. 23)

The Committee are not satisfied with the present arrangement which leads to a great deal of administrative delay, difficulties in the discharge of the allotted work and consequent inconvenience to the staff. The Committee understand that unless all accounting documents are countersigned by the Director, DMRL, Hyderabad, they do not have any validity in the eyes of Controller of Defence Accounts (Southern Command), Poona. The Committee have been surprised to learn that the accounts of the Cell, which is so near to Calcutta, have to be audited by the CDA (Southern Command), Poona and not by the CDA (Factory), Calcutta. They recommend that all these matters may be examined by the authorities concerned at an early date and suitable steps taken to eliminate unnecessary hardship to the staff, difficulties to the administrative authorities and handicaps to the smooth working of the Cell.

## REPLY OF GOVERNMENT

Government orders have been issued declaring DMRL Cell at Ishapore as a self-accounting unit. The Director of the Laboratory has been authorised to re-delegate his financial and administrative powers to the Officer-in-Charge of the Cell. The Controller of Defence Accounts (Fys) Calcutta and not Controller of Defence Accounts, Southern Command, Poona, will audit the accounts of this Cell in future. These will obviate the inconvenience caused to the administration and the staff and ensure smooth working of the cell.

[Ministry of Defence O.M. No. 15 (22)/66/D (R&D), dated 11.10.66].

**Recommendation (Serial No. 5, Paragraph No. 25)**

*The Committee consider that it will be advantageous to secure the advice and experience of the best talents available in the country for the D.M.R.L. Advisory Committee in the interest of the Laboratory as a whole. They, therefore, suggest that the desirability of having a specialist from the private sector industry on the Defence Metallurgical Research Laboratory Advisory Committee may be considered by the Government as such a representation will ensure an independent and critical approach to a problem, which can as well act as a stimulant to the work of the Laboratory.*

## REPLY OF GOVERNMENT

Government agree with the Estimates Committee that D.M.R.L. Advisory Committee should have the advice and experience of best talent in the country including the private sector.

Accordingly, Dr. D. P. Antia, Director, Union Carbide Ltd., Calcutta and President, Mining, Geological and Metallurgical Institute of India, has been appointed as a member of the D.M.R.L. Advisory Committee.

[Ministry of Defence O.M. No. F. 15 (21)/66/D (R&D), dated 12-9-1966.]

**Recommendation (Serial No. 6, Paragraph No. 26)**

*The Committee do not feel happy about the position stated in this para. They consider that if the Defence Metallurgical Research Laboratory Advisory Committee is to fulfil its objectives with which it has been set up, the Advisory Committee should meet more frequently in future. The Committee feel that the rule regarding the frequency of the meeting of any Advisory Committee should indicate the minimum number of meetings in a year rather than put a ceiling on the number as has been done in the present case—"not more than twice a year".*



The Committee hope that the matter will be examined by Government at an early date.

REPLY OF GOVERNMENT

The orders regarding the frequency of the meetings of DMRL Advisory Committee have been revised to ensure that its meetings can now be held not only twice a year, but oftener, if necessary.

[Ministry of Defence O.M. No. 15(21 (66)/D (R&D) dated 27th August, 1966.]

**Recommendation (Serial No. 7, Paragraph No. 29)**

*In view of the fact that the functions and activities of the various Research and Development Laboratories/Establishments have increased considerably, the Committee are of the view that the appointment of a Governing Council as envisaged in the Model Constitution for each major R&D Laboratory/Establishment would be a step in the right direction. The Committee feel that this arrangement will help the Laboratory in selecting the research projects and in promoting expeditious completion of research projects assigned to them and in administrative work so that the Director and other research workers will find more time to devote to technical and scientific work. The Committee hope that an early decision will be taken in the matter.*

REPLY OF GOVERNMENT

Noted. The Model Constitution as a whole is under consideration.

[Ministry of Defence O.M. No. 15/21 (66)/D (R&D) dated 27th August, 1966.]

**Recommendation (Serial No. 8, Paragraph No. 32)**

*The Committee partly agree that the shortage of properly equipped technical and scientific research personnel in the Defence R&D Laboratories/Establishments is due to the general shortage of technical and scientific staff in the country. In this connection, they would like to refer to the information given by an eminent Metallurgist that the country is not short of technical and scientific staff but what is lacking is the machinery which can locate and recognize talents and take good care of them and enthuse them with confidence for nation-building tasks. The Committee feel that the scientists in the country do not have proper encouragement and facilities to pursue advanced studies. Besides, they have to work under great handicap on account of bureaucratic rules and procedures. Because of this, some of the best brains of the country go abroad and in many cases settle there out of a sense of frustration and the Committee think that this drain*

of the scientific talents of the nation should be checked at an early date. In the Committee's view at least a partial remedy lies in the improvement of conditions of work including the facilities in the Research Laboratories and salaries. The Committee recommend that concerted efforts should be made by Government to locate scientific and technical talents in the country by offering them all possible facilities and better career prospects. They further recommended that as a long-term measure to remove the shortage in the supply of properly trained scientists and technologists, the Defence R & D Organisation, the Council of Scientific and Industrial Research and the Education Ministry should make an assessment of the nation's requirements of scientists and technologists for each Plan period and to make the necessary arrangement for their training within the country and if necessary also abroad.

#### REPLY OF GOVERNMENT

Noted.

The Estimates Committee's recommendation has been brought to the notice of the Ministry of Education, CSIR and the Manpower Directorate of the Ministry of Home Affairs. The Defence R&D Council also have constituted a Committee with Scientific Adviser as Chairman and representatives of the Ministry of Education and CSIR as members to examine available avenues for the training of Defence scientists in specialised fields in the higher Institutes of Technology in the Country.

While there is shortage of metallurgists at present, steps are being taken to increase training facilities in teaching institutions so that adequate number of graduate engineers and diploma engineers will be available shortly. The present shortage is expected to be met within the next 2-3 years.

[Ministry of Defence O.M. No. 15/21(66)/D (R&D) dated 12th September, 1966.]

#### Recommendation (Serial No. 9, Paragraph No. 33)

In this connection the Committee would like to observe that while the Defence Metallurgical Research Laboratory Cell has some experienced technical officers on its strength who do not have full time work, the Headquarters Defence Metallurgical Research Laboratory at Hyderabad has a number of young scientists with little experience. The Committee suggest the desirability of providing adequate training for these young scientists so that they can undertake serious research in as short a time as possible.

## REPLY OF GOVERNMENT

Defence Metallurgical Research Laboratory officers and staff availed of training at the following places in India during 1965:—

- (a) *Atomic Energy Establishment, Bombay.*  
 Safety aspects in Industrial application  
 of Radiation Sources .. 1 officer
- (b) *Central Electro-Chemical Research  
 Institute, Karaikudi.*  
 Electroplating Course .. 1 NGO
- (c) *CIA, Kirkee*  
 Basic Armament Training .. 2 NGOs.  
 Course.

DMRL would further avail of training facilities in the Ordnance Factories, Atomic Energy Establishment, National Metallurgical Laboratory, Hindustan Aircraft Ltd., Hindustan Steels Ltd. and other institutions.

*Training Abroad.*

5 members of DMRL are already undergoing training in the various metallurgical fields in France. The period of their training is approximately one year commencing from August, 1965. Also a case for training 11 more staff members of DMRL abroad has been sanctioned. Of these 6 individuals proceeded to France in July, 1966.

In addition 1 Senior Scientific Officer Grade II from DMRL would proceed to UK shortly for one year's training in Metallurgy.

US authorities have recently agreed to provide facilities for participation of 3 metallurgists from DMRL in their research work on different facets of metallurgy. Action is in hand to finalise the selection of suitable scientists for availing these facilities.

[Ministry of Defence O.M. No. 15/21(66)/D (R&D) dated 12th September, 1966.]

**Recommendation (Serial No. 10, Paragraph No. 34)**

*It is evident that no systematic norms of work load have so far been laid down for any categories of the staff. The Committee consider that fixing of such norms is very essential for efficient and economical utilisation of staff. They recommend that steps should be taken by the Defence R & D Organisation to determine, as far as possible, the norms of work for all categories of staff particularly for the non-technical staff and to reassess and rationalise the staff strength of all R&D Laboratories/Establishments accordingly.*

### REPLY OF GOVERNMENT

The technical and scientific work is somewhat unique in as much as not only is the work of one establishment different from that of the other, but the various disciplines followed or the projects or programmes taken up in one establishment are different from one another. It is, therefore, not easy to lay down set norms for the technical and scientific staff. However, the Institute of Work Study of the Research and Development Organisation has been asked to make an assessment.

Regarding the fixation of norms of work, particularly for the non-technical staff, the matter was examined, as an example in some detail in the case of LRDE, which was one of the laboratories examined by the Estimates Committee. It was found that some norms of work exist and are applied to several categories of non-technical staff, particularly the administrative staff, based on criteria evolved by O&M Division or SIU. This is also the case for the non-technical staff, even for categories other than purely administrative. The administrative categories for whom norms exist are Clerks, Head Clerks, Stenographers, Steno-typists, Cashiers, Asstt. Cashiers, Peons etc. Other non-administrative categories among the technical staff are Store-keepers, Storemen, Gardeners, Gate-keepers, Fire Fighting Staff, Gestetner Operator, Photographers, MT Drivers, Medical Staff, Security Staff etc.

To implement the recommendation of the Estimates Committee, R&D Organisation will act in consultation with the CSIR and the Atomic Energy Establishment etc.

*Ministry of Defence O.M. No. 15/21(66)/D (R&D) dated 12th September, 1966.]*

#### **Recommendation (Serial No. 11, Paragraph No. 37)**

*With a view to avoid delays and also in the interest of the smooth and efficient functioning of the Laboratories, the Committee recommend that the desirability of raising the powers of Directors Grade I of the Defence R&D Labs./Ests. to bring them at par with those of their counterparts in the CSIR may be examined by Government.*

### REPLY OF GOVERNMENT

Government have delegated additional powers to the Heads of R&D Establishments/Laboratories, *vide* Enclosure 'A'.

[*Min. of Def. O.M. No. 15/21/66/III (R&D), dated 23rd November, 1966.]*

ENCLOSURE 'A'

N. 93916/RD-26/11088/D (R&D)

Government of India,

Ministry of Defence,

New Delhi, the 31st October, 1966.

To

The Scientific Adviser to the Minister of Defence and Director General, Defence Research & Development New Delhi.

SUBJECT:—FINANCIAL POWERS OF HEADS OF ESTABLISHMENTS/LABORATORIES.

Sir,

I am directed to convey the sanction of the President to the delegation of further powers as listed in the Annexure 'B' to this letter to the heads of Establishments mentioned in the Annexure 'A'.

2. This Ministry's letter No. 93916/RD-26/1504/D (R & D) dated 15.2.66 is hereby cancelled.

3. This issues with the concurrence of Ministry of Finance (Defence) vide u.o. No. 5923/Proj.-II dated 26th October, 1966.

Yours faithfully,

Under Secretary to the Government of India,  
Sd/- M. R. SHARMA,

Copy to:—

The Controller General of Defence Accounts, New Delhi; the Director of Audit, Defence Services, New Delhi; the Controllers of Defence Accounts, Central Command, Western Command and Southern Command; the Controller of Defence Accounts, (Navy) Bombay; the Controller of Defence Accounts (Air Force), Dehra Dun; the Controller of Defence Accounts (Fys), Calcutta; the Controller of Defence Accounts, Patna; the Senior Deputy Directors of Audit, Defence Services, Calcutta and Poona; the Deputy Director of Audit, Defence Services Western Command, Meerut, the Assistant Audit Officer, Defence Services, Bangalore, Secunderabad and Kirkee; the Assistant Director of Audit, Defence Services, Dehra Dun and DCDA (AF), New Delhi.

DFA (Proj); DFA (AF); DFA (Navy); CC (R & D)—(RD-26)—120 copies.

Copies signed in ink sent to all the Controllers of Defence Accounts.

*Annexure 'A' to Min. of Def. letter No. 93916/RD-26/11088/D (R&D) dated 31st Oct., 1966.*

**Establishment/Laboratory.**

1. Defence Metallurgical Research Laboratory	Hyderabad
2. Defence Research & Development Laboratory . . .	Hyderabad
3. Terminal Ballistics Research Laboratory . . . . .	Chandigarh
4. Instrument Research & Development Estt. . . . .	Dehra-Dun
5. Explosives Research & Development Laboratory . . . . .	Poona
6. Armament Research & Development Establishment . . . . .	Poona
7. Electronics and Radar Development Establishment . . . . .	Bangalore
8. Solid State Physics Laboratory . . . . .	Delhi
9. Defence Electronics Research Laboratory . . . . .	Hyderabad
10. Himalyan Radio Propagation Unit . . . . .	Mussoorie
11. Research & Development Establishment (Engineers)	Dighi, Poona
12. Gas Turbine Research Establishment . . . . .	Bangalore
13. Aeronautical Development Establishment . . . . .	Bangalore
14. Vehicle Research & Development Establishment . . . . .	Ahmednagar
15. Defence Science Laboratory . . . . .	Delhi
16. Institute of Nuclear Medicine & Allied Sciences	Delhi
17. Defence Institute of Physiology & Allied Sciences . . . . .	Madras
18. Indian Naval Physical Laboratory . . . . .	Cochin
19. Naval Chemical & Metallurgical Laboratory	Bombay
20. Defence Research Laboratory (Materials)	Kanpur
21. Defence Laboratory . . . . .	Jodhpur
22. Defence Food Research Laboratory . . . . .	Mysore

*Annexure 'B' to Ministry of Defence letter No. 93916/RD-26/11088/D (R & D), dated 31st Oct. 1966.*

Sl. No.	Nature of Power	Extent	Conditions, if any
1	Advances from GP Fund, IOFWP Fund and IODP Fund.	Full including final withdrawal	Subject to conditions prescribed from time to time in Governments orders.

Sl. No.	Nature of power	Extent	Conditions, if any
2	Advance of TA for journeys on temporary duty.	Full	Subject to conditions laid down in AI 199 of 1961.
3	To make appointments.	Class III and IV	Subject to observance of general orders.
4	Grant of casual leave to employees for participation in sporting events.	Full	Subject to conditions prescribed in Ministry of Defence Memo. No. 27(37)/53/1915/L/D (Appts.) dated 23-7-54 as amended.
5	Charge in home town	Full	In respect of non-gazetted/Industrial Establishments and subject to conditions as may be prescribed by the Govt. from time to time.
6	Direct purchase of stores.	Upto Rs. 20,000.00	<p>(i) the limit is in respect of each item or number of similar items purchased at one time;</p> <p>(ii) in respect of Rate/Running contracts the limit is Rs. 400.00 in each case and Rs. 4,000 in aggregate in year.</p> <p>(iii) observance of general conditions prescribed.</p>
These powers will not apply to purchase of stationery office contingencies etc.			
7	Development Projects sanctioning of	<p>(i) Upto Rs. 10,000.00 for study projects.</p> <p>(ii) Upto Rs. 20,000.00 for Panel approved projects.</p>	These powers will also be operative for placement of development orders/contracts on trade/Public Sector Undertakings etc.

S. No.	Nature of Power	Extent	Conditions if any
8	Local purchase of books of Indian origin.	Full powers subject to cost of each book not exceeding Rs. 100.00	Subject to availability of funds within the sanctioned allocation.
9	Fixation of higher initial pay on first appointment to class III posts.	Upto 3 advance increments'	Subject to recommendations of the Selection Committee in respect of posts.
10	Grant of special pay to Gestetner Machine Operators.	Full	Subject to conditions prescribed in Ministry of Defence letter No. 2(4)/62/8643/D (Civ-I) dated 21-9-62 as amended.
11	Grant of special pay to Cashiers.	Full	Subject to conditions prescribed in Ministry of Defence O.M. No. 2(32)/61/11013/D (Civ-I) dated 23-10-63.

### Recommendation (Serial No. 12, Paragraph No. 38)

*The Committee cannot over-emphasise the importance of well-designed training scheme for a laboratory which is engaged in the research and development of defence metallurgy. They suggest that closer coordination should be maintained with the training schemes of National Metallurgical Laboratory, Atomic Energy Establishment and other private and public sector undertakings, with a view to take full advantage of their experience in the same field. The Committee also recommend that as far as possible some of the scientists and technologists of the Laboratory should also be sent to Ordnance or other allied factories in the country for short periods in order to familiarise themselves with the manufacturing problems.*

#### REPLY OF GOVERNMENT

Noted.

Advantage has been taken of suitable courses offered by Atomic Energy Establishment and National Metallurgical Laboratory in a limited manner. Instructions have been issued to take full advantage of existing training facilities for our metallurgists wherever



they are available in the country. It has also been decided to set up R&D cells in selected Ordnance Factories. Metallurgists of DMRL will also be included in the cells and will get an opportunity to familiarise themselves with manufacturing problems.

[Ministry of Defence U.O. No. 15/19(66)/D (R&D) dated 15-11-1966.]

### **Recommendation (Serial No. 13, Paragraph No. 39)**

*The Committee are surprised to note that residential accommodation has not so far been provided to any member of the staff of the Defence Laboratories at Hyderabad although these are located at a distance of 7-8 miles from the city and the intervening area is not also inhabited. During their visit to Hyderabad in October, 1965 the Defence Sub-Committee of the Estimates Committee noticed that there were no proper transport arrangements for the conveyance of the staff from and to the city. The Committee realise that due to financial stringency at present, it may not be possible and advisable to undertake a programme of constructing residential quarters. Nevertheless they consider that for efficiency of work steps should be taken by the Organisation to arrange a proper bus service preferably with the help of the State Government or with the local transport authorities so that the staff working in the three laboratories, namely, Defence Metallurgical Research Laboratory, Defence Research and Development Laboratory and Defence Electronics Research Laboratory is not put to any inconvenience. The Committee hope that an early action will be taken in the matter.*

### **REPLY OF GOVERNMENT**

In the case of DMRL, the proposal for provision of residential accommodation to the extent of 40 per cent of requirements for scientific staff was sanctioned in February, 1965, but later, due to the financial stringency, it was decided in December 1965 to defer it.

[Ministry of Defence O.M. No. 15/21(66)/D (R&D) dated 27th August, 1966].

### **FURTHER INFORMATION CALLED FOR BY THE COMMITTEE**

*Please state whether any steps have been taken by the Organisation to arrange a proper bus service so that staff working in the three laboratories DMRL, DRDL&DLRL is not put to any inconvenience.*

[Lok Sabha Secretariat O.M. No. 5/5(1)66-CII dated 16th December, 1966.]

FURTHER REPLY RECEIVED FROM GOVERNMENT

Local transport authorities have already made arrangements to provide bus Services for conveyance of employees of DLRL, DRDL and DMRL. Since it is not adequate a proposal for the provision of one bus each for DRDL and DLRL has been received and is under examination.

[Ministry of Defence O.M. No. Admin./RD-30|0105|13700|D (R&D), dated 3.1.67.]

Recommendation (Serial No. 14, Paragraph No. 41)

*The Committee find that although the decision to shift the Laboratory from Ishapore to Hyderabad was taken as early as in February, 1963, not much advance planning had been done in the matter of provision of permanent accommodation for this Laboratory. They feel unhappy that sufficient vigour has not been shown in dealing with this problem. The Committee recommend that every effort should at least now be made to complete the buildings for the Laboratory as early as possible as the delays in such cases invariably increase the estimated cost of the project and adversely affect the output of research work of the Laboratory.*

REPLY OF GOVERNMENT

A regular project costing Rs. 188.80 lakhs was approved in January 1964. Administrative Approval was also issued in February 1965. However, as a sequel of Pakistan emergency and pressing drive for economy, Govt. have decided to undertake construction immediately of only technical blocks and workshops at the cost of Rs. 103.245 lakhs and deffered the construction of the rest of the project to a later date. Action for Phase I is in hand.

[Ministry of Defence O.M. No. 15|22|(66)|D (R&D) dated 11.10.66.]

FURTHER INFORMATION CALLED FOR BY THE COMMITTEE

*Please intimate us to when the Phase-II of the Construction of Buildings for the Laboratory is likely to be taken up.. Pending its completion what arrangements have been made for the provision of adequate accommodation?*

[Lok Sabha Secretariat O.M. No. 5/5(1)66-EC II dated 2/3 Feb., 67]

FURTHER REPLY OF GOVERNMENT

The residual items of work relating to Admin. and Laboratory Block, residential accommodation and allied amenity buildings which together with connected services are estimated to cost

approximately Rs. 85.12 lakhs, has been taken up for sanction in June 1967 so as to ensure that these buildings are completed along side or shortly after Phase-I Works, authorised at a cost of Rs. 88.25 lakhs, get ready.

Pending completion of Admin. and Laboratory Block which is the only functional accommodation relegated to Phase-II, the Establishment would continue to make use of existing improvised accommodation for the purpose in Ahmed/Mohd Manzils.

[Min. of Def. O.M. No. Admin (RD-30)/0106/66/2953/D (R&D), dated 29-3-1967]

#### Recommendation (Serial No. 15, Paragraph No. 43)

The Committee are not convinced by the reasons advanced for the shortfall in expenditure. They are concerned over such shortfalls. The Committee feel that such shortfalls at the end of the year do not reflect well, as such shortfalls in expenditure will mean shortfall in development and research work also. They trust that the Laboratory would be more careful in future in preparing its budget estimates in a realistic way. Having budgeted for a certain amount the Laboratory should ensure that the funds are fully utilised in a planned and economic way.

#### REPLY OF GOVERNMENT

Noted.

[Ministry of Defence, O.M. No. 15/21(66)/D (R&D) dated 27th August, 1966].

#### Recommendation (Serial No. 16, Paragraph No. 45)

The Committee appreciate the difficulties encountered by the Defence R&D Organisation regarding the release of foreign exchange. They feel that the present procedure for allocation and sanction of foreign exchange for procurement of equipment and stores etc. by the Defence R&D Establishments/Laboratories is cumbersome and time consuming and needs to be simplified. The Committee recommend that the matter may be examined by Government at an early date.

#### REPLY OF GOVERNMENT

The Committee's views are noted. The procedure for allocation and sanction of foreign exchange has been streamlined to ensure the elimination of avoidable delay in sanctioning foreign exchange.

[Ministry of Defence U.O. No. 15|21|66,|D (R&D), dated 31st October, 1966.]

**Recommendation (Serial No. 17, Paragraph No. 44)**

The Committee note that the question of introducing cost accounting in some form is already engaging the attention of the R&D Organisation. They recommend that steps should be taken to make cost accounting a reality so as to enable the R&D Organisation to exercise effective control over the operational expenses of the Laboratories/Establishments.

**REPLY OF GOVERNMENT**

Cost accounting of some projects is being tried out. Further necessary action will be taken on the experience gained in the case of these projects.

[Ministry of Defence O.M. No. 15/21(66)/D(R&D), dated 27th August, 1966]

**Recommendation (Serial No. 18, Paragraph No. 55)**

It appears that the target dates fixed for completion of the projects are not generally adhered to. While the Committee recognise that circumstances can arise in the case of R&D Projects, which may call for extension of time and/or for closure of a project, they consider that the targets in such cases should be refixed after proper scrutiny of the progress so far made, and the scientific and technical data and the facilities available at the Laboratory. The purpose of laying the targets is lost when it is not adhered to. For planned development it is essential that targets are realistic and capable of achievement. The Committee recommend that there should be periodical assessment of the progress made particularly for projects which are in progress for more than three years, and wherever necessary, target dates may be refixed on the basis of the assessment of the progress and of the facilities available or likely to be made available at the laboratory.

**REPLY OF GOVERNMENT**

The Government have already taken steps to implement the recommendation of the Committee for periodical assessment of the progress with a view to facilitate the achievement of targets.

Moreover, in order that the dates of completion are maintained in respect of development projects, advanced management techniques such as PERT (Programme Evaluation and Review Technique) and CPM (Critical Path Method) are being applied in a limited way. With the experience gained it is the intention to apply these techniques on a wider scale, encompassing all major projects.

[Ministry of Defence, O.M. No. 15/21(66)/D(R&D) dated 27th August, 1966]

**Recommendation (Serial No. 19, Paragraph No. 58)**

*The Committee are unhappy at the delay in purchasing and installing the Powder Metallurgy Plant which evidently has resulted in the increased cost of the Plant. It is obvious that the acquisition of such a Plant for a Laboratory which deals with defence metallurgy was a 'must' from the beginning. That the Govt's approval to the proposal and the actual procurement of the Plant should have taken about five years is really surprising. The Committee would urge that expeditious action should at least now be taken to put in operation the Plant which has been lying idle for more than one and a half years so that the activities of the Laboratory are not further allowed to suffer due to the non-installation of the Plant.*

**REPLY OF GOVERNMENT**

Necessary steps are in hand. The Powder Metallurgy Plant is expected to be put in operation by November 1966.

[Ministry of Defence O.M. No. 15/21 (66) / (R&D) dated 27th August, 1967].

**Recommendation (Serial No. 20, Paragraph No. 59)**

*Since magnesium metal is vital for the production of aircraft and armaments, the Committee hope that a close watch will be kept by the Defence Metallurgical Research Laboratory on the progress of the project at the National Metallurgical Laboratory.*

**REPLY OF GOVERNMENT**

Noted.

[Ministry of Defence O.M. No. 15/21 (66) / (R&D) dated 27th August, 1966].

**Recommendation (Serial No. 21, Paragraph No. 60)**

*It will be seen that due to non-availability of raw materials and lack of certain technological facilities either in the Laboratory or elsewhere in the country, the project relating to the development of Aluminium Alloy Base Plate had to be abandoned after nine years and the expenditure incurred on this project was rendered infructuous. The Committee regret to note that this is one of the many instances where a project had to be ultimately dropped due to non-availability of facilities in the country as a whole and Defence Metallurgical Research Laboratory, in particular. The Committee would like the Government to examine if any of these dropped projects can be usefully revived and carried to fructification.*

## REPLY OF GOVERNMENT

The project that were dropped are:—

(a) Development of Aluminium Alloy Base Plate for ML 3" Mortar.

(b) Development of Lead Tellurium wires of different diameters to give different delays for standard delay switch.

(c) Investigation to establish indigenous manufacture of 20 Pr. Tungsten carbide cores.

These projects were examined individually if any of these could be usefully revived.

The 3" mortar is going out of service and its place is being taken by 81 mm mortar. There is, therefore, no requirement of the project on 3" Mortar Base Plate, but in its place further work is proposed to be undertaken on 81 mm mortar base plate in aluminium alloy. Forging facilities are now available at the Hindustan Aircraft Limited, Bangalore, which will be utilized.

As regards (b) above, considerable experiments were carried out with delay pieces made out of developed lead alloy wire, fitted in delay switches and subjected to trials. The delay switches gave unsatisfactory results in delay timings. The schedule of operation for making the lead alloy wire was also modified and further trials carried out, but all the trials gave inconsistent results in delay timings making it unsafe for this type of switch to be used. It may be added that the UK authorities have also come to the same conclusion independently, and the use of this type of switch there has been banned. This project is, therefore, not being revived.

The project at (c) above namely 'Investigation to establish indigenous manufacture of 20 pdr Tungsten carbide cores' was dropped due to non-availability of facilities at that time. This task will now be fulfilled by the Powder Metallurgy Plant at DMRL which will be working from November, 1966.

Production of 20 Pdr cores has been established in the civil sector also but the production capacity is low. 20 Pdr cores manufactured at DMRL will augment the production and also assist the two plants in civil sector in removing their technical difficulties so far as defence work is concerned.

[Ministry of Defence O.M. No. 15/21(66)/D(R&D) dated 27th August, 1966]

**Recommendation (Serial No. 22, Paragraph No. 63)**

The Committee are constrained to observe that this is yet another instance of failure to instal the equipment immediately on receipt. That it took nearly three years for the Defence Metallurgical Research Laboratory to put the Vacuum Induction Furnace into operation is really surprising. This is obviously due to bad planning. In this context, the Committee cannot over-emphasise that delays in such cases put off production and also result in delay in speedy completion of the various projects which are dependent on the timely installation of the plant and equipment. They recommend that not only energetic efforts should be made to ensure that such cases do not recur in future but that action should also be taken to fix responsibility for the default.

**REPLY OF GOVERNMENT**

A Committee has been constituted to look into the causes of the delay and fix responsibility.

[Ministry of Defence u.o. No. 15|21|66|D (R&D), dated 31st October, 1966].

**Recommendation (Serial No. 23, Paragraph No. 64)**

The Committee are informed that the demand of the various users for the permanent magnets is being met in full by the Laboratory. They trust that since these magnets are very vital for the manufacture of anti-tank firing mechanism, concerted efforts will continue to be made by the Defence Metallurgical Research Laboratory to ensure that there is no shortfall in their production and the demand of users is met in developed metallurgy, reliable.

**REPLY OF GOVERNMENT**

The demand of the permanent magnets placed on Defence Metallurgical Research Laboratory is being met in full and there is no likelihood of any shortfall.

The Indian Telephone Industries and Bharat Electronics Limited have also been asked to state their requirement of permanent magnets to enable DMRL to undertake the production of this additional requirement.

[Ministry of Defence O.M. No. 15|21(66)|D (R&D) dated 27th August, 1966].

**Recommendation (Serial No. 24, Paragraph No. 66)**

The Committee need hardly stress that metallurgical research and development is the backbone of all defence industries. Without a well developed metallurgy, reliable defence of a country is

not possible. Considering the inadequacy of facilities for practical implementation of metallurgical processes in the country, the Committee feel that pilot plant facilities will have to be strengthened at the Defence Metallurgical Research Laboratory. Creation of such facilities will also help in mass production of weapons and equipments at the Ordnance Factories. It will be regrettable if the latest equipment is not made available to the Laboratory for lack of foreign exchange. The Committee, therefore, urge that Government should give serious consideration to this aspect and allocate foreign exchange to the Defence Research and Development Organisation for this purpose. In this context, the Committee also recommend that the facilities that are available at present in the country may be pooled together and a beginning may be made immediately for production of selected metals and alloys on a pilot plant scale. They hope that every effort will be made in the direction.

#### REPLY OF GOVERNMENT

Noted.

In spite of acute foreign exchange shortage in the last few years, DMRL has been given Rs. 54.3 lakhs in foreign exchange in the last 3 years to build up its research facilities.

Apart from the Pilot plant for magnets which is in operation producing alnico permanent magnets, the powder metallurgy plant, scheduled to go in operation in November 1966, will undertake pilot plant production of 20 pdr. tungsten carbide cores. Also the experimental production of copper crusher gauges required for recording pressures in guns is being expanded to pilot plant production.

The Advisory Committee of DMRL has representatives from CSIR (National Metallurgical Laboratory), Atomic Energy Establishment, civil industry and Indian Institute of Technology. Maximum advantage is taken of pooling of the resources available at the DMRL, NML, AEE and IIT. Further a 'Get together' was organised by the CSIR in December 1965 which was attended by a large number of delegates from the CSIR, Defence Department, the Atomic Energy Establishment, other Govt. departments and the private industries. The working group of the 'Get together' on metallurgy have recommended the pilot plant production of selected metals and alloys by the Atomic Energy Establishment and the National Metallurgical Laboratory where facilities for such production exist.

[Ministry of Defence O.M. No. 15/21 (66) | D(R&D) dated 12.9.66].



**Recommendation (Serial No. 26, Paragraph No. 69)**

*The Committee feel that Standardisation is very essential for achieving self-sufficiency in various metallic materials required for defence purposes and hope that the question of standardisation may be taken up with the Indian Standards Institute at an early date. The Committee also expect that the work of evaluation of the quality of metals and alloys would be expedited.*

**REPLY OF GOVERNMENT**

There are 25 Specialists Committees in the Indian Standards Institution dealing with metals, on which the Department of Defence Production is represented. This ensures that the Indian Standards stipulated for common-user materials do have regard to the Defence requirements.

There is also a Material Standardisation Sub-Committee under the Standardisation Committee of the Ministry of Defence for the purpose of reviewing the existing range of materials in use by the three services DGOF and other consumers in the Ministry of Defence.

[Ministry of Defence O.M. No. 15/21(66)/D (R&D) dated 27th August, 1966].

**Recommendation (Serial No. 27, Paragraph No. 71)**

*The Committee are aware that development of the indigenous manufacture of raw materials and components now imported from abroad is not an easy task. They, however, would like to stress the urgency of self-sufficiency in such strategic articles and believe that with a determined phased programme much progress could have been made during all these years. The Committee hope that even now a determined attempt will be made to produce these articles indigenously on a phased programme.*

**REPLY OF GOVERNMENT**

Noted.

2. DMRL has already made some contribution in the field of import substitution:—

- (a) Development and pilot plant manufacture of permanent magnets required for Defence use; these were also supplied to ITI, BEL, EME, Railway and P&T workshops.

(b) Development and production of copper crusher gauges required for measuring pressures in guns.

(c) Development of Barbed Tape for Defence use.

3. Work is in progress in the following fields:—

(i) Partial substitution of Molybdenum in shell steel will cut down imports of Ferro-molybdenum.

(ii) *Frigate Steel*: DMRL is helping to solve the problem of indigenous production of steel plates in consultation with HSL for Leander Frigates being built in Mazagon Dock, Bombay.

(iii) Development work on Nimonic Alloys for Turbine blades.

(iv) Development of aluminium base bearing metal for conservation of copper and copper base alloys.

(v) Preparation of Beryllium copper master alloys now imported from abroad.

4. The Estimates Committees observations have been passed on to DMRL for necessary action.

[Ministry of Defence O.M. No. 15 (22) /D (R&D), dated 11-10-1966.]

#### **Recommendation (Serial No. 28, Paragraph No. 73)**

*The Committee cannot over emphasise the importance of maintaining close collaboration between the Defence Metallurgical Research Laboratory and the National Metallurgical Laboratory, the Indian Institutes of Technology and Atomic Energy Establishment and suggest that energetic steps may be taken to enlarge the scope of this collaboration.*

#### **REPLY OF GOVERNMENT**

Close collaboration is being maintained between the DMRL, NML and IIT and the AEE. To assist close collaboration the Dir NML, Dir (Met Group) AEE and Dir IIT Madras are members of the DMRL Advisory Committee, and all major problems are discussed in the DMRL Advisory Committee meetings also.

[Ministry of Defence u.o. No. 15/21 (66) /D (R&D) dated 15-11-1966.]

#### **Recommendation (Serial No. 29, Paragraph No. 75)**

*With a view to keep pace with the latest techniques in production and particularly metallurgical requirements of defence, the*

*Committee recommend that early steps should be taken to organise a Technical Information Cell at the Defence Metallurgical Research Laboratory. In this connection they also suggest that the desirability of having a common technical Library for all the three Laboratories located at Hyderabad may also be examined by the Government.*

#### REPLY OF GOVERNMENT

A Technical Information Cell has already been formed at the DMRL.

The creation of a Central Library, which will contain general reference books, storage of micro films, such publications as are of interest to each of the three establishments is also being planned for the three laboratories in Hyderabad.

The specialized technical books/journals pertaining exclusively to the subject dealt by the laboratory will however be kept individually by each laboratory.

[Ministry of Defence O.M. No. 15|21(66)|D (R&D) dated 27th August, 1966].

#### Recommendation (Serial No. 31, Paragraph No. 81)

*The Committee appreciate the attempts which have now been made by the R&D Organisation to augment indigenous production of stores and equipment. They, however, feel, that with a view to reduce dependence on imports and save scarce foreign exchange, greater effort is needed to establish expeditiously indigenous production of stores and equipment particularly required by the Defence Metallurgical Research Laboratory. The Committee suggest that Government may conduct a survey of the existing capacity for manufacture of the metallurgical equipment in the country so that machinery, equipment and spare parts which can be indigenously produced, may not be imported.*

#### REPLY OF GOVERNMENT

The Ministry of Supply and Technical Development have been requested to take necessary action to carry out a survey of the manufacturing capacity for the metallurgical equipment in the country. Whenever small quantities are required, we have them produced on a pilot plant scale. This is being increasingly done.

[M. of D. u.o. No. 15|21|66|D (R&D), dated 31st October, 1966].

## CHAPTER III

RECOMMENDATIONS WHICH THE COMMITTEE DO NOT DESIRE TO PURSUE IN VIEW OF THE GOVERNMENT'S REPLY.

### **Recommendation (Serial No. 25, Paragraph No. 68)**

*The Committee regret to note that although the development of barbed tape was perfected by the Defence Metallurgical Research Laboratory, no patent has been taken for the item. This has obviously deprived the Government from claiming any royalty thereon from the private firms who have now undertaken the mass production of the tape. The Committee suggest that the matter may be reconsidered by the Government.*

### REPLY OF GOVERNMENT

R&D Organisation had clarified in their written reply to Q. No. 28 of the Estimates Committee that none of the aspects of taking out a patent for an invention had been fulfilled in the case of the barbed tape and that therefore the question of taking out a patent did not arise.

As R&D Organisation does not claim to have done any new or original development work in this case, no action can be taken to obtain a patent.

Instructions have been issued to all R&D Establishments to secure patent rights both on national and international scale, whenever new processes/techniques are developed and to claim royalties, wherever possible.

[M. of D. u.o. No. 15|21|66|D (R&D), dated 31st October 1966].

### **Recommendation (Serial No. 30, Paragraph No. 77)**

*In the Committee's view, the present system of purchase through the Director General of Supplies and Disposal has been causing delay. They feel that the nature of delays as well as their reasons need careful examination by Government at the earliest. In order to expedite the procurement of equipment and stores for various R&D Laboratories/Establishments the Committee recommend that a Stores Purchase Committee may be set up in the R&D Organisation in consultation with Ministry of Supply and Technical Development with adequate powers to clear indents costing upto Rs. 50,000 per item. They feel that this would go a long way in reducing delays as well as lack of co-ordination among various authorities concerned.*

## REPLY OF GOVERNMENT

Noted.

The Department of Supply and Technical Development and Ministry of Supply, Technical Development and Material Planning have already taken a number of steps to speed up indents received from the Defence Ministry.

The indents received from the Defence Ministry are classified according to the nature and urgency of the demands and procurement action on them is expected to be taken with necessary speed and Vigilance. DGS&D has an exclusive Director of Progress (Defence) to attend to pre and post contract functions relating to indents received from Defence. Besides Ministry of Defence have a Liaison Cell located in DGS&D to keep a watch on the indents placed by Defence Service Indentors. The progress of supplies of all critical items of Defence are watched by a Defence Coordination Committee which meets at periodical intervals for this purpose.

A Study Team has examined the Organisation, structure, methods of work and procedures of the Directorate General of Supplies and Disposals, particularly with a view to locating the points at which delays occur, where the bottlenecks exist and where administrative failures are possible, and they have suggested in their Report a number of measures for improvement. Most of the recommendations of the Study Team have already been accepted and implemented. Improvement may therefore be expected in the working of the DGS&D particularly from the angle of coverage of indents and early supply of stores.

The Ministry of Supply, Technical Development and Material Planning have also agreed to the setting up of a Stores Purchase Committee for R&D Organisation for purchase up to Rs. 20,000. The new arrangement will be tried out for 2-3 years, after which the position will be reviewed.

[Ministry of Defence O.M. No. 15|21(66)|D(R&D), dated 12th September, 1966].

NEW DELHI;

P. VENKATASUBBAIAH,  
Chairman,  
Estimates Committee.

December 26, 1967.

Pausa 5, 1889 (Saka).

## APPENDIX

*Analysis of the action taken by Government on the recommendations contained in the 94th Report of the Estimates Committee (Third Lok Sabha)*

1. Total number of recommendations	31
2. Recommendations accepted by Government Nos. 1-24, 26-29 and 31	
Number	29
Percentage to the total	94%
3. Recommendations which the Committee do not want to pursue in view of Government's replies. Nos. 25 and 30	
Number	2
Percentage to the total	6%

---

©1967 BY THE LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT

PUBLISHED UNDER RULE 382 OF THE RULES OF PROCEDURE AND CONDUCT OF  
BUSINESS IN LOK SABHA (FIFTH EDITION) AND PRINTED BY THE GENERAL  
MANAGER, GOVERNMENT OF INDIA PRESS, MINTO ROAD, NEW DELHI.

---