

nounced that it will call itself an entirely Tamil University. I cannot imagine what will be the fate of those students who study in Tamil University entirely in the Tamil medium their subjects or Science and Social Studies. I do not know what they will do. They will be actually frogs in the well if they are going to learn the entire thing in Tamil.

Therefore it is necessary that the extremists of both sides should get together and think in terms of the practical difficulties.

SHRI S. KANDAPPAN : In Tamil Nadu we are very cautious about this.

DR. M. SANTOSHAM : I know. It is necessary when people are studying in the regional languages, it is essential, if there are six questions or nine questions in an examination, that the students must be able to answer at least three questions in English, so that their own subjects they can teach in terms of English and so that they will be able to express themselves in English. Then only there can be an expansive knowledge which will go on expanding. (*Interruption*). If I use my language and speak to you on my subject in my language, you will not understand.

Therefore, the purpose of education, the university-level education should be such that the university should be actually a laboratory where the minds of our young men and our young women must be cultured in such a way that the future citizens at least in our country should be able to have a sort of homogeneous thinking and homogeneously working society. If that society is not to be built now, it cannot be built hereafter.

Therefore, the responsibility of the Minister of Education is not a very ordinary thing. Posterity will blame you if you are going to adopt some measure by which this country is going to separate itself into various cubicles in different parts of the country, posterity will blame you that the cause of the disintegration of this country and the cause of the ruin was the Education

Minister who was sitting on the destinies of the education of our younger children in this State.

Here I would like also to talk about the University Grants Commission's endeavour to do student services. In various fields they have made efforts to improve the hostels, to improve the laboratories, to improve the libraries and so on. But in spite of all that, student unrest is still on the increase.

MR. CHAIRMAN : Will the hon. Member continue tomorrow ? Let us now take up Discussion under Rule 193 on the air crash of the Chief Test Pilot of the Hindustan Aeronautics Limited.

Shrimati Sharda Mukerjee.

17 hrs.

DISCUSSION RE.
 AIR CRASH OF CHIEF TEST PILOT
 HINDUSTAN AERONAUTICS LTD.

SHRIMATI SHARDA MUKERJEE (Ratnagiri) : Mr. Chairman, Sir, I would like to express my gratitude to a large number of Members of the House who have evinced interest on the discussion of this subject. This discussion concerns the air crash resulting in the death of Group Captain Das, the Chief Test Pilot of HAL at Bangalore on the 10th January, 1970. On the 11th January, 1970, some of the press reports mentioned that Group Captain Das was killed while flying the HF-24 jet aircraft on a routine flight. However, what is well known is that he was testing the advanced version of the HF-24 known as HF-24-1-R. We do not know whether the new engine had been fully cleared and whether this model of the HF-24-1-R had been certified as airworthy. How is it then that such misleading reports came in the press ?

A few days ago, that is, on the 1st May, 1970, there was a report in *The Statesman* :

"The Bangalore Division of Hindustan Aeronautics Ltd. has done it again. It has added one more feature to

[Shrimati Sharda Mukerjee]
its cap with the successful test-flight of
HF-24 Mach 1 Trailer."

Who is to say whether this model of the HF-24 was actually the same as the one flown by Group Captain Das? Or was it that Group Captain Das was testing a re-heated Orpheus 703 engine? What the Government have done is that they have publicly honoured Group Captain Das with a Padma Vibhushan, but privately, they have dishonoured him with the most serious indictment—the indictment of negligence.

To a pilot, the esteem of his colleagues in life or death is worth much more than a bagful of these badges and medals. If Group Captain Das has been indicated by the inquiry committee of negligence, then I must say that equally, the Government also stands and must stand indicated of injustice...

SHRI NAMBIAR (Tiruchirappalli) :
Dereliction of duty.

SHRIMATI SHARDA MUKERJEE :
Of injustice.

There are certain doubts regarding the inquiry committee. Who were the judges and who were the witnesses? As you know, in such departmental inquiries, the witnesses and the judges are both of the concerned department. In this case, the Ministry of Defence and the Hindustan Aeronautics Ltd. Yet, the HAL is a public sector undertaking and this 'plane was a product of that undertaking.' Why then this secret military inquiry? That is what I would like to know.

The important fact alleged to have emerged from this inquiry is—because such things do not remain secret in the service—that Group Captain Das's air crash was caused mainly by the fact that the canopy was not properly locked by him. This is totally untenable and unbelievable in the case of a pilot of the standing of Group Captain Das, a man who was long-experienced in flying and of outstanding ability.

What are the alleged findings of the inquiry committee? The committee is said to have found that the canopy not

being locked, turbulence would have developed in a jet aircraft, and this would have resulted in the engine stalling. Secondly, the committee is said to have found that the ejection cartridge had been fired, but the committee assumes that the ejection cartridge was fired on impact of the aircraft. In other words, what the committee implies is that Group Captain Das failed to eject himself out of the plane, which he could have done, and thus he could have avoided being killed and that he must have realised that the plane was not gaining height. Therefore, whichever way you look at it, the blame is squarely put on Group Captain Das, and nothing is attributed to structural defects or mal-functioning of any part of the aircraft.

Let the House remember that what we are discussing today involves not a single accident of an air crash resulting in the death of a pilot, but the question of justice to scores of young men serving in the air force. Let us demand that justice be done to those whose voices are muted by death and to thousands of others still in the service.

Let me put before the facts as I know them, firstly, facts concerning Group Capt. Das, secondly facts concerning the HF-24. Group Capt. Das was a renowned pilot whose ability was recognised all over the world. I shall quote to you from a letter he wrote to me in 1961 when he joined the HAL as their Chief Test Pilot. He wrote to me on the 26th June, 1961. That was the occasion when he flew the HF-24 for the first time. He said therein :

"For some years, I had been a test pilot in the IAF. Last month I went to England and France to fly some supersonic planes. I flew the Mirage in France at double the speed of sound. I came back to India. On the 11th I took over the duties of Chief Test Pilot at HAL. On the 17th June, I flew the HF-24 for the first time. The inaugural flight was on the 24th. You might have seen the news in the papers. These two great days were great days in the history of Indian aviation, to

(Disc.)

HAL and IAF. Needless to say, they were great days in my life as well.

In this hour of happiness and achievement, I "feel I must personally write to you to tell you that thanks to your late husband's hard work and determined effort against tremendous opposition, we are about to get a real front-line plane in the IAF in the near future which will be on equal par with any foreign product."

I need say no more about the patriotism and ability of this man. As far back as 1961, he had already flown a plane at twice the speed of sound. Further, Group Capt. Das was one of the few Asian pilots to have participated at the Farnborough Show when he displayed the Gnat. Is any further testimony required of his ability? Can you believe that a man of this experience would neglect the first duty of a pilot and leave open the canopy of a jet plane?

It is true, as the papers said, that he was on routine flight. But it was not routine in the sense you would understand it. But it was a flight, though not the first flight, of HF-24-1-R. Equally it is true that he had complained on a number of occasions of the malfunctioning of the locking system of the canopy.

Secondly, any pilot of experience would be able to confirm that it is next to impossible that the ejection cartridge would get fired on impact of the aircraft with the ground. Therefore, what must have happened is this, that Group Capt. Das did fire the ejection cartridge, but it did not work, because the aircraft showed that there was just a slight scratch in the canopy. I would request the Minister to inquire into this

17.09 HRS.

[SHRI SHRI CHAND GOYAL *in the Chair*]

Is this possible? If the ejection cartridge had been fired while the aircraft was in flight, would it have just left a slight scratch on the canopy?

Secondly, this aircraft had been under development since 1956. One would

like to know how was this decision taken to equip the air frame, which is already 15 years old, with a modern Mach 2 engine.

The crux of the point is this.

Was this a political decision? or was it a decision at the instance of qualified technicians? If so, which technicians?

SHRI NAMBIAR: Is it only this plane that had that engine? Or is it that the others also had the same type of engines?

SHRIMATI SHARDA MUKERJEE: HF-24 which he flew in 1961 did not have this, this had the Orpheus 703. This was a new version and the air frame was old; the engine was new.

Secondly, if it was a decision of the technicians was there any attempt made to ascertain whether this air frame of an obsolete aircraft could be matched to an advanced modern plane with Mach II capacity? HF-24 has had a very tortuous history; it has been coloured by high politics and international pressure tactics. This is made quite clear from his letter to me as far back as 1961 when he talked of hard work and determined against tremendous opposition.

Government in their wisdom appointed two committees—the Tata Committee in 1963 and later the Subramaniam Committee. But one has sadly to admit that the full reports of these committees have never been made available to Parliament or the public; an abridged or summary version of the Subramaniam report was available; it is not the full version; I have seen the summary version about a year and half ago... (Interruptions.) In Britain you heard of Lord Powden's Committee. This report was made available to every body; it was discussed in public and in Parliament. What is wrong in this, especially when you are manufacturing planes even for civilian uses—for example the Avro 748, is this not a matter where you should have a true assessment of what is going on in the aircraft industry? Therefore, I request the hon. Members in the House that they join me

[Shrimati Sharda Mukherjee] in demanding that first of all the full text of these two reports be placed before the House. Secondly, there should be a new committee appointed to enquire into the manufacture and development of indigenous planes. What is more, that committee should have as its chairman a man of high esteem, a man who will inspire confidence among the people, especially in the Air Force. There should also be qualified technicians on it. I may add that those technicians should not in any way be associated with the Ministry of Defence. Thirdly, there should be some Members of Parliament on it. Above all, the chairman must not be a political person or a person who hopes to hold political office in the future. Why do I say so? Take for instance the management of the HAL. This has been managed by Service Officers through the years. One can understand this happening at the beginning. Now it has been in existence for years and even today it is managed by Service Officers. It is no gain to the industry and it is a loss to the service. First of all they have no managerial, production or design experience or experience in handling labour. The HAL Division at Bangalore is having constant trouble with labour. They have no experience of cost accounting and such sophisticated matters. These officers are posted on deputation and therefore, at best, they can only have a temporary interest. The most important point is this. The users cannot be the suppliers also. So, you have the present trend of phenomenal expenditure and negligible output and the risk of sub-standard aircraft for the Air Force and the facts about them will always remain suppressed as they had been in the case of Group Capt. Das's crash. Today, your aircraft industry has undertaken supposedly very vast responsibilities. You have the Avro-748 which, as I said before, is being manufactured at Kanpur, and it is being used for civilian purposes. You have the Mig-21 and HF-24 and the Gnat and so on.

Let me put to you the human angle of it. Do you know what was the salary

of Group Captain Das when he died? His salary was only Rs. 2,000 plus Rs. 500. This man was a test pilot in 1961. That is all that he got. What do you give to your IAC pilots? What is the usual amount? It is approximately about Rs. 6,000. The other day, when Group Captain died, he was 49 years old. Now, Sir, it is well known that by the time a man is 35 to 38 years old, he is past the age of flying a Mach I or Mach II aircraft. It might be said that Air Chief Marshal Arjun Singh flew a Mig-21 on the day he retired. But it was not a test flight. That is the main thing. It was not a test flight. Why was the Group Captain kept there? Could he not have been utilised somewhere else?

There was a news item that he was going to be appointed as Deputy General Manager two days after he actually crashed. But this is totally unfounded. (Interruption) He was to be appointed, when he died two days before. But it is totally unfounded. I found that before he died he was told that there was no such thing in the offing.

Then, his widow is not going to get any pension. You know that a test pilot has to be heavily insured and the Government has to bear this insurance. All that she is going to get is Rs. 1,25,000; no pension at all.

In conclusion, I would like to say that the House can assess the sort of system which perpetrates this diabolic injustice and which shelters and protects inefficiency and muddle-headedness of a number of people who are occupying comfortable, cushy jobs, while young, patriotic people of ability are pushed to the wall and are ultimately sometimes sacrificed.

MR. CHAIRMAN : Please conclude.

SHRIMATI SHARDA MUKERJEE: Sir, this is a system which succeeds in suppressing facts by appointing committees whose express function is to simply exonerate the guilty and to condemn the innocent, and that is why the whole country is today erupting with violence and anarchy because of this double-standard which the Government maintains. We want the country to progress, to progress especially in the

(Disc.)

direction of self-reliance where equipment of the Armed Forces is concerned. But to achieve this, let us have the courage to admit our mistakes and learn from them and then condemn. Therefore, let this House raise its voice in the name of justice and national security. Let us demand an impartial and objective enquiry into this whole matter of the aircraft industry and let the enquiry's findings be made known to Parliament and the public. This is not purely a military matter so that the Government should have no hesitation whatsoever in conceding to this.

The only fitting tribute that we can pay to this gallant man who sacrificed his life in the service of his motherland would be to see that his death was not in vain, as indeed I think it would be if the circumstances responsible for his aircraft crash were sought to be covered up. Sir, there is a strong and indefinable bond between those who serve in the Air Force, a bond which is woven through years of comradeship against a common and relentless enemy. The enemy is death by air crash. So, I say if Group Captain Das has died so that hundreds of young aircraft boys might fly in safety, then his death shall not have been in vain. But now, it is the duty of Parliament to see that we ensure safety of the young boys who are flying in the Air Force.

I appeal to the House to support me in making this demand, to enquire into the shortfalls and mistakes of this unfortunate system which has come into being and which will be disastrous to the morale of the Armed Forces of our country.

SHRI RANJEET SINGH (Khalilabad) : Sir, I add my voice to the powerful voice of my lady comrade. She has put the case across very beautifully. I would appeal to the Defence Minister because doubts have been raised in the House as well as in the press about the happenings in HAL and also about the capability of HF-24, and such doubts seep across the frontiers of the country. We know that we shall not be benefiting from the production of aircraft for our own Air Force unless we really become not only self-sufficient but are in a posi-

tion to export aircraft, especially such aircraft, good trainer aircraft or even military aircraft, to foreign countries. There is nothing wrong in selling military merchandise. After all, their *Gurus* are doing it. Every single advanced country is doing it. Therefore, we should have an eye on the export potential of our defence products. Therefore, I say that these doubts should be cleared and they can be cleared up only by an enquiry commission of the type suggested by Shrimati Sharda Mukerjee. The reason why Members of Parliament should be associated with it is that now Parliament is becoming more and more concerned with the defence affairs of the country. It is only the voice of the Members of Parliament which can dispel the doubts from the minds of the people at large. They are not ready to believe today a committee in which the Government has interest. Therefore, it is necessary to associate Members of Parliament. I would suggest not only two, but at least one member from each major party and group should be there.

So far as the findings of the Enquiry Committee which enquired into Group Captain Das's crash are concerned, there are two points. One is that he flew with the canopy not fully secured. It seems to me that this is a deliberate finding for one reason. It occurs to me that the court of enquiry had been given instructions to exonerate the designers, the manufacturers, and to put the blame on the pilot. Therefore, they put a point in their finding there, about which anybody knowing anything about aircraft, would immediately say, "this is wrong, puerile, foolish". Every pilot has got a flight check card. As soon as he gets into the canopy he makes those checks. Before he takes off, he makes those checks from the check card.

He might have had 20,000 hours of flying. Even then, he will not rely on his memory. He will take the card out and one by one he will read out each check and ensure that those checks are carried out. One such check is to secure the canopy. Moreover, in advanced aircraft, the canopy is of such a design that unless it is fully secured, there will be indications on the instrumental panel

[Shri Ranjeet Singh]

that the canopy is not fully secured. Therefore, to say that he flew with the canopy not fully secured is, I think, one of the most foolish statements that could have been made. I think this finding was deliberately given to show to the country that this is a false finding, a wrong finding, but we are under pressure to give such a finding. Such a finding has put the blame of the crash on the pilot and as the pilot was to blame for the crash, we have the phenomenon of his family not getting anything after his death. This is absolutely ridiculous. I would request the minister—after all, he was not responsible for the crash and he should not take it that we are criticising him. But he must also make a thorough enquiry into this. He might go through the flight check card and see whether this is one of the points he should have checked.

There are other matters arising out of it. Why should we continue with the HF-24 development? We are going in for MIG-21. I believe we are going in for some improvements in MIG-21. Both HF-24 and MIG-21 are fighter-interceptor aircraft. Under certain circumstances, they can be used for ground support role also. What is its great superiority that we should stick to an aircraft which we visualized about 13-14 years back when in this world design is changing so fast? And there are countries which are actually making an aircraft to last in their air force for only two or three years. The Soviets are not bothered about keeping an aircraft for a longer service in their air force. They kept their MIG-15 for three years; then they switched over to MIG-17 which they kept for two years; then they switched on to MIG-19 which they kept for four years and then they had MIG-21 in service for three years. Now they have gone to MIG-23 and then they will pass on to some MIG-24 or so. They are not interested in keeping an aircraft in service for a long time.

Here we are not only keeping it in service but we are trying to design it for fourteen years. And this adventure of Egyptian collaboration, where we asked them to make an E-300 Mach-2

engine for our aircraft, that particular venture or misadventure shows some very foolish thinking somewhere at the top regarding the designing and manufacturing of aircraft in this country. Who could ever think that a country could try to become self-sufficient in military aviation—if the air frame was designed here and the more sophisticated engine designed three thousand miles away in another country.

Now we have lost money on that and the worst thing is we have lost time on that. For the development of an engine for HF-24 we had paid I think, Rs. 2.4 crores to a British firm and, as pointed out in the PAC Report, that money has just gone down the drain. They said that unless we give the money they are not going to design it. So, we gave them some money. After that we said "we want this change". They wanted more money. We have paid them something like Rs. 2.4 crores and this whole amount has gone down the drain. This is the state of affairs with the Planning Division and that is why the Committee on Public Undertaking commented :

"It had not fully realized the complexities of production of this aircraft and made an optimistic estimate. HAL Production Planning Organisation needed to be changed."

This is the comment of people who have gone into it. What more do you want? Then there were allegations in an article by Dr. J. P. Chawla, one of our foremost technocrats. When these are casting doubts, why does the government not come out and say "we are clean and, therefore, we do not mind a committee probing into our affair". Or, if the government itself doubts that everything is not clear, then again it should say : let the committee go into it and find out where the bottleneck lies, where the fault lies, so that corrective measures can be taken.

After all, these all affect not only the procurement of a few aircraft, the production of a few aircraft, these affect the life of our pilots, and we have played about too much with the life of our servicemen. We have put them into battle under-armed; we have sent them to the

mountains under-clothed. Even now we are trying to give them weapons for political reasons. Therefore, for their morale too and their safety we should have this committee and the committee should go into every aspect of aircraft production, especially at HAL.

Now, another point that arises out of this is the training system. I would like to know from the hon. Minister what training system do they have for producing test pilots. Test pilots are not just picked out of any Tom, Dick and Harry. Major Ranjeet Singh or Natha Ram or somebody else cannot test fly these planes. Test pilots are something special. Test pilots are technocrats as well as pilots. They are engineers as well as pilots; then they should have flying experience under varied conditions on various aircraft. I would like to know from the Minister where are we training our test pilots? How many such test pilots have we trained? Or are we going to rely on just one or two test pilots? When Group Capt. Das died there was no other test pilot to take over from him. Certain planes had to be tested and for one month we had to wait because we did not have proper test pilots with us. We had not of pilots, no doubt. There was Air Marshal P. C. Lal who took upon himself the duties of a test pilot. But it should not be done. The person who is now Chief of Air Staff should not be asked to become a test pilot. Apart from the position there is the question of age. In supersonic speed the slightest change in the path of the aircraft, the slightest change in the straight path into a parabola induces in the pilot a pull of gravity that sometimes is six to eight times more than the normal gravity. There is black out. Therefore, the age limitation is always there for test pilots. I would like to know from the Minister as to where and how we are training our test pilots? How many of them have we got? We should not try to take shelter behind secrecy because there are certain very obvious things publicly known and the Defence Ministry says it is not in the public interest to disclose. Only the other day when I asked a question as to whether we had entered into an agreement for manufacture of an anti-tank guided mis-

sile with a foreign firm; if so, what was the name of the foreign firm, to which country did it belong and what was the production schedule; the answer given was : (a) Yes—meaning we have gone into an agreement with a foreign firm. As regards the name of the foreign firm it was stated that it was not in the public interest to disclose. We are signing an agreement with a foreign firm. It is no secret with them but it is a secret to the Members of this House. I do not understand the logic. Therefore, I would request the Minister to agree to a Committee to go into this question.

SHRIMATI SHARDA MUKERJEE : Group Capt. Das was in the habit of taxiing to the end of runway and then locking his canopy.

SHRI K. P. SINGH DEO (Dhenkanal) : Today we are discussing a resolution moved by Shrimati Sharda Mukerjee, one who knows the Air Force from inside out, who has been the first lady of the Air Force and who has spoken with a lot of feeling from a mother's heart about the death of a brilliant young flier, an outstanding Indian flier who has flown more than 4,000 hours, who has 35 years of magnificent flying career, who has more than 2,000 hours of production test flying and prototype test flying.

Then we heard Major Ranjeet Singh who has served in Air Force and Army and, as such, has a mate knowledge of the things he was talking about. As a layman I may say that it is not only just a pilot who has died but it is a patriot, somebody who has sacrificed his life and I would go further and say that in my opinion it amounts to pure murder because for the simple reason our development of the Hindustan Aeronautics Ltd. right from the beginning has been shrouded in mystery and doubts have raised in the Press, public and in the Parliament.

I would like to refer to the two reports—the Seventieth Report of the PAC of the Third Lok Sabha and the Eighth Report of the Committee on Public Undertakings of the Fourth Lok Sabha, which my hon. friend, Major Ranjeet Singh, referred to. Utter disregard has been shown by the management and the people at the helm of affairs right from

[Shri K. P. Singh Deo]

the ex-Defence Minister onwards whose handpicked men are still running the show, who are in key positions and who are perpetuating the wrong which has been carried on for so many years.

I do not have much time to go into the details of this. Hon. speakers, who spoke before me, have charged that there has been foreign pressure, international intrigue and politics, which have waylaid our aircraft industry. Major Ranjeet Singh also referred to how we lost Rs. 2.4 crores in trying to develop an engine and losing so many years. Even after that loss of Rs. 2.4 crores, the Soviets also promised to develop an engine for us for which they took more than five years and we lost another Rs. 2.8 crores on which the PAC has also reported.

Under these circumstances, when the reports of the Subramaniam and Tata committees have yet to see the light of the day, when a departmental inquiry has been held, when people have vested interests to guard and hide certain things, I would reiterate the demand made by Shrimati Sharda Mukerjee and Major Ranjeet Singh that a full judicial inquiry or a high-power committee in which Members of Parliament and other eminent citizens of the country should be represented, should go into this so as to remove doubts, put at rest the demoralising effect on the morale of our people in the Air Force as well as in the country and in Parliament, and put an end to the sordid affairs that are going on.

श्री शिव चन्द्र झा (मधुवनी) : कमेटी मुकर्रर करने का जो सुझाव दिया गया है उसका पता लगाने के लिए कि टैस्ट पायलट की किन सरकारमस्टॉसिस में मृत्यु हुई, उसका मैं समर्थन करता हूँ। इसकी पूरी जांच होनी चाहिये और उसको डिटेल सामने आएँ उन से हम को भी अवगत कराया जाना चाहिये। इस चीज को सीक्रेसी के नाम पर छिपाया न जाए, यह मेरी प्रार्थना है।

आपने आज अखबारों में पढ़ा होगा कि अमरीका के मजदूर नेता श्री वाल्टर रूथर को प्लेन क्रेश में मृत्यु हो गई है। यह दुनिया के सभी मजदूरों के लिए दुख की बात है।

उसकी तमाम डिटेल्स जांच के बाद अमरीकी जनता के सामने आ जायेंगी। वहां चाहे पायलट गुजरा हो या मुसाफिर गुजरे हों, तमाम जो डिटेल्स होती हैं, जनता के सामने आ जाती है। लेकिन मुझे दुख है कि हमारे यहां इस तरह नहीं किया जाता है। हमारे यहां इस तरह की कोई मशीनरी नहीं है कि अगर कहीं प्लेन क्रेश हो, उस में चाहे पायलट मरे या मुसाफिर मरें या क्रियू मरें उसकी तमाम डिटेल्स हमारे सामने आ जाएं। मैं यह इसलिए कह रहा हूँ कि आपको याद होगा कि श्री होमी भाभा एक प्लेन क्रेश में मरे थे। कई बरस पहले यह दुर्घटना हुई थी। यह दुर्घटना यूरोप में हुई थी और वहीं वह गुजरे थे, इसको मैं मानता हूँ। लेकिन मैं जानना चाहता हूँ कि क्या अभी तक कोई रिपोर्ट जांच की आपके पास आई है कि किन सरकारमस्टॉसिस में उनकी मृत्यु हुई, किस तरह में प्लेन क्रेश हुआ, क्या यह सेबोटॉज की वजह से तो नहीं हुआ? जहां तक मुझे मालूम है सरकार के पास इस तरह की कोई कमेटी नहीं, कोई मशीनरी नहीं जो इन तमाम बातों की जांच करके जो रिपोर्ट हो, वह हमारे सामने लाए। यह बहुत ही दूख की बात है। सरकार के पास एक सैटल मशीनरी होनी चाहिये जो जब कभी क्रेश हो और जिस में चाहे पायलट की मृत्यु हो या मुसाफिरों की हो, या क्रियू की हो उसकी जांच किया करें। अभी जो जांच कमेटी मुकर्रर की जाएगी वह जांच करने के बाद डिसाइड हो जाएगी। लेकिन मैं एक परमानेंट मशीनरी की मांग कर रहा हूँ जोकि ज्यों ही क्रेश हो, उसकी जांच करे और सीक्रेसी की बात न उठाई जाए और जो भी रिपोर्ट हो वह जनता के सामने आए।

मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि जांच तीन बातों को सामने रख कर दी जाए। एक तो इन्टरनल कंस्ट्रक्शन की बात है। उन्होंने ओबसोलीट एयरक्राफ्ट की बात उठाई है। यह कितने दुख की बात है कि एयरक्राफ्ट की बनावट अच्छी न हो और इस तरह के एयरक्राफ्ट इस्तेमाल किए जायें। ये सरकारी

कारखानों में बनाये जाते हैं। आप यह भी देखें कि 26 जनवरी को हवाई जहाजों का प्रदर्शन होने वाला था। लेकिन वह इसलिए नहीं हो सका कि मौसम खराब था और उसके पहले एयर क्राश हो चुका था। क्या हमारे प्लेन ऐसे हैं कि इतनी सी मौसम की खराबी के कारण फ्लाई-पास्ट में भाग नहीं ले सकते हैं? यह बहुत दुख की बात है। तो फिर हमारे प्लेन आंधी और तूफान में कैसे उड़ान करेंगे? प्लेन की इनटर्नल बनावट की जांच करते समय इस बात पर भी नज़र रखनी चाहिए।

इस के अलावा सैबोटैज की संभावना पर भी विचार करना चाहिए। जब डा० भाभा की मृत्यु हुई थी, तो यह बात उठी थी कि कहीं सैबोटैज के कारण तो उन के प्लेन की दुर्घटना नहीं हुई। वह एक बड़े ऐटॉमिक साइंटिस्ट थे। इसलिए यह सवाल भी उठाया गया कि कहीं उस दुर्घटना में बाहर के किसी आदमी का तो हाथ नहीं है लेकिन इस संबंध में कोई बात प्रकाश में नहीं आई। हमें जांच करते समय सैबोटैज का भी खयाल रखना होगा।

जहां तक हमारे पायलट्स का संबंध है, हम को उन पर नाज़ है। पाकिस्तान के साथ लड़ाई के समय हमारे नौजवान पायलट्स ने जिस तरह नैट्स से शत्रु के हवाई जहाजों का मुकाबला किया, वह एक गर्व की बात है। लेकिन एनक्वारी के समय हमें अपने पायलट्स की उरम्, तंदरुस्ती और काम करने की परिस्थितियों की जांच करनी चाहिए।

केवल इसी दुर्घटना की जांच करना पर्याप्त नहीं होगा, बल्कि भविष्य में जो भी एयर-क्रैशिंग हों — उन में पायलट्स की मृत्यु हो या मुसाफिरों की — एक पर्मानेंट मैशिनरी के द्वारा उन की तफ़्सील में जा कर इन सब पहलुओं को जांच की जाये। सरकार तथ्यों को छिपाने की कोशिश न करे, बल्कि उन को सदन के सामने लाये। ताकि हम

उन के आधार पर भविष्य के लिए कोई कदम उठा सकें या योजना बना सकें।

SHRI SAMAR GUHA (Contai) : Mr. Chairman, Sir, Mrs. Mukerjee has done, I should say, a national service by raising this question in this House. We all tried our Questions, Short Notice Questions and Call Attention Notices but we failed. But she persisted and, as it was expected of her, because of her personal association with the first Indian Air Marshal Mukerjee, we have seen how by her persisting in it, ignoring all sorts of criticisms, she could get this motion before this House today.

We have lost one of the most brilliant pilot India ever produced, I should say, in the form of late Group-Captain Das who had many feathers in his cap as one of the most capable and courageous pilot. It is very extra-ordinary that in the inquiry it has been said that it was due to the failure of locking of the canopy that the tragedy or the crash occurred. It is on record that Group-Captain Das, not once, several times complained to the authorities that an automatic arrangement should be there so that if locking of the canopy fails, there should be a red glow, as a danger signal. That was not done. It is also there that Group Captain Das several times made suggestions that there should be an automatic arrangement for ejection. That was also not done. Had it been done so, perhaps, this tragedy would not have occurred. If what they have said is true which I don't think so that such an experienced, such a brilliant, pilot could even fail to lock the canopy, even if that was done, a signal would have been there and the tragedy would not have occurred. Even if the canopy failed, if an automatic ejection system was there, he could jump out, bale out, of the plane. But now you will be shocked to know, after his tragic death—because certain expenditure was to be incurred, it was not done—they have now introduced an automatic system for locking up of the canopy for low-flying ejection.

I want to know from the Defence Minister whether it is not a fact that the person in whom you trusted to enquire into the cause of the tragedy. Group-

[Shri Samar Guha]

Captain Suri, failed, in 1961, to fly HF 24, whether it is not a fact that as a result of that, he was replaced by Group Captain Das and whether it is not a fact that it was only Group Captain Das who succeeded in that. Even so I want to know from you, the person who failed, who was replaced by him—naturally, human elements are there; the question of rivalry and other things are there—must show some cause also as to why Group Captain Das failed. That is, I should say, it was not an inquiry at all. It was a farce of it. The discredited person must be replaced by a more efficient and capable pilot and he is allowed to inquire into the matter. But then again what is strange? The first evidence has to be taken from nobody; it has to be taken from the wife of Captain Das. But here evidence was not taken. I would not dilate on other aspects. I would say that this is a matter not of the loss of one brilliant pilot only; it is a matter which concerns our future pilots who should have confidence in the defence machinery. We ask them to undertake testflying. Therefore, don't consider it as an individual case. For other pilots who will be working as test pilots as also manoeuvre all other Indian aircraft, you should really undertake such an inquiry which will create confidence in the minds of not only the people of India but also in the minds of other pilots in the Defence Department. Therefore, I will agree with Mrs Mukerjee that it is a concern not only of this House but it is the concern of the entire nation. So far as the Committee to inquire into the incident is concerned, a non-Departmental committee should be constituted with technicians—I quite agree, not from the Defence Ministry—and with Members of Parliament and that Committee should be presided over either by a Supreme Court Judge or an eminent High Court Judge.

Sir, it is almost cruel, I would say, that the Government wanted to deny the elements of compassion in the form of compensation to the bereaved family. Why, because it was his fault? The device for automatic locking of the canopy, the device for the automatic ejection was

made—by whom? Whose fault is it? I would ask. We should point out that man who is guilty. The designer is the man who is guilty in indirectly killing him. He did not give credence to his suggestion. Therefore, it is not only cruel but it will also be demoralising to future test pilots and also to the other aircraft men in many of our Defence installations if the Government deny the elementary right in the form of giving compensation and a non-departmental committee presided over by a Judge is a must that this Government will have to comply with.

SHRI BRIJ RAJ SINGH—KOTAH: (Jhalawar) : After all this galaxy of great experts and the time taken, I don't think I will take more time of the House. But I shall ask what were the findings of this crash? From what we know, the plane took off and crashed soon after. It is inconceivable to any person who knows a little bit of aeronautics that mere not securing of the canopy would cause a crash. A crash can only happen be cause of power failure. Sir, there is an article here by a reputed technocrat who says that the findings are that the left engine failed and that is why the HF-24 crashed.

We know how HAL is working.. We also know how the Chief Designer was selected. What were his qualifications before he was selected? Was he really competent enough to be selected for the post that he now holds?

These are questions that make the House very much concerned about these matters and the way the HAL is running.

I would suggest to the Minister to keep in mind the bad record of having certain unqualified service officers running the show of Defence Research and Development Organisation. If this House is seized of this problem of probing into the question of how our entire Research and Development is organised, how HAL's running is to be geared up, I think it will be doing a national service.

Besides this, I want to point out one thing. The Tata Committee Report has not been placed before the House, at least, not to my knowledge. The Subramaniam Committee report is put out to

us as a summary, as if we are a bench of little children and we cannot read the full edition of it. Only we are given the abridged edition. It is not even available in the library. We wanted to go through it.

These are various things which perturb the hon. Members of this House and we demand that proper enquiry should be made into this crash. Why has it crashed? Why this test pilot had to lose his life?

Also, I would like to know as to what is the Government's policy with regard to the pay of a test pilot. I would like to know what other countries pay to their test pilots and whether they belong to the services or not.

Sir, the test pilot performs a hazardous job. They have to test new planes, they have to test new modifications in them, and they have to be absolutely in a state of perfect physical and mental health, with proper reflexes for reactions. Their life is very hazardous. They should get better pay.

The hon. Member Shrimati Sharda Mukerjee said that the test pilot Group Capt. Das was only getting Rs. 2,500 whereas the Boeing pilots who fly for Air India and Indian Airlines pilots who fly the Caravelles are getting more than Rs. 4,000. This I think this is certainly a matter of great discrepancy and it needs certainly to be gone into.

A doubt had been raised in our minds as to why this frivolous little canopy is being held over our heads as the cause for this crash. I hope the Minister will answer all the points raised by me.

THE MINISTER OF DEFENCE, AND STEEL AND HEAVY ENGINEERING (SHRI SWARAN SINGH): Mr. Chairman, Sir, I would first like to give the Honourable House the facts as I have got and thereafter only I will try to answer some of the points that have been raised by the hon. Members.

Sir, I need hardly say that I very much regret that the HF-24 I.R. Prototype crashed on the 10th January, 1970. This prototype had been flying since March, 1969 and had done nine flights

before it crashed. It was most unfortunate that in the crash both the aircraft and the pilot were lost. Gr. Capt. Das was one of our ace pilots and his death is really a national loss. He had been flying the HF-24 aircraft since 1961 and had contributed a great deal to its development.

In view of the seriousness of the matter, the Government decided that a Board of Investigation should be appointed by it and I would like to clarify that this Board of Investigation or Board of enquiry was not constituted by the H.A.L., who were the manufacturers of this aircraft that was flown. But, it had been constituted by Government although the normal practice is that it is the manufacturer who would constitute the Board of Enquiry. Here, the Board of Enquiry was appointed by Government and was asked to investigate....

SHRI RANJEET SINGH: Here who was the manufacturer? Was it not the Government?

SHRI SWARAN SINGH: H.A.L. is an autonomous body. The Board of Investigation was asked to investigate and determine the circumstances and causes of the accident and other allied matters. The Board consisted of as many as ten members and I would like to give their names. They are:—

- (i) Air Cdre. R. L. Suri who was the Presiding Officer.

SHRI RANJEET SINGH: There is no Air Commander.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH: Probably the hon. Member might have heard me as Air Commander. Actually I meant Air Commodore. The other members are:—

- (2) Gp. Capt. R. J. Hermon, I.A.F. Member.
- (3) Gp. Capt. S. N. Roychoudhary, Director, GTRE, Member.
- (4) Wg. Cdr. K. Yadav, I.A.F., Director, GTRE, Member.
- (5) Wg. Sdr. S. P. Varma, I.A.F., Member.

[Shri Swaran Singh]

- (6) Shri S. K. Sahiar, Representative, DTD&P (Air), Member.
- (7) Shri S. C. Das, H.A.L. (Design Deptt.), Member.
- (8) Shri Guru Dutt, H.A.L. (Design Deptt.), Member.
- (9) Shri R. Varadarajan, C.R.E. (Aircraft), Member.
- (10) Shri V. R. Sinha, C.R.E. (Engines). Member.

This was an expert body of eight senior officers—they were all technicians who came from the Users'—Manufacturers'—Department and Designs Organization and the Engine Manufacturing Department and from the Directorate of Training.

SHRI SAMAR GUHA : Who was there to decide whether the designing and everything was all right ?

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : You may have some doubts and I may have some doubts in such matters. But, in a matter like this, it will be a wrong approach to think like that. I shall say all these are experts in designs. They are independent officers.

SHRI RANGA (Srikakulam) : They are not independent.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : I have mentioned the names of the officers drawn from the Air Force.

SHRI RANJEET SINGH : They are all from H.A.L.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : There are as many as five or four officers from the Air Force. And then, there was a Director of Training. I would appeal to the hon. Members not to have this kind of approach that the senior officers of the Air Force are responsible for training. And the senior officers who belong to the designs Department and the aircraft manufacturing side and the aircraft engine development side—all of them—conspired and tried to white-wash the affair ! This will not be a correct approach because all these persons are interested in ensuring and seeing that the right causes of the unfortunate crash should be known. So, why should they be interested in not finding out the

correct cause of the accident ? And why should there be any doubt ?

SHRI NAMBIAR : It is easy to find fault with a dead man and with a dead machine and get themselves saved.

MR. CHAIRMAN : Will the hon. Members kindly hear the hon. Minister ?

18 Hrs.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : There is no question of making any suggestion of the type that anybody was interested either to cover up the fault of anyone or anyone was trying to find any excuse for this accident. Is it suggested that these people belonging to the Air Force who were interested in seeing that the 'plane that is developed is the right type of plane' and who were very much interested in ensuring this, were interested in not finding out the real fault ? The manufacturers were equally anxious to ensure that there was no fault left in the manufacturing programme which should remain undetected.

I would plead that the basic approach which has been highlighted by some hon. Members is not correct. They start with this presumption as if after the happening of this unfortunate incident, this unfortunate crash, anybody was interested in not finding the real reason. I do not see any basis for this fear, and I would appeal to hon. Members not to view it from that angle.

I would like to give very briefly the report of the Board of Investigation. The report of the Board of Investigation has been received by Government. On the basis of evidence available, the board has come to the conclusion that the canopy was left unlocked inadvertently by the Chief Test Pilot, and the port engine also flamed out due to a combination of distorted flow at the intake caused by the open canopy and fast opening of the throttle . . .

श्री रवि राय पुरी : मरने के बाद दोबारा मार रहे हैं ।

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : I would like to remind hon. Members that without knowing the reasons given by the Board of Investigation and without knowing the result of the inquiry of the

investigating team, they should not rush to conclusions. . .

SHRI SAMAR GUHA : This is a very farcy report.

SHRI BRIJ RAJ SINGH—KOTAH: We also know something about flying. We have also done some flying. We are not children to whom this kind of information could be bandied about that the canopy was open and, therefore, this happened.

SHRI RANJEET SINGH : If the canopy was shot off in war, would it have crashed ?

SHRI BRIJ RAJ SINGH—KOTAH: Does he mean to say that a pilot cannot fly without a canopy ? I have seen a "Seahawk" take off from the "Vikrant" without a canopy and it landed in Cochin most comfortably.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : The Maharakumar of Kotah may be a pilot and he may be an expert, but I am not, and I have to go by the advice that I receive from my experts. I would appeal to him that we should view it objectively.

SHRI BRIJ RAJ SINGH—KOTAH: This is not objective.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : They are criticising the report of a body of experts.

SOME HON. MEMBERS : We are entitled to criticise.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : They are entitled to criticise; I do not dispute their right, but I am entitled to press my point of view. . .

SHRI SAMAR GUHA : We want him to be objective. For that purpose, we want an objective inquiry by a non-departmental man and on whom there cannot be cast any reflections.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : I would like, first of all, to complete the report that has been given to Government about this. It was further mentioned that the power available was thus inadequate to sustain the level flight. This conclusion has been reached after carrying out certain wind-tunnel tests.

The Board of Investigation has also given the following possible reasons as to why the pilot did not make any attempt to jettison the canopy or eject :—

- (a) HF-24-I-R aircraft was the only prototype of its type; it is likely that the pilot attempted to save the aircraft by force-landing.
- (b) pilot's awareness of the proximity of Marathahalli village very near the flight path of the aircraft.
- (c) pilot's awareness that releasing the fully open canopy is likely to damage the control surfaces and aggravate the emergency since the thrusters are not available to clear the canopy away from the aircraft.

The Board has also stated that the investigations reveal that even if the pilot had attempted to jettison the canopy, this would not have been possible from the fully open position. The Board of Investigation has recommended that a red light indication should be provided so that the pilot can find out whether the canopy. . .

SHRI RANJEET SINGH : If it was not there, then it was a serious matter.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : . . . had been locked or not. I am giving the House all the information that I have. If they have any further comments, they can make them afterwards.

SHRI RANJEET SINGH : We are not blaming him.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : I do not take it as any blame on me or on anybody else. But even those who are not here are entitled to be judged objectively, and whatever is the information available should be known to the House.

It is only thereafter that we can form an opinion.

SHRI RABI RAY : Why not agree to another committee ?

SHRI SAMAR GUHA : Why as the flight allowed without making the arrangement for that automatic glow ?

SHRI RANJEET SINGH : Why does he think that the committee we have suggested is going to put the blame on those who inquired into it?

MR. CHAIRMAN : He has not answered that.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : It is very tempting for me also to enter into a running dialogue and take each question raised, but I would not indulge in it. I would first give you the basic information thereafter, if there are questions, I am prepared to answer them.

Another recommendation is that the design of the canopy should be such that its hood sheers off at air loads corresponding to a speed of 120 knots.

Several other recommendations have been made covering procedure for flight development and trials. The report of the team of investigation is under consideration. The House will, however, agree that a certain amount of risk is involved in all development flights. In the present case, the engines were test flown after necessary clearance had been given by a committee duly constituted for this purpose. This answers one of the queries raised as to why was a test flight permitted at all. No test flight is permitted unless a committee consisting of all the concerned experts goes into every aspect and it is only after they give the clearance that any particular test flight is undertaken. That procedure had been gone through in this case also before the actual test flight took place.

All the same, deficiencies are noticed in the course of development flying from time to time and corrective action taken. This is how development work is done everywhere. It is important to note that engines developed by the Gas Turbine Research Establishment have been flying in HF-24 Mark 1A since Sept. 1964 and even the prototype which crashed had flown 9 times earlier. Between these two aircraft, the engines had already flown 260 times.

On the test bed, the engine has been running for about 2,000 hours.

I must express regret for this unfortunate accident. We are fully conscious of the seriousness of the matter. I would like to assure the House that we would very carefully examine the recommendations of the board of investigation and take all measures to prevent accidents during prototype development to the extent possible.

Having given this basic information, I would now like to touch upon some points raised. Some hon. members had indicated that there could be sabotage. Here is the report of the investigating committee consisting of experts before me.

AN HON. MEMBER : Nobody suggested sabotage.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : What could be the sabotage, what could be its nature, who could be concerned in it, who would be interested in it—this is a matter which has to be gone into. I fail to understand what *prima facie* suggestion or doubt has been raised that should create the feeling or suspicion that there could be sabotage (*Interruptions*).

SHRI C. K. BHATTACHARYYA : Let the hon. Minister answer Mrs. Mukerjee's questions first.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : So far as her questions are concerned, a large numbers of them have been answered by the report of the investigation team. They have gone into all those aspects and their report is before the Government.

SHRIMATI SHARDA MUKERJEE : Will you lay it on the Table?

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : I shall consider it after getting expert opinion on that report. I shall get it examined further with all the expertise that is available and if there are any further points that arise as a result of that investigation, I shall get it probed further. Raising doubts—a layman's reaction as mentioned by some hon. Members—without any basis and without any cogent evidence is not fair. Just raising a doubt and throwing the onus on the other side is not just.

In regard to the general questions about the functioning of the HAL, discussions on P.A.C. report or the report of the Committee on Public Undertakings, there are well-known procedures how these reports are dealt with. In this particular case, a discussion was raised on a specific instance where one of our bright and brilliant test pilots met an unfortunate end. We regret this very much and I share the sentiments so feelingly expressed in this House.

About compensation, I should like to say, that a sum of Rs. 1.25 lakhs had been paid to the dependents. This is the insurance amount on a policy for which premium was paid by the HAL. Money can compensate only upto a certain point in such cases. The loss to his family and to the country is great indeed.

SHRI RANJEET SINGH : The normal pension paid to an officer who dies on duty should be paid to his family.

SHRIMATI SHARDA MUKERJEE : She should get Rs. 500 a month.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : I shall go into that aspect. As I said the HAL paid the premium on this policy. It is only to cover such unfortunate cases that they had taken upon themselves the responsibility to pay the premium so that if the unfortunate incident took place, as in this particular case, some immediate amount should be made available to the family and the dependents. That payment has been made; if it has not been made, it will be made.

About pension and other retirement benefits, the family will certainly get what is due under our rules. I cannot make a statement just now about it. If there is any discretion that is to be exercised, it will be in favour of granting those benefits rather than for blocking them. I am fully in tune with the sentiments of sympathy that had been expressed on the floor of this House by the hon. Members.

It has been suggested by the lady Member who raised this discussion, supported by several other hon. Members, that it is a case in which there should be an independent Committee presided over

by either some high court judge or some other outstanding public man to go into the various circumstances of the case. A case of this nature is concerned with highly technical matters and in such matters, it is those people who are familiar with the problems, those who are

AN HON. MEMBER : Assisted by technicians.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : ... in the know of things, who know as to what type of problem is involved. . . (Interruption)

SHRI SAMAR GUHA : In all such enquiry committees, they are presided over by judges.

SHRI RANJEET SINGH : Defence is a very technical matter. How is he heading it ?

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : I am not heading an enquiry.

श्री रवि राय : क्या पहले एयर फ़ोर्स में जजों ने हाई पावर एन्क्वारी में हेड नहीं किया है ? मंत्री महोदय ऐसा तर्क क्यों देते हैं ।

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : In this particular case, ten experts belonging to different wings, who know their jobs, have sat on this enquiry and their report is before us. I have already given the assurance that the recommendations, the findings of this Committee, would be carefully scrutinised with such further technical bias, with such technical knowledge as Government can muster, and in the light of that, if any investigation is necessary, any further enquiry is necessary, we will certainly undertake it, but I cannot see any useful purpose will be served by constituting another court of enquiry or another enquiry presided over by a high court judge to enquire into a matter which is essentially technical and which is a matter of very great importance. I would like to assure the hon. Member that there is no politics in this; *prima facie* there is no foreign hand and it will be a poor approach for us if in the case of any tragedy, any diffi-

[Swaran Singh]
 culty, we start seeing a foreign hand in such matters. It was a case in which our own experts, our technocrats and engineers, our technicians have been associated in evolving this prototype. It is all our Indian test pilots who have been flying all this time. HF-24 is already in squadron service and our pilots are very happy about its performance. (*Interruption*) So, I am opposed to holding an enquiry of the type which has been suggested by the hon. Member.

SHRI SAMAR GUHA : Sir, on a point of order. Nobody in this House used the word 'sabotage' or 'foreign hands'. Is it right on the part of the Defence Minister to try to introduce something new, when he is answering the points made by Members in this House? Is it fair on the part of the Minister?

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : Prof. Samar Guha was not present through-out; the Chairman would bear me out that several hon. Members had mentioned this word. (*Interruption*)

SHRI BRIJ RAJ SINGH—KOTAH: You can go through the records.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : We can check the record. (*Interruption*)

MR. CHAIRMAN : Mrs. Mukerjee, did you mention that?

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : Sir, are we to cross-examine here?

SHRIMATI SHARDA MUKERJEE : I said "international pressure tactics."

I remember my words : international pressure tactics.

SHRI RANJEET SINGH : I did not use the word "sabotage". I think that the Minister is mixing up the point with the enquiry on the crash of the *Kashmir Princess*.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : Therefore, I would like to say that if there is any insinuation or suggestion that there is any foreign pressure, it is not correct. What could be the foreign pressure in a matter like this? Which could be the foreign agency which could induce us to develop this prototype and create a situation where one of our test pilots flies? I absolutely fail to understand what is the relevance of this foreign insinuation or pressure.

SHRIMATI SHARDA MUKERJEE : Kindly read the reports of your own Parliamentary Committees—Public Accounts Committee and the Committee on Public Undertakings.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH : They are there, but now we are concerned only with the unfortunate incident. We should not bring into this debate other general wider questions which can be discussed separately, about which I can give information in greater details, but this limited discussion was on a specific issue, relating to this unfortunate incident. I have already given the information and said that an investigating team has gone into it and there is nothing further that can be done or should be done and no useful purpose would be served by appointing another committee.

18.21 Hrs.

The Lok Sabha then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock on Wednesday, May 13, 1970/Vaisakha 23, 1892 (Saka).