

बयान पढ़ने के बाद मुझे ऐसा लगता कि यह सारा बयान विवादस्पद बातों में बरा हुआ है। मैं अपनी जिम्मेदारी पर गलत-बयानी करना चाहते हैं, तो करे।

MR. SPEAKER: Can you listen to me for a minute? Now, the statement is laid on the Table of the House. That motion is already there. If you want to send any comments you can send it to me.

श्री मधु लिमये : उस पर तो निर्णय आप नहीं करने जा रहे हैं।

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA (Alipur): How will you decide it? Yesterday you held over this privilege.

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA (Begusarai): He is making a statement with regard to the privilege.

MR. SPEAKER: I may tell you that we were kept so busy in the last few days. This came only this morning. I found no time and so I could not come to any conclusion so far.

श्री मधु लिमये : तो इसे आप विदहोल्ड कर दीजिये। यह बहुत विवादस्पद है।

MR. SPEAKER: He has now laid it on the Table of the House.

SHRI MADHU LIMAYE: Do not allow him to lay it on the Table.

MR. SPEAKER: Well, I have allowed him to lay it on the Table of the House. That will not affect my decision.

श्री मधु लिमये . अध्यक्ष महोदय, इस में एक बाधा है जिस की ओर मैं आप का ध्यान दिलाना चाहता हूँ। गंगा पो न्यूशन इंक्वायरी कमीशन के बारे में यह कहते हैं :

"Charges were framed against them for negligence and carelessness in the performance of their duties but it was noticed thereafter

that this particular offence was not covered under the provisions of the IOC's Conduct, Discipline and Appeal Rules."

अध्यक्ष महोदय, क्या आप इस की कल्पना भी कर सकते हैं कि एक अधिकारी को नेगलीजेंस और केयरलेसनेस बरतने का अधिकार है? क्या इस तरह के इनके क्लेम्स हैं और क्या इस का नोटिस यह सदन नहीं लेगा? इस में साफ कहा गया है कि कोई भी अधिकारी नेगलीजेंस कर सकता है, केयरलेसनेस दिखा सकता है लेकिन कोई एक्शन उस पर नहीं हो सकता।

SHRI MADHU LIMAYE: Are you taking us for a ride?

SHRI D. K. BOROOAH: You are taking us for a ride—not we

श्री मधु लिमये : क्या इस तरह की बात हो सकती है? क्या यह सरकार इस तरह से चल सकती है? क्या सभी अधिकारियों को यह अधिकार दिया हुआ है, यह हक दिया हुआ है कि वे नेगलीजेंस दिखाएँ, वे केयरलेसनेस दिखाएँ और फिर आप उन को प्रोमोशन दें। दीजिये प्रोमोशन, मुझे क्या करना है, जेहनूम मे देश की पटुका दीजिये।

MR. SPEAKER: You stop it now. Now, the Minister of Education, Social Welfare and Culture.

12.28 hrs.

STATEMENT RE. INDIAN INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY KHARAGPUR

THE MINISTER OF EDUCATION, SOCIAL WELFARE AND CULTURE (PROF. S. NURUL HASAN): On 18th April, 1974, the hon. Shri Samar Guha made a statement in the House under Rule 377, when he made some allegations against the Chairman, Board of Governors, IIT-Kharagpur. The points

raised by him were more or less the same which had been dealt with by me on 11 April 1974 and in reply to Unstarred Question No. 7662 on 22nd April 1974. On the same day i.e. 18-4-1974 he addressed a letter to the Deputy Speaker, copy of which has been sent to me, listing the allegations that he had made earlier as also some new allegations. Yesterday, i.e. 9th May 1974, I received a copy of letter of the same date addressed by him to you, Sir, in which he sought clarification from me on some of the points raised by him, I will attempt to deal with the main points raised by the Hon. Member.

The appointment of the Chairman of the Board of Governors of IIT-Kharagpur has been Questioned on the ground that he heads on Industrial concern and does not possess any technical knowledge. There is neither a legal requirement nor has it been the practice that only persons possessing technical Qualifications should be appointed as Chairmen of the Boards of Governors of IITs. The practice so far has been that a person of eminence connected with industry or education or science/technology, is appointed in this capacity by the Visitor. Among the industrialists, mention may be made of Shri Kastur Bhai Lal Bhai who was Chairman of the Board of Governors of IIT, Bombay from 1953 to 1965, his successor, the late Shri G. L. Mehta, who was Chairman from 1965 to 1971; Shri Padampat Singhania, who was Chairman of the Board of Governors of the IIT, Kanpur from 1965 to 1971.

**SHRI S. M. BANERJEE (Kanpur):** We have removed him. This man, Mr. Haksar, is a tobacco dealer.

**MR. SPEAKER:** This is also a very long statement, about 8 pages as I see it.

**PROF. S. NURUL HASAN:** I beg to lay it on the Table.

**SHRI SAMAR GUHA (Contai):** No, Sir. There are serious allegations and charges. He is not prepared to meet

any of these charges. I have so many documents with me and I want to hear it.

**SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU (Dimand Harbour):** He is a tobaccoist to use a civilised word. He need not become chief of the IIT.

**MR. SPEAKER:** You are all speaking simultaneously. Do not speak simultaneously.

**SHRI SAMAR GUHA:** The statute has been violated. A serious situation has been created. A crisis has been created.

**MR. SPEAKER:** In deference to your wishes, because you were not satisfied with the statement as shown to me, I asked him to make a more comprehensive statement so that the matter could be cleared.

**SHRI S. M. BANERJEE:** May I have your guidance....

**MR. SPEAKER:** No question of guidance. Let me finish my observation. I am not allowing you. This is a very bad habit.

He has come in deference to your wishes as conveyed through me because you were not satisfied with the statement. You wrote to me. He has got a very long statement. It is much better he lays it on the Table. You read it at leisure and later on you can rise this point. I will not object to it.

**SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE (Gwalior):** He should have come earlier. There is no time for a discussion now.

**MR. SPEAKER:** That was why I had to give this introduction, because the Minister brought the statement as his main speech in the debate.

**SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA (Alipur):** Why has he brought a statement on a controversial matter on the last day?

**MR. SPEAKER:** It went to him only....yesterday. Prof Samar Guha wrote to me that he was not satisfied. I conveyed that to him yesterday. That is the reason why he has come today with the statement.

**SHRI SAMAR GUHA:** I have explained everything.

**MR. SPEAKER:** I would advise you this. Let it be laid on the Table. Otherwise it is your pleasure; I can ask him to read it.

**SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA:** Will it be made available?

**SHRI SAMAR GUHA:** I have so many documents with to substantiate the serious charges. In the appointment of the personal adviser, the statute has been violated. The Visitor has refused to accept the appointment of the personal adviser.

Recently another thing happened. As Chairman he asked the present Director to give up his job. He appointed another temporary incumbent there. So many irregularities are being committed by that gentleman.

You know I took up the matter of Delhi IIT. I succeeded in doing a little bit to that institution. Here I have so many charges. What am I to do? This is the last day.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Instead of his reading this long statement and your listening to it, I advise that he lays it on the Table. You read it. After that, we can proceed further.

**SHRI SAMAR GUHA:** Today.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Not today. Today is non-official day.

**SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU:** We only want an assurance from the hon. Minister, if it is not in the statement, that this gentleman who is only a commercial executive working for a British monopoly concern would be removed and a proper academician installed.

**SHRI S. M. BANERJEE:** The question was raised by Shri Samar Guha and supported by others on that particular day. In an institution like the IIT, we should have a luminary in education as Chairman. Mr. Haksar has no knowledge in this respect, he is not an academician or technical expert. He was merely concerned with the Indian Tobacco Company..

**MR. SPEAKER:** I thought that you were on the question of same procedure. The point now is whether it should be laid on the Table of the House or whether it should be read.

**SHRI SAMAR GUHA:** This man has been appointed as a Personnel Adviser. It is an illegal appointment and it will continue. He is creating all kinds of troubles. The Chairman without the sanction of the President who is the visitor as enjoined upon him by the statute has appointed a senior professor! ..

*(Interruptions)*

**MR. SPEAKER:** I do not allow a debate on this. The hon. Minister can lay it on the Table of the House. I am sorry I touched the subject, and the Members started speaking on it.

**SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU:** On a point of order. The direction came from the Chair, if I remember, about 20 or 25 days ago to get information from Kharagpur. The Hon. Education Minister should not, under any circumstances, have taken more than seven days. I want to ask the hon. Education Minister, for whom I have great regard; why is it that he has chosen to come before the House on the last day.

**MR. SPEAKER:** I have already told you.

**SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU:** Secondly Mr. Haksar is a commercial executive working for Imperial Tobacco. We are trying to cut to size this company, but this Government would

not do so. Will he give an assurance today that Mr. Haksar would be asked to resign and they would get a proper candidate for this job.

**MR. SPEAKER:** May I tell you that Mr. Samar Guha's letter came to me. The Minister sent me a copy of his speech in which he had covered these points at the time of the discussion on the Demands for Grants

**SHRI SAMAR GUHA:** My point is this. A letter had been written to you. They are pushing Mr. Mukherjee. He has written. I cannot understand how the Minister can entertain such a letter from the Chairman....

(Interruptions).

अध्यक्ष महोदय . अब मैं क्या करूँ ? यह बहुत खराब बात है कि जब मैं बोल रहा होता हूँ तब लोग बीच में खड़े हो जाते हैं और डिस्ट्रैक्शन पैदा करते हैं। यह आदत ठीक नहीं है। मैंने तो कही ऐसा नहीं देखा कि वो आदमी बात करते हैं तो तीसरा घुस कर बीच में बाँध करने लग जाये। आप लोगों की कुछ आदत सी हो गई है। रात में ज्यादा लैट सोने की बजह से दवा की दो गोलियाँ खा कर आया हूँ। आखिर आप लोगों को कोई प्रोसीजर तो फालो करना चाहिए।

I forgot what I was going to say. Let him lay the paper on the Table of the House.

**PROF. S. NURUL HASAN:** Sir, I beg to lay the statement regarding I.I.T. Kharagpur, on the Table of the House.

#### Statement

On 18th April, 1974, the hon. Shri Samar Guha made a statement in the House under Rule 377, when he made some allegations against the Chairman, Board of Governors, IIT—

Kharagpur. The points raised by him were more or less the same which had been dealt with by me on 11 April 1974 and in reply to Unstarred Question No. 7602 on 22 April, 1974. On the same day i.e. 18-4-1974 he addressed a letter to the Deputy speaker, copy of which has been sent to me, listing the allegations that he had made earlier as also some new allegations. Yesterday, i.e. 9 May 1974, I received a copy of a letter of the same date addressed by him to you, Sir, in which he sought clarification from me on some of the points raised by him. I will attempt to deal with the main points raised by the hon. Member.

The appointment of the Chairman of the Board of Governors of IIT-Kharagpur has been questioned on the ground that he heads an Industrial concern and does not possess any technical knowledge. There is neither a legal requirement nor has it been the practice that only persons possessing technical qualifications should be appointed as Chairmen of the Board of Governors of IITs. The practice so far has been that a person of eminence connected with industry or education or science/technology, is appointed in this capacity by the Visitor. Among the industrialists, mentioned may be made of Shri Kastur Bhai Lal Bhai who was Chairman of the Board of Governors of the IIT, Bombay from 1958 to 1965, his successor, the late Shri G. L. Mehta, who was Chairman from 1965 to 1971; Shri Padampat Singhania, who was Chairman of the Board of Governors of the IIT, Kanpur from 1965 to 1971. Even the predecessor of the present Chairman of the Board of Governors of IIT, Kharagpur was an eminent industrialist, Shri Biren Mukherjee. There is thus no impropriety in appointing the present incumbent to the office of the Chairman, Board of Governors.

An allegation has been made that the Chairman is planning to drive out present Director. This is entirely untrue. In fact, the Chairman had asked me whether I could recommend to the Visitor that the term of appointment of the present Director, which ends in June, 1974, be extended by about one year until the Director attained the age of 55 years, the maximum age limit permissible under the rules. The Government were unable to accept this view because it was felt that as in the case of the Vice-Chancellors of Central Universities, the term of appointment of the Director should be for a period of five years. The present Director had already served for ten years (from 1959 to 1969) as the Director of IIT, Bombay and completes his five-year term as Director, IIT-Kharagpur in June, 1974. The Directors of the IITs of Delhi, Madras and Bombay have all been appointed on a five-year contract, as is the case with the present Director of IIT, Kharagpur. In fact, the Visitor has been pleased to approve of the appointment of the successor of the present Director also for a term of five years.

The present Director had applied for terminal leave till the expiry of his period of contract. The leave was granted by the Board of Governors and the Visitor had approved the appointment of one of the senior most Professors as acting Director. Subsequently the present Director decided not to avail of the leave. He can, therefore continue until the expiry of the period of his contract.

It has been suggested that the present Chairman wanted to oust the Registrar, Shri D. C. Bhattacharya. This again is far from the truth. According to the information supplied to me by the Director, the Registrar applied for the post of Chief Administrative Officer, in the Indian Institute of Management, Calcutta and was selected for the same. Although the Director said that it

could not be in the interest of the Institute that Shri D. C. Bhattacharya be permitted to leave, the Chairman stated that he was not against mobility in principle but that he would not agree to Shri D. C. Bhattacharya leaving his post without the concurrence of the Director and that it was essential to ensure proper succession at IIT-Kharagpur. The final view taken by the Director was that he would not like to stand in the way of Shri D. C. Bhattacharya joining the Indian Institute of Management, if appointed. Shri Bhattacharya wanted to move to the Indian Institute of Management in his own interest and there was no attempt on the part of the Chairman of the Board of Governors to oust him from IIT Kharagpur.

Exception has been taken to the part played by Shri D. P. Barua a Senior executive in the I.T.C. He was asked to assist the Director in locating a suitable Registrar. The Director has forwarded to me excerpts from a letter written by the Chairman to him dated 18th August, 1973, which is as follows:—

"I believe that administration is one of the areas which should be really strong. To this end, apart, from advertising, I would be obliged if you would also correspond with my colleagues, Shri A. Basu and D. P. Barua c/o I.T.C. Calcutta, to assist you in developing the profile, locating individuals and then selecting somebody really suitable for the job. I think the person concerned should preferably have an Accounting background with previous experience in an educational institution and a personality that will be acceptable to all in the organisation."

The need for this procedure had arisen because the Director in his letter of 27 June 1973 to the Chairman of the Board of Governors had expressed serious doubts about the suitability of the Deputy Registrar (Finance and Administration) to succeed to the post of Registrar because his experience has been by and large in Finance and accounts. This view was accepted by the Chairman who stated in his letter to the Director dated 7 December 1973 that it was necessary to find someone with wider experience to take up the post of Registrar on a substantive basis. Earlier the Chairman had felt that the Dy. Registrar might be competent to take up the post of the Registrar. It seems that a change in his views was largely because of the opinion expressed by the Director as also his own experience of the functioning of the Institute.

Another matter which has been raised concerns the appointment of a Personnel Adviser. Although I had dealt with this matter on two earlier occasions, I find that the Hon'ble Member wishes to seek further clarification from me. I shall therefore take the liberty of explaining the position at some length.

In many IITs matters connected with 'karamacharis' have led to serious difficulties. There is the question of the temporary employees and their demand for absorption on a permanent basis, question of the determination of Seniority, categorisation of posts, rules of promotion, the question of mess employees, etc. Delay in taking decisions on these matters accentuates unrest among the 'karamacharis'. Someone, therefore, has to devote a great deal of time to the solution of these problems. If the Director or any of the senior academics is entrusted with this responsibility, then they would have little time left for providing academic guidance or for discharging their academic responsibilities. The Registrar too has

responsibilities which are partly statutory and partly administrative. He cannot possibly be expected to devote his exclusive attention to the sorting out of the problems of the 'karamacharis'. It was, therefore, felt that someone who possessed suitable academic qualifications and who had extensive experience of dealing with personnel matters should be appointed as Personnel Adviser to sort out urgently the problems relating to the 'karamacharis'. The Board of Governors selected Dr. A. M. Sharma for appointment as Personnel Adviser on a contract for 5 years subject to the approval of the Visitor. Dr. Sharma is an M.A. in Economics from Delhi University and a Ph. D. in Sociology from Bombay University. He served for about 25 years under the Government as well as business firms dealing with problems of labour and personnel. He has not yet attained the age of 60 years. In view of the urgency of dealing with the labour problems Dr. Sharma was asked to start work and he has already succeeded in negotiating agreements with the Unions of 'Karamacharis'. However, as I have stated earlier in the House, the appointment will hold good only if the approval of the visitor is forthcoming.

Regarding the allegation of the Chairman serving "hot drinks" to students, I had said in the House on 11 April 1974 that I got in touch with the Chairman of the Board of Governors and I took the liberty of reading what he had written to me in this connection. I quoted the following portion from the letter of the Chairman of the Board of Governors:—

"In so far as the question of entertaining students is concerned, this is absolutely incorrect and there is no grain of truth in it whatsoever. The students do certainly come and see me but never have they been offered any drinks other than soft cold drinks".

It appears that this statement of mines escaped Shri Guha's attention and he repeated the allegation on 18 April 1974.

Shri Guha has referred to a letter from the Director to me. The letter mainly demonstrates the difference of opinion between him and the Chairman and on these matters it would be more proper for the new Director to take suitable measures. I would however like to mention a few points raised in that letter.

Regarding the prevention of ragging, the Chairman has expressed the view that the punishment for excessive ragging should not be such as to ruin the career of the students. One may not agree with this view but it would be incorrect to say that Chairman has thereby encouraged ragging of an undesirable nature. The Director has also objected to the Heads of the Departments and other Faculty Members directly meeting the Chairman, without proceeding through the Director. I am of the view that this cannot be accepted in an academic institution. Faculty Members should be free to approach the Chairman or any other person and there should be no restriction on their academic freedom. The Director has also made a mention of financial irregularities allegedly to have been noticed in the accounts of the Students Gymkhana. The Board of Governors examined this question and took a decision. However, on this matter a further report has been called for from the Institute. If it is felt that there should be a more detailed investigation into the allegations of financial irregularities, I would be willing to take appropriate action. Earlier, allegations of irregularity have been made against the present Director himself. These will also be looked into.

Shri Guha has also drawn attention to a confidential letter dated 19 April 1974 sent to the Members of the

Senate by the Director. As certain allegations have been made in this letters, I do not think it proper to make any comments until the views of the Senate are before me

**SHRI SAMAR GUHA:** The whole matter can be enquired into. Let there be an enquiry committee. You should give a direction that there should be an enquiry committee with competent technologists from anywhere in India to go into the whole affairs of this I.I.T. Dr. Sathna can do it, I have no objection.

12.35 hrs.

#### STATEMENT RE. REPORTED SALT CRISIS IN WEST BENGAL

**THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT (SHRI M. B. RANA):** I lay a statement regarding the reported salt crisis in West Bengal, on the Table of the House.

##### STATEMENT

During the discussions Shri Samar Guha has stated that the price of salt has gone up in West Bengal by 10 to 15 times and that it is being sold at the rate Rs. 2 to Rs. 3 per kg. in rural areas.

The retail price of salt in West Bengal was between 23 to 37 paise per kg. In November, 1973 whereas in February, 1974, it was 25 to 42 paise per kg. The whole sale price for a bag of salt (one quintal) in West Bengal in November, 1973 was between Rs. 16.75 to Rs. 24.38 per quintal, while in February, 1974 it was between Rs. 20.17 to Rs. 33.50 per quintal. There has thus been an increase in price which is largely due to the fact that the State nominees have not lifted the full quota of 22,000 tonnes per month. Against the requirement of 77,000 tonnes from January, 1974 to 15th February, 1974, the actual lifting of salt has been about 62,000 tonnes only. Some increase in price is also due to the fact that the bunker surcharge has