

Mr. Speaker: Then Members may object that they did not get advance notice.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: Will the motion fixed for 3 P.M. come today or tomorrow?

Mr. Speaker: Since it is fixed for a particular period, we must take it up at that time. After that, we will take up the other discussion.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: After the discussion on railway accidents, according to the Order Paper, there are Supplementary Demands for Grants.

Mr. Speaker: They are not likely to come up today.

12.28 hrs.

MOTION RE: REPORT OF UNION PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION—
Contd.

Mr. Speaker: The House will now take up further consideration of the motion moved by Shri Datar regarding the Eleventh Report of the Union Public Service Commission. Shri K. Pattanayak will continue his speech.

श्री कि० पटनायक (मन्त्रालय)

अध्यक्ष महोदय, यूनियन पब्लिक सर्विस कमीशन का निर्माण संविधान के द्वारा हुआ है और यह एक बहुत ही महत्वपूर्ण संस्था है। लेकिन गये सालों में पब्लिक सर्विस कमीशन के द्वारा ऐसा कुछ भी काम नहीं हुआ, जिससे कि इस देश के प्रशासन में कोई मौलिक परिवर्तन हो सके। जब ब्रिटिश जमाना था, अंग्रेजों की सरकार थी, उस समय अफसर लोग जिस किस्म के थे और वे जिस ढंग से शासन चलाते थे अभी भी आज़ाद हिन्दूस्तान के अफसर वैसे ही हैं और उम ढंग से ही काम चलाते हैं। जनता के साथ उनका सम्पर्क भी अभी वैसे ही है, जैसे कि अंग्रेज के जमाने में था। इसमें परिवर्तन लाना गृह मंत्रालय तथा पब्लिक सर्विस कमीशन दोनों की जिम्मेदारी होनी चाहिये थी। लेकिन इन दोनों के द्वारा अभी तक इस दिशा में कोई कदम नहीं उठाया गया है।

एक तो यह है कि संविधान का जो पार्ट १७ है आफिशल लैंग्वेज के बारे में उसको कार्यान्वित करने की कुछ जिम्मेदारी इस पब्लिक सर्विस कमीशन तथा गृह मंत्रालय को होनी चाहिये थी। लेकिन उस दिशा में तो अभी तक कुछ भी नहीं हुआ है। संविधान को ३४३, ३४४ और ३४५ जो धाराएँ हैं, उनकी अवहेलना देश में जितने अधिकारी हैं सबके द्वारा हो रही है प्रधान मंत्री से लेकर असैम्बलियों और पार्लियामेंट के स्पीकर द्वारा हो रही है। सभी इन धाराओं को शायद भूल ही गए हैं और शायद उन सबको पता नहीं है कि संविधान में ऐसी भी कोई प्राविजन है कि पंद्रह साल के बाद यह अंग्रेजी नहीं चलने वाली है और इसलिए देश को तैयार होना चाहिये, पार्लियामेंट में, असैम्बलियों में तथा दफ्तरों में ताकि उसके बाद दूसरी भाषा इसका स्थान ले। लेकिन इन अंग्रेजी के स्थान को बदलने के लिये अभी तक क्या हुआ है? अभी तक कुछ भी नहीं हुआ है और न ही इसके बारे में कोई चेष्टा ही की गई है और अब ऐसी चर्चा है कि एक संशोधन इसके बारे में पेश किया जाएगा। इस असफलता को छिपाने के लिये बार बार यह प्रश्न उठ रहा है कि संविधान का बदलना पड़ेगा और शायद गृह मंत्री इसके लिये एक संशोधन पेश करेंगे अगर ऐसा किया जाता है तो यह एक बहुत ही बुरी चीज होगी। जो जिम्मेदारी इनके ऊपर थी, उस जिम्मेदारी को वह नहीं निभा पाये हैं, उसको पूरा नहीं कर पाये हैं और अपनी उस अयोग्यता को छिपाने के लिये अगर वह संशोधन लाया जायेगा तो यह बहुत ही बुरी चीज होगी। इस सेशन में वह उसको लाने वाले थे लेकिन अभी तक नहीं लाए हैं और मेरा निवेदन यह है कि वह उसको कभी भी न लायें। यह एक खतरनाक कीज है कि १९४७ में आज़ाद होने के बाद से हम जितना आगे बढ़ रहे हैं, आज़ादी के मूल्य को हम उतना ही भूलते जा रहे हैं। अंग्रेजी का पहले जितना विरोध था यह विरोध अब मंत्रियों और अधिकारियों की तरफ से कम होता जा

रहा है। अब भी अगर माननीय गृह मंत्री जो सचमुच में इस संशोधन को लायेंगे तो इतिहास में, आजाद भारत के इतिहास में, उनका नाम गुलाम गृह मंत्री के रूप में ही रह जाएगा। इसलिए मेरा निवेदन है कि इस संशोधन को वह न लायें।

मैं यह भी कहना चाहता हूँ कि पब्लिक सर्विस कमिशन को यह भी देखना चाहिये कि जो अफसर आजाद हिन्दुस्तान में बनें उनकी चाल ढाल, उनका रंग ढंग वैसा न हो जैसा अंग्रेजों के जमाने में अफसरों का हुआ करता था। अभी उनमें कोई परिवर्तन आया हो, ऐसा दिखाई देता नहीं है।

आई० सी० एस० और आई० ए० एस० आफिसर्स में कोई फर्क नहीं आया है। जैसा वे पहले रहते थे, वैसा ही अब रहते हैं, जनता के साथ जैसा वे पहले व्यवहार करते थे, वैसा ही अब करते हैं। जो आई० ए० एस० आफिसर्स अब बन रहे हैं, वे भी वैसा ही जनता के साथ व्यवहार करते हैं, जैसे आई० सी० एस० करते हैं और उनकी तरह से ही उनका रहन सहन है। पब्लिक सर्विस कमिशन को जो एग्जामिनेशन होते हैं, जो टेस्ट्स होते हैं, उनको इस ढंग से बदलना चाहिये जिससे कि जो अफसर निकलें उनके चरित्र में कोई परिवर्तन दिखाई दे, जनता के साथ उनका सम्पर्क, उनका व्यवहार ठीक ढंग का हो।

इस सब के लिये यह बहुत जरूरी है कि पब्लिक सर्विस कमिशन के जितने एग्जामिनेशन होते हैं, जितने इम्तहान होते हैं, उन सब में से अंग्रेजी को हटा दिया जाए। अंग्रेजी के माध्यम से जो लोग इम्तहान पास करते हैं और आई० ए० एस० आफिसर्स बनते हैं, वे दफ्तरों में और सरकार के कामों में भी अंग्रेजी को कायम रखना चाहते हैं। कभी कहीं अगर सरकार की तरफ से कोई बिल पास भी करवा लिया जाता है कि अंग्रेजी के माध्यम से काम नहीं चलाना है बल्कि प्रान्तीय भाषा के माध्यम से या किसी अन्य भाषा के

माध्यम से चलाना है तब भी ये अफसर लोग ऐसी कोशिश करते हैं और उस कोशिश में कामयाब भी हो जाते हैं कि वह बिल या वह एक्ट कार्यान्वित न हो सके। ऐसा एक उदाहरण उड़ीसा में हुआ है। वहां पर जब श्री नवल कृष्ण चौधरी जी मुख्य मंत्री थे उस समय यह कानून पास हुआ था कि जितना भी सरकारी काम काज है वह उड़िया भाषा में चलेगा लेकिन चूंकि यह कानून जितने बड़े बड़े अफसर थे, आई० सी० एस० और आई० ए० एस० अफसर थे, उनके इंटरिस्ट के खिलाफ जाता था, इसलिये उन लोगों ने कोशिश करके इस कानून को बिल्कुल भी व्यवहार में नहीं चलने दिया। इसके नतीजे के तौर पर उस कानून को उड़ीसा में आज तक कार्यान्वित नहीं किया जा सका है।

इसी तरह से मैं यह भी चाहता हूँ कि अफसर लोगों का जो रहन सहन है उसमें भी तबदीली आनी चाहिये और इस काम में भी पब्लिक सर्विस कमिशन की कोई जिम्मेदारी होनी चाहिये। अभी पब्लिक सर्विस कमिशन के सामने जो कैंडीडेट्स इंटरव्यू के लिए जाते हैं, सब क सब नेकटाई पहन कर जाते हैं। नेकटाई न पहनना एक डिसक्वालिफिकेशन माना जाता है, कैंडीडेट्स के मन में ऐसी धारणा है। पब्लिक सर्विस कमिशन के मन में कोई ऐसी धारणा है या नहीं, यह मैं नहीं कह सकता हूँ। यह बात सही है कि हर वह कैंडीडेट जो पब्लिक सर्विस कमिशन के सामने इंटरव्यू के लिए जाता है नेकटाई लगा कर जाता है। नेकटाई की निन्दा तो प्रधान मंत्री जी भी करते हैं। प्रधान मंत्री साहब की इस बात का कोई मूल्य है या नहीं, देश में या पब्लिक सर्विस कमिशन में, मैं नहीं जानता हूँ। लेकिन यह बिल्कुल सही बात मैं कह रहा हूँ कि नेकटाई न पहनने से इंटरव्यू होता ही नहीं है। अंग्रेजी बोलना और नेकटाई लगाना, ये दो बहुत बड़े फैक्टर होते हैं जिन पर किसी कैंडीडेट को चुना जाता है। यह वही तरीका है जोकि ब्रिटिश जमाने

[श्री कि० पटनायक]

में चलता था। जो इस बन्दर-भाषा का ठीक तरह से उच्चारण कर सकता है और गला-लंगोट को ठीक तरह से बांध सकता है, उस का बहुत अच्छा इम्प्रेशन पब्लिक सर्विस कमिशन के ऊपर पड़ता है और अफसर बनने के लिये ये बहुत बड़े फँक्टर हो गये हैं। इस ढंग के टैस्ट्स से और इस ढंग की इंटरव्यूज में जो लोग चुने जायेंगे और अफसर बन कर जायेंगे, वे क्या जनता के साथ मिल जुल सकेंगे, जनता की सेवा कर सकेंगे, जनता के साथ ठीक तरह से बरताव कर सकेंगे? ऐसे अफसरों के पास न जनता जायेगी और

अध्यक्ष महोदय : आप एक तरह से पब्लिक सर्विस कमिशन पर कटाक्ष कर रहे हैं जो नहीं होना चाहिये। आप ने बहुत ज्यादा जोर दिया है कि पब्लिक सर्विस कमिशन नेकटाई को और अंग्रेजी भाषा को ही देखती है और बाकी किसी चीज को नहीं देखती। मुझे नहीं मालूम कि क्या आप नेकटाई के साथ सूट को भी शामिल करते हैं या धोती के साथ अगर नेकटाई लगी होगी तो उस को ही आप ठीक मान लेंगे। आप इस तरह की नुक्ताचीनी न करें कि पब्लिक सर्विस कमिशन के पास जो लोग टैस्ट के लिये जाते हैं, उन में वह कैंडीडेट्स की इन्हीं बातों को टैस्ट करती है। अगर आप ऐसी नुक्ताचीनी न करें तो बेहतर रहेगा। आप अंग्रेजी को कोसे चले जायें और जितना ज्यादा कोस सकते हैं, कोसे, मुझे कोई एतराज नहीं है। मगर आप पब्लिक सर्विस कमिशन के बारे में इस तरह की बातें न कहें।

श्री कि० पटनायक : मैं नुक्ताचीनी, जिस ढंग का अफसर लोगों का बरताव है, उसकी या जिस ढंग से वे चुने जाते हैं, उस को कर रहा हूँ और यह कह रहा हूँ कि इस ढंग से सिलेक्शन नहीं होना चाहिये। सिलेक्शन

में कुछ ऐसी गलतियाँ हैं कि हमारे अफसर लोग अच्छे नहीं बन पाते हैं, जन सेवक नहीं बन पाते हैं। मेरे कहने का प्रधान उद्देश्य यही है।

उस दिन किसी माननीय सदस्य ने कहा कि जो अफसर हैं, वे चरित्रवान होने चाहिये। चरित्र से उन का मतलब क्या था मैं नहीं जानता हूँ। मैं समझता हूँ कि उन का तात्पर्य यह है कि जनता के साथ उस का जो सम्पर्क है, उस सम्पर्क में उस का चरित्र ठीक तरह से परिलक्षित होना चाहिये। अफसरों के बारे में सरकार का जो दृष्टिकोण है वह भी बदलना चाहिये। अफसरों को, मंत्रियों को, पार्लियामेंट के मੈम्बरों इत्यादि को जनता से दूर रखने का तरीका जोकि ब्रिटिश गवर्नमेंट ने अपनाया था, अभी भी अपनाया जा रहा है। बड़े अफसर या पार्लियामेंट के मੈम्बर और मंत्री बारक्स बना कर साधारण जनता से दूर रहते हैं। तो यह जो प्रशासकों के लिये अलग बारकों का तरीका है यह खत्म होना चाहिये क्योंकि अगर यह तरीका खत्म नहीं होगा तो वे लोगों के साथ मिल जुल नहीं सकेंगे और उन की सेवा ठीक ढंग से नहीं कर सकेंगे।

उस दिन प्रधान मंत्री साहब ने कहा था कि अपोजीशन का माइंड माइंड बिल्कुल नहीं है और पश्चिम के लोग कैसे खाते पीते हैं उसका भी उन को ज्ञान नहीं है। मैं मानता हूँ कि इस मामले में, खाने पीने के मामले में, प्रधान मंत्री जी को और दूसरे मंत्रियों को ज्ञान है लेकिन जो असली चीजें हैं वे यूरोप में किस तरह होती हैं उस का भी उन को ध्यान रखना चाहिये। यूरोप में अफसर लोग जनता से दूर बारक्स बना कर अलग नहीं रहते। इस में तबदीली होनी चाहिये। अगर हम यह तबदीली नहीं लायेंगे तो आइ० ए० एस० आफिसर्स और दूसरे

अ फसर्स जनता की ठीक सेवा नहीं कर सकेंगे ।

दूसरी बात मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि—आई० ए० एस०—नाम को हटा देना चाहिये क्योंकि यह —आई० सी० एस०—से बहुत मिलता जुलता है । आई० सी० एस० अफसरों की जो ब्रिटिश जमाने में भूमिका थी वह आई० ए० एस० अफसरों की आजाद हिन्दुस्तान में नहीं होनी चाहिये । ब्रिटिश जमाने में तो ऐसे अफसर चुने जाते थे जो जनता के दुश्मन हो सकते थे । क्या अभी भी ऐसे लोगों को चुना जाता है जो जनता से दुश्मनी करें ? आई० सी० एस० और आई० ए० एस० इन दो नामों में इतनी समानता है कि आई० ए० एस० अफसरों की भी वही साइकालाजी हो जाती है जो आई० सी० एस० अफसरों की होती थी । मेरा मुझाव कि इस अंग्रेजी नाम को तो एक दम हटा दी देना चाहिये और किसी भारतीय भाषा या हिन्दी का कोई नाम जैसे—लोक सेवा—रखना चाहिये । ऐसा नाम रखा जायेगा तो अफसरों के दिमाग में अच्छा परिवर्तन होगा ।

Shri Harish Chandra Mathur (Jalore): The discussion on the Report of the UPSC has now become almost an annual feature, but my regret is that we have not been able to rise above the return. Even the hon. Minister when he initiated the discussion did not take us any far; he would not tell us what improvements he has effected, what improvements in standards he has in mind, what the policy matters are and so on. It was only a sort of clerical approach that we had from him that in so many cases only, that is, only in four cases, had Government disagreed with the UPSC, and that Government were doing their best.

I pointed out even during the discussion last year that I had no quarrel with Government if for any good reasons they had sometimes to disagree

with certain recommendations of the UPSC and if in the explanatory memorandum which they submit they could satisfy the House about the justification for their disagreement.

I have no hesitation in saying in the four cases in which Government have disagreed with the UPSC, Government are on a sound wicket, and the House gives full support to Government in their disagreement with the UPSC, particularly regarding the period of probation for the IAS officers. Every Member who had given some thought to this matter had supported Government's decision that the period of probation should be increased from one year to two years.

But I would like to ask the hon. Minister whether this question of probation has been given any real thought already or not and in how many cases during probation they have applied certain standards by which there has been any weeding out of the undesirable officers. I would like to have from him certain figures. Previous reports of the Commission also mention this probation. If you look into the reports of 1953, 1954 and 1955, you will find there is a clear mention of the probation period of the IAS and IPS officers, that out of so many officers, so many had been weeded out. I feel that out of the vast number of officers recruited during the last five years, hardly a few had been weeded out during probation. If the period of probation is just a formality, what is the use whether you keep it one year or two years? If you have certain standards for probation and if probation means something real, I can appreciate and understand that the period of probation should be two years. But that is just to tell the House and the hon. Home Minister that we are not very punctilious about a particular recommendation here and there.

The basic question before the country today—and I posted this

[Shri Harish Chandra Mathur]

question last time when we discussed the Report—is this. Let us take stock of the situation after 14 years. Have we after these 14 years of experiment and experience been able to improve the real standards and are we having a set of officers who fulfil the needs of the country or not? The Union Public Service Commission recommends to Government regarding recruitment of officers, their training, their probation, their promotion and their punishment. So at every stage, the UPSC comes into the picture and is supposed to be there to inject good health into the services. The UPSC and the Home Ministry together are responsible for the good health of the services in the country.

Last time when we discussed this matter, we had before us the remarks of Mr. Justice Mulla and other judges about the IPS. Though on the floor of this very House, I had spoken while discussing this matter that sweeping remarks such as those passed by Mr. Justice Mulla were not supported by me, still the situation remains as it is. While speaking about the IAS officers, I quoted Sardar Panikkar and I asked Government to take note of it. We would like to know whether we have introduced any improvement in the matter of selection, in the method of training and in the matter of the probation period on the advice of the Union Public Service Commission, and whether later on certain standards had been laid down which would make the service cater for the needs of the country and of the society today.

The hon. Minister should have thrown some light on these matters. But I find the situation remains as it is. I posed the question the country has now posed; it is not only Mr. Justice Mulla or Sardar Panikkar but the entire country has posed this question to the Home Ministry now. What was the complaint during the

general elections? The most important complaint during the general elections was against the administration. Their complaint was about corruption, about delays, about harassment, their complaint was that there was no human approach to the problems and that there was no developmental approach to the problems. Now, who is responsible to answer this charge-sheet which has been levelled by the public at large, the entire public of this country, or the Government. It has been accepted on all hands that the programmes and policies of this Government, the Congress Government, are almost unexceptionable. They have to be supported. At least I stand here without a twinge of my conscience to say that the policies and programmes chalked out by the Congress Government and which have been given for the country's benefit, for its social advance, are almost unexceptionable. There can be nothing better in the circumstances, but in spite of these policies and programmes, what happens about implementation, and who is responsible for the implementation except these services and the instruments which we are using for the implementation of these programmes? Have we given after these 14 years, and this is the fifteenth year, any consideration to this matter?

I posed this question last time when we discussed the report of the Union Public Service Commission. I say this question has now been posed by the entire country, and I would like to draw the attention of the hon. Minister to what the Rashtrapati said only day before yesterday in his message to the nation on the eve of the fifteenth anniversary of our Independence. Speaking from that position, he had, of course, to use very mild language. I would just like to read a few lines out of what the Rashtrapati said. What the Rashtrapati said was:

"The implementation of the Plan has been somewhat inadequate.."

Now, what is significant is what he says are the causes why the implementation has been inadequate. He says:

"...because there is little emotional involvement on the part of the staff—managerial and subordinate—in the great national work they are engaged in. It is essential for our public services whether they are engaged in Government services or public and private industries, that they should have a sense of pride in their work. They should feel that they are engaged in a bloodless revolution of raising the living standards of 440 millions of people and strengthening their moral fibre. All those who work for the people should be humble, kind and considerate. Economic development and clean administration will help to strengthen national solidarity."

The biggest problem before the country, therefore, is whether we have been able to inject these standards, these traits of character into our services. What steps have been taken, what suggestions have been made by the Union Public Service Commission to make our services such that they discharge their responsibilities adequately? That is the crucial problem before us.

It has been found that even preliminary attention has not been paid to certain most important and fundamental things. Our services still remain rule-oriented. Rules and regulations are supposed to help the administration to go ahead, but these rule-oriented services are the greatest blockade in the developmental progress of this country. Whether it is the big businessman, whether it is the small businessman, whether it is the agriculturist, everybody is full of complaints against these methods and procedures, and much more than that, the mental approach and the mental attitudes of the services. They have not been able to do during these 15 years anything. I am not talking of

1477 (A1) LSD—6.

the old ICS and IAS and what their mental approach was. I feel deeply concerned about it. There is no developmental approach, there is no human approach, and I do not know what steps the Government have taken in this matter.

I am quite aware, while accusing the services, of those people who are in charge of their good health, and I think I would say that the non-officials, including the Ministers, are responsible to a very great extent for the erosion in the morals and the good working of the services. I am quite aware of it, but even here, it is the Ministry of Home Affairs who can do something in the matter, who owe a responsibility in the matter to the country, who have to find out to what extent corrosion has taken place in the services because of the interference of the non-officials or Ministers and their stooges, how far the services are not permitted to function in the manner in which they ought to function, and what safeguards are provided against it. That is another big problem which has to be posed before the Home Ministry.

I do not know if they have even revised their code of conduct for the services. I should like to know from the Home Minister how many cases they have referred for punishment where there have been inordinate delays, where under the protection of a rule an officer has conducted himself in a manner that we have wasted thousands and lakhs of rupees, just because he has been seeking protection behind a particular rule, whether they are developmental minded or not, whether the approach not only of the services, but the approach of the Ministry itself has changed or not, whether they have revised their code of conduct or not, whether they have charge-sheeted people for these deficiencies and faults or not.

I would next submit that we have this Constitution, and in this Constitution we have made a special provision for the Union Public Service

[Shri Harish Chandra Mathur]

Commission, but today the position is that I do not think the Union Public Service Commission is responsible for even one-third of the appointments which are made. Two-thirds of the appointments are made directly by one body or the other. We have now got the public undertakings. They are autonomous bodies. I do not mean to say the recruitment to the public undertakings should also be through the Union Public Service Commission, but if the constitution-makers thought it fit to make a special provision for a body which would be responsible for the recruitment, promotion etc., of the Government Services, what right has any Government or any officer to make their own laws outside Parliament, and without the sanction of Parliament to make recruitment to the extent of two-thirds of the public services? It is the responsibility of this Parliament to see that this matter is thoroughly considered, and a proper organisation is set up. It definitely means indirectly that our Union Public Service Commission is an outdated body, which is not fit for effecting the recruitment and looking after the conditions of service of public undertakings. If it is so, then definitely it is the responsibility of this Parliament, and I crave your indulgence to request the appointment of a parliamentary committee which will report only to Parliament. I do not ask the Government to appoint a committee. It should be a parliamentary committee which should go into the entire question as to how far the Public Service Commission today is a fit instrument to look after the recruitment of the entire services, the various other services for which certain different arrangements ought to be made, and the nature of that organisation which has got to be set up. That organisation must receive the sanction of Parliament before it functions.

If you look into the report, you will find that so far as the public

enterprises are concerned, we do not know anything about them. No report is submitted. They have given this report for one-third of the recruitment, but what about the other two-thirds? Who is going to submit a report to this House, how is this House going to consider it, and how are we going to discharge our responsibility in this matter?

Even to the limited extent to which an industrial-administrative pool was constituted, we do not know anything about it. I put a question. They had selected 170 or 175 officers some two or three years back, and everybody has been absorbed leaving aside possibly five or six, some of whom are not available. We do not know to this day how the recruitment is going ahead, how the managerial staff is being recruited, and what is being done. I think it was on these matters that the hon. Minister, while initiating the discussion, should have thrown some light and taken the House into confidence.

13 hrs.

I will only refer to a few points which have been mentioned in this. We find certain appointments have been excluded from the purview of the Commission. They have been mentioned at page 3 and in Appendix IV. Their services and the designations of the posts are given, such as 'Posts on the Secretariat and Personal staff of the President of India'.

This report makes mention of two exemptions regarding the posts and services concerned with the administration of Naga Hills-Tuesang Area and the Officer for Parliamentary Affairs in the Ministry of Home Affairs.

Regarding these two posts, in fact, we made a mistake when this thing was moved here on the floor of the House. I moved a motion objecting to the authority being delegated to the Government to exempt certain ser-

vices, between themselves and the U. P. S. C. It was the function of Parliament to examine all that. But, however, things are laid on the Table of the House.

What intrigues me in this report is that these two, the services concerned with the administration of Naga Hills-Tuensang Area and the Officer for Parliamentary Affairs in the Home Ministry, are to be exempted and the Commission had agreed for a limited period for the first. I can understand that. But there is no mention about the Commission's agreement regarding the other posts, the posts on the Secretariat and Personal staff of the President and posts in the Vice-President's Secretariat, and Official Liquidators under the Companies Act, 1956. There is no mention as to what is the Commission's view. It is for the hon. Minister to throw some light as to why these posts should be exempted from the purview of the Commission.

We do not want that the Secretariat of the President and the Vice-President should become the personal affair of these high dignitaries. They should be drawn through the Public Service Commission as had been done so far. What new difficulties have come in the way of the Home Ministry about the staff of the President or the Vice-President? Why should there be this exemption; and has this exemption also got the concurrence of the Service Commission or not? Even if it has the concurrence of the Public Service Commission, I do not know why any personal atmosphere is being created round the President and the Vice-President. They are the greatest public dignitaries and they should draw people from the regular services. I can understand the Private Secretary or a particular officer being left to the discretion of the President or the Vice-President. We allow this also to the Ministers. They can also have their Private Secretaries or Personal Assistants appointed by themselves, but not the entire

Secretariat. I can understand some justification if the Prime Minister had asked for exemption of certain posts, for keeping people of his personal confidence where certain things are transacted in a manner and where the personal equation of the Prime Minister with those officers is the essential thing. The Prime Minister has not asked for this. I see very little justification for this.

There is another thing. The Chairman of the Union Public Service Commission goes abroad to various countries to make certain recruitments. About 50 persons have been appointed from them. I do not mind if some of our Indian scientists continue to serve in foreign countries. It adds to the glory and dignity of this country.

While speaking on this subject, the other day, the Minister of Education gave me the fullest support. This was raised by me while discussing the Demands for the Ministry of Education. Certain hon. Members just jeered; but I raised this point I said, what difference would it make; and, if these people have any sense of patriotism, there is no reason why they should not come here. Why should the Chairman of the Union Public Service Commission go hunting for individuals from abroad? I do not grudge the Chairman of the Commission a trip to all the foreign countries once a year. But, I do not think that this is very healthy and should continue.

I also wish to invite the attention of the hon. Minister to the recruitment of the All India Services. Now, I think, there is a very unhealthy tendency which is developing in all the States, to expand the cadre of IAS. Even these jobs which should definitely be left for the Provincial Services, which should be left for the educationists and which should be left to somebody else are being taken over by the IAS; and the strength of IAS is increasing every day. I can understand the IAS officer being in his proper place where his administrative abilities are required.

[Shri Harish Chandra Mathur]

But, if you look at the list you will find that the Vice-Chancellor of an Agricultural University is an IAS officer. It is fantastic. It is doing the greatest injustice to the university; it is doing the greatest injustice to the Agriculture department to permit an IAS officer to be the Vice-Chancellor of an agricultural university.

Only the other day, I read about a certain panel of names recommended by the Aligarh University. They wanted to include the name of an IAS officer. There was no justification for that and there was resentment in the academic world and that is justified if such things are permitted to happen. I do not want to go into details; but I have at least half a dozen cases which I can place before you.

The Minister of State in the Ministry of Home Affairs (Shri Datar): I do not want to interfere with the hon. Member's speech. But, this is entirely beside the point. Here, we are considering the report of the U.P.S.C. The hon. Member has brought in the States and the State services in general.

Shri Harish Chandra Mathur: The recruitment for the IAS is being made through the U. P. S. C. This Government is giving the requisition for it; and that requisition is wrong. Why should this Government want the UPSC to recruit so many IAS people when they are not needed at all, when they are being wasted like this? Why not the UPSC question the Government about their requirements? Unnecessary recruitment is being made and money is being wasted.

I do not know whether it is with the concurrence of the UPSC that Government have introduced this Selection Grade for the IAS.

Mr. Speaker: Probably, the Home Minister wanted to say that so far as the increase in the requirements of the States of IAS officers was concerned, that was the concern of the States and they have only to make the selec-

tion. But so far as his debate is concerned, it is about the activities of the UPSC. (Interruption)

Shri Harish Chandra Mathur: I am criticising the Home Ministry so far as this is concerned. The States do not fix the number; it is the Home Ministry that fixes the number. I do not know whether the approval of the UPSC is taken for fixing the number. I want the Minister to tell me. Definitely, it is the Home Ministry that fixes the number of IAS officers in consultation with the States. It is their job to do it; it is on the basis of that they ask the UPSC to just make the recruitment.

I am referring to another thing. I want the hon. Minister to tell me whether it was with the concurrence of the UPSC that the number of Selection Grade posts was increased from 4 to 85 during last year.

It appears to me that even in the important matter of the conditions of service the UPSC is not consulted. Is it so? Why is it that the Commission are not consulted where the avenues of promotion for the IAS are concerned. I understand from my friend that they did not consult the UPSC when they introduced the Selection Grade. It does not appeal to any reason.

We have made some research and statistics. I would like to know what is the result of this research and statistics. Nothing has been said about it. Because of the shortness of time, I would mention the last point and sit down.

I may make it clear that I am not against personality tests; it is a very important and very effective method of selection, not only in this country or for the I. A. S. but for other services as well. But what is the result of your personality test? Does it confirm to the performance of the officer in the field or not? Here is a gentleman who gets the top marks in the personality test. Let us take those officers

who get top marks in the personality test in preference to the written test. They are selected. I have no objection. But let us examine it, I posed this question five years ago and asked the hon. Home Minister: let us know what is the result and how these personality tests have been verified in the field service. I find, not from the U.P.S.C. report but from the report of the Home Minister and the Ministry of Home Affairs that they had conducted such a study. I should like this House to be enlightened about the result of that. These are important matters of principle and the whole House feels exercised about personality tests. We all agree that it should be there. It has been there for so many years. I would sit down appealing to the hon. Home Minister that we are not interested in individual cases or in the various small facts and figures. We know it is a large establishment and a large Government and one irregularity here or there is possible, but I would request him to go into these fundamental questions and to see that our services are such as to cater to the needs of society.

13.12 hrs.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. Speaker: Shri S. M. Banerjee brought to my notice some difficulties about the business of the House. Five hours are allotted for the Railway accidents and it is put down in the Order Paper today. If we begin it today, after the current discussion, we will have only one hour for the other discussion today; we may get about two hours tomorrow and so we may have to carry it on to Saturday. That means the discussion would be carried on into three parts and will be spread over three days. That would perhaps not be convenient for the Members as well as for the Government. Therefore, if I get the consent of the House, I propose that immediately after this discussion is finished, we may begin the discussion on railway accidents as it is put

down in the Order Paper and carry it on till the end of the day, that is, 5 o'clock and then finish it by tomorrow after utilising the five hours allotted to it.

With regard to the second motion put down for 3 P. M. today, we can take it up afterwards. Objection had also been taken that later reports had not been included though we had got them. The Minister is prepared, I think, to take up with the other reports and notice has also reached me saying 'that this House takes note of the third report of the Commissioner for Linguistic Minorities laid on the Table of the House on 24th April, 1962.' So, that report would also be taken along with the second and both will be discussed and time would be extended.

Shri P. K. Deo (Kalahandi): When will this report on linguistic minorities be taken up?

Mr. Speaker: After the Supplementary Demands.

Shri P. K. Deo: Tomorrow, it is a non official day; it will not come up.

Mr. Speaker: Then it will go to Saturday.

The Minister of Home Affairs (Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri): May I add a word? We agree to have the debate on the 2nd and 3rd reports on Saturday. But as the third report is also to be discussed, could it be taken up a couple of days later? But I entirely leave it to you; I am merely suggesting if it is possible.

Mr. Speaker: Would it be convenient for the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs because it is they who arrange the Order Paper now. I think Members have no objection if two days more are given to the hon. Minister. Let it be Monday or Tuesday or whatever other day convenient to the