

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

[Mr. Speaker]

Ministry as well as to the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs but it should be known to the Members.

**Shri Surendranath Dwivedy** (Kendrapara): On Saturday, there is a no day-yet-named motion. That will be all right

13.15 hrs.

MOTION RE: REPORT OF UNION PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION-  
contd.

**Shri R. Barua** (Jorhat): Mr. Speaker, Sir, the U. P. S. C. consists of very eminent persons from different walks of life and their report should be given due weight. I feel, that some matters which have been pinpointed by the Public Service Commission have been answered in the memorandum submitted by the Home Ministry. Unfortunately, we do not find that. A reading of the report will convince us that there are certain glaring lapses on the part of the Government which need rectification. For instance, rules are framed by the U. P. S. C. with regard to temporary appointments. In that regard paragraph 29 of the report and also the appendix are to be seen; it would be apparent that some appointments are made which are *ab initio* irregular and according to the Commission's opinion, it should not have been so. If things are allowed to go on like this it will create an impression in the administrative machinery which after all would not be very congenial for efficient working. One is led to the inference that there must have been some indolence or some sort of extraneous considerations for delaying the references or making regular appointments; in both the cases it does not redound to the credit of the Government. The Ministry of Home Affairs has to see that a clean administration is given to the country and also that rules are framed not to disobey but to be observed in order to maintain a cleaner administration.

Then I may refer to the disagreement of the Government with regard to four cases. I feel that in regard to two appointments the reasons advanced by the Government are not at all convincing, because these two appointments are not in relation to any particular, specialised training. They were normal and ordinary appointments of the Public Service Commission, and after due consideration they came to their decision and gave their opinion. It is not understood why, with such insufficient reasons, the Government should disagree. There might have been cases in which the Government can or should disagree, and there may be cases where the Government may have occasion to disagree, but in order to disagree with the opinion of such a respectable body there must be very solid grounds for the Government, but here the Government's reasoning with regard to the two appointments cannot be said to be very convincing.

With regard to the Commission's remark about promotion in the Central services, the wording of the Commission is rather cryptic. It is not understood what rules they mean; it is not understood whether they mean that the Government do not recruit properly. It is not clear what rules are intended to be framed for the purpose of efficient functioning of the Commission. Therefore, in this respect, I think the Home Minister should give us a clear answer and say what rules the Commission actually mean.

With regard to the Chairman's going about foreign countries in search of students for recruitment to the country's administrative service, I submit that that is a practice which my hon. friend Shri Harish Chandra Mathur rightly objected to. The tour of the Chairman of the Public Service Commission, giving interviews to prospective candidates does not ensure either to the credit or to the benefit of the country. If really these persons are necessary for the country's administration, if really they are anxious to come and serve the country, let