

191 Proposal to Convert SRAVANA 10, 1895 (SAKA) Proposal to convert 192 ICAR into Deptt. of Agrl. Ministry (CA)

Complaints made by U.P.S.C. against Ministries and Public Undertakings for not following U.P.S.C. regulations in temporary appointments

12.00 hrs.

MR. SPEAKER: Now we take up the call-attention motion....

1600. SHRI MUKHTIAR SINGH MALIK: Will the PRIME MINISTER be pleased to state:

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU (Diamond Harbour): I want to draw your attention....

(a) whether Government have received complaints from U.P.S.C. that a number of Ministries and Public Undertakings are not following the U.P.S.C. regulations with regard to temporary appointments made without prior consultation with the Commission; and

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: I rise under rule 225, Sir....

(b) if so, Government's reaction thereto?

MR. SPEAKER: No, no. Why do you try to confuse every issue every day? After the questions comes the call attention motion....

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: Rule 225 clearly lays down:

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF HOME AFFAIRS AND IN THE DEPARTMENT OF PERSONNEL: (SHRI RAM NIWAS MIRDHA): (a) and (b). The Union Public Service Commission are concerned only with recruitment to civil posts under the Government of India and such posts in other bodies which have been specifically brought within their purview. In paragraph 34 and 41 of the twenty-second Annual Report for the period from 1st April 1971 to 31st March 1972, a copy of which was laid on the Table of the House on 1st March 1973, the Union Public Service Commission have referred, *inter alia*, to the cases where consultation with the Commission is delayed or where appointments made are *ab initio* irregular. Cases of such irregular appointments are brought to the notice of the various Ministries/Departments concerned from time to time, so that they may investigate the circumstances in which such appointments were made, fix responsibility therefor and take remedial steps wherever necessary. Moreover, all Ministries/Departments have from time to time been advised to follow strictly the provisions of the rules with regard to consultation with the Union Public Service Commission.

"after the questions and before the list of business is entered upon. . ."

MR. SPEAKER: Do you not know the precedence of business? Every day I have to invite your attention to it. Why do you do it every day?

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: Rule 225 clearly lays down, Sir....

MR. SPEAKER: A clause is also there. Please do not do it every time.

MR. P. K. DEO

12.01 hrs.

CALLING ATTENTION TO MATTER OF URGENT PUBLIC IMPORTANCE

PROPOSAL TO CONVERT INDIAN COUNCIL OF AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH INTO A DEPARTMENT OF THE MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE.

SHRI P. K. DEO (Kalahandi): Sir, I call the attention of the Minister of Agriculture to the following matter of urgent public importance and request

that he may make a statement thereon:

“Reported consideration by the Union Government of a proposal that the Indian Council of Agricultural Research be made a Department of the Ministry of Agriculture as recommended by the Gajendra-gadkar Committee.”

THE MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE (SHRI F. A. AHMED): While joining the Honourable Members in the concern expressed by them during the discussions in the Parliament on May, 1972, at the unfortunate suicide by the late Dr. V. H. Shah, Senior Agronomist of the Indian Agricultural Research Institute, New Delhi, I had *inter alia* given the following assurance:—

“My Ministry would like to express its utmost concern over this tragedy and I wish to convey the assurance that a thorough study of its implications will be made in order to evolve a better system of recruitment rules and working procedures.”

In accordance with the above assurance, the Government of India set up *vide* Notification dated June 27, 1972, a High Level Committee under the chairmanship of Dr. P. B. Gajendra-gadkar and consisting of the distinguished leaders of science and education as members, to enquire into the recruitment and personnel policies of the Indian Council of Agricultural Research.

The terms of reference prescribed for the Committee were as follows:—

- (i) To examine the statements and incidents mentioned by Dr. Shah in the letter of May 5, 1972, addressed by him to the Director-General, Indian Council of Agricultural Research, New Delhi, before Dr. Shah committed suicide.

- (ii) To review the recruitment and personnel policies of the Indian Council of Agricultural Research, Institutes and Centres working under it, and to suggest measures for their improvement.
- (iii) To consider any other relevant matters which, in the opinion of the Committee, would help it to make effective recommendations.

The Committee started its work on July 24, 1972 and submitted its Report to the Minister of Agriculture on January, 19, 1973. The Committee have suggested some radical changes in the present organisational set-up of the Indian Council of Agricultural Research. Decision on the recommendations requires a detailed study by the Government of India in the overall context of organisation and management of scientific institutions in the country. The Cabinet have accordingly appointed a Group of Minister under the Chairmanship of Minister of Agriculture to examine all aspects of the matter to enable decisions to be taken on the detailed and exhaustive recommendations.

On the advice of the Group of Ministers decisions on some urgent matters have already been taken. One such decision is that in order that work on important and urgent schemes may not suffer due to posts remaining vacant, action may be taken for filling up approximately 1200 posts that are at present vacant, through an emergency recruitment procedure to be worked out by the D.G., ICAR, in consultation with the U.P.S.C. It has further been decided that the same emergency procedure should apply to any further vacancy that may arise before final decisions on the recommendations of the ICAR Inquiry Committee have been taken. Likewise, it has been decided that senior vacant posts in the ICAR headquarters may be filled by transfer or deputation in accordance with prevailing rules and

[Shri F. A. Ahmed]

procedures of Government, in consultation with the UPSC, until an alternative procedure has been decided upon. At the request of the Government of India, the UPSC have agreed to undertake this emergency recruitment on behalf of the ICAR on terms and conditions mutually agreed upon between the Commission and the Council. The modalities and mechanism of this emergency recruitment procedure have been finalised and the Commission is expected to initiate action for recruitment shortly.

The Government of India is fully conscious of the urgency and importance of this matter and all possible steps are being taken to arrive at decisions on the major recommendations of the ICAR Inquiry Committee, as expeditiously as possible.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA (Alipore): All this matter has got a reference to Gajendragadkar Committee's report which was submitted in January last. I want to know what happened to that. Why not the Minister lay a copy of the report on the Table of the House? . . . (Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: There is no point of order. Let the Member ask his question.

SHRI P. K. DEO: Science is a very powerful instrument of power both for economy and military and more so, for the agricultural science. In an agricultural country like ours, the ICAR has a very important role to play.

Appreciation of the role of science came to this country in the last two decades due to strong advocacy of the late Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru. Large funds were provided and many laboratories came up at that time and the Science Policy Resolution was adopted in 1958. But due to the suicide of Dr. Vinod Shah, a commotion was created in the country and a controversy arose. He died by committing suicide and leaving a suicide note that he is

dying for the cause of science and for the betterment of the conditions of service of the scientists. All these things have raised a controversy and as a result, some of us took the initiative to have a Symposium and at the initiative of Shri Dahyabhai Patel a symposium was held and this book was published—'Wither Indian Science'. Dr. Gajendragadkar Committee was also appointed by the Government to look into this aspect. The Committee has fully recognised the usefulness of this book and the recordings of this symposium. One of the recommendations of that symposium was that there should be less bureaucratisation in scientific institutions. In this regard I would like to submit that the Gajendragadkar Committee submitted the report on 19th January. This House should have been taken into confidence and this Report should have been placed on the Table of the House, we could have had this discussion in the House on the basis of which Government could have taken action. But they have brushed aside all the usual formalities and procedures. The Government has *quo motu* taken certain action.

In this regard we are grateful to the Hindustan Times Correspondants who have brought this news and we get a scope to discuss this aspect of the Gajendragadkar Committee Report. It has been revealed that as many as 1200 posts of scientists are lying vacant when so much of scientific activity has to be done in this country. Gajendragadkar Committee has further corrected the illegal promotion that has been done by reverting Dr. Deo and has made a suggestion that this institution will become a Department of the Ministry of Food and Agriculture. I would respectfully submit that research institution should get full freedom for the work which they do. They should have the fullest autonomy. Once a problem is identified and the object has been defined they should have full freedom and there should be no interference at all. Mr. Indrajit and Mr. Chandrajit who

were Members on the Committee of Justice A. K. Sarkar on CSIR will bear me out. They have hammered on this question of the autonomy of the various scientific institutions. Considering all these aspects of the problem we all feel that the solution of the malady does not lie on bureaucratisation of the institution and making it a department of the Ministry of Food and Agriculture and getting it entangled in the red-tape. The main controversy started because of the promotions. There were certain aspirants there. Somebody was superseded. If this is left to the Government we know what happens. We have seen this in the case of the Supreme Court Judges. We have seen how Supreme Court judges were superseded. In this case we came across many instances. Though they did not commit suicide like Mr. Vinod Shah, instances were brought to our notice where there were interference. In view of all these aspects of the problem I would like to ask him whether full autonomy will be given to these scientific institutions and promotion outlets provided there. The evaluation of the research work done should be the main criteria for promotion in any scientific department.

Therefore I would like to put these questions. Why has there been this complacency on the part of the Government and their dereliction of duty for not bringing up this Report to this House before taking any action thereon? Secondly I want an assurance that it will not be made as a Department of the Ministry where there is every possibility of constant bureaucratic interference and interference in promotion of scientific work. Thank you.

SHRI F. A. AHMED: The hon. Member made a number of observations. But the gist of his question is that the Government has been complacent about this matter. There is no complacency so far as the Government of India is concerned. As far as the Report is concerned, we went into the Report and the recommendations

made by the Committee. After it was discussed in the Cabinet, the Government took a decision that as it relates to a very important matter, the future organisation of a scientific institution, this should be thoroughly examined.

So, it has been referred to a group of Ministers who have had meetings already. As soon as the recommendation is obtained, it would be considered by Government and decision taken and then a final report would be placed before the House.

SHRI P. K. DEO: My question has not been replied. Why was the House not taken into confidence? And why was this report not placed on the table of the House?

SHRI F. A. AHMED: Before it is placed on the table of the House, the Government would have to take a decision on it.

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी (ग्वालियर):
अध्यक्ष जी, आप को स्मरण होगा मैंने इस बारे में प्रिवलेज मोशन भी दिया हुआ है। श्री गजेन्द्र गडकर कमेटी की रिपोर्ट पर हम बहस कर रहे हैं, जो आज के ध्यान-आकर्षण सूचना का आधार है, लेकिन वह रिपोर्ट सदन के सामने अभी तक नहीं आई है। 14 मार्च को शिण्डे साहब ने दूसरे सदन में कहा था कि रिपोर्ट जल्द से जल्द पार्लियामेन्ट के सामने रखी जायेगी। रिपोर्ट जितने समय में पेश की गई या जितना समय रिपोर्ट तैयार करने में नहीं लगा, उस से ज्यादा समय सरकार उस पर निर्णय लेने में लगा रही है। सरकार निर्णय लेने में समय लगाये, लेकिन संसद को उस के बारे में अन्धरे में कैसे रखा जा सकता है? मुझे मेरे प्रिवलेज मोशन के जवाब में कल एक उत्तर मिला है, जिस में कहा गया है—

"The report has been treated as a classified document by the Ministry of Agriculture".

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी

इस का क्या मतलब है? क्या यह देश की सुरक्षा से सम्बन्धित मामला है? या उस रिपोर्ट को बताना पब्लिक इन्टरेस्ट में नहीं है या उस पर सवाल नहीं हो सकती? जब तक आप मंत्री महोदय को आदेश न दें कि वह रिपोर्ट सदन के मेज पर रखें—यह कारवाई प्रायः चल नहीं सकती।

पेन-कमीशन की रिपोर्ट पर सरकार अभी विचार कर रही है, निर्णय होना बाकी है, लेकिन रिपोर्ट सदन के पतल पर आ गई है और उस पर चर्चा होने जा रही है। इस रिपोर्ट के बारे में ऐसी कौन सी बात है कि जिस से इस रिपोर्ट को छिपाया जा रहा है और आश्चर्य यह है कि हम से छिपाया जा रहा है, जब कि अखबारों में रिपोर्ट छप रही है। अखबारों में रिपोर्ट हम ने नहीं दी है। मैं अखबारवालों को बधाई देता हूँ, वे रिपोर्ट निकाल कर ले आते हैं, मैं उन के खिलाफ कुछ नहीं कहना चाहता, लेकिन मंत्री महोदय हम को रिपोर्ट नहीं देना चाहते।

मेरे सामने एक प्रेस कंटिंग है—शिवदे साहब न 18 जून को रायूज आफ इण्डिया को एक इन्टर्व्यू दिया था, जिस से कहा था

"The Union Cabinet has decided that all selections in institutes run by the Indian Council of Agricultural Research will now be made by the Union Public Service Commission."

यह सिफारिश गजेन्द्र गडकर कमेटी की रिपोर्ट में है। शिवदे साहब ने यह भी बतलाया कि अभी तक जो पुराने एप्वाइन्टमेंट हुए थे, जिम में डा० राजेन्द्र प्रसाद की भी नियुक्ति है उन्हें नियमित किया जा रहा है—अध्यक्ष जी, मैं इसे पढ़ कर सुनाना चाहता हूँ—

"In an exclusive interview, Mr. Annasaheb P. Shinde, Minister of State for Food Agriculture, told this reporter to-day that the candidates selected for various posts in ICAR institutes before the ban on recruit-

ment was imposed were being asked to join their new posts.

In the Indian Agricultural Research Institute, Dr. Rajendra Prasad joined as Professor of Agronomy on June 5, 1973. It will be recalled that Dr. Shah, who was senior to Dr. Prasad, had competed for the same post. The two had appeared before the ICAR selection Committee on May 1, 1972."

प्रेसवालों को इन्टर्व्यू दिया जा रहा है, हिन्दुस्तान टाइम्स में ब्योरे से रिपोर्ट छपी है, लेकिन इस सदन के सामने रिपोर्ट नहीं लाई जा रही है। मैं मंत्री महोदय से सवाल बाद में पूछूंगा, पहले मैं आप का रुलिंग चाहता हूँ—क्या सरकार गजेन्द्रगडकर कमेटी की रिपोर्ट को छिपा कर रख सकती है? आप मंत्री महोदय से पूछिये—वह किस आधार पर सदन के पतल पर रिपोर्ट नहीं रख रहे हैं।

SHRI AMRIT NAHATA (Barmer): Specially when the appointment of the Gajendragadkar Committee was announced in the House.

SHRI VASANT SATHE (Akola): Sir, I was one of the members who participated in this debate and I was very much exercised on this. When Gajendragadkar Committee was appointed, I fail to understand why the Report was not placed before the House. We also feel the same way. What is the secret about it? What sort of security is involved about it we do not know will you kindly take us into confidence and let us know why can't it be placed on the table of the House for our decision?

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी: अध्यक्ष जी, मुझे रूल कोट करना पड़गा। हमारे रूल कहते हैं—अगर किसी रिपोर्ट का रेकॉर्ड दिया जाये, हवाला दिया जाये, तो यह मांग की जा सकती है कि पूरा डॉक्यूमेंट टबिल पर रखा जाय। यह काल एक्शन मोशन गजेन्द्र गडकर कमेटी की रिपोर्ट के बारे में है। पहले यह तय हो जाय (अध्यक्ष)

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE (Kanpur):
 On a point of order....

MR. SPEAKER: There cannot be a point of order on a call-attention.

जो आप बात करत है वही वह कर रहे है । आप के करने मे कोई फर्क नही पड़गा । जिन का नाम है वही बोल सकते है ।

श्री एस० एम० बनर्जी : अध्यक्ष जी, मुझे मालूम है कि जिम का नाम है वही बोलता है । या तो आप बोलते है या वह मदम्य बोलता है.

अध्यक्ष महोदय मतलब है कि मैं न बोलू, आप बोलते जाये । ऐसे कैसे काम चलेगा आप क्रिया बढ जाइये ।

श्री एस० एम० बनर्जी : आप मेरा पोटेंट आफ आर्डर मुन तो लीजिये । अगर मैं कोई गलत बात कहूँ तो मुझे बैठा दीजिये ।

इम काल अटगन को बेस किया गया है एक पाटिकुलर न्यूज पेपर रिपोर्ट पर जिम में गजेंद्रगडकर कमेटी की रिपोर्ट का जिक्र किया गया है । आप को ख्याल होगा कि यहां पर पार्लियामेंट में काफ़ी चर्चा हुई थी त्रिप के बाद डा कमेटी को एपॉइंट किया गया था । हम लोगों को उम रिपोर्ट की कौपी मांगने का विशेषाधिकार है । जिस का उल्लंघन किया जा रहा है ।
 Don't you think that it is a question of privilege?

MR SPEAKER: How is it a question of privilege?

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE: क्योंकि

जब मदन में विचार के बाद कमेटी की नियुक्ति हुई तो उस ने क्या रिपोर्ट दी इस का ज्ञान मदन को पहले होना चाहिए, पेपर में पहले नहीं जाना चाहिये ।

It should be laid on the Table of the House first, and till then this call-attention should be postponed.

MR. SPEAKER: He is basing his motion on a paper, That is one thing. The other thing is that Government have not laid the report on the Table of the House. These are two different points.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA: May I remaind you, Sir, of a recent precedent where you had very correctly upheld the right of the Members to have access to the report? I am referring to the Malaviya Committee's report on the ONGC. A similar situation had arisen then and the report had been submitted but it was not being placed on the Table of the House, but it was being discussed outside and revealed to the press, and after agitation in the House, you were good enough to direct Government to lay it on the Table of the House.

MR. SPEAKER: Shri Vajpayee is also referring to it already.

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी : आप रुलिंग दीजिये अध्यक्ष जी ।

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA: What is the solution to it?

SHRI VASANT SATHE: The most annoying thing is the leakage. What is most shocking to us is that it is being leaked out to the press and we come to know it only later. That is the sanctity which is being attached to the House. I want to submit that the sanctity of this House is being lost thereby.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU (Diamond Harbour): The Boeing crash report was placed on the Table of the House only after it was released to the press. This is what is being done by Shrimati Indira Gandhi and her Government.

SHRI SEZHIAN (Kumbakonam): Even from the press report we find that Shri Shinde, when asked when the report would be presented to Parliament, said that Government

[Shri Sezhayan]

needed more time to consider the report and it was not likely to be presented before the monsoon session of Parliament in July. They are discussing the report with the press but not with the House.

MR. SPEAKER: I think the hon. Minister based his observations on that report, and, therefore, it is natural on the part of the Members to enquire about it. He is basing his observations on that report which is not before the House and on which a call-attention notice has already been given.

SHRI F. A. AHMED: I would like to point out to the House that the reason why this report was not placed before the House was that in order to have a useful debate I thought that it was better that the House should also know about the decision of the Government on that report. . .

SHRI P. K. DEO: His intention is to hide the report.

SHRI F. A. AHMED: But since the Members want that the report should be placed on the Table of the House, I have no objection; I shall place it before the House.

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी : अध्यक्ष जी, अब मैं सवाल पूछना चाहता हूँ। अभी तो मैं इस पर बोल रहा था कि रिपोर्ट प्रायी कि नहीं। अब काल अटेंशन पर आने दीजिये। अध्यक्ष जी यह काल अटेंशन इस बारे में है कि

श्री बसंत साठे : आप इस को पोस्टपोन कीजिये। पहले रिपोर्ट मदन में रखी जानी चाहिये।

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी : मुझे कोई आपत्ति नहीं है, यह रिपोर्ट आ जाने दीजिये, तब तक इस को पोस्टपोन कर दीजिये।

MR. SPEAKER: Now that it has started, it cannot be done in the midst. Some Members have already spoken while others have not.

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी : अध्यक्ष जी, यह काल अटेंशन इस प्रैस रिपोर्ट पर आधारित है कि इंडियन काउन्सिल ऑफ एग्रिकल्चरल रिमार्च को मिनिस्ट्री ऑफ एग्रिकल्चर का एक डिपार्टमेंट बनाये जाने की गजेंद्रगडकर कमेटी ने सिफारिश की है। आप पूरा ध्यान देख लीजिये। मंत्री महोदय ने इस सिफारिश के बारे में ध्यान में एक शब्द नहीं कहा है। यह बयान जिस कागज पर लिखा गया है उस कागज के बराबर भी कीमत नहीं रखता है।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : उन को कहिये कि रिपोर्ट पेश करें।

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी : अध्यक्ष जी, दो, तीन मवाल पूछना चाहता हूँ। इस बयान में मंत्री महोदय ने कहा है कि हम इमरजेन्सी रेक्यूमेंट कर रहे हैं और यह कहा है कि उन "कमन्टेशन विद दी यू०पी०एस० सी०" इस में पहले राज्य मंत्री श्री शिन्दे ने राज्य सभा में कहा था, मैं उन को उद्धृत करना चाहता हूँ

The Commission advised us not to make recruitment and, therefore, almost 4,200 posts are lying vacant. They suggested to us that unless the new procedure or the recommendations were taken into consideration by the Government of India, no further recruitment should be made. So, as far as this thing is concerned, we have stayed action.

इस के बाद भी डा० गजेन्द्र प्रसाद के एपॉइंट-मेंट को रेगुलराइज कर कर दिया गया। उसी एप्वाइंटमेंट को ले कर बा० बिनोदशाहा ने शिकायत की थी, जिस का परिणाम उन की आत्म हत्या में हुआ। अध्यक्ष महोदय, उस रिपोर्ट में, हिन्दुस्तान टाइम्स की रिपोर्ट में वह भी कहा गया श्री रजत डे के एप्वाइंट-मेंट के बारे में गजेंद्रगडकर कमेटी ने आपत्ति की है और कहा है कि वह एप्वाइंटमेंट ठीक

नहीं था। मैं जानना चाहता हूँ जब नये एग्जाइ-
 इटमेंट्स को रोक दिया था और मंत्री महोदय
 ने यह कहा था कि जो कमेटी की सिफारिश
 होगी उस के अनुसार एग्जाइटमेंट किये जायेंगे
 तो बिना कमेटी की सिफारिशों को प्रकाशित
 किये और बिना उस को पूरी तरह से स्वीकार
 किये यह एग्जाइटमेंट्स क्यों किये जा रहे हैं।
 इन के स्टेटमेंट को देखिये, यू०पी०एस०सी०
 से एग्जाइटमेंट ऐसा करना जिम में यू०पी०एस०
 सी० से कन्सेलेशन किया जाय दूसरी बात
 है। शिंदे साहब ने कहा था :

The Union Cabinet has decided that
 all selections in Institutes run by the
 Council will now be made by the

U.P.S.C. और आज जो स्टेटमेंट दिया गया है

उस में क्या जा रहा है 'इं कन्सेलेशन विद दी
 यू०पी०एस०सी०'। मैं पूछना चाहता हूँ
 कि "इन् कन्सेलेशन" का मतलब क्या है ?
 क्या जो पुरानी सेलेक्शन कमेटियां बनती थीं
 जिन में डायरेक्टर जनरल प्रोसाइड किया
 करना था, जिन सेलेक्शन कमेटियों ने पहले
 गडबडियां को वही सेलेक्शन कमेटियां
 एग्जाइटमेंट करने रूठेगो और यू०पी०एस०सी०
 का एक मेम्बर उस में जोड़ लिया जायगा
 या हम का अर्थ यह है कि मारे एग्जाइटमेंट्स
 यू०पी०एस०सी० से किये जायेंगे ?

दूसरी बात मैं यह जानना चाहता हूँ
 कि जो पुराने एग्जाइटमेंट्स थे और जिन को
 ले कर डा० विनोद शाह की आत्म हत्या हुई,
 उन को रेगुलराइज कैसे किया जा रहा है।
 डा० राजेन्द्र प्रसाद को प्रोफेसर आफ ऐग्रोनामी
 कैसे बनाया गया ? गजेन्द्रगडकर कमेटी
 ने इस सम्बन्ध में कोई स्टिचर्स पास किये हैं
 कि नहीं ?

तीसरी बात यह है कि शिंदे साहब ने
 अपनी बृतरथ में कहा है कि यह रिपोर्ट अब
 नेशनल काउन्सिल आफ साइंस और टेक्ना-

लाजी को विचार के लिये भेजी जायगी।
 क्या यह सच नहीं है कि गजेन्द्रगडकर कमेटी
 के साथ प्रमुख वैज्ञानिक भी सम्बद्ध थे ?
 कुछ वैज्ञानिक उन की मदद के लिये नियुक्त
 किये गये थे, उन से विचार विमर्श कर के
 गजेन्द्रगडकर कमेटी ने सिफारिश की थी।
 अब नेशनल काउन्सिल आफ साइंस और
 टेक्नालाजी को यह रिपोर्ट भेजने की क्या
 जरूरत है ? यह नेशनल काउन्सिल
 आफ साइंस और टेक्नालाजी वही है जिस
 प्लानिंग कमीशन को अभी एक पेपर दिया
 है और जिस पेपर में जो मिन्बर्वा का यू०के०
 का एक जर्नल है उस के कुछ हिस्से वाइली
 लिपट कर लिये, उन को कोट भी नहीं किया,
 ऐकनालिज तक नहीं किया, और प्लानिंग
 कमीशन उस पर आपत्ति कर रहा है। इस
 नेशनल काउन्सिल को जो देश के लिये बलक
 बन गयी है, जिस ने सारी दुनिया में भारत
 को बदनाम कर दिया, उस को यह रिपोर्ट
 भेजने की कोशिश की जा रही है।

अध्यक्ष महोदय, मेरी शिकायत है कि
 गजेन्द्रगडकर कमेटी की सिफारिशों पर पानी
 फेरने के लिये प्रयत्न हो रहा है। ऐसा लगता
 है कि डा० विनोद शाह का बलिदान व्यर्थ
 जायगा। कुछ लोगों ने वैज्ञानिक अनुसंधान
 संस्थाओं में अपना साम्राज्य कायम कर
 लिया।

हम चाहते हैं कि आटोनामी रहे। लेकिन
 आटोनामी के नाम पर धाधली नहीं चलने
 दी जा सकती है। इस से पहले कि कोई और
 वैज्ञानिक आत्म हत्या करे, सरकार इस मामले
 में कोई खिलवाड़ न करे और इस सम्बन्ध
 में तुरन्त फैसले ले और वह फैसले के ऊपर सदन
 के सामने जाये जिस से सदन उन पर विचार
 कर सके।

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN
 THE MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE
 (SHRI ANNASAHEB P. SHINDE):
 Sir, before my senior colleague rep-
 lies to the queries, since my name has

[Shri Annasaheb P. Shinde]

been mentioned, if you will permit me, I would like to submit that I have not been faithfully reproduced in the report read by Shri Vajpayee.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE:
But you did not counter it.

SHRI ANNASAHEB P. SHINDE:
There are so many things in the name of Ministers. I only want to mention two things. About the UPSC selection, I did mention it; and I mentioned about Rajendra Prasad's appointment. Nothing also beyond that.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE:
Nothing about sending the report in respect of the National Council and all that?

SHRI ANNASAHEB P. SHINDE:
I did not say that.

SHRI F. A. AHMED: Sir, the only thing which I would like to point out is that in many of the observations which have been made by my hon. friend there, there is a misconception about them, because the report is not before the House, before the hon. Members..

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE:
You are responsible for that.

SHRI F. A. AHMED: to make a positive assessment. Since I have assured the House that I will place the report before this House, I think it will be better that these matters are discussed after the report has been placed, and then it will be profitable to have the observations from the hon. Members.

अभ्यक्ष नहीवयः वह भी कहते हैं, आप भी कहते हैं, कर दें ऐसा ।

श्री दल बिहारी बाजपयी : मैंने यू०पी० एस०सी० से ऐप्पाइंटमेंट के बारे में मामला उठाया है । जो रिक्लूटमेंट किया जा रहा है उस का तरीका क्या है ?

SHRI F. A. AHMED: The hon. Member is aware that all appointments are made by the Government on the recommendations of the UPSC. A similar procedure will be followed so far as these appointments are concerned. The UPSC will be consulted and they will make the recommendation and the decision will be taken by the Government. (Interruption)

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: Are you yourself convinced about the reply, Sir?

MR. SPEAKER: There is no question of my being convinced or not. Now, Mr. Y. S. Mahajan.

SHRI Y. S. MAHAJAN (Buldana): Sir, I am glad that the hon. Minister has agreed to lay the report on the Table of the House. It would have been better, in the interests of fairness and propriety, if it had been done earlier.

Now, the report in the papers says that the Government intend to convert the Indian Council of Agricultural Research into a Government department. I am afraid this will be a very retrograde step because, once your government alise a research institution, things become stereotyped, rigid and have the effect of blighting research in the institution. Therefore, I hope the institution will remain as it is now as an autonomous institution and not come under Government control.

In this connection, I would like to ask two or three specific questions. In most of the institutions in our country usually, there are many junior scientists doing research work but they are not given full scope by the senior ones. They are not given powers to purchase their own equipment and materials, nor are they given much scope in the selection of topics for research. Therefore, I would like to ask the Minister to see whether, when he is considering the reconstruction of the body, he will provide for these contingencies, and

see that the juniors will get sufficient scope for their research, that they will have sufficient freedom for the purchase of equipment and materials.

Then, in arranging for promotions, will he kindly arrange to see that promotion is given on the evaluation of the research work, particularly in the case of young people who are talented, who have shown evidence of their genius, and whether there will be any provision for special promotion in their case?

Finally, I hear that the employees of the Indian Council of Agricultural Research represented their grievances before the Gajendragadkar Committee. They have also, I hear, sent a representation to the Government and they have said that they will require some facilities as regards housing and research. I would like to know whether the Minister will provide for these things.

SHRI F. A. AHMED: These are useful suggestions which can be considered when the report is discussed.

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA (Begusarai): Since the report has been placed before us, there is a strict limit on us so far as the calling attention motion is concerned. But I must preface by saying that there have been serious complaints about the malfunctioning and maladministration of this institution. The situation deteriorated to such an extent that the affected person thought it fit to commit suicide. Such a state of affairs would certainly make one wonder whether there is not something seriously wrong with the structure of the institution itself. What appears to me clear is that the terms of reference did not include a radical suggestion like the one for making this institution into a department of the Government. That is my reading of the terms of reference. Yet I find that the Committee has made a recommendation to that effect. May I know whether the group of

Ministers which had been appointed to consider the recommendations of this committee had made any comment on this radical suggestion of the Gajendragadkar Committee and if they have, the hon. Minister should take the House into confidence.

It is reported that the Gajendragadkar Committee has recommended that recruitment should be made in consultation with the UPSC. What we have before us indicates clearly and unambiguously that recruitment should be through the UPSC. Why did the hon. Minister think it fit to modify it? One would naturally like to ask whether it is the policy of the Government that all research institutions should be converted into departments of the Government. What applies to this research institution would also apply to other institutions. We want to know whether it is the view of the Government that the recommendation which has been made by the Committee in relation to a particular institution should be universally applicable to all research institutions.

Lastly, the hon'ble Minister has said in his statement that there were radical suggestions made by the Gajendragadkar Committee. One would like to know something about the radical suggestions which the Minister has mentioned. How long would the Government take to come forward with their own decisions on the report of the Gajendragadkar Committee?

SHRI F. A. AHMED: The reference is to the group of Ministers concerned. Three meetings have already been held and no decision has yet been taken by this group of ministers. We are examining this question from all aspects and whenever a decision is taken I shall certainly come forward before this House and place the decisions of the group of Ministers.

SHRI ATAL BISHARI VAJPAYEE: Who are the ministers in the group?

SHRI F. A. AHMED: The Minister of Industrial Development, the Minister of Education and myself.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE: Because the UPSC is involved, why not include the Home Minister, Mr. Mirdha?

SHRI F. A. AHMED: The House would not expect me at this stage to go into the details of the recommendations made by this enquiry committee. I think it will be more fruitful if all these details are discussed after the hon. members have had the benefit of going through that report. So far as the present procedure is concerned, we are referring all the cases to the UPSC. On the basis of their recommendations, appointments will be made.

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA: The hon'ble Minister has said that the report would be placed on the Table of the House. If that is so, why is the hon'ble minister not prepared to take us into confidence with regard to the specific question whether they have recommended that this should be turned into a Department of Government? What is standing in his way now, because we are going to know about it a little later?

SHRI F. A. AHMED: The committee have said that for a period of five years, reference should be made to the UPSC. Before a decision on that is taken, we have said that so far as the pending appointments in Class I and Class II services are concerned, they should be referred to the UPSC.

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA: My question is whether they have made a recommendation that it should be converted into a Government department.

SHRI F. A. AHMED: I have said, this is a matter which cannot be replied to in one word. It has many

implications to be considered. When the report is placed before the House, hon. members can go through it.

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA: This is very unfair to the House. The whole calling attention motion was based on that. Because of the Chair's intervention, the hon'ble Minister said that the report would be made available to the House. What is the difficulty in replying to this specific question?

सप्यज्ञ बहोदय : कह दिया है जब आएगी देखेंगे। अब आप पूछ रहे हैं। मेरे बस की क्या बात है।

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA: Is it one of the recommendations or not? He can say yes or no.

MR. SPEAKER: I cannot force the minister.

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी : छः महीने से रिपोर्ट पर चर्चा हो रही है। कार्लिन एटेशन मॉशन आया है कि क्या रिपोर्ट में सिफारिश है कि इसे एग्रिकल्चर मिनिस्टरी का एक डिपार्टमेंट बनाया जाए—उन्हें बताने में तकलीफ क्या है ?

सप्यज्ञ बहोदय : मैं कैसे बता सकता हूँ कि तकलीफ क्या है। आप उनसे पूछ लें।

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA: The responsibility of the Chair in the matter is clear. You have been pleased to admit this Calling Attention. It is based on that specific question.

MR. SPEAKER: I have allowed your question and the Minister has replied to it.

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA: If the hon'ble Minister does not reply, what is our remedy?

MR. SPEAKER: It is much better you raise it when it is placed on the Table.... (*interruptions*).

SHRI H. N. MUKERJEE (Calcutta-North-East): Sir, I rise on a

point of order. Do I have to shout all the time in order to attract your attentions?

MR. SPEAKER: Do you think I have many ears to listen to all of you?

SHRI H. N. MUKERJEE: It is peculiar that when a point of order is raised, unless one belongs to one particular fraternity, you do not listen.

MR. SPEAKER: Why do you get excited whenever you raise a point?

SHRI H. N. MUKERJEE: Is it in order for a Minister to refuse to answer a question which has been as far as your presence in the chair is concerned, permitted to be a legitimate question, intended to elicit information? Here the Minister has refused, for reasons unknown to the House, to divulge the information which was very relevant to the questions asked. Are you not going to protect the rights of the House in regard to securing legitimate information from the Minister of the Government?

MR. SPEAKER: Let me know how to do it?

SHRI H. N. MUKERJEE: You should know; you are in the Chair; not I.

MR. SPEAKER: You ask a question. You do not tell me the remedy or reply. Resume your seat, please.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE: You put us in the chair. Then we will tell you.

MR. SPEAKER: The only solution seems to be that we will take up this question when the report is laid on the Table.

SHRI F. A. AHMED: I would like to make a correction. I gave the names of the Ministers who are mem-

bers of this group. I must mention that the Minister in charge of Personnel is also there.

I have no objection to reply to any question raised by the hon. Members. But I would like to point out that it is not such a simple matter that I should say either "yes" or "no" to what has been asked. There are implications of the recommendations made by the Committee. It will be very unfair to the Committee if I say that they have said "yes" or "no" with regard to it. Let hon. Members read the report carefully and afterwards let them make observations.

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA: Why is he behaving like a traditional Hindu wife who cannot invoke the name of her husband? Why can he not mention the recommendations of the Committee?

SHRI SAMAR GUHA (Contn): I am sure that most of the members of this House, regardless of their party affiliations, will consider it a fantastic nonsense to categorise a report on an educational or agricultural research organisation as a classified document. This report does not concern the security of the country, nor does it concern any Cabinet secret. So,—I again use that term—is it not a fantastic nonsense? Under the cover of such nonsense the Hon. Minister is refusing to discharge his elementary responsibility of placing the report on the Table of the House.

The report has been treated as a classified document by the Ministry of Agriculture. Perhaps, tomorrow, a Dairy Farm's Report will also be considered as a classified document. He has stated that it is not known to what extent the *Hindustan Times* Correspondent could get access to the document since no information on the subject has been communicated by the Department of Agriculture to the *Hindustan Times*, and, therefore, the question of any breach of privilege does not arise.

[Shri Samar Guha]

This is not the first time that such reports are trickling into the press. In the case of the Pay Commission's report, before the report was submitted to the Government, the reports were coming in the press. It is a matter to be seriously considered by you, Sir, and by the whole House as to what has happened to this Government, whether it is intentional leakage or whether it is tacitly done by the Government just to create some confusion or whether there is any espionage system operating inside the Government. That is the first question. It is a pertinent question. I want to know from the hon. Minister whether he is going to institute an inquiry to find out who is the officer responsible for leaking out or giving this news to *Hindustan Times*.

SHRI PILOO MODY (Godhra):
Congratulate the officer and condemn the Minister for with holding it.
(Interruptions)

SHRI SAMAR GUHA: I do not know. Why should an officer be allowed to do it?

Another flippant explanation has been given by the hon. Minister that a Group of Ministers was set up to advise the Government regarding the question of implementing the recommendations of the Gajendragadkar Committee in order to enable this House to have a fruitful discussion. What kind of a fruit you will bear. You will bring a fruit for us and say; Either take it or leave it. Is this the way to have a fruitful discussion? What kind of a fruitful discussion? If the hon. Minister has the right to seek the advice of a Group of Ministers, perhaps, it would have been in the sense of democratic humbleness that he should have first place the Report on the Table of the House, allowed the House to have a fruitful discussion and, on the basis of the discussion and in the light of the discussion, he could have considered all the aspects of recommendations before accepting them.

Sir, you will remember, with what a surcharged emotion this House discussed the tragic episode of self-immolation of a dedicated scientist like Dr. Shah. I want to remind you one line of what he said before he died:

"I think, the time has come again that the scientist will have to sacrifice his life in disgust so that other scientists may get proper treatment. Kindly guard the interests of persons dedicated to scientific work."

The whole House discussed this tragic episode and, on the basis of that, the hon. Minister made an announcement in the House that a high-powered Committee under the Chairmanship of Shri Gajendragadkar would be appointed.

Now, this Committee submitted its report on 19th January, 1973. The Government did not feel the pulse of the House, the emotions that were aroused in the House and the poignancy that was associated with it. If they had felt the impact of it, the Government should have taken the first opportunity, the first day of the Budget session, to place the report on the Table of the House.

Instead of placing the Report on the Table of the House, the Minister says:

"On the advice of the Group of Ministers, decisions on some urgent matters have already been taken."

What are these urgent matters? According to the reply given by the Minister, 1200 posts are lying vacant at present. And what is the sense of urgency shown by the Government? On the 19th January the report was submitted, and today is 1st August. Over six months have passed. Is this the sense of urgency that they have to fill the vacancies? Even now they have not filled any of these vacancies? They have only finalised the

modalities and mechanism. In the statement they say:

“The modalities and mechanism of this emergency recruitment procedure have been finalised and the Commission is expected to initiate action for recruitment shortly.”

MR. SPEAKER: You are making a beautiful speech. But it is a question of time. You have already taken more than double of your time.

SHRI SAMAR GUHA: I want to know what kind of urgency is this. They have taken six months only to finalise the modalities and mechanism of the recruitment procedure. And the U.P.S.C. is ‘expected to initiate action for recruitment shortly’. They have not even started it?

In the Report it has been stated that most of the complaints that were made by Dr. Shah in his last letter have been found justified by the Committee. I want to know whether it is a fact.

I also want to know whether it is a fact that the report has disapproved appointment and promotion of Dr. Dey. If it is so may I know whether the Government feel it an urgent matter to take steps against those who were responsible to reject the complaints that were lodged by Dr. Shah—as a result of which a valuable life was lost.

I also want to know from the Government whether the questions of rationalisation of the categories of scientists, fixation of their pay scales, their independence in research work, independence of the machinery of promotion, whether those scientists who want to appear for Ph.D., who want to submit their theses, are being permitted to register their names in other Universities....

MR. SPEAKER: How is it relevant here?

SHRI SAMAR GUHA: These are the main points, Sir. This is how the scientists are treated. I will give you an example. This is the report of the Secretary of the Association of ICAR:

“It is difficult for the staff to seek an interview with the Director....”

I want to know whether all these points were covered by the Gajendra-gadkar Committee.

13 hrs.

Lastly, I have a request to make to you, as to whether you will allow this kind of evasion of responsibility on the part of an hon'ble Minister that almost everytime, without placing the report before the House, they are with an element of impetuous indignity saying before the House.... (Interruptions) Sir, it is upto you whether you will issue a directive to the Minister and the Government that whenever there is any committee set up on the basis of a discussion on the floor of the House, the report should first be placed on the Table of the House. At least before implementing any recommendation of the report, if not the permission of the House is sought, at least your permission should be taken.

MR. SPEAKER: I am completely in your hands.

SHRI SAMAR GUHA: It is upto you to uphold the dignity of the House. It is within your power. They are flouting it, they are violating it with an element of impetuous indignity.

MR. SPEAKER: I will do everything. I will obey your orders.

SHRI F. A. AHMED: The hon. Member has raised the question of

[Shri F. A. Ahmed]

leakage. About my Ministry, I have made an inquiry and so far as my Ministry is concerned, the leakage has not taken place there and if necessary, I will make a further inquiry in order to satisfy myself whether what has been stated by the hon. Member is a fact.

So far as many other matters are concerned, I have already told the Members that it will be helpful to discuss all these after the report has been read by the hon. Members and after they have taken a decision one way or the other.

He has made a reference particularly. . . (Interruptions).

MR. SPEAKER: Have the patience to keep sitting, Mr. Samar Guha.

SHRI F. A. AHMED: He has particularly made a reference with regard to the appointment of Dr. Dey. May I tell him that so far as the recommendation of the committee is concerned, that appointment was held by the committee as irregular. He was appointed in the year 1971 before the committee was instituted. We are consulting the Law Ministry as to how to overcome the difficulty of appointment which was made in 1971 and how to implement the recommendation of the committee.

SHRI SAMAR GUHA: A point of order, Sir. In his reply just now the hon. Minister said that after laying the report on the Table of the House the whole matter can be discussed and nothing can be discussed just now. On what right he has disclosed that the committee considered Dr. Dey's appointment as irregular and that they were considering as to what to do now? What right has he got, to disclose this information? Is there not a contradiction in his statement? The hon. Minister is withholding all the information regarding the recommendations of the committee. . . (Interruptions) I want to know from you. . .

MR. SPEAKER: I have nothing to tell you.

SHRI SAMAR GUHA: It is a point of order. I want to know. . . (Interruptions) I am a student of science. Therefore, I consider it my sacred duty to place the position of the scientist in the Country to-day before the House. He has come out with some fresh information which was not incorporated in the report.

MR. SPEAKER: It was identical question and he gave the same reply. What is the harm? Why not take it up, as he himself said, when the report is laid on the Table of the House? All the matters should be raised there.

13.05 hrs

RE. QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU (Diamond Harbour): We have given notice of a Privilege Motion. Will you be kind enough to allow us to make a submission?

This happened within the precincts of Parliament. . .

MR. SPEAKER: How can bring it up as a Privilege Motion? If something happened inside the party executive meeting, it is a party affair. I am sorry. I do not allow it.

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA (Begusarai) I am on a point of order. This arises out of your own ruling on this. . . (Interruptions).

Mr. SPEAKER: Order please. That is not a Privilege Motion at all.

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA: The party is competent to discuss anything in the party meeting in the manner it likes, but the moment the party briefs the Press, it is published