

surcharge. Unless and until we increase our earnings, we cannot increase our expenditure. The justification given by the railways is that they are increasing the amount of compensation, which is no doubt a welcome thing, therefore they are increasing the surcharge. I support it and I also support the surcharge, because if this is not done, wherefrom the money will come to meet the additional expenditure?

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: They say, you economise.

SHRI A. P. SHARMA: We have talked in the past about economy in the administration. But looking to the amount of expenditure, the economy effected is too small. However, I do not want to enter into an argument over it.

I support the proposal made by Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad for a daily mail train from Delhi to New Bongai-gaon via Bhagalpur. It serves the interests of many States. I know in the past also the Railway Administration had held out a promise and even published it in the railway timetable. But subsequently this was changed. Now it is high time that the Deputy Minister of Railways should consider the unanimous demand from every section of the House, belonging to different States. If there is any operational difficulty in running a daily train, they might start with a tri-weekly service, but it must be a mail train, because any other train will not serve the purpose.

श्री शंकर दयाल सिंह (चतरा) : इस बिल में जो मद्दे उठाए गए हैं उनका मैं सपर्यन्त करता हूँ। आप मुआवजे की राशि को बीस हजार से बढ़ा कर पचास हजार करने जा रहे हैं। लेकिन किस चीज के लिए आप मुआवजा दे रहे हैं? जिन्दगी के लिए? मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि जिन्दगी का कोई

मुआवजा नहीं हो सकता। आप किसी के जीवन के बदले उसे लाख और करोड़ दें, लेकिन उसकी जिन्दगी नहीं लौट सकती है। इसलिए होना यह चाहिए कि एक्सीडेंट हो ही नहीं। दुर्घटनाएं इस देश में बढ़ रही हैं साथ साथ रेलवे में अनुशासनहीनता भी बढ़ रही है, कर्तव्य निष्ठा की भावना में कमी भी आ रही है। आप आंकड़े देखें। 1971-72 में 4950 दुर्घटनाएं रेलों में हुई हैं जिन में 2819 लोग हताहत हुए। इसके साथ साथ रेलवे कासिग्न पर जो दुर्घटनाएं हुई हैं उन में तीन वर्षों के अन्दर 142 लोग मारे गए हैं। कल जो दुर्घटना हुई और जिसमें आठ आदमी मारे गए

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: You may continue tomorrow.

15 hrs.

DISCUSSION Re: REORGANISATION OF ICAR

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: We take up the discussion under Rule 193 on the Government's decision to reorganise the Indian Council of Agricultural Research. Shri Samar Guha.

SHRI SAMAR GUHA (Contai): Sir today we are dealing with the Report of the ICAR Enquiry Committee and Government decision thereon. The Indian Council of Agricultural Research deals with very vital problems of our country, agricultural research as well as agricultural education. Agricultural research deals with the vital problems of our food as also the other problems of agriculture. It is known to all of us that agriculture contributes the highest quantum of our national income as well as the highest quantum of our national employment.

Before the self-immolation of Dr. Vinod Shah an impression was created by the authorities of the ICAR that

[Shri Samar Guha]

not only they were doing unique research works but they were taking the country towards development of a unique nature and that their research and developmental work was mainly responsible for the green revolution in the country. They were giving publicity to their scientific achievements not only in the Indian papers but the world-renowned magazines like *Nature* of England where fundamental scientific work is being published, and they tried to create an impression that by the research work that they are doing they are going to open a new vista of agricultural progress as a result of which about 18 million new employment would be provided. On the basis of these claims of achievements of agricultural research Dr. Swaminathan was given the Magsaysay and many other awards. On the basis of that, a number of scientist were sent on deputation to foreign countries and we were getting international aid also.

It is not known to many people that this institution has a budget of almost Rs. 35 crores in the year 1972-73. It is controlling laboratories, research institutions, centres, sub-centres, about 110 in number and it is conducting about 100 research schemes. This institution, with the help of the Americans, in 1954 set up an Indo-American team to go into the functional and organisational aspects of ICAR in which out of seven experts three were Americans. In 1959 a second team was set up in which out of seven experts four were Americans. In 1963 there was a third team, almost for the same purpose, where out of six experts three were foreign experts, headed by an American. I have no grouse against foreign experts, be they from America, Canada, USSR or Japan for the assessment of the development of our scientific work, but ICAR should not be dependent on them.

An impression was created not only here but also in the international world that the ICAR was creating

a unique field for the achievement of scientific work on agricultural problems. But actually in this research institution some kind of monarchical hierarchy was established with intrigue and a coterie was set up as a result of which scientific incentive, initiative and independence were strangled and tomfoolery claims were made about hyperbolic scientific achievements. Government was also benumbed by the glare of publicity that was done by this institution.

Before 1966 recruitment to this institution was made on the basis of the recommendations of the UPSC. But after 1966 this monarchy—I am using this word for the administrative authority of ICAR—get complete freedom as a result of which favouritism, nepotism and all other kinds of gross irregularities were committed by the ICAR in making appointments of scientists and other staff. Even Shri Jagjivan Ram made a very strong remark about the nature of appointments; even Shri Fakhruddin Ali Ahmed made a criticism about it. Mr. Shinde expressed “shock and surprise” about the procedure of recruitments. That is what I find from the report of the ICAR Inquiry Committee. Even then, it was not known to us earlier. Under the barrage of press propaganda, radio propaganda, publicity an impression was created as if the ICAR was the real architect of the green revolution in our country. Everything was almost going normal because all the facts about ICAR activities were not known to us. But it was after the shocking self-immolation of Dr. Vinod Shah who in his last letter said “I shall sacrifice my life so that other scientists may get better treatment” that the affairs of ICAR became known to us.

It was in surcharged emotion and, at the same time, with the indignation expressed about the working system and the authoritarian control of the authorities of the I.C.A.R. that the Government ultimately agreed to set

up an Inquiry Committee. That Inquiry Committee was set up with the highest scientist of our country, like Dr. Kothari who is known as the most eminent Physicist of our country Dr. Sethna the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission and other wellknown scientists also. This Committee was entrusted mainly to go into the charges that were made by Dr. Vinod Shah. To be sure that they did not make any mistake or any mis-judgment about their investigation into the working system, the function and the control exerted by the authorities of the I.C.A.R., they had set up a Panel of Advisors with eminent scientist, agronomist and statistician. This was done to be doubly sure that the investigation work by the ICAR Inquiry Committee was not in any way wrongly done.

What are the broad charges that were made by Dr. Vinod Shah? These can be divided into a few categories. Firstly he accused the I.C.A.R. authority that the appointment of Dr. Rajat De was wrong and the appointment of Dr. Rajendra Prasad was also wrong; secondly, he said, that most of the claims that were made of scientific achievements made by the I.C.A.R. were fabricated, manipulated and that they did not bear with the applied field experiments when they were put on national demonstration; thirdly, he said, there was strangulation of the scientists within working system of the I.C.A.R. and that the scientists were deprived of their independence and initiative in their research work, and, lastly, he said that there were gross irregularities in making appointments of scientists in I.C.A.R.

In respect of these charges made by Dr. Vinod Shah, the Inquiry Committee categorically said that the appointment of Dr. Rajat De was unjustified. The Secretary Mr. Menon, did not care to appear before the Inquiry Committee. Not only so. In a very strong note, I should say, the I.C.A.R. Committee reported that Mr. Menon who was the Secretary of the I.C.A.R. did not appear before the

Committee, he did not reply even to questionnaire of the Committee and that, ultimately, he privately, met the Chairman of the Inquiry Committee. What is the observation that was made by the Committee regarding appointment of Dr. De? I quote:

"The appointment of Dr. De as ad hoc head of the Division of Agronomy, the I.A.R.I., gave rise to the apprehension that he was being favoured and groomed for ultimate selection as the head of the Division." and was "unjustified".

About Dr. Rajendra Prasad, although the Committee said that this appointment was not unjustified because of his academic qualifications. Previously, when Dr. Rajendra Prasad and Dr. Vinod Shah applied for the same post as an Agronomist as also a Project Officer, because of his field experience, Dr. Vinod Shah was selected.

The Committee said that, because of the requisite qualifications of Dr. Rajendra Prasad, his appointment was not considered as unjustified. But all the same time, the Committee observed:

"though, as we have already indicated Dr. De's appointment as Head is open to objection, his presence in the Committee which selected Dr. Prasad though in a sense unfortunate, cannot by itself be said to, and does not affect the propriety of the selection of Dr. Prasad by the Committee."

They have used the word "unfortunate" about the presence of Dr. De in the Selection Committee. According to the two verdicts given by the High Court of Punjab as well as by the High Court of Delhi, if there is an undesirable person in the Selection Committee, the whole selection is vitiated. Therefore though on the basis of qualifications of Dr. Rajendra Prasad his appointment may not be unjustified, but on the basis of legality and morality, because the Selection Committee was vitiated by the presence of

[Shri Samar Guha]

Dr. De, the selection of Dr. Rajendra Prasad in preference to Dr. Vinod Shah was not tenable.

About the other claims of scientific achievements made by Dr. Swaminathan, the Sharbati Sonora wheat has been produced by Dr. Swaminathan in which, he claims a higher protein and lysine content; it was even claimed by him that its lysine was almost equivalent to milk. (*Interruptions*). What the panel of Advisers appointed by the Enquiry Committee say about that? They said, "the lysine content is nowhere near 4.61 per cent, as claimed by Dr. Swaminathan." This is the observation made by the Panel of Advisors that was appointed by the Enquiry Committee. For three years, no field research work on Sarbati Sonora wheat was permitted. This Panel of Advisers took the help of the Hyderabad laboratory, the Mysore laboratory and the Bangalore laboratory, and on the basis of the research work done there, they have found that the claim made by Dr. Swaminathan is unfounded, the lysine content may be a little higher, but it was not so much as he claimed; "it was nowhere near 4.61 per cent as claimed by Dr. Swaminathan."

About Baisakhi Moong, I would like to quote the opinion of the Enquiry Committee:

"There appears to be some substance in Dr. Shah's allegation that Baisakhi Moong did not prove successful in national demonstration. It seems that further experimental and demonstration work was necessary before the varieties were released."

About the Nitrification inhibitors, the I.C.A.R. claimed that by this device the intake of nitrogen can be accelerated. There also the Committee observed:

"It seems that the work is still in its exploratory stages."

When this work is still in an exploratory stage, it should not have been published. About the large-sized

potato giving a large yield, the committee has observed:

"We were able to obtain from the Director, I.A.R.I. the Field Note Books on these experiments. We are gret to say that the field records in these books are extremely unsystematic and that the books are more in the nature of scribbling pads. The physical condition in which they are preserved is also not good....The note book does not record the actual quantity of seed used in the specific experiments. We consider this quite unsatisfactory manner of recording of experimental date."

The conclusion is obvious. About the new strain of maize, I again quote the observation made by the committee:

"It is obvious therefore that there has been a certain confusion in public mind regarding the claims of the high-lysine maize because of a failure to see the difference between protein content and lysine content. In this, the scientists of the ICAR are not entirely free of blame. The subject also appears to be somewhat over-advertised."

About bajra, during the Sri Ram Memorial lecture, Dr. Swaminathan claimed of a yield of 82 maunds per acre. That was also quite untenable by the committee.

As I have already said, the committee has made very stringent observations on the premature publicity made about scientific research work by I.C.A.R. It says:

"While the inquiry was in progress leading newspapers of the Capital and the All India Radio reported about some multiple cropping patterns developed in the IARI which could provide jobs for 17.5 million people....This report appears to be based on the article 'Multiple Cropping in Rural Development'...."

About this strangulation....

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: What about the Government decision?

SHRI SAMAR GUHA: I am coming to that.

In regard to the other allegations made by Dr. Shah's letter expressing his serious concern about the sickening atmosphere prevailing in the campus and unworthy things taking place inside the ICAR, the committee has come to the conclusion that the general nature of the complaints the campus and unworthy things taking place inside the ICAR, the committee has come to the conclusion that the general nature of the complaints made by Dr. Shah is quite justified. Dr. Shah's complaints regarding irregularities in recruitment of scientists, was not within the jurisdiction of the committee. About 900 cases of irregular appointments have been gone into by the committee and about appointments of fifteen specific cases of persons drawing salaries from Rs. 700 to Rs. 2000, the committee found that the appointments were mostly unjustified and irregular. In conclusion, the committee made a very, very strong observation. I should say that indeed the report of this committee is a devastating indictment against the function; the working and also the method of control of ICAR and there the committee said—I quote—

"They have created a crisis of character and confidence inside the ICAR."

The Government appointed jurors and then they appointed another set of jurors and the finding of both the sets of jurors is that except some cases of marginal doubts that in about 90 per cent of the cases they have found that the charges made by Dr. Vinod Shah were justified. The persons who are holding the monarchical bureaucracy, the monarchical hierarchy of the ICAR have been held guilty by this inquiry committee. What is the reaction of the Government to this verdict of the Inquiry Committee? In this House the Government had made a promise that the inquiry committee's report will be thoroughly discussed before the

Government took any decision about its recommendations. The Government further said that recruitment for about 1200 vacant posts will be made through UPSC. The Government made such a promise on the floor of the House. But what do we find? The appointments are not made through the UPSC. I charge the Government that they have not only by-passed this House, but they have shown utterly disdainful attitude towards the rights and the privileges of this House. It is a question of breach of privilege of the House also. The Government have by-passed the recommendations of the Inquiry Committee. They say, recruitment will not be through the UPSC. There are about 1200 posts which are lying vacant. The Salary-range of the posts are from Rs. 700 to Rs. 1800. Now it is said that the Government have appointed the Scientific Committee and the appointments will be made by them. So, I charge that the Government has cynically rejected the recommendations of the ICAR Inquiry Committee almost in toto.

This Committee was set up with eminent scientific personages like Dr. Kothari, Dr. Sethna and others. They have made 27 major recommendations, none of which have been accepted by the Government. Sir, one of the recommendations was that the ICAR should be made a department of the Government, that is to say, Department of Agricultural Research and Education, titled as DARE. But the Government has rejected it. They say that they want to re-structure ICAR on the pattern of the CSIR on the lines of the Sarkar Committee Report on C.S.I.R. They say that the re-organisation of the ICAR shall be on the basis of the changes recently made in the CSIR in the light for the recommendations of the Sarkar Committee. Under whose authority or under whose advice this is being done, I would like to ask. This is the view expressed by the governing body of the ICAR, the guilty body. I do not know whose advice was this, they have not men-

[Shri Samar Guha]

tioned the names of the scientists who made such suggestions. I would like to point out that before making these recommendations, the inquiry Committee consulted and got the views of the ICAR and on the basis of that they made those recommendations.

In regard to the status of the ICAR I would like to state about one instance of what happened in the Punjab High Court. In an Affidavit, the Government said:

"The abolition of the various posts in the I.A.R.I. will be the consequence of a just, lawful and valid decision of the Government of India to transfer the administrative control of the Institute to the I.C.A.R., an autonomous body, thereby securing the maximum good for the country."

And do you know what Government said in the case of another Affidavit before the High Court of Delhi? This is what they said:

"The Secretariat of the I.C.A.R. as an attached office of the Department of Agriculture has continued to exist legally and constitutionally. The staff cannot claim to be part of the Secretariat which is a Government office. They have accidentally come to be located at the duly constituted I.C.A.R. Secretariat."

That is why I say that a dyarchy is going on in the administration of the I.C.A.R.; it is being treated as Government a department as well as an autonomous body, because a large number of the employees of the ICAR are the direct employees of the Government, while other employees are being denied the same privilege. This is my main point. When ICAR authority exerted pressure on the employees, 51 per cent of the employees opted for ICAR service and 49 per cent still continued to be direct Government servants.

The Government had the courage to say that the ICAR is an autonomous body. In these circumstances, the Government has given the Director

the status of a Secretary of the Government of India attached to the Department of Agriculture and, at the same time, he will be the Director of the ICAR also. At the same time, some of the other officers will remain as direct employees of the Government while the others will not be. That means the others are being denied all the privileges and rights that were being enjoyed by other Government officers of the ICAR. This is a kind of diarchy. How is it that on the basis of the recommendations of that Committee you cannot make the ICAR, like the Atomic Energy Commission, Defence Science Organisation etc., a direct departments of Government? In U.S.A., Japan, Formosa, U.S.S.R. and other countries, agricultural research institutions are direct departments of their Government. In India, agriculture has the highest employment potential. This should therefore, be made a direct department of Government. But, the Government cynically rejected this recommendation of the Committee. Under what circumstances have they done this? The ICAR administration was functioning in an atmosphere of despair, frustration, irregularity, manipulation and clique. I may use the expression under a monarchical regime." This regime was set up in the ICAR. After 1966-67, when complete freedom was given to the ICAR in regard to the framing of bye-laws etc. for the selection of scientists as also other staff. These are the main reasons for the corruption spreading into the ICAR.

The Inquiry Committee categorically said that under no circumstances this freedom should be given to the ICAR but all the selections should be made through the UPSC.

SHRI VAYALAR RAVI (Chirayinkil): That is another institution for corruption.

SHRI SAMAR GUHA: Scientists are also to be recruited through the U.P.S.C. Several other suggestions were also made with regard to the reorganisation of the I.C.A.R. and

about the selection of staff and scientists as junior and senior—principals and super-principals. They wanted to rationalise the pay scales of staff but the Government has not accepted any of their suggestions. Not only that, the Inquiry Committee said that they had received about 900 complaints about irregularities in the matter of appointments. They, however, said that this was not within their jurisdiction of this inquiry. Take the case of C.S.I.R. what has happened to it? The Sircar Committee said that there were innumerable individual cases in which not only irregularities but even favouritism, nepotism etc. were shown in the matter of appointment of Scientists. Sircar Committee had suggested appointment of independent Committee by the Government in the C.S.I.R. so that they could go into each individual case on the basis of merits so that the wrong done might be rectified. In this case, the Government have got sufficient powers to deal with the cases. The post of a professor carries the scale ranging from Rs. 700 to 2,000. The Committee said that out of 900 cases, irregularities 15 cases are very serious nature. Because it was not within their competence to deal with the individual cases, the Committee had made certain indirect suggestions to Government. The Government should have come up immediately to appoint an independent person as in the case of the C.S.I.R. who will go through the cases to find out whether the appointments made were regular or not.

What have they done about the persons about whom already charges were considered as justified. The Committee said that in the case of certain officials against whom charges of corruption were levelled, ninety per cent of the charges had been proved. Only in 10 per cent of the charges there may be marginal doubts. What about these guilty persons I want to ask from you as to why you are not taking steps to punish those guilty persons. It is they who had created demoralisation in

this institution. Why don't you remove them from the Institute? Who is responsible for bungling the whole thing? Instead of removing him, he was made Secretary to the Government of India and, at the same time, he continued to hold the post of Director-General. There are many instances of corruption and manipulation in the coterie of officials as made out by the inquiry Committee, but, they have been kept as they were.

The Government have stated about the report on the CSIR. But what about the grievances of the employees. In the CSIR report, they had said that a personnel committee should be set up to go into the grievances of not only the junior scientists but even of the senior scientists and staff who did not even have opportunity to meet the heads of the department what to speak of the directors? There was no scope for dialogue between the employees and the heads. There was no communication between them. They were strangled and there was no freedom in the ICAR at all. This inquiry committee's report has not improved that position at all. As in the case of the CSIR, why should the hon. Minister not agree to set up a personnel committee so that the individual grievances and other things can be gone into?

In the CSIR, another committee has also been set up for redressal of the grievances of the junior scientists, senior scientists and the staff and the scientific side of the employees. Why does the hon. Minister not have that shown courage to set up a similar committee to look into the grievances of the employees and to have opportunities of dialogue with their officers.

I shall conclude by saying that the present regime in the ICAR is a monarchical regime with an attitude of absolute power towards the scientists and having a hierarchy of intrigue, coterie, manipulation favouritism, and nepotism. The authorities there have strangled the independence, incentive and aspirations of the scientists.

[Shri Samar Guha]

It is high time that Government have the courage to deal with this institution firmly, because this institution deals with problems of agriculture, and I repeat again that agriculture is the base of our economy and contributes the highest quantum to the national income and national employment.

SHRI SHYAM SUNDER MAHA-PATRA (Balasore): While I stand to speak in this debate, my mind goes back to the day when Dr. Shah died, died almost as a symbol of intellectual frustration in this country where after 25 years of freedom, intellectual merit is still seldom recognised.

I commend the endeavour of the Agriculture Ministry to probe into the matter. The inquiry committee has produced a report which throws light on many aspects of the malaise that is spreading in the ICAR. But I certainly say that it is far to inadequate to meet the necessity of the times.

As a teacher who has spent a few precious years of his life in educational institutions, and as one who feels at one with the intellectuals in this country or persons who are reading men, from 1952 onwards, I have seen through all the reports produced by different inquiry commissions instituted under the commissions of Inquiry Act, 1952; very carefully during the last one month, I have gone through the reports beginning from those of Justice Vivian Bose, A. N. Mulla, S. R. Das, Rajagopal, Mudholkar Khanna, T. Venkatarama Iyer, Sarju Prasad Govinda Menon and Chagla and others and at last I was going through the report by one commission against Mr. Biju Patnaik. Seldom I probably 25 per cent of the commissions' recommendations have been accepted by us. Mr. Justice Gajendragadkar has a reputation in this country of being one of the stalwartes in rendering justice. Not to accept the recommendations of this inquiry committee will be an in-

justice to Mr. Gajendrakar and the scientists of repute who were included in the committee.

11th May, 1971 was a very crucial day because on that day Dr. Banes died and with the death of Dr. Banes, they were all Banes in the ICAR. I shall read out the names of the five persons who were there in order of seniority; the names were; Dr. S. S. Banes, Dr. I. C. Mahapatra, Dr. N. T. Dastane, Dr. Shah (late) and Dr. Rajat De.

In all fairness, when Dr. Banes died, Dr. I. C. Mahapatra should have succeeded, but unfortunately he was there at that time in my place Balasore, on 32 days' leave. I am trying to put myself above narrow parochialism, because in this report there has been a stricture also against an Oriya gentleman, Mr. Sanungo who is a near relation of our ex-Minister Shri Kanungo or ex-Governor of Gujarat.

So I am trying to put myself above narrow parochialism because in this Report Oriyas have been strictured Bengalis, Tamils, Karalites, everybody has been strictured. As an educationist I try to put things properly in a national perspective. Dr. Mahapatra could not be there because he was on leave (*Interruptions*). I am only trying to add some fervour to the discussion. Dr. Mahapatra could not come because he was away on leave. Dr. Swaminathan let him know that he could enjoy his leave and then come back. It was also Dr. Swaminathan's desire that those who would occupy the position of Dr. Bones would continue till Dr. Mahapatra came back and joined the post.

The office noting was:

"While we have been following the convention of requesting the PC to look after the duties of the Head whenever the Head is on leave or on deputation abroad"—

Dr. Swaminathan agrees with this convention that whenever the Head

is away outside the country or elsewhere in the country, it is the Project Co-ordinator who comes to occupy the post Mr. Mahapatra was the only man next to him in seniority. But he says:

"...in the present situation it may be difficult for the PC to do justice to two jobs for several months".

This is a fantastic thing because it is on record in the ICAR that whenever the Head of a Department has gone on leave, somebody has occupied the post and those who were appointed Head of the Division have occupied the post in addition to their own duties. Even now Dr. Mahapatra is in charge of two posts of Project Co-ordinator for the last 1½ years.

AN HON. MEMBER: Where is he now?

SHRI SHYAM SUNDER MAHA-PATRA: He is still in ICAR as Project Co-ordinator.

This is one of the reasons why Dr. Shah died because in his last letter he had written that this post should have gone either to Dr. Mahapatra or to Dr. Dastane. The letter is in the safe custody of ICAR. Dr. Dastane was at that time in FAO and could not come. To pinpoint the fact that one officer has worked in both capacities, I may mention that Dr. C. Dakshinamurthy now working as Project Director of nuclear Research Laboratory, Water Technology Centre is also Head of the Division of Agriculture Physics. Dr. B. Ramamurthy worked as Head of the Division of Soil Science and also as Project Co-ordinator. Dr. H. B. Singh also worked as Head of Division and Project Co-ordinator, and he worked not for one but for several years.

If this was the convention, what was the necessity of overlooking the seniors and appointing a junior like Dr. Rajat De who never had a First

class in his life whereas Dr. Mahapatra and Dr. Dastane were First classes all through in Inter Science, M.Sc. Ph.D. in America with awards? Dr. Dastane is not an Oriya, though Dr. Mahapatra is my namesake. My only point is that only merit should be recognised. Merit should not be thrown to the dust-bin of history.

Coming back from Beirut, Dr. Dastane took over. It was for a few days that Dr. Rajat De had occupied the post.

There is another thing. I have seen the record of IARI from senior officers. They have said that there had been no ad hoc appointment at the level of an ad hoc appointment for Dr. of which is still lying in the archives

Rajat De? It was certainly mis- of Head of Division. If there was no

There were five posts of Heads of Division which were vacant—I am trying to pinpoint this particular matter to bring home the fact that injustice was done here only. The five posts were: Biochemistry Soil Microbiology, Agricultural, Physics, Plant Physiology and Agronomy. Why did they try to fill in the post in respect of Agronomy only? Why not—all the others? Was Dr. Rajat De so very invaluable a person for that post?

SHRI INDER J. MALHOTRA (Jammu): Agronomy is more important.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE (Gwalior): It is more important than astronomy:

SHRI SHYAM SUNDER MAHA-PATRA: The Committee writes in page 46:

"Dr. De did not satisfy the essential requirements prescribed by sub-clause I of Clause A.....He

[Shri Shyam Sunder Mohapatra.]
did not have even a B.Sc. degree in agriculture, and his M.Sc. in agriculture from the Banaras Hindu University had crop physiology and not agronomy."

He did not have Ph.D. in agronomy; he had Ph.D. in crop physiology. And then, they say:

"This position has not been and cannot be disputed."

(Interruptions) I am only quoting from the Committee's report.

Now, the interview was on 8th September, 1971 at 2.00 p.m. The next morning, at 10 a.m. Dr. Rajat De joined. I have been a teacher and have served in Government, but I have never seen an interview taking place one afternoon and the next morning at 10 a.m. the man has come and occupied the throne! Unless the whole thing had been managed and prepared before-hand, this could not happen.

In the year 1968, for the post of Project Co-ordinator, both Dr. Rajat De and Dr. Mohapatra appeared, and Dr. De was not selected. The Head of Agronomy episode was over in September, 1971. And now came the interview on 1st May, 1972. The lost cause for sacrificing his own life, Dr. Shah. Here, Dr. Shah saw that Dr. De was on the Board as a member. Dr. De was his junior in respect of status, pay and rank. Basically,—I want to mention this—he was disqualified. But Dr. De got the post and on the second interview, he saw that a person who was junior to him in merit, status and qualification was going to judge his merit. Dr. Shah died on the 4th May, and the Committee selected Dr. Rajendra Prasad. I am not going to dispute that. I am only going to bring out certain malaise which has been there and the record of which is still lying in the Archives of the ICAR.

There are other cases also. Dr. Swaminathan is a very reputed agricultural scientist. I am not going to dispute about it. I do not know the ABC about crops, and he has gone to show to the world so many inventions one of them being about dry farming. But there is a letter which I have got, written by Mr. Balwant Singh on the 19th November, 1970 to Dr. C. Dakshinamurti, Head of the Department of Farm Operation and Management, IARI, in which he has said:

"Being an Irrigation Engineer, I personally feel that such deceiving experiments should be discouraged in our Institute which is of a national importance and the land reform policy of the country depends upon the publicity made by the Institute."
"Deceiving experiments,"—he says. And he is an engineer. Further, he said:

"Such unreliable results are bound to affect the farming community adversely as a whole resulting in the conversion of the green revolution into a grave revolution."

This is written by Mr. Balwant Singh; he is not an Oriya; and Mr. C. Dakshinamurti is a man from Andhra Pradesh. He further said:

"I request that the position may kindly be brought to the notice of the Director so as to avoid any defamation to the Institute by publishing wrong results".

SHRI VAYALAR RAVI: Is he the authority to say so? Who is he to say so?

SHRI SHYAM SUNDER MOHAPATRA: I am also an ordinary man as you are. I am only quoting a letter from the engineer (Interruptions). I am on my legs.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: But that is from the file of the ICAR, he says.

SHRI VAYALAR RAVI: What was the criterion for questioning his authority? Who is this man? He is a big cipher.

SHRI SHYAM SUNDER MOHAPATRA: I crave your indulgence, Sir. Let not tempers be frayed on narrow considerations. Let us rise above narrow considerations. (*Interruptions*).

SHRI VAYALAR RAVI: There is a limit to this.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: I may say that the whole discussion is riddled with names. Normally we do not mention names. (*Interruptions*). Order, please. Let me finish. Normally we avoid names here. (*Interruptions*). Why don't you allow me to finish my sentence? But unfortunately the report itself deals with personalities and so I cannot help it. Even so....

SHRI N. SREEKANTAN NAIR (Quilon): Beyond the report why should he attribute things to some persons?.... (*Interruptions*).

SHRI SHYAM SUNDER MOHAPATRA: I seek your indulgence to say that there has been a grave injustice to another scientist, Gupta, whose case is now before the High Court. I have all my feelings for the teaching community. Unfortunately they are teachers. One teacher tries to discriminate against the other teacher. Dr. Gupta was conducting research and this facility has been taken away.

I have to speak a few words about the employees. Mr. Guha has already spoken about them. The committee has said that the concept of society is a myth. I personally feel that after 20 years of service, ordinary facilities are not also available to the employees. They are denied CHS facilities; there are no retirement benefits; there is no security of service or permanency; no right to seniority, no avenue of promotion to supervisory posts, no better prospects. My contention is that it should be part of the Government machinery as it is in the United

States and in USSR, the country which has given us the planned economy. All the interviews should be conducted by the UPSC. Once a doubt has been cast by a committee headed by no less a person than Gajendragadkar, the appointments should be left to the UPSC; it should not be in the pattern of the SICR. It should form part of the agriculture ministry headed by hon. Mr. Ahmed and next to him, Mr. Shinde.

SHRI KRISHNA CHANDRA HALDER (Ausgram): Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, the Government had submitted its views on the recommendations of Gajendragadkar Report on the 12th November, 1972 and the House is presently discussing the report and the Government's reactions thereto. You are no doubt aware of the fact, Sir, that in May 1972 one of our talented agricultural scientist, Dr. Vinod Shah had committed suicide as a protest against the prevailing corruption and injustice in the Indian Council of Agricultural Research. A brilliant career was thus cut short in frustration and despair. But this is not the lone incident. In 1960 Dr. M. C. Joshi and in 1970 Dr. B. S. Batra had committed suicide in almost identical circumstances trying to protest against the bureaucratic administrative system obtaining in that Institute and the suffocating atmosphere that prevailed there where the junior scientists of talent and prospect had no opportunities to flourish and to contribute their best to the activities of the Institute.

My friend Shri Samar Guha has already dilated up on the various recommendations of the Gajendragadkar Committee and therefore without repeating the same I would briefly touch upon some of them. The Committee in its report has suggested that the ICAR should take the form of the Department of Agricultural Research and Education under the control of the Ministry of Agriculture. The Committee has *inter alia* suggested that the Agriculture Minister should

*The original speech was delivered in Bengali.

(Shri Krishna Chandra Halder.)

be the President of this new organisation while two scientists who have earned eminence in the field of agriculture should be its Vice-Presidents. The report has further stated that a famous agro-Scientist should be the Secretary of this Department but he will not be an employee of the Department. The Committee has further proceeded to suggest there shall be two Committees under the DARE namely, the Executive Committee on Agricultural Research and the Executive Committee on Agricultural Education. As regards the membership of these Committees it has laid down that barring the ex-officio members, other members will enjoy a five-year term only.

Now, Sir, in the background of these recommendations and other findings of the Committee which have testified the prevalence of unhealthy practices being followed if the Institute, it is our firm view that the first imperative need of the hour is to root out all sources of corruption and to cleanse the Institute of all such practices as are now being followed causing frustration and despair among the scientists. It is also our view Sir, that we will have to ensure a situation to all the junior scientist working with dedication and responsibility that they should be given proper promotion facilities and their work will be fully recognised. It would not be out of place to mention that over the past few years the research scientists of ICAR had become publicity prone. In the year 1967 Dr. Swaminathan had claimed that Sarbati Sonar variety of wheat seed contained protein and 4.61 per cent of lysine. Unfortunately, the field experiment conducted subsequently proved the fallacy of the claim of Dr. Swaminathan so far as the lysine content was concerned. We have also found that even in respect of research projects, the contribution made by the junior scientists is ignored. While the junior scientists work hard and put in their best to make a new discovery, their thesis is always published in the name of their boss or the Head of the Department under which the research scheme is

undertaken. Not only this Sir, the glory of making a new break through in any sphere of agriculture gets hyperbolic praise in the press and is invariably attributed to the Head of the Department or the boss even though both these gentlemen may not have had done anything in regard to that project and the poor young scientist remains in the gloom of oblivion and his contributions are never recognised either in the press or by the Department. Therefore, Sir, while we plead for more autonomy for scientific organisations we equally plead for the eradication of all sorts of corrupt practices that may be prevalent in those organisations. Ours is a predominantly agricultural country where 70 to 80 per cent of the population directly depend on agriculture and live in villages. Only a couple of years ago we were talking about green revolution but our hopes have been belied and curiously enough we are in a worst situation today. Why should it be so? If we could make the result of agricultural research available to the village farmers and encourage them to adopt the modern methods of science we could have turned the corner for good but unfortunately that is not the case prevailing in the country today. Much of the benefits of research remain confined to the institute and never reach the farmer and added to this we are also unable to develop methods which will suit our own conditions. This is the main reason why we find that we have often to borrow the agricultural methods which have been developed either by the Ford Foundation or the Rockefeller Institute or the Japanese methods and we have to graft these alien methods to our agricultural system whether suit our conditions or not. We have to keep borrowing. But if you are really interested to attain self-sufficiency in regard to foodgrains then something drastic has to be done. The prevailing situation in the country is not only difficult but truly speaking it is awe inspiring. In the State of Maharashtra, Rajasthan and West Bengal we are not only suffering from inadequate supply of foodgrains but honestly speaking a

state of famine actually prevails in some parts of these States. In order to get rid of such situations and avoid their recurrence in future it is but essential that the work of the agricultural research has to be conducted with far more seriousness than is being done at present. And particularly working of the State units have to be toned up to achieve maximum efficiency and result. But if we look at the things as they are prevailing I feel really disappointed, Sir. You will be surprised to know Sir, that out of 35 lakhs of students who go in for higher education and research only 1.2 per cent of them offer themselves for agricultural studies. Should we not have more agro-scientists in our country to help and guide the millions of our country agriculturists through new paths of knowledge and new techniques of agriculture to maximise production and thereby attain a permanent self-sufficiency in matters of foodgrains? I would like to emphasise in this connection Sir, that the benefits of agricultural research and discoveries being made by the Research Institute in regard to high yielding varieties of seed do not reach the poor farmers. It is the rich farmers, jotdars, and the landlords who only benefit from the high yielding variety of seeds and this is the precise reason why the rich farmers have grown richer and the poor still poorer. It is but proper and just that this imbalance is set right and a system is evolved whereby the benefits of research must essentially reach the millions of our poor farmers and they are not restricted among the richer agriculturists only.

I would further suggest that in order to ensure a proper and a systematic study of agricultural science and for conducting research therein the Government must consider the feasibility of founding an all India Agricultural Research Service. If it is done, I am sure, the problems of the junior scientists who have no promotion avenues at present and who cannot look forward for a promising future will be solved to a great extent. It cannot be denied that much of the

difficulties of the agro-scientists today have resulted from the bureaucratic attitude of the IAS officers who are at the helm of the administrative wing of the Ministry. There is no justification, Sir, why the brilliant agro-scientists of our country should not enjoy the same pay-scale, service conditions and status as is being enjoyed by IAS officers today? This disparity must end and sooner the better.

Yet another aspect of the matter on which I would like the Government to pay their attention is the question of people's cooperation in the field of agriculture both in regard to formulation of plans and also for research activities. Not only that the organisations should enjoy more autonomy and there should be proper decentralisation of authority giving more and more facilities to young scientists to shoulder greater responsibilities but it is also necessary that people's cooperation should be sought and the MPs, MLAs, Kisan Sabhas, etc. should find due representation in the advisory committees. (*Interruptions*). Yes, Sir, this is very necessary. Not that these persons will be actually conducting the research but they would atleast be able to make the research workers know the difficulties of the agriculturists. It is an irony Sir, that the down to earth cultivators of our country are not consulted for anything because of the bureaucratic attitude of the officers of the Ministry of Agriculture and this is the main reason why our research and approach to agriculture always remain unrealistic to the present conditions prevailing in our country. I have no hesitation to say Sir, that our agro-scientists will also benefit a lot in their research activities if they have the benefit of practical experience of the poor illiterate cultivators who may not have proper education but who have fund of experience in the field.

16 hrs.

Before I wind up Sir, I would also like to suggest that the Government

[Shri Krishna Chandra Halder]

is at present pursuing an anti-labour policy in regard to class III and IV and low paid employees of IARI and its affiliated institutions. These employees do not have a proper pay scales, security of job and promotional avenues. The Indian Express dated 7th June 1973 has carried a news item which says that because of this anti-labour attitude of the Government the staff of the IARI had to go on a Dharna before the Institute and this was led by our Congress member, Shri Shashi Bhusan MP. We feel Sir, that unless our attitude to the workers of the Institute under goes a thorough change we would never be able to solicit their best cooperation and I would suggest in this connection that all such employees be given the minimum need based wage which has been accepted by Government in principle.

Finally, Sir, it is our view that along with the autonomy of research organisations the administrative machinery must be freed from all corrupt practices and the young and junior scientists should be trusted more and given proper opportunities to go ahead in their carrier. Without a proper development of agricultural research, attainment of self-sufficiency will always remain a phony word. Let us create a situation where death of scientist is not repeated again, where he has not to languish and is not compelled to sacrifice his life for eradication of corruption and for better opportunities being made available to them.

SHRI VASANT SATHE (Akola): Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, the Gajendragadkar Committee was appointed in 1972 with the following terms of reference:

- “(i) to examine the statements and incidents mentioned by Dr. Vinod Shah in his letter of May 5, 1972, addressed by him to the Director-General, the Indian Council of Agricultural Research before Dr. Shah committed suicide;
- (ii) to review the recruitment and personnel policies of the Indian

Council of Agricultural Research, Institute and Centres working under it and suggest measures for their improvement; and

- (iii) to consider any other relevant matter which in the opinion of the Committee would help it to make effective recommendations.”

The Committee consisted of, as we know, apart from the ex-Chief Justice of India, Mr. P. B. Gajendragadkar, the Vice-Chancellor of Bombay University, eminent scientist prof. D. S. Kothari, Dr. Nag Chaudhuri, Dr. H. N. Sethna, Dr. Venkatappiah and Dr. Kanungo. They had also got the advice of an Advisory Committee consisting of Dr. V. M. Dandekar, Dr. L. S. Nagi, Dr. J. S. Patel and Dr. Rao on certain matters

After taking a lot of evidence and examining various documents and other things, they have given this Report.

There are two basic recommendations which are made in this Report. The first is about the reorganisation of the I.C.A.R. and they have, in brief, suggested that the I.C.A.R. should become a Department of the Agriculture Ministry. They have given their well-considered reasons as to why they have come to this conclusion. I will not go into all that. But in Chapter VIII, they have given reasons in detail.

The history of ICAR shows that, in 1929, it was first registered as a society under the Indian Societies (Registration) Act. Then in 1930, by a Resolution of the Government of India it was made an attached office of the Department of Agriculture. This continued to be an attached office till 1947. Originally it was Imperial Council of Agricultural Research and after 1947 it became the Indian Council of Agricultural Research but was an attached office. After independence, three committees were appointed mostly known as Indo-American expert committees in 1954, 1955 and

1959; in 1963 also there was another committee which was appointed with an American scientist as the head. They made their recommendations. It was on the recommendations made by these committees that the ICAR came to be reorganized.

In 1966 the major reorganization took place when recruitment to ICAR was taken away from the UPSC and given to the ICAR. A certain autonomy was given to the ICAR; greater powers were given to them. Recruitment is one aspect which covers the whole working of the ICAR. Because that was there, the dissatisfaction among the scientists grew and a scientific atmosphere could not be created and scientists like Dr. Shah were forced to commit suicide. That is why, the recruitment policy of ICAR becomes relevant.

Now let us consider how things developed after reorganisation in 1966. Not only Ministers like Shri Jagjiwan Ram, the then Food Minister, Shri F.A. Ahmed and Shri Shinde but also the others found that selections in the ICAR had become chaotic. In fact, after this autonomy in internal selection was given it was found that there was more political influence. This is one of the answers given that if we accept the recommendation and give it to UPSC and do not give this autonomy, there may be political influences working. But I would say that the moment it was taken away from the UPSC and given to the ICAR, political influence started coming in. The Minister was influenced, notes from MPs and notes from other influential persons started coming in.

I have no time, Sir; otherwise, I could quote chapter and verse from this report to point out in *extenso* what kind of havoc was being caused in the selection matters in the ICAR. Because this type of thing was happening, they suggested, 'Let it go to the UPSC which is an independent body'. The most important thing is a sense of detachment and independence. This has to be there if a fair selection is to be made. You can try

for five years and if you find that a new independent body of scientists like the UPSC can be created, you may create that. But let it not be connected in any way with or under the ICAR because the moment it comes under the ICAR—today 'X' may be there and tomorrow another gentleman may come—it is liable to be influenced by the persons who are in charge. They have in fact said that the Minister himself should not be the head of the ICAR where selections are done because the Minister is the person who is most amenable to influence whoever be the Minister. That is a fact of our political life. Therefore, this suggestion was made.

My second suggestion is about reorganization. One is about giving selections to the UPSC and there came the question of one of the charges about Mr. De. As regards De's appointment is concerned, the committee has come to the categorical conclusion—page 47 of the report:

"Apart from this aspect of the matter, however, it seems to us clear that on the terms of the advertisement, Dr. De did not possess the basic qualifications prescribed by clause (A)."

Then on page 48 they say:

"We would also like to make some observations regarding the manner in which selection to this post was rushed through. Interview for the post of Head of the Division of Agronomy was held on 8-9-71...."

And on 9-9-71 his appointment was made. The Minister himself in a minute recorded:

"I have received one more copy of similar representations before the interview. I had called for the file. I am surprised that before these representations were disposed of, the selection has been finalised."

Then they say:

"Shri T. P. Singh in his deposition before the committee reasserted his dissatisfaction with the manner in

[Shri Vasant Sathe]

which the appointment was rushed through."

The committee, therefore, concluded that the appointment of Dr. De as Head of the Division of Agronomy was not properly made.

These are the grounds, well-catalogued and well-considered by no less a person than a former Chief Justice who has no interest in any one here or there and scientists like Shri H. N. Sethna and Prof. D. S. Kothari. Does this report deserve any weight or not?

Another aspect is about making the ICAR as a Department of the Government. If the Americans recommend a certain thing, we easily swallow that and follow their recommendations and accept most of them. But if the Indian experts give a recommendation, you are going to throw it into the waste paper basket. Why do you not give it a trial? Why do you not say that we will accept this report? Because what are the grounds and the reasonings which you have given here? In countries like USA, agricultural research and education is under the Government as a Department. So also in USSR. Two different systems. In Japan it is under the Government system. Are you out of the world? What about Atomic Energy which is under the Prime Minister in this country? Why is it that in respect of agriculture which is the basis of our economy and on which the whole country's prosperity depends, you want to euologise autonomy. Then, mind you, they have said that they have not taken away the autonomy in what they have proposed as a new organization. They have not said anywhere, "Take away the autonomy." In fact they have given an in-built mechanism of how that autonomy can be maintained. They have suggested this in paragraph 8 when they suggest a new organization called Organization of the Department of Agricultural Research and Education. Then they say:

"We feel that the time has now come when the Central Govern-

ment should itself directly take up agricultural research as one of its responsibilities rather than entrust it to a Society or a Corporation."

This they described as a myth, and myth it is. Then they say:

"In order that coordination of research is done in an effective manner the ICAR should enjoy a status which would enable it to deal with the State Govt. and the Universities on the same footing as other bodies under the Central Government are able to do. It would be possible to achieve this objective if the ICAR is converted into a Department of Agricultural Research and Education under the Ministry of Agriculture."

I am only confining myself to the basic recommendations. I have not in mind any personality. In fact I may say that I regard Dr. Swaminathan as a pride of this country, as one of the most eminent scientists that Mother India has produced in this field, but as they have stated, scientists should remain as scientists. If he becomes an administrator in fact he ceases to be a scientist. Dr. Swaminathan has said so before the Commission. I would very much wish that Dr. Swaminathan should come back as a scientist and help research and guide research and should not continue to have this position as Administrator, Director-General-cum-Secretary. cum this and that and if we do so, we are ruining a good man and it will be a loss to the country. It should be taken directly as a responsibility of the Government. I give my support to the report. I really do not understand why basic recommendations should not be accepted, for which no valid reasons have been given.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA (Alipore): The unfortunate and tragic suicide of Dr. Vinod Shah was debated in this House sometime in May 1972. Emotions were running high, quite naturally and the demand was unanimous for a thorough inquiry and investigation into working of the ICAR and the

IARI. After this passage of time, the results of this Inquiry are before us together with the Government's decisions thereon. Personally I am a bit cautious about this, but I am feeling a little gratified today. I am sorry, I cannot agree with my friend Mr. Sathe with whom I agree on many matters. And, I find myself surprisingly gratified by my friend Mr. Samar Guha's remarks today, because, I was a humble Member of the Sarkar Committee on the CSIR and very trenchant remarks were made by Mr. Samar Guha on the floor of the House when we were discussing the Sarkar Committee's Report. He vehemently stated at that time that the report should not be accepted because it was a motivated report, it was being drafted under pressure and so on and so forth. But today I find him here pleading that this Sarkar Committee Report should be accepted *in toto* and whatever lapses there are in this report can be made up by following what the Sarkar Committee has stated. And then he asked: Why did they not have the courage to do at least what the Sarkar Committee did in respect of certain things.

SHRI SAMAR GUHA: Because that provision was not there. The CSIR Committee was not constituted of the scientists. It was an admixture of politicians, administrators and a few scientists.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA: I quite agree—I am not saying that the Sarkar Committee was a perfect Committee. But, Mr. Guha is not right when he said that there were no eminent scientists on it.

SHRI SAMAR GUHA: I said that there were a few scientists. It is on record of this House that a report was first prepared and it was completely tampered and I produced that and placed it on the Table of the House. That was on this basis. That report was changed under pressure of the Government. That was my contention. I placed the original document

on the Table of the House which is on record.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA: Unfortunately, Shri Guha gets provoked whenever I speak. I was hoping he would get over this habit.

SHRI SAMAR GUHA: I only stated the facts. Why should I get provoked?

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA: When I spoke on that occasion, I had commended to Government that certain aspects of the Sarkar Committee's recommendations should be borne in mind when this matter of the I.C.A.R. is looked into.

I was referring to the aspects which are particularly directed at ensuring the autonomy and the scientific atmosphere of research institutes in our country. I do not say that you should equate the C.S.I.R., national laboratories or the I.C.A.R. with the Atomic Energy Commission or the Defence Science set-up because those two are on a separate footing, as far as I understand them, for obvious reasons of security and so on. But, in this type of organisation, I have said at that time and I still maintain it that to convert this simply into a Department of the Government would mean the death-knell of scientific research in this country.

Now, of course, Mr. Sathe and others have cited the examples of other countries and so on. I am not in a position to discuss what happens in the U.S.A. or in Japan or in U.S.S.R. because we are in India and I am concerned with what goes on in this country and not in other countries. Here I am not generally in favour of governmentalising—if I may use that expression—these research institutes. What was this I.C.A.R. suffering from actually? Was it suffering from an over-dose or under-dose of bureaucratisation? Unfortunately, Government was responsible for this. For many years, they could never make up their minds whether the I.C.A.R. should

[Shri Indrajit Gupta]

be autonomous or not. Its autonomy was limited in various ways that the Government sometimes said that it is autonomous when there was a question connected with the problems of recruitment, promotion and so on. But, when it comes to the overall administration, we were told by Government that the government rules and regulations would apply to it. We cannot do anything about it.

Now, I find from this statement which has been laid here on the 12th of November in both Houses of Parliament—it says:

“The basic rationale was that the traditional practices of Government may not be the most appropriate ones for a body primarily concerned with the purpose of promotion of research. However, this has been believed in practice for two reasons as far as I.C.A.R. is concerned. Firstly, in terms of its administrative links with the other arms of the Central Government and in terms of financial procedures, the I.C.A.R. was treated as an attached office of the Ministry of Agriculture.”

This is how it was being treated in fact.

“Secondly, even in regard to what may be regarded as the internal management, procurement of equipments, stores, construction of buildings and so on, the *de jure* autonomy was eroded by application to it of all the relevant rules of the Central Government *mutatis mutandis*.”

So, if this belated admission of the Government is true, what we have always suspected is a fact namely that the ICAR from the beginning had neither the basis for being properly autonomous or the benefits, if you like to call it so, of being a full-fledged Government organisation. I do not know exactly how to describe it, but it was a sort of hybrid thing without a well-defined basis.

Now, the Gajendragadkar Committee has come out very strongly in favour

of its conversion into a department of the Government. I have very great respect for the authors of this report. I am not a scientist, and, therefore, I fear to tread into those places where angels fear to tread. But I must say that I do not agree, and for once, I must commend Government for not having accepted that recommendation.

But what have Government done? They seem to be in two minds. A kind of uneasy compromise has been brought about by saying that the ICAR will be retained as an autonomous body and also along with that, a new department is to be created under the Ministry known as the Department of Agricultural Research and Education. The idea, as I understand is that certain administrative support which the ICAR lacks in its relations with the Government is to be provided by this department acting as a link. I do not know actually how this is going to work in practice. It is for the hon. Minister to enlighten us. Secondly, I am feeling a bit uneasy because it seems that a very important part of agricultural research activity, namely international collaboration is to be made the direct responsibility of this Department, if I have correctly understood it. If that be so, I would also like to know what guidelines are going to be laid down, because in my earlier submissions in this House, I had particularly pointed out that in the ICAR and IARI there had been a very sad experience of things which had been happening, under the plea and guise of bringing in foreign expertise; all sorts of so-called experts from various countries had not only been brought in but had been put into positions including even membership of selection committees, let alone other vantage positions, in such a way that our own Indian scientists were in many cases feeling resentful and frustrated because of the privileges being given and the powers being given in many cases to those people on the ground that they were foreign experts. I am all for international cooperation, but the guidelines

for it should be laid down for this new department which is being set up now. A lot of fishy things has gone on in the name of foreign expertise. I have no time to go into some of those things which I had listed last time. But from the point of view of self-reliance which is the most important thing for us in the field of agriculture, because it is really a battle of survival for us now, it is essential to see that in the name of bringing in foreign expertise, nothing is done which hinders or frustrates our advance towards self-reliance at as early a stage as possible.

The whole essence of a scientific research institute should be its flexibility in structure. I had argued last time that if that flexibility had been there, this unfortunate situation would not have arisen where Dr. Rajendra Prasad and Dr. Vinod Shah were as it were pitted against each other as though they were rivals or competitors. It is not a government office or a government department where people have always to go in for examinations and competitions against each other. This is a scientific institute, and the extraordinary thing was that both these scientists, young gifted scientists, had practically the same qualifications and here was an institute which could not absorb both of them, which created a situation in which both felt as though they were rivals to each other and competitors to each other and ended up with one of them taking his life.

This flexibility of structure can only be ensured, if in the words of the Government's statement, if they really mean it, greater autonomy and flexibility in its operational management procedures is laid down and a new personnel system is evolved which does not involve recurring applications and competition among scientists themselves.

We found some malady in the decision-making processes in the CSIR. There were some complaints that it was not being broad-based enough; younger scientists were feeling frustrated; they had complaints against

the senior scientists; they felt decisions were taken without their being consulted, without their being associated with vital projects, and then all the credit was taken by a few top scientists and so on. We have made some recommendations,—I do not know what they are worth—in which we sought to remove this feeling of frustration by making the whole process of association and consultation within the Institute much more democratic and broad-based. I see Government has come forward with acceptance of some of these things in principle. As far as I am concerned, I welcome them, provided these things are actually concretised, defined and properly implemented.

There are certain omissions here also, very serious omissions. Some of them have already been mentioned! I agree with those points. There was nothing in the terms of reference to deal with those things. So one cannot blame the Committee about those cases of irregularities, about 500 or 900 complaints actually represented before the Committee, being left undecided. But the Committee should have ruled them out by saying that these were outside their terms of reference, so they did not propose to entertain them. They did not do that. I am not blaming them for that. A situation like that does arise. But having heard all those complaints and grievances, they say at the end that because their terms of reference did not extend to that, there was nothing they could do about them. Leaving the whole thing hanging in mid-air like that is, I think, a very unsatisfactory state of affairs altogether. I think Government have the power to come forward and take some decision so that these cases which have been put on record are at least looked into, investigated and disposed of in a satisfactory manner by some independent agency outside the ICAR. This is essential.

I find that the Committee have suggested some improvements on the previous system of maintaining confidential reports, but they have not gone

[Shri Indrajit Gupta]

as far as we went in the Sarkar Committee. I have no time to make a detailed comparison between the two. But I would request Government to look into this particular matter carefully. An atmosphere of secrecy cannot prevail in a research institute in terms of the performance of individual scientists. It is not a government department where that type of annual confidential report is prepared in secret, kept secret. Such a thing in a research institute will be absolutely the worst thing possible for the scientists. Here the whole idea is to make an assessment report, an evaluation report of the scientist based on his work which is first prepared at his own level, then the Director and other people add their comments, and if there is a dispute over it, the matter can be discussed and then the final assessment or evaluation is made of his work.

About the grievance machinery, which Shri Samar Guha mentioned, I am surprised there is nothing here about it. What is to happen to all these employees? I am not talking only of the scientists; there are a whole lot of employees who are called Research side staff of the ICAR. They have got myriads of complaints about promotions, service conditions, leave facilities, salary scales and so on. But there seems to be no mechanism to look into these. They complain that in the ICAR they have no way of approaching the higher authorities. Therefore, I would like to know whether Government are contemplating some machinery, not, of course, on trade union lines, but some grievance machinery, some joint machinery, some kind of Staff Council or something of that kind whereby they are able to ventilate their legitimate grievances which can be disposed of expeditiously.

I hope all these things will be looked into and some general improvement brought about in this way.

SHRI INDER J. MALHOTRA. (Jammu): This Report has two main aspects, one concerning the very basic structure of agricultural research in the country and the other, which is a matter of detail, which deals with some irregularities committed in the past in promotions and other things.

Now, before I take up any other recommendations or points mentioned in this report, I would like to go on record to say that I would like to pay the highest tributes to our agricultural scientists in this country, because they have really done a very good work which has enabled this country to achieve a major breakthrough as far as agricultural production is concerned. So, let us not approach this problem with this thing in mind, namely, that everything is wrong as far as agricultural research in this country is concerned. Let us, be more objective about it.

I know, and I can recall the year of 1959 when unfortunately Dr. Joseph of the Indian Agricultural Research Institute committed suicide due to mere administrative frustration. At that time also, it was promised by the Central Government that they would **deeply look into the structure of the whole agricultural research and the atmosphere prevailing in our research institutions.** Even today, I would say that the most important thing is the atmosphere which prevails in our research institutions. As Mr. Indrajit Gupta was saying,—I would like to support his argument—it is very important that our scientists working in the research institutions must have full confidence and full freedom in the work which they are doing. It is rather the duty not only of the Indian Council of Agricultural Research but also of the Ministry of Food and agriculture from time to time to look into the factors which became responsible for the deterioration of the good atmosphere which was prevailing in our research institutions.

16.37 hrs.

[SHRI K. N. TIWARY in the Chair]

I am sorry to say that the steps which should have been taken much earlier were delayed, and the result is that even today we are facing certain types of lacunae which exist in our research institutions and also in the ICAR.

Again, when we talk about the ICAR, I would like to say that the Indian Council of Agricultural Research, whosoever had been its Director—whether it was Dr. Pal or Dr. Swaminathan—was guided under their eminent leadership, and the Indian Council of Agricultural Research was set on proper lines. As I was saying, it becomes the responsibility of the Indian Council of Agricultural Research to see that if there are certain lacunae which exist in respect of the administrative procedure which are hampering the work of the scientists, especially in the Indian Agricultural Research Institute here in New Delhi, I will say that the Indian Council of Agricultural Research to some extent did fail in its duty to point out all these things much earlier. But I am quite confident that Dr. Swaminathan is a capable man. He has proved his ability beyond any doubt in that he has made a major contribution to achieve a major breakthrough, as I said, as far as agricultural production in this country is concerned.

AN HON. MEMBER: Singly or collectively?

SHRI INDER J. MALHOTRA: The whole army fights, but it all depends on the General, what strategy he follows, what approach he makes and what attitude he has got towards his work. That is why I say it is very important.

So, I would like to point that the basic thing is, how we approach and what strategy we have to adopt to put

our agricultural research on a sound and better footing.

As the other friend has also pointed out, it will be a great folly, and it will amount to suicide if agricultural research is converted into a government department. Why were we faced with all these difficulties in the past? It is because there was too much of administrative interference on the part of the Ministry of Food and Agriculture and on the part of the non-technical officers who had no technical background and who could not appreciate the difficulty of a particular agricultural scientist or of a particular research worker. That is why it was thought better that the person who heads the ICAR should also get the status of the Secretary to the Government so that he should be able to take independent administrative decisions also. Mr. Sathe and some hon. friend were mentioning that in the United States of America, Agriculture was under the Government department. To my knowledge it is not. I happened to be a student in the United States for four years and Agricultural Research in the United States is still the entire responsibility of the Agricultural Universities. We should in our country take certain steps to give more freedom to our agricultural scientists. What happens in the United States? The University allots a particular amount for a particular research project. That research scientist is told: Here are ten thousand dollars. This is the target and this is your project, you take this amount and spend it the way you want. This is the amount of confidence which the nation places in its research scientists. That is why even today we have to look towards those countries in certain areas of science. In our country after 25 years of Independence, in an institution like the IARI, a particular sum is sanctioned for a particular research project in a particular division. Now (why can't we place more confidence in scientist? Why should the head of the department of the scientist himself once in every two months or three months go

[Shri Inder J. Malhotra]

before the Under Secretary, who represents the finance department whether this type of equipment is required in that project or not. Unnecessary queries are being made and that is why we are not able to achieve the results which we should have by this time in the field of Agricultural Research.

It was rather unfortunate for me to listen to some of my hon. colleagues where they tried to bring in one doctor against another. I had been associated with the Agricultural Research Institute, and so I was associated with the ICAR also. Therefore, I can say with confidence that everything is not wrong. There had been certain faults committed. What is required now is that the relationship between the scientists and the administrator must be categorically defined and decided by the Government. To what extent you want to give finance, administrative and other powers to the scientists so that with complete freedom and with complete confidence he can give the country what the country wants from him? It is rather unfortunate that we bring in different persons who are working in the IARI or the ICAR. I do not hold any brief for Dr. Swaminathan. I happened to know his work. The whole nation knows his worth. He is known as a Scientist of repute in the whole world. How can our nation ignore his capabilities? In this report there are certain things with which I am not in agreement. Lastly I would only draw the attention of the hon. Minister again that there is a good deal of scope for improvement especially in the atmosphere existing in our research institutions. I am sure that the Ministry of Food and Agriculture and the Central Government, as a whole, will give due thought to this problem and try to take steps to improve the atmosphere in our research institutions.

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी : (स्वा.लियर)
सभापति महोदय, इस चर्चा में भाग लेते समय एक प्रश्न बारबार मेरे मन में उठ रहा है कि क्या डा० विनोद साहा का वनि-

दान व्यर्थ जायेगा ? क्या फिर किसी नव-युवक वैज्ञानिक को हमारी वैज्ञानिक संस्थाओं में व्याप्त दमघोटू वातावरण के विप्लव आत्म-हत्या के अतिरेकपूर्ण पग को उठाना पड़ेगा ?

मुझ को शिकायत है सरकार से। उस ने सारे मामले को जितनी गम्भीरता से लेना चाहिए था नहीं लिया। सारे देश में आवाज उठने के बाद, इस संसद् में पर्याप्त उत्तेजना के पश्चात्, उसने गजेन्द्रगडकर समिति का निर्माण किया।

कमेटी का निर्माण करने के बाद उस के टर्म ऑफ रेफरेंस बदल दिए गए, उन्हें सीमित कर दिया गया। कमेटी ने यह माना है कि वह पुराने मामले नहीं देख सकती। ऐसे मामले जिन में वैज्ञानिकों को शिकायत है कि उन के साथ अनियमितता बरती गई, ऐसे मामले जिन में वैज्ञानिकों को शिकायत है कि उन के साथ भेदभाव किया गया, ऐसे मामले देखने में समिति ने अपनी असमर्थता स्पष्ट शब्दों में व्यक्त की है।

मुख्य रूप से समिति की सिफारिशें सरकार ने अस्वीकृत कर दीं। अगर इतनी उच्चधिकार सम्पन्न समिति की सिफारिशें रद्दी की टोकरी में फेंकी जाने वाली हैं तो इस तरह की समिति को बनाने का कोई औचित्य नहीं था। यदि ऐसी समिति की सिफारिशों के साथ इस तरह का व्यवहार किया जायगा, जैसा सरकार कर रही है, तो मैं नहीं समझता कोई सम्मानप्रिय अवकाश प्राप्त न्यायाधीश या कोई गणमान्य वैज्ञानिक सरकार द्वारा नियुक्त समितियों की अध्यक्षता या सदस्यता स्वीकार करेगा।

सभापति महोदय, समिति की रिपोर्ट 10 महीने तक सरकार ने दबाये रखी। समिति की रिपोर्ट को सभा पटल पर लाने के लिए हम को कृषि मंत्री महोदय पर दबाव डालना पड़ा। मंत्री महोदय ने उस समय स्वीकार

किया था कि जो 1200 जगह खाली हैं उन को पब्लिक सर्विस कमीशन के जरिए भरा जायगा। लेकिन अब वह बात भा रद्दी की टोकरी में फेंक दी गई। अब कहा जा रहा है कि स्पेशल रेक्यूटमेंट बोर्ड बनेगा। मैं पूछना चाहता हूँ कि उस बोर्ड का निर्माण कौन करेगा? अभी तक यह स्पष्ट नहीं है। इस प्रकार को प्राणका व्यक्त की जा रही है कि समिति के द्वारा जो लोग कठघरे में खड़े किये गये हैं उन्हीं की सलाह से वह बोर्ड बनाया जायगा। यह भी बात कही जा रही है कि उस बोर्ड की कार्य सीमा में हेडक्वार्टर्स पोस्टर्स का समावेश नहीं होगा। वह बोर्ड नई नियुक्तियां करेगा लेकिन हेडक्वार्टर में जो स्थान हैं उन के बारे में नियुक्तियों का अधिकार बोर्ड को नहीं होगा। मैं चाहता हूँ कि मंत्री महोदय इस मुद्दे को स्पष्ट करें। मैं तो चाहता हूँ कि यूनियन पब्लिक सर्विस कमीशन के द्वारा भर्ती होनी चाहिए। ऐडमिनिस्ट्रेटिव रिफार्म्स कमीशन ने भी इसी आशय की सिफारिश की थी। लेकिन यदि आप बोर्ड बनाने पर तुले हुए हैं तो बोर्ड के बारे में पार्लियामेंट का ऐक्ट बनाइये। बोर्ड में कौन होंगे इस के बारे में संसद् को विश्वास में लीजिए। बोर्ड का जिस तरह से गठन होने वाला है उस की स्पष्ट तस्वीर हमारे सामने आनी चाहिए।

दूसरी बात यह है कि सभापति महोदय, समिति ने सिफारिश की है कि कृषि अनुसंधान परिषद् को सरकार के एक विभाग के रूप में चलाया जाय। इस के बारे में पर्याप्त मतभेद है। मतभेद स्वाभाविक है। कोई वैज्ञानिक अनुसंधान परिषद् सरकार का विभाग हो कर चले यह बात सुनने में कुछ अटपटी लगती है। मैं भी आटोनोमी का समर्थक हूँ लेकिन इस संदर्भ में मैं पूछना चाहता हूँ कि आटोनोमी किस की? क्या वासेज की? आटोनोमी क्या मनमाना काम करने की, क्या नियमों को ताक पर रखने की? क्या योग्यता के अनुसार

नियुक्तियां न करने की? क्या ऐसी आटोनोमी जिससे परेशान हो कर एक वैज्ञानिक को अपनी जान देनी पड़ी? मैं आटोनोमी चाहता हूँ, लेकिन जूनियर साइंटिस्ट्स के लिए भी वह होनी चाहिए। आज वह उनको नहीं है। हमारी अनुसंधान संस्थाएं एक साम्राज्य बन गई हैं, उन में बॉसिज्म चल रहा है। मैं इस चर्चा में व्यक्तियों को घसीटना नहीं चाहता। लेकिन हमारे जूनियर साइंटिस्ट इसलिए परेशान हो कर देश से बाहर जा रहे हैं—इसलिए नहीं कि तनख्वाह कम है—कि उन्हें काम करने के लिए क्षेत्र नहीं है। आज सबेरे ही प्रतिभा पलायन पर चर्चा चल रही थी। श्री सुब्रह्मण्यम् साहब उत्तर दे रहे थे। हमारे नौजवान वैज्ञानिक काम करना चाहते हैं लेकिन काम वे करने हैं और नाम बड़े वैज्ञानिकों का होता है। मैं बिना नाम लिए एक समाचार पत्र के एक अंश को उद्धृत करना चाहता हूँ

"It has been discovered that a scientist serving IARI has been producing scientific papers at the rate of a paper every 12 days. In 1942-52 he produced 20 papers, in 1952-62 19 papers. In the next five years, up to 1967 it trebled. With his position rising in the division, he produced 160 papers in the next five years. This makes an average of one paper every 12 days."

बारह दिनों में एक पेपर? जरूर कोई बड़ी वैज्ञानिक प्रतिभा का धनी है—

SHRI N. SREEKANTAN NAIR: I can write one paper every day.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAEYEE: But that will be thrown into the waste paper basket. I am not talking of those papers.

[श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी]

इसका अर्थ यह है कि जूनियर साइंटिस्ट्स की मदद से पेपर लिखे जाते हैं, जो रिसर्च स्कालर हैं उनकी सहायता ली जाती है लेकिन श्रेय उन्हें नहीं दिया जाता, नाम अपना डाला जाता है। क्या इससे प्रतिभाएं विकसित हो सकती हैं? क्या इससे वैज्ञानिकों को प्रोत्साहन मिल सकता है? मैं चाहता हूँ कि आटोनामी का विचार करते समय आप इस पहलू को भी ध्यान में रखें।

मैं इस कमेटी की रिपोर्ट से सहमत हूँ। अगर भारतीय कृषि अनुसंधान परिषद् सरकार का विभाग बना दी गई तो कोई आममान टूटने वाला नहीं है। अगर एटामिक एनर्जी कमिशन सरकार के विभाग के रूप में चल सकता है तो क्या यह उसमें भी अधिक बारीक काम है?

एक बात निश्चित है कि वहाँ अनियमितता नहीं होनी चाहिए, नियुक्तियों में घांघली नहीं होनी चाहिए, बड़े और छोटे वैज्ञानिकों के बीच में भाईचारे की भावना होनी चाहिए, मिल कर काम करने की भावना होनी चाहिए, खाद्य मोर्चे पर देश को सफल बनाने का एक संकल्प होना चाहिए।

मैं श्री इंद्रजोत गुप्त से सहमत हूँ कि एक वैज्ञानिक दूसरे वैज्ञानिक के विरुद्ध कर्तव्य कार्य करता है। मेरे पास इतने पत्र आए हैं और शिन्दे साहब बनायें कि आखिर कमेटी के पास भी इतनी शिकायतें क्यों गई? क्या वहाँ सब शिकायतें करने वाले हैं, कोई काम करने वाला नहीं है? अगर काम करने का वहाँ वातावरण नहीं है तो उनके लिए भी कौन जिम्मेदार है? हमारी अनुसंधान संस्थायें एक परिवार के रूप में चलनी चाहिए। वहाँ सहयोग होना चाहिए। स्वयं प्रति-

स्पर्धा के लिए गुंजाइश हो सकती है। लेकिन एक दूसरे की टांग पकड़ कर खींचने के लिए कोई जगह नहीं होनी चाहिए, यह आप को मानना पड़ेगा।

मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि —
Something is definitely rotten in the kingdom of Denmark.

हमारी अनुसंधान संस्थाओं में जरूर कुछ गड़बड़ी है। डा० विनोद शाह की आत्म-हत्या से वह एक विस्फोटक के रूप में सामने आ गई है। अगर हम इससे कुछ शिक्षा ले सकें, इन संस्थाओं का सुधार कर सकें, एक एक वैज्ञानिक को संतुष्ट कर सकें तो मैं समझता हूँ कि वह बलिदान व्यर्थ नहीं जाएगा।

लेकिन मुझे निराशा हुई सरकार की इस सिफारिश को पढ़ कर कि जिन वैज्ञानिकों ने अपनी उपलब्धियों के गलत दावे किए उनके बारे में भी सरकार सिफारिश को स्वीकार करने के लिए तैयार नहीं है। शरबती सोनारा एक मजाक का विषय बन गया है। क्या डा० गजेन्द्रगडकर की रिपोर्ट इस सम्बन्ध में कोई अर्थ नहीं रखती है? उसकी रिपोर्ट के बारे में यह कहना कि वह रिपोर्ट कोई अर्थ नहीं रखती है....

श्री श्यामनन्दन मिश्र (बेगुसराय) : गजेन्द्रगडकर साहब कई कमेटियों के चेयरमैन बनाए गए। अब किसी कमेटी का उनको चेयरमैन नहीं बनाया जाना चाहिए। दर्जनों कमेटियों के चेयरमैन उनको बनाया गया।

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी : उनको बनाना चाहिए या नहीं एक अलग प्रश्न है। किन्तु हमारे वैज्ञानिक कृषि के क्षेत्र में अगर कुछ अनुसंधान करके दिखाते हैं, प्रगति करके दिखाते हैं तो उसकी सराहना की जानी चाहिए और अगर झूठे दावे किए जाते हैं तो उन पर पर्दा डालने का प्रयत्न नहीं होना चाहिए।

श्री इन्द्रजीत मल्होत्रा : यहां सियासत त
को मत लाडये

श्री अटल बिहारी बाजपेयी : आप
किसी का नाम ले कर तारीफ के पुल बांध रहे
हैं तो क्या वह सियासत नहीं है ?

श्री इन्द्रजीत मल्होत्रा : वह साइंटिस्ट
का सम्मान है ।

श्री अटल बिहारी बाजपेयी : मैं भी
जो रिपोर्ट में लिखा हुआ है वही बता रहा हूँ ।
उसमें यह है कि शरबती सोनारा के बारे
में जो दावा किया गया वह बड़ा चढ़ा कर
था । दावा यह था कि गेहूँ इतना अच्छा
हो गया कि उसको खाने के बाद दूध पीने
की जरूरत ही नहीं । जो जो अच्छा काम
किया है मैं उसकी तारीफ करने में किसी
से पीछे नहीं हूँ । लेकिन केवल तारीफ ही
नहीं जहां वैज्ञानिक आलोचना के अधिकारी
हैं उनकी आलोचना भी होनी चाहिए ।
माथ ही माथ संसद सदस्यों को भी किसी
का पक्ष ले कर या किसी के विरोध में बोल कर
वैज्ञानिकों को इस बात का मौका नहीं देना
चाहिए कि पार्लियामेंट के मੈम्बरों में लाठीग
कर सकें और इस सदन की प्रतिष्ठा को नीचे
गिरा सकें ।

श्री नाथू राम मिर्धा (नागौर) : नदन
में गजेन्द्रगडकर रिपोर्ट पर चर्चा हो चुकी
है । एक वैज्ञानिक मि० शाह ने आत्महत्या
की और आत्महत्या करने से पहले वह एक
कागज छोड़ गए जिस में दो तरह की बातें
थीं । एक तो यह थी कि जो दावे वैज्ञानिकों
द्वारा किए जाते हैं वे सही नहीं हैं और दूसरे
यह कि उनका यह खयाल था कि उन से जो
जूनियर थे और जिन का क्लेम नहीं बनता
था उस तरह के किसी आदमी का प्रमोशन
हो गया । उनको जो यह शिकायत थी और
उनके दिमाग में जो यह बात थी उस सब का
कुल मिला कर इफैक्ट यह हुआ कि उनको
आत्महत्या करने की बात सोचनी पड़ी ।

हम प्रजातंत्र में रहते हैं । हमारा प्रजातंत्र
बड़ा लचीला है । अखबारों में बात आई और
मा० नोय सदस्यों ने यहां पर अपने विचार
उस पर व्यक्त किए । क्योंकि हमारी
सरकार एक लोकतांत्रिक सरकार है, जनता
के प्रतिनिधियों की भावनाओं का सम्मान
करती है, इस वास्ते उसने यह कमेटी मुकारर
की । इस कमेटी ने सभी पहलुओं पर गौर
किया और अपनी रिपोर्ट दी । जो उस
कमेटी के टर्म्ज आफ रेफ़ेंस थे उन में एक तो
यह था कि जो वह कागज छोड़ गए हैं उस में
जो बातें उन्होंने कही हैं उनमें क्या सच्चाई
है ? दूसरा टर्म आफ रेफ़ेंस यह था कि
एग्वाइमेंट्स के मिलाने में आई सी ए आर
में जो तरीके चलते हैं, उन में क्या अच्छाई
या बुराई है ? इन दो मोटी बातों के अलावा
अन्य इन्सिडेंटल बातों को भी कमेटी देख
सकती थी । इस कमेटी ने अपनी मदद के,
लिए एक एक्सपर्ट्स की कमेटी भी बनाई
जिस ने कल्याण सोना, सोनारा गेहूँ, आलू और
बैसाखी मंग आदि के बारे में अपनी फ़ाईनल
री, जिन का जिक्र श्री समर गृह और दूसरे
माननीय सदस्यों ने किया है ।

रिसर्च के कई स्टेजिज होते हैं । वैज्ञानिक
एक कोअर्डिनेटिड वे में अलग अलग किमी
फ़सल पर शोध का काम करते हैं । लेकिन
फ़ाइनल रिजल्ट्स तक पहुंचने के लिए एक
विशेष तरीका बना हुआ है । फ़ाइनल
रिजल्ट्स मिलने के बाद ही उन चीजों का
चलन किया जाता है और उन को किमानों
तक पहुंचाया जाता है । लेकिन जैसा कि
मैंने कहा है, फ़ाइनल रिजल्ट से पहले कई
स्टेजिज हैं । उन स्टेजिज के दौरान कुछ
साइंटिस्ट्स कह सकते हैं कि फ़लां चीज
ठीक है और कुछ साइंटिस्ट्स कह सकते
हैं कि वह ठीक नहीं है । उन में डिफ़रेंस
आफ़ ओपिनियन होना स्वाभाविक है ।
इस संस्था में उन डिफ़रेंसिज को रिजाल्व करने
के लिए फ़ोरम बने हुए हैं । वैज्ञानिकों की
कमेटीज बैठती हैं । उन के वाद-विवाद,

[श्री नाथू राम मिर्धा]

सेमिनार्ज और मिम्पोजियम होते हैं। विभिन्न विचारों पर गहराई से डिसकशन करके उन का समन्वय किया जाता है। रिसर्च के परिणामों को तभी आउट किया जाता है, जब कि सब माइंटिस्ट्स की एक राय हो जाये।

श्री शाह ने अपने पत्र में रिसर्च के बारे में जो बहुत सी बातें लिखीं, वे फ़ाइनल स्टेज को नहीं थीं। उन्होंने उन बातों के बारे में विवाद खड़ा कर दिया और लिख दिया कि मैं स्ट्रैगुलेशन महसूस करता हूँ और इस स्थिति में मुझे आत्महत्या कर लेनी चाहिए। हो सकता है कि किसी आदमी को प्रमोशन के बारे में शिकायत हो और वह यह समझता हो कि उस के साथ इन्फ़ाफ़ नहीं हुआ है। उस के लिए भी लोकतंत्र में एक तरीका बना हुआ है, किसी भी फ़ैंगने के बारे में अपील हो सकती है। दुनिया में बहुत से लोग मुसाइड करने हैं, क्योंकि कई लोगों का वीक माइंड होता है। उन्होंने समझा कि उन्हें मुसाइड या रास्ता ग्रहण्यार करना चाहिए। श्री वाजपेयी को चिन्ता है कि एक होनहार माइंटिस्ट स्वर्गलोक चला गया और कहीं और माइंटिस्ट्स की भी यही हालत न हो। उन की राय है कि सरकार ने इस कमेटी की रिपोर्ट के बाद ठीक कदम नहीं उठाये हैं।

मैं निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि कृषि की शोध, उस की शिक्षा और उस से सम्बन्धित अन्य बातों के लिए केवल गजेन्द्रगउकर कमेटी ही एकमात्र एथॉरिटी नहीं है। उस के संबंध में कई कमेटियां काम कर चुकी हैं। नालागढ़ कमेटी ने कृषि संबंधी रिसर्च और रिसर्च कॉमिल के गठन के बारे में बहुत सी सिफारिशों की थीं।

मैं माननीय सदस्यों का ध्यान इस तरह भी दिलाना चाहता हूँ कि हमारे देश में एक राष्ट्रीय कृषि आयोग भी बना हुआ है, जिस को इस सदन और सरकार ने बनाया है, . .

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी : माननीय

सदस्य जिस के अध्यक्ष हैं।

श्री नाथू राम मिर्धा : जिसका मैं अध्यक्ष हूँ, और इस लिए मुझे ज्यादा जानकारी है, जिसको मैं बड़ी नम्रता के साथ माननीय सदस्यों के सामने प्रस्तुत करना चाहता हूँ।

नैशनल कमीशन आफ एग्रीकल्चर ने अब तक अठारह अन्तरिम रिपोर्ट्स दी हैं। श्री वाजपेयी ने उन में से कितनी रिपोर्ट्स का अध्ययन किया है? मैं उन से अनुरोध करूंगा कि वह उन में से कम से कम दो रिपोर्ट्स का अध्ययन जरूर करें। उन में से एक है: "सम एस्पेक्ट्स आफ रिसर्च, एजुकेशन, एक्सटेंशन एंड ट्रेनिंग" और दूसरी है "कोऑर्डिनेटिड स्कीमज अंडरटेकन बाई आई सी० ए० आर० एंड देयर मैरिट्स"। आई० सी० ए० आर० द्वारा शोध की ऐसी बढ़िया स्कीमज बनाई गई हैं, जिन को दुनिया के कई देश, जिनमें कृषि में पिछड़े हुए और अग्रगण्य देश भी हैं, अपने यहां लागू करना चाहते हैं।

इस लिए इस सदन के जिन माननीय सदस्यों को आई० सी० ए० आर० के बकप्राउंट का अधिक ज्ञान नहीं है, या जिन का कृषि या किसानों में ज्यादा सम्बन्ध नहीं है उनको किसी एक छोटी बात का एकतरफ़ा ज्ञान हो सकता है, लेकिन कृषि के सभी पहलुओं का समन्वित ज्ञान बहुत आवश्यक है। मुझे खुशी है कि श्री इन्द्रजीत गुप्त ने एक बड़ा बेलेंसड व्यू लिया है। इस रिपोर्ट के बाद सरकार ने जो डिमिशन लिये हैं, वे पूरे डिमिशन नहीं हैं, अभी और भी डिमिशन लिये जाने हैं।

राष्ट्रीय कृषि आयोग ने ये जो दो रिपोर्ट्स दी हैं, उनमें इस बात का विवरण दिया गया है कि हमारे देश में कृषि शोध की दिशाएँ क्या हों, हमारी रिसर्च आनप्रॉइजेक्शज के फ़ंक्शनज क्या होने चाहिये, आई० सी० ए० आर०, आल इंडिया रिसर्च इंस्टीट्यूट्स और कृषि विश्वविद्यालय क्या करें, उनमें इस समय साइंटिस्ट्स के बीच कोऑर्डिनेशन का जो

अभाव है, उसको कैसे दूर किया जाये। उन व्यवस्थाओं को बहुत डीटेल में हमारी रिपोर्ट्स में दिया गया है। लेकिन अभी हम ने फाइनल रिपोर्ट देनी है कि फाइनल एडमिनिस्ट्रेटिव सेट अप क्या हो।

मुझे खुशी है कि भारत सरकार ने जो डिमिजन लिये हैं, वे केवल गजेन्द्रगडकर कमेटी की सिफारिशों को ध्यान में रखते हुये ही नहीं लिये गये हैं, बल्कि नेशनल कमीशन आफ एग्रीकल्चर की रिपोर्ट्स को भी ध्यान में रखते हुये लिये गये हैं। मैं ममझता हूँ कि सरकार के वे निर्णय बड़े सुन्दर हैं। उन निर्णयों को कार्यान्वित करके हमने अपनी शोध के परिणामों को, नये तरीकों को, देश की 75 फीसदी किसान जनता तक पहुंचाना है, ताकि हमारे देश में कृषि का उत्पादन बड़े और जानवरों का विकास हो।

हमारे देश में आई० वी० आर० आई०, आई० ए० आर० आई०, आल-इंडिया राइस इंस्टीट्यूट और इंडियन डेयरी रिसर्च इंस्टीट्यूट आदि जो शोध संस्थायें हैं, वे क्वालिटी में किसी से कम नहीं हैं। हैदराबाद में जो इंटरनैशनल रिसर्च इंस्टीट्यूट फार ड्राई फार्मिंग बनाया गया है, उसमें हमारे कई बड़े बड़े वैज्ञानिकों को लिया गया है। हमारे वैज्ञानिक दुनिया के बड़े माने हुये कृषि वैज्ञानिकों में अपना स्थान रखते हैं।

पिछला साल, डेढ़ साल का टाइट हमारे देश की कृषि और हमारे किसानों के लिये बहुत नुकसानदेह रहा है। चूंकि सब एपायंटमेंट्स बन्द कर दी गई हैं, इस लिये 1200 बैकेंसीज खाली पड़ी हुई हैं और कृषि शोध का काम रुक गया है। इस कमेटी की रिपोर्ट के बाद सरकार ने सीनियर साइंटिस्ट्स को एपायंट करने के लिये एक बोर्ड बनाने का फैसला किया है। अन्य पोस्ट्स के लिये एपायंटमेंट्स रिसर्च इंस्टीट्यूट्स के द्वारा ही की जायेंगी। इस के बाद शोध का रुका हुआ काम फिर से चलने लगेगा।

श्री वाजपेयी ने पहले तो यह कहा कि वह यू० पी० एम० सी० द्वारा साइंटिस्ट्स की एपायंटमेंट्स किये जाने से सहमत नहीं है और इस संस्था में आटानोमी होनी चाहिये, लेकिन फिर उन्होंने कहा कि यह काम यू० पी० एम० सी० को देना चाहिये। यू० पी० एम० सी० को भी भारत सरकार ही नियुक्त करती है। इंसान सब जगह एक हैं। यू० पी० एम० सी० में भी इंसान बैठते हैं। वे जो फैसले करते हैं, उनमें भी लोगों का शिकायतें होती हैं, लेकिन उन फैसलों के बारे में एक सीमित डंग में ही बोल सकते हैं, क्योंकि मविधान के द्वारा उसको एक विशिष्ट स्थान दिया गया है। प्राइवेटली हम चाहे कुछ भी कहें, लेकिन जिस को यू० पी० एम० सी० ने मिलेक्ट कर लिया, हम और आप उसके बारे में कुछ भी नहीं कह सकते हैं। लेकिन किसी डिपार्टमेंट द्वारा की गई मिलेक्शन को हम क्विटमाइज कर सकते हैं।

साइंटिस्ट्स का जो बोर्ड बनाया जायगा, वह एक अच्छे दर्जे का बोर्ड होगा। उसका चेयरमैन कोई टॉप साइंटिस्ट होगा। जो कोई भी होगा वह अच्छा आदमी होगा, जिसमें माननीय सदस्यों का शिकायत नहीं होगी।

यह दुर्भाग्य की बात है कि हम सब लोग साइंटिस्ट्स की बातें सुन-सुनाकर, आइडिया-लोजी की बात करके, उनमें झगड़े पैदा करते हैं। उसमें देश का बड़ा नुकसान होता है। हम सब को इन बातों से ऊपर उठना पड़ेगा। जिन साइंटिस्ट्स पर शोध की जिम्मेदारी है, उनको इस प्रकार के विवादों में अलग रखना पड़ेगा।

श्री शिन्दे ने जो छः सात डिमिजन सदन के सामने रखे हैं, वे काफी अच्छे डिमिजन हैं। एक डिमिजन यह भी किया गया है कि शोध संस्थाओं भारत सरकार, जिस पर कृषि उत्पादन बढ़ाने की जिम्मेदारी है, और राज्य सरकारों के बीच, जिनके अन्तर्गत कृषि का विषय आता है, समन्वय कैसे स्थापित किया जाये।

[श्री नाथू राम मिर्धा]

तो राज्य सरकारों का, केन्द्रीय सरकार का, गोध वाली संस्थाओं का आपस में कैसे ताल-मेल हो और किस तरह से इंटरनेशनल जो रिमर्च के मामले हैं उन में भी उन का सहयोग लिया जाय और दिया जाय, इन सारे मामलों को कोऑर्डिनेल करने के लिए इस का एक छोटा सा सेक्रेटेरिएट मिनिस्ट्री में लिक करने हुए रखने का जो फौमला है वह इस सारे ग्रा० सी० ए० आर० को एक डिपार्टमेंट बनाने के बजाय बहुत ही अच्छा अरेंजमेंट है क्योंकि ओवर आल रेस्पामिबिलिटी प्रोडक्शन बढ़ाने की मंत्रालय की है, राज्य सरकारों की है। इंटरनेशनल क्षेत्र में दुनिया से संबंध रखना उन का काम है। जितनी उनकी मुश्किलत है साइंटिस्ट्स की, जितने उन के परिणाम हैं, उन के लिए फंड का प्राविजन है, उन के लिए रिमर्च के डायरेक्शन को प्रायोरिटी से ले डायन करना है और और ऐसे मामले हैं—जिन में एकसपर्ट एडवाइस है मंत्रालय के पास इन सारी चीजों को चैनेलाइज करने के लिए एक लायजन का काम इसका होगा। जनता और इन के बीच यह मैक्रेटेरिएट एक लायजन का काम करेगा। अभी तो चार पांच फौमले किए हैं, अभी और भी फौमले करने हैं। राष्ट्रीय कृषि आयोग सारी बातों को बड़ी गहरा से देख रहा है और मैं निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि अगर आपको हिन्दुस्तान के किसानों में कुछ भी रुचि है, कृषि अगत से कुछ भी आपका नाता है तो बहुत गहराई से आप छानबीन उन रिपोर्ट्स की करेंगे, इनको देखेंगे। दुनिया का एक माना हुआ काम राष्ट्रीय कृषि आयोग का रहा है और मुझे खुशी है कि 18 इंटीरम रिपोर्ट्स जो उसने दी है उन सारी रिपोर्ट्स को स्वीकार कर के पांचवी योजना में भारत सरकार ने उन्हीं को बस माना है कृषि के दायरे में। मेरी प्रार्थना है—

Don't be guided by this report which has looked into certain aspects and certain things which may be correct.

जो बातें उन्हींने कहीं हैं, यह नहीं है कि वे मही नहीं हैं। शरबनी मुतारा व्हीट की बात आप कर रहे थे। इसने देश में क्रान्ति कर दी है—

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी : मैंने यह कहा है कि दूध के बारे में जो दावा किया गया कि उस में उतने ही गुण हैं जितने दूध में हैं यह दावा गलत निकला।

श्री नाथू राम मिर्धा : एक कंटेंट है।

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी : तो फर्क हो गया न।

श्री नाथू राम मिर्धा : मैं मानता हूँ फर्क हो गया। वह भी एकसपर्ट की ऑफिनियन है। मैं मान लेता हूँ। लेकिन जो हमारे यहां पैदावार व्हीट की इन में बढ़ी है उस को आप देखें। आज से 6-7 साल पहले वारह मिलियन टन पैदावार होती थी इस वरायटि ने लास्ट यीअर 26 मिलियन टन की पैदावार कर दी थी और इस साल वह तीस मिलियन टन होगी। व्हीट की इस बढ़ोतरी को देखते हुए जो इस टीम के लीडर थे स्वाभिनाथन भाइव वे बघाई के पात्र हैं।

He is the leader of the team and he must be congratulated.

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी : आप अगर व्यक्ति की तारीफ करेंगे तो उसकी प्रशंसा भी होगी।

श्री नाथू राम मिर्धा : मैं तारीफ नहीं करता। मैं कहता हूँ कि ही इस दी लीडर आफ दी टीम। वह दुनिया के जाने माने व्यक्ति है। आप सच्चे मन से देखेंगे तो इस बात को समझ लेंगे। इसलिए बहुत गहराई से इन बातों को देखने की आवश्यकता है सरकार के जो किए हुए फौमल हैं वे तुरन्त तुरन्त लागू किए जाय क्योंकि जो अभी डिले हुई है डेढ़ साल से रिफूटमेंट बन्द है उसे जो नुकसान हो रहा है उसको कम्पेंसट करने के लिए उसको जल्दी से जल्दी लागू

करना चाहिये । आप इसको पूरी गहराई से देखें । जितने लोग यहाँ हैं सारे लोग हिन्दुस्तान के किसानों से बोट ले कर आते हैं लेकिन उन में ख़ाब कन लोग हैं । उन में ज्यादा ख़ाब लोग और गहराई से विचार कीजिए, यही मुझे कहना है ।

SHRI SEZHIYAN (Kumbakonam). I am glad that we are having this discussion on the Report given by the Inquiry Committee on the Indian Council of Agricultural Research and it is a good thing that this discussion has cut across party-lines. In respect of those who are on the other side, that is, the ruling side, some of them accepted the point of view which has been taken by the Government. Some others said that the Report should be accepted *in toto*.

On this side also, out of the three Members who have spoken so far, two were for acceptance of the Report but Shri Gupta had said that he had some reservations. I join with him in this regard to even out the sides taken by the Opposition. I want to make one point clear. I am not here to defend the errors and the irregularities committed etc. by the I.C.A.R. It is for the Government to defend them and put the correct perspective before the House and the public.

In this report, apart from some observations on the working of the ICAR and on the correction or otherwise of the findings of the scientists who are working there, these are some other important things which have come for comment. As far as we are concerned, certain basic issues have been raised and certain vital directions have been indicated by the Inquiry Committee. It is true they are fully competent to give such recommendations. It is equally true that we also are fully competent to accept them or not. The major recommendations made by the Inquiry Committee are: first, this Institute be made a full-fledged department and U.P.S.C. should be entrusted with all recruitment. Although they have said that, I am not able to accept both these basic re-

commendations. Suppose if something goes wrong in some research institute, they owe a responsibility to explain it. Why should they put one as a non-department and the other as a department of Government? In the matter of recruitment of staff, the Government says that it is autonomous. Then when the question of autonomy—I am not speaking of autonomy of the State—comes in, they change the character.

I may quote the case of I.C.M.R.—Indian Council of Medical Research. I.C.A.R. is accepted as an autonomous body. The parallel case is I.C.M.R. Why should it not be made an autonomous body? I was associated with the P.A.C. which went into the case of the I.C.M.R. and so many things were brought to our notice—so many anomalies in the matter of recruitment and promotion were brought to our attention. There have been persons who have been there in the employment of the I.C.M.R. for over 34 years without being made permanent. Year after year their appointment was renewed. We went into the question of the working of the I.C.M.R. And the P.A.C. recommended that the I.C.M.R. should be made an autonomous body.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA: Under the Health Ministry.

SHRI SEZHIYAN: The I.C.M.R. was set up in 1949 and it continued to operate as a subsidiary department of the Ministry of Health. We said that maximum autonomy should be provided to the Council which may be comparable to that of the C.S.I.R. If necessary, it may be made a Statutory Body. The autonomous character should be retained in a functional rather than in a national manner. I am quite clear in my mind that if any scientific body worth its name wants to do research in a successful way, it should be made autonomous.

Therefore, the basic thing is that the I.C.A.R. should keep its autonomous character, not in a manner of an uneasy compromise—but in a real way.

[Shri Sezhiyan]

If we are not satisfied with the Director General, take him out of the office. The institute is not for the Director General. The most important thing is scientific research which is going on in this country. If we go through the report, we are puzzled. The report, on page 9, says:

"For the development of science and its research, it is necessary that the institutes and centres must enjoy autonomy to carry on their work within the constraints reasonably implied in the very nature of their work. This concept of autonomy is not a legal concept, nor is it a concept based on considerations of prestige. It is, in a sense, an academic and an ethical concept which postulates that it is only under freedom from external pulls and pressures that education can be imparted and research conducted."

They thus said that autonomy should be there. When they come to the recommendation, I am very much intrigued at what they have given. They say:

"In view of the importance of agriculture and the responsibility of the Government to help in the production of proper and adequate food by the people of the country, we recommend that the Government should assume direct responsibility for agricultural research and education."

If this is the argument, is not health a vital problem for the people and should that not also be the direct responsibility and should the ICMR also not be made a Government department? Similarly what about industrial research? Is not industrial progress vital for the nation? So, should the C.S.I.R. also not be made a Government Department?

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE (Rajapur): They do not want to take over rice but they want to take over research.

SHRI SEZHIYAN: I want that Government should be very clear in their mind about this matter. As some hon. Members have said there are many nations where research institutes are under the aegis of Government while in other nations they are independent. So, I want that we should make the position very clear. Let us not have one yardstick for the CSIR and another for the ICAR. What is good for the goose should be good for the gander also. If Government want to have an autonomous character for the research institutes, let them have it for all the other institutions also. If there are failures and irregularities, let them come down with a heavy hand. Even for the ICMR we said that there should be a reviewing committee to go into its working. But an autonomous character should not be destroyed on the plea that there were any irregularities. If the Government were to assume the role of management, then that will be the end of all research in the country.

Regarding the failures and other things, my other hon. friends have given very many figures. I do not want to go into those things. In scientific research there is no finality. Some results might have been obtained. In fairness, we should accept their correctness; it is probable that the results obtained by some other scientists may be different. I am not holding any brief for anyone, nor am I a scientist, but probably because of the very nature of the scientific work, the results may be different. Supposing it is proved that the results have been given fraudulently, it is quite a different matter.

SHRI SAMAR GUHA: It has been tested in three laboratories, in Mysore, Hyderabad and Bangalore.

SHRI SEZHIYAN: Even in regard to sharbati Sonora, the panel has said that the results are somewhat higher but nowhere near the percentage mentioned by the director. In the case

of Hyderabad, it is 2.48, in the case of Mysore it is 2.99 and in the case of Bangalore, it is 3.17. Even between the results obtained in Bangalore and Hyderabad there is a difference of about 30 per cent.

SHRI SAMAR GUHA: Not to that much extent.

SHRI SEZHIAN: Yet, the difference is there. Because the results obtained in Bangalore are higher, you cannot say that they are a fraud. One cannot say that. Without being clear about the whole position, we should not jump to conclusions and say that whatever research has been done has been a fraud. Though I belong to the Opposition, I would say one thing very clearly, although I would like Government to put their house very much in order. I must acknowledge, however, that something good has been done as a result of the research done by the ICAR and other allied institutions. Nobody has disputed that, as Shri Vajpayee has said.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: Even the committee has accepted that.

SHRI SEZHIAN: Therefore, I want the totality of things to be taken into account. If they have done something within three or four years, let us put them in a direction where they can deliver more goods instead of hampering them with our discussions or by other considerations which may be in the nature of hindering their work and dampening their zeal.

Therefore, I for one accept the action taken by Government, but they have not gone far. My plea is that Government should make it fully autonomous and not have this divided responsibility of the Secretary here acting as Dr. Jekyll here and Mr. Hyde there. That will not deliver the goods. Either it should be made fully autonomous or it should be made a full-fledged department with Government taking full responsibility on their head. Let them not try to please

Gajendragadkar as well as the others. When Government want to do the thing, they should be very clear in their mind.

There are some other minor matters. For instance, I am baffled by some of the recommendations made. One of the recommendations made is that the maximum salary of a scientist here should be only Rs. 2,000 whereas in other research institutes jobs with more than Rs. 2,000 salary are available, what crime has been done by the ICAR to deserve this type of ceiling, while such ceilings are not there in the other research institutions?

After all, it is not as though the report of this committee is the last word on the subject. We are in a scientific age and in a scientific world, nothing is final. Even the findings of this committee are apt to be studied later and modified. Even the judgment of the Supreme Court has been contested by us and we did not accept it. Since we wanted social change we said that they should change. Therefore, I am very sorry to say that I am not able to accept the pay scale recommended by the committee.

As for the irregularities and failures pointed out, I suggest that they should be remedied by Government. But I do not accept the basic recommendations that it should be made a full-fledged department. I do not also accept the proposition that the UPSC should intervene. If I remember aright, there was an all-India conference of scientists and technologists held in Delhi in 1972. They went into this question. Dr. Kothari and other eminent scientists mentioned in the Report were present there. They formed a committee to go into this matter and then they passed a unanimous resolution saying that the UPSC should not be asked to select scientists and technicians.

(Shri Sezhiyan.)

Therefore, while supporting the major decisions taken by Government, I would request Government to give full autonomy to the research institutes.

SHRI K. LAKKAPPA (Tumkur): I listened to the speeches made on this Motion. I also feel that agricultural research has advanced by leaps and bounds after 1966. Before 1966, there was not even financial freedom for the scientists to carry on the expected research in agricultural science. But after that year, the ICAR has done much research in the agricultural field which concerns the basic occupation of millions of people in the country.

My friends have stated that because of a certain unfortunate event taking place, the Gajendragadkar Committee was appointed. Certain valuable suggestions have been made by the Committee. I hope and trust that on the basis of the conclusions reached by the Committee, there would be streamlining of the functioning and research work of the ICAR. Because of the handling of administrative matters in a certain way, certain scientists have become frustrated. This is one of the maladies that have to be rectified. This has been brought to the notice of the Ministry of Agriculture in the past also. The matter was discussed also. Action had been taken on various aspects and some of the maladies pointed out in research in the field of agriculture have been remedied.

Though the scope of the Committee was limited, still its findings are very useful.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please continue the next day.

SHRI K. LAKKAPPA: Tomorrow I will not be here.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I do not know.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU (Diamond Harbour): I do not mind if he continues for another five minutes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All right.

SHRI K. LAKKAPPA: We have to give credit to our agricultural scientists who have carried on very useful research. Of course, certain difficulties have been experienced and certain events took place which are sad in the history of the ICAR.

Certain suggestions have been made not only by the Gajendragadkar Committee but also by the National Commission on Agriculture. They have gone into all aspects of the matter.

We have to give full freedom to our scientists. I do not pay a glorious tribute to Dr. Swaminathan because he comes from the south. I have no such regional or parochial inhibitions. But the fact is that Dr. Swaminathan is one of the outstanding scientists of our country. He has carried on many researches, mostly into the evolution of wheat strains. This has been a useful research which has attracted the attention of not only this country but also other countries.

Also, the research which has been carried on in our universities is not enough to advance our scientific growth, and therefore, I would like to suggest to the Ministry that the various aspects in regard to food production have to be dealt with in so many universities which are functioning. The ICAR should also be streamlined and the universities should be adequately represented in scientific research institutions. The scientists should have some confidence and they must also create confidence and they should work under an atmosphere of confidence. This kind of autonomy should be there for this purpose. This autonomy alone will create an enthusiasm because scientific research is a continuous one. It is not static; it is dynamic. Therefore, this dynamism should be retained by the Ministry and the various changes and suggestions made in the report should be carried into effect. The findings:

of this Committee as given in the report and the decisions taken by the Government upon them are commendable.

In addition, our Ministry should guide certain scientific research in the agricultural field including animal husbandry and the various aspects of it should be developed in a proper way. Unless we create great confidence among the scientists it cannot be developed. Also, the scientists should be given the freedom to work and also financial help and assistance to carry on research without fear or favour. Because of a few appointments and because of the frustration of a few, and because of certain administrative methods, and also because of administrative control, they might have failed, and so, agricultural administration should be entrusted to the scientists. I also agree that scientists should be properly represented in their respective fields and any kind of discrimination should be immediately nipped in the bud.

This kind of vilification of scientists on any side, from any angle, is very bad for our country because our country has to develop and grow so far as the agricultural field is concerned. Therefore, I would like to suggest that full autonomy should be given to research institutions and other organisations including the universities who carry on research. The financial aspect has to be controlled by the ICAR and the scientists should be given full freedom to work and have their say in the administration and even in promotions and regulations in the institutes. Otherwise, the dual policy, the dual power and the dual administration would also shatter the scientists' minds and this will not allow a healthy competition to grow for scientific research in this country.

Therefore, the hon. Minister has really rendered some service to this great country through the ICAR. Not only that. They have given full free-

dom to the ICAR by accepting the findings of this Inquiry Committee. That would create a great change in the ICAR and I hope and trust that this change will always be for the better, and that the scientists could do better work in scientific research in the ICAR.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. H. M. Patel. Please begin.

SHRI H. M. PATEL (Dhandhuka): Mr. Chairman, Sir, I would like to say that much of the discussion today—

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please continue when the subject comes up again.

Now, we are taking up the half-an-hour discussion raised by Shri Jyotirmoy Bosu.

17.34 hrs.

HALF-AN-HOUR DISCUSSION AVAILABILITY OF FERTILIZERS

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU (Diamond Harbour): Sir, this is an important subject. Today, the country is in the grip of a serious crisis and the poor farmer has been really pushed to the corner of his life, and I cannot but say that the ruling party is wholly responsible for this. In that context, I would like Mr. F. A. Ahmed to kindly give us a comprehensive list of the wholesalers in fertilizers appointed since December, 1970 State-wise, month-wise, till date.

THE MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE (SHRI F. A. AHMED): I might inform the hon. Member that so far as the appointment of the wholesalers is concerned, it has nothing to do with this.

17.35 hrs.

[SHRI SEZHIYAN in the Chair]

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: I wanted Mr. Borooah to be present here for this discussion, but I do not find him here.