

[شری محمد قیشی]

شاستری جی نے کہا ہے کہ جو مختلف قسم کی ایسوپشدر میں درگھلائیں روکے میں ان کا کام بڑھانے کی انہوں نے تجویز ہی ہے۔ مہری سب سے بڑی تملایہ ہے کہ اگر یہ لوگ اس بات کو پہچانوں کہ کام سب سے پہلے تو ہوا سندر ہو۔ تب میں ایکے پاؤں دھو کر پیتا اگر ایسے اہوتا۔ لیکن بہتستی ہے۔ ہے۔ کہ ایکے سمجھانے پر اور آپکے مشورہ پر یہ لوگ کام روک رہے ہیں اور سارے ملک کو قضا میں قال رکھا ہے انہوں نے۔ آپ گلہگری یونہی کو ایلیگریج کرنا چہرے دیں۔ تو ہلدوستان کی تقدیر بدل سکتی ہے۔

باقی انہوں نے جو باتوں کہوں ان کا میں جواب دینا نہیں چاہتا۔ وہ جواب دینے کے قابل نہیں ہیں۔]

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is: "That the Bill be passed."

*The motion was adopted.*

16.38 hrs.

DISCUSSION RE: REORGANISATION OF I.C.A.R.—Contd.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Now we take up further discussion on the statement laid on the Table by the Minister of State for Agriculture on the 12th November, 1973, indicating Government's decisions on the reorganisation of the Indian Council of Agricultural Research in the light of the recommendations of the I.C.A.R. Inquiry Committee.

Mr. H. M. Patel.

SHRI H. M. PATEL (DHANDHUKA): It seems to me that the Government, when they considered the Gajendragadkar Committee's report, had forgotten the circumstances under which this Committee came to be appointed. There was a scientist who, feeling frustrated and disappointed, committed suicide, and that suicide aroused such emotions and feelings in the country that the Government was constrained to appoint this Committee to go into the circumstances that led a scientist of this distinction to commit suicide.

Mr. Chairman, at the request of this House that an independent committee be appointed, Government appointed a really high-power committee consisting of independent persons—an ex-Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, very distinguished scientists and a very experienced administrator—to go into all these matters and submit a report. It was clear, at that time—and the Government themselves admitted—that the conditions in the I.C.A.R., I.A.R.I. etc. were not what they ought to be. Now when the Committee has given its report, the Government finds that they cannot accept its recommendations, and the reasons for not accepting these recommendations have not been given as methodically and as cogently as the Committee has given them. For everyone of its recommendations the committee has given the most persuasive and convincing arguments. It has done so after examining witnesses, after taking oral evidence, after considering the written evidence and after visiting various institutes, and yet the Government consider the report and its recommendations not worthy of consideration at all. It is true that they would say, 'Yes, we have accepted some recommendations.' But then they forget that the committee itself has pointed out that their recommendations form a composite whole, that to take one or two recommendations and to leave some out,

would be to make the recommendations totally unsatisfactory and not capable of achieving the purpose for which the committee was appointed and for which their recommendations have been made.

I would like to draw your attention to what the committee has said in this connection. It has said:

"It is in the light of these broad principles that we proceed to ask ourselves what should be the kind of atmosphere on campuses where agricultural education is imparted and agricultural research is carried on. In our view, on these campuses, it is absolutely essential that the atmosphere should be serene and conducive to a sustained and dedicated effort to pursue academic work. A genuine spirit of inquiry and search for truth must inspire every scientist on the campus. While engaged on search for truth, humility of approach must mark his effort and willingness to submit his views and his theories to a full and free debate and discussion with all his colleagues must never be absent. A free and full discussion is a condition precedent for any scientific progress, whether in agriculture or other branches of science and, in such a free and full discussion, dissent must always occupy a place of respect."

Now, that is the spirit in which the committee examined the entire facts and circumstances and what did they find when they went round these campuses? This is what they say:

"Our visits to the campuses of the I.A.R.I. and some of the Centres have created an impression in our mind that everything is not well on the campus of the I.A.R.I. and the Centres which we visited. At the I.A.R.I. some of us met cross-sections of scientists, junior, mid-senior and senior, and we found to our regret that, in the mind of most of them, there was a sense of disappointment, dis-satisfaction, frustra-

tion and even fear. Some of them in fact told us that they would prefer to avoid sending answers to the Questionnaire supplied to them because they were afraid that, if the answers which they gave came to the knowledge of the higher authorities, they might be victimised."

Now, this is very important. Consider the circumstances in respect of which the committee was called upon to unravel and unveil and on the basis of these conditions they have made their recommendations and, ignoring all these circumstances, the Government ignore their recommendations.

Going further, I would like to point out what they have got to say:

"When a person becomes a head, whether of a section or a division or an institute, he is likely to be occupied mainly with administrative work and, to that extent, may lose touch with science; and, if he holds the post of the head permanently, it would not be surprising that he ends up by being a mere administrator and almost a stranger to science. This is a loss to science which must be avoided."

Laying down the principle, they proceed further:

"When a head is appointed for life, so much power vests in him, whether he is the head of a division or the Director of an Institute or one of the senior officers at the I.C.A.R. that inadvertently, unwillingly or unknowingly he may not always use the power objectively or fairly. Sometimes, the head may form a good opinion about certain scientists and a bad opinion about certain others. Assuming that this opinion formed by the head is justified, the fact that the head will remain a head permanently is bound to create an unfavourable atmosphere for the scientists falling in the later category and it may not easily

[Shri H. M. Patel]

afford an opportunity to those scientists to better their prospects by improving their work.”

And then this is the point which they made:

“The existence of a permanent hierarchical structure, in our opinion, is one of the major causes for the unfortunate atmosphere which pervades the campus of the I.A.R.I. and other Institutes.”

**सभापति महोदय :** अभी हमारे माननीय प्रतिनिधि, श्री ब्रेजनेव, पार्लियमेंट हाउस में आने वाले हैं। अभी कुछ और माननीय सदस्य बोलना चाहते हैं। हम इस डिस्कशन को आज खत्म करना चाहते हैं। अगर माननीय सदस्य पांच मिनट से ज्यादा न लें, तो मैं सब को चान दे सकूंगा।

**SHRI H. M. PATEL:** I request you to give me a few more minutes. I have to leave out some of the points which are very important. But what I wish to point out is that the Government have, for some unknown reasons, not accepted the recommendations which they ought to have accepted.

Sir, the Committee was a balanced one and had among its personnel, men with ample experience of science, scientific research, education and its administration as well as general administration. If the recommendations of such a Committee were to be virtually ignored, why was it appointed at all? Government might as well have been left to do what it thought best as indeed it intends doing now.

The Committee has made a thorough examination of the various statements, as I have said, and have come to these balanced conclusions. And what does the Government do? They have not agreed to the findings of the Committee in so many respects. On what grounds? It is difficult to understand that. They say that the

Committee did not go fully into facts. In respect of Dr. De's appointment, that particular matter was referred to the Law Ministry. And what did the Law Ministry say? They say, it was perfectly legal. But, whoever questioned the legality of that appointment? What the Committee said was, that it was not proper, that it was improperly done. Certain rules which should have been respected were not respected in making that appointment. Therefore, to refer it to Law Ministry is almost to say that you are paying no attention whatsoever to the Committee's recommendations. The Committee concluded that the appointment of Dr. De as Head of the Division of Agronomy was not properly made. Then if you go ahead and look at various items of scientific research etc. about which Dr. Shah had referred in his testamentary letter, here again the Government says that they do not agree with some of the findings. But the Committee gave its findings on the basis of a report submitted by a panel of advisers. That panel of advisers was made up of very competent people. It should have been respected. Instead, Government ignores it all and says no. It virtually amounts to ignoring the report altogether.

What I really feel is that the Government should have given the fullest consideration to the recommendations of this report, and to the fact that they formed a package. As they themselves say:

“The more important of these recommendations may be usefully reproduced here to show our anxiety that this scheme can work only as composite scheme:

1. Maximum autonomy to the Institutes.
2. Powers should be delegated down the line to the scientists actually doing research.
3. All managerial posts upto the Head of the Division level

should be held on a tenure basis.

4. D. G. Directors and Heads of Divisions should exercise their powers in consultation with properly constituted committees.

Sir, in the field of agriculture, education and research, adequate importance should be given to the agricultural universities.

Finally, this is something on which Government has made no remarks whatsoever in this statement. That is about the status of the employees of the I.C.A.R., on the research side who have a special designation. The ministerial staff have many grievances. Although the Committee says that they were not called upon to deal with this particular item, they felt it ought to be considered because once again, if their claims are ignored we would be leaving seeds of discontent in the whole set-up.

Therefore, I suggest that the Government may seriously consider this. My conclusion would be this that the Government should bear in mind what the Committee has said towards the end of their report. I am deliberately quoting from the report of the Committee because, the Committee's recommendations have been so completely ignored, almost as if the Committee has not said anything in these matters. I quote:

"Thus, our approach in dealing with the problems entrusted to us is to make recommendations which would meet the present recruitment and personnel policies and help to create a healthy atmosphere on the campus of the I.A.R.I. and other Institutes so that the scientists working in them are able to play their legitimate part."

Now, as far as their recommendation on the question of recruitment through the U.P.S.C. is concerned,

that again has been ignored. And curiously, the Committee has gone into the alternative of setting up a panel of scientists which has been accepted by Government. They considered it carefully and rejected it. They considered it necessary that the recruitment by the U.P.S.C. should be resorted to. For what reasons? Because, there was prevalent a sense of dissatisfaction—discontent—and lack of confidence. There was a crisis of confidence; there is a crisis of confidence among the scientists. If that was to be removed, then you should, to begin with, for at least for five years, recruit through the U.P.S.C. They themselves say that if this experiment fails, then you can consider some other arrangement. It is most unwise to ignore the recommendation of a Committee a high-powered Committee—which has made this recommendation in such a fair and objective manner and after the most careful consideration of all the available evidence and to accept arrangement based on the advice, presumably, of those whose conduct itself was under the investigation of this Committee. There could have been no other source or no other set of advisers to whom the Government could have turned to. That, in itself, was to my mind a most improper thing to do.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I have to make a request to all the friends who want to speak now. Everybody is very anxious to take his seat in the Central Hall. May I make a request to those who have not spoken to forgo their right to speak so that they may hear the hon. Minister?

SHRI CHAPALENDU BHATTACHARYYA (Giridih): I think it will be very unfair on your part in not permitting us to speak. Please extend the time by a few minutes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Everything that the Chair does is fair. I am just making a request. How can it become unfair?

**SHRI CHAPALENDU BHATTACHARYYA:** This is not an aspersion on the Chair. I apologise for it.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Mr. Ravi. Please be brief.

**SHRI VAYALAR RAVI (Chirayinkil):** I shall be as brief as possible. First of all, let me tell you that the Report is not a Bible which cannot be changed. I believe that there is so much of inconsistency in the report. As it is you are cutting the salaries. Here is a hierarchy. I would like to know from the Hon. Member one thing. Does he mean to say that the scientists should not be head of the Research Institutes like the I.C.A.R.? There is already a debate going on in the country today as between the technocrats and the generalists. If we say that technical people and scientists and competent people should not be there at the top of this kind of institution but the hierarchy of Government should be continued there and scientists cannot sit there, it means that we are going to create more conflict thereby. Further I feel that if we make it a purely government department, it would mean more red tape and more problems will arise thereby.

In this connection, I would like to mention one thing. I am not pleading for anybody when I say this. But a statement has been made by Shri H. M. Patel here that some of the Members have been afraid of speaking the facts. I cannot agree with him on this, because the Committee itself has recorded its satisfaction regarding the work done by Dr. Swaminathan and the help that he had rendered.

Moreover, the ICAR is an institution which combines education and research together. The Committee itself has observed in paras 2.17 and 2.18 at page 9 of its report that the ICAR has helped a great deal in bringing about the green revolution. There may be some disgruntlement on the part of some scientist or somebody else. But the fact remains, as the committee

itself has acknowledged, that the ICAR has been responsible to a great extent in bringing about the green revolution. So, some credit must be given to the ICAR in this regard. So, one has to give one's commendation and accept the truth in regard to the working of the ICAR. I know that we are having this discussion in the national interest. But if we want to rely on the report and accuse somebody in the ICAR, we must accept his fact also.

Shri Samar Guha had referred to the secretary. A questionnaire had been sent to the secretary. He was not a scientist but only an IAS officer. So, how could he answer that questionnaire? Either they must have given a personal hearing to him or else they should have sent him another questionnaire. If they had not done so, how can one accuse the secretary to the I.C.A.R. here?

It is very unfortunate that hon. Members have taken the name of one of the topmost scientists of the world on the floor of the House and thereby demoralised the scientists. This is very regrettable. Of course, we do have the privilege of criticising anybody. But basing the argument on the question whether the protein content is 2.81 per cent or 4.2 per cent, it is not proper to drag the name of an eminent scientist and accuse him on the floor of the House and thereby demoralise the scientists. This kind of tendency to criticise the scientists will not help the scientists to come forward more and more but would demoralise them.

In conclusion, I would say that I happen to be the president of one of the unions of the employees of the ICAR. I have to record my regret that the question of the employees has not been considered properly, but I hope the hon. Minister will consider that also.

**SHRI ANANTRAO PATIL (Khed):** In response to your request, I shall give my time to the hon. Minister, but before he is called upon to speak, I

would like to ask just two or three questions.

As far as agriculture and agriculturists are concerned, Government are fully justified in the fact that they have not accepted the committee's recommendation in toto; two major recommendations have not been accepted; I do not say that they have been rejected.

The committee has suggested that instead of the council being more autonomous, it should be a government department. Taking into consideration the research work in the agricultural sphere, the results of the research should be applied in the field, and this work has been going on with co-operation between the council and the State Governments and the universities. In view of this, if Government have thought it fit and justified that it should not become a department of the Government, I think they are fully justified in their decision.

But the basic question is that the need of this country today is more production of foodgrains including cereals and millets etc. Our scientists have been trying their level best and they have been doing a wonderful job for the last four or five years, and they have produced high-yielding varieties of wheat and rice, and they are trying to produce similar high-yielding varieties of pulses and other things also. The Sharbati Sonora, the Sonora variety etc. have been referred to here. But I would like to know from the hon. Minister whether the results of this new technology which brings about this high yield have reached the remotest villages and especially the small farmer, so that he could apply all those new methods and have more production.

Is that machinery there or not?

The other point is that the UPSC cannot be competent in every walk of life. They cannot be expert in every branch of knowledge. Instead of the UPSC, if there is a selection board

consisting of eminent scientists, it can do justice to the younger scientists in the matter of recruitment.

17 hrs.

The creation of the grievance cell will simplify matters and will lessen the complaints of the employees.

I think much capital has been made by some members who said that the sanctity of the Committee, the stature and standing of its members and so on should have been taken into account and Government was wrong in departing from their recommendations. This is not a new thing that has happened.

SHRI CHAPALENDU BHATTACHARYYA (Giridih): The Report of the ICAR Inquiry Committee has its undertone of an unsolved question, namely, the degree of power, the degree of autonomy that societies, literary, cultural or even scientific, may have with relation to state power. Therefore, it is bound to be a trial and error method.

The step which has been suggested that ICAR should become a department of Government would, I think, be a retrograde step. Different degrees of autonomy in such societies should be experimented with. It is agreed that Dr. Swaminathan is a great scientist. He has proved it by the growth of a crop of younger scientist by his guidance. There should be not only a green revolution in the field but also an upsurge of growth in research under his aegis.

Attempts have been made to find a kindred system by examining the structure of other organisations like AEC, CSIR, Defence Science, ICAR and so on. There are various efforts made. It may be that there have been some mistakes. Those mistakes could be corrected. In fact, the Sarkar Committee also looked into the working of the CSIR just as the Gajendragadkar Committee looked into the working of the ICAR. Government have tried to find a kindred point between conflicting viewpoints. This could not have been done better.

**SHRI B. V. NAIK (Kanara):** I thank you for permitting me to say a few words.

**SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA (Begusarai):** Before this formality is completed, his time would be over!

**SHRI B. V. NAIK:** While we appreciate that we have to be present in the Central Hall to welcome our honoured guest, I am quite sure that the honoured guest himself would like that the proceedings of Parliament extend by a few minutes more so that we need not go there by young adolescence to await his arrival for half an hour and more. However, within the limitations of time, I will try to cover what best I can.

The last part of this Report which is the most salient one contains the Report of the Panel of Advisers appointed under Dr. Dandekar with Drs. Negi, Patel and Rao. They very candidly bring forth the point that what has happened at the ICAR is not an isolated incident; it is the case prevailing almost in all the scientific community in this country. I think it needs a restatement because it is the only point that I am trying to make. We are reluctant to recommend any specific measures to correct the situation in the present case because unfortunately the phenomenon is not confined to the ICAR and its institutions. Barring some minor exceptions, it pervades the entire scientific and academic community in this country; at the root of it is the greed for bureaucratic power and love of a comfortable life which afflicts this class of scientists. In this matter, there is no distinction between juniors and seniors.

**SHRI SAMAR GUHA (Contai):** Quorum is not there. Let there be quorum first. It is an important issue that we are discussing. Or, let it be postponed.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The bell is ringing. In the meanwhile, the hon. Mr. Naik may proceed with his speech.

**SHRI B. V. NAIK:** The juniors are intellectually as corrupt as their seniors. Politicalisation of academic and scientific life has made matters worse. We wish to emphasise this general situation because without reference to it, we think it will be unjust to pass judgment or to suggest specific measures in the particular case before the ICAR Inquiry Committee.

I think that has been the gist of the conclusion which has been arrived at by the Committee. I request that as far as this case is concerned, we look at it not from an individual point of view but from an institutional point of view, and to that extent, I suppose with the limitation of time I have said what best could be said, and I leave it to the Minister to make his speech.

**SHRI P. G. MAVALANKAR (Ahmedabad):** Mr. Chairman, Sir, while I congratulate the Government on appointing this Inquiry Committee on this important matter, I wish they had gone to the extent of accepting the major recommendations of this Committee, made in their report. I am sorry to find that the Government have accepted only those things which were found convenient, namely, taking over the ICAR as part of the Government department and leaving over the matter of autonomy to them. Therefore, I feel that Government's response to this report is neither just nor proper, and the Government, instead of having the best of both the worlds, are having the worst of both the worlds'.

Even the main grievance of the late Dr. Vinod Shah has not been properly paid heed to. I feel that the scientists who have to work in an atmosphere and spirit of freedom and experimentation are denied the legitimate climate of freedom to experiment.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Now, there is quorum.

**SHRI P. G. MAVALANKAR:** Sir, some hon. Members have said in the course of the debate that the scientists

are being attacked in the report of the Committee, but if you see on page 13 of the report, you will find that it is not so. The report says clearly—I quote:

“... We would like to add with a sense of satisfaction that, during the course of our inquiry, we found that in spite of disappointment, frustration and even anger which pervade their minds, almost all the scientists, whom we met, struck us as highly qualified and competent in their respective disciplines and determined to serve the country by making their contribution to its agricultural development, by their experiments and extension work in the respective disciplines of their choice.”

Therefore, I want to conclude by saying this. The Gajendragadkar report does emphasise the great work done by the scientists. All it wants to be done is, let it be done with a combination of responsibility and autonomy. I should have thought that the Government was doing this, but the Government in order to go in its own way, have made things worse, because I am afraid that by what they are doing, there will be more bureaucratisation and less of autonomy and freedom.

I shall conclude by saying that an atmosphere of involvement and climate of participation and conditions of healthy competition must obtain in all those campuses of research and scientific inquiry. I am afraid that by what they proposed to do this may not happen. Dr. Gajendragadkar had referred to four specific cases to the Ministry of Agriculture, and he had requested for an investigation through the C.B.I. I wonder whether that has been done or not. I hope the Minister will reply to that point as well.

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी (ग्वास्तियर) :

सभापति जी, मुझे एक ही बात कहनी है कि कल सदन में गजेन्द्रगडकर कमेटी की रिपोर्ट पर चर्चा हुई लेकिन ग्राल इंडिया

रेडियो ने उसको ब्लॉक आउट कर दिया। रात 9 बजे के समाचार में उसका कोई उल्लेख नहीं था। इससे पहले राज्य सभा में जब चर्चा हुई थी गजेन्द्रगडकर कमेटी की रिपोर्ट पर उसको भी ग्राल इंडिया रेडियो ने रिपोर्ट नहीं किया था। मैं समझता हूँ ग्राल इंडिया रेडियो ने रिपोर्ट नहीं किया था। मैं समझता हूँ ग्राल इंडिया रेडियो का यह तरीका सदन के साथ व्यवहार करने का उचित नहीं है। यह बहुत गम्भीर मामला है और इस पर आप ध्यान दें।

सभापति महोदय वाजपेयी जी ने जो कहा वह रिकार्ड पर चला गया है। पार्लामेन्टरी मिनिस्टर देखकर उसपर कार्यवाही करेंगे।

उन्होंने मुझे लिखकर भेजा था इसलिए मैंने उनको एलाऊ कर दिया।

THE MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE (SHRI F. A. AHMED): I am indeed grateful to the hon. Members who have participated in this discussion and provided me with an opportunity of clarifying the viewpoint of the Government. At the outset, however, I should like to put on record my deep appreciation for the valuable work done by the Gajendragadkar Committee and the recommendations made by them and particularly for the speed with which they have submitted the report and the thoroughness with which they have gone through various matters which were referred to them. I am really grateful to Shri Gajendragadkar and his colleagues for all this.

I think it would be wrong for the hon. members to say that we have rejected the report submitted by this Committee. The reorganisation of the ICAR was under contemplation by the Government before this Committee was appointed. After this Committee was appointed, the Chairman asked me that we should not take any action on our proposal unless and until the report of the Committee was avail-



[Shri F. A. Ahmed]

able. Therefore, after the report came into our hands we took into consideration the recommendations and suggestions made by them with regard to the future of the ICAR and also various other factors. Government went into this matter very deeply and after that they have taken certain decisions which have been placed before this House.

I should like to point out that so far as the recommendations of the Committee are concerned, they can be classified under three or four main heads. With regard to many other things they have made observations. There is no need for us to consider now what they have suggested with regard to those matters. We have rejected them. We are not taking them into consideration at all. What we have laid before the House is that on the many points about which recommendations have been made, Government have taken certain decisions and those decisions have been placed before the House for its consideration.

What is the main recommendation of the Committees? It is that the ICAR should be a Government department. So far as its present status is concerned, it is a registered society. Since 1939, it has been considered as an attached department. It was neither here nor there. Therefore, in the interest of research and in the interest of education Government thought that it was desirable that it should be given an autonomous status. We think that interference either by bureaucrats or politicians is likely to harm research and education, particularly research and education concerned with the development of agriculture and our economy. So we thought that it should be given an autonomous character. We have suggested that research and educational responsibility will entirely be handed over to the Governing Body which will have several committees to look into various aspects and they will not be fattered either in administrative matters or in financial matters so far as their work is concerned. On page

9 of the report even the committee says that—

"For the development of science and its research, it is necessary that the institute and the centres must enjoy autonomy to carry on their work within the constraint reasonably implied in the very nature of their work;"

We have only respected the opinion of the committee and given an autonomous character so that it may be possible to carry on research and education unfettered and uninterfered by bureaucrats and politicians. That is one aspect.

Secondly, we have also realised that there was some justification in the committee recommending that it should have the status of a department because unless and until there is some governmental authority, research done by ICAR cannot be taken to the field level, for that purpose, we have constituted the Department of Education and Research in the Agriculture Ministry. It will be a small department which will take the results of research of ICAR to the field level. The Head of the Department will be the Director-General of ICAR. This has been set up only for the purpose of linking and coordinating research work and field work. It is not that we have rejected the recommendation of the committee. We have actually taken advantage of the report before us, the working of the CSIR and other things and we have decided to constitute a body which will be autonomous on the one hand and on the other hand, it will have the effect of the carrying the benefit of the research to the field level. For that purpose this Department of Agriculture and Research has been set up in the Ministry of Agriculture.

**SHRI SAMAR GUHA:** Is it not a fact that some employees and scientists working in different national laboratories are considered as Government employees?

**SHRI F. A. AHMED:** The hon. Member is raising a different issue

It is a fact that the present employees of ICAR are of two or three categories—those who were employed by ICAR, those who were employed by other institutes and later came to ICAR and those who were employees of Government and who are on deputation in ICAR.

After the status has been given to ICAR it will be open to the Government employees to remain there on deputation as long as they are on deputation. They will be governed by the Government Rules. So far as the ICAR is concerned, it will have its own procedure. According to that procedure they will enjoy the benefits and facilities provided by that institution.

The second important matter about which this Committee gave recommendation was the recruitment of personnel. The Committee has recommended that for a period of five years the recruitment should be handed over to the UPSC. As a large number of appointments had to be made, I said that I would accept this recommendation of the Committee and that the UPSC should take over the recruitment for these posts immediately. Actually, the posts were also advertised by the UPSC. Later on, it was found that there was a decision of the Calcutta High Court that the Public Service Commission cannot undertake recruitment for bodies which are autonomous and which are not government bodies. When this matter was examined the Law Ministry expressed the view that it can be interpreted either way. Therefore, we thought that it would not be desirable to take a decision in the matter to get the posts filled up through the UPSC because in case on a future date such appointments are considered illegal, it will be creating difficulties not only for the Government but also for those employees.

SHRI SAMAR GUHA: You had made a commitment to this House the recruitment will be made through the UPSC. If on account of the decision of the High Court of Calcutta

you had to change your decision, was it not your obligation to inform this House of the change in decision? Not informing the House to such a decision amounts to disregarding the House.

SHRI F. A. AHMED: The hon. Member is not justified in making this remark. The very first day of the meeting of the House, we placed the decision of the Government on the Table of the House.

What we have now decided is not something different. We have now appointed a Board, which will comprise a scientist and a person with experience as a chairman. So far as we are concerned, we have taken a decision with regard to appointment which will give entire satisfaction to the House.

SHRI SAMAR GUHA: Will that scientist be outside the ICAR?

SHRI F. A. AHMED: Yes. Government have decided to appoint an independent recruitment board in the ICAR under the chairmanship of a whole-time chairman. This will eliminate the lacunae pointed out by the Enquiry Committee and, at the same time, provide a mechanism for proper scientific assessment of candidates who are agricultural scientists. The recruitment board is being set up expeditiously. It has been decided to appoint Dr. Shahare as the Chairman of the Board soon after he relinquishes charge as member of the UPSC. Even if we have given this matter to the UPSC, it would have gone to him and, in consultation with the other members, he would have made those appointments. Dr. Shahare holds M.Sc. and Ph.D. in Agricultural science subject. He was the principal of a college in Aurangabad. During the years 1962-67 he had been a member of various academic bodies of the Bombay University. He has also been a member of the Governing Body of the ICAR. He was a member of the Maharashtra Public Service Commission during the year 1967-68 and has been a member of UPSC from February 1968. We are fortunate to

[Shri F. A. Ahmed]

have in Dr. Shahare a competent scientist with academic experience and, at the same time, an experienced public servant in recruitment procedure. With his appointment it is hoped that the vacant posts in the ICAR can be easily filled up.

Therefore, the hon. Members will realise that even because of the difficulties, it was not possible for us to refer these appointments to the U.P.S.C. We have set up a Board which is something like the U.P.S.C. It is quite independent of those connected with the I.C.A.R. I hope, the decision which we have taken will give satisfaction not only to the Members of this House but also to all the employees of the I.C.A.R. It will be a one man board and that person will invite scientists, not connected with the I.C.A.R. from outside to help him for the purpose of making selection. He can do so. That is one aspect so far as the recruitment policy is concerned.

The other aspect is that one of the grievanecs and one of the reasons for frustration was that the scientists had to appear for vacancies from time to time before a number of Selection Boards. This is one grievance, as a result of which they had the reason to be dissatisfied. Now, what we have done is that so far as the existing vacant posts carrying salaries of Rs. 700—1250 and above are concerned, they will be advertised, the applications will be received and the selection will be made by this Board. Later on, they will have to give report of the work done by them at the end of every year to the head of their Department. The assessment of their work will be done through an appropriate assessment procedure. On the basis of this assessment there will be promotion upto the scale of Rs. 1100—14,00 and they need not go to various Selection Boards and so on. Only for the purpose of senior posts at salary levels from Rs. 1300—1600 and above, there will be again a reference to the Selection Board and, on the basis of merit, those persons will be appointed.

I can also point out one fact that, here, one of the reasons of dissatisfaction has been that many of the scientists hoping to become the head of the Department have been tampering or have been interfering with the work of scientist, I can tell you that this is the policy of the Government and our present Director-General also approves of this policy that so far as the senior posts are concerned, like, the posts of Director-General and so on, they will be tenure posts and that they will not be for an indefinite period. They will be appointed only for a period of five years and, after the period of five years, they will have to give up these posts. This is the thinking in our Department; this is the thinking of the present Director-General and, I hope, the step which we have taken in this connection will to a great extent satisfy the scientists, both senior and junior scientists.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA (Alipore): It is only a thinking.

SHRI F. A. AHMED: I can tell you that this is the recommendation which we are considering and there will be no difficulty so far as taking a decision in this respect is concerned.

I would like the Members to realise that so far as this Inquiry Committee is concerned, it was based on a letter written by Dr. Shah. He had given reasons as to why he was dissatisfied. He had given two instances that is, the case of Dr. Prasad and the case of Dr. De. I would like to point out that so far as the case of Dr. Prasad is concerned, the Committee has come to a decision that there was no justification in the allegation made so far as his appointment was concerned.

SHRI SUMAR GUHA: They have used the word "unfortunate".

SHRI F. A. AHMED: They have come to a finding that it was justified and there was no justification in the allegation made.

So far as the case of Dr. De is concerned, after examining various things, they have come to a decision

that it was not proper. Now, the question before us was—it is not that we have rejected the recommendation made by the Committee—what follow-up action has to be taken by the Government as a result of this recommendation. Now, we referred the matter to the Law Ministry asking them what follow-up action we could take against him because of the appointment having been made, he having been appointed and discharging the responsibilities and so on. The opinion of the Law Ministry was that, as the appointment made was legal, though improper, we could not take the action of removing him from that post. Therefore, we had to accept the opinion of the Law Ministry. If we had dismissed him or removed him from that post, he would have gone to a court of law and the result would have been against the Government. So, it is not a question that we did not accept the recommendation. We were helpless in the matter because the Law Ministry's opinion was that it was not *mala fide*; it was improper however, it was a legal appointment. Therefore, nothing could be done, so far far this matter was concerned.

So far as the claims of the ICAR with regard to research activities are concerned, the hon. members would be pleased to see that the Committee had referred the items mentioned by Dr. Shah to a panel of Advisers.

The panel of advisers had gone very deeply into these matters, and the hon. members will be pleased to find that by and large, the allegations have not been substantiated.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No, no.

SHRI F. A. AHMED: With regard to potato, it has been found that the allegation was not substantiated. With regard to even Baisakhi Moong, it was said that there might have been some opinion. With regard to rice, the allegation was not substantiated.

The only thing was—and to which the hon. Member made a reference—

about Sharbati Sonora. I would like to point out that, first of all, so far as Sharbati Sonora is concerned, this was a strain which was produced by Dr. Swaminathan and Dr. Verghese from the parent strain of Sonora-64, and it was analysed by one Dr. Austin. Let us not mix the two things. So far as the strain is concerned, it was produced by Dr. Swaminathan and Dr. Verghese, and it was analysed by Dr. Austin and at that time it was found that it had a lysine content to the extent of 4.61 per cent. This was done in the year 1967. One or two years later, there was a claim somewhere that the wheat discovered in some university in America contained lysine to the extent of four per cent. Then in the course of a lecture somewhere, Dr. Swaminathan said that, in India, we had found a variety of wheat which had lysine-content of 4.61 per cent. That was mentioned by him in the course of a lecture. Later on, people in other parts started to find out whether the claim made by the Indian scientist was correct or not. In various laboratories this was brought under test and they found that the lysine-content was not so high. Later on it was also tested in our laboratories and it was found that it did not have four per cent but it had a higher protein content than Sonora. The only question is this. For this, can we put that much blame which has been ascribed to Dr. Swaminathan not only in this House and in the Rajya Sabha but also in public statements? (*Interruptions*)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Samar Guha, please do not interrupt the Minister again and again. Let him finish. We have to go to the Central Hall function.

SHRI SAMAR GUHA: Was it not a fact that Dr. Y. P. Jadav who has a lot of experience in the laboratories challenged the findings of Dr. Swaminathan and he was penalised?

SHRI F. A. AHMED: Therefore, what I submit is that because of an error committed, can we say that Dr. Swaminathan is not-worthy of the

[Shri F. A. Ahmed]

claim that he has been making? I would like to take the House into confidence that to-day I am proud of Dr. Swaminathan, not because of what he has said but because of what he has done to agricultural research and to-day among the scientists of the world he is regarded as one of the greatest scientists so far as agricultural research is concerned.

I may also point out that I have been approached by several organisations from outside and particularly, by the International Rice Research Institute of Manila to spare Dr. Swaminathan so that he can go and work there, but I have been refusing to do so...

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: Please do send him.

SHRI F. A. AHMED: I am not going to send him because I stand by him. He has done very valuable work for our agricultural development. It is very unfortunate that the hon. Member should indulge in this kind of vilification which has no justification whatsoever... (Interruptions)

SHRI SAMAR GUHA: Is it not a fact that his system of work has created such a situation where the committee itself has said that it has created a crisis of confidence and character in the whole campus? What more devastating indictment can there be?

SHRI F. A. AHMED: Even this committee which went into all these facts in great detail has nowhere said... (Interruptions) I must say that not only Dr. Swaminathan—there are other scientists also like Dr. Joshi and many others—but other scientists also have done very valuable and good work and it will be a sad day for us to minimise what they have done so far as the development

of agricultural science is concerned... (Interruptions)

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: We should not either minimise or exaggerate.

SHRI SAMAR GUHA:\*

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. Members is always interrupting. He is speaking without my permission. Whatever he says will not go on record.

SHRI F. A. AHMED: The other important recommendation of the committee was with regard to the pay-scales of the scientists. What the Government have done is this. We feel that there should be no differentiation in the pay scales of agricultural scientists and other scientists and whatever will be the pay-scales fixed for other scientists after taking into consideration the recommendations of the Pay Commission will also have an application to agricultural scientists. Therefore, how can any one find fault with us that we have not agreed with the recommendations of this committee?

At the same time, I would like to say that there are many useful suggestions for the improvement of the functioning of ICAR...

SHRI SAMAR GUHA: What about the Grievances Cell?

MR. CHAIRMAN. I will appeal to the hon. Member not to interrupt again and again. An honoured guest is coming and all the members want to go and take their seats in the Central Hall. Let the Minister finish.

SHRI F. A. AHMED: I was coming to that. I said that we have actually made a reference in the paper which has been placed before the House so far as the major recommendations are concerned.

The Committee has also made recommendations regarding setting up of a Grievances Cell and with regard to many other matters and I can tell the House that so far as the Grievances Cell is concerned, we propose to set up one and we hope that this will also remove a good deal of grievances so far as the junior scientists and all the scientists are concerned. We have also said that their work will be evaluated at the end of every year on the research done by them, on the recommendations made by their Head, and on the assessment made by the Head of the Department. On that basis the promotion to senior scales and so on will be made. **These are the steps which are undertaken by us.**

17.40 hrs.

STATEMENT RE. DEATH OF TWO  
CITU WORKERS IN RANIGANJ ON  
26-11-1973

MR. CHAIRMAN: Now, there will be a statement by the Home Minister on the death of two C.I.T.U. ....

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU (Diamond Harbour): CPI (M)....

MR. CHAIRMAN: C.I.T.U. workers in Raniganj on 26-11-73.

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF HOME AFFAIRS AND IN THE DEPARTMENT OF PERSONNEL (SHRI RAM NIWAS MIRDHA): Mr. Chairman, Sir, according to the information furnished by the State Government,....

SHRI PRIYA RANJAN DAS MUNSI (Calcutta South): I rise on a point of order. I categorically want to know two things. One is, this matter relates to a State which is run by a popular Government. Law and Order is a State subject. This relates to Law and Order. This is my clear point of order, Sir. Law and Order is a matter which does not come under Central subjects. Any subject which is related to the State matters is con-

trolled by that State and by the popularly-elected Government there. Let me submit to you....

SHRI DINEN BHATTACHARYYA (Serampore): Under what rule does he say this? You are in the Chair. You have allowed it. Under what rule does he say? What is this? (*Interruptions*)

SHRI PRIYA RANJAN DAS MUNSI: The Minister cannot make a statement. This matter falls entirely in the State list and there is popular Government which is there. Let them bring it up in the Assembly (*Interruptions*) and fight it over there. It is not a matter to be raised over here.... (*Interruptions*)

MR. CHAIRMAN: There is one thing. This matter was placed before the Honourable Speaker. A request was made to Honourable Speaker. He wanted the Minister to make a factual statement.

SHRI VAYALAR RAVI (Chirayinkil): You are in the Chair. You have to give a ruling.

SHRI PRIYA RANJAN DAS MUNSI: Here is a popularly-elected Government. This Government is running the administration there. This subject is a subject of law and order. How can you interfere? It is a matter for the State Government. (*Interruption*)

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Hon. Minister wants to make a statement. He will make a statement. There is no point of order.

SHRI PRIYA RANJAN DAS MUNSI: Sir, it is under a State Government. It is not under President's rule, nor is it a Union Territory, it is not under Home Ministry.

MR. CHAIRMAN: He will lay it on the Table of the House and this will be circulated.

SHRI RAM NIWAS MIRDHA: Sir, I lay it on the Table of the House.