*128. [*The Questioner (Shri M. Kalyanasundaram) was absent. For answer* vide *cols.* 41-42 *infra*].

**Talwar Committee Report**

*127. SHRI SHRIDHAR WASUDEO DHABE:†

SHRI A. G. KULKARNI:

Will the Minister of AGRICULTURE be pleased to state:

(a) the details of the findings of Talwar Committee which looked into the complaints regarding working of bio-chemistry Division of IARI;

(b) the date when the report was submitted to Government and the reasons for not making it public so far; and

(c) the decision taken by Government on the report?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE AND RURAL RECONSTRUCTION (SHRI R. V. SWAMINATHAN): (a) The report of the Talwar Committee, which looked into the complaints about the working of the Bio-chemistry Division of I.A.R.I., is under examination.

(b) The report was submitted on 26th August, 1980. The examination of the report has not yet been completed The Committee has *inter alia* examined the grievances and problems of individual scientists including Dr. Y. P. Gupta and Dr. T. S. Raman Bio-Chemists. Some of the grievances looked into by the Talwar Committee are also the subject matter of applications filed by Dr. Y. P. Gupta and Dr. T. S. Raman in the Supreme Court of India. The matter is, therefore, partly *sub judice*.

(c) Decision on various recommendations made by the Talwar Committee will be taken after the Examination of the report has been completed.

---

†The Question was actually asked on the floor of the House by Shri Shridhar Wasudeo Dhabe.

SHRI SHRIDHAR WASUDEO DHABE: Mr. Chairman, since you have put a time-limit on the questions, such a lengthy answer should have been placed on the Table of the House so that we could have studied it in detail. Hereafter you please direct the Ministers to place such lengthy answers on the Table of the House . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: That is all right. You put your question.

SHRI SHRIDHAR WASUDEO DHABE: Sir, this is a very serious matter. I would like to know what the findings of the Talwar Committee are in respect of the complaints by these two scientists in the IARI about the quality of wheat which was developed and which was stated to be very good by Dr. Swaminathan. Because they found that it was not such a very good variety, they were victimised by their office and they were removed from the faculty against which they made a report. I would like to know what the report is of the Talwar Committee in regard to the complaints of these scientists who are very eminent scientists and who have done eminent research in wheat development.

RAO BIRENDRA SINGH: It is a very bulky report and it is still under consideration. The main question before this Committee was the working conditions of the scientists in the bio-chemistry department of IARI. But as my colleague has already submitted, and you have yourself held the highest judicial office of the land, all these matters are *sub judice* in the Supreme Court. There is a review petition pending on behalf of the two scientists. Most of these questions have earlier been answered several times in this House This is a question about Dr. Swaminathan's...

SHRI NAGESHWAR PRASAD SHAHI: The Committee's report is not *sub judice*. The Minister should not hide behind the excuse of *sub judice*.

RAO BIRENDRA SINGH: I would request that there should be no dis-

cussion here since the Government has not been able to see the report yet...

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Dhabe, you are a lawyer, you understand it. I do not know what that case is. Is it *sub judice*?

SHRI SHRIDHAR WASUDEO DHABE: All matters are not *sub judice*. My question is: what are the findings of the Talwar Committee? It is not a question of review by the Supreme Court. It is a question of fact, the findings of the Committee on the complaint of Dr. Gupta and Dr. Raman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Minister, you confine yourself only to answering what the findings of the Talwar Committee are.

RAO BIRENDRA SINGH: If you permit me the time, I would give a gist....

MR. CHAIRMAN: Why don't you put it on the Table of the House?

SHRI SHRIDHAR WASUDEO DHABE: I have asked about the two complaints only. I wanted to know what the findings are on the complaint of these scientists. I am not concerned with the other general report on the working of the Institute.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Have you got these?

RAO BIRENDRA SINGH: I can place a gist of the report on the Table of the House.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think that will be better. Would you like to see it first?

SHRI SHRIDHAR WASUDEO DHABE: I have to ask my supplementary.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Otherwise, there are other ways of bringing it before the House.

SHRI SHRIDHAR WASUDEO DHABE: Or, we will have a half-an-hour discussion on this.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Now I shall restrict it to such things as can be legitimately discussed in the House, subject to the decision of the court.

SHRI SHRIDHAR WASUDEO DHABE: My second supplementary is this. What are the grievances of these two gentlemen who made the complaints for which the Talwar Committee as appointed?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Your report will include this also, I believe.

RAO BIRENDRA SINGH: I can give the terms of reference of the Committee.

SHRI SHRIDHAR WASUDEO DHABE: I want the complaints made by these scientists and not the terms of reference.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That will be very long.

SHRI SHRIDHAR WASUDEO DHABE: He can give one or two major grievances.

RAO BIRENDRA SINGH: The main complaint of these scientists was that both of them were not selected for a certain post in the Biochemistry Department. Again the decision of Selection Committee they went to the High Court. Their petitions were rejected. Then they went to the Supreme Court. Their petitions were again rejected. Then they filed a review petition. As far as I know, even their review petitions were rejected after which Dr. Gupta has field a second review petition which is now pending before the Supreme Court. Along with his claim for that particular post, he levelled certain allegation of *mala fide* against the head of the IARI and the members of the Selection Committee. Also, side by side, he talked about bad working conditions and certain other things. All those were taken into consideration by the Government and then the Government appointed this Talwar Committee to go into all these complaints. This report has now come and we are examining it.

SHRI SHRIDHAR WASUDEO DHABE: Sir, you know the position of review petitions. They are decided

in Chambers by circulation. That cannot be a ground for *sub judice*.

MR. CHAIRMAN: This being a problem of attrition, the man wants somewhere to succeed. You know that review on review is not allowed. I won't express an opinion. Dr. Bhai Mahavir.

DR. BHAI MAHAVIR: I am afraid the hon. Minister has not been honest to facts when he spoke about review and second review....

SHRI ARVIND GANESH KULKARNI: The train is too fast and older people like me cannot catch it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I am much older than Mr. Kulkarni. But I will beat him in a 100 yards race. His turn was there. I am sorry. I will call him after this.

DR. BHAI MAHAVIR: I do not mind your allowing him even now.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I will call him after you.

DR. BHAI MAHAVIR: His writ petition refers only to an earlier decision of the High Court in which it held that the IARI being a registered society, the employees worked in a master-servant relationship with the bosses. It is on that legal question that the case is pending, and not about the matter which was before the Talwar Committee. My question to the hon. Minister is this. It is now more than three months that the report was submitted to the Government. It was on the 25th August and now we are at the end of November. Three months have elapsed since the submission of the report. I would like to know if the Government thinks if the matter is such an unimportant thing or the time factor does not count at all. Suicides have been taking place and the hon. Members know that in this intervening period another scientist has committed suicide. So, Sir, I want to know why they have taken this long period in not coming to the House or sharing the Report with the people. Will the Government lay the Report on the Table of the House? That is number one and that is because of the urgency, as I said. Then, Sir, secondly, I would like to know whether it is a fact or not that originally, when the Talwar Committee was asked to inquire into these complaints, it was somewhat of the nature of an Inquiry Committee, but, subsequently, the nature of the Committee was changed to that of a Review Committee.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You are taking too long, Dr. Bhai Mahavir. You have taken three minutes.

DR BHAI MAHAVIR: I will finish, Sir, just now.

MR. CHAIRMAN: There will be more suicides at this rate.

DR. BHAI MAHAVIR: In that case it is for them to see whether they can go on sitting on important things like this and they do not even come to the House and tell us.

Now, Sir, was the nature of this Committee changed from an inquiry into just a review and, if so, were the complaints by the scientists to this effect looked into? I would also like to know whether they were given a chance to substantiate the allegations they had made at all So, Sir, on all these three specific points, let the honourable Minister reply.

RAO BIRENDRA SINGH: Sir, I would give the terms of reference of the Committee for the information of the honouarble Dr. Bhai Mahavir.

They were—

(a) to review the working of the Bio-Chemistry Division of the IARI since its inception with reference to the contributions of the Division as a whole as well as of individual scientists including the Head of the Division taking into account the investment made on each scientist by way of salaries and facilities;

(b) to examine the grievances and problems of individual scientists including Dr. Y. P. Gupta and

Dr. T. S. Raman, the Bio-Chemists and suggest remedial measures; and

(c) to offer suggestions for further development of and improvement in the working of the Bio-Chemistry Division.

Sir, these were the terms of reference and this Committee was appointed by the Government on the recommendation of the Director of the IARI and, Sir, as I stated, the Government has not yet examined this Report. It is still with the ICAR and with the recommendations and comments of the ICAR when the Report comes to us, I shall be able to throw further light on this.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Now, Question No. 128.

DR BHAI MAHAVIR: Sir, my question was why they have taken these three long months.

MR. CHAIRMAN: No, please.

DR. BHAI MAHAVIR: If they take such a long time on examining the Report, how will they do justice to the scientists who commit suicides?

MR. CHAIRMAN: I have already stated—you were not in your seat—that it should end in eight minutes and you have taken three minutes out of the eight minutes. I am not allowing your question.

DR. BHAI MAHAVIR: Sir, he read out the long term of reference which I did not want. I had asked why they have taken these three months in examining this Report and coming to the House.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Don't answer. That is the only way. Yes, the next question now. Question No. 128

**Provision of Houses for Slum Dwellers**

*128. SHRIMATI MONIKA DAS†:
SHRIMATI USHA MALHOTRA:

Will the Minister of WORKS AND HOUSING be pleased to state:

(a) the contribution made by the Centre to the State Governments for providing better houses to the slum dwellers under slum clearance schemes; and

(b) what is Government's time bound programme for slum dwellers for the Sixth Five Year Plan?

THE DEPUTY MINISTER IN THE MINISTRY OF WORKS AND HOUSING (SHRI MOHAMMED USMAN ARIF): (a) and (b) A Statement is laid on the Table of the Sabha.

**Statement**

The Slum Clearance/Improvement Scheme was started as a Central Sector Scheme in May, 1956 and was transferred to the State Sector with effect from 1.4.1969. The main features of the scheme are the following:—

(i) The Scheme provides for rehousing of families living in slum areas, where the income of the head of the household did not exceed Rs. 350/- per month, through the provision/construction of developed plots, skeletal houses, dormitory/hostel type of accommodation and *pucca* tenements.

(ii) It also provides for construction of Night Shelters in such cities and towns where the problem of pavement dwellers is acute.

(iii) Improvement of environmental conditions in slum areas and improvement of *pucca* built slum dwellings, subject to certain conditions, was also permissible.

†The Question was actually asked on the floor of the House by Shrimati Monika Das.