

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: The question is:

"That the Bill further to amend the Drugs and Cosmetics Act, 1940, as passed by Rajya Sabha, be taken into consideration."

*The motion was adopted.*

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: We now take up clause-by-clause consideration of the Bill. There are no amendments. So, I put all the clauses together to the vote of the House.

The question is:

"That clauses 2 to 5, clause 1, the Enacting Formula and the Title stand part of the Bill".

*The motion was adopted.*

*Clauses 2 to 5, clause 1, the Enacting Formula and the Title were added to the Bill.*

PROF. D. P. CHATTOPADHYAYA: I beg to move;

"That the Bill be passed"

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The question is:

"That the Bill be passed"

*The motion was adopted.*

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Today, we are in a happy position. We have disposed of all the business before the next item, before time. Since Mr. Atal Bihari Vajpayee, the mover of the Motion is here and the Minister is also here, we can take up that item.

15.22 hrs.

MOTION RE: STATEMENT ON SUICIDE BY DR. V. H. SHAH, A SCIENTIST OF IARI, NEW DELHI

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी (ग्वालियर): उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं प्रस्ताव करता हूँ:—

"कि यह सभा भारतीय कृषि अनुसंधान संस्थान, नई दिल्ली के एक वैज्ञानिक डा० वी० एच० शाह द्वारा आत्म-हत्या के बारे में कृषि मंत्री द्वारा 9 मई, 1972 को सभा पटल पर रखे गए वक्तव्य पर विचार करती है।"

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, कृषि मंत्री ने अपने वक्तव्य में डा० शाह की आत्म-हत्या पर शोक प्रकट किया है। इसी प्रकार का एक वक्तव्य आज से लगभग बारह वर्ष पूर्व उस समय के कृषि मंत्री द्वारा इस सदन में दिया गया था, जब डा० जोजफ ने आत्म-हत्या की थी। उस समय कृषि मंत्री श्री पाटिल थे। उन्होंने भी एक वैज्ञानिक की आत्म-हत्या पर मातम मनाया था। उस दुर्घटना को बारह वर्ष बीत गये। एक युग चला गया। इस बीच में दुनिया बदल गई। विज्ञान ने मनुष्य को चन्द्रमा पर पहुंचने की शक्ति प्रदान कर दी। देश में प्रधान मंत्री बदले। कृषि मंत्रियों में भी परिवर्तन हुआ। यह सदन बदला। लेकिन वैज्ञानिकों की आत्म-हत्या की शृंखला नहीं टूटी। बारह वर्ष बाद हम आज फिर गहरे शोक की छाया में इस बात पर विचार कर रहे हैं कि हमारे देश में कोई नौजवान वैज्ञानिक मृत्यु का आलिगन करने के लिए क्यों विवश होता है।

15.24 hrs.

[SHRI K. N. JIWARİ in the Chair].

डा० जोजफ की मृत्यु के बाद एक जांच हुई थी। जांच का क्या परिणाम निकला, उस जांच के परिणामस्वरूप कौन से परिवर्तन किए गए, भविष्य में इस तरह कोई नौजवान वैज्ञानिक अपनी जान पर न खेले, इसकी रोक-थाम के लिए कौन से कदम उठाए गए, इसके बारे में सदन को विश्वास में नहीं लिया गया।

डा० शाह की आत्म-हत्या के पहले भी दो आत्म-हत्याएँ हुईं। बंगलौर के डेयरी रिसर्च इन्स्टीट्यूट में एसिस्टेंट रिसर्च आफिसर के रूप में काम करने वाले डा० एस० एस० बन्ना 28 मार्च, 1970 को आत्म-हत्या करके इस दुनिया से चले गये। वह एक सोनियर व्यक्ति थे, लेकिन उनके सिर पर एक जूनियर व्यक्ति बिठा दिया गया। डायरेक्टर ने उनकी आत्म-हत्या का समाचार तुरन्त नई दिल्ली नहीं भेजा। आत्म-हत्या के पूर्व उन्होंने कौन सा पत्र लिखा, यह भी पता नहीं है। स्पष्टतः

[श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी]

उनकी आत्म-हत्या के मामले की कोई जांच नहीं हुई।

इसी प्रकार की एक आत्म-हत्या डा० पार्थसारथी ने की, जो इंडियन वेटेरीनरी इंस्टीट्यूट में अनुसन्धान का काम करते थे। उनसे कहा गया कि वह विदेशों में प्रशिक्षण लें। वह लौट कर आये, मगर उनके साथ न्याय नहीं हुआ। वह महु के वेटेरीनरी कालेज में काम करते थे। ऐसा कहा जाता है कि वहाँ भी—मुझे तथ्यों की जानकारी प्रमन्नता होगी—डा० पार्थसारथी के साथ अन्याय हुआ और उन्होंने अपनी जान ले ली। मामले की जांच नहीं हुई। उनकी मौत पर एक भी आसू नहीं बहाया गया।

डा० विनोद शाह ने जिन परिस्थितियों में आत्म-हत्या की, वे परिस्थितियाँ बड़ी दारुण हैं। सारा मामला बड़ा हृदयविदारक है। 39 वर्ष का एक नौजवान वैज्ञानिक, जिसके घर में पत्नी है, दो छोटे छोटे बच्चे हैं, जो विदेशों में शिक्षा प्राप्त कर चुका है, जिसको विदेशों में काम करने के निमंत्रण मिल रहे हैं, इस देश में आत्म-हत्या के लिये विवश होता है, तो समझना चाहिए कि कुछ ऐसी परिस्थितियाँ थीं, कुछ ऐसी व्यवस्थायें थीं, जिन्होंने डा० शाह को आत्म-हत्या के लिए विवश किया।

यह कहना गलत होगा कि उन्होंने इसलिये आत्म-हत्या की कि उन्हें प्रोफेसर नहीं बनाया गया। यह कहना भी उनके साथ न्याय करना नहीं होगा कि उनके बेतन में अगर दो सौ रुपये की वृद्धि कर दी जाती, तो शायद वह आत्म-हत्या का मार्ग न अपनाते। जिस रात को उन्होंने आत्म-हत्या की, उस रात को उन्होंने डा० स्वामीनाथन के नाम जो पत्र लिखा, वह संतुलित मस्तिष्क से लिखा गया था। उसमें भावना का प्रवाह नहीं है, तथ्यों का निरूपण है। जब मैं उनका वह पत्र बार-बार पढ़ता हूँ, तो मैं अपने को रोक नहीं पाता हूँ। उन्होंने मृत्यु का फैसला कर लिया था और वह अंतिम पत्र लिख रहे थे। उन्होंने कहा :

"It has become impossible for me to bear the happenings around me in the past."

सभापति महोदय, इन शब्दों में कितनी बेदना भरी है, इस वाक्य में कितनी पीड़ा छिपी हुई है।

डा० शाह ने आगे कहा :

"It is too much of a struggle to get a better opportunity."

दुनिया की अदालत में वर्तमान व्यवस्था के विरुद्ध अपना अभियोग-पत्र प्रस्तुत करते हुए डा० शाह ने लिखा :

"I think, the time has come again that a scientist will have to sacrifice his life in disgust so that other scientists may get proper treatment."

उन्होंने पदोन्नति के लिये आत्म-हत्या नहीं की, पैसे के लिये वह जान पर नहीं खेले। वह प्रतिष्ठा के भी भूखे नहीं थे। वह तो केवल प्रापर ट्रीटमेंट चाहते थे, अच्छा व्यवहार, ऐसा व्यवहार जिसमें प्रतिभा विकसित हो सके, जिसमें नौजवान वैज्ञानिक अपना सर्वोत्तम राष्ट्र के लिये समर्पित करके राष्ट्र के विर्माण में भागीदार बनने की अनुभूति पा सकें, ऐसा अवसर जिसमें वैज्ञानिक आत्माभिव्यक्ति कर सके। लेकिन ऐसा अवसर डा० शाह को नहीं मिला। ऐसा अवसर अनेक नौजवान वैज्ञानिकों को नहीं मिल रहा है।

सभापति जी, डा० शाह ने आत्म-हत्या नहीं की। आप मुझे क्षमा करें कठोर शब्दों का प्रयोग करने के लिए, डा० शाह की हत्या की गई। यह ठीक है हत्यारा कोई व्यक्ति नहीं। डा० शाह की हत्या के आरोप में किसी को कठघरे में नहीं खड़ा किया जा सकता, किसी को सजा नहीं दी जा सकती। लेकिन उनका हत्यारा एक व्यक्ति नहीं, एक व्यवस्था थी, वे परिस्थितियाँ थी जिनमें डा० शाह काम करने के लिए मजबूर थे, ऐसी परिस्थिति जिनमें उनको लगता था कि उनके साथ न्याय नहीं हो रहा है, उनके साथ अच्छा व्यवहार नहीं

किया जा रहा है। वह अन्याय के विरुद्ध लड़ें। वैज्ञानिकों को सम्मान बिलाने के लिए उन्होंने आत्मोत्सर्ग किया। प्रधान मंत्री जी ने चुनाव में नारा लगाया कि अन्याय हटाओ। डा० शाह अन्याय हटाने के प्रयत्न में बलि हो गए।

सभापति जी, आपको स्मरण होगा अब संसद में सी० एस० आई० आर० के बारे में चर्चा चल रही थी, नियुक्तियों में गड़बड़, पक्षपात, भाई-भतीजावाद को प्रोत्साहन आदि की और संसद के आग्रह पर जब सी०एस०आई० आर० की कार्याविधि की जांच करने के लिए एक कमेटी बनी तो मुझे याद है कृषि संस्थानों में काम करने वाले वैज्ञानिकों ने यह कहा था कि सी० एस० आई० आर० से भी ज्यादा खराब हालत आई० सी० ए० आर० की है, आई० सी० ए० आर० की भी जांच होनी चाहिए। उनकी मांग को अनसुना कर दिया गया। शायद उस समय उनकी बात सुन ली जाती तो डा० शाह के अनमोल जीवन की रक्षा की जा सकती थी।

1966 में आई० सी० ए० आर० का पुनर्गठन किया गया था जिसका उद्देश्य उन कमियों को दूर करना था जिनसे हमारा कृषि अनुसंधान पीड़ित है। कुछ कमियां दिखाई गई थीं—

Delayed and wrong selection of scientists by the UPSC.

Low and several scales of pay.

Frequent changes in lines of research work of scientists in quest of promotion to higher posts.

Inordinate delays caused by bureaucratic procedures and red-tape.

पहले कृषि वैज्ञानिकों का चयन यू० पी० एस० सी० के द्वारा होता था। बाद में अनुभव किया गया कि यू० पी० एस० सी० इसके लिये एक समर्थ संस्था नहीं है। केवल जनरलिस्ट यह काम नहीं कर सकते, इसके लिये विशेषज्ञों का इस्तेमाल किया जाना जरूरी है। इसलिये

सेलेक्शन का काम कौंसिल की जो सेलेक्ट कमेटीज हैं उनको सौंप दिया गया। होना तो यह चाहिए था कि इससे स्थिति सुधरती। लेकिन अनुभव यह बताता है कि स्थिति बिगड़ी है। दवा ऐसी की गई है जो बीमारी से भी ज्यादा घातक साबित हुई। पुनर्गठन के फल-स्वरूप आई० ए० आर० आई०, करनाल की एन० डी० आर० आई०, इज्जतनगर की आई० बी० आर० आई०, ये सब सरकार के नियंत्रण में से निकल कर आई०सी० ए० आर० के अधीन कर दी गई। किन्तु इसके लिये संसद में कोई कानून नहीं बनाया गया। न पुनर्गठन के बारे में वैज्ञानिकों से राय ली गई, न विभिन्न संस्थाओं में कार्य करने वाले कर्मचारियों को अपने विचार प्रकट करने की छुट दी गई। यहां तक कि कर्मचारी संगठनों को धमकी दी गई कि अगर आई० सी० ए० आर० की सेवा में नहीं जाएंगे तो उन्हें निकाल दिया जायगा। मैं समझने में असमर्थ हूँ कि इस सम्बन्ध में संसद में कानून क्यों नहीं बनाया गया, वैज्ञानिकों और कर्मचारियों की राय क्यों नहीं ली गई ?

मेरा निवेदन है कि जिस उद्देश्य से पुनर्गठन किया गया था वह उद्देश्य विफल हो गया। जब से पुनर्गठन हुआ है यह शिफायतें आ रही हैं कि आई० सी० ए० आर० एक साम्राज्य बन गया है जिसमें हां में हां मिनाने वालों का बोलबाला है। नियुक्तियों में पक्षपात है। नये वैज्ञानिकों को प्रोत्साहन नहीं है। ये आरोप गम्भीर आरोप हैं। मैं इस विवाद में नाम लेना नहीं चाहता था ..

SHRI N. SREEKANTAN NAIR (Quilon): I rise on a point of order under Rule 353. He first referred to murder and then he has come to favouritism and nepotism. I will read out Rule 353 for the benefit of the other Members, who do not have it. This is retarding Procedure regarding allegation against a person. It says:

"No allegation of a defamatory or incriminatory nature shall be made by a member against any person unless the member has given previous intimation to the Speaker and also to the Minister con-

[Shri N Sreekantan Nair]

cerned so that the Minister may be able to make an investigation into the matter for the purpose of a reply'

'Provided that the Speaker may at any time prohibit any member from making any such allegation if he is of opinion that such allegation is derogatory to the dignity of the house or that no public interest is served by making such allegation'

He is a very senior Member of the House I did not want to intervene at all I had to intervene only when he started entering into dangerous ground This organisation is an organisation of scientists The members of these organisations have international reputation They have done yeoman service to the country by bringing in the green revolution and the Government owes a debt to them

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE This is not point of order, I refuse to yield

SHRI N SREEKANIAN NAIR It is the Chair who has to give the ruling

MR CHAIRMAN I am giving

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE I also know about green revolution

SHRI N SREEKANIAN NAIR My submission is no speaker should be allowed to point out any allegation against any officer or scientist especially when an inquiry has been ordered by the Government

MR CHAIRMAN He has not named any officer

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE. Names cannot be avoided Certain names are mentioned by the hon Minister himself in his statement We have to discuss certain matters How can you avoid names?

MR CHAIRMAN There is no point of order because he has not mentioned any names He has not named anybody

SHRI N SREEKANIAN NAIR The dignity of the House has also to be protected by you That is all I have submitted

MR CHAIRMAN There is no point of order as yet

SHRI PILOO MODY (Godhra) The point of order has been overruled

SHRI N SREEKANIAN NAIR. It will come up at the appropriate time

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी . सभापति जी, यह सदन कृषि मंत्री जी के वक्तव्य पर चर्चा कर रहा है। कृषि मंत्री के वक्तव्य में स्वयं कुछ नाम दिये गये हैं, कुछ नाम डा० शाह के अंतिम पत्र में लिखे हैं—क्या उनका उल्लेख नहीं किया जायगा।

सभापति महोदय आपने हमको गलत समझा है। हमने यह नहीं कहा है कि जो चीज मिनिसटर साहब के स्टेटमेंट में है या डा० शाह के पत्र में है उसका उल्लेख नहीं होगा। मैंने यही कहा है कि जिनका उल्लेख है, उनका जिक्र किया जा सकता है। अभी तक तो आपने कोई नाम ही नहीं लिया था, जिन पर उन्होंने आपत्ति की है। आप इसको पढ़ सकते हैं।

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी अध्यक्ष जी, मुझे खेद है कि इस विवाद को मैं जिस स्तर पर चला रहा था, ऐसा लगता है कि सदन

SHRI K MANOHARAN (Madras North) Kindly ask Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee not to lose his temper

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE (SHRI ANNASAHFB P SHINDL) I do not think that he should get up-set

SHRI K MANOHARAN Let Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee be calm

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी इस प्वाइंट आफ आर्डर का कोई मतलब नहीं है।

सभापति महोदय प्वाइंट आफ आर्डर बहुत से लोग उठाते हैं, क्या करे, सुनना पड़ता है।

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी . सुनना ठीक है, लेकिन उसके साथ सहमत होना ठीक नहीं है।

मैं निवेदन कर रहा था कि जब से पुनर्गठन हुआ है तब से ये सिकायतें आ रही हैं

कि नियुक्तियों में, तरक्कियों में, ऊंचे पदों के लिये वैज्ञानिकों के चयन में अनियमिततायें बरती जा रही हैं। डा० शाह ने अपने अन्तिम पत्र में इस बात का स्पष्ट उल्लेख किया है—मैं उन्हीं के शब्दों को उद्धृत करना चाहता हूँ—

“Whenever it suits someone, seniority counts in the same line; at other times, seniority, contributions, basic qualifications, capacity to inspire intelligent young scientists etc. are completely ignored, for example, the appointment of Dr. De as head of the division of agronomy, selection of Dr. Prasad as Professor of Agronomy, men with qualifications in plant physiology and soil science. . .”

मैंने इस सम्बन्ध में कुछ जानकारी एकत्र करने का प्रयत्न किया है और मुझे जो जानकारी मिली है, उसके आधार पर मैं ऐसा कह सकता हूँ कि डा० शाह ने अपने पत्र में जो अभियोग लगाया है, उसे निराधार नहीं माना जा सकता। उदाहरण के लिये यह बात कही जा रही है कि डा० डे एक विशुद्ध प्लांट-पैथोलोजिस्ट हैं, उनके पास एग्रोनामी की कोई डिग्री नहीं है। अगर मैं गलत कह रहा हूँ तो मंत्री महोदय उसका खण्डन कर सकते हैं। डा० डे का एडहाक एप्वाइन्मेंट किया गया। डा० शाह ने अपने अन्तिम पत्र में इस प्रश्न को उठाया है कि जो कन्सिल के कर्ता-धर्ता संहर्ता हैं, वे जब चाहते हैं एडहाक एप्वाइन्मेंट करते हैं, जिसको चाहते हैं एडहाक एप्वाइन्मेंट करते हैं। जिस व्यक्ति में योग्यता नहीं है, लेकिन जिसे आगे लाना तय किया जाता है, उसका पहले एडहाक एप्वाइन्मेंट किया जाता है। वह थोड़े दिनों वहाँ काम करता है, अनुभव प्राप्त करता है, उसके बाद उस पद पर उसका अधिकार बन जाता है जो और उससे अधिक योग्य हैं, उनको हटाकर वह उस पद पर नियुक्त कर दिया जाता है।

अब इस प्रश्न का उत्तर देना होगा कि एडहाक एप्वाइन्मेंट करने की पद्धति क्या है? उसके नियम क्या हैं? क्या यह केवल अधिकारियों पर छोड़ दिया जायगा?

मैं अधिकारियों को काले या सफेद किसी रंग में रंगने से सहमत नहीं हूँ। जो उन्हें देवता बनाना चाहते हैं, मैं उनसे भी सहमत नहीं हूँ और जो उन्हें दानव बनाकर चित्रित करना चाहते हैं, मैं उनसे भी सहमत नहीं हूँ। वे मानव हैं और कृषि विज्ञान के क्षेत्र में उनकी उपलब्धियाँ प्रशंसनीय हैं। लेकिन वे मनुष्य हैं, गलतियाँ भी कर सकते हैं, उन्हींने गलतियों की हैं और आज इस सदन को उन गलतियों पर विचार करना होगा।

किस आधार पर एडहाक एप्वाइन्मेंट किये जाते हैं? डा० शाह की उपेक्षा करके डा० डे को आगे कैसे बढ़ाया गया, क्या उनकी योग्यता देखी गई? क्या यह सच नहीं है कि डा० महापात्र और डा० दस्ताने की उपेक्षा करके डा० डे को पहले तो एग्रोनामी का हैड बनाया गया, फिर उन्हें प्रोफेसर का पद दे दिया गया। इस पद के लिये कोई एडवटिजमेंट नहीं किया गया। डा० डे के बारे में यह भी कहा जाता है यह बड़ी गम्भीर बात है—जब डा० शाह बाहर गये थे, तो डा० शाह के अन्तर्गत काम करने वाला एक शोध छात्र था—के० पी० झा, जो डा० शाह की देखरेख में शोध कर रहा था, उसे डा० डे ने अपने अधीन ले लिया और उसके थीसिस पर, उसके प्रबन्ध पर अपने हस्ताक्षर कर दिये। जब डा० शाह लौट कर आये तो उन्हें बड़ा ताज्जुब हुआ, दोनों डाक्टरों में कहा मुनी हुई। मुझे यहाँ तक बताया गया है कि डा० शाह के लिये टेलीफोन का उपयोग करना और कूलर का उपयोग करना भी मना था। यदि यह आरोप सच है तो बड़ा गम्भीर आरोप है। क्या किसी वैज्ञानिक के साथ इस तरह का व्यवहार किया जाना उचित है?

इस सारे विवाद में डा० प्रसाद का भी नाम आया है। उस नाम को भी टाला नहीं जा सकता। मंत्री महोदय ने कहा है—राज्य सभा में हुई चर्चा का उत्तर देते हुए—इस सिलेक्शन कमेटी का जहाँ तक मक्के का मामला था, वहाँ डा० शाह को उपयुक्त समझा गया, लेकिन जब प्रोफेसर का सवाल आया तो डाक्टर शाह की तुलना में प्रो० प्रसाद को

[श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी]

अच्छा ममसा गया। लेकिन हम सम्बन्ध में एक बात बड़ी विचित्र रही गई है। डा० प्रसाद ने फटिलाटजर पर एक लेख लिखा था जिसकी बड़ी तारीफ हुई। वह लेख लिखने वाले डा० प्रसाद अकेले नहीं थे, स्वर्गीय डा० बेन्ज भी थे और उनके साथ डा० भाटिया भी थे। डा० बेन्ज को उस लेख पर 25 हजार रुपये का पुरस्कार मिला, तो क्या उसी लेख के लिये डा० प्रसाद को फिर से पुरस्कृत किया गया। अगर यह सही नहीं है तो इसका खंडन किया जाये। जिन डाक्टर शाह को सुपरसीड करके डा० रे को ऊंचे पद पर बैठाया गया था, वही डा० रे उम मिलीकदान कमेटी में बैठे थे, यह देखकर डा० शाह को जरूर बुग लगा होगा। यदि उनके मन में यह भावना पैदा हुई है कि उनके माथ अन्याय किया गया है—तो हम में आश्चर्य की कोई बात नहीं है।

मैं व्यक्तियों में आपको नहीं ले जाना चाहता—मैं व्यवस्था की बात कर रहा हूँ—यह चयन और नियुक्ति का कैसा तरीका है कि जिसमें एक बार जो जिस व्यक्ति में पिछड़ जाता है, वही जज बन कर बैठ जाता है। क्या हममें अमन्तोष नहीं होगा। मंत्री महोदय ने स्वयं अपने वक्तव्य में माना है—मैं आपको उद्धृत करना चाहता हूँ—

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

मंत्री महोदय भी मानते हैं कि आज जो व्यवस्था है, वह सन्तोषजनक नहीं है, नियमों में परिवर्तन हो सकता है। क्या इस अनुभूति के लिये एक वैज्ञानिक को जान देने की आवश्यकता थी? क्या यह मामला पहले भी नहीं उठा था, क्या वैज्ञानिक वर्कर्स, माइन्टिफिक वर्कर्स इस चीज को अपने स्मृति पत्र द्वारा प्रधान मंत्री महोदय के सामने नहीं लाते रहे हैं। मंत्री महोदय ने आगे भी स्वीकार किया है—

"The system inevitably provides frequent occasions for disappointments leading to frustration."

"लीडिंग टू सूसाइड" में अपनी तरफ से जोड़ रहा हूँ।

मेरा निवेदन है कि डा० शाह ने अपने पत्र में कई वैज्ञानिकों के नाम लेकर यह शिकायत की है कि उनकी उपेक्षा हुई है, उन्हें निरस्कृत किया गया है। मैं उनके पत्र के एक अंश को उद्धृत करना चाहता हूँ।

"Dr Mahapatra, myself, Dr. Dastane, Dr Bharadwaj, Dr Sadopal, Dr. Pandey, etc are struggling hard against heavy onslaught, mentally as well as administratively, as they are supporting mediocre and pseudo agronomists at the expense of intelligent agronomists"

यह बात कोई व्यक्ति केवल आरोप लगाने के लिए नहीं लिख सकता है। जिनमें अपने जीवन का अन्त करने का फैसला कर लिया है, जो फामी की डोरी गले में डालकर हम जगत में नाना तोड़ने का सफल कर चुका है उनके द्वारा लगाए गए अभियोगों को यह कहकर नहीं टाला जा सकता कि वे भावुकता में लगाए गए हैं, उनका कोई आधार नहीं है। इन आरोपों की गम्भीरता से छानबीन करनी होगी और यह प्रयत्न करना होगा कि भविष्य में इस तरह के काण्ड नहीं होने चाहिए।

महापति जी, प्वाइन्ट आफ आर्डर में जो समय चला गया है आपको निकाल दीजिए।

श्री समापति : आपको निकाल दिया है।

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी : मैं निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ देश में जो हरित क्रान्ति हुई है वह एक महान उपलब्धि है। मदन का कोई भी सदस्य उसके महत्व को कम करके आकरना नहीं चाहेगा। पहले हम पराये अन्न पर पलते थे, आज पराये को अन्न देने के लिये तैयार हैं। पहले हम जहाज से लेकर मुह तक जीवित रहते थे, आज हमारे जहाज हमारा गेहूँ लेकर विदेशों में जाने के लिए तैयार हैं। इस हरित क्रान्ति में जिन जिन लोगों में योगदान दिया है,

वह वैज्ञानिक हों, इंजीनियर हों, रिसर्च करने वाले हों, किसान हों, किसान के पास तक नया बीज, खाद, पानी का संदेश लेकर जाने वाले छोटे से छोटे कर्मचारी हों, उन सभी की सराहना की जानी चाहिए, उन सभी का अभिनन्दन किया जाना चाहिए। शिखर का महत्व इसी बान में है कि शिखर को ऊपर धारण करने के लिए कुछ लोग नींव का पत्थर बनकर अपने को अंधेरे में मिटाने के लिए तैयार होते हैं। यदि हरित क्रान्ति का श्रेय कुछ शिखर पर खड़े हुए दो चार व्यक्ति लेने का प्रयत्न करेंगे तो हरित क्रान्ति के साथ भी न्याय नहीं होगा और यह बाकी के लोगों के साथ भी न्याय नहीं होगा। राजनीति में व्यक्ति पूजा चल सकती है, विज्ञान में नहीं। विज्ञान नो टीमवर्क के आधार पर आगे बढ़ता है। केवल एक व्यक्ति की सिद्धि इतना परिवर्तन नहीं कर सकती।

इस बात की भी जांच होनी चाहिए कि हमारे यहां कुछ वैज्ञानिकों का यह जो तरीका बन गया है कि वे कोई खोज करते हैं तो सीधे उसका प्रचार करते हैं क्या वह उचित है। मेरे पास कई उदाहरण हैं जिसमें बड़े बड़े दावे किए गए लेकिन बाद में ऐसा लगा कि उन दावों में सच्चाई नहीं है। वे दावे नहीं थे, दिखावे थे। उनका विश्व में प्रचार किया गया और उनके आधार पर बाहवाही लूटी गई लेकिन उसके समर्थन में कोई वैज्ञानिक तथ्य नहीं दिए गए। और अन्त में जाकर पता लगा कि वे दावे खोखले थे। मेरा निवेदन है कि ऐसी व्यवस्था होनी चाहिए कि किसी भी अनुसंधान का मूल्यांकन करने का प्रबन्ध हो सके। वैज्ञानिक सीधे प्रेस में जाने के बजाये, आकाशवाणी पर अपनी कीर्तिकला को बिखेरने के बजाय उसका मूल्यांकन कराने के लिये तैयार हों।

सभापति जी, आप किसान हैं, आप जानते हैं अब दावा किया जा रहा है कि ऐसी चमत्कारी मक्का बनाई गई है जो कि दूध के समान पीण्डित है। अब गिन्दे साहब को दिल्ली मिर्क सप्लाइ स्कीम की तरफ से दूध का

प्रबन्ध करने की आवश्यकता ही नहीं है। खाली मक्का दूध का काम कर सकती है, और मक्का में चूहा गिरने का भी खतरा नहीं है। वह मक्का ऐसी है कि उसको खाकर अगर चूहे पांच गुना मोटे हो सकते हैं तो फिर आप मेरे जैसे मोटे आदमी की कल्पना कर सकते हैं कि मक्का खाकर मेरे ऊपर क्या प्रभाव होगा। लेकिन बाद में पता लगा कि मक्का में जिन गुणों को आरोपित किया गया था वे गुण नहीं हैं। मेरा निवेदन है कि यह दावे कैसे किये गये ?

बात केवल मक्का तक ही नहीं है, गेहूं के बारे में भी कहा जाता है कि एक शरवती सोनोरा बूढ़ निकाला गया है जो मैक्सिको से आयातित सोनोरा 64 से अधिक प्रोटीन रखता है और वह दूध के बराबर हो गया। एक सिम्पोजियम में यह कहा गया कि :

"The protein content of wheat has thus been made merely comparable to the protein content of milk with regard to lysine content."

किन्तु मैक्सिको के इंटरनेशनल भेंज एंड व्हीट इम्प्रूवमेंट सेंटर ने इस दावे को स्वीकार नहीं किया। मैं उन्हें भी उद्धृत करना चाहता हूँ :

"The analysis do not corroborate the results obtained in India and in no case was there a significant difference between the normal varieties and the mutations."

अब कहा जा रहा है कि चावल की एक किस्म सावरमती भी बनायी जा रही है जिसमें सुगन्ध है, जो पकने में अच्छी है, जो चिपकती नहीं है। किन्तु जब उत्तर प्रदेश के एक वैज्ञानिक ने उस पर परीक्षण किया तो पता लगा उसमें ब्लास्ट बीमारी हो जाती है। उसे बोलने वाले किसान घाटे में रहे। लेकिन आज तक नई दिल्ली से इस बान को स्वीकार नहीं किया गया।

बाजरे के बारे में भी एक दावा किया जा रहा है। कहा जा रहा है कि आई० ए० आर०

### [श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी]

आई० ने एक ऐसा बाजरा विकसित किया है जिससे एक हेक्टेयर में 15 क्विंटल की जगह 80 क्विंटल बाजरा पैदा किया जा सकता है। क्या यह दावा मजबूत है? क्या कृषि मंत्रालय इस दावे की पुष्टि करता है?

इसी प्रकार यह भी दावा किया गया है कि एक एकड़ से 15,000 रु० की आमदनी हो सकती है। जो सीरिंग घटाने की इस आधार पर मांग कर रहे हैं कि एक एकड़ से 15,000 रु० की आमदनी हो सकती है उनको जरा सोच ममत्त कर काम करना चाहिए। खेती करने वालों ने मुझे बताया कि एक एकड़ में पांच छह हजार रु० में ज्यादा की आमदनी नहीं हो सकती। लेकिन 15,000 रु० का दावा किया गया है। न इस दावे का खंडन किया गया है और न इसकी पुष्टि की गयी है। दावा करने वाले वैज्ञानिक जगत में रंग जमा रहे हैं, उनकी वाहवाही हो रही है।

**सभापति महोदय :** एक एकड़ में 6,000 रु० की आमदनी भी नहीं होती है।

**श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी :** कोई बहुत प्रोग्रेसिव किसान थे उनके मुंह से सुना। अब अगर कोई प्रतिक्रियावादी किसान कोई दूसरी बात कहे तो मैं वह भी मान लूंगा।

मेरा निवेदन है कि डा० शाह ने जो अपने पत्र में बातें कही हैं उनको नजरदाज नहीं किया जा सकता है; मैं फिर उद्बन्ध करना चाहता हूँ :

"A lot of un-scientific data are collected and passed on to you to fit in your line of thinking. For example, in relay-cropping very large-sized seed potato was used to show high yields. Who will know, besides some persons in agronomy, that it is highly uneconomical to grow? Why is it that so much publicized Baisakhi Moong did not prove successful in national demonstration? Why is it that so much praised work with slow-release N-fert or Nitrification inhibitors did not find experimental validity anywhere else in the country".

"इलस्ट्रेटेड वीकली" के सम्पादन श्री लक्षवन्त सिंह ने भी इस पर टिप्पणी की है कि कुछ दावे गनत सनत किये जाते हैं और उनकी जांच करने की कोई व्यवस्था नहीं है। इसने सारी दुनिया में हमारी हंसाई होती है।

सभापति जी, आई० सी० ए० आर० में काम करने वाले केवल वैज्ञानिकों का ही सवाल नहीं है, कर्मचारियों का भी सवाल है। अभी तब यह तय नहीं हुआ कि आई० सी० ए० आर० का स्वरूप क्या है, उसका दर्जा क्या है? क्या वह रजिस्टर्ड सोसाइटी है, या वह औटोनामस बौडी है, या वह सरकार का एक विभाग है? पंजाब हाई कोर्ट में कहा जाता है कि वह औटोनामस बौडी है, दिल्ली हाई कोर्ट में कहा जाता है कि वह सरकार का एक विभाग है, और जब कर्मचारी मामले ले कर जाते हैं तो कर्मचारी जिस बात से घाटे में रहे ऐसी बात कोर्ट में कही जाती है। कृषि-मंत्री महोदय ने राज्य सभा में कहा कि वह एक औटोनामस बौडी है। लेकिन मेरा निवेदन है कि यह बात कोर्ट में आज तक क्यों नहीं कही गयी? और अगर एक बार कही गयी तो दूसरी बार उस का खंडन क्यों किया गया? प्रश्न उन 16 हजार कर्मचारियों का भी है जो विभिन्न संस्थानों में काम कर रहे हैं। उनके भविष्य के बारे में भी निर्णय होना चाहिए।

16 hrs.

सभापति महोदय, डा० शाह की आत्महत्या से देश के मानस को झकझोड़ा गया है और हमें पुनर्विचार करने के लिए विवश होना पड़ा है। इसलिए यह आवश्यक है कि एक उच्चधिकार सम्पन्न जांच कमेटी बनाई जाय और उस कमेटी में एक वैज्ञानिक भी हो और संसद के सदस्य भी उसमें शामिल किए जाएं। अगर सी० एस० आई० आर० की जांच संसद के सदस्य कर सकते हैं, तो मैं समझने में असमर्थ हूँ कि कृषि मंत्री जी इस सारे मामले की जांच में संसद सदस्यों को शामिल करने में क्यों



कतरा रहे हैं। शायद सरकार ने कुछ पुनर्विचार किया है। हम प्रतीक्षा करेंगे कि कृषि मंत्री महोदय इस विवाद के बाद कौन सी घोषणा करते हैं, लेकिन जांच होनी चाहिए—जांच होनी चाहिए सारे बकिंग की, एग्रीकलचर इंस्टीट्यूट की भी और कौंसिल की भी और उससे संबंधित जितनी संस्थायें हैं उन की भी। उन दावों की भी जांच होनी चाहिए, जो वैज्ञानिक करते रहे हैं मगर जिन्हें वास्तविकता के आधार पर सिद्ध नहीं किया जा सकता। आज तक जिन व्यक्तियों के साथ नियुक्तियों में, प्रमोशनस में अन्याय के आरोप लगाये गये हैं, उनकी भी जांच होनी चाहिए। इस बात का पूरा प्रबन्ध होना चाहिए कि अब किसी वैज्ञानिक को आत्महत्या नहीं करनी पड़ेगी, अब किसी नौजवान को अपनी जान पर खेलना नहीं पड़ेगा। हम ड्रेन की शिकायत करते हैं। हम अपने नौजवानों को जो विदेश चले गये हैं वापस लाने की बात करते हैं, लेकिन जब हम अपने देश में उन्हें फलने-फूलने का अवसर नहीं दे सकते, उनके साथ मानवता का व्यवहार नहीं कर सकते, तो हम अपने नौजवानों को विदेश जाने से नहीं रोक सकते। मेरा निवेदन है कि डा० शाह की आत्महत्या का मामला कोई दल का मामला नहीं है। हम सब लोग कटघरे में खड़े हैं, यह सरकार, यह संसद, सारा देश। दुनिया देख रही है कि हम अपने वैज्ञानिकों के साथ कैसा व्यवहार करते हैं। यह आत्महत्या अन्तिम आत्महत्या होनी चाहिए और फिर किसी वैज्ञानिक को जान पर खेलने की नीबत नहीं आनी चाहिए लेकिन यह इस बात पर निर्भर करता है कि सरकार क्या कदम उठाती है। डा० जासेफ, डा० बत्रा और डा० पार्थसारथी की हत्याओं की शृंखला में एक कड़ी और जुड़ गई है। यह कड़ी अन्तिम होनी चाहिए लेकिन इस के लिए यह आवश्यक है कि इस मामले की जांच कर के सारे तथ्यों को सामने लाया जाय। इसमें कोई बिचहन्ध का सवाल नहीं है। हम किसी वैज्ञानिक के पीछे नहीं पड़े हैं। अनेक वैज्ञानिकों को तो मैं जानता तक नहीं हूँ। मैंने उनके चेहरे तक नहीं देखे हैं। मगर सबसे डा० शाह की हत्या हुई है इतने तथ्य

हमारे सामने आये हैं जिन्हें पढ़ कर कभी कभी लगता है कि क्या सन् 1972 के भारत का चिन्म यही है। हम विज्ञान और टैक्नालाजी के युग में आ गये हैं मगर वैज्ञानिक संस्थाओं का काम वैज्ञानिक ढंग से नहीं चला सकते। हम पक्षपात से ऊपर नहीं उठ सकते, हम प्रान्तीयता का तिरस्कार नहीं कर सकते, हम वैज्ञानिकों को फलने फूलने का अवसर नहीं दे सकते।

मेरा निवेदन है कि सदन इस विषय पर विचार करे और मंत्री महोदय उच्च स्तरीय जांच का आदेश दें जिससे सब को संतोष हो सके और भविष्य में इस तरह की घटनाएं रुक सकें।

**समापित महोदय :** श्री बाजपेयी का यह मोशन जो मूड्ड है, उसके बाद के सस्टीट्यूटेड मोशनस हैं नं० 1 और नं० 2। आप इनको मूब करना चाहते हैं ?

**श्री अटल बिहारी बाजपेयी :** मैं नं० 2 को पेश करना चाहता हूँ :

‘That for the original motion, the following be substituted, namely:—

‘This House, having considered the statement laid on the Table by the Minister of Agriculture on the 9th May, 1972 regarding suicide by Dr. V. H. Shah, a scientist of the Indian Agricultural Research Institute, New Delhi, directs the Government to appoint a Committee of Scientists and Members of Parliament to enquire into the entire working of the Indian Agricultural Research Institute and the Indian Council of Agricultural Research with special reference to the rules and procedures of recruitment, promotion and service conditions of scientists and other staff members.

‘The Committee shall investigate all cases of promotion, supersession, termination of service etc. that have taken place in these institutions during the last 5 years.

The Committee shall further examine the validity of the claims about scientific advancement being made by these bodies in recent years.’ (2)

**MR. CHAIRMAN :** The substitute motion is now before the House.

**SHRI S. P. BHATTACHARYYA (Uttara Pradesh):** Sir, the death of scientist Shah should be an eye-opener to our Government. The achievement of this research department is accepted by all and we are proud of it. It is accepted even by the foreign countries. The Minister has stated in his statement that even the Soviet Union has asked how India has progressed so much in agricultural research. So, regarding the contribution of scientists we are one that they have contributed something. But when any scientist of any research department is compelled to commit suicide, it is a challenge to us, to the Government of the country and to the department which is controlling it.

Dr. Shah has said that after the end of his life a situation should arise where scientists may not be ill-treated like this and their future may not be darkened any more and for that he is giving his life. I hope our Minister will consider these things very seriously. As Shri Vajpayee has said, our system is such that the scientists, instead of doing more research and developing new things for our country, are compelled to end their lives. This situation must be put a stop to. For that the whole system of dealing with scientists and research departments should be changed in the interests of the development and research workers. The system should be changed in such a way that every research worker can devote his full energy and attention to his research work so that the country will be benefited by his research work. If we cannot create such a situation then we shall be unworthy of running this administration.

We must have a thorough change in our dealing with the scientific institutions. The research workers should have confidence that their future will not be adversely affected by the action of the administration. There should be no occasion or scope for any scientist to have any genuine grievance because of which he may think of committing suicide. I want the Minister to take the necessary steps to create that atmosphere in which our scientists may have sufficient confidence in the Ministry and the House will have sufficient confidence that the Ministry will deal with the scientists in a proper and just way. The death of Dr. Shah should arouse in us our sense of responsibility to do the right thing for the better functioning of our research institutions.

**SHRI VASANT SATHE (Akola):** Sir, I rise to speak in this discussion because I feel that it is a matter of serious concern for the entire country that in free India, which is looking forward to our onward march in the field of science, in this age such a tragic situation should arise where a scientist, instead of devoting himself whole-heartedly to the growth of science with enthusiasm, should feel frustrated to the extent of being pushed to the well as it were and be forced to commit suicide. This is the saddest commentary that there ever could be any system in the world. I would like to know if anybody has made a research in this; whether in any country in the world there have been such instances, in any field, where scientist after scientist—this is the fourth scientist now—Shri Joseph, Shri Batra, Shri Parthasarthy and Shri Shah (the fourth scientist) who committed suicide. This is most amazing. The reasons have been given in every case.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Why you are going into all this. If you have to speak something you speak. There will be interruptions and you will lose time in interruptions.

**SHRI VASANT SATHE:** Thank you, Sir. I only hope that we had saved the life of the scientist. I want to point out that in this case there is something basically wrong with the system. I am not today going to attack the scientists. I do not believe in that. I entirely agree that this attitude of witch-hunting is entirely wrong. It is not a particular scientist today or yesterday or anywhere who should be attacked. It is a system in which the scientists do not get an opportunity of job satisfaction. There is no use crying over his death now, because we cannot bring him back. But we must cure the administration.

I will make some concrete suggestions in the light of the experience that we have gained in working in the I. C. A. R. and I. A. R. I. The defect is this that a scientist's main satisfaction, as you will appreciate Sir, is in his work, his research. In that line he must feel that he has complete scope to go to the highest, maximum height and also the highest pay scale. He should not be made to feel that there is some one who is going to boss over him and handicap or hinder his research to suit his convenience. No scientist would ever like to be interfered within his research work and therefore, there should be

a system wherein we can provide continuous pay cadre. That means, in a particular line, if a scientist is making research, he need not go to a higher post. That in a particular line there should be that potentiality a continuous cadre. Then he could go in a higher scale right from Rs. 400 to Rs. 1000, Rs. 1,000 to Rs. 1,500 and Rs. 1,500 to Rs. 2,500. There he must not be made to feel that unless I go to a higher post, I cannot go in higher scale.' That feeling should not be there to a scientist. A scientist should not bother about becoming a Dean or head of the Department. How many heads can you have in the Department? After all, there is going to be a limit to that. Therefore, why should a scientist hunker to be the head of a particular Department or even a Professor for that matter. Every scientist need not be a good professor, need not be a good teacher. But today with that professorship certain status is attached, certain power is attached, certain further scope is attached. That is why it creates all this feeling and brings the politics into it. That is one thing.

Secondly, I would suggest that in addition to continuous pay cadre, project-wise sub-division of budgets within the Department should remain so that a head of Department of some other discipline does not control either the research work or even the budgeting of a particular research man in his field as Dr. Shah had said in his letter. He said, if a man, the chief is interested in publicity, then he can always encourage the juniors to give a particular type of research or result." Then, he can always encourage the juniors to give a particular type of research or results. That will hinder real research. One man can provide larger budget to his own favourite field and starve the field of another scientist. Therefore, I would suggest that there should be project-wise sub-division.

My third suggestion is that all superior and administrative posts should be tenure posts, both in the Institute and in the I. C. A. R. Tenure posts mean, you give the post according to your job, on the basis of "hire and fire", as in other countries. What is this false notion about security of service that we have borrowed from civil administrative service to the scientific field also? It should go. This has created a wrong approach in the entire bureaucracy. We are bringing in bureaucracy here also. So, I suggest, it should be tenure-oriented. Say, for example, four years, tenure. If you give results, you

continue to be there. If you do not show results, you go out. There should not be any feeling of permanency. Till he dies, till he retires and, ever after he is superannuated, he wants to continue. That is the attitude we find here. Have you not got an example of I. C. M. R. where men of 65 years of age are in service? Even after retirement, the persons are re-appointed. There is no age bar. How can you encourage younger people in this country?

**SHRI M. RAM GOPAL REDDY** (Nizamabad) : Experienced people cannot be thrown out.

**SHRI VASANT SATHE** : Experience does not go only by age. In scientific field, you will never have brilliant scientists if you put a premium on age. If he is so learned, he can do research privately. Why does he want to occupy any post? So, these posts should be tenure posts.

There is an unfortunate factor which has pained us very much. Why have this publicity fanfare in the field of science? Scientific work must get recognition in the world of science on its own merit. Why go about rushing to the press, to the newspapers, to the radio, etc., publicising certain inventions which later on are proved false? There are three or four examples of it. My hon. friend, Shri Atal Bihari Vajpapee, has already given a few examples. This is what was pointed out by Dr. Shah. This is very shocking. He said :

"If he does this, or encourage this, his colleagues and subordinates will, naturally, feed him with half-cooked, half-baked data. Such results cannot stand in the field . . ."

What happened to that high lysine wheat? There was no such thing as high lysine wheat or triple dwarf wheat. That also proved to be a dwarf in the field of science. About triple dwarf wheat, it was suggested that it would yield hundred maunds per acre. . . .

**MR. CHAIRMAN** : What is the subject and what you are talking about? (*Interruptions*).

**SHRI VASANT SATHE** : We are not having the *post mortem* of Dr. Shah. We are trying to find out the causes why Dr. Shah committed suicide so that these causes do not recur. That is why the propagation of false or bogus research is to be discouraged. About

[Shri Vasant Sathé]

this triple dwarf wheat, that you can have hundred maunds in an acre, and if you find in the field that it does not happen, will it not discourage a scientist? Sir, you as an expert *kisan* know it. That is why I pointed it out. I would submit that this must be stopped, whosoever the persons are. I do not want to talk about other things.

In conclusion. I would say that we are proud of our scientists; we want to encourage our scientists; the name that they have achieved in the world, we acclaim. We want only to see that our scientists, particularly the younger ones, get the best opportunities to show results and to bring about development of this country faster.

SHRI K. MANOHARAN (Madras North): Mr. Chairman, at the outset, I should pay my homage to late Dr. V. II. Shah and offer my condolences to his beloved family. I am very sorry for whatever had happened in the scientific field.

I have heard with rapt attention what Mr. Vajpayee talked about. After having heard his speech, I had a feeling that he should have been directed to the scientific field, rather than to the political field. He spoke like a scientist. But in his speech he said—and also the speaker who followed him—that certain scientists had a bogus claim, indirectly involving some top scientist who could now be acclaimed as a scientist of international fame. I had an occasion to hear the discussions that took place in the other House where personalities had been singled out for attack. I feel very sorry for saying this. This is my humble appeal to the Members of Parliament that they must be proud of having ICAR as one of the important and outstanding institutions in the world and we must be proud of having scientists of international reputation. But, unfortunately, we, members, have developed a sort of fascination to indulge in witch-hunting, to indulge in mud-throwing on top ranking scientists or anybody without any basis whatsoever. My humble submission is this. We, Members of Parliament, should feel that we are the servants of the nation and not the masters of the country. We must understand our limitations and limits. I am for the dignity, decorum and decency of Members of Parliament and not for their arrogance and conceit to be displayed inside and outside the House. We think that we are masters of everything: we think that we can

criticise anybody. But I may tell you that if tomorrow an election is held and I am rejected by the people, I will be in the streets, but the scientists will never be in the streets; they have got their own standing, they have got their own calibre, they have got their own position in life. These scientists are doing a marvellous job for the country. But, unfortunately, in the other House, specifically Dr. Swaminathan had been picked out for attack, Dr. Menon had been picked out for attack.

AN HON MEMBER: Dr. Pal also.

SHRI K. MANOHARAN: I do not know. These two people had been taken out for attack. Somebody suggested in the House that Dr. Swaminathan's claim was very bogus. While I heard Mr. Vajpayee saying that we should not indulge in witch hunting, I was very happy, but I want to draw his attention to a particular news item that had appeared in a paper which I wish to be white and not yellow. The name of the paper is *Motherland*. I think, that is the official organ of the Jan Sangh Party.

SHRI PILOO MODY (Godhra): That is the *'Rising Sun'*.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: *'Motherland'* is not the official organ of our Party. We have no official organ.

SHRI K. MANOHARAN: Thank you. Mr. Vajpayee and his friends have no organs at all. I am very happy.

SHRI PILOO MODY: This is the only research Mr. Manoharan has done.

SHRI K. MANOHARAN: I am very thankful to Mr. Pilo Mody for his discovery.

Here is a news which appeared—it pains me very much, it ought to pain the entire people of this country.

"The case of Dr. M. S. Swaminathan, Director General, Indian Council of Agricultural Research appears to be getting curiouser and curiouser.

Dr. Swaminathan fancies himself.."

You just watch the expression..

"Dr. Swaminathan fancies himself father of the green revolution. His American friend even got him the Magsaysay award carrying a cash prize of Rs. 75,000. But his claim about developing a revolutionary new wheat.."

We are talking about land ceiling, I think a ceiling on the ignorance of these people is a MUST now. I wish these people should read the bio-data of Dr. Swaminathan; Dr. Swaminathan has got national and international awards and here it is said that through his American friends, he got it. Through his American friends he got! Not only that, for what he got? According to the *Motherland*.

"His claim about developing a revolutionary new wheat, which would cure the protein deficiencies of India, namely Sharbati Sonora on the basis of which he got the Magsaysay award appears to be phoney at best."

This is what the *Motherland* said. But, Sir, here is the citation of the award :

"In electing Moncompu Sambasiva Swaminathan (Dr. M. S. Swaminathan) to receive the 1971 Ramon Magsaysay Award for Community Leadership, the Board of Trustees recognises his contributions as scientist, educator of both students and farmers, and administrator towards generating a new confidence in India's agricultural capabilities."

Another thing is : how he got the Award? This is what the *Motherland* said. I am very happy the *Times of India* came out with an editorial which clarifies the whole position like this :

"The controversy over the affairs of Indian Council of Agricultural Research has taken an unfortunate turn. It cannot be denied. . ."

I entirely agree with the *Times of India* editorial.

"...that it has made some serious mistakes; and it is only appropriate that these should be exposed to public censure. But it will be wrong to use these errors, glaring though they are, as a pretext for the wholesale condemnation of the ICAR which is what some persons seem to be doing. Nor will it be fair to use these to denigrate the Council's Director-General. Dr. M. S. Swaminathan, who is unquestionably one of the country's most distinguished agricultural scientists."

Another thing, Sir. The editorial says :

"Some of them, for instance, have insinuated that Dr. Swaminathan owes his eminence to the family connections of his wife."

Sir, I don't call them as fools, but, I have no guts to call them as intelligent people either.

Then it says,—

"This kind of sniping is not only unfair but indecent. If it is allowed to continue it can only result in tearing to shreds the carefully woven fabric of the ICAR."

I want to draw the attention of the hon. Minister to this point. Dr. Shah committed suicide. What are the conditions which promoted Dr. Shah to commit suicide? This has already been explained by several Members. So far as I am concerned, I wish to refer to one thing. There is another man who was chosen for attack. He was Mr. Menon. When the House took up this debate earlier on some other occasion, I had occasion to meet one of the friends who wanted to attack Mr. Menon. I asked him whether he knew Mr. Menon at all. He openly told me, he did not know anything about Menon. I said, without knowing anything about any individual, how is it that he could attack on that personality. He said, I have been receiving enough information about him, so I am going to attack. Regarding Mr. Menon I know him for the past 7 years. He is a man of integrity, administrative efficiency and capability. He has been criticised by some Members, that he is a Keralite, that he used to go to Kerala often.

AN HON. MEMBER : Who has said it? Nobody has said it. May be in the other House.

SHRI K. MANOHARAN : He being a Keralite, he has to go to Kerala. There have been umpteen allegations. He used to assist the institutions, there have been 4 or 5 institutions connected with the ICAR. He is responsible for strengthening the institutions. Kerala has got an agricultural university. One Man commission of inquiry is going on. Menon had to go to assist that particular judge. He had to take team of scientists to Kerala. By why he is being dubbed as Keralite and why Mr. Swaminathan is being dubbed as a Tamilian is something which I do not understand at all. I don't know where we will be. Scientific community is the community of the world. Dr. Swaminathan and Dr. Menon both have got reputation, they have done meritorious service for this country, they had done enough for this coun-

[Shri K. Manoharan]  
try, for the prosperity of the nation, and the green revolution was ushered in because of these people. Instead of appreciating them we should not humiliate them. It will never speak good of this country.

SHRI SAMAR GUHA (Contai) : My friend does not know that the new variety of wheat which is responsible for the green revolution is the Mexican variety of wheat. There has been only marginal contribution by the ICAR people.

SHRI K. MANOHARAN : I know you are a scientist.

SHRI SAMAR GUHA : There has been only marginal contribution by the ICAR people.

SHRI K. MANOHARAN : This is the tragedy of country. People who know nothing about science speak about science ; I am very sorry for it. Before he committed suicide, 3 months before that, he wrote a letter to Dr. Swaminathan.

SHRI SAMAR GUHA : I am prepared to give my degrees to him after he finished his speech.

SHRI K. MANOHARAN : I reject your degree. I shall send you to Bangladesh. This is the letter which Dr. Shah wrote to Dr. Swaminathan :

"It was a unique experience to listen to your lecture entitled-Cau we face a widespread drought again without food imports ?

On March 26, 1972, the compilation of the available information, its analysis, interpretation and presentation were such that it was difficult for the people to find words to express their appreciation."

So, I would like to impress upon the House today that let bygones be bygones, but let us be very careful about the future. Four people have already sacrificed their lives, and hereafter let the history not be allowed to repeat itself. As regards what must be done, we must think positively about it. There is no question of *Post-Mortem* examination. What should we do ? Why have all such things happened ? Here, I would like to make one suggestion.

Every two or three years, these scientists are expected to appear before a board or a

selection committee. Formerly, they had to appear before the UPSC. Then, a different board was constituted and every two or three years they had to go before that. Dr. Rajendra Prasad was not selected, but he was found to be outstanding. Then, Dr. Shah was selected. And then Dr. Rajendra Prasad was selected. I am not attacking Dr. Shah ; I have no bad opinion about him, but scientists should not be so sensitive about things.

What are we expected to do now ? I would suggest that just as we are having the IAS and IPS cadres, let us have an Indian Agricultural Research Service cadre, and these people should be selected from that service. Once they are selected, automatic promotion would be there and there would be no question of the humiliation of appearing before the commission often and often.

SHRI K. S. CHAVDA (Patan) : He has not replied to my question whether Mr. Menon was a scientist.

SHRI K. MANOHARAN : Mr. Menon has been offered several times the post of vice-chancellor of the agricultural university ; Kerala has offered and another State had also offered it. What does that show ? Unless he has some background, how could he have been offered the post ? Does my hon. friend mean to say that they would have invited him without any background ? So, my hon. friend should understand that also.

SHRI K. S. CHAVDA : He is evading the reply.

SHRI K. MANOHARAN : I am not in the habit of evasion. The last point that I want to make is in regard to section officers. My hon. friend Shri Annasaheb P. Shinde may please note it and while replying, let him find out a solution for this and give the correct answer. While examining the recruitment procedure, Government should give thought to the conditions prevailing in other fields also. As an example, they are conducting examinations periodically for section officers' grade, and the yard-stick adopted by Government is wrong. If a person gets 80 per cent marks in one examination, he is not given the post, whereas a person who gets even 60 per cent at another time is given the post of section officer. The reason is very simple. The whole thing is dependent upon the vacancies available. This procedure is very wrong. My request is that Government should

review the cases of the last few years and see that a person who gets higher marks in one examination is given due recognition, and the position should be reviewed. I request the Home Minister to look into the matter seriously forthwith.

There is just one last point, and I have done. I appreciate your patience, . . .

**SHRI PILOO MODY :** He has overdone.

**SHRI K. MANOHARAN :** Lastly, I would request the hon. Minister to institute a committee. I think he has promised that he would institute a committee. That committee should not be an eyewash committee, but the entire gamut of this must be gone into, and the points raised by Dr. Shah must all be attended to. Each and every item which agitates the minds of the young scientists who want to come up in life should be attended to. That committee should be representative of not only the scientists, but the scientist Members of Parliament. We have got some scientist Members of Parliament, some bogus scientists also. So, I wish that they include some real scientist Members of Parliament and a full-fledged committee should go into the question and see that such kind of deaths does not occur hereafter.

**MR. CHAIRMAN :** Shri Piloo Mody.

**SHRIMATI T. LAKSHMIKANTHAM-MA (Khanmam) :** Sir, I just want to bring to the notice of the House that we are discussing a matter which,—whatever it is, whether it is right or wrong—is a serious matter concerning an eminent scientist who had committed suicide. So, this kind of laughing and all that is not proper.

**MR. CHAIRMAN :** Shri Piloo Mody.

**SHRI PILOO MODY (Godhra) :** Mr. Chairman, Sir, I pray to God that if I ever commit a mistake in my life, Mr. Manoharan does not defend me.

We are today discussing a matter which, as the hon. lady Member has just pointed out, is extremely delicate, and extremely tragic. I think that it is indeed tragic that every now and then a scientist of our country has to commit suicide in order to shock the moral conscience of this Government. I think that it is even more tragic that in spite of the fact that a scientist of our country has committed

suicide, the moral conscience of this Government just does not move.

Sir, the aftermath of these suicides, I find, is that the great omnibus of the Government moves along the same well-worn paths. To this day, we have no clear idea of whether an institution of this magnitude and age is an autonomous body or not. When it suits the Government they instruct their lawyers to show that it is an autonomous body. But when it does not suit the Government they instruct the lawyers to show that it is not an autonomous body, and ultimately, the judges themselves depending on the evidence produced before them, rule first one way and then the other way.

Sir, as far as autonomous bodies go, we have always charged this Government that the autonomy that it gives to these autonomous bodies is pure eyewash, because it is never autonomous in its real sense. It continues to put a finger into the administration in its day-to-day running; it continues to influence the hiring of personnel; it continues to hold tight the purse-strings; it continues to treat some of the members of the autonomous bodies as a sort of adjunct of the department to which that body may belong. I think that a great deal of this trouble arises from the fact that this Government just cannot behave itself.

Sir, on this particular issue, we have a very delicate problem. We have a delicate problem because, on the one hand, we have a very great scientific institution, which on all accounts, has been doing good work. But we have, on the other hand, a mass majority of the people within that institute who are both totally dissatisfied with their life and totally dissatisfied with their lot in life. And, therefore, we have to think very seriously whether we are going to continue playing this sort of autonomous game to which we invite people. We cry when people leave this country and go abroad and settle abroad and we invite them to come here. We offer jobs and all manner of opportunities. But once they come within the administrative cogwheel, there is nothing but suppression which takes place.

About the green revolution also, if it is at all a revolution, it should have been a scientific revolution: not a revolution of publicity and propaganda. What we have done as far as the green revolution is concern-

[Shri Piloo Mody]

ned is merely scratched at the surface. Yet, we have held it up to the whole world as a green revolution, because we revel in grandiose terms and now we are trying to make it appear as if it was a green miracle of some sort.

A great deal more hard work, a great deal more sweat, a great deal more of research will have to go into this country before our agricultural economy becomes viable, because it is not merely enough that the agricultural economy of this country should merely feed the mouths that we have to feed; but it is necessary that all those who eke out a living out of agriculture in this country get a fair day's wage and a fair day's living and get the profits that arise out of a hard day's work. To that extent, the green revolution has not yet been fulfilled. I visualise that it will take many more years before the agriculturists in this country will become anywhere near as affluent as their urban counterparts.

SHRI K. D. MALAVIYA (Domariaganj) : Science alone will not do it.

SHRI PILOO MODY : Only science and technology will do it. But socialism will never do it. Only science and technology will do it; socialism will never do it in a hundred years. Take the example of all the countries that you seem to revel in; in not one country has socialism produced food. Do not give me this gup; just listen for a while. (Interruptions).

A scientific institution cannot be patterned on the basis of a department—secretary, additional secretary, joint secretary, under secretary, deputy secretary, section officer, head clerk, lower division, upper division and so on, all the way upto class IV. You cannot run a scientific institution on this basis.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE : Lower cannot come before upper.

SHRI PILOO MODY : Vajpayee has some notion about upper and lower which I do not quite understand. You cannot have a hierarchical society in a scientific institute. You have an institute in which you have scientists; each scientist performs his own part; each one gaining his own job satisfaction within the research he is doing and each one is treated by the head of the institute with due deference and knowledge of the contribution that he is making. In my own observation I have known many institutions

in which very eminent men of the calibre of Einstein and Oppenheimer have worked sometime as ordinary lecturers and assistant professors, and sometimes as professors and the head of the organisation who controlled him, who had administrative control over him had been an ordinary man with mediocre ability but with capacity to manage the men and that man had the good sense to give deference due to the great scientist and listen to him, even though in the hierarchical structure he may not have been anything at all. It is this sort of attitude we have to develop in our research institute. Otherwise we will end up with the Peter principle, each scientist will be promoted to the level of his own incompetence and we will have no further progress, particularly in the field of science.

A lot has been said about the administrative set up, about selection procedures and about even the brain-drain. But I should like to focus attention on one thing. We have over a period of time become very indifferent and callous to the way in which our citizens react. We here have a scientist who was a man, at best, with a delicately balanced temperament who had to be nurtured in the same way as a little seedling that is to usher in the green revolution. Unless we do that with our people, particularly the ones who have by one means or another acquired talents to push this country forward, unless we recognise that it is only through the efforts and dedicated work of such people that this country will ever make progress, we have not only failed as Government, we have failed as a nation. Therefore, I urge you that in the sacrifice of Dr. Shah, we learn the lesson that bureaucracy, the old means and established practices are not the answer to now-a-days problems, that we shall have to think afresh and utilise technology and convert ourselves into human beings with a scientific bent of mind and stop shouting slogans, because slogans are not going to take us anywhere.

DR. HENRY AUSTIN (Ernakulam) : It is said that this debate is carried on in the shadow of death, death by suicide, not one or two, but four deaths one after another. This should really alert us to the problems of the young scientists, on whose discoveries depend the progress of our country to a very large extent.

Hon. members who spoke before me had



highlighted the conditions obtaining in some of our scientific institutions. Jawaharlal Nehru, in his vision, thought the foundations of research would be the surest safeguard for the development of our country. But at a time when his vision is coming true it is unfortunate that our scientific organisations become the subject of criticism. I agree with Mr. Mody that the sort of bureaucratic set-up of administration we have now will not at all fit in research centres where development of science and technology take place. It is high time we devoted our attention to the creation of a new pattern of administrative structure where the creative mind of our scientists and scholars would have a better atmosphere and forum for the making creative contribution. I do share in the sorrow of the bereaved families of these scientists. But this pathetic situation or sorrowful background should not blind us to the fact that the contributions of the Indian Council of Agricultural Research have really come to the rescue of the Indian people. Prophets of gloom and doom had predicted that by 1972 or 1973 our country would plunge into an abyss of starvation. In a book published in America, *Famine 1975* by Paddock Brothers, it was predicted that in the early seventies most of the developing countries would be victims of famine, that India will be in a hopeless situation and nobody can save this country from famine. It is in this background that this problem will have to be viewed.

The contributions of IARI ICAR under the stewardship of Dr. Swaminathan cannot be forgotten. I wish to highlight this aspect, because although we should share in the sorrow of the bereaved families and of the nation on account of the loss of four scientists and the scientists who are not getting opportunities to show their talents, the paramount task of the nation is to analyse the contributions of our scientists to the development of our country. When we run down the scientists because of some incidents here and there, we are doing a great disservice to the nation. If our Indian nation survives today and if we are able to say loudly that we do not want any more PL 480 imports or foreign aid, and if we have been able to develop the concept of self-reliance, it is largely because of the fact that we have attained self-sufficiency on the food front. When the whole nation owes so much to these scientists, instead of thanking them, if we do harm to the scientific society by indiscriminate remarks we are

not fair to the scientists, whose contributions made us self-reliant on the food front.

Therefore, while I would urge that adequate steps should be taken for that matter, the hon. Minister of Agriculture has already announced that he is constituting a committee to go into the points raised by the late Dr. Shah and, I am sure that the situation will be taken care of by that committee—we should also see that our scientific organisations and institutions should not be made the subject of indiscriminate criticism. If we allow our scientists' names to be tarnished, that will not be a service to the nation. I do not want to make a lengthy speech. I would only say that we certainly have to bestow some thoughts as to how to create circumstances so that the young scientists can work without any disturbance to their work caused by unnecessary bureaucratic interference. In Socialist countries like the Soviet Union the scientists are given higher salaries and they are also given freedom of expressing new and original ideas. Similar conditions should be created here and their salary structure should also be revised.

Therefore, I wish to impress upon the House that while the security and well being of our young scientists should be assured by taken care of by organising new thoughts on the subject we should also ensure the reputation of scientists like Dr. Swaminathan and other eminent scientists of the Indian Agricultural Research Institute ICAR and other organisations. ICAR has won universal recognition for making many contributions by its scientists of international repute. If we in Parliament run them down, I am sure people who are jealous of our country will get a handle to run down our country too. Therefore, let us be objective in the assessment of the situation. While I fully sympathise with our scientists who work in difficult situations, we have to see at the same time, that adequate encouragement is given to the leading scientists who have helped us in many fields through their dedicated research and scholarship.

SHRI P. V. G. RAJU (Visakhapatnam) : Sir, Shri Vajpayee read out the letter written by Dr. Shah. Therefore, I request that I may be permitted to say a few words about the letter. By reading that letter Shri Vajpayee has appealed to the emotion. I use the word "emotion" advisedly because if he had not read out that letter the discussion would have

[Shri P. V. G. Raju]

been at a higher scientific level, but by reading that letter he has imported emotion into the debate. So, I may also be permitted to say something emotional in the matter.

I would like the hon. Minister to examine why Dr. Shah committed suicide. When a person joins government service he acquires two rights. One is the right to provident fund and the other is the right to gratuity. Provident fund and gratuity go with the service of an officer. Unfortunately, in the matter of these two rights Dr. Shah was not very sober. I use the term "sober" deliberately. I am saying this because, unlike the other officers of government, he refused to give the right of his provident fund and gratuity to his wife. I would not have referred to this but for the fact that Shri Vajpayee read out his letter to the department. Here I feel that I should mention that Dr. Shah was over-emotional in the sense that he did not nominate his wife for provident fund and gratuity which he should have, although, he was slightly over-emotional so far as his official career was concerned.

Then I will refer to another thing which happened before his suicide; For nearly 36 hours before he committed suicide he did not take food in his house. If he was fasting, why was he fasting? May be because Dr. Swaminathan or Dr. Paul did not appoint him for that post. I would not like to go into the details. I personally feel that Dr. Shah was rather an emotional person. Otherwise, he would have nominated his wife for his provident fund and pension. But he nominated his minor children aged 6 or 7 which is not normal.

SHRI VASANTI SATHE: That shows that he did not expect to die so soon. Why do you say it is emotional?

17 hrs.

SHRI P. V. G. RAJU: I do not know the definition of "suicide". But, certainly, suicide is emotional. This is what I think. Otherwise, nobody will commit a suicide unless he is emotional.

These are some of the things which I wanted to say. Of course, other Members have said many scientific things. I would like to say, at the same time, that I personally feel that this Research Institute has done a yeoman's service to India and we should encourage it. Instead of becoming

emotional and running it down, I think, this is an occasion for us to be objective in our attitude regarding the death of a scientist.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA (Alipore): Mr. Chairman, Sir, I associate myself with the sorrowful sentiments which have been expressed by all the hon. Members here at the tragic suicide which has given rise to this discussion.

These tragic suicides, one after the other, serve only one useful purpose that they seem to stimulate public conscience and the conscience of this Parliament to wake up and at least have a discussion on the question of how our scientific community is being treated.

I do not hold to the view that until a suicide of a scientist takes place, we should not bother ourselves about what is happening in the research institutions and laboratories in our country. Nor do I hold to the view that because a suicide has taken place in a particular institution, everything must be wrong with that institution.

Sir, I have had the privilege, the opportunity, of working on the Sarkar Committee which enquired into the C. S. I. R. We spent about three years over it. We looked into the affairs as far as we could of about 30 to 35 national laboratories and we met. I think, several hundreds of scientists, particularly, young scientists, excellent scientists, who are the pride of our country. From my own experience, I can say that I am not prepared to hold to the view that until a suicide takes place, we should take it for granted that there is no frustration, no disappointment, no grievance, amongst scientists nor do I hold to the view that we should go in for any sort of character assassination of individuals.

I have very little time at my disposal at the fag-end of this discussion. A committee is going to be appointed. We have taken that for granted because that is what the Minister has already said. So, let us look to the future. I do not hold any brief for Dr. Swaminathan nor am I prepared to give credence to all manner of accusations hurled against him now. That is not the point at all. Dr. Swaminathan has taken over his present responsibility only very recently. Many of the things which have been referred to took place long before he appeared on the scene. Dr. Swaminathan was one of our colleagues on

the Sarkar Committee. I had occasion to work with him for nearly three years there. I cannot judge his professional work as a scientist because I am a layman in this field. But from what I saw of him at close quarters working in the Committee, particularly, when we were drafting the report, I hold him in the highest esteem. That does not mean that I consider him to be infallible, as none of us is infallible, and cannot be so.

The point is that this matter has been certainly thrown into the lime light because of Dr. Shah's suicide. Let us now consider what are the broad lines of enquiry which are called for by the committee which is proposed to be set up and, I hope, will be set up very soon, and what are some of the glaring maladies which have been brought to light.

17.05 hrs.

[ SHRI SEZHIYAN in the Chair ]

The first question which I do not think any hon. Member has referred to, and I must bring it out, is the question of the tie-up, between the ICAR and the IARI on the one hand and the so-called foreign experts on the other. I want it to be probed into. I am not, on the face of it making any very positive allegation, but I know that a large number of our Indian scientists are very much resentful of the way in which we have made ourselves over-dependent on institutions like the Ford Foundation, the Rockefeller Foundation. Because we get grants from them, in exchange for those grants, all kinds of privileges and powers are being given to foreign experts, the so-called experts—some of them must be half-baked experts, I do not know—who are injected into these organisations to hold important posts, to influence important decisions which are taken and even, we are told, to sit on selection committees. This whole arrangement must be probed into carefully. I think, now at least, when this Government is swearing by the slogan of self-reliance, particularly in the field of food production, we must be very careful to see that, in the name of getting foreign expertise, we do not demoralise our scientists to an extent where in fact we move away from self-reliance and become increasingly dependent on others. I am not going into this matter in detail; I am posing it as an issue which must come within the terms of reference of this committee which is proposed to be set up.

We know one case of Dr. Richaria, who was the Director of Rice Research Institute, who is alleged to have lost his job only because he had the temerity to disagree with the foreign expert who was working there in close proximity to him or to challenge his decision or opinion. If that is so, I do not consider that to be any better than a suicide; if he loses his job on that account, how is it any better than suicide? It is a sort of murder of an Indian scientist.

I do not see why they should sit on selection committees and I would like the Government to be careful to see that under cover of foreign experts so-called experts, no kind of malevolent and evil agencies are allowed to operate in our country, because Americans are very frank about this. The Director-General of CIA has said openly that under the guise of various technical experts, they have got their people working in various countries of the world.

I know, in 1965,—Mr. Mody may not know—one of the gentlemen working here, called Williams, when the Indo-Pakistan hostilities broke out, tried to run away across the border into Pakistan taking some of our materials, pulses materials, from the Institute, and actually it was Dr. Swaminathan who, discovering that, gave timely information to the police, and Williams was caught and brought back, for which the American community in this country is rather annoyed.

Another point that I would like to be probed into, not by this Committee, but by a separate inquiry, is: is it or is it not a fact that substandard jute seeds have recently been supplied to Bangladesh? Please find out if it is true and who is responsible for it. Is there some hand behind it which wants to create bad feelings between our country and Bangladesh? I have it on the highest authority that only recently in the name of assisting Bangladesh, jute seeds which were sent are substandard jute seeds, and I cannot take it on the face of it that there is nothing behind it.

Now the question is this. For once, Mr. Mody spoke one or two sensible things one of which was that Government (*Interruptions*) is to blame for not clarifying, upto now, what should be the exact status of ICAR. For this nobody else is to blame except the Government. The declaration that it is an autonomous body was made seven or eight years ago. Some

[Shri Indrajit Gupta]

legislation was supposed to be brought to give that a proper statutory basis but nothing has been done uptill now. Please tell us 'Why' and what you propose to do, because, whenever there is any trouble over appointments, we are told that it is an autonomous body, so, we cannot interfere because they are responsible for their appointments. When it is a question of overall administration, scientific administration, then we are told that it is a Government Department, and, therefore, there are all these Government Rules and Regulations and 'What can be done?'

According to the concept we have inherited and according to the Rules we have inherited from the British days, a temporary employee, in the Central Government service, can remain temporary for years together. And are our scientists to be treated as such? Many scientists are appointed as temporary scientists because there is some opening in a particular project or plan and he is taken on and if he is to be given the status of a temporary appointee and the temporary appointment to go on for years to come, this kind of things cannot be done. Mr. Mody, for once, you are right. You cannot run the scientific research institutions like Government Departments. It is an impossible thing. I will commend to you the report of the Sarkar Committee. I have no time. At least, we have thought and I don't say we have succeeded, but we tried at least to tackle this problem and make some new type of recommendations with regard to the CSIR. I would request the Government and this Ministry to kindly refer to those and see if there is anything useful which they can borrow.

SHRI PILOO MODY : Why refer? Just ask them to read it.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA : Secondly, I will say the real thing which is required is that there should be a flexible structure. A kind of rigid structure, a rigid inflexible structure of a cadre system, a hierarchical system means absolute death of a scientific research institute. There must be a flexible structure. Had there been a flexible structure in this particular case, I am sure, the two scientists, Dr. Vinod Shah and Dr. Rajendra Prasad, if you go into their histories and their bio-data and their qualifications, there is very little to choose between the two. It is almost like a tie. It is as if one is pitted against the other. It is as if one is competing against the other. This

is because of the type of structure we have inherited. If you had flexible structure, it would have been possible to provide and absorb both of them without causing any heart burning or mutual rivalry or jealousy. But, you cannot do it in the present system. Therefore, I suggest that there should be a running pay scale with efficiency bars if you like, but there should be a running pay scale for all the scientists from the lowest to the highest. They should know they can reach the top provided they cross the efficiency bars. I am totally opposed to Mr. Manoharan's idea of an All India Agricultural Service where promotion will be automatic, just as it is in the Government Department. It is not the way in which the scientists are to be evaluated.

SHRI VASANT SATHE : That will spell ruin.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA : Then, Sir, the Heads of Divisions in this ICAR and the IARI enjoy powers and opportunities which are, what shall I say, like those of grand Moghuls. Some decentralisation is necessary within these institutions. I believe Mr. Swaminathan, as Director, did try to at least divest the Directors of some of the powers and distribute them among the Heads of the Divisions, but the Heads of Divisions, unfortunately, did not carry that process further at the next stage. For example, a Head of a Division is in the Grade of Rs. 1300-1600. A Professor is in the Grade of Rs. 1100-1600, not much difference. Both are very senior people. But, as it is the structure, the Head of the Division, by virtue of his post, has complete control over the budget, the facilities and everything of the project on which the Professor is working. (Interruptions) He can help him or he can absolutely finish him off.

So, senior scientists, that is, the Project Leaders like Dr. Vinod Shah was, they should get the necessary freedom to operate within their budget and to recruit the personnel for their own project and in exchange for that, of course, they must be held responsible for their own projects. But they must be given that freedom. This is the problem we found in so many of our national laboratories. That is why I am referring to it and somebody has mentioned, I think, it was Mr. Sathe, in the higher posts of Managers and Heads of Divisions, Directors and so on, there should be some fixed tenure. There can be fixed tenure or there can be a system of making them rota-

tional. But there must not be a hierarchy, a rigid hierarchy which cannot be changed or which cannot be moved. Responsibilities as well as opportunities must be shared. They must be shared. Otherwise, this misuse of powers will be very likely.

May I refer briefly to one of the recommendations of the Sarkar Committee just as an example? I don't know whether you consider it to be anything new. It says:

"It was pointed out to the Committee by several persons that the existing system of writing annual confidential reports should be drastically altered to make it reflect more objectively the worth of the scientific work of the person concerned. The Committee are of the view that each member of the scientific staff should be asked to write at the end of each year an account of his own work. He should prepare a statement describing the work allotted to him during the course of the year and the work actually done by him. His immediate superior should add his comments whether the account given is correct and give his opinion as to the value of the work done. A reviewing officer, higher than the immediate superior, should make the final evaluation. In the event of disagreement on facts between the person concerned and his immediate superior, the reviewing officer should call a meeting to discuss the matter jointly with both and arrive at his own decision. A copy of the report in full should be made available to the person concerned while the original should be retained as record in the office. In fact it should not be called a confidential report but an assessment report or an evaluation report because secrecy is demoralising to the scientist and leaves room for the superior to write a non-objective report."

This is the type of thing that we have tried to do and I hope you would try to benefit from this. Sir, I wish to finish in a minute. You should try to apply similar types of methods here.

Then, Sir, I am told there is no staff council there. There is no staff council at this institute. There is no grievance machinery. The Sarkar Committee has tried to provide for these. After all, if the people have some grievance whom are they to go to? Who will hear the grievance unless there is some

sort of established recognised machinery? You don't allow trade union there under the Trade Union Act. There are only scientists workers Associations. But many directors and heads don't want to recognise them, they don't want to talk to them. They have a contemptuous attitude and hostile attitude towards them. There must be a recognised grievances machinery and a staff council must be set up.

It has been brought to my notice that the condition of housing of the scientists there is very pathetic, particularly here on the campus of Pusa, you find, it is a lovely place with wide open space and beautiful trees and all that, but have you tried to find out how many people have been housed? You find that the majority of the scientists, particularly in the middle and lower categories are not provided with housing facilities. Most of them are living in one room places that they have taken on rent and they are being fleeced by the landlords, racketing is going on. Half his income is going out almost in rents. How do you expect people who are engaged in valuable scientific research to devote their mind to their work when they are having to suffer like this? Why has the Government not done anything about it? Cannot we have a housing project for the scientists? We are talking of housing project for so many people. Quite rightly. But scientists, as somebody said, have to be nurtured. They are the treasure, the prize of our community, they are the people who can make this country go forward out of the backward condition in which it is who can lead the country towards self reliance, if anybody can, and they have to be prized and treasured and they have to be guarded as the apple of our eye. They must be provided with housing and with other amenities. Why should only MPs alone enjoy the amenities which are denied to scientists? I would like to know that. For what reason?

Therefore, Sir, I hope this Committee which is going to be set up will go into all these matters, particularly the decentralisation of powers, how far it can be done, what structure should be set up, how merit promotion is to be done, how job evaluation has to be done, grievances machinery, how selection committees are to be set up, etc. All this must be done. There must be no room for any justified grievance and frustration on the part of the scientist. I hope this Committee will be set up very soon. I am not particularly enamoured from my own experience with the idea that we must necessarily have a

[Shri Indrajit Gupta]

large number of MPs on that Committee. Our Sarkar Committee had a large number of MPs on it. They are all valuable and trusted colleagues. But this is a subject in which they were as ignorant or more ignorant or less ignorant than I am, I include myself in that. In the CSIR we found there was a whole field of inquiry on which we could do nothing, we could discuss nothing, because we could understand nothing. We had to see that those 4 or 5 scientists who were members of the Committee should be constituted into a separate group or sub-committee and all these subjects should be dealt with by them and they should submit a report to the whole committee and, as was inevitable, we more or less agreed with everything that they said because we had no better knowledge to suggest anything. So, I am not saying that MPs should be ruled out, I think perhaps after what has happened the scientists themselves would like that there should be some public men associated with it. But I think outside scientists who are not directly connected with the institutions must also be there. There should be a properly balanced team which should comprise this Committee and they should go into the matter as soon as possible, and the terms of reference should be made sufficiently wide so that they can examine all aspects of it. Then only perhaps we may do justice—I do not know whether we shall be able to do—in the future to other young scientists who may not have to suffer the same fate as Dr. Shah.

SHRI VAYALAR RAVI (Chirayinkil) : I fully agree with my hon. friend Shri Indrajit Gupta who has said that the amenities and facilities to the young scientists should be increased and we should not take them into narrow political corridors or make them subject to the bureaucratic methods.

Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee who initiated the discussion has already narrated the story which led to the sad suicide of Dr. Shah. Of course, there were suicides even before, but I consider the suicide of Dr. Joseph much more serious. Dr. Joseph committed suicide due to poverty. It was poverty which forced him to commit suicide. Government had failed to give him more facilities, to enable him to earn his own bread and to feed his wife and children. But, unfortunately we parliamentarians and the public were unable to go into the matter deeply when Dr. Joseph committed suicide. Now we are only thinking

of the frustration or humiliation suffered by Dr. Shah.

I do want the House to consider that the ICAR had done great service to the country. We are having research activities in so many fields. We are having research activities in the agriculture, medicine and in space field. But except in the agricultural field, we cannot say much about research in other fields. In the space research or medical research or industrial research we have not made such significant progress as we have made in the agricultural field.

SHRI VASANT SATHE: It is not necessary to make such comparisons, and bring down the scientists in the other fields.

SHRI VAYALAR RAVI: It is in the field of agricultural research that we have made significant contributions, and in fact, our green revolution is the result of those research activities. So it is necessary to project the importance of ICAR.

My hon. friend Shri Indrajit Gupta had referred to the arrest of the American scientist working here when he was fleeing to Pakistan. These are all things contributing to the situation that annoyed certain people of Public Law. For the last two years, there has been a consistent attack mounted against the ICAR from different corners. So, I would submit that we cannot judge the ICAR on the basis of a single incident.

Anyway, we have to think about what has to be done in the future. We have to think of the scientists of the country in such a way that they would be dealt with in such a way that they can concentrate their energies on scientific activities. The Government must provide them more facilities and amenities. But unfortunately, I have to say with great regret that the entire scientific community of the country has divided itself into different groups fighting with each other for their own positions. They are more concerned with these things than with research activities. That is the whole pity of this country.

I know that Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee never makes any false allegations. But unfortunately I have to disagree with him on this occasion. I am sure he will agree with me that every scientific achievement is subject to debate; it has always to be debated in different forums by the intellectuals and the

scientists, and it will be disputed also on many an occasion. So, we cannot come to any judgment at once. So, we cannot say that the different claims made by the different scientists are bogus. So, I have to disagree with him on this point.

Unfortunately, the names of Mr. Menon and others have been dragged in the other House, and different persons have been singled out and attacked, I know some of them personally, and I would like to take this forum to express my own feelings on this occasion.

One hon. Member has asked whether the secretary of the ICAR is a scientist. No, he is not a scientist. Shri T. N. Kaul was the secretary of the ICAR; he was not a scientist; he was not a doctor also. With regard to Mr. Menon, I just like to quote one paragraph from the report of the Issac Commission, the one-man commission constituted by the Government of Kerala to inquire into allegations regarding the Kerala Agricultural University.

The Secretary of the ICAR has been summoned four times to Kerala by the Commission. He had to go to Kerala. Otherwise, the court could say he was not respecting the court. I quote from what the Commission said :

"I record my gratitude to the Indian Council of Agricultural Research, New Delhi, and its very able and energetic Secretary, Shri K.P.A. Menon, for all the assistance that I have derived from them. The ICAR had been good enough to arrange my visit of the agricultural universities and other allied institutions. Shri K.P.A. Menon, in the midst of his heavy official work, spared time and accompanied me while visiting some of the universities and institutions. He inspected the lands at and around Mannuthy with a team of experts and furnished a joint report, expressing their views regarding the nature and extent of the land required for the Agricultural University and the selection of a proper campus site. He evinced great interest in the establishment of the Agricultural University in this State; and I have received invaluable assistance from him in my work."

This is the comment by Justice Issac of the Kerala High Court. I hope my friend

will correct himself about the doubt he mentioned about this matter.

I am not taking any more time. I am concluding by saying that I agree with Shri Indrajit Gupta in his suggestion regarding the future set-up of the scientific institutions including the ICAR.

SHRI K. S. CHAVDA (Patan) : Mr. Chairman, Sir, Dr. Vinod Shah's death this is the fourth case of suicide by scientists working under the ICAR because of frustration, because of dissatisfaction over the denial of opportunities for promotion.

In today's newspapers also, there is one case mentioned. It has appeared in the *Indian Express* of today. It says that Mr. T. S. Raman, a biochemist in the Indian Agricultural Research Institute, has sent a telegram to the Prime Minister today—that is, on the 24th—urging her to "intervene immediately" in the affairs of the IARI. Copies of the telegram have been also sent to the Union Agriculture Minister and to Dr. Swaminathan, the Director-General of the IARI. In the telegram he has said that he is "being persecuted and made desperate. Under intolerable mental strain. Intervene immediately." This is the telegram.

AN HON. MEMBER : Is he also going to commit suicide ?

SHRI K. S. CHAVDA : The Government should take care so that he would not commit suicide. This is also another case. This scientist is also Joint Secretary of the IARI unit of the Association of Scientific Workers of India, which published the Young Scientist Bulletin last year, in which certain claims of the institute were challenged in an article: 'Agricultural Research—Claims versus Reality'. This has appeared in the *Indian Express* today.

Sir, there are general complaints that promotions are made on considerations not of merit. There are examples. Some of the heads of the departments are selected by the Selection Committee not belonging to the concerned disciplines. Then, the question is, how they can appreciate the research work done by scientists working under those people.

I am giving one example. The head of the Agronomy Department who has got a lift after superseding the claim of others is basically a plant physiology man. And we know that Dr. Kburana's request for a junior post-

[Shri K. S. Chavda]

tion was turned down by the institution. But when he got international recognition in the United States of America and when he got the Nobel Prize, then they repented the loss.

I would like to read one more news item which appeared in the *Evening News* of Friday, May 12, 1972 in which it is mentioned how they choose the men. It is by a Selection Committee. A Selection Committee is set up by the ICAR, and the Chairman of the Selection Committee is appointed by the Government on the recommendation of the Director-General of the ICAR.

SHRI C. M. STEPHEN : We are not the selection Committee for the Member to argue anybody's case !

SHRI K. S. CHAVDA : I am giving the facts and it is for the Government to reply I am holding no brief for anybody. There is a question here : "Can a non-scientist hold a senior post, essentially meant for a scientist ? Yes, at least in the Indian Council of Agricultural Research." Then that paper gives the example. The Council needed a person to fill the post of a research officer (planning) and without bothering about selection rules, the Council authorities promoted a section officer to officiate in that position and he was allowed to continue for over 1½ years. He gives another example, but I shall not take the time of the House in giving more examples.

Dr. Shah's letter says something regarding the Director-General, regarding appointments and promotions and so on. It is for the Minister to reply whether it is a fact or not. The letter says : the Director or the Director General seldom likes to hear complaints against the heads of departments or officers ; mediocre people are recruited in preference to candidates with experience, energy and drive merely because they have the tact to keep the higher officials close to them by fair or foul means. He further says : a person with ideals is always victimised when it comes to promotion or employment. Even their achievements shown in their reports, the contributions made and their programmes of future work were changed so that they do not appear outstanding. That is the position of the ICAR. Therefore, I rise to support the motion that the Government should appoint a committee to enquire into the working of the ICAR and IARI, the service conditions, recruitment, promotions, and so on.

MR. CHAIRMAN : Shri Nahata—not speaking ; Shri Unnikrishnan.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE : All from Kerala ?

SHRI K. P. UNNIKRISHNAN (Badagara) : I thought that Kerala was as much a part of India as U.P. or M.P. and it does not lie in the mouth of Shri Vajpayee to say this ; at least I did not expect a respected leader like him to say so.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE : What have I said.

SHRI K. P. UNNIKRISHNAN : All from Kerala . . . (Interruptions)

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE : It is a statement of fact.

AN HON. MEMBER : He said in a light vein . . . (Interruptions)

SHRI K. P. UNNIKRISHNAN : The unfortunate suicide of a very promising scientist has led to a debate on the functioning of the Indian Council of Agricultural Research and its subsidiary organisation the IARI in both Houses of Parliament. It has generated a lot of interest in the Press and among the public. All deaths, as John Donne said, are a loss because "it diminishes humanity". Death is tragic, suicides are the more so because it makes you think about the compulsions and inner urges of human mind. When Marilyn Monroe, the noted American film star committed suicide years ago, it made many of us think about the value system of the United States of America and its society. But the Parliament of a country which ought to be concerned with institutional framework and policy cannot be allowed to be swept of its feet by sentimentality ; there is a lot of cheap sentimentality in this country and I am sure at least Mr. Vajpayee will agree with me that it is not part of Bharatiya Sanskriti. Manliness was part of Bharatiya Sanskriti. To judge all issues on a sentimental basis results in complete loss of perspective and it does not befit the Parliament of this country. Unfortunately, this is what has been going on during the debate about the ICAR, both here and outside. This is going on not only inside the House but also outside in the press and among the public.

But, unfortunately, the debate has provided more froth than substance. During the



last few years, if there has been a single achievement on the Indian economic front and on our developmental front, it has been on the agricultural front. I concede the benefits and achievements of green revolution. I am one of the sharpest critics of the green revolution because of its social costs and the social tensions it has generated in the Indian village scene. But that is not to deny the contribution made by our agricultural scientists. If there are certain social mal-adjustments which have come up as a result of the green revolution, it has to be remedied elsewhere and that is the duty of the Parliament and the policymakers to remedy them. But the blame should not go to the poor scientists of ICAR. They have done a tremendous service for the country and to a certain extent even helped us to win the war because it made us a viable entity at a critical juncture of our history.

Dr. Austin, my friend, referred to 'Famine-1975'. There were many prophets of doom who said that India would collapse under the weight of famine. There were some friends here who felt in this manner and some of us even felt so. But, more than that, the United States of America, their mass media and their scientists felt so. That was the importance of Dr. Austin's quotations from Paddock Brothers book "Famine-1975." Except for a very few like Norman Borlaug, generally the tendency among the Americans have been to run down the contribution of Indian scientists. I am so sorry that some Members and some Indians should have also joined this and tried to decry Dr. Swaminathan and his eminent team of colleagues. The whole point is that under the guidance of Dr. Swaminathan, Dr. Pal and other officials of ICAR, they have been able to give a positive re-orientation to our agricultural effort. It is not their duty to concern themselves with the policy framework of development and distributive justice. It is the business of the Government of India, the political leadership and this Parliament. It is not the business of the ICAR and its officials. If we have failed on those fronts, we have to remedy them and we shall soon remedy them.

Sir, there have been some references also about Dr. Swaminathan. I felt it was very tragic. Dr. Swaminathan is not where he is today because he happens to be the son-in-law of somebody or he has married somebody. He is there because of his own eminent contributions which have not only been acclaimed

in the Western world but also in the Socialist world including the Czechoslovakian and Soviet Academy of Sciences. It is such a scientist, because somebody somewhere unfortunately committed suicide, is being pilloried and this is what I referred to earlier as complete loss of perspective.

Sir, unfortunately, there are disgruntled scientists in this country just as there are disgruntled politicians or just as there are disgruntled elements in other sections of society. But are we to be guided by those disgruntled sections? If you say that there are genuine reasons for this, they must be solved, I agree with that-but we should not be guided by them. This is, unfortunately, what has been going on.

I want to know specifically about an association which parades itself as the Association of Scientific Workers. Of course, it had even the blessings of Jawaharlal Nehru at one time but now it consists of complete nincompoops who have not contributed anything worthwhile to the Indian agricultural effort. Many of their leaders have not even written a paper during the last ten-fifteen years.

I also want to know, while they have also gone to many friends of mine, whether they are bringing out an organ called 'Young Scientist', which some time ago came out with charges against Dr. Swaminathan, Shri Menon and everybody. There was also an interesting gentleman called Ahuja who was a part of this and suddenly he disappeared and I understand with reliable authority that he has been later found to be a CIA agent. I want the Government to tell me, is this a fact? What was Ahuja doing with Kathawate and other groups of disgruntled scientists and association of scientific workers? Every member of the association of scientific workers disowned responsibility for this article and said, "we have nothing to do with this association or allegation." I want to know what is Ahuja's role in this.

That the whole problem of promotion, selection, etc. in ICAR has to be reviewed afresh, I am glad an opportunity has arisen to do so. As Mr. Piloo Mody pointed out, we are bound by the hierarchical system. More than in any other country, there is a basic element of inequality and hierarchy involved in our society. In any society it is bad, but more so in our society. As Mr. Sathé pointed out, we think in terms of Secretary to Class IV. There are separate houses for Secretaries,

[Shri K. P. Unnikrishnan]

Class IV and for everybody, based not on his contribution to society or his social achievement, but based on inequality. This problem cannot be solved by Swaminathans or Menons. It will again have to be solved by policy-makers and Government. Even the Indian social milieu is inhospitable to scientific temper, because our social milieu has respect for *babas*, *vibhutis*, etc. Unless we change the whole set-up and attack the root of the problem, we are not going to solve it by attacking some scientists or some officials or ICAR or any part of Government. Modern scientific research work is organised by effective teams. Team work plays the most crucial role. That alone can produce scientific results. That has been the experience of the western world as well as the socialist world. Selection and evaluation of performance will have to be based on what I would call non-hierarchical basis. Why should there be a head of a division? There can be somebody who can guide research and he can get any amount, Rs. 2000 or 2500. But there must be a new approach to the whole problem, instead of giving room for scientists like Dr. Shah to commit suicide, because he was not chosen for xyz post. Dr. Rajendra Prasad was considered to be very good by the committee. So was Dr. Shah, but there was room for only one. Our whole approach to the problem of scientific personnel is absurd and wrong. It can only be done by the policy-makers. There is no point in attacking any of these unfortunate gentlemen. It is unfortunate but very interesting to find that a large number of assorted individuals and groups have come forward to attack ICAR and the Ministry of Agriculture. It includes politicians of the right. Normally they have never shared anything with pseudo-radicals, but as far as this attack is concerned, they are on the same side as also the disgruntled scientists, those who have not contributed anything and still MPs keep on writing letters asking that they should be given promotions even though they have not done anything during the last 15 years except to run down this or that scientist. This unfortunate politics of the scientists has to be ended, just as the scientific work of the politicians will have to be ended! We are not the people to decide in this House about protein content or molecular biology. That must be left to the scientists. This task cannot be taken over by my colleagues in Parliament or political parties. What we can give them is a positive policy frame-work as well as a genuine concern for

the scientists and his work. I am sure with this changed emphasis, the minister will be kind enough to institute a probe into the whole thing and I am sure once again ICAR will be able to make its contribution to national well being, just as any other scientific body.

SHRI J. B. PATNAIK (Cuttack) : Mr. Chairman, may I raise a discordant note to the trend of this debate. While I do not want that an idea should go round that this Parliament glorifies the case of a suicide, at the same time, I do not want that the idea should go round that this Parliament completely brushed aside a very serious case of suicide by an eminent scientist.

ICAR has done very good work and has contributed to the self-sufficiency of foodgrains in this country. It has many glories to its credit and it should be given credit when it deserves it. At the same time, in its administration if certain things have cropped up which deserve to be criticised, and this criticism is not being made fairly in a democratic set up, I think this Parliament does not do its duty towards the country. This sort of criticism at times against a scientific institution which has grown to a very big organisation in our country, whether it is a corporation or an autonomous body, is good. Certain things have been found out which require to be clarified. This spring cleaning is certainly good in a democratic set up.

I would like to point out certain things in regard to those appointments that have become responsible for the death of the scientist. I am afraid, I will have to mention the names of some scientists because Dr. Shah in his letter referred to the names of certain persons, and that letter was quoted here.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE (Kanpur) : That is because Shri Mahapatra is not promoted. Remember this person is a gold medalist.

SHRI J. B. PATNAIK : The person who is holding the post of head of the department of Agronomy does not hold any degree in agronomy. He is really a B. Sc. in Agriculture.

There are certain points that are to be clarified in this House. It is not a question of a particular individual. If a particular individual becomes a cog in the machinery,

and that creates this situation, then certainly we have to criticise that machinery. It is not a question of Dr. Dey. I am stating certain facts which have become responsible for the present state of affairs in the ICAR. This gentleman was first appointed as Professor of Agronomy, superseding two seniors who were highly qualified in the subject, namely Dr. Mahapatra and Dr. Dastani.

MR. CHAIRMAN : I would suggest that to the extent possible he can avoid names and give designations.

SHRI ATAL BEHARI VAJPAYEE : Sir, how can you prevent him from mentioning names? When Dr. Swaminathan was praised to the skies the Chairman did not object. So, how can there be any objection when they are criticised?

SHRI M. C. DAGA (Pali) : We are discussing a personality. He is mentioning Dr. Swaminathan and Dr. Shah. We should think what we should do about it. We must make an inquiry.

SHRI J. B. PATNAIK : The first shock to Dr. Shah was when he was superseded by some person who was less qualified than himself was appointed as Professor on an *ad hoc* basis. Another thing was that this professorship was not advertised during the period when he held his professorship and he was confirmed in the post. To the post of no other head of the department has a person been appointed on an *ad hoc* basis, and that too he has been made permanent in the post. This has become an exception only in the case of this gentleman.

After the death of Dr. Bains, this gentleman was again promoted to the post of Head of Agronomy and he was appointed on an *ad hoc* basis. This was the second shock to Dr. Shah. This gentleman was junior to Dr. Shah and yet he had now become the Head of the Department. After some time the post was advertised and the qualifications required were mainly two. One was a doctorate in Agronomy, relaxable to M. Sc, degree or equivalent postgraduate qualification in the case of candidates of exceptionally distinguished record of productive research.

- (2) 10 years experience in Agronomy as evidenced by published work.

This gentleman—I am not taking his name—had neither of these two qualifications. The then Secretary of Agriculture, Shri T. P. Singh,

I understand, advised the I. C. A. R. not to call this gentleman for interview as he did not possess the essential qualifications required. But he was called for interview. The Government may say that he might have been wrongly called for interview, but the Selection Board selected him. While no wrong can justify the right, even the constitution of the Selection Board was defective. For the post of the head of the Department of Agronomy, an expert in Agronomy should have been called from outside. No Agronomy expert was called from outside. Instead, those who were called were Plant Physiologists. As the Plant Physiologists are birds of the same feather, as this particular gentleman, he was selected. So, he was selected while two gentlemen who senior to him and head and shoulder above him in terms of a brilliant academic career and qualifications in Agronomy were left to their fate.

This was the second shock to Dr. Shah who found his junior not only superseding him but all the senior people in the Agronomy Department to sit at the head. So, when he was appointed to this post, the professorship post fell vacant and, in the Selection Board, Dr. Dey, a junior who worked under Dr. Shah sat in judgment over his qualifications. He was the departmental head and had a big say in the selection and he selected a Plant Physiologist, not an Agronomist. This was the last straw on the camel's back as a result of which he committed suicide.

The whole chain of appointments has become a subject of controversy. We are not going to defame any particular person. There are many prominent persons in this Department who have contributed highly to agricultural science in this country. We must certainly praise them and whatever is due to them must be given to them. This country must have great regard for the scientists. But it does not mean that when there are certain defects in the administrative set-up, if there are certain cases of nepotism, we should excuse this matter.

There are other irregularities which I would like to point out. I have a painful duty of doing this. In the I. C. A. R., there is an undermatic who has become a Class I officer in the welfare Section. There is one who is the Chief Photo Officer without any officer under him. A Geologist has got into this organisation as a senior agricultural scientist and now he is in-charge of foreign aid. Fellowships are distributed at will and not to the deserving candidates.

[Shri J. B. Patnaik]

There are many instances of alleged promotions. What I say is that we should not ignore these cases of omissions and commissions. Therefore, the Government should appoint a special committee of enquiry. Of course, the Government has appointed a special committee. I am thankful to the hon. Minister that he is now trying to enquire into the whole set-up. But what I mean to say is, to go into the circumstances of this special case of suicide, there should be a high-powered commission with a person of a status of a High Court judge to go into the whole circumstances of the suicide and suggest remedies and these remedies should be carried out by the Government.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE (Kanpur): I only request you that when the Minister replies, let him also reply whether in the matter of one promotion, a Minister of the Council of Ministers also wanted to influence Dr. Swaminathan to promote that gentleman and, because he was not promoted, he also incurred the displeasure of that Minister.

श्री भूलचन्द डग ( पानी ) : सभापति महोदय, पार्लमेण्ट मे बहुस चल रही थी कि देश में जो प्रतिभाशाली लोग है, जो वैज्ञानिक हैं या जो मरुस्वती के पुत्र है जिनके द्वारा इस देश का उत्थान हो सकता है उन लोगों के साथ कोई अन्याय न हो। इसमें सवाल जांच का है, हमें किसी की प्रशंसा नहीं करनी है कि उन्होंने बहुत अच्छा काम किया, उन्होंने बहुत अच्छा काम किया। मवाल यह है कि आपके विभाग मे, कृषि अनुसंधान संस्थान की व्यवस्था में ऐसे क्या कारण थे जिनकी वजह से एक प्रतिभाशाली वैज्ञानिक निराश और कुंठित हो कर इस समार से उठ गया। हमें इसी बात की जांच करनी है। हम नहीं कहने कि हिन्दुस्तान मे किम प्रकार के लोग पैदा होते हैं, जो प्रतिभाशाली लोग है उनको पूरा अवसर दिया जाये। राजनीतिज्ञ किसकी वकालत करते है यह भी यहा पर कोई सवाल नहीं है। हिन्दुस्तान के अन्दर अगर कोई वैज्ञानिक बढ़ना चाहता है तो उसकी प्रगति होनी चाहिये, कोई प्रतिभाशाली वैज्ञानिक है तो उस का उत्थान होना चाहिये जिससे देश का भी उत्थान हो। हमने देखा है कि 1969 के अन्दर

लोगों के यह आवाज उठायी थी कि हमारे चयन में अव्यवस्था है, निराशा है, और इस के बाद मृत्यु हो गयी। उसके बाद भी आवाज उठायी थी कि इस अव्यवस्था में हमें कुछ परिवर्तन लाना चाहिये।

सवाल देखने का यह है कि भारत में हर साल 29,000 के करीब आत्म हत्यायें होती है, 206 प्रतिशत आत्म हत्यायें होती है, जिसका मतलब है कि कुछ सामाजिक व्यवस्था खराब है। आज अगर उड़ीसा के बारे में कोई कहता है या दक्षिण वाले कहते हैं तो सवाल यह है कि वैज्ञानिकों को पूरा अवसर दिया जाना चाहिये अपनी उन्नति करने का तभी देश भी आगे बढ़ेगा। यह न हो कि भारत में बैंड बजाने वाले और तम्बू टांगने वाले हो जायें। वैज्ञानिकों को अनुसंधान की पूरी स्वतन्त्रता होनी चाहिये।

मैं आत्म हत्या को अच्छा नहीं समझता। यह कमजोरी है। लेकिन साथ ही यह एक चुनौती है कि हमारी व्यवस्था में कहीं कमजोरी है जिस को सुधारने के लिये जांच करानी चाहिये। जब डा० शाह की 4, 5 मई को मृत्यु हुई तो अखबारों ने हमारा ध्यान आकर्षित किया और हम ने सोचा कि देश में जो वैज्ञानिक हैं या प्रतिभाशाली वैज्ञानिक है वे ऊपर आये और उनके उत्थान में यह छोटी मोटी बातें बाधायें पैदा न करें। हम यह न कहें। कि यह अच्छा है और वह बुरा है। जब प्रस्ताव इस बात पर सीमित हो गया कि हमें जांच करनी चाहिये कि व्यवस्था में खराबी है या नहीं, तब हमें अपने को उन्हीं बातों तक सीमित रखना चाहिये, क्योंकि सवाल यह नहीं था कि कौन माइंटिस्ट अच्छा है। किसी के एक की तारीफ के पुल बांध दिये तो दूसरे ने उसकी बुराई की, यह नहीं होना चाहिये। यह प्रस्ताव इतना था कि हिन्दुस्तान में अपने देश के विकास के लिये प्रतिभाशाली जो लोग हैं उनको राजनीतिज्ञ लोग अपने तरीकों से अपने नीचे न बना लें। इसलिये बीटीनामस इंस्टीट्यूशन में वैज्ञानिक अपना विकास कर सकें और हमको उनके दायरे में

नहीं आना चाहिये । कमी कमी राजनीतिक हर जगह टांग बढ़ाते हैं । लेकिन साथ ही मैं इस मत का हूँ कि वैज्ञानिक को भी इतना कमजोर नहीं होना चाहिये । स्थितियों का, निराशा का डट कर मुकाबला करना चाहिये । अगर वह समझता है कि आत्म हत्या करने से देश सुधर सकता है तो गलत है देश के वैज्ञानिकों को चाहिये कि स्थिति का मुकाबला करें, और जो देश की सेवा करना चाहते हैं, जो ऊँचे दर्जे के वैज्ञानिक हैं उनको अपने अन्दर निराशा नहीं आने देनी चाहिये, क्योंकि लड़ना ही जिन्दगी है, मुसीबतों का नाम ही जिन्दगी है और कठिनाइयों से लड़ना चाहिये ।

SHRI SAMAR GUHA (Contai) : Sir, I think, it would be extremely unfortunate if an impression is carried either in this House or outside that this debate on the tragic death of one of our promising scientists is meant to run down our scientific community or in any way to denigrate them. On the contrary, we should say that it is with a view to uphold their dignity, their research initiative and their intellectual freedom, unfettered, so that they can have the pleasure of creative research and creative work, that these discussions are being held here. To me, the tragic death of Dr. Shah is a sensitive instance of martyrdom for science. I should go a step more. I consider it as a very delicate case of self-immolation of a young scientist for the cause of science, for upholding the ideals of science and also for the scientific researchers.

18 hrs.

He was not a sort of melancholic personality that he committed suicide. It cannot be considered as a pathological case of melancholia. Even before his death, even upto the last moment, he maintained his dignity, calmness and composed balance. That would be evident from the letter he had written to Dr. Swaminathan. He said :

"I think it will go in the annals of the scientific research that a scientist has sacrificed his life so that other scientists of his calibre, of his position, can have the freedom of doing scientific work in a creative manner."

He wrote :

"I think time has come again that a scientist will have to sacrifice his life in

disgust so that other scientists may get proper treatment. I have one request to make to you...."

Please note the noble sentiment expressed by him. He said :

"Kindly guard the interests of persons dedicated to scientific work."

This is the kind of the noble sentiment expressed by him.

I would have been happy if the Minister in his reply in the Rajya Sabha would not have mentioned about the payscale Dr. Shah would have enjoyed if he was appointed a Professor. I do not know whether it is known to the Minister that he comes from a very wealthy family that if he had chosen the profession of his family, he would have been one of the men of rich community, many in this country would have perhaps envied. He had no economic motive behind his self immolation. The question of whether he got the post of a Professor or not was secondary to him ; it was the urge of a scientist to become more creative, to become more purposeful was his principal ideal. Failure of this ideal agonised him from within his soul.

I would also have been very happy if the question of appropriateness of appointment of Dr. Rajendra Prasad was not justified by the Minister. It is a matter to be judged and investigated, if you really want to enquire into the whole matter.

In his letter, although it has been already read out by other members, yet I want to reiterate a single sentence of that letter was written by him. In that letter he said :

"Personal ideas will always by victimised whenever it comes to promotion or getting employment."

This has to be underlined. He further wrote "Even their achievement reports, the contribution made by the section as well as the programme of future work were changed so that they do not appear outstanding. Administrative bottlenecks are so many and so humiliating." Really, by his death, by his sacrifice, he has highlighted the whole problem of young promising scientists. He has mentioned not only the bottlenecks, he has also accused the scientists of underrating, even changing the bio-data of a scientist, the creative of activities, his statistics and even the figures of a scientist. I do not know in a scientific world a greater accusation can be made than tampering with the data,

[Shri Samar Guha]

figures and conclusions of a scientific research work.

I have innumerable allegations from the Institute about which we are discussing here. Many outstanding scientists came, many young professors came to see me. Many young researchers also came to me. I ask the Minister concerned one question. Why so many scientists, why so many young researchers should come to us? There must be something wrong. It may be they are feeling that they are bound by certain rules, they cannot freely give expression to their grievances, and this tragic occasion has given them an opportunity to speak out frankly to some Members of Parliament.

I do not want to enumerate the charges against the Director or the Deputy Director or the Secretary of that Institute. But there are allegations, innumerable allegations, of preferential promotion, of favoured selection, of favouritism and nepotism, of mal-administration of worst type. Even some reports have come to me of moral turpitude against some of those who are in charge of certain sections. I do not say these allegations are true; I do not say these are wrong. But I only want to say this. Here is the case of the death of a person, the sacrifice of a scientist, the martyrdom of a young promising scientist. It is the national duty, it is the duty of your conscience if you have any conscience, to see that the whole matter should be probed into and should be investigated, not only thoroughly, but impartially, without any prejudice, with no other consideration but achieving freedom for science. His intellectual initiative should not be hampered. The scientist must have the feeling that he can create something, that he can have the joy of that creativity. That is the main consideration for a true scientist. I have many allegations that eminent scientists were not given proper places here, they have to go outside, there are instances of brain drain and persons going abroad and getting eminent posts there, but I am not going into that aspect now.

I am extremely sorry that an impression is being created that Mr. Swaminathan or Mr. Menon belongs to certain territorial area, and therefore they are some how malefically involved. There is another person, Dr. P. K. Paul who belongs to other State. Dr. Swaminathan gave him many undue extensions of service. Do you think I will not say that

because I belong to certain territory to which Dr. Paul also belongs? There are grievances against Dr. Paul also. I was told about some kind of trio, Dr. Swaminathan, Dr. Paul and Dr. Menon ruling our IARI. I don't know; it may be wrong or may be right. But I request you to go through the whole allegations, the whole grievances so that the whole project of scientific research may be set right.

I have been a humble student of science and I was a research student of a very eminent scientist. Dr. J. C. Ghosh. I did some research work also. I should say, Dr. Swaminathan undoubtedly is an eminent scientist, one of the rare eminent scientists in India. But Sir, a scientist is like an artist or a philosopher. He is sensitive, he is delicate, he is inwardly creative. He is by nature shy of publicity. But unfortunately Dr. Swaminathan has excelled the politician in his craze for press. An applied scientist should never go to the press or radio before his results are verified in the field or tested adequately. What has he done, Sir? For Sharbati Sonora he has claimed 16.3 per cent protein content and 3 per cent lysine content. If it is so, it is unique achievement. Immediately he goes to the press; he goes to the radio and on the basis of that he got the Magsaysay Award. I don't want to quote because Mr. Manoharan has already dealt with it. But Sir, I am extremely sorry, I feel unhappy, in theoretical science it happened that a research work of the day, a finding or conclusion may change after 10 years. On theoretical science that conclusion or that research may be challenged or could be completely rejected. But in applied science, it never happens. Agronomy is an applied science. Without testing the research findings in the field and also in the other national laboratories, he should not have publicised the results. This result has been challenged by an eminent scientist like Dr. Norman Boulaugh of Mexico, who is a Nobel-Laureate in agronomy and who is the Director of the Maize Centre in Mexico. Is it something not very commendable on our part when it is said by him that these results were not borne out by experimental data or field test? But that has happened.

It may be that it has happened because a scientific director does not really do all the research work by his own hand. He has a circle of researchers, and they provide him with the data and on the basis of these data he derives conclusions. It may be that certain

researchers around him, some orbit of researchers around him may have developed some kind of flattery and provided him with wrong data and on the basis of the wrong data, he may have arrived at a wrong conclusion. But that should not have happened. That is why I say that an applied scientist should not rush to the press without making field experiments.

The whole crux of the problem has been very nicely put by Shri Indrajit Gupta. The issue is one of the principles and systems, promotion and selection. Are the Government going to set out some principles and definite rules, independent of the authority of certain institutions, so that no personal flattery, no prejudice, no closeness, no regional consideration or any other except scientific merit alone could prevail? That can be achieved only if an independent authority is allowed to make a choice or make a selection or promotion.

The second problem, where also I agree with Shri Indrajit Gupta, is how to coordinate the different pieces of research and how to run the administration properly without authoritarian control of a hierarchy. Today, there is a lot of grievances against the administration of the institute which we are discussing.

Let the sacrifice, martyrdom and self-immolation by a brilliant scientist, a young promising scientist who had the whole life before him, who had before him his family, his wife, children and everything, but who was inwardly so much agonised, who was inwardly so much upset that he forgot his family and his wife and his children that he sacrificed his life, move us to positive action. Consider the noble sentiment that he has expressed in his last letter while bidding goodbye to Dr. Swaminathan, namely 'Guard the honour, dignity and the future of dedicated scientists'.

I would appeal to Government to institute a real inquiry committee with eminent scientists, a few Members of Parliament and if possible a few international scientists also, so that in future no young scientist feels that he is in any way gagged but he feels that he has unfettered freedom in his creative activity and in his research work.

**THE MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE**  
(SHRI F. A. AHMED): I share the grief and the concern which has been expressed by the

entire House over the circumstances under which this tragedy of cutting short the life of a scientist has taken place in our country. It is a matter about which I know every Member of the House feels very seriously, and they want to discuss this matter not because a suicide has taken place or a life has been lost but because they want to see that something should be done so that in future these things may not recur and the scientists may be allowed to do their work unhampered in future.

Now, a number of questions have been raised, but I compliment the Members of this House that they have avoided bitterness, and have considered the subject not subjectively but rather they have gone into it objectively, and have given many suggestions in this respect, I have taken notes of the various suggestions, and whatever can be done by the Ministry in implementing them will necessarily be done.

The only point which requires consideration here is: what are the implications of the suicide committed by Shah? What are the implications of the letter left by him? These are important matters which require consideration. That is why I thought that the best thing would be that instead of one or two persons forming judgment, all these matters should be referred to a Committee so that the matter may come in its true perspective before us and we may take correct decisions on the matter.

Sir, I would not like to go into the details of this letter, but if the hon. Members will be pleased to look at it, they will find that three main points have been raised by Dr. Shah in his letter. One is, whether the system of recruitment requires a second look. That is a matter which he has raised in his letter. The second matter he has raised is that there is some research of a doubtful nature and that is given prominence without its being proved: whether it is a fact or not. The third is that the supervision done by the head of the division is very unsatisfactory and hinders the work of scientists. These are some of the important matters which have been raised in that letter, and that is why, on the 8th of May, 1972, a statement was made in the Lok Sabha expressing the deep regrets of Government over this sad happening. Since then many things have been said and published in the newspapers which have done a fair amount of damage to the cause of agricultural research, for many things have been said which

[Shri F. A. Ahmad] are ill-informed or motivated. Taking everything into consideration, we have decided to take certain actions which I hope the hon. Members will appreciate.

In the statement of 8th May, it had been indicated that Government proposed to appoint a Committee headed by an eminent scientist to review the recruitment rules and procedures of ICAR and suggest suitable changes. In view of the subsequent development and what has been stated by the hon. Members and the anxiety they showed in both the Houses, the membership and terms of the Committee have since been enlarged. Therefore, it has been considered desirable to appoint a retired Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, Dr. Gajendra-gadkar, who has kindly agreed at my persuasion, to head this Committee. Three other members who have also consented to be associated with this Committee are : Dr. B. D. Nag Chaudhury, Science Adviser to the Ministry of Defence ; Dr. H. N. Sethna, Chairman Atomic Energy Commission ; and third, Shri B. Venkappiah, Chairman, Rural Electrification Corporation Limited, New Delhi. We are likely to appoint another member, but at the moment, I am not in a position to give his name. I shall do so in the course of a day or so.

To be specific, the terms of the reference of this Committee would be :

- (1) To examine the underlying causes of the suicide of Dr. Shah with particular reference to specific and general points raised by him in his letter of May 5, 1972, addressed to Dr. Swaminathan.
- (2) To review the recruitment and personnel policies of the Indian Council of Agricultural Research and to suggest measures of their improvement.

Hon. Members would agree that the terms are fairly comprehensive and should take care of all reasonable matters—

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE: Promotion. *(Interruptions).*

SHRI F. A. AHMED: They will all come under it. Please listen till I have finished,—which must be considered with speed to the satisfaction of the large majority of agricultural scientists involved. It would not be worth-while to investigate every single

case of termination of service or promotion and supersession in the last five years, as has been suggested by Mr. Vajpayee.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: Make it for the last two years then.

SHRI F. A. AHMED: If the proposed Committee finds that there is any further detailed investigation necessary, it would certainly recommend or may as well, with the consent of the Government, enlarge its own scope. But it would be futile and utterly calamitous to question every single promotion or appointment in the ICAR merely because a few people have made sweeping remarks without basis and without full information. Some of the hon. Members have, on various occasions, referred to some specific cases, and I have looked into them. I do not feel there is any warrant for sweeping condemnation of the personnel policy followed by the ICAR or question the intellectual integrity and impartiality of the large number of scientists who have constituted these various selection committees and been responsible for appointments.

Since this committee has been appointed with these terms of reference, I think it will not be desirable for me to express any opinion one way or the other with regard to various names and suggestions which have been raised in the course of the discussion. I hope the House will be satisfied with this.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE: Why not associate a Member of Parliament?

SHRI F. A. AHMED: One member is to be appointed; let me consider. I have already announced the names of the members of the committee.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA: Would the Minister consider drafting the terms of reference in such a way that it would not preclude consideration of the role played by the foreign agencies with which the ICAR is tied up.

SHRI F. A. AHMAD: I shall consider that.

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी : अध्यक्ष महोदय, मन्त्री महोदय ने एक जांच कमेटी की घोषणा की है जिसके अध्यक्ष सुप्रीम कोर्ट के एक रिटायर्ड चीफ जस्टिस होंगे। मैं सरकार के इस निर्णय का स्वागत करता हूँ। लेकिन मैं चाहूंगा टर्म्स आफ रेफरेन्स के बारे में अभी



और थोड़ा विचार कर लिया जाये। केवल कौंसिल में जो कुछ चल रहा है, श्री कुछ हो रहा है या जिस ढंग से नियुक्तियाँ होती हैं उन्हीं में जाना काफी नहीं है। कौंसिल के साथ रिसर्च इंस्टीट्यूट है और कौंसिल के साथ और भी एप्रीकल्चर इंस्टीट्यूट लगे हुए हैं। उनके वैज्ञानिकों में भी असंतोष है। क्या मंत्री महोदय ने जो एलान किया है उसका अर्थ में यह समझें कि कौंसिल के साथ जुड़ी हुई सारी संस्थायें इसके अन्तर्गत आ जाती हैं? यदि वह आ जाती है तो मैं समझता हूँ कि यह ठीक है।

इसके साथ ही पार्लमेंट के मेम्बरों को इसमें सम्बन्धित करना आवश्यक है। राज्य सभा में मंत्री महोदय ने यह बात नहीं मानी, लोकसभा में भी मानने के लिए वे तैयार नहीं हैं। क्या जनता के चूने हुए, सदस्यों पर उनका विश्वास नहीं है ... (व्यवधान) ...

मैं श्री इंद्रजीत गुप्त से सहमत हूँ कि हमारे कृषि विज्ञान पर विदेशी शक्तियों का और व्यक्तियों का जो प्रभाव है उसको खत्म करने की बड़ी आवश्यकता है। मुझे पता लगा है कि एक ऐसे विदेशी विशेषज्ञ बनकर यहां बैठे हैं जो अपने देश में जानवरों को रेल के डिब्बों में चढ़ाते थे और उतारते थे। वह आज कल यहां विशेषज्ञ बनकर बैठे हैं। वे 1966 से रह रहे हैं। उनका कार्यकाल निरन्तर बढ़ाया जा रहा है। इसके पीछे कौन सी माया काम कर रही है, यह हमारी समझ में नहीं आता। हमारे कृषि संस्थानों को अमेरिकी प्रभाव से मुक्त करने की बड़ी आवश्यकता है और मैं चाहूंगा जांच कमेटी को इस बात का भी मौका दिया जाना चाहिए।

मंत्री महोदय ने कहा कि वह हर एक मामले में नहीं जायेंगे, प्रमोशन के मामले में या नियुक्ति के मामले में। हर एक मामले में जाने की जरूरत नहीं है लेकिन कमेटी को इस बात का अधिकार होना चाहिए कि जिन कारणों से वैज्ञानिकों में असंतोष पैदा हुआ है, उनकी तह में जाये और उससे नियुक्ति और तरक्की का सवाल जुड़ा हुआ है।

मंत्री जी ने तारीफ की है कि इस चर्चा का स्तर ऊंचा रहा। हमने तो ऊंचा रखने की कोशिश की लेकिन जिन्होंने डा० स्वामीनाथन को लेकर उनकी तारीफ की, जिन्होंने मेनन साहब पर बिना हमला हुए उन्हें बचाने की कोशिश की उन्होंने इस चर्चा का स्तर ऊंचा रखने का प्रयत्न नहीं किया है। मुझे इस विवाद में कुछ मदद्यों के भाषण सुनकर ऐसा लगा कि जैसे वे पहले से तय करके आये थे कि उन्हें स्वामीनाथन की वकालत करनी है और उन्हें मेनन के लिए प्रशंसा के पत्र देने हैं। कोई यहां पर हमला करने की नीयत से नहीं आया। मेरे तो दिल में भी कभी यह बात नहीं आ सकती कि तमिलनाडू से आया है इसलिए उसकी आलोचना की जाये, कोई केरल से आया इसलिए उस पर हमला किया जाये। हम सब भारत के हैं और सबकी उपलब्धियां इस देश की उपलब्धियां हैं। वह किस प्रदेश के हैं, कौन सी भाषा बोलते हैं, किम मजहब के मानने वाले हैं यह बात हमारे दिमाग में भी नहीं आती। दूसरे सदन में क्या कहा गया, उमका जवाब इस सदन में देना, दूसरे लोगों को आलोचना करने का मौका देना है। इसीलिए प्रो० समर गुहा ने आलोचना की और कोई उम पर आपत्ति नहीं कर मरा। लेकिन मैंने तो जब भाषण शुरू ही किया था, तभी प्वाइंट आफ ऑर्डर खड़ा कर दिया कि नाम नहीं ले सकते और फिर नाम ले लेकर तारीफों के पुल बांधे गये।

सभापति जी, अगर डा० स्वामीनाथन और श्री मेनन प्रशंसा का अमृत पीना चाहते हैं तो उन्हें आलोचना का जहर पीने के लिये भी तैयार रहना चाहिए। अगर उनकी तारीफें होनी हैं तो फिर उनको बुराइयों से भी नहीं बचाया जा सकता। आखिर वह प्रमुख बन कर बैठे हैं, उनके अपने दायित्व भी हैं। मैं डा० स्वामीनाथन को जानता हूँ, वह प्रमुख वैज्ञानिक हैं, मैंने पब्लिक एकाउन्ट्स कमेटी में उनको निकट से देखा है। मैंने उनके साथ जिरह की है, उनकी उपलब्धियां से किसी को इंकार नहीं हो सकता। लेकिन जैसा मैंने कहा—मया वह

[श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी]

गलती नहीं कर सकते ? क्या उनमें भूलें नहीं हो सकती, क्या उन्हें ठीक नहीं किया जाना चाहिए ? केवल हरित-क्रान्ति का नारा लगा कर मारी भूलों पर पर्दा नहीं डाला जा सकता । वैज्ञानिकों की सुरक्षा के लिये आवश्यक है कि जो दादागिरी चल रही है, जो आका वायम हो गये हैं, उनकी दादागिरी समाप्त की जाय । हम सब जगह समानता का नारा लगा रहे हैं, लेकिन वैज्ञानिकों में हमने वर्ण-व्यवस्था वायम कर रखी है । कोई सवर्ण है, कोई शूद्र है, कोई पञ्च-वर्ण के है । इस स्थिति में विज्ञान का विकास नहीं हो सकता, इसमें नये वैज्ञानिकों की प्रतिभा प्रफुल्लित नहीं हो सकती और मैं समझता हूँ कि मारे मामले पर एक नये ढंग से विचार करने की आवश्यकता है । मैं आशा करता हूँ कि यह कमेटी—इसके ट्रम्जे आफ रेफ्रेन्स में आवश्यकता हो तो सुधार करने के बाद और समद के सदस्यों को इसके साथ जरूर

सम्बद्ध करने के बाद—यह कमेटी अपने दायित्व को पूरा करेगी और फिर सदन को इस तरह की बहस करने की आवश्यकता नहीं पड़ेगी ।

MR. CHAIRMAN. Does he want to press substitute motion No. 2 ?

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: No, I want to withdraw it

MR CHAIRMAN. Is it the pleasure of the House that substitute motion No. 2 be withdrawn ?

SOME HON MEMBERS. Yes.

MR CHAIRMAN. Yes, it is withdrawn by the leave of the House

*The motion was withdrawn by leave of the House.*

18.30 hrs.

*The Lok Sabha then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock on Friday, May 26, 1972/  
Jyestha 5, 1894 (Saka)*