

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : He says there will be an inquiry into it.

SHRI A. G. KULKARNI : Mr. Bhupesh Gupta knows. . .

(Interruptions)

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : I say a CBI investigation is called for. You seem to be coming to his rescue. He is quite capable of defending himself. I say a CBI investigation is called for. Do you support it ? You get up for sugar cooperatives. . .

(Interruptions)

SHRI K. R. GANESH : Conscious of the responsibilities that this mandate has given to this Government, conscious of the new forces that have come up in this country, conscious of the new unity that has been achieved between all the democratic forces even though some Members on that side may not like it, conscious that a historic role has got to be played and our people have got to be mobilised in their hopes and aspirations, I am sure this Government will implement the various mandates that the people have given with these words I commend this Bill to the House.

SHRI NAWAL KISHORE : Just want to say that the honourable Minister has not spoken a word about economy and austerity nor has he pointed out any positive steps taken so far in that direction. May I know from him whether there would be any ceiling on Government expenditure, that is, on the money being spent on the upkeep of the Ministers and other high dignitaries of the Government, and on their pomp and show ?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Mr. Minister, do you want to say something ?

SHRI K. R. GANESH : No, I have said enough.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : Sir, one point I raised about the Minister trying to buy a house. I would ask him to request the Prime Minister to call for an explanation from every Minister as to whether. . .

(Interruptions)

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : The question is :

“That the Bill to authorise payment and appropriation of certain sums from and out of the consolidated Fund of India for the services of the financial year 1972-73 as passed by the Lok Sabha, be taken into consideration.”

The motion was adopted.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Now we shall take up the clause by clause consideration of the Bill.

Clauses 2 and 3 and the Schedule were added to the Bill.

Clause 1, the Enacting Formula and the Title were added to the Bill.

SHRI K. R. GANESH : Sir. I move :

“That the Bill be returned”.

The question was put and the motion was adopted.

DISCUSSION UNDER RULE 176

SUICIDE BY DR. V. H. SHAH, SENIOR AGRONOMIST,
INDIAN AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH INSTITUTE,
NEW DELHI, AND THE CIRCUMSTANCES
RELATING THERETO

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA (West Bengal) : Before I take up the discussion, I have one submission to you. When this matter came up I suggested that we should be given chance to move a resolution for the appointment of a committee also or at least a chance to record our recommendation to the Government that Members of Parliament should be associated with the inquiry that may be conducted. Now, Sir, under this Rule, after the discussion nobody can give amendment to a Resolution of this kind. Therefore, let the discussion take place. But at the end of the discussion, you can give us permission to move a Resolution in order that we can recommend to the Government that the Members of this House should be associated with the inquiry. This, I think, is a reasonable demand and a compromise.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : But under this rule, there can be no amendment.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : I cannot do it. If it is a motion for consideration, then of course anybody could have given amendment and having considered the amendments the House can recommend that such and such a thing should be done.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : It cannot be done now.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : What is the remedy ?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : You can give your suggestions.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : That of course I will make. But give us permission at the end of the debate to move a Resolution.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : I do not think it is possible. You can make your suggestions.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : Anyway I shall come to that later.

Sir, when we read the news about the death of Dr. V. H. Shah of IARI, we were all profoundly shocked. Before that Dr. Joseph had committed suicide and we had the occasion to discuss the matter in the House. Later it was followed by a suicide of another scientific worker of the NDRI, Shri S. S. Batra of Bangalore who drowned himself. I understand that yet another scientific worker in Kalyani in West Bengal, committed suicide. Now we have got Dr. Shah who right in Delhi committed suicide. In no country such tragic instance like this—when scientists out of frustration and with the feeling that they have been aggrieved committed suicide—happens and therefore when they put an end to their lives, it becomes a serious matter. I do not know in how many countries such things are taking place or have taken place. We had, some of us, to live abroad sometimes and we never came across instances of this sort. We read newspapers, but we do not get instances when scientists in other countries commit suicide because they feel that they are ill-treated by the authorities who are supposed to look after them. Therefore, this by itself is a serious matter for the Government to take note of and take steps to remove these circumstances, but unfortunately this Government is not doing so.

The statement by Shri Fakhruddin Ali Ahmed in the other House and Shri Annasaheb Shinde in this House shows lack of awareness of the seriousness of the situation and also the problems connected with that and we are sorry that the Government does not view it in the way it should much less move in the matter to set things right.

I know that I am suffering from certain limitations, not being myself a scientist or in any way associated with the functioning of scientific institutions. In the beginning I wish to say that I am one of those who wish well to these institutions and other scientific institutions and if anything is wrong it should be remedied, but on no account would I like them to be demigrated or run down. Here we are not concerned, with the individuals as such. Here we are concerned of course, with the well being, prosperity and success of these institutions. We are here to point out certain things which have gone wrong in the management of the institution, certain things which have gone wrong with men in authority and, in this particular case, to begin with, Dr. Swaminathan or Mr. Swaminathan, who is concerned with it as the Director-General.

Now, Sir, we would like things to be set right and as I said, Sir, it is not possible for us, at least for me, to give any opinion as to who is more qualified and who is less qualified. I am not a scientist and so I cannot evaluate this thing and come forward with an opinion of my own. We have to go by what others have said and also we have to leave it to the expert and competent opinion in such matters. Therefore, Sir, my case is not that somebody is more qualified and others are less qualified or *vice versa* for the simple reason that I am not in a position to give an opinion on that specific and delicate point.

But, at the same time, I cannot shut my eyes to the fact that favouritism has accumulated in high positions in the Institute so much so that some people at least have no faith in the management and go to the length of putting an end to their lives. Sir, I am not one of those who would commit suicide in a comparable situation. But I would like to fight, fight for my cause and hit against those who are indulging in malpractices, corruption, nepotism or other irregularities. But, Sir, we are forced with a situation in which people do commit suicide. Now, it is not a question of sentiments being aroused. Who will not feel hurt if one of the scientists in the country puts

an end to his life in this manner? It is a matter of deep concern and sorrow for us. Therefore, emotion does come in here whatever may be the other considerations. Sir, the very fact that a scientist has put an end to his life is in itself a consideration which should overwhelm us. Therefore, a little emotion will be aroused in such cases also and it should not be taken that emotion alone is persuading us to take up this matter.

Sir, we are interested in the proper functioning of the Organisation, of our scientific institutions. But, Sir, things are going very wrong. Sir, as far as the institutions like the ICAR, IARI, etc. are concerned, last year—not last year, but the year before last—a survey was taken by a certain organisation called the Association of Scientific Workers of India, its branch of the IARI, to find out as to what the scientific workers and others feel. Many people were met and their opinions were taken and it came to the conclusion that discontent or frustration or dissatisfaction, whatever you may call, was due to low salary, lack of chances of promotion, lack of facilities and administrative interference and obstruction. The survey revealed that many persons possessing post-graduate qualifications, as many as 50% of them were working in Class III scales while 33% of the workers were working in Class II scales. That was also another revelation.

Then, Sir, one of the important questions which has a bearing on the scientific atmosphere prevailing in the Institute revealed that the superiors are taking away the credit for their work either in part or in whole. Out of the total number of 360 scientists who replied to this question, 15% clearly indicated that credit for their work taken away by their superiors while 43% expressed the opinion that part of the credit for their work is taken away by their superiors and the majority of the scientists whose credit for their work is taken away by their superiors either in full or in part belong to Class II or Class III scales. Even among the Senior Class I Officers, 21 out of 75, who responded to this question, reported that part of the credit for their scientific work is taken away either in full or in part by their superiors. Ten refused to answer this question. Now, Sir, this is a serious matter. I am mentioning this fact because a survey had been conducted in 1970 which pinpointed the reasons for discontent, dissatisfac-

tion, frustration among the scientific workers.

And all these things are known to 4 P. M. the Government or, at least, should be known to the Government. But nothing is being done to remedy the situation.

Sir, selections are arbitrary, dictated by the present Director-General, Dr. Swaminathan. As far as this gentleman is concerned, I am told he had been a brilliant scientist and had been good at his work when he was not so high up. But he came to occupy the high position due to the favours also of Mr. Subramaniam who was then the Minister in charge of Agriculture in this country. Well, I would not say that he got this position because he happens to be the son-in-law of Mr. Bhoothalingam, the ICS officer of the Government at that time; I would not say that; maybe or may not be. But, surely Mr. Subramaniam showered favours on him when he came. When he went to that position he became an administrative despot and in some years what he built was his empire of people on whom he showered favours and everything revolved round him and he was doing what he wanted. So this gentleman was a planet having around him some satellites, some dozen people. Now, that is what I am saying. This is what your scientific workers are telling which is what I am telling you. Why should those scientific workers tell me such things? Are they telling a lie, simply because they are complaining against one officer? I know that in the same institution people are committing suicide. Therefore, this is a fact; one fact.

Secondly, the younger scientists, the survey scientists and senior research assistants are not given due recognition. That is very wrong. Those who are at the top of the institution should feel proud that those who work under them are rising. The glory of their juniors should be their glory. Instead of trying to steal the credit from them they should help them. After all, the credit and honour of an institution or even of a Head of the institution has to be seen in the fact that it is the collective efforts, collective activities, collective research which produce good results and build up the image and stature of this institution. Now, instead of doing that if you try to steal credit from others, denying them what their due is, steal papers from them and utilising them for your own aggrandisement or for winning some award abroad—the Magasayay Award or some other award—then something is seriously

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta]

wrong. Yet everybody is talking about it. This is not the way to promote scientific talent much less cultivate it and develop it. Many senior officers there are not doing work but getting the work done by young scientists. It is like our ICS officers who do nothing except initialling the papers. The donkey job is done by other officials and the credit is taken by them. And this has been transplanted into our scientific institutions. They are more and more taking on the character of the bureaucrats—living on the labour of others, the achievements of others, signing the documents and stealing the credit that way. Such a thing should be treated with contempt. It is a demoralising situation.

Is it the way to develop scientific research in our country? Would the Soviet Union have risen to its present position if they had not encouraged young talent? If anything you should give them a little extra credit rather than stealing credit from them. That is why people are demoralised. Not only that. Such attempts should never be made—to claim credit which is not one's own. But Dr. Swaminathan and some others have been in the habit of making extravagant claims for what they have not done. The rule in the scientific world is: Make your claim modest, leave something to question and re-examine it again. That is the scientific approach. Scientific research workers and scholars are not the people who make election speeches or carry on the administration. In the election speeches many hon. Members can say many things, get votes and then forget everything. But you cannot follow the same pattern in scientific institutions. There, you can claim in a very moderate manner, with humility so that the achievement for your work, if any, is below your actual achievement instead of going far ahead of it.

Then, Sir, these institutes are filled with CIA agents. I say these things because I have been told so by people who are knowledgeable who have worked in these institutes. They have developed fascination for Rockefeller and Ford Foundations and the Foundations are founding themselves freely in the Institute in the shape of CIA infiltration. The Ministers are shutting their eyes at this. Why everybody is talking about the CIA? Have you asked the CIB to look into it, to give some facts and figures as to what they are saying with regard to the CIA? Nothing you have done. Sir, Americans are very much favoured and liked

in this Institute. In some of the Selection Boards I find that even foreigners are put in order to test and select our candidates. This is very bad again.

I do not know why the Director-General should be the Chairman of a Selection Committee. Selection Committees should be such as are aboveboard. I would not say that he is the Caesar's wife because nobody today is the Caesar's wife in this regard. It is good that the Caesar's wife did not live in the modern days, otherwise she would have been virtueless. Therefore, I am not talking about it. But for propriety's sake, when your *bona fides* are questioned, when you are likely to be carried away by your likes and dislikes, why should you sit as the Chairman on a Selection Committee? Sir, the selection Committee has been a source of irritation, a source of complaint, a source of grievance, where the people think that the promotions and other things are taking place on the basis of favouritism and nepotism and so on. That is another point.

I need not dilate upon many things. Here, for example, I have got another thing. In the Forest Research College we find cases of seniority and permanency of some of the scientists are pending for more than 12 years. Cases of suppression are rampant and many young scientists are victims of such a sabotage. Unfair and humiliating tactics are adopted and this way the career of scientists is ruined.

The confidential reports have also become another source of injustice. Due to these confidential reports, many young scientists are demoralised. The bosses put in whatever they like in these reports. Whomsoever they want to promote they will write good things for him and whomsoever they do not like he is given a poor report. The result is that they suffer. That is also happening.

Sir, these are the things which are happening right under the nose of Mr. Fakhruddin Ali Ahmed and Mr. Shinde and you do not do anything. You say that you do not know the matters. But when the matters are brought to your notice, even then you do not take any action. No action is taken. That way you cannot go on. It is not a question of just reacting to the tragedy of a loss of life or a suicide by an eminent scientist. So, we must act in a manner so that we set things right.

Some time back we took up the question of the CSIR and an Enquiry Committee was appointed. I am not suggesting that kind of enquiry which actually was a wrong enquiry and which stopped the scientific work and administration of the scientists for future. But I am suggesting that some enquiry should be made within three months or so, and a report should come. At least the demands should be gone into and found out. Therefore let me make a few suggestions. I would suggest that democratisation of the structure of the scientific organisations is essential today. The Sarkar Committee, although it has taken a long time, has done some good work in this respect and I think the CSIR today is in a far better shape than when Mr. Atma Ram was ruling it and when the Sarkar Committee had not come into the picture. So parliamentary intervention was very helpful.

The power structure now is of a feudal type there and I think it has got to be changed. Scientists' participation at all levels in the scientific work and administration should be ensured so that one person does not become repository of all scientific wisdom and of scientific power and of administrative matter. Administration should not dominate the scientific field and the scientific institution. I do not see why an IAS officer should be put there in charge of the administration. They can do some servicing work. In fact the Secretary of the Institute should invariably be a scientist who knows the work he is supposed to promote and carry out there. Why should Mr. Menon, an IAS officer, be there? There are many complaints against him. Besides the IAS officer is not eminently suited to this kind of work. Is it to be believed that from among the hundreds and hundreds of scientists who are working in these institutions we cannot produce one person who can man the post of Secretary of this Institute? Surely such a person will have a better understanding of the problems of how the scientific mind works, what are the problems of the research, what are the special activities, etc. Why we should have IAS officers there I cannot understand.

Then coming to the selection procedure, the selection procedure should be completely changed. The present selection procedure is out-dated and a lot of discontent has grown because of the wrong selection procedure which allows nepotism, favouritism, manipulation and even corruption at times. Therefore the

procedure should change. The Government and the authorities should know that there is plenty of literature on the question of modern methods of selection of scientists, why these should not be studied and why you should not introduce modern methods of selection. I can not understand. Why should you stick to the old, antiquated, harmful method of selection which stands self-condemned in many respects now?

The next suggestion I would like to make is that you should have someone to look into the grievances. I would suggest that the Ministry should appoint someone. I know the CSIR has appointed a Director-General of Vigilance to look into the grievances and other complaints. I think some arrangement should be made here by appointing a person from outside who will look into the grievances of the scientists—he should be a scientist—sort out things, see that things do not go too far, that matters are settled and sorted out. That should be done, otherwise you will suffer.

Then some arrangement has to be made for mutual consultation among the different scientific organisations such as the CSIR, ICAR, Atomic Energy Commission, UGC, Defence Science Research and Development Organisations, Indian Council of Medical research and so on. These organisations should sit together and settle some guiding rules as to how to handle promotions, postings, etc. and they should also exchange information from time to time. That is very essential. These are the suggestions I make. I do not wish to take more time.

Sir, I have deliberately avoided using strong words or criticism against anybody in the institution because I do not want to hurt anybody. They are all scientifically qualified people. The administration has gone wrong, the style of leadership is wrong and selection, promotion, appointment etc. have been coloured by extraneous and impermissible considerations and even nepotism has crept in. That is why I am suggesting all these things. As for Mr. Swaminathan, I am sure many Members will speak against him. Personally I agree that he is a good scientist. I have tried to find out things about him. But a good scientist does not necessarily mean that he is also a leader of scientists. It is possible for one to be a learned man but to be a good teacher is a different thing. Dr. Swaminathan is an able man in his own way.

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta]

but, as the leader he has failed as leader of the organisation he has failed, and he has failed rather badly and he has put the organisation in disrepute. I am told he is a very conceited person. Therefore, when he talks to you, he does not talk to you like a scientist. We have had in the other House Dr Meghnad Saha. How full of humility he was! We had a scientist Satyen Bose, in this House, and you saw how full of humility he was. There are many scientists here and abroad also, and they are men full of humility. But Dr Swaminatha has imbibed the ICS temperament and the ICS mentality, not because he is the son-in-law of an ICS officer,—he does not inherit any thing because inheritance does not go that way—but perhaps because of proximity

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA (Orissa) In Kerala it goes that way

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA I do not know but may be some reasons here. But the fact remains that an overwhelming majority of the scientific workers of the ICAR and the other institutions do not have confidence in him. This you have to accept. This is not a matter of opinion. This is a question of fact. Now Mr Fakhruddin Ali Ahmed or Mr Shinde may or may not agree with it, but the fact remains that those who are under him, they do not have faith in him.

DR Z A AHMAD (Uttar Pradesh) How do you presume they do not agree?

MR DEPUTY CHAIRMAN Mr Bhupesh Gupta Your time is over.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA I presume because now the and they are doing hardly anything.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN You have exceeded your time.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA about the ceiling law. I am not satisfied with their treatment of the ceiling laws and other things. I have lost faith also in their thinking. Therefore I am very clear about it. It is for them to agree with me let them get up and say, 'I will agree with it, I will accept it.'

Now Sir, this is the position. Sir, if a Commander-in-Chief is leading his armed forces

somewhere and, politically if the leadership here and the Prime Minister here that find that an overwhelming majority of the officers and rank do not have faith in that Commander-in-Chief the Defence Minister may have a fascination for the Commander-in-Chief but it will be unwise, it will be risky and it will be dangerous to national security to allow that commander-in-Chief to continue in his post under such circumstances. The same thing applies here. You cannot impose on the scientific workers somebody whom they refuse, whom they do not like to take, in whom they have lost faith about whose education they have some faith but about whose leadership they have no faith today. This is the objective fact, and a scientific man should always have an objective mind. Your approach to problems of science and scientific institutions should not be subjective. It should be an objective approach and if the objective approach is to be given the necessary play, you have to take into account the facts that I have narrated before you. If you challenge these facts and disprove them, I shall stand corrected. But these facts are from the very people who have made your institution great, who are responsible for the Green Revolution, who are responsible for many scientific achievements. If these men, in this collective set of people come forward and express themselves against the leadership, against the Director General in particular, you surely have to take into account that overriding objective fact to take the necessary decision as to how you should reorganise or restructure your scientific institutions.

Sir, therefore, I say enquiry should be conducted and this is my last point. We demanded here there should be enquiry. Why Government is hesitant to associate Members of Parliament with the enquiry? Sir, we are not scientists but we deal with human beings, we deal with the worries, sufferings and feelings of human beings. Surely the scientists will be more open hearted to us when we go and talk to them and they will tell us where they feel things had been done wrongly and so on, I think we should be given an opportunity. Besides, why should we not be acquainted more intimately as to how the institution is being run, how the management of the institution goes on? Why is there an attempt to keep us out of the enquiry? In the case of the CSIR, as you will remember the Prime Minister ordered an enquiry and associated

Members of Parliament with it. Not only that. She consulted us as to who should be on the committee. Members of Parliament were consulted as to what kind of committee they liked. That is how things were done here. I find our Ministers, Mr. Fakhruddin Ali Ahmed and Mr. Shinde, are not doing anything. Finally, before I sit down the Ministers, Mr. Fakhruddin Ali Ahmed and Mr. Shinde, I think deserve to be strongly criticised for the manner in which they reacted to this matter, the way they are trying to be evasive over this matter. This is not very proper. Surely Mr. Fakhruddin Ali Ahmed would not like me to flatter him when flattery is absolutely impermissible. He has earned public approbrium for the statement that he made in this House and the other House. One officer said that Dr. Shah because of cowardice committed suicide. Still that man continues in high position and so on. Therefore, I say that a beginning should be made at the level of the Minister himself. I think steps will be taken. I hope the conscience of Mr. Fakhruddin Ali Ahmed and Mr. Shinde will be sufficiently aroused as a result of the discussion in this House. They should wake up to the realities of the situation and take necessary steps to set things right for the well-being of our institutions, scientists and the research workers who run them.

SHRI KRISHAN KANT (Haryana) : Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, the moment of anger has passed, but the moment of sadness still remains. Why is it that this House and the Lok Sabha have to meet such a situation and discuss it? Was it necessary for Dr. Shah to commit suicide so that we could discuss it? I was sorry to read it when the next day the statement of the Minister appeared that the scientist was emotional? Is it that all the scientists in the field of Agriculture are emotional? No. There must be something basically wrong. In 1972 in the month of May, we are discussing this. It was in 1958 March, when Parliament adopted the Scientific Policy Resolution we said that scientists can be a substitute for capital. They can be a substitute for any other physical inputs that are required, because they will give new life and new impetus to methods of production so that the country may go ahead. We want to create a scientific climate. We want a peaceful country, progressive country, so that the fruits of science can go to the commonman and we can build up a new socialist India. But after fourteen years of the Scientific

Policy Resolution we are discussing here today why scientists are dying, why they are committing suicide. The other day the Minister said that there was only a difference of Rs. 200 in the pay, but scientists do not work or function only for the sake of money. It is the mental climate atmosphere around which stimulates them to work. If they are throttled or choked, they can not function. They require a proper atmosphere as is given in other countries, whether it is America or the Soviet Union. We may achieve Green Revolution, but these things happen. Our scientists cannot feel proud of the work they are doing. They cannot feel satisfied in the atmosphere in which they work in the laboratories and with their colleagues and there can be no more damaging a picture to a scientist than this. Why does it happen always, as Mr. Bhupesh Gupta has said that agricultural scientists commit suicide? It so happened that when Dr. Joseph died, he was in Delhi. So, the newspapers took it up and flashed it all over the country. Now, Dr. Shah committed suicide and it became national news and world news. Dr. Bhatia committed suicide by drowning himself in Bangalore, but it did not become world news. And then it becomes world news. But is it necessary that scientists should die? I am told that some letters have been written to the Prime Minister that if this atmosphere continues, there will be more suicides. Are we going to wait for such a situation so that some more suicides may be committed? I know, our Ministers are well intentioned. I know that they would like to set things right. But these things are not set right. Many MPs have written to them. Either they do not have the machinery to get the whole thing examined or they do not reply properly. Every time you write to the Minister, a reply comes which gives out the position as an officer gives. They have no other cell, they have no other method to get the whole thing examined, to get at the whole truth, so that they can set right things. I was told, and I know that certain selections were to be made, they come to me and said, "Sir, this type of Selection Committee is being formed, is being constituted. These are the persons who are in the Selection Committee and such and such persons are going to be selected." And they were selected, such committees were formed. It seems that this technique is going round there and especially in the agricultural science field. Well-read doctors coming from foreign countries, they do not get jobs here. So, is not something basically, funda-

[Shri Krishan Kant]

mentally wrong ? Why does a person want to die leaving his wife and children behind him to suffer ? I can understand a youth who is not married or who has no children wishing to commit suicide in an emotion, but a person who is married . . .

SHRI NAWAL KISHORE (Uttar Pradesh)
What about Mr. Bhupesh Gupta ?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : I will be the last person to commit suicide. If it is manslaughter, it may be otherwise.

SHRI KRISHAN KANT : The basic question is : Why does such a situation arise ? Why do scientists commit suicide ? Nobody wants to leave his wife and children in the lurch. If they die, what will happen to the wives and children ? He may be a wealthy man. But such a situation has arisen. I was sorry to hear the replies of the Minister. Clear cuts were given to them as if all the processes are working all right. The time has come to review things. I have got here a bunch of cases where there was one selection, second selection, third selection, and fourth selection to show how the advertisements were tailor-made and selections were made. When a particular person was not wanted to be selected but the other person was to be selected, again an advertisement was made, and the qualifications were modified and the other person was selected. I do not want to go into the details of the various cases. How the IARI and the ICAR are working under him ? It is a big history. I would not like to go into the individual cases. But into the malady you must go. Why this individual frustration is there ? Why does it come to such a pass that such a situation arises in this country and we have to face it ? After all, we have adopted a policy on Science and Technology, which has to come to our aid India has to become an industrialised State. That is the basic point. Only about one person I would like to speak, and that person must go, and he is the villain of the piece. He is the Secretary of the ICAR. He is on deputation. He is an IAS. About others, I am not convinced of what has happened. But I am convinced about one person. He is the villain of the piece. He is the cause of many troubles. He is one Mr. Menon who is in the ICAR, because I was told again and again how that person manages the Selection Committees. How can the Minister not know

all these things, how is it cases are not put up to the Minister and how are sanctions taken ? It may be considered whether all the files go through the Minister. There was a suggestion that the Prime Minister should not be the President of the CSIR because she is the highest authority. If such a constitution remains, the Minister has to come to the rescue of the paper which he has signed. The constitution must be changed.

I was talking of one Mr. Menon, I do not know him but I have heard about him, about his manipulations, manoeuvrings, his harangues, his animosity, his anger and how he tries to manipulate the whole thing. And people of his liking are appointed. He manipulates and then gets sanction from the Minister. Ever since he has become Secretary you will see lot of things. So when we demand an enquiry, an enquiry should be held into the whole working of the I.C.A.R. It should be found out why things are happening like that. He is an I. A. S. officer. Basically in administration no person should be allowed to remain there after two or three years because he develops vested interest. He has his connections with other organisations. He helps the people of the other organisations and they help his people. A Secretary should not remain Secretary for more than two or three years. That is the basic thing. Mr. Menon is there for six or eight years. I do not know why they cannot find a better man. He must go. That is the only demand I would like to make here. Besides, a Commission of Enquiry should be appointed. I would prefer some Members of Parliament to be on it because, I am afraid, enquiry committees are constituted of hand-picked men who are not well disposed off towards scientists. Those who are presently controlling the I.C.A.R. are interested parties, and if they are put on the Commission of Enquiry truth will not come out. Time has come when truth must come out and a permanent solution must be found so that the agricultural science field is separated from the rest of the science. (*Time bell rings*). It should be just like the Sarkar Committee in the Council of Scientific and Industrial Research. One basic thing is that for individual grievances there must be an independent cell, not of the officials, but of impartial people, to go into those grievances so that everybody feels satisfied. It is not merely money, it is the psychological, mental and moral approach, the atmosphere in which our scientists work. That must be taken care of.

The second demand is democratisation of the whole organisation. At the various levels, the Professors and others should have the right to decide how they have to work. Every time the Director General or the Directors should not be imposed. I would not like to repeat what Mr Bhupesh Gupta said how scientists are treated. But the basic thing is that there should be democratisation of the whole organisation. The disputed way in which the ICAR is working should go. I would not go into the whole details. But I would like the whole thing to be thoroughly looked into and enquired into. If no enquiry is made it will be a permanent blot on the present administration, present Minister that an opportunity came but the hon'ble Minister did not come forward to remedy it.

Lastly, there should be no administrative interference. But I have one word for the scientist too. We want to create a scientific temper in the country and through scientists. The difficulty with many scientists is when they get to the top, instead of remaining scientists or technocrats they become bureaucrats. I would like to appeal to the scientific community here in Parliament that it is a challenge to them. They must rise to the occasion. Why the scientist should not be at the top? It is a challenge to them. But when these scientists function in narrow rooms in cliques against their own people in the ICAR or other places, the scientists lose respect. They behave like administrators. They behave like bureaucrats and bring a bad name to the scientific community. So this is my appeal to the scientists in the country, whether in the ICAR or the CSIR that they must rise and really show the scientific spirit. They should be the vehicle to bring about a new India. They should imbibe the qualities of scientific temper, objective temper, truth, tolerance and objective behaviour. Sir if they do not come up their future is dark and the administrators will dominate over them. Their country has hope in them. They must take up the challenge and see that things are set right by their own efforts by their own co-operation, by their own imagination and by their own faith in science and scientific values.

श्री नवल किशोर : उपसभापति, डा० शाह ने आत्महत्या करने से पहले उस रात्रि को एक पत्र डा० स्वामीनाथन को लिखा था। उसमें तीन, चार बातें हैं जो मैं आपकी इजाजत से पढ़

देना चाहता हूँ :

‘It has become impossible for me to bear the happenings around me in the recent past * * * It is too much of a struggle to get a better opportunity’

उन्होंने इतना कहने के बाद आखिरी सेंटेंस बहुत ही पैथेटिक लिखा है, जो इस प्रकार से है

‘I think that the time has come again that a scientist will have to sacrifice his life in disgust so that other scientists may get better treatment’

“Dr Mahapatra, myself Dr Dastane, Dr Bhardwaj, Dr Sadaphol and Dr Panda are struggling hard against heavy onslaughts, mentally as well as administratively. You may be supporting mediocre and pseudo-agronomists at the expense of intelligent agronomists”

श्रीमन्, यह जो लेटर है, वह सदन को साफ तौर से आई० सी० ए० आर० और आई० ए० आर० आई० में जो दयनीय स्थिति है, उसको दर्शाती है। श्रीमन्, एक मीटिंग 1 अगस्त, 1970 को हुई थी। वह एसोसिएशन आफ साइंटिफिक वर्क्स आफ इंडिया की थी, जिसमें उन लोगों ने आई० ए० आर० आई० के बारे में कुछ बातें बतलाई थी। श्रीमन्, मुझे याद है कि जब चार, पांच दिन पहले यहाँ पर इस सम्बन्ध में डिबेट हुई थी, या इसके सम्बन्ध में जो कालिग एटेंशन मोशन सदन में आया उस समय मंत्री जी ने बतलाया था कि 1966 के पहले इन संस्थाओं के तमाम सलैक्शन यूनियन पब्लिक सर्विस कमीशन के माफ़ होते थे और उसके बाद से कमेटी बनी, तो श्रीमन्, इस मीटिंग की कुछ फाइंडिंग्स हैं जिनको मैं आपके सामने पढ़ना चाहता हूँ :

“Dr Kathavate said that the working of the ICAR since 1966 has shown that the professed objectives of the reorganisation had not been fulfilled. Selection of scientists by the ICAR has been worse than by the UPSC earlier and there has been no improvement in the emoluments of the scientists except for a privileged few. Migration of scientists to higher

[श्री नवल किशोर]

posts leaving their specialised fields still continues and administrative delays due to red tape have increased because the institutes lost their independence as a result of centralisation under ICAR

"Also merit promotions of several scientists were held up for nearly three years. The Secretary, ICAR (Mr Menon) has been largely responsible for the present unhappy situation and Dr Kathavate's call for a drastic change in the ICAR administration was greeted with thunderous applause.

The ICAR, after reorganisation, has grown into an inverted pyramid and has been feathering its own nest at the cost of the working scientists in the institutes. While a number of top-heavy posts of desk-bound scientists have been up-graded, the working scientists have been left high and dry.

Particular reference was made to Dr R. H. Richharia, former Director of the Central Rice Research Institute, Cuttack, a scientist of international repute who had to go in 1966 because he advised against haste in introduction of some rice varieties. . .

In conclusion, Dr Kathavate demanded that the working of the ICAR and its set-up be thoroughly inquired into and cases of individual injustice be examined and remedied "

श्रीमन्, इसके बाद मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि यह तमाम झगडा इस बात पर हुआ कि डा० स्वामीनाथन् उन लोगों से खुश होते हैं जो उन्हें गलत डाटा देते हैं या जो डाटा वे चाहते हैं वे देते हैं। श्रीमन्, मेरे पास एक बुकलेट है "अग्रिकलचर रिसर्च क्लेम्स, वर्सेज रियलिटीज"। असल बात यह है कि कुछ साइंटिस्ट आई० सी० ए० आर० और आई० ए० आर० आई० मे लम्बे-लम्बे दावे करते हैं और यह क्लेम करते हैं कि हमने इतना बड़ा रिसर्च किया है, उसमे बहुत से क्लेम्स ऐसे होते हैं जो सही नहीं होते हैं। मैं कोट करता हूँ।

श्री जगदम्बर, प्रसाद यादव (बिहार): वोगस होने है।

SHRI NAWAL KISHORE "It is regrettable that certain highly placed agricultural scientists have vitiated the atmosphere of research by organised publicity of achievements in agriculture which are later found to be unsubstantiated or exaggerated. In their quest for publicity, they have delegated scientific integrity and intellectual honesty to the background "

"It is unfortunate that a few scientists are exploiting their high position and using the mass media to project their own image "

श्रीमन्, 18 अप्रैल 1971 को इलस्ट्रेटेड वीकली आफ इंडिया मे मिस्टर यशवन्त सिंह ने लिखा :

"I can give two recent examples of obviously exaggerated reports of achievements in agriculture. One scientist claimed to have developed a new strain of sugarcane which has double the quantity of sugar in its juice as compared to ordinary cane. Another made a similar claim that he had developed a new strain of maize with its protein content doubled "

"In any advanced country the claimants would have been hauled up before a panel of scientists to substantiate their statements, and on failure to do so, been severely censured "

श्रीमन्, एक ओर चीज है। शरबती सोनोरा एक क्लैम है जिसके लिए कहा जाता है कि मिस्टर स्वामीनाथन ने ईवाल्ड किया इंडिया मे मैक्सिकन सोनोरा 64 का म्यूटेशन करके। उसके लिए उनको एक एवार्ड मिला, मेगसेसे इंटरनेशनल एवार्ड मिला, उसमे कोई मुझे शिकायत नहीं है, शिकायत सिर्फ यह है कि इनाम मिले, मेरिट पर मिले, तब खुशी होती है उसमे दिक्कत की कोई बात नहीं है, क्योंकि देश की भी शान बढ़ती है, लेकिन अगर धोखाधड़ी के सहारे, गलत डाटा पर कोई चीज मिलती है तो देश की मानहानि होती है और एक मजाक बन जाता है साइंटिफिक वर्ल्ड -

के अन्दर। श्रीमन्, शरवती सोनोरा के बारे में हमारे डारेडक्टर साहब का कहना है :

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

और श्रीमन्, उनका कहना यह है कि यह लाई-सोन कन्टेन्ट 5 परसेंट इसके अन्दर है, लेकिन the report of the International Maize and Wheat Improvement Centre, Mexico, का कहना यह है कि—

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

"No competent scientific authority has confirmed the 'discovery' of higher protein and lysine content of Sharbati Sonora made by the IARI scientists."

श्रीमन्, यही नहीं, उनका यह भी दावा था कि बाजरे का कोई ऐसा बीज उन्होंने निकाला जिसमें 32 मन फी एकड़ पैदावार है जबकि पहले 6 मन होती थी। उनका यह क्लेम वोगस साबित हुआ। मेरा कहना यह है कि जो साइटिस्ट आई सी एस आर और आई ए आर आई में मिस्टर स्वामीनाथन की इच्छानुसार डाटा कैंलकुलेट करके देते हैं, उनको तो प्रमोशन मिलते हैं और जो नहीं करते हैं उनको प्रमोशन नहीं मिलते हैं बल्कि उनको परेशान किया जाता है और अपमानित किया जाता है।

दधर माननीय मंत्री जी ने बहुत सी बातें बताई थी। मैं यह बात जानता हूँ कि वे जानकर कोई बात गलत नहीं कहेंगे, मगर जो मालूमात मेरे पास है उनमें साबित होता है कि या तो मिनिस्टर साहब को मिस्गाइड किया जाता है या उनको इन बातों की ज्यादा जानकारी नहीं है। डा० शाह को फेकल्टी की मेम्बरशिप न देने की बात कही गई थी। तो उन्होंने यह फरमाया था कि उस मेम्बरशिप को प्राप्त करने के लिए तीन साल का पोस्ट ग्रेजुएट क्लासेज का टीचिंग एक्सपीरिएंस होना चाहिए। श्रीमन्, मेरे पास

केसेज है जो यह साबित करते हैं कि यह बात सही नहीं है। डा० एच० के० दास जिन्होंने इंस्टीट्यूट को मार्च 69 में जोइन किया था वह जून 25, 1969 को मेम्बर बना दिए गए, सिर्फ तीन महीने के अन्दर। डा० एस० एल० मेहता ने जुलाई 69 में जोइन किया और अक्टूबर 69 में वे मेम्बर हो गए फेकल्टी के, उनको सिर्फ तीन महीने लगे। डा० जी० के० वेराट ने 70 में जोइन किया था, 71 में वे मेम्बर हो गए। ऐसा लगता है कि आप शायद गलती से 3 महीने की जगह 3 साल कह गए। अगर तीन साल की बात है तो मैंने तीन केसेज सेम्पिल सर्वे के रूप में आपके सामने पेश किए हैं जो आपकी बात को गलत साबित करते हैं।

श्री जगदम्बी प्रसाद यादव : यह तो नहीं बताया कि तीनों पर बड़े लोगो का वर्चस्व है।

श्री नवल किशोर : हाँ, वह बात तो है।

श्री जगदम्बी प्रसाद यादव : सबसे बड़ी बात तो यही है।

श्री नवल किशोर : श्रीमन्, यह अकेला केस नहीं है। डा० शाहा ने अपनी चिट्ठी में इस बात को लिखा है कि आज भी बीसों और पचासों साइंटिस्ट्स ऐसे हैं जिनको इस कदर फ्रस्ट्रेशन और मायूसी है कि उनकी समझ में नहीं आता है कि वे क्या करें। डा० शाहा इमोशनल थे ऐसी बात मैं मानता हूँ। उनके आत्मसम्मान को ऐसा आघात लगा कि उन्होंने समझा कि मैं अपना बलिदान दे कर यदि और साइंटिस्ट्स को बचा सकूँ तो यह अच्छी बात होगी। मेरे पास बहुत केसेज से हैं, लेकिन मैं उनमें जाना नहीं चाहता। मेरे पास एक केस है डा० वाई० पी० गुप्ता का। 21 साल की इनकी सर्विस है। इनका सीनियर बायो केमिस्ट के लिए एक मिलेक्शन हुआ, लेकिन उसको नहीं माना गया। दुबारा ऐडवर्टीजमेंट हुआ। उन्होंने अप्लाई भी नहीं किया था, फिर भी उनसे कहा गया कि इंटरव्यू में आ जाओ उसके बाद श्री एस० एम० मेहता जिन की ढाई साल की सर्विस है उनको वहाँ रखा गया। इसका यह विषय भी नहीं था।

[श्री नवल किशोर]

माननीय मंत्री महोदय ने उस दिन कहा था कि अगर डा० शाह हमको रिप्रेजेंट करते तो हम उनके मामले की छानबीन करते। मिस्टर गुप्ता ने रिप्रेजेंटेशन दिया माननीय मंत्री महोदय को, कोई जवाब उनको आज तक प्राप्त नहीं हुआ। स्वामीनाथन साहब को दिया, उन्होंने इन्टरव्यू देने से इन्कार कर दिया। और उल्टा उनको तंग करना शुरू कर दिया। उनको स्टूडेंट नहीं दिये जाते हैं, फेकल्टी की मेम्बरशिप भी छीन ली गई है, स्टाफ हटा लिया और हर तरीके का हेरममेत उनके साथ किया जा रहा है। श्रीमन्, इसी तरह एक और केस है। एक डा० आर० वी० मिह थे। वह एक सेलेक्शन कमेटी में आये थे और जब वे कमेटी में आये थे तो उनको एक पोस्ट दे दी गयी। कहा गया कि हम फरेरेज कोऑर्डिनेटर की पोस्ट आपको देने हैं। उस समय एक डा० पाटिल थे, उन्होंने रिप्रेजेंट किया कि यह चुनाव मैलाफाडडी हुआ है। शिन्दे साहब ने उसमें इन्टरवीन किया और उनके इन्टरवेंशन पर डा० आर० वी० मिह को हटाया गया और डा० पाटिल को वहा अप्वाइंटमेंट मिला। तो इस तरह से मैं बतलाना चाहता हूँ कि डा० जोशी का केस है। इसी तरह से डा० एम० एम० जोशी को बाई पाम कर दिया गया फॉर दि डाइरेक्टर जनरलशिप पोस्ट मिस्टर एम० एस० नायक, यह 1967 में क्लास टूके थे। नाऊ ही इज इन 1300-1600 स्केल, जो हाइयेस्ट ग्रेड है उसमें उनको रख दिया गया है चार, पांच साल में। इसी तरह से मिस्टर दास की बात मैंने बतलायी। एक श्रीमन्, मिस्टर कौल है। उनके लिए एक नयी पोस्ट क्रियेट हुई श्रीनगर में और एक सब स्टेशन का इंचार्ज उनको बनाया गया। उनका क्लास टू का अप्वाइंटमेंट था, उनको क्लास वन में अप्वाइंटमेंट दे दिया गया और पोस्टिंग हुई श्रीनगर में। लेकिन आज भी वह जो दिल्ली का हेडक्वार्टर है वही विराजमान है। अभी तक श्रीनगर नहीं गये। उनके साथ डबल फेवर किया गया। नयी पोस्ट बना कर उनको अप्वाइंट किया गया और फिर दिल्ली में ही रख दिया गया। यह उनके बारे में है और इन सब केसेज में सब सीनियर्स को सुपरसीड करने के

बाद उनकी नियुक्तियां हुई हैं। इसके बाद श्री मी० एस० आर० कृष्णमूर्ति हैं, उनको सीनियर बना दिया गया। इसी तरह से श्री वी० वी० चैनल है, मिस्टर चोपड़ा है। एक श्रीमन्, डा० मिश्र है, उनका दो पोस्ट्स के ऊपर सेलेक्शन हो गया था। फिर एक मिस्टर सिद्दीकी थे, डा० सिद्दीकी, उन को उसी दिन पी० एच० डी० मिली थी। एक पोस्ट पर उनको नम्बर एक बना कर रख दिया गया यह बात तो समझ में आ सकती है अगर एक आदमी दो पोस्ट पर चुन लिया जाय तो पहले उसको च्वायस दी जाय, कि वह किस को पसन्द करता है लेकिन उससे बिना पूछे ही सिद्दीकी साहब को उसमें से एक पोस्ट दे दी गयी। श्रीमन्, मैं इसमें ज्यादा नहीं जाऊंगा, लेकिन इस तरह के बहुत से केसेज हैं, मैं नाम कहा तक लूँ। 90 फी सदी वैज्ञानिकों में असंतोष है कि उनके साथ न्याय नहीं हो रहा है। यह इस बात को साबित करना है कि वहा पर कोई नियम नहीं है, कोई मेरिट नहीं है। जो 10 साल के रिसर्च एक्सपीरियंस की बात है उसका वायलेशन ज्यादा होता है और उस पर इम्प्लीमेंटेशन कम होता है, मनमानी है। डा० स्वामीनाथन् की और डा० मेनन की। 65 फी सदी की यह भी शिकायत है कि अनुसंधान तो वे करते हैं परन्तु नाम होता है सीनियर्स का।

श्री जगदम्बी प्रसाद यादव : दो आदमी और हैं जिनको आप छोड़ रहे हैं।

श्री नवल किशोर : आप उनको बता दीजिएगा। तो मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि जो माग की गयी है और भूपेश गुप्त जी ने भी की कि उस के लिए एक कमेटी बनायी जाय, मेम्बर्स पार्लियामेंट उससे एमोशियेटेड हो ताकि इन सबका एक थारो इवेस्टीगेशन हो और मैं आप को बताता हूँ कि डा० शाह के जो भाई हैं उन्होंने चिट्ठी भी लिखी है डा० स्वामीनाथन् को और उन्होंने यहा तक लिखा है कि उनके फाईनेन्सेज को भी हम बर्दाश्त करेंगे बशर्ते कि पूरा सर्वे हो जाय, उसकी इक्वायरी हो जाय, पूरी प्रोबिंग हो जाय ताकि और जो दूसरे साइंटिस्ट्स हैं उन के साथ न्याय हो सके। तो मैं इस इक्वायरी की

मांग के साथ यह भी मांग करता हूँ कि मिस्टर मेनन को और मिस्टर स्वामीनाथन् को उनकी जो मौजूदा जगहें हैं उनसे हटाया जाय और फिर इक्वायरी की जाय। वहाँ जो फस्टेशन है उसमें मुझे भविष्य में भी डर है। हर आदमी इमोशनल हो यह जरूरी नहीं है लेकिन कभी-कभी मायूसी में आदमी कुछ कर बैठता है। तो कुछ ऐसा हो कि हिन्दुस्तान को जो इस आत्महत्या से बदनामी हुई है अंतर्राष्ट्रीय साइंटिफिक जगत में उसको दूर किया जाय और उसका एक ही तरीका है कि इसकी आप इक्वायरी कराइये और इसके लिए मिस्टर स्वामीनाथन् हों या जो कोई दूसरे साहब गिल्टी हों उनको कड़ी पनश्मेंट मिलनी चाहिए।

SHRI JOACHIM AIVA (Non inated) : Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, when all references have been made to Dr. Swaminathan, I remember the host of Indian scientists who have become great and illustrious men, men of great distinction, men who, if they had a loss like Swaminathan, might not have become so great as they have become today.

Sir, I remember Sir J. C. Bose and I heard him as a student, heard his lecture in the Bombay University on plants, on how the plants spoke to each other. You know, J. C. Bose is one of the tallest men in the country and he grew taller and had he a man like Swaminathan or a man like the Secretary, Mr. Menon, J. C. Bose would never have grown so tall and would never have become so great.

Sir, I remember P. C. Roy, another great scientist of our country. A lady has written a biography of Shri Roy. Sir, he used to say, "The future is mine, my own" and he used to gather scientists around him and there was no place for people like Swaminathan under his tutelage or in his group. Then, Sir, I recall the lives of the Curies, Madame Curie and her husband, who became very famous in Europe and France and throughout the world and you know what their contribution is and they are for ever remembered by all and they are a part of the history of science. Then, you know, Sir, Dr. Bhabha, who was a very great man, a very great atomic scientist. I saw him and I visited him only at the Secretariat and I can never forget him. He was also associated with the Indian Institute of Science as a Member. These are all great men. And, Sir, when we think of Swaminathans who have been going like worms or like cattle and when we have to defend them

against Dr. Joseph, Dr. Bhatia, Dr. Shah, etc., we are getting very very tolerant.

Sir, I remember an incident which took place in 1925. A certain lady was questioned by the Scotland Yard in connection with something and the whole British House of Commons woke up to the situation and tried to settle the issue. This is how the British Parliament works. See what we are accustomed to. We see deaths on the right, see deaths on the left, in the front and the back and we do not seem to worry about anything. Sir, as I told you on the last occasion, Einstein ran away from the terror of Nazism and he was a great friend of our Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru and also, Sir, you know, Dr. Teller, whose lecture I heard in Boston and he was one of the makers of the hydrogen bomb and even he ran away from Nazism. But, Sir, how can you run away from Swaminathans? How can you run away from Menon and others? They are all frustrated and the Ministers who should be responsible to the people of India, as representatives of the people of India, defend them. These people become frustrated and they die like this. It is not mere sentiment alone. What do you mean by sentiment? Sir, Shri Nawal Kishore read out the letter of Dr. Shah and what he had said two or three days before he committed suicide. He had written a letter to Dr. Swaminathan, but nothing came out of it and he died and, Sir, he died leaving his children and wife helpless and I want the honourable Minister to tell us how he is going to look after the wife and children of the scientist. I want him to tell us how they are going to be looked after. We never bother about them. But they say that the rules will take care of them. But I am sorry to say that the rules have nothing about them to look after the wife and children.

The other day on the Defence budget I raised this point. When a pilot in the airlines dies due to an accident he gets one lakh rupees; they are entitled to get one lakh rupees. But I want to ask, if there is a young man in the Air Force for less than two years and if he dies in his plane, does he get one lakh rupees from the insurance company? This is our attitude towards them. This is our duty towards them. It is our duty towards children, fathers and mothers. This is what we should do.

5 P. M.

Then, I am reminded of Dr. Raman, another great scientist. What a great vibrant man he

[Shri Joachim Alva]

was. Had he lived, he would not have allowed Dr Swaminathan to get the Raman Magasaysay Award of Rs. 75,000. He was an author of a book on Green Revolution. There are various scientists working in the agriculture field. We have never heard young scientists having been promoted, but the name of Dr. Swaminathan is always on the top. He got the Award and a prize of Rs. 75,000. Then, came the question of Padma Vibhushan. His father-in-law is Mr. Bhoothalingam. I have nothing to say against Mr. Bhoothalingam. Mr. Bhoothalingam was an Assistant Collector in my district. He is a very claiming man, but he was born in an American atmosphere. He runs an organisation which is fed by American funds, Ford funds and Rockefeller funds. I do not know the name of the organisation, but it is a very well known organisation. It is the *Pithoo* of the Birlas. How can you go on like this? I come into their relationship only when they clash with our interest, when they clash with public interest. I remember the name of Sir C. P. Ramaswamy Iyer. He was a great personality. Although he wanted to keep Travancore independent of India, we mourn his death. But when the question of people like Dr. Swaminathan comes in, when they do everything in favour of their personal interest, we have to do something for it. My friend, Mr. Bhupesh Gupta talked of Mr. Shah, the never talked a single word. He was an astonishing man. He died of a heart attack. He could not talk to any one and I remember, Sir, that he was the second speaker in the Lok Sabha when a Resolution was moved by Pandit Nehru on the use of atomic energy for peaceful purpose. He made a great speech and after his speech, I was the man to speak in the Lok Sabha. These are the men who are the shining ornaments of the Indian scientific world. Should we have persons like Swaminathan and Bhoothalingam to bifurcate young scientists to bifurcate politicians and Ministers?

On the last occasion, when Shri Chandra Shukla moved a Resolution on the International Scholar, I asked him that Mr. L. P. Singh was patronising the whole Institute. Mr. L. P. Singh, the ex-Home Secretary, is a great American stooge. I know for two to three years what happened there. I wish that Officer would have told you what happened there. I am grateful to the Prime Minister for having gone into the matter. Then, there was Mr. Ashok Mehta. He is another American stooge. He was the Chairman of the College and we

saw how the things were happening there. But we knew that on the second occasion he would not be made a Governor. Fortunately being an ICS officer, he has gone as an Ambassador to Nepal. These are the types of people we have got. The whole system of agriculture should be reviewed. There should be really a strong Committee. I find that the Ministers are very reluctant to have Members of Parliament on such Committees. As I said, on a former occasion, the Minister for Civil Aviation did not want to have a Member of Parliament on a Committee when it was appointed after crash of a plane. Members of Parliament are not anxious to be appointed on these Committees. They are not anxious to be associated with those Committees. We know every time this demand is brushed aside. But why is it that every time some or the other IAS Officer should be there? These IAS Officers are the shadows of Ministers. They love to drink well. I do not mean to say that I do not drink but I do not drink too much. I remember Mr. Nehru making a famous statement that we do not want men who lose their balance. But they want to drink well. Their *bachas* also drink well. They are starting new traditions for our society. They are the persons made responsible for agricultural development, for bringing in new revolution, but it is a great mistake for us to think in these terms. I still remember the conversation on the Chinese Revolution. There someone said you have made a great mistake. You have not put in the right men for bringing in revolution in India. The ICS men flatter Sardar Patel was a great brain and Sir Shankar was the man who lauded all the prices and they managed to get all the favours from them. They even managed to gain favours of Pandit Nehru. But these ICS Officers do not allow young men to come up. If you want to find the names of young men on the top they are not here. Their names disappear from the top. If this is the state of affairs, the whole revolution would go into shatters. The young revolutionary minded persons should have been put in offices and not these IAS officers. We look upon IAS Officers to be men of stuff but they do not have any principles, they have nothing of the sort.

I am not a scientist and not even a mathematician. I could not pass in arithmetic or solve sums. But I would like to refer to our great predecessor, Ramanujam. You know about the great Shakuntala Devi. She could do ten sums a minute. What is there in IAS people?

Then, Sir, there are a lot of appointments made in this Ministry which are irregular. There is a case of Dr B. K. Sen. He has been made Deputy Director of the Animal Section. He gets around Rs 2,000 to Rs 2 500. He is solely responsible for the Section. I do not know how this appointment was made, why it was made. Then, there is a case of Dr Rafiq. I think we are making secularism public. Dr. Joseph was a Christian. Dr. Shah was a Hindu. So was Dr. Bhatia. And Dr. Rafiq a living scientist, who has not got any creditable performance, has also been given a high job, a very creditable job, in charge of the Division in this Department. There are so many other appointments made in this manner. I want to put a question to the hon. Minister whether he has gone through the list of scientists. I do not want him to appoint his own favourites. But I would only like to know whether he has gone through the list of scientists. Does he know which appointment is made, when it is made and why it is made? The Minister has got every right to see what kind of people are appointed in his Department. Sir, I was a member of the Indian Institute of Science for six years on behalf of Parliament. There the question of Directorship arose. It think it was Dr. Krishnan, he said he was entitled to become the Director of the Institute. He was a well-known scientist, well known in Cambridge. He was dissatisfied, poor man, though both Members of Parliament, Mr. Santhanam and myself, strongly voted for him as against everybody else. But he was not taken and he went to the court. The moment he went to the court all our sympathy for him was gone. We asked him why did you go to the court? He said he went to establish his own right that he should be the Director and not somebody else. Now this Dr. Shah was a sentimental man, he did not go to the court he took liberty with his life to the utter sorrow and misery of his wife and children. There are so many such scientists whose names we do not know, whose names we do not find in the glossary and if they die it is a loss to us. As I said on another occasion the ICS men never send their sons to the defence services. If you ask them what their son is doing they will say, my son is in the ICM or IBM, in Brook Bond, in Firestone. Because they are sons of ICS officers they get good jobs with fat salary. These are the things that you have to bear in mind. We owe a duty to our scientists. (Time bell rings) Sir, I am thankful to you, you have been very kind to me. I will take

only a couple of minutes. As I said we owe our scientists a duty. They are known to fight; they go to court as Dr. Krishnan did. Two Members of Parliament solidly backed him because he was well-known in Cambridge; he was a man of distinction but when he went to court we did not give him our sympathy. Then there are our scientists who are abroad. It is not good that our scientists should be staying abroad. Their duty is here to their motherland and to serve the country just like others, you and I, with less money but with pride and gratification. When incidents like these happen they do not like to come back to the motherland. That is why I say we all owe a duty to them to do whatever we can to help them. Of course the Minister will give a nice reply but it will not satisfy us, whatever may be the reply I hope things will improve by the force of our contention.

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE (SHRI ANNASAHAB SHINDE): I am thankful to you for allowing me to intervene in this debate. My senior colleague of course will be replying at the end but since I have been taking some interest over a number of years in the activities of the Indian Council of Agricultural Research I thought, this debate being a very important one, I should also be given an opportunity to make some submissions. I listened very attentively to the observations made by Shri Bhupesh Gupta and others. I quite concede the point that agricultural science has a very important role to play in our country. Therefore if politicians like Shri Bhupesh Gupta and others are showing interest in this, we welcome it very much because I have no doubt in my mind that today's debate is going to be very helpful for strengthening the scientific organisations particularly doing work in the field of crop sciences and animal sciences. Only one thing I would like to submit and I hope my hon. colleagues will not misunderstand me. Here many times we name individuals who are not in a position to defend themselves like us. If some charge is proved against somebody I have nothing to say but many times we make some statements on the basis of impressions. Therefore I would plead with my colleagues ultimately how do we judge the work of the scientists in this country? If according to the criticism of hon. Members just now my friend Mr. Alta also spoke and I have great respect for him— if everything was wrong in the administration of the ICAR the results which are

[SHRI ANNASAHEB SHINDE]

flowing today, would they have flowed? I am not saying this to minimise the weaknesses, drawbacks or shortcomings. In fact, as I said earlier, this debate will help us to remove many of the drawbacks, many of the weaknesses. To some of the suggestions perhaps I will come later on, but my submission is, ultimately, how as politicians we should judge the performance of the Indian Council of Agricultural Research. Now, what has happened in this country? As I have been submitting many times, this major development in agriculture—the breakthrough in agriculture in India—has many aspects and many facets. Everybody has played a role in it. The farmers have played their role. The Extension Workers have played their role. Our State Governments have cooperated, and everybody has played an important role in this. But what is the basic thing? How is it that the breakthrough has come? And I think you will appreciate and agree with me that the breakthrough has come mainly because of the contribution made by the Indian Council of Agricultural Research and the scientists working in this organisation under the leadership of Dr. Pal, under the leadership of Dr. Swaminathan and a number of other scientists. Ultimately, scientific work is team-work. It is like an army fighting. Whoever may be the Commander, unless everybody fights the result will not be there. Here it is team work. Leadership also is a very important question and some questions were raised about the leadership. Now, Mr. Bhupesh Gupta said that Dr. Swaminathan is a good scientist. I am glad at least he said this. I am very happy that he was good enough, was fair enough, to concede this point. But he said that he is not a good leader. Now, I do not want to pass my judgment but as a colleague of yours I would like to express my views because I have been acquainted with and have been in contact with a number of agricultural scientists in this country, and I must say—you may agree or you may not agree—I have rarely seen a scientist of the calibre of Dr. Swaminathan.

SHRI NAWAL KISHORE: That is conceded, but the point is about leadership.

SHRI ANNASAHEB SHINDE: Then the other point was made that our scientific activity is dominated by American ideas. May I submit, Sir, as far as the development of agricultural science in this country is concerned, that you will find that almost 99% scientists

are our own scientists and you will be in a position to appreciate that agricultural science is not such a science where, as in industrial science or in other fields, you can transplant ideas such as they are. The agro-climatic conditions in every country are different even the physiography. The peculiar characteristics of the crops are different in different countries and there are many conditions. You can adopt an idea to the local conditions, but you cannot transplant an idea as it is. You may borrow it but, unless you adapt it, it is no good. Therefore, agricultural science is not such a science which you can simply borrow from somebody and try to develop on that basis unless you have the ability to adapt it to suit your country's local conditions. I made some statement earlier regarding nuclear energy. In nuclear energy some discovery took place in the world, and it became very important knowledge for humanity as a whole. But these countries alone which had the capacity to absorb and adapt the new knowledge—the new discovery, adapt it to their own use, these countries alone could go along with it.

Similarly in the field of agricultural science, because our scientists are in a position to adapt all new ideas to our country's advantage. But what has happened today to our economy? Hon. Members will appreciate that one of the greatest and important sectors which has given strength to our economy today is the agricultural sector. Now, in this a vital role has been played by our agricultural scientists. Therefore, if we have to judge the performance of the Indian Council of Agricultural Research, it should be on the basis of results, on the basis of performance. And this is the most important yard-stick. Likes and dislikes should not really play an important role. Results should be the guide. Results should be the main criterion to determine the nature of the contribution that the Indian Council of Agricultural Research has been making in our country. Then Sir, the point has been made, though not directly, but Mr. Alva made a statement, as if Dr. Swaminathan has been appointed Director-General because he is related to some higher-up. I must share with you how the selection was made, the procedure that was adopted and how the Government's decision was made. I must share with you information in regard to this. Normally the Cabinet Sub-Committee is authorised to make some selection because it is a very high-level selection.

श्री जगदम्बी प्रसाद यादव : यही पर डेजर है। यही पर चार्ज है कि कैबिनेट में उनकी ऐसी पहुँच है कि जिसके कारण वे कैबिनेट के मिनिस्टर की चिन्ता नहीं करते हैं।

SHRI ANNASAHB SHINDE The point is my senior colleague, Shri Fakhruddin Ali Ahmed and the Prime Minister thought that though the Cabinet Sub-Committee had the authority and was competent to make the selection for a very high level post, a very important post, a key post in the 'ICAR' they felt that we should appoint a committee of experts to make the selection. Naturally there were a number of people. The Cabinet Sub-Committee did not exercise its right directly. A very high-level committee was appointed on which were the late Dr Sarabhai, Mr Sivaraman, Dr Randhawa, Dr Mukherjee and Dr B. D. Nag Choudhury. The Cabinet Sub-Committee gave the records of some eminent scientists and the Committee was asked to give their recommendation as to who should be selected. Then the Cabinet Sub-Committee took the decision of selecting Dr Swaminathan on the basis of the unanimous recommendation of this Committee. Therefore, there was no question of the Government being pressurised in such an appointment by anybody. The Government was very careful and particularly my senior colleague and all of us thought that in this case we should really take a decision on merit and, therefore, this decision was taken.

Then, there are many statements made by hon. Members as if Dr Swaminathan was responsible for all the past. Even Dr Joseph's suicide has been referred to. Of course, we are sorry. Anyone committing suicide is a very sad thing. It should not happen and it should not be repeated. All necessary steps should be taken to see that in future such unfortunate events are avoided. I share and I quite agree with the sentiments expressed on the floor of the House by hon. Members, but the point is how is Dr Swaminathan concerned with Dr Joseph's suicide? He was nowhere there. He was not the head of the organisation. He was neither the Director of IARI at that time nor in charge of ICAR but now in an atmosphere surcharged with emotion all sorts of statements are being made.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : Nobody at all suggested like that. Things should not be distorted.

SHRI ANNASAHB SHINDE Bhupesh Gupta, I am sorry, you look into the record. On the previous occasion when questions were asked of the Government this charge was also levelled. I am prepared to sit with you and speak on the basis of the record. Now, Dr. Swaminathan has been selected to lead this organisation only in February, 1972. How is he responsible for the selection procedure of the selection committee?

श्री जगदम्बी प्रसाद यादव डा० जोशी के बारे में भी बतला दीजिये।

SHRI ANNASAHB SHINDE I would really plead with you because I am one of the great admirers of Dr Joshi. Please do not bring in the names of individual scientists here. After a lot of effort and because of your co-operation we have built up such an atmosphere in the country and we are trying to see that our scientists are highly respected persons and, therefore, if we are

श्री जगदम्बी प्रसाद यादव : श्रीमन्, डा० जोशी की स्थिति बड़ी भयावह है। किसी के मरने के बाद ही चिन्ता नहीं करनी चाहिए। उनका केस अभी कमीडर करने की स्थिति में है।

SHRI ANNASAHB SHINDE I do not think the hon. Member should consider himself as having the monopoly of protecting or championing the interests of Dr Joshi. We are sympathisers of Dr Joshi. We know the contribution he is making. He is one of our valued scientists. The hon. Member is unnecessarily taking credit for arguing his case which he himself could not appreciate. I was speaking about the selection committee. Even Mr Menon's name was referred to. After all, officers may be good and bad. In fact, one suggestion which has been made here is that the administrator should also be a scientist. My Ministry will give thought to it. It is a suggestion which needs closer examination. But I may tell you. Unfortunately, Mr Menon is not here to defend himself.

श्री नवल किशोर आपने कहा है कि प्रिजुडिस्ड है। हम किसी के लिए प्रिजुडिस्ड नहीं हैं।

SHRI ANNASAHB SHINDE. I am thankful to you. Mr. Menon himself is completing his tenure here.

श्री जगदम्बी प्रसाद यादव : हमने तो किसी का चेहरा भी नहीं देखा है।

SHRI ANNASAHIB SHINDE And he is going back, reverting back, to his State service, West Bengal. He would be going there by the end of May, after the current month. My only submission was, he is one of the officers who have been responsible for building up an efficient administrative set-up. As I said, I concede this point—there may be shortcomings. But he is one of the officers who made some contribution. All of us are human beings. Perhaps we have our weaknesses. Nobody is perfect in this world. But I think those persons who are not here to defend themselves. I would plead. I would urge upon you not to make such charges against them unless they can be proved.

श्री जगदम्बी प्रसाद यादव : जो चार्ज लोगो ने लगाये है उनका जवाब दीजिए तो लोगो को सतोष होगा और वह मानेंगे कि जवाब ठीक आ रहा है। हमने उस दिन कहा था कि आप भी उनका कुछ बिगाड़ नहीं सकते, आप तो उनके साथ रहेंगे।

SHRI ANNASAHIB SHINDE Mr Bhupesh Gupta made a point. I have been visiting frequently the IARI and I have been trying to speak to the scientists. I have had regular informal discussions with them. They of course have given vent to their grievances. May I submit for the information of Mr Bhupesh Gupta and of the honourable House that we are very seriously examining the whole problem of the reorganisation of the ICAR, the whole structure? I quite see his point, because, in fact, for the first time the ICAR was reorganised in the year 1966. A number of steps were taken, and the most important principle which we are observing today is this that the ICAR must be allowed to

श्री जगदम्बी प्रसाद यादव : यह भी गलत है।

SHRI ANNASAHIB SHINDE, My time is very limited. If the hon. Member goes on intervening like this, what can I do?

Sir, the ICAR is being reorganised. We are benefiting from the experience of the past. Now,

the most important principle which we are observing is that ICAR must be an autonomous body, there should be no interference either from the administrators or the politicians in its functioning. And at least my senior colleague and myself have been so meticulously observing it. Though we are Ministers, we have never been interfering.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA It was reorganised in 1966. But its Director General did not resign and also certain other officers. When the lower ranks resigned, how is it that those people who were on the top did not resign and continued with the Government?

SHRI ANNASAHIB SHINDE, Thereafter, we tried to understand the feeling of the scientists. Quite a large number of scientists did not resign because our intention was not to harm their interests. Anyway, it is an autonomous body and an independent organisation like the Food Corporation of India. The services of the Food Department employees were transferred to the Food Corporation. Of course, we have enacted a statute. Now, I do not want to go into the past when scientists might have resigned. About the future I may say that in the ICAR, we are not going to do anything which would adversely affect the scientific community and the scientists of the ICAR. We will consult you. MPs and you will find that there is the fullest satisfaction as regards the scientists. A new arrangement will be worked out and nothing will be done which will disturb the functioning of the ICAR.

श्री जगदम्बी प्रसाद यादव : सेलेक्शन कमेटी कैसी है कि डा० खुराना को सक्रिड ग्रेड में भी नहीं लिया गया।

SHRI ANNASAHIB SHINDE Neither Dr Swaminathan nor Dr Menon was associated in forming those Selection Committees because Dr Pal was in charge as Director General up to February, 1972 and he was formulating the proposal. But since this matter is being discussed again, we will try to review the whole thing. In fact, on the basis of the recommendation of the Inquiry Committee and the suggestions from the hon. Members, we would like to review the whole approach. But I would like to plead with the hon. Members about one thing. Our Indian Council of Agricultural Research today is one of the prestigious organisations not only in India but also in the world. Many

of you are aware of this fact that the Indian Council of Agricultural Research today is being appreciated all over the world and many people are surprised as to how the Indian agricultural science is making such fast progress

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA That is why it is all the more necessary because a suicide of a leading scientist would damage the international reputation

SHRI ANNASAHLEB SHINDE Mr Gupta we are aware and we are equally sad about it. As a result of this debate whatever suggestions are there we will ponder very seriously over them. But we must bear in mind that today the Indian Council of Agricultural Research enjoys the highest prestige in the world. Many scientists have come. Many foreign people who have some knowledge of the Indian Council of Agriculture Research have come and put on record in the country and outside that there are few countries in the world where such spectacular progress in the field of agricultural research is taking place.

Some time back I was in the Soviet Union and I had occasion to meet some of the chiefs there. They in no uncertain terms expressed their interest and they wanted to know from me how the Indian agricultural science is making such fast progress. I asked them to better come here and see for themselves. Mr Bhupesh Gupta may be knowing that we were very happy to receive a team of Soviet agricultural scientists. Yesterday I replied a question on the basis of which we have entered into an agreement with the Soviet Union in the field of science. Dr Bor Laug who is closely associated with the development of wheat in many countries has made a statement that there is no parallel in the world to the way India is making progress in the field of development of wheat. Dr Sorma has also expressed the same view. I need not go on enumerating the names. But today the Indian Council of Agricultural Research is making valuable contribution for the development of Indian agriculture and for the development of science and for the humanity as a whole. I only hope nothing should be done, I would plead with you, I would urge upon you and I would request you not to say anything which would damage the prestige and the normal functioning of the scientists.

We have agricultural Universities and we have co-ordinated projects. We have 24 Insti-

tutes where we have Directors. If the discipline is broken it would be a bad day for India. Let us identify the weakness. Let us try and improve upon them and see that our Indian scientists are allowed to function in such a way that there is maximum involvement, that their initiatives are not sapped and full democratisation is brought about.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA What about confidential reports?

SHRI ANNASAHLEB SHINDE Confidential report never plays any important part. We can go into that question.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA I just pointed out in a recent case—not yours in the Indian Standards Institute—it was discovered that the outgoing Director had made adverse entry in the case of three persons to enable the fourth person to come up. In this case also the Confidential Report is responsible because when you record something and you do not show it to the person concerned, it is great injustice to him. Even in the Home Ministry adverse entries are shown to the person against whom the remark is made. Here you do not show it to him. Therefore, I say this matter should be recorded.

SHRI ANNASAHLEB SHINDE As I said, we will look into this.

(Interrupted by some Hon'ble Members)

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN There should be no cross-questioning.

SHRI JOACHIM ALVA May I repeat Dr Shah's first two complaints in his last letter, i.e., (1) not admitting them to the post graduate faculty for a long time and (2) not giving them students?

SHRI ANNASAHLEB SHINDE He was given student every year. In fact, the Minister last time read out a list of students. Moreover, he was given *ad hoc* appointments to the faculty. The rule is one must have three years' teaching experience before one is admitted to that. Since he was qualified for that he became a regular member and there was no injustice on that score.

I will resume my seat after making only one point.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA The confidential report should be shown to them

SHRI ANNASAHEB SHINDE : I say Mr Bhupesh Gupta, we will take into consideration the remarks made by you. We will go into them and all the implications will be examined. Nothing will be allowed to be done which will discourage scientists. If the present system is coming in our way, we will try to improve on it. Ultimately our scientists can function only with your goodwill. I would only plead with you that whether it is Dr Swaminathan or other scientists, if there is all-round goodwill they will do much more valuable service to the country and our country will become one of the proudest countries in the world. Therefore, I only seek your co-operation. As far as the specific points of suggestion are concerned, we will go into them and my Ministry would see that no stone is left unturned and at various stages, we will consult the Members of Parliament so that ultimately a general consensus is evolved. As far as scientific activities are concerned, let us not import party politics into them.

श्री जगदम्बी प्रसाद यादव : आप गलत बह रहे हैं। सदन आपको पूरा विश्वास और सहयोग देता है। जब 3 व्यक्ति आत्महत्या किए हैं तब सदन चौका है।

SHRI NAWAT KISHORI This is bad. When you want the co-operation of the House, you should not attribute motives. Everybody is for the best interests of the scientist and the Research Institutions.

SHRI ANNASAHEB SHINDE I am very happy you have clarified the position. I am not attributing any motives.

SHRI JOACHIM ALVA It is all only soothing words and no concrete steps.

SHRI ANNASAHEB SHINDE My senior colleague will deal with some of the specific suggestions. Sir, with these words, I conclude and I am thankful to you for giving me an opportunity to say a few words.

डा० भाई महावीर (दिल्ली) : उपसभापति जी, श्री शिन्दे ने अभी इस चर्चा में भाग लेकर कुछ मुद्दों पर प्रकाश डाला। शिन्दे जी ने एक बड़ी विशेषता है कि वे इतने मीठे ढंग से बोलते

हैं, इतने डिस्आमिन्ग तरीके से बात करते हैं कि ऐसा लगता है जो बात हमें कहनी थी वे पहले से ही समझ गए हैं और अब कुछ कहने की जरूरत बाकी नहीं रह गई। उन्होंने यह भी कहा कि वे बाहर गए तो कई वैज्ञानिकों ने भारत की प्रगति की तारीफ की। दुर्भाग्य की बात है कि उन्हें कोई ऐसा वैज्ञानिक नहीं मिला जिसने यह भी पूछा हो कि आपके यहाँ यह आत्महत्या करने का रिवाज क्यों चला है? अगर कोई यह भी पूछता तो शायद शिन्दे साहब को यह प्रश्न इतना हल्का न मालूम होता और इस चर्चा को एक सामान्य चर्चा के रूप में समाप्त करने की और जिस तरह का समाधान सरकार हमेशा देती आती है और जैसे तसल्लिया देकर और बातें बनाकर सदा हमें सतुष्ट करने की कोशिश की जाती है, वह कोशिश अब भी नहीं होती। मैं इस बात में सहमत हूँ कि हम कोई ऐसी चीज न करें जिससे देश के नाम के ऊपर कालिख लगे या हमारे वैज्ञानिकों के रास्ते में कोई रुकावट आए और मैं सरकार को आर शिन्दे जी को यह आश्वासन देना चाहूँगा कि यहाँ से जो भी सदस्य कुछ विचार इस विषय पर प्रगट कर रहे हैं, उनमें से कोई भी देश के हित और इस संस्थान के हित के सिवाय और कोई भावना से प्रेरित नहीं।

महोदय, जो विषय इस समय आया है उसके सबध में मैं यह लेख देख रहा था साप्ताहिक हिन्दुस्तान में, जिसका शीर्षक उसने दिया है "विज्ञान के गले में लाल फीते का फदा"—केवल लाल फीते का ही नहीं, जो फदा विज्ञान के गले में पड़ा है वह कई ऐसी कुरीतियों का है जो आज हमारे वैज्ञानिक अनुसंधान के क्षेत्र में जहर उड़ेल रहा है। आखिर डा० शाह को आत्महत्या क्यों करनी पड़ी? यह कहना कि वह एक बड़े भावुक व्यक्ति थे और यह बड़े दुख की बात है उन्होंने अपनी जान ले ली, मैं समझता हूँ यह सारे मामले पर परदा डालने की कोशिश की है। केवल इतनी बात नहीं है, डा० शाह ने जो चिट्ठी लिखी है मर्ने के पहले, उस चिट्ठी को यदि हम पढ़ें उसके ऊपर समाचारपत्रों में टिप्पणियाँ आई हैं कि कोई व्यक्ति आवेश में आकर उस मौत की तल्खी में, जबकि मौत का फदा गले में डालने जा

रहा हो, इस तरह की सयन चिट्ठी नहीं लिख सकता। इसलिए जो तथ्य उन्होंने लिखा है उनकी ओर सरकार बड़े शांत भाव से ध्यान दे। यह इस विषय की चर्चा की अनिवार्य शर्त है।

उन्होंने कहा कि कुछ अनुसंधान के मामले में इस तरह की रीतियां बन गई हैं कि जो वैज्ञानिक ऊपर की आई हुई दिशा के अनुसार राय देता है वह तो आगे बढ़ता है, जो स्वतंत्र राय देकर के और अपनी ईमानदारी से कहता है कि यह है, बात सही नहीं है उसको न सिर्फ पीछे हटाया जाता है बल्कि दबाया जाता है, उसका तकरीबन गला तक घोंटा जाता है। गला घोटना मैं शाब्दिक तौर पर नहीं कहता, हालांकि वह भी मैं आगे कहूंगा। यह स्थिति कि उम वैज्ञानिक को छात्र न मिल सके, उस वैज्ञानिक को पोस्ट ग्रेजुएट फ़ैकैल्टी में निकाल दिया जाय, कितने-कितने देश तक उसका स्टाफ़ छीन लिया जाए, क्या इस तरह की जो स्थिति है वह स्वस्थ स्थिति है? क्या डा० शिन्दे यह बतलाना चाहते हैं कि क्योंकि एक एवार्ड डा० स्वामीनाथन् को मिला, मैं नाम में नहीं जाना चाहता हूँ, मैं समझता हूँ कि हम लोग उनकी योग्यता के मुकाबले में बहुत छोटे हैं, वैज्ञानिक की दृष्टि से शायद हम कुछ भी नहीं जानते हैं। लेकिन प्रश्न यह उठता है कि जिन वैज्ञानिकों ने, उसी संस्थान के काम करने वाले दूसरे वैज्ञानिकों ने जो बातें उठाई हैं, जो सामने बातें लाई हैं, क्या आप उन बातों को सिर्फ़ द्वेष भरा मान कर रद्द कर देंगे? मैं समझता हूँ ऐसी स्थिति नहीं है।

टाइम्स आफ़ इंडिया में इस बात पर सम्पादकीय आ चुका है। डा० शाह ने आपकी मौत के पहले जो पत्र लिखा था उसमें यह सवाल उठाया था कि इन्डियन अग्रिकल्चर रिसर्च इंस्टीट्यूट ने जिस तरह की रिले क्रापिंग की बात उठाई और कहा कि इतनी सफलता मिली है कि चार फसले एक के बाद एक पैदा की जा सकती हैं। इस तरह की मांग, इस तरह का दावा करना बिल्कुल निःसंशय है, कही नहीं हो सका, क्यों यह नहीं हो सका। फिर भी यह मसूला इस बात को उठाती रही क्योंकि शायद सरकार या हमारा मंत्रालय यह चाहता था कि यह जाहिर किया

जाय कि बहुत बड़ी तरक्की हुई है। उस सम्पादकीय में इस बात को भी इसमें जुड़ना हुआ बतलाया गया कि डा० शाह ने जो लिखा है भूमि सीमाबन्दी के साथ सम्बन्ध जोड़ते हुए कि भूमि की किसी टुकड़े में कितनी आय पैदा हो सकती है। इसमें 15 हजार रुपये एक एकड़ की फसल से प्राप्त किया जा सकता है, यह दावा अगर हमारी यह संस्थान करे, तो मैं समझता हूँ कि यह इतना छोटा विषय नहीं है कि हम इधर उधर की बातें सुनकर या कुछ वैज्ञानिकों का चिट लेकर हम अपना समाधान कर सकें।

महोदय, जहाँ एक एकड़ जमीन के अन्दर पांच छह हजार रुपये की फसल पैदा की जा सकती है, वहाँ पर कोई वैज्ञानिक यह दावा करे कि 15 हजार रुपये की फसल पैदा की गई है, करके देखा गया हो कि यह बात ठीक है, तो हम में ज्यादा कौन खुश होगा? जब इस तरह की बात हो जायेगी तो देश के अन्दर एक वैभव का युग शुरू हो जायेगा और मैं समझता हूँ कि अगर इतना बड़ा परिवर्तन आ सकता है, तो यह एक बड़े सौभाग्य की बात होगी। लेकिन सौभाग्य की होगी इस वास्ते हम सब मान लें, यह तो अपने आप को धोका देने की बात होगी, जब तक इसके बारे में तथ्य न हों, आकड़े न हों, वैज्ञानिक आधार न हो तब तक केवल एक व्यक्ति कहता है और वह क्यों कहता है क्योंकि जो लोग उसकी जी हाँ मे हाँ मिलाते हैं वे तो ठीक हैं और जो हाँ मे हाँ नहीं मिलाते हैं, वे पीछे फेंक दिये जाते हैं तथा रद्द कर दिये जाते हैं। यह जो स्थिति है वह कोई स्वस्थ स्थिति नहीं है और उसे बदलना होगा।

महोदय, शरबती सोनोरा की बात की गई जिसके बारे में डा० स्वामीनाथन् को मैंगामेसे एवार्ड मिला। यह शरबती सोनोरा सचमुच क्या है, इसके अन्दर वे गुण हैं जिसके बारे में दावा किया जाता रहा है। सचमुच में इसकी खेती के अन्दर जितनी फसल बढ़नी चाहिए उतनी बढ़ी है जिस व्यक्ति ने यह किया था उसका प्रतिवाद भी लुधियाने, पन्त नगर के वैज्ञानिकों ने और दूसरे वैज्ञानिकों ने कर दिया था। तो मैं पूछना

[डा० भाई महावीर]

चाहता हूँ कि शरबती सोनोग आज हमारे देश के मू-भाग के अन्दर बोया जा रहा रहा है ओर उसके अन्दर कितनी औसत उपज मिल रही है। अगर अच्छी औसत मिल रही है तो यह बड़े आनन्द की बात है, बड़ी खशी की बात है और हम तो बहुत ही प्रमन्न होंगे। परन्तु यदि न हो, जी हजूरियो को लेकर हम इस बात पर चलते रहे, तो जी हजूरिपन कही भी फायदा नहीं करता, राजनीति में भी नहीं करता और सरकार में भी नहीं करता। लेकिन मैं समझता हूँ कि वैज्ञानिक क्षेत्र में येसमैन की बात *It is a contradiction in terms* जो वैज्ञानिक येसमैन बनने की कोशिश करता है *He is no scientist at all* वह वैज्ञानिक नहीं बन सकता है। जो आदमी दूसरी बी राय के ऊपर खाली अगूठा लगाना अपना फर्ज समझ ले, ऐसी स्थिति में जो यह प्रश्न उठा है, उस पर विचार करना पड़ेगा।

महोदय, कुछ तथ्य हमारे मिन दे चुके हैं और मैं उनको दोहराने की कोशिश नहीं करूँगा। लेकिन मैं एक बात कहूँगा कि नियुक्तियों के अदर गलत तरीके से प्रायोरिटीज दी गई है। जो आदमी जूनियर था उसको ऊपर बढ़ाया गया, जो आदमी न्यूनतम आवश्यक शर्त पूरी नहीं करता, मिनिमम क्वालीफिकेशन पूरी नहीं करता, उनको भी आगे नियुक्त किया गया। जो लोग छोटी नौकरियों के वास्ते, नीचे दर्जे की नौकरियों के वास्ते रिजेक्ट कर दिये गये थे, उन्हें कुछ समय के बाद उससे ऊँची ग्रेड के वास्ते नियुक्त कर दिया गया। जो आदमी आज एक जगह पर नियुक्त किया जाता है, उसको दो तीन साल के अन्दर चौगुने वेतन स्केल के अन्दर ले लिया जाता है। तो ये सारी चीजें और ये सारे लोग क्या एकाएक बिल्कुल अलौकिक कौशल के मिल गये हैं जिनको अभी तक ढूँड नहीं पाया गया था। ये सारे एकाएक यहाँ पर प्रकट हो गए हैं। मैं समझता हूँ कि ऐसे लोग कभीकभार दुनिया के अन्दर आ जाते होंगे, लेकिन इसी तरह के लोगों को डा० स्वामीनाथन ने अपने इर्दगिर्द जमा किया है, यह दावा सही नहीं प्रतीत होता।

डा० रजत डे का नाम पिछली बार आया। मैं आलोचना के लिए नाम नहीं ले रहा हूँ, बल्कि इसलिए ले रहा हूँ कि जिनके कारण डा० शाह के लिए आत्महत्या की नौबत आई। वे डा० रजत डे प्रोफेसर आफ एग्रोनोमी बनाए गए जबकि वे प्लान्ट पेशोलोजिस्ट हैं, एग्रोनोमी उनका विषय नहीं रहा। इसका कोई कारण अगर है तो आप उसकी जाच करके बताइए कि इस कारण से ऐसा किया गया और अगर वे एक विषय हैं तो दो अलग डिपार्टमेंट्स इस संस्थान में क्यों रखे गये। जब प्रश्न खड़े होते हैं तो हम इसके लिए मजबूर हो जाते हैं कि उन पर विचार करें क्योंकि जो वैज्ञानिक वर्कर्स हैं उन्हीं से हमें इस तरह की शिकायतें मिलती हैं। हमें बताया गया कि यहाँ पर एक एसोसिएशन बनाया गया और उस एसोसिएशन की थोड़ी बहुत चर्चा की हमारे नवल किशोर जी ने। मुझे यह पढ़कर बहुत आश्चर्य हुआ, जैसा कि मैंने शुरू में कहा, कि जो लोग हा में हा नहीं मिलाते उनमें से एक माइटिस्ट डा० वाई० आर० आहूजा को कत्ल तक करने की धमकी दी गई। कुछ लोगों की तरफ से जो डाइरेक्टर जनरल के व्यक्ति समझे जाते हैं, यहाँ तक नौबत आई हमारे वैज्ञानिक अनुसंधान के संस्थानों में तो मैं समझता हूँ कि यह बड़ा शोचनीय और चिन्ता का विषय है। श्री शिन्दे ने कहा कि हम दुखी हैं : *We are sad* दुखी होना ही पर्याप्त नहीं है, हमें इस चीज से उद्दिग्न और असन्तुष्ट होना पड़ेगा कि कहा जड़ के अन्दर खराबी है, कहा जहर का पोधा फैल रहा है, उस पोधे को उखाड़कर फेंकना फेंकना होगा और अगर उसको हम निकाल कर फेंके तो मैं समझता हूँ कि सारा हाउस, सारे दन और सारा देश आपके साथ होगा। लेकिन क्या इस तरह की घटनाएँ किसी देश के अन्दर सहन की जा सकती हैं?

महोदय, यही तक नहीं है। मेरे पास एक रिपोर्ट है एसोसिएशन आफ साइंटिफिक वर्कर्स आफ इंडिया की। इस रिपोर्ट के कुछ अंश को नवल किशोर जी ने उद्धृत किया। मैं चाहूँगा कि इसका थोड़ा अंश मैं आपके सामने और रखूँ। इस संस्थान की बैठक में, जिसकी रिपोर्ट मेरे हाथ में

है, हमारे माननीय सदन के कुछ सदस्य भी थे, श्री कृष्णाकान्त थे, मोहन धारिया थे जो अब मंत्री हैं उनके सामने जो चर्चा हुई है वह प्रकाशित है, उसवी दो तीन बातों के बारे में मैं ध्यान दिता-ऊंगा। जिस बात पर विशेष जोर दिया गया वह है फारेन इनफ्लूएस की बात। भूपेश जी ने भी इस बात को कहा था। मुझे उस समय लगा कि शायद भूपेश जी जिस लाइन पर सोचते हैं वे खीच-खाच कर इस बात को वही ले जाने होंगे, परन्तु मुझे यह देखकर बहुत दुःख हुआ कि सचमुच हमारे वैज्ञानिक इस बात को अनुभव करते हैं कि किसी विदेशी की चमड़ी को देखकर हमारे यहाँ पर सोचा जाता है कि उसकी वैज्ञानिक योग्यता बहुत बड़ी होगी। उम मीटिंग में जो चर्चा की गई उसमें फारेन इनफ्लूएस के बारे में यह कहा गया —

"The most serious consequence of re-organisation was the increasing involvement of foreigners in policy making, administration and academic matters. Foreigners not only sit on selection committees but often act as Chairmen."

आगे कहा—

"If the aid giving organisations were honest about their intentions, why did they almost invariably back ill-qualified influential lackeys and hound out competent scientists?"

I repeat :

Why did they almost invariably back ill-qualified influential lackeys and hound out competent scientists ?

इसी के आगे इसी विषय पर डा० जे० जी० भोवाल, जेनेटिस्ट आई० ए० आर० आई० उन्होंने अपना अनुभव सुनाया वे कनाडा में थे, वहाँ का उन्होंने अपना अनुभव सुनाया —

"A Canadian Scientist from the same Department who had been in India as an expert had stated on his return to Canada that though there have been a number of highly qualified competent agricultural experts in India, the Indian Government did not accept their opinions and insisted on foreign experts who were really not competent to advise on problems which

were peculiar to the soil, climate and social conditions in India."

उन्होंने कहा कि यहाँ से लौट कर गए हुए एक वैज्ञानिक ने जो अपनी राय दी है उस पर मैं चाहूंगा विचार किया जाय और उसका ध्यान आगे में रखा जाय। परन्तु, महोदय, इतना ही नहीं है, अमरीकन साइंटिस्ट और अमरीकन डिग्री वाले साइंटिस्ट के लिए जो खास प्रिफरेंस है उसके बारे में भी यह कहा गया :

"Another example of foreign influence was the recent advertisements of posts in some agricultural universities inviting applications preferably from candidates having a doctorate degree from the USA. As against this, highly qualified agricultural scientists having doctorate degrees from Russia found it difficult to get employment."

हम क्या यहाँ पर अमरीकन साइंटिस्ट्स के दिमाग की गुलामी के अंदर तो नहीं फंसे रहे हैं, यह विचार करना चाहिए। सेल्फ रिलायंस की बात कही जाती है। पहले सेल्फ रिलायंस ज्ञान के क्षेत्र में प्रारम्भ करना पड़ेगा और यदि उसमें हम सेल्फ रिलायंस प्रारम्भ करने की बजाए औरों की गुलामी के दलदल में फंसे जा रहे हैं तो मुझे खेद है, मुझे चिंता है, कि हम अपने देश की प्रगति को बनाने की बजाय उसके रास्ते में रोड़े डालेंगे।

महोदय, दूसरा जो प्रश्न महत्व का है वह है असंतोष। इतना बड़ा असंतोष है इस सारे संस्थान के अंदर कि उसका एक छोटे कोटेशन का हवाला आपके सामने देना पर्याप्त होगा :

"Dr. N. C. Fant, Professor of Entomology, IARI, who spoke next gave the findings of a survey conducted by this organisation through a questionnaire. He reported that 90% of the scientific workers are totally dissatisfied with their jobs and service conditions and that over 65% complained that their bosses take the credit for research work done by their juniors. The findings further showed that 80% of the scientists were against foreign experts being members of the ICAR Selection Committee, while opinion on the essentiality of foreign aid was equally divided."

[डा० भाई महावीर]

महोदय, अगर इस तरह का असंतोष किसी और संस्थान में होगा तो क्या वह देश की आशाओं को पूरा कर सकेगा? स्वाभाविक रूप से कहना पड़ेगा कि उससे आशाये पूरी नहीं होगी। आपको ऐसे असंतोष को निकालना पड़ेगा। ऐसे असंतोष की तरफ ध्यान खींचने के लिए मिनिस्टर साहब ने पिछली बार कहा था कि अगर हमें डा० शाह लिख करके भेजते तो हम मुन लेते और उनको बुला लेते। इस तरह के उदाहरण है, कि जिन्होंने लिख करके भेजा उनको नहीं बुलवाया किसी ने। यदि डाइरेक्टर जनरल के पास लिख करके भेजा तो बुलवाना तो दूर उनको सजा इस बात की भुगतनी पड़ी कि उन्होंने इस तरह का दुस्साहस क्यों किया।

मुझे एक छोटा सा उदाहरण याद है लेकिन मैं उसका बड़ा महत्व नहीं समझता। मैंने स्वयं एक चिट्ठी शिन्दे साहब को लिखी थी। एक विज्ञापन आई० ए० आर० एस० संस्थान की कुछ नियुक्तियों के बारे में निकला था। कुछ क्वालिफिकेशन्स दिए हुए थे, कुछ क्वालिफिकेशन्स साइंटिफिक रिसर्च और दूसरे प्रकार की योग्यताओं के थे। एप्लीकेशन्स आ गईं लेकिन आने के बाद कुछ नहीं हुआ। मेरे पास लोग आए। जो एप्लिकेण्ट्स थे, जो साइंटिस्ट थे, जिनके तजुबे थे, उन्होंने कहा कि हम जाते हैं लेकिन कोई कार्यवाही नहीं हो रही है। उन्होंने यह बताया कि जो लोग क्वालिफाइड नहीं हैं, लेकिन जिन लोगों को एड् हाक एप्वाइन्टमेंट मिल गया है, उनकी कोशिश यह है कि यह मामला अटका रहे और छः महीने या साल दो साल ऐसे ही चलता रहे और उसके बाद हम लोग कहे कि हम इतनी देर से बैठे हैं, हमारा हक बन गया है। जहां तक मुझे लगता है वह शायद जिन वैज्ञानिक योग्यता वाले और क्वालिफिकेशन्स वाले लोगों को रखने की बात थी वह असफल हो गई और वही की वही रह गई। इस तरह से मंत्री जी के पास शिकायतें आती हैं लेकिन वे उनको देख नहीं पाते होंगे। सबसे बड़ी अदालत के अन्दर डा० शाह ने आज जो अपनी शिकायत पहुंचाई है, अगर उसके बाद भी हमें इस प्रश्न को जितनी गंभीरता से और जितनी ईमानदारी से लेना चाहिए और इसको

दुरुस्त करने के लिए जो भी कदम उठाने चाहिए उनको नहीं उठाते हैं तो मैं समझता हूं कि देश के इस सपूत का बलिदान भी व्यर्थ जाएगा।

इस दृष्टि से मैं खाली एक सुझाव देना चाहता हूं। शिन्दे जी ने बार-बार कहा कि यहां पर सदस्य जो भी सुझाव दे रहे हैं उनको मैं विचार में लाऊंगा प्रौर उनका ध्यान रखूंगा। उन्होंने यह भी कहा कि हम इस संस्थान के पुनर्गठन की बात सोच रहे हैं तो उस चर्चा में संसद के सदस्यों को शामिल करने में आपको आपत्ति क्यों है? उसमें आपको क्या दिक्कत है, या परेशानी है? अगर सी० एस० आई० आर० की जांच के अंदर संसद के सदस्य जा सकते थे, तो यहां क्यों नहीं जा सकते और यहां उनका उपयोग क्यों नहीं हो सकेगा? बहुत सारी बातें ऐसी हैं जिनके संबंध में सरकार अपनी चहारदीवारी के अन्दर कैद रखती है और उसके बाहर सोच नहीं सकती।

अभी मेरे मित्र जगदम्बी प्रसाद जी यह बता रहे थे कि एक लाख का संस्थान जो नामकुंड, रांची में है और जो एकमात्र लाख का उत्पादन करने वाला है, वहां पर छः वर्ष से कोई डाइरेक्टर नहीं है। और बराबर दो साल से लिख रहें हैं, उसका कोई फैसला नहीं होता। सरकार देखती है और छूट देती है। यह हमारा सोभाग्य है कि लोगो को हमारे पास आने में कोई दिक्कत नहीं होती और इसलिए हमारे पास तक यह बातें पहुंचती हैं जो कि आपके पास नहीं आ पाती। हम चाहते हैं कि आप संसद सदस्यों को उसमें शामिल कर ले और जैसे कि सुझाव दिया भी गया है और उस एक लेख में भी आया है कि हमारे जो महत्व के स्थान हैं, जैसा डा० गिरिराज सिंह सिरौडी ने सुझाव दिया, कि जो हमारी एडमिनिस्ट्रेटिव पोस्ट्स हैं उन पर लोगो को रोटेशन में चांस देना चाहिए। ऐसा होने पर उस में हर एक को काम करने का अवसर मिलेगा और उनको अपनी स्वाभाविक प्रतिभा के विकास का अवसर भी प्राप्त होगा। दिल्ली यूनिवर्सिटी में इस तरह का प्रयोग हुआ है। मैं चाहूंगा कि आप इस पर विचार करें। लेकिन बुनियादी

चीज यह है कि इस मामले की आप ऐसी जाच करे कि जो इस मामले की जड़ों तक जाय। जिस तरह की शिकायतें हैं उनको देखते हुए हम इस चीज में न पड़े कि कौन बड़ा है और कौन छोटा है और कौन वैज्ञानिक कैसा है और आपने जैसा कहा कि इस फैसले के लिए मंत्रिमंडल के मंत्री आये, हम उस बहस में नहीं पड़ते, उसमें बहुत से सवाल आ जायेंगे, लेकिन देश में बहुत से लोग ऐसे हैं कि जो समझते हैं कि भ्रष्टाचार प्रारम्भ ही ऊपर से होता है। मैं इस झगड़े में नहीं पड़ना चाहता, लेकिन मैं चाहता हूँ कि आप इस मामले की जाच आब्जेक्टिव, डिडिपेंडेंट और इम्पार्शल तरीके से करने का प्रयत्न करें और सदन के सदस्यों को आप उसमें साथ लीजिए और यदि आप ऐसा करेंगे तो उस एसोसिएशन की मीटिंग में जो बार-बार मांग की गयी है, उस मांग को भी आप पूरा करेंगे और महोदय, यदि यह हो जायगा तो मैं समझता हूँ कि डा० शाह का बलिदान स्वीकार होगा, देश उनकी इतनी बड़ी कुर्बानी से कुछ न कुछ फायदा उठा सकेगा।

SHRI V. V. SWAMINATHAN (Tamil Nadu) Mr Deputy Chairman, Sir the young promising agronomist, Dr Vinod Shah died in despair and disappointment. This is really a very sorry state of affairs. This is not the first or the second or the third tragedy among the scientists. There are no two opinions about it. The Government must constitute a committee to inquire into the sorry state of affairs and prove to this House and to the world who really is responsible for this suicide of Dr Shah.

But in our extreme sentimentalism and sorrowful mood let us not cast aspersions against those scientists who cannot be present here to defend themselves. I am told that the Nobel Peace Prize winner, Dr Norman said that if India can claim any self-sufficiency in food production or green revolution that credit goes to Dr Swaminatham and his team of scientists. He is the recipient of many awards. He is a world-famous geneticist. He is the first Indian geneticist to be chosen to preside over the International Geneticists Conference in 1962 at the very young age of 38. He was the recipient of awards like the Shanti Swarup Bhatnagar Award in 1961 and the Birbal Sahni Award in 1966, Mendel Award of the Czechoslovak Academy of Sciences in 1965. We should feel proud

that he received the Raman Magasaysav Award for Community Development last year. He discovered the potentialities of Hurricane Dwarf crops.

In our attempt to prevent suicides of scientists let us not assassinate the character of eminent scientists who are responsible for bringing in self-sufficiency and Green Revolution to India and great fame to the Indian Agricultural Research Institute,

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA Mr Deputy Chairman, Sir, while participating in this debate I do not claim any special knowledge about science. Therefore, my approach would be purely a layman's approach and if I am wrong anywhere I would be only too glad to be corrected by the hon. Minister who has at least the advice of the scientists available to him.

Now, Sir, some of the previous speakers have already indicated about it but I would like to throw some more light on another aspect of the Report of the Association of Scientific Workers of India, Pusa Institute. As far back as 1971 the Pusa unit of this Organisation made a study regarding the reaction of the scientists so far as the behaviour of their topmen was concerned towards them. It has been indicated here that almost 90 per cent replied that they were extremely dissatisfied. To the question whether there was a general feeling of dissatisfaction among the scientists of IAMR, 94 per cent replied in the affirmative. The affairs of perhaps the entire division supported this finding. So far as the Agronomy Division is concerned, Dr Shah was No. 4 in the scale of Rs 1100 to Rs 1400. Things began deteriorating faster in the Division after the death of the well-known scientist Dr S. S. Bains in May last year. At the time of his death, the next man in the Department Dr T. C. Mahapatra, was on 32 days' earned leave and the man next to him, Dr Dastane, was in Lebanon attending a Conference. Therefore, the gentleman who was No. 5 in the list, i.e. Dr Rajat Dey, was made the Head of the Agronomy Department. He did not have any special qualifications. He was a scientist. There is no doubt about it. But it needed specialisation and without that special knowledge I do not know how he was selected and why Mr. Shah, in the absence of these two other senior men, was ignored? All of them were ignored. Dr. Shah, Dr. Mahapatra and

[Shri Lokanath Misra]

Dr Dasiana were ignored and Dr Rajat Dey superseded them. It must have been brought to the notice of the hon. Minister then and it was categorically brought to his notice by Mr K C Panda, one of our Members. The Minister says that he could have taken action if Mr Shah had brought it to his notice. If bringing to his notice needs a special channel I do not know whether that channel was used or not but the medium of a Member of Parliament should also be considered as an important medium and that was used. Even then the hon. Minister, Mr Fakhruddin Ali Ahmed, did not feel moved. I do not know how he assures us that he would have looked into the case of Mr Shah, had it been brought to his notice. I am surprised at such statements of the Minister. (Interruptions) I do not know whether it is the Minister himself or the Minister of State who said so immediately after the death of Mr Shah. He said that he had become emotional. If Mr Ahmed wants that all the scientists in the country should be thick-skinned.

THE MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE
(SHRI FAKHRUDDIN ALI AHMED) : I have not said it.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA : Whosoever has said it, but it is a fact that the scientists cannot be thick-skinned like politicians. If you want the scientists to develop their faculty, you have to provide them with a congenial atmosphere. They must be provided with an atmosphere where they would be creating faculties; they should be most delicately situated. If they become thick-skinned, if they become irresponsible, then probably they will lose scientific faculties. Therefore, whosoever made the statement made a wrong statement. We expect scientists to be extremely emotional, to be extremely sensitive or else they will be crude fellows, probably as lay in the matter of science as I am or as Mr Fakhruddin Ali Ahmed is.

Sir, the villain of the piece, has already been mentioned. The other day I talked about Dr Swaminathan. I am not a scientist and therefore I should not be in a position, nor should I claim to be in a position to judge Dr Swaminathan's ability as a scientist. Granting that he is 100 per cent efficient in his Department of Agricultural Science, I agree with Mr Bhupesh Gupta when he said that he has failed in his leadership. It is only under

his leadership that these things are now multiplying. Maybe the beginning was probably some two years back when Dr Joseph committed suicide.

DR K. RAMIAH (Nominated) : It was earlier.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA : It was even earlier. But now we see things are multiplying. Discontent is multiplying and maybe if the hon. Minister is so callous that suicides multiply, ultimately the entire responsibility has to be borne by the Director General. He cannot run away from the responsibility he is holding. He cannot have it both ways that he would continue as the Director-General and at the same time he would run away from the kind of responsibility that he is expected to carry along with the position. Therefore last time when I accused him I accused him only, because as Director-General he should be in a position to carry the responsibility or else he should get away from there. Let him be a scientist, we shall worship him as a scientist but he cannot be an administrative head, fail in that completely and still claim the same honour and dignity that he would have claimed as a scientist. The worst part of it is that he is always under the advice and influence of the villain of the piece Mr Menon. I do not know him, I have not even seen his shadow. I wish I had seen such a villain.

THE DEPUTY MINISTER IN CHARGE
MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE (SHRI JAGANNATH PAHADIA) : You have only heard.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA : I have heard about the villain. I want to stay away from that villain. I have a lunch of four programmes of Mr Menon. Once, twice every month he goes to Calicut and to Kerala. I told he belongs to Kerala. I wish I had his intelligence in using the public exchequer to visit my home. Every month he takes an opportunity of using the money from public exchequer to visit his home. This is the gentleman who was given a certificate a few moments back by the Minister of State, Mr Shinde. Probably Mr Shinde did not have the time to go into these things. These are minute details of course but a person who has a special faculty, special capacity of cheating the Government in this way by creating situations where he can use Government money for an fare in order

to visit his home and look after his domestic problems is not the right type of person who should be in charge of the Indian Council of Agricultural Research. Therefore the sooner he goes the better. At the same time the hon. Minister should write to the Government of West Bengal to be careful about the gentleman. If there is at all a character roll, that has to be written. The hon. Minister should immediately write on it that he is a person whose conduct has to be watched and watched properly. I would not have such a person for such a job. That the Minister did not have the time to look into the conduct of such a man goes to show how seriously the hon. Minister is looking after the ICAR. Therefore I would now suggest that Dr. Swaminathan should only be allowed to remain as a scientist, probably as the highest in the cadre. I have no quarrel with that but there must be somebody else to look after the administration so that this institution which has earned a reputation, according to Mr. Shinde, all over the world should not get such a blot because of the maladministration of the Director-General.

Now there is only Union Public Service Commission for recruitment of all cadres including candidates for the autonomous bodies, candidates for public undertakings, candidates for educational institutions and so on and the UPSC is too busy with the recruitment only to the IAS and allied Services. Therefore Sir, what I would suggest is that there should be a special public service commission for the scientific cadres in these institutions and in the public undertakings. If possible, they should be tagged together, or they should even be separate and there should be two public service commissions, one only for the autonomous bodies which have a scientific cadre or backing, and the other should be exclusively for the public undertakings. I think, if there is a public service commission that way for the scientific cadre, it can look after the scientific Services much better than the Minister looking after them. I hope there would not be much of a difficulty regarding that.

Now, Sir, the Minister is the President of the ICAR. I would plead with him it is not a matter of prestige at all for him. The position that he holds is probably the highest post so far as the Agriculture Department is concerned because he is the Government of India's representative and the peoples representative combined representing the field of agriculture. Therefore, it does not add to his

credit to remain President of the Indian Council of Agricultural Research. If it can be headed by somebody else, then he can objectively look at it from a distance. Now, his name being associated with it is being used by the sly foxes in that autonomous body. Kindly don't lend your strength and I would plead with the Minister not to lend his strength to be used by the sly foxes in the autonomous body called the Indian Council of Agricultural Research. Therefore, he should remain at a distance and look objectively at it. Sir, it seems the Minister is very averse to Members of Parliament getting associated with the committee that he proposes. The Secretary, Mr. Menon, probably takes all the credit for having picked up this gentleman Mr. J. R. Patel, a retired Food Commissioner, for having picked him up from oblivion and, therefore, whatever is dictated by Mr. Menon would be the judgment of the proposed committee, that goes without saying. A person, who is now looked upon as somebody in the field of science, or in the field of administration, or even a Judge of a High Court, or even an ex-Judge of a High Court, would have been a much better person to head such a probe. And if such a person is not acceptable to Mr. Fakhruddin Ali Ahmed or his Ministry, I would mention we have an eminent scientist belonging to agriculture here, who is Member of this house. Why don't you take his service? I am told he was also associated at one time when there was a probe regarding the working of the ICAR. If that is so, now, why don't you take his services? He would combine both a scientist and a Member of Parliament in him. What is wrong about it? But I would not however accept he could be the villain of the piece and could be chosen to head the committee and carry out the probe. Therefore you must select a person who would be in the confidence of the public. Supposing Mr. Patel writes something about the incident, would anybody take it seriously? Probably people would throw it into the waste paper basket. I would throw it into the waste paper basket because I am guided by the feeling that Mr. Menon, the way he behaved, must have given the feeling to Mr. Patel that the finding must be this way, or else "you will never be picked up for another enquiry". Therefore, I would plead with the hon. Minister. They may come to a consensus. He may take the advice of his colleagues here. We do not want to misguide the Minister. We want the prestige and the honour of the institution to be kept up as much as he does,

[Shri Lokanath Misra]

but if you give the fifth man the first position in the wrong direction, can we be with you? Even when it is brought to your notice by a Member of Parliament, you close your eyes and you do not see because probably the villain of the piece would have advised you that things are being done rightly. Finally, I would request the hon. Minister to kindly concede the suggestion that Members of Parliament should be associated with this probe. If that is done, I will give great confidence to the people that a proper and objective enquiry is being made and there is nothing fishy about it.

DR. K. RAMIAH: Mr. Deputy Chairman Sir, I am rising with a heavy heart for the reason that my judgment of people appears to differ so radically from the opinions of my colleagues in Parliament. The ICAR was reorganised in 1965 as a result of the report of the special committee appointed for the purpose. The report of the committee was accepted in 1965 and since then the ICAR became an autonomous body entrusted with the responsibility of carrying out agricultural research, teaching and extension of education for the whole country. It so happened that with the reorganisation the ICAR became an autonomous, independent body, free from direct bureaucratic control. It has its own special rules to recruit its staff. The committee had actually suggested the same model as was then being followed by the CSIR which is also an independent autonomous body. It is likely that any set-up which comes in with the best of intentions can go wrong. After all, it is the human being who function interpreting the rules or regulations framed for the body. If something serious has happened like this calamity which everyone of us deplors, it has happened because of some mistake in following the rules or regulations of recruitment. Let the committee which is to be appointed examine it and say why this tragedy occurred and suggest amendments to change the existing rules so that we will not have a similar tragedy happening again. But let not this scrutiny or request for scrutiny be utilised to condemn the whole organisation which, during the last seven years, has set a world record by increasing agricultural production in the country. It is after the reorganisation of the ICAR, the team of agricultural scientists, who can stand on their own, developed their own schemes and projects and carried them out in a co-ordinated manner

with the cooperation of the scientists working in the States. We know how successfully the schemes have worked to reach the present level of agricultural production in the country. Let us not, in our anxiety to change the ICAR, condemn the good work the scientists in the organisation have done.

Regarding the letter which Dr. Shah had written just before he died to Dr. Swaminathan, there are one or two technical points which I would very much like to get cleared. For instance, he has suggested that the reliability of the figures he got for yields of a particular rotation was vitiated by the use of big-sized potatoes as seeds in the experiment. In fact, ordinarily when any potato-grower goes to an agronomist for consultation, he is advised to use big seeds. So, it is nothing special that has been done to vitiate the normal results of that experiment. Next is the Baisakh Moong. I wish to mention in this connection that the ICAR, in addition to the agricultural research that it is carrying out all over the country, has also certain regulations to adopt before any agronomic practice or any new variety of crop is released to the public. It has got to go through a series of tests. We have got the national demonstrations, the all-India Co-ordinated Variety Tests and the Variety Release Committee and a number of workshops where the results which are obtained are discussed and it is on the unanimous decision of the Committee that the particular variety of crop is released in the country. I do not know how the release of moong was manipulated. I know Dr. Swaminathan for a long time since his scholarship in the Agricultural College in Coimbatore where I was also a student about sixty years ago. When he completed his agricultural education, he got selected to the Indian Police Service. At that time he had also a scholarship to go abroad for training, and I advised him not to accept the IP job but to go in for the technical training. And we know how he has come out with high credentials everywhere. He is a clever agricultural scientist. I would like to illustrate this. I know late Dr. C. V. Raman whom we all admired. The late Shri C. V. Raman was a shrewd judge of men. I introduced Dr. Swaminathan to Sir C. V. Raman once at one of the Academy meetings. Dr. Raman invited him for a lecture at the annual Academy meeting in Bangalore. Since then—that was about 15 years ago—so long as he was alive, Dr. Raman used to invite Dr. Swaminathan at every meeting and asked

him to talk about his work, which he did, and it was very much appreciated. It is possible that people might commit mistakes. After all, human weakness is everywhere. Let us not in our anxiety deploring the sad demise of a good scientist, Dr. Shah, try to condemn people without proper scrutiny or examination. That is my only wish. Thank you.

SHRI FAKHRUDDIN ALI AHMED As Dr. Ramiah has already elaborated the procedure under which recruitment to the ICAR and the IARI are made, I would only touch upon this point very briefly. Before the year 1966 recruitment was done through the Public Service Commission, and it was only from the year 1966, after examining the discontent which prevailed in the institution, that it was decided that the appointments to the ICAR and the IARI should be made by a Selection Committee composed of scientists, and it is since then that this procedure has been followed. And I have not been able to understand how, because the selection has been made in a particular case, either Dr. Swaminathan or Shri Menon is responsible for it. As already pointed out, the procedure is that we maintain a list of all experts in the various disciplines, and out of that list, the Chairman is selected by me out of three or four names suggested by the Director-General and then two names are added as Advisers. It is they who make the selection and on the basis of their report the appointment is made. We do not generally interfere with the recommendation made by the scientists in selecting a proper person for the appointment. I think those are matters which need not have been brought. So far as this case is concerned, we are very unhappy at the suicide of Dr. Shah, and I would like to confine myself to the letter which he has left. In his letter to Dr. Swaminathan to which a reference has been made repeatedly, Dr. Shah has raised three major questions. There are other secondary items which I do not like to discuss as I have no time. One is that the system of recruitment of ICAR requires a second look and, secondly, that he has some doubts about the way scientific inventions have been given prominence or otherwise relegated to secondary positions in IARI. I would like the hon'ble Members to realise that we have taken on hand scrutiny of both of these. As I reported, there is already a committee looking into the working of IARI, its achievements and shortfalls. The Committee consists of eminent scientists and we hope their report would be a cardinal assess-

ment of IARI and would lead to better results in future.

The second committee which has not yet been named, which I hope to constitute very shortly would look after the recruitment and other procedures and would be essentially manned by scientists. Some Members have impressed on the need for some Members of Parliament being associated with it. I honestly feel that it is not necessary because the problems that the scientists face would be known to them better but I would very much like to consider whether an academician or someone who has had vast administrative experience in the field of education or allied fields and who happens to be a Member of Parliament could also not be included as a member. I am making no promise because it is my intention to constitute mainly a committee of scientists who have administrative experience also for the purpose of going into the procedures of ICAR recruitment and personnel policy.

Thirdly, Dr. Shah has also made comments on the behaviour of Heads of Divisions in IARI and we shall also examine what new management practices should be introduced in the functioning of our institutes.

Mr. Deputy Chairman, you would appreciate that the three essential points contained in the letter of Dr. Shah have already been taken care of. Hon'ble Members have insisted that I must examine each sentence of the letter of Dr. Shah. I have examined but in view of the fact that these two Committees are going to examine the essential points of Dr. Shah's letter, would it be fair for me to go over the same matter again at this stage and prejudge the issues? Therefore, I would like that so far as the merit of the case is concerned, the implication of the letter is concerned, it is better that instead of our expressing our opinion we may leave these matters to be judged to be considered by the two Committees, one which is already functioning and the other one which I propose to set up in a very short time.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA . Mr. Ahmed, to be specific, what will be the terms of reference of the Committee? Kindly let us know whether it would look into the cases of supersession, illegal supersession and all that for the last two or three years or five years and the discontentment among the scientists. Would that Committee go into these things also?

SHRI FAKHRUDDIN ALI AHMED As I have already pointed out, one of the Committees is already going into the question of the working of the Institute and also the assessment of such work. This Committee will be set up in order to examine the recruiting procedure, and the amendments which are called for.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA Not that. The point that has been highlighted here is that there have been lot of illegal supersessions many people have been ignored and there is heart turning among the scientists. Would that be one of the terms of reference?

SHRI FAKHRUDDIN ALI AHMED It includes all the essential points.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA . There must be specific effort to see that it must go into reasons for discontentment among the scientists and to look into illegal supersessions, if any.

SHRI FAKHRUDDIN ALI AHMED My impression is that the working of the institution includes examination of discontent and if any clarification is called for we shall see what can be done. I was just trying to say that these are the main issues which have been raised in Dr Shah's letter. But I would like to point out one thing that a good deal has been said about Dr. Swaminathan. I would only like to point out after what has been said by Mr Shinde that it is not very fair that we should make allegations which are not based on actual facts. In other countries, whenever a scientist or any person receives an award the people are proud of that achievement. But in our country, instead of being proud, we are trying to make all kinds of wild allegations against the person, which are quite unjustified and quite uncalled for. I may inform the House that Dr Swaminathan has received awards not only in our country but also international awards. He is a scientist of great eminence and it will really break the heart of such a great scientist if we talk here in this manner. Not only this, I would like to point out that a letter was written by Dr Shah himself to Dr Swaminathan on the 30th March, 1972 and it will be of interest if I read out that letter.

"My dear Dr Swaminathan,

It was a unique experience to listen to your lecture entitled "Can we face a

widespread drought again without food imports?" on March 26, 1972. 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.

It was nice to see that maize crop also found its place in your analysis. It has been the concern of the maize scientists to look into the reasons of slow spread of HYV of maize. One of the reasons may be found in Table 8. There appears to be almost direct relationship between the price of the grain and the extent of coverage of area under high yielding varieties of a crop.

It may also be noted that despite the differences in the prices of wheat and maize the net increase in income per hectare under HYV were similar for both the crops. Obviously this is due to the fact that increase in per hectare production of maize over the package period was more than double that of wheat if we consider that the increase was entirely due to HYV. Wheat is also a longer duration crop than maize and is grown during a season which is relatively free from clouds and in which even maize crop gives higher yields as pointed out in your paper. It is also well-known that over 84 per cent of maize is grown as a rain fed crop while in wheat the area under irrigation is very high. We have been conducting some experiments under rain-fed conditions since 1970. The results obtained may be of interest to you and may find place along with data on other crops reported in Table 13.

We, the maize scientists, would very much like to have your guidance in re-orienting our research programmes to give an added impetus to the high yielding variety programme with maize. I hope that we will have such opportunity during the ensuing Annual Workshop to be held in Delhi from April 10 to 13.

With very best regards."

Therefore, so far as Dr Swaminathan is concerned Dr Shah had nothing against him. On the other hand, he respected him as a great scientist and as one who was of great assistance and help to him in his work as a maize specialist in the Institute.

Now, Mr. Misra also raised the question of Dr Rajat De and he tried to point out that a person who was not qualified, was appointed Professor. Now, Dr Rajat De had done his M. Sc. and Ph. D both from the Faculty of Agriculture with specialisation in some aspects of production physiology. Dr Rajendra Prasad had done his Master's Degree in Soil Science and Ph. D in Agronomy. The science of Agronomy is a broad-based science and an Agronomist might have specialised in any of the various branches such as farm management, soil and fertiliser, crop physiology, etc. Some of the prominent internationally recognised Agronomists in the country like Dr Raheja, Dr Mirchandani, Dr Anant Rao and Dr. Gautam had done their Ph. D. work in fields such as crop physiology, crop breeding, etc. as related agronomy. So, it was not that any special consideration was given to Dr Rajat De. There have been precedents before and agronomy is a wide subject which includes many things such as soil science, fertiliser, crop physiology, etc. Therefore, I think there was nothing wrong in the preference of Dr De for appointment as Professor. I think first of all he got appointment through the Public Service Commission as an Agronomist and ever since he had been doing that work, and he was considered as such. Now, in the letter left by Dr Shah the names of some scientists have been mentioned. Those scientists have been requested to indicate the kind of difficulties they are facing. Dr Shah mentioned that some of the scientists are facing difficulties. So a letter has been addressed to all those persons and one of the scientists has replied and that reply has been received from Dr Bhardwaj, Agronomist and Principal Investigator, All India Coordinated Wheat Improvement Project. Dr Bhardwaj has requested that he may be given a higher post in view of his contributions to wheat agronomy. As far as the point made by Dr. Shah is con-

cerned, he has stated as follows —

"I would further like to point out that the second part of the statement 'are struggling hard against heavy onslaught—mentally as well as administratively'—is not applicable to me. I have always been bestowed with farms and appreciations from you and I am really thankful to you for that. Dr D. also has been very kind to me and has provided all the facilities I demanded. Therefore, I am dedicated to research even now with the same drive and energy as before."

He is one of the persons about whom Dr Shah mentioned that he had some grievances and so a letter was written to him and 'this is what he has said in reply to that letter. There are others—Dr Mahapatra, Dr Sadaphal, Dr. Dastane, Dr Pande. Letters have been written to them also and we expect that we shall get a reply from them. And we will look into what the difficulties are which have been mentioned in this letter. I would only like to point out that this is not the occasion when we should cast any reflection either on individuals or on the work done by the scientists for the simple reason that the entire matter is going to the two committees which will look into all these affairs, and after that hon. Members will have the opportunity of expressing their views, and whatever suggestions are made will be taken into consideration before we take a final decision in changing our organisation so far as the ICAR and the IARI are concerned.

MR DEPUTY CHAIRMAN The House stands adjourned till 11 A.M. tomorrow.

The House then adjourned at thirtythree minutes past six of the clock till eleven of the clock on Friday, the 19th May, 1972.