

[Prof. P. G. Mavalankar]

harassment must be looked into and action taken quickly to remedy the injustices.

Their next grievance is that college and university teachers including demonstrators, tutors, librarians, directors of physical education and instruction are not being given the UGC scales as recommended by the Sen Committee. It has been going on for the last four years; I am one of the witnesses and you were also one, to this matter. Some states have implemented the UGC scales and some others have not. The Finance Minister is not giving money to the Education Ministry which in turn is not able to allocate money to the UGC to be given to the professors and other teaching and other staff... (Interruptions). Apart from the state governments the central government must also take a share in this. Many states have not implemented the pay scales.

Their next demand is about managements. Many college and university, managements are far from democratic. The hon. Finance Minister himself was connected with a number of academic institutions like Charutar Vidya Mandal at Vallabh Vidyanagar and he knows the position. Managements are by and large far from satisfactory in their working. They are often arbitrary and undemocratic, and acts of nepotism are going on. I was myself a victim of this kind of undemocratic management, so I had to resign in 1968 after 19 years of teaching in the college at Ahmedabad. Managements are undemocratic and I had to resign because I said and insisted that the principal ought to be a member of the governing body. Even today principals are not members of the governing body. So the whole point is that college managements must be more democratic.

They also want statutory security of service and it must be given to all teaching and non-teaching staff. The teachers are also demonstrating for the retention of 10 plus 2 plus 3 system because they do not—I also do not—want students to become guinea-pigs of experimentation. Thousands and lakhs of students are involved and the government must take urgent, effective and purposeful action soon and sincerely. Prof. Chunder is a distinguished academician and knows about the problems of the academic community. As a professor myself, I am naturally concerned about all these matters. I feel that academic discontent should not be allowed to go on increasing because if it increases, it is good neither for anybody nor for democracy.

14.15 hrs.

(iii) REPORTED THREATS TO PRIME MINISTERS LIFE

SHRI VAYALAR RAVI: (Chiraymkil): It has been reported that some threatening letters are being received about the life of our hon. Prime Minister. There are organised sabotage activities in different parts of the country. There is one item published in Indian Express. There is a letter published in the Indian Express and it says 'disastrous consequences' will follow unless government heeded the demand of Anand Margis. That letter says that they will not spare even the life of the Prime Minister; it is a serious threat. Another letter published in Jaipur says that the Anand Marg takes upon itself the responsibility for the railway accidents; they are openly saying that they are behind that sabotage. This House is very much concerned with what steps the Government is going to take in this regard. Unfortunately, if we see the statements made by the hon. Home Minister and the Minister for External Affairs—one from Bombay and the other from Patna—we will find that they have been making only a political attack instead of finding the real culprits. The Minister for External

Affairs, when he made a statement in Patna, even after these open letters of threat, had gone to the extent of patting the Anand Margis instead of condemning the letters. That is what I could sense. And in Bombay, the hon. Home Minister, when he made a statement never made any attempt to condemn this kind of activities. He did not make a categorical statement there that he will book the culprits.

Sir it may not be out of place to mention another very important and interesting thing which has appeared in a weekly called 'Organiser', which nobody has raised so far, but which is a political attack on the Prime Minister. It says:

"The question, therefore, arises, why did the pilot try to land at Jorhat as scheduled? Perhaps, because he wanted to stick to the schedule and not cause the cancellation of any engagements of the Prime Minister. However, safety is vastly more important than any engagements."

This is a political attack on the Prime Minister. This House and the country is very much concerned about the life of the Prime Minister. It is not a matter of right for anybody to make such a threat to the life of the Prime Minister and it has to be dealt with properly by the Government with all the powers it has.

14.18 hrs.

MOTION RE. STATEMENT ON "SAMACHAR" BY THE MINISTER OF INFORMATION AND BROADCASTING. .contd.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Now we shall take up the next item viz., submission to the vote of the House of the substitute motion moved by Shrimati Parathi Krishnan. Do you want to press it?

SHRIMATI PARVATHI KRISHNAN (Coimbatore): Yes.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Now, I shall put the substitute motion No. 5 moved by Shrimati Parvathi Krishnan to the vote of the House.

The motion was put and negatived.

14.19 hrs.

STATUTORY RESOLUTION RE. DISAPPROVAL OF THE BANKING SERVICE COMMISSION (REPEAL) ORDINANCE, 1977
 AND
 BANKING SERVICE COMMISSION (REPEAL) BILL—contd.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Now we shall take up further discussion of the following Resolution moved by Shri Saugata Roy on the 29th November, 1977, namely:—

"This House disapproves of the Banking Service Commission (Repeal) Ordinance, 1977 (Ordinance No. 10 of 1977) promulgated by the Vice-President discharging the functions of the President on the 19th September, 1977." and

further consideration of the following motion moved by Shri H. M. Patel on the 29th November, 1977, namely:—

"That the Bill to repeal the Banking Service Commission Act, 1975 be taken into consideration."

DR. MURLI MANOHAR JOSHI (Almora): Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir I rise to support the Banking Service Commission (Repeal) Bill, 1977 and oppose the resolution placed by Shri Saugata Roy before this House. When I was listening to the debate and especially the points raised by my friends on the Congress side, I was surprised to find some very interesting remarks. I expected some more serious points and objections against this Bill, which I failed to discover anywhere in this debate. One of the friends on the other side had argued