

this. First you have to have a job because the preparatory move has to be made, the plans have to be prepared, the project has to be made, orientation has to be given to certain policies and so on. So it is only thereafter..... (Interruptions) I will give an example here. Somebody said that he expected to manufacture 300 cars in one year. So, a friend of his went to him after two days and asked him "where are the two cars because you said you would manufacture 300 cars which means one car per day or so. Therefore, you should have manufactured two cars in two days".

SHRI RAGAVALU MOHANARANGAM: But one year has passed after the Janata Party assumed office.

SHRI SHANTI BHUSHAN: So, the preparatory work has to be done first. Thereafter, the results have to come. But the results will come surely and definitely. There is no reason to doubt that.

THE MINISTER OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS AND LABOUR (SHRI RAVINDRA VARMA): Sir, time may be extended for discussing this Bill. This can be taken up next day.

SHRI VASANT SATHE: Sir, what practice you are following? Every time you say we can continue next day.

SHRI SAUGATA ROY: Every time you say next session. (Interruptions)

SHRI RAVINDRA VARMA: Shri Mavalankar had asked a specific question whether his half-an-hour discussion would be taken up at 5.30 and in answer, he was assured by the Chair that it would be taken up at 5.37. Therefore, I thought, I should remind hon. Members that since his half-an-hour discussion has to be taken up and the Speaker has given

a commitment for that, the only answer would be to extend the time for this Bill and take it up next time. Some other hon. Members also want to speak on the Bill.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We will take it up next time.

इस को दूसरे दिन लेंगे ।

श्री यमुना प्रसाद शास्त्री : मान्यवर, इस का समय बड़ा बीजिये ।

समापति महोदय : ठीक है, इसको अगले दिन लिया जायगा । अब मैं हाफ-एन-आवर डिस्कशन के लिये बुलाता हूँ ।

17.41 hrs.

HALF-AN HOUR DISCUSSION

INDO-US SUB-COMMISSION ON EDUCATION AND CULTURE

MR. CHAIRMAN: The House will now take up half-an-hour discussion to be raised by Prof. Mavalankar.

PROF. P. G. MAVALANKAR (Gandhinagar): Mr. Chairman, Sir, I am compelled to initiate this half-an-hour discussion on an important subject concerning the relationship between our country and United States of America and the reasons that compelled me are somewhat personal, but predominantly of a public nature.

Although I am bound to say at the very outset that I also wish to raise certain other procedural matters including matters about composition of Commissions and sending members of the Commissions to various countries—in this case to America—for the benefit and advantage of India, I am raising this half-an-hour discussion for the simple reason that I feel distressed and disturbed that the Education Minister, my distinguished and good friend, Dr. Chunder, should have chosen to give an inaccurate, evasive and misleading answer to my specific Unstarred Question on the very first day when we met for the Monsoon session, Monday, the 17th

[Prof. P. G. Mavalankar]

July, 1978. Apart from that as I said, a number of important issues involving Indo-US relations need to be further elaborated, and because the answer is inadequate and evasive therefore, I feel the discussion is all the more necessary.

I am sorry to point out to this House the manner in which the Minister of Education went about replying to my original question. I want this House to know not only with regard to this question, but many questions put by Members of Parliament how bureaucracy very clearly either avoids answering, evades answering or sometimes deliberately proceeds by giving fewer facts in the hope that perhaps the Member who asked the question is not in possession of full facts. This is how it is done. Many times, these bureaucrats and their bosses, the Ministers, go scot free because Members are unable to go into every aspect of the matter and point out to the Speaker or to House that answer to such and such question is incomplete, inadequate and misleading.

SHRI HARI VISHNU KAMATH (Hoshangabad): They have made it a fine art.

PROF. P. G. MAVALANKAR: Yes, they have made it a fine art and I am sorry that Dr. Chunder should have allowed himself to be so misled by officials of the Ministry of Education, cratic procedure in general and I am not speaking about this or that person, I am speaking about the bureaucracy as a whole, and the bureaucratic procedure is general and I am taking advantage of this point for making this important proposition that the Parliament is taken for a ride by these officers and unless we are awakened to our responsibility and privileges, I do not know where we will go.

The Minister of Parliamentary Affairs was good enough to suggest that I should begin my discussion at the right time; I hope, he will lend me his ears also and listen to this point which I am making.

The whole purpose of Parliament, and particularly the whole purpose of question hour is lost if answers are either evasive, misleading, inadequate or sometimes deliberately misleading. I am charging the Minister of Education that he has deliberately misled. Kindly see how it has happened. I was asking a question about Indo-US Sub-Commission on Education and Culture, and before I could go into it and the history of it in a minute of two, let me point out how the answer was given I was asking in that question. Unstarred Question No. 46 on the very first day of the Monsoon session, 17th July at (d) whether all those persons who were invited to go to New York for the purpose—which means the meeting of the Indo-US Sub-Commission on Education and Culture on May 15th and 16th, 1978—and who actually attended were full members of the said Sub-Commission. ~~We~~ this very straight and simple question—I hope I don't have to repeat the question; it is simply worded—what did the Minister reply? I asked: "Whether all those who were invited to go to New York for the purpose and who actually attended, were full members of the said Sub-Commission", and the answer given was: "The composition of the Members of the Indian delegation is decided before the meeting." I am asking something, and I am getting something totally different, I never asked him how it was composed. I asked whether they were full members of the Indo-U.S. Sub-Commission on Education and Culture. And instead of saying yes or no, or partly-yes and partly-no, or partly-yes and substantially—no, the reply says: "The composition of the Members of the Indian delegation is decided before the meeting." Is that the answer?

Again, I asked: "Who selected the Indian delegates and on what criteria?" Look at the answer: "Composition of the Indian delegation was decided by the Minister of Education, Social Welfare and Culture, in consultation with Minister of External Affairs and Dr. M. S. Gore, co-Chairman of Indo-U.S. Sub-Commission on Education and Culture." But I asked him, "On what criteria?" He has conveniently not replied to that aspect either.

Do we want that this House should be treated in this fashion? This House is being replied to in this form, i.e. evasively. You will see that the Indo-U.S. Joint Commission was established on 28th October, 1974. I had asked a question, an Unstarred Question No. 5251 on 28th July, 1977 to which, on behalf of the Minister of External Affairs, the Minister of Parliamentary Affairs and Labour laid a statement on the Table of the House on that day. In that statement, it was said that the Indo-U.S. Joint Commission was established on 28th October 1974 and then, three sub-commissions were established, viz. (1) Indo US Sub-Commission on Education & Culture, (2) Indo-US Sub-Commission on Science & Technology and (3) Economic and Commerce Sub-Commission.

When the Janata Party came to power, they decided—and perhaps in a way rightly so—because when a new Government comes to power it has its rights—to change the composition of the Sub-Commission on Education & Culture. Mrs Gandhi's Government had appointed certain types of academicians and a few Members of Parliament to these 3 sub-commissions. The Janata Government dissolved those 3 sub-commissions and re-appointed their personnel. The Minister gave a reply to my Unstarred Question on 28th July, 1977. I am quoting from it:

"The present composition of the Indian side of the Educational and

Cultural Sub-Commission is as follows:

Prof. M. S. Gore, Leader, Prof. P. G. Mavalankar, MP and Director of the Harold Laski Institute of Political Science, Prof. A. N. Bose, Vice-Chancellor of Jadavpur University, Prof. M. N. Srinivas of the Institute of Social and Economic Change, Prof. Raj Krishna of the Delhi School of Economics, Prof. Manzur Alam of Asmanfa University, apart from officials."

Thus, the sub-commission consisted of 6 members, i.e. 5 others and myself. And at the invitation of the Janata Government, I joined it. The Prime Minister's office, as also the offices of the Ministers of External Affairs and of Education contacted me at Ahmedabad a few days before a meeting was to be held in New Delhi. I accepted the invitation. That meeting took place on the 25th and 26th May 1977 in Delhi, because this Commission meets annually, once in New York and the next time in New Delhi. But I was surprised when I found the actual composition of the team which went to New York for the annual meeting held there in May this year.

Mr. Chairman, I am the last man to go begging to anybody asking for any favour, much less to a Minister, and much less for going abroad etc

I am not interested in it. I am a non-conformist. But my point is that I would have been satisfied if the Indo-US Sub-Commission on Education and Culture's meeting at New York had been attended by full members of the Sub-Commission. Instead of that, what the Government of India did was—my charge is—that they only sent Prof. Gore, the Chairman, and four out of five others, who attended the New York meeting, had nothing to do with the Delhi meeting of May, 1977.

[Prof. P. G. Mavalankar]

Now, when we attended the Delhi May 1977 meeting, we were not told that we were members of a delegation; we were invited as members of the Indo-US Sub-Commission on Education and Culture; and having been so invited, we naturally thought that it would be there at least for a year or two or three, whatever it may be. Instead of that, what the Minister had done was: he said that he had done it in consultation with the Foreign Minister. I have nothing to say against any individual. But my charge is that these commissions have been slighted. We have been insulted as members. As I said, I do not mind whether I go or not. If I have to die after 30 years or 40 years and if I do not go to America at all, I just would not care, because to go to America or any foreign country is not important; but the important thing is how you treat the members of a commission appointed by the Government, particularly if they happen to be Members of Parliament. Is that the way of treating Members of Parliament and the members of this commission? That is my point.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You have to conclude.

PROF. P. G. MAVALANKAR: It so happens, Sir, that there are only three Members wishing to ask questions and one of them Mr. Kachwal is absent. Therefore, I may be given some more time. My point is that the American Delegation attended those four meetings in 1975, 1976, 1977 and 1978 and by and large they remained the same.

MR. CHAIRMAN: How many people from America attended the meetings?

PROF. P. G. MAVALANKAR: If you want me to give the exact number, in 1977, there were nine full-fledged members accompanied by a few official observers whereas in the 1978 meeting in New York, there were I

believe, 11 full-fledged members of the United States team. But the more important point is—that is why I want to raise this discussion—that the American delegation consisted of some of the outstanding scholars and academicians of the United States. They were: (1) Dr. Franklin Long, who is the Henry Luce Professor of Science and Society, Cornell University, Ithaca, New York; (2) Dr. Eleanor B. Sheldon; she is the President of Social Science Research Council, New York; (3) Dr. Edward C. Dimock, Jr. President, American Institute of Indian Studies, University of Chicago, Chicago, Illinois; and (4) Mr. Phillips Talbot, President, the Asia Society, New York. These four persons attended the May 1977 meeting in Delhi and the same four persons also attended the May 1978 meeting in New York. This is the treatment given by the Americans to this Sub-Commission. But the Government of India, in order to patronise certain individuals—I charge them of political corruption, nepotism and also favouritism for this—instead of sending the right type of persons and advancing and enhancing the nation's interest, they went on thinking that this was the opportunity of sending one or two or more individuals of their liking to a foreign country at the cost of the tax-payers' money. That is my charge.

Therefore, I conclude that if this is going to happen, then Mr. Chairman, what will happen is that there will be no continuity. Dr. Chandra must remember that after all there is something like continuity of membership. If American side has continuity of membership in terms of such distinguished personnel, can we not have some kind of respect for continuity? You may select whom you like. If you like you may—because of this discussion today—remove my name from the Commission. I do not mind.

There are many more people who are intelligent than I. But the whole point is that continuity must be maintained and the American Delegation has not only maintained continuity, they have also seen to it that important academicians and distinguished people are included; and by rotation, only two or three or four of them retire every three years at any given time so that the majority of members remain there for quite some time. So, to conclude, my point is that educational, economic, cultural, scientific and academic, all these aspects are involved, as far as this Indo-US Sub-Commission on Education and Culture is concerned. My feeling is that if India and America have to come closer, they will not be able to come closer because they are having political agreements; political agreements and political disagreements can be varied and they can also change. Sometimes you agree; sometimes you do not agree. What is important, however, is that democratic dissenting, cultural trends, events and individuals in America and their counterparts in India must be able to meet one another regularly, continuously. That is not done. If that is not done, to that extent you are sabotaging the whole system, the whole idea of the joint commission which was set up in 1974. It is not a matter of delegation composition, and who went and who did not. We in this country have to rise above certain considerations of favouring this person and not favouring that person. We should go by the interests of the nation, and we must see to it that the American people respond to this very well. Dr Chunder should remember this point. He may be angry with me today, because my business is to speak the truth as I see it. If the Americans see that we are treating this in a light manner, we are doing it in a bureaucratic fashion, they will do the same and they will also send American bureaucrats and not their distinguished American scholars like those I have mentioned. We want cultural exchanges and educational exchanges

between American and India to grow in a meaningful way. I told them at the last year's May meeting here in Delhi that not only must Americans come to India, a sizable number of Indian scholars and academicians must also as of right go to America; it is not only that America has to give to India, India also has something to give to America.

THE MINISTER OF EDUCATION, SOCIAL WELFARE AND CULTURE (DR. PRATAP CHANDRA CHUNDER): The learned Professor Mavalankar who referred to my written answer has not only rejected my answer but also used very strong words against me by commenting that the answer was inaccurate, evasive, misleading, deliberately misleading, all these strong words have been used. Of course so far as inadequacy is concerned, it is a matter of opinion. When the learned professor criticises my answer he must be aware of facts; whether he is aware of facts, that is the first test to which he must submit himself. He himself has admitted that in many cases Members are not aware of facts. Here also I respectfully submit that he is not aware of facts. This sub commission—for the matter of that, the joint commission itself, is not a constitutional body nor is it a statutory body. It is created purely by an executive order of the government. I really play second fiddle here. The real player in this matter is the External Affairs Minister. There are other sub commissions also connected with industry, commerce, etc. Education sub commission is only one of the sub commissions. I the part also, each time a meeting was held the sub commission was constituted. The first meeting was held in 1975 and it consisted of 13 members. In the next year the second meeting was held in New York. The first meeting was in New Delhi and more people could be associated with it here. But when there is a question of holding a meeting in a foreign country, there is the question

[Dr. Pratap Chandra Chunder]

of finance also. So 13 could not be sent; for that purpose a new composition was made and the second meeting was held in New York in 1976. Only five had been sent there. Some new comers were there and some old people were also there. Similarly, when in 1977 we had come to office, this sub-Commission was reconstituted and there were 14 members to attend the meeting in Delhi. There were some observers also.

18.00 hrs.

Now when the fourth meeting was held in New York this year, naturally the number had to be reduced and the number was finally reduced to six. I do not know why Prof. Mavalankar has made a charge because he has said that this should not have been done. I would have understood if it was a Constitutional body or a statutory body and there could have been a charge that we have violated the provision of the Constitution or statute. This is entirely a body which is created by an executive choice

Now he has spoken of patronising, etc. May I ask Prof. Mavalankar how he was selected? It was I who had selected him. There are hundreds of M.P.s. There are thousands of professors in the country. I had selected him because I have regard for him. Therefore, he cannot complain if this year I have selected a few more, keeping in view some of the requirements of that particular meeting. I do not know how he could complain against me. These others were selected this year in the same manner as Prof. Mavalankar had been selected. (*Interruptions*) He does not know facts. Therefore, he is criticising. It is based on executive order. I made it clear when he raised this question. I sent my submissions to the hon. member. Still he is raising this contention. So, I respectfully submit that we are very conscious of the fact that there should be proper selection and proper representation. I should think that Prof.

Mavalankar is not competent to judge the competence of others who have been selected.

PROF. P. G. MAVALANKAR: He has not replied to my points at all. He has not told what happened in the meeting. Also, how many of those who went to New York were Members of the Sub-Commission?

DR. PRATAP CHANDRA CHUNDER: I have said that decisions will be laid on the table of the House.

As far as my note goes, he has not mentioned that. But in reply to a question I have said that the details of decisions will be laid on the table. Summary of the decision taken will be laid on the table

PROF. P. G. MAVALANKAR: What is the criteria of selection?

DR. PRATAP CHANDRA CHUNDER: In a subjective choice what could be the criteria? We have decided on our own and the same criteria is there that enabled me to select Prof. Mavalankar. With that criteria others have been selected. There is no other criteria

Hon. lady Member has put a question. In reply I may mention that we had selected:

Dr. M. S. Gore—Co-Chairman

SHRI R. N. Mirdha—Deputy Chairman of the other House. He is the President of the Museum Sub-Committee. He is the Chairman of Lalit Kala Academy.

Dr. C. N. Eaksar—Retired Professor, Chemistry.

Shri A. S. Gill—Additional Secretary, Deptt. of Culture.

Shri M. V. Desai—Director, Indian Institute of Mass Communication.

and Smt. S. Kochar—Secretary,
I.C.C.R.

They attended. Two others could not attend. One was a professor of Ravindra Bharat University. He is the Head of the Bengali Department of Literature. He is expert in Drama and there was a possibility of having some talk or exchanges in dramatic arts.

MR. CHAIRMAN: He wants to get some clarification regarding continuity.

DR. PRATAP CHANDRA CHUNDER: I explained it. Each time it is selected. Therefore, there is no question of continuity. It is an *ad hoc* appointment and *ad hoc* selection.

SHRIMATI AHILYA P. RANGNEKAR (Bombay North-Central): When are the members selected? Are there any permanent members?

DR. PRATAP CHANDRA CHUNDER: Members of the Sub-Commission are selected before the meeting of the Sub-Commission. There is no continuity. There is no permanency. There is no question of full members, half members or other sort of members.

PROF. P. G. MAVALANKAR: I was there for two days—25th and 26th May.

DR. PRATAP CHANDRA CHUNDER: That may be so.

श्री बुधराज (कटिहार) : सभापति महोदय, भारत और अमरीका के बीच सहयोग के लिए शिक्षा और संस्कृति के एक उप-आयोग की बैठक अभी न्यूयार्क में हुई। हमारी ओर से बहाने प्रतिनिधि गये और अमरीका के प्रतिनिधि संभव से मिले। उन में वैज्ञानिक और सांस्कृतिक मामलों पर चर्चा हुई और इस सम्बन्ध में भी बातचीत हुई कि किस तरह से विज्ञान और सहयोग का मार्ग अधिक

से अधिक प्रवृत्त किया जा सकता है। पिछले वर्ष मई में सब-कमीशन की बैठकें हुई और उन में इन तीन विषयों पर तीन सेमिनार करने का प्रस्ताव स्वीकृत हुआ था : यूनिवर्सिटी रिसर्च, साइंस रिसर्च इन एजुकेशन और लनिन्ग एंड एथनिक मोबलाइजेशन इन कल्चरली डाइवर्स सोसायटीज। इस के प्रतिरिक्त फ़ैलागिन्ग, संग्रहालयों, प्रदर्शनिया आदि भाषी हित के विषयों पर गोष्ठियाँ आयोजित करने का कार्यक्रम बनाया गया।

हमारा देश संसार का सब से बड़ा लोकतांत्रिक देश है। उसकी तरफ से एजुकेशन और कल्चर के सम्बन्ध में जो प्रतिनिधि बहाने गये, हम ने उन पर लाखों रुपये खर्च किये। मगर हमारे प्रतिनिधि हमारी भाषा की यथास्थितिवादी शिक्षा के पृष्ठपोषक थे। स्थिति यह है कि हम न तो अपने देश में और न विदेशों में अपनी सही भावना का प्रतिनिधित्व कर पाते हैं।

मैं यह जानना चाहता हूँ कि मई, 1977 में सब-कमीशन की बैठक में जो प्रस्ताव पारित हुआ, उसको कार्यान्वित करने के लिए क्या कार्यवाही की गई है और इस बार जो प्रस्ताव पारित हुआ, उसके सिलसिले में क्या प्रगति हुई है।

DR. PRATAP CHANDRA CHUNDER: I respectfully submit that this question does not arise from the question which was originally put. He wants to know how far the old decisions have been implemented. If the hon. member puts a separate question. I will certainly answer it.

SHRI C. K. CHANDRAPPAN (Cannanore): I may say at the outset that while giving reply, the hon. Minister took it very subjectively and he replied in anger.

DR. PRATAP CHANDRA CHUNDER: Where is anger?

PROF. P. G. MAVALANKAR: I am not angry with the Minister. In fact, I love him. But I am angry at the procedure adopted.

SHRI CHITTA BASU: Because the Minister treated him as a casual labourer.

SHRI C. K. CHANDRAPPAN: When Prof. Mavalankar asked whether this membership was only for those two days of the meeting, the Minister said, it may be so. I am very much surprised at that answer. The Committee may not be a statutory committee, the Committee may not be a committee of the type which the Minister mentioned but the Committee was constituted with a certain purpose, with eminent people in the list. And the Minister said that they were selected on the basis of certain criteria. Now, you are selecting a delegation to go abroad to function as members of the Committee, to participate in the discussion. I think it would have been proper if those members could have been consulted — if it is not obligatory, it may be important—whether they would be available to go. That should have been ascertained. I think, in this case, it was not done. I do not know in what way these persons are more eminent than those who were already there. Here, two members resigned. One was already abroad and he was included. Another member, Mr. Ghosh, did not attend because of short notice. Why did the Minister take this trouble of informing somebody at short notice? When some people were associated with it, whether it is Mavalankar or somebody else, that is a different matter, they should have been given certain consideration. And there is no use getting angry over that point.

MR. CHAIRMAN: He said that it was not only one man but he had given consideration to six persons.

SHRI C. K. CHANDRAPPAN: If you compare only Mr. Gore and Mrs. Kochhar were the only two from

the earlier commission. What was the criteria in selecting these people? In what way they were more eminent than those who were already there? Who selected them? Whether there was any pressure from outside over the bureaucrats? That is something important to be looked into.

I would like him to reply dispassionately. I am not angry with you and you need not be angry with me.

DR. PRATAP CHANDRA CHUNDER: All these months I have been answering so many questions and meeting all situations. I have never been angry. I have stressed certain points and submitted them with some sort of emphasis. I most respectfully request my hon. friends not to interpret it as a sign of anger.

However, as I have already explained, the selections are made ad hoc in respect of a particular sub-commission, and this has been the practice. There are four sub-commissions of which this Education-Culture is one. It is wrong to say that there was any pressure from outside. We judge the requirement of a particular meeting and then we decide who could be suitable for the purpose.

12.14 hrs

CALLING ATTENTION TO MATTER OF URGENT PUBLIC IMPORTANCE

DECISION TO CLOSE DOWN REHABILITATION DEPARTMENT

SHRI CHITTA BASU (Barasat): I call the attention of the Minister of Works and Housing and Supply and Rehabilitation to the following matter of urgent public importance and request that he may make a statement thereon:

"The reported decision of the Government to close down the Rehabilitation Department despite the protests of the Governments of West Bengal and Tripura."