

इन्वेस्टमेंट है, सरकार की तरफ से जो निवेश है, उसे दुगुना करना पड़ेगा। मान्यवर, जो विधेयक है, यह ठीक है कि इस विधेयक में सरकारी नियंत्रण को कम करने की कोशिश की गई है, परंतु इस विधेयक में सबसे बड़े आश्चर्य की बात यह है कि इसमें विद्यार्थी परिषद की बात तो कही गई, लेकिन विद्यार्थी परिषद का जो कॉन्स्टीट्यूशन है, उसकी जो संरचना है, वह ऐसी संरचना है कि उसमें विद्यार्थी समूह का कोई प्रतिनिधित्व नहीं होता है। हम लोग यह शुरू से मानते रहे हैं और आज भी कि जब तक यहां विद्यार्थी छात्र संघों की स्थापना नहीं होगी, छात्र संघ स्थापित नहीं होंगे, विद्यार्थियों को अपना संघ, अपना संगठन, बनाने की छूट नहीं होगी, तब तक हम विश्वविद्यालय के अंदर कैसे एक स्वस्थ और शैक्षणिक वातावरण का निर्माण कर सकते हैं। उसमें केवल यह कोशिश की गई कि केवल बीस विद्यार्थी, विश्वविद्यालय की जो कौंसिल होगी, उस कौंसिल में जो दूसरे लोगों का जो प्रतिनिधित्व होता है, उसमें विद्यार्थियों का भी प्रतिनिधित्व हो जाए, यह ठीक बात है, परंतु मैं चाहता हूं कि छात्र संघ की स्थापना अलग से होनी चाहिए और छात्रों को यह अधिकार होना चाहिए कि वे अनिवार्य सदस्यता के आधार पर अपना चुनाव कराएं, लोकतांत्रिक तरीके से अपना चुनाव कराएं। अगर इस प्रकार की प्रक्रिया नहीं होगी, तो जो हम कहना चाहते हैं कि डेमोक्रेटाइजेशन, स्वायत्तता, लोकतंत्रीकरण और उसी के साथ ही साथ जो शिक्षा की गुणवत्ता बढ़ाने की बात कही जाती है, हम उस लक्ष्य को प्राप्त नहीं कर सकते हैं। इसलिए मेरा यह कहना है कि यह जो सुझाव है, उस सुझाव को भी इस विधेयक में शामिल किया जाए, इन्हीं शब्दों के साथ मैं अपनी बात खत्म करना चाहता हूं। बहुत-बहुत धन्यवाद।

MESSAGES FROM LOK SABHA

The Metro Railways (Amendment) Bill, 2009

SECRETARY-GENERAL : Sir, I have to report to the House the following messages received from Lok Sabha, signed by the Secretary-General of Lok Sabha :

"In accordance with the provisions of rule 96 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in Lok Sabha, I am directed to enclose the Metro Railways (Amendment) Bill, 2009, as passed by Lok Sabha at its sitting held on the 24th February, 2009."

Sir, I lay a copy of the Bill on the Table.

STATUTORY RESOLUTION

Disapproving the Central Universities Ordinance, 2009 (No.3 of 2009) and the Central Universities Bill, 2009 *Contd*

SHRI N.K. SINGH (Bihar): Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, first of all, let me begin by complimenting the hon. Minister and the Department for fulfilling two important objectives. One key objective, is the Prime Minister's vision, the vision contained in the UPA Government's programmes, is of substantially improving access and quality higher education. To the extent that this proposed Bill begins to try and endeavour to fill these important gap in our education policy, they need to be complimented. But, let me also add the second compliment to the Ministry that out of the 15 important recommendations made by the Standing Committee on HRD, of which I have the privilege of being a Member under the distinct leadership and chairmanship of Shri Janardan Dwivedi, who

has now come to the House, they have been kind enough to accept seven recommendations, leaving eight important recommendations largely untouched.

I realise, Sir, that this cannot be a debate on the future[^] of our education policy. Some other time, an opportunity would be needed it to be taken up for considering some of the broader issues which many of my colleagues have raised. I will raise two procedural points, one sharper point, and, eight small amendments.

First, the procedural point. Sir, other speakers and colleagues have pointed out somewhat – if I would not use the word, 'impropriety' – colourable use of the technique of an Ordinance on a matter which was pending before this House and had received the consideration of the Standing Committee that in disregard to the Standing Committee's recommendation, the Ministry thought it fit, for reasons which do not look now very convincing, to go ahead and adopt the ordinance route because, after all, I am not really wanting to accept some of the kind of things which have been in circulation in the press and elsewhere that it was done with a collateral purpose of laying foundation stones or making appointments to important offices for the transitional responsibilities.

Sir, I will not go into these allegations but then, I must point out that somewhat colourable use of the technique of an Ordinance on a matter which was pending before this House, which had received the consideration of the Standing Committee, and, that it was the unanimous view of the Standing Committee, which was exercised sufficiently to write a letter in protest against this procedure – somewhat unprecedented in the parliamentary history – to both the hon. Chairman and to the hon. Speaker. I leave that subject there for the time being, Sir.

The second issue, which I want to raise, is also somewhat a procedural issue. It looks somewhat extraordinary that only three universities were selected in the country for purposes of being converted into Central Universities. The least that could have been done is perhaps the Ministry could elaborate some transparent criterion, some means by which such universities are being picked and chosen because I really do believe that a Bill of this nature must contain some reference to a transparent criterion by which it does not leave the subsisting impression that we are picking and choosing on which ones to take, which States to take from, and, which are the ones which are to be favoured. I know that is something on which, they will not accept any change now but in the medium term, the Ministry might like to consider that.

Third, Sir, and, this is really something which has troubled me, I do believe, Sir, that looking at the broad vision which the Prime Minister has repeatedly outlined in his speech on what this country needs, not only improving access, improving quality, making India into a knowledge hub, catalysing the demographic differentials which we have, moving up the value-added change in terms of making an important contribution to global excellence. This Bill, Sir, afforded the Government an

unprecedented opportunity to break away from the old mindset, not to look at structures, which we have hitherto inherited; not to look at the same governance structure, the same kind of institutions which we have inherited, the same kind lack of autonomy which we have inherited, the same kind of a thing where in terms of research quality, we are not ranked really high up in the category of nations which may have talent but whose talent remains largely unutilised. Sir, for the broader issues of educational reforms, this was an opportunity, which has regrettably been missed. It was an opportunity.

Sir, I refer to the National Knowledge Commission. I know that this is not a very popular expression in the Ministry, but I do wish to seek your indulgence in reading something, with your permission, Sir, which the National Knowledge Commission commented, a commission of lot of independent experts, a commission appointed by the Prime Minister with great expectations of what it could do to catapult India into a real knowledge economy. What did that Commission have to say, Sir, on this Bill, and, with your permission, I read it. The National Knowledge Commission had described the proposed legislation on Central Universities as, "a danger to autonomy and excellence in higher education".

They go on to say, Sir, and again I quote, "The National Knowledge Commission is alarmed by provisions of the Central Universities Bill, 2008. This draft legislation, which vests overwhelming control with the Government, repeats earlier mistakes and compounds persistent problems of higher education in India, negates the letter and spirit of the essential recommendations contained in successive Commissions including the National Knowledge Commission". It ends by saying, "It represents a danger to autonomy and excellence". And, a danger to any desire on the part of the Government, "at arm's length from Government so that Universities have academic freedom and institutional autonomy to foster excellence". Sir, this is the background. Notwithstanding all this, today we are considering this Bill. I leave the judgement to my colleagues.

I now move on to, Sir, some very specific amendments which I have to bring to the Minister's kind notice. I know that she will not have the flexibility to accept even partially, much less, fully, but I am enjoined upon, Sir, with the privilege of having been in the Standing Committee to point out and bring to her kind notice only those which she has chosen to completely ignore. First, Sir, in terms of clause 6 (1) (i), there is no particular reason why the disciplines of Law and Agriculture have been left out. I realise Law is a separate discipline; I realise Agriculture is a separate discipline; and there are specialised universities. But when you are creating new Central Universities, these are the disciplines in which there is absence and shortage of talent in this country, and this is an area which she might like to consider. I then move on to the second 'one which is on clause 6 (xvii). It begins by saying, "to confer autonomous status". What the Standing Committee had said was based on certain parameters and conditions so that we circumscribe the conditions where we will really confer autonomous status. I move on, Sir, to the third amendment which I wish to submit for her

consideration which is in clause 6 (2) which says, "to maintain an all-India character and high standards of teaching and research", and, because the Standing Committee had suggested something, adopt innovative measures encompassing all aspects of academic programme for enhancing quality. That is something, Minister, which is pretty innocuous. It is not inconsistent with the objects and broad purpose of the Bill. And you could well have considered instead of having completely ignored that. I move on to the fourth important suggestion, Sir. This is something which my colleague has pointed out with great force and I go on to repeat that I also regard that just leaving the words "and other agencies" and not circumscribing it perhaps of its capability to be exploited by business and commercial interests to the detriment of the academic standards. That is something also Minister which was pretty innocuous, not inconsistent with the broad aims and objectives which could have had and you could have considered. I move on to the sixth suggestion which I had on clause 44. We realise, Sir, that there was a hurry. And that is why the Standing Committee had suggested that for the first appointment of the Chancellor, of the first Vice-Chancellor and to be appointed on the recommendation of the Visitor, instead of a normal five-year period, we would have perhaps gone into a three-year period which the Standing Committee had recommended, because the criteria by which we select will improve as it go on in time and, therefore, time taking it to a lower period, as suggested, would have been of value. My seventh suggestion, Sir, is that in terms of clause 44 (d), and I seek your permission to read that clause which says, "The first academic council shall consist of.." and I describe what it consists of. The suggestion of the Standing Committee would have said, "The eligibility conditions and qualifications for the first court, the first Executive Council and the first Academic Council shall be stipulated in the Statute of Rules". Surely, you would like to have good quality appointments; surely, you would like not to begin by circumscribing right from the beginning. I am sure, you would agree that you don't want to make them lame duck Central Universities by not selecting the best possible talent. That's not something which the Ministry would like to foster and that's why, I believe that what the Standing Committee had recommended would have made eminent sense for the Ministry to accept.

Finally, Sir, I come to the last small suggestion which is in terms of the Second Schedule appended to the Bill. It is in terms of clause 5 of the Bill which confers the power on the Visitor to really take action, by dismissing the Vice-Chancellor and other officials. The Standing Committee had recommended something quite innocuous that it should have said, "Provided that the Visitor in exercising such powers only in exceptional cases....." I want to emphasise the phrase 'in exceptional cases' to be inserted because it should not become a routine that everyday on some pretext or the other, the Visitor is advised to take such drastic action as removal of people who have been selected and appointed and the circumscribing of exceptional conditions would have been appropriate which the Standing Committee had recommended. And, that's something which I am sure you would like to give to those new Central Universities and also the kind of protection which they need to be able to function with the nature and objects that you have in mind.

Sir, these were my suggestions. I know that based on the conventions which this House has, none of them will be accepted. But, I am sure, perhaps the Minister would consider keeping some of these in mind as the policy evolves further and that you will give a thought to the broader issues of educational reforms and changes in our educational system which India deserves and which India needs not only to fulfil the vision which we commonly share, but also to be able to genuinely capitalise. As I said on the great comparative factor advantage which this country has is, in terms of its demographic differentials and in terms of the fact that by 2011, 785 million Indians will be in a working age group. I hope, we will be able to use this power to become the world's knowledge hub. But, for that, in the longer run, we need a different Bill and a different consideration of what you want the Central Universities to become. Thank you very much.

DR. JANARDHAN WAGHMARE (Maharashtra): Sir, I stand here to support the Central Universities Bill, 2009. Sir, the difference between the Central University and an affiliating university is, the affiliating university has many colleges attached to it and these affiliating universities are over-burdened. They have to spend their time, energy and money only on managing the colleges.

(THE VICE-CHAIRMAN, PROF. P. J. KURIEN, in the chair)

That's why, these affiliating colleges cannot give enough time for research. Central Universities are fortunate enough. A Central University is a unitary university. It does not have affiliated colleges and, therefore, it can give ample time for research. Teaching and research have been twin objectives of university education. Even Central Universities are not very serious about research. The word 'research' is, of course, mentioned here. But, there is no Board of Research included in this particular Bill. Therefore, we have to pay much more attention to research. Since we did not pay much attention to research, we had to establish national labs in the country. So, we have to be very keen about research. Sir, higher education has to be expanded. We spent many years on the expansion of education at all levels. Perhaps that was the need. But, now, we cannot ignore quality of education. Universities in the advanced countries are talking about total quality management.

And we have to bear in mind that quality has no alternative at all, and specially, in this global world, you require quality, and therefore, this quality has to be maintained at all levels of education, specially, at the level of higher education. Sir, I am going to make certain observations as well as certain suggestions also. For instance, in clause 6, courses of study of different branches of learning are mentioned. But some of the faculties or branches are not mentioned. For instance, Commerce Faculty is not mentioned, Law Faculty is not mentioned, Education is not mentioned. Management Sciences have become a very independent branch of knowledge these days. I would request the hon. Minister to include these faculties in that. Sir, in the same clause, the powers of the University are mentioned. There are certain things, perhaps, left out. So, the University should institute chairs

and chairs are very important. The University should have lecture series. That also is not mentioned. The University must have its own publications, books and research journals. Our people publish articles in foreign journals, but our own journals should be very, very standard, and we have to pay attention to that.

Sir, in this Bill, the Equivalence Committee is not mentioned. These Central Universities also have to give or recognise the courses of other universities, their degrees. So, that has to be there. Now, this particular Bill talks about extra mural studies, but there is no mention of the Board of Extra Mural Studies. Now, in this particular Bill, I would like to request the Minister to include the concept of academic audit. This concept of academic audit is very relevant today. It talks about the accountability of the teachers. In our universities, we have not nurtured the work culture. So, this work culture has to be created in the campus of the University. Sir, University officers have been enlisted in this particular Bill, specially, under clause 9. There are certain other officers who should be there. Perhaps, they may be appointed later on. For instance, there should be certain boards. The Students Council is mentioned, but about Dean of Students Council, some provision has to be made. There should be placement centres in every University so that you can, of course, give jobs to your own students. Therefore, there should be a Director of Placement Centres. Game and Sports are very important, but the Director of Game and Sports is not there. There should be an independent separate Board of Game and Sports in these Universities. Therefore, I would suggest that we will have to include in this particular Bill a Board of Game and Sports, Board of Extra Mural Studies, and Board of Examinations. Controller of Examinations is mentioned, but there should be a Board of Examinations. Academic Councils and Board of Studies have become very ineffective Bodies these days. Boards of Studies meet once or twice or thrice in a year and a few members come together, prescribe books, lay down certain syllabus, but that does not serve the purpose.

Development of curriculum is a continuous process in the University; otherwise, you cannot upgrade, update the syllabus in the University. There should be some such body; I may call it 'Board of College and University Planning and Development'. So, this could be considered. Research is mentioned, but there is no Board of Research. I think, this also needs to be considered. Now, the University has to build a number of buildings and roads. The Campus has to be developed. Building and Construction Committee should be there in this particular Bill.

Grievances Redressal Committee also is very important. So, these are some of the suggestions. Medium of instruction is not mentioned anywhere. Perhaps, English is supposed to be the medium of instruction. Since these are the Central Universities, they are teaching in both English and Hindi, languages. Because these are Central Universities, we have had a language policy. Kothari Commission was insistent on language policy. Three-language policy we have adopted. Unless we develop our own languages as vehicles of learning and knowledge, perhaps, always you will have to depend on English. English, of course, is a very important language. It has now great importance in

the whole globe, in the whole world, but we cannot afford to ignore our own languages. So, our Language Departments should be, really, very strong. Therefore, these are some of the suggestions. I will not take much of your time, but it is time to drop the affiliation system of education. Nowhere else in all advanced countries, you have affiliating system. You have to have autonomous colleges. We talk about autonomy on the one hand and on the other hand, our colleges are not ready to take autonomy. There is a contradiction in our academic life. Therefore, the number of autonomous colleges has to be increased. They had a certain plan, in the past, to increase the number of autonomous colleges. But teachers are reluctant. Teachers are reluctant even for reformation. Our Prime Minister talks about radical reforms in education. The Knowledge Commission also talks about it. But that radical reformation is not reflected in this particular Bill. If you could kindly consider all these things, all these suggestions, perhaps, this legislation will meet the challenges. Higher education has become a challenge these days. Thank you very much, Sir.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P. J. KURIEN): Thank you, Waghmareji. Shri D. Raja.

SHRI D. RAJA (Tamil Nadu): Thanks, Sir. This is a very important Bill and, in fact, all should have found more time, in a better atmosphere, to discuss this Bill. Due to constraint of time, I do not get into amendments. I associate myself with the amendments suggested by our esteemed colleague, Dr. N.K. Singh, and Comrade Sarkar.

Sir, having said this, I must point out that on such an important matter, Government should not resort to the Ordinance route. Our Parliament is a vibrant, functioning Parliament. These issues could have been discussed properly in the Parliament, instead of Government having taken the Ordinance route.

Then, coming to the Bill, Sir, as everybody has mentioned, the Bill talks about the gross enrolment ratio in higher education. That is number one point stated in the Statement of Objects & Reasons. It is, approximately, 11 per cent. It shows the weakness of our system. If you consider that higher education is the superstructure, I think, the base is school education where we have yet to do a lot more, to strengthen our primary education and secondary education. In fact, the commercialisation of education and the privatisation of education have become major threats to the educational system. And education has become the real field of struggle between haves and have-nots.

Even in America 98 per cent of the children go to Government schools. Only two per cent of the children go to private schools. In other developed countries like Britain, France, etc., the school system is supposed to be a strong one and you find there the common school system. In India, we don't have the common school system. We have been fighting for the common school system and we have been fighting for equal access to education for all children. I think, there are gaps and these

gaps will have to be bridged. If you think that higher education should be given thrust – higher education is the focus of the Eleventh Five Year Plan – if you want to succeed, you will have to strengthen primary education and secondary education. Otherwise, as the Bill says, if 11 per cent is the gross enrolment ratio, when you start one Central University in each State, you will not find any increase in the number of students coming to the universities. The very purpose of this Bill will not be served. Now you are starting one Central University in each State. It means that you need to get students for higher education. How do you get students if you don't strengthen primary education and secondary education? Now, the Government has given a promise. Many speakers have pointed out that six per cent of the GDP would be spent on education. When we questioned this, the reply that we got was that this would be done over the years and not in one go or in one year. Now the Government is completing its term; its term is coming to an end. What percentage of the GDP have you spent on education? I don't think it is more than four per cent. It may be less than four per cent. If that is so, what is the commitment of this Government to strengthening higher education? That is what I doubt.

I would like to draw the attention of the Minister to one problem. She is a more considerate Minister in the Government. There is one university, the University of Culture, Bhubaneswar. It is a premier University in the field of culture and art. But it is under the Government of Orissa. The University was started in 1999. Till now there is no permanent campus of its own. No permanent teaching faculties are appointed till now. The classes in the University are not regular, so also are the examinations and publication of results. Even the identity cards are not being issued to the students. There is corruption. I don't want to go into the issues of corruption and other things. But the students, boys and girls, don't have separate toilets. That is the condition of the University. It is aided by the UGC also. If that is so, what is the understanding of the Government in starting a number of Central Universities without providing the minimum facilities to the students? How to rectify this? That is where, I think, the Government needs to be more responsible.

Here, again, I would like to mention Mr. Singh has referred to that autonomy. Autonomy should be understood in a proper perspective. I can refer to a case in Coimbatore, Tamil Nadu. There are institutions of higher learning. They would try to become deemed universities. By becoming deemed universities, they try to become private universities. It is causing great concern for the teachers. How do you control this? It is not autonomy. It is a kind of authoritarianism on the part of the private institutions. How are you going to regulate them? How are you going to control them? It is a challenge. In the coming days you will be facing similar problems.

Coming to the teaching faculties, it should really be a matter of concern. In India, we claim that we are an emerging knowledge society; we are an emerging global knowledge power and every thing. But what about our teaching faculties?

I think the quality of teaching is not as good as it is there in several other countries. Here the

Government will have to consider developing a system of education, training and upgradation of teachers. In fact, there is a need for creating a kind of teaching cadres. For administration, we have IAS and for foreign services, we have IPS. But for teaching, we do not have such a teaching cadre policy. I am not proposing anything. The Government will have to apply its mind. If you ask me, I think, there is a need to create a kind of a teaching cadre and there is a need for continuous upgradation of teachers; otherwise, it would not serve the purpose of starting more number of universities.

So far as the Knowledge Commission is concerned, I differ from what Shri N.K. Singh has said. Whatever the Knowledge Commission has been proposing, we cannot agree with that. It is called Knowledge Commission, but what links they have got with the ground realities of the country! I have my own views. The Knowledge Commission proposes privatisation of universities and also privatisation of education. If the Planning Commission comes out with a proposal for privatisation, if the Knowledge Commission comes out with a proposal for privatisation, I do not know where the end is. Privatisation is not the answer. As a Welfare State, the Government has a responsibility to provide education to the people. So far as the Free and Compulsory Education Bill is concerned, why is there such a delay? Shri Arjun Singh is not here. He had written to me that the Bill would be taken up in the Winter Session. But the Winter Session has already gone. Now this Session is also going to end and we are going to have elections. That Bill will not see the light of the day. If that is the commitment, I very much doubt as to what will happen to this Bill also. When it becomes legislation, how far are we going to be successful?

So far as this Bill is concerned, clause 7 talks about the University open to persons of whatever caste, creed, race or class. It says, "Provided that nothing in this section shall be deemed to prevent the University from making special provisions for the employment or admission of women, persons with disabilities or of persons belonging to the weaker sections of the society and, in particular, of the Scheduled Castes, the Scheduled Tribes and the other socially and educationally backward classes of citizens". This is what the Bill says. But this very House, passed the SC and ST (Reservation of Posts and Services) Bill, which takes away reservation in 47 institutions; reservation so far given to SCs and STs. Now this Bill is pending before Lok Sabha. I would like to know how this Bill would be implemented. If that Bill is not rejected by Lok Sabha, this Bill will not stand. Already you have a legislation which takes away reservation from SCs and STs. What is the response of the Government? What is the answer of the Government? Are you going to stop that Bill? Are you going to stick to this Bill? These are all contradictory positions taken by the Government.

SHRI S.S. AHLUWALIA (Jharkhand): These are interlinked Bills.

SHRI D. RAJA: That is what I am asking. What will happen? You are saying that reservation will be provided. But a Bill has already been passed by this august House and it is pending before Lok

Sabha. I would like to know from the Government as to what is the real stand of the Government on reservation. Are you sticking to the reservation policy? Or are you saying good-bye to the reservation policy in order to leave the Dalits and Adivasis to be handled by the market forces or the forces of privatisation, neo-liberalism? This is a serious issue. I hope the hon. Minister would respond to these issues. Thank you.

श्री भगत सिंह कोश्यारी (उत्तराखंड): आदरणीय उपसभाध्यक्ष जी, आपने मुझे बोलने का अवसर दिया, इसके लिए धन्यवाद। मान्यवर, यह केंद्रीय विश्वविद्यालय विधेयक जो लाया गया है, इसके संबंध में मुझे हिंदी की एक कहावत याद आती है "देर आयद दुरुस्त आयद", लेकिन इसमें आधा ही सही है। इस विधेयक के बारे में मैं यह कह सकता हूँ कि "देर आयद", लेकिन कुल मिलाकर यह दुरुस्त नहीं आया। इसको जैसा आना चाहिए था, यह वैसा नहीं आया है। अभी हमारे एन.के. सिंह जी नॉलेज कमीशन के बारे में बोल रहे थे, उसके सुझावों के बारे में और उसके comments के बारे में बोल रहे थे। मैं उस कमीशन की रिपोर्ट को पढ़ रहा था और मुझे स्वयं आश्चर्य लगा और इस विधेयक में भी, और कहीं न कहीं हमारी स्टैंडिंग कमेटी की जो रिपोर्ट है, उसमें भी वर्णन किया गया है कि हमारे हिंदुस्तान में higher education में जो gross enrolment ratio है, वह केवल 11 परसेंट है, जबकि दुनिया में यह 56 परसेंट से भी ज्यादा है। इसलिए नॉलेज कमीशन ने कहा कि हमारे यहां ज्यादा universities होनी चाहिए। अभी केवल साढ़े तीन सौ हैं, कम से कम पंद्रह सौ universities इस देश में होनी चाहिए - यह नॉलेज कमीशन की रिपोर्ट है। हमारे केंद्र सरकार के मंत्री जी ने शायद यह कोशिश की कि उसकी ओर ध्यान दें, लेकिन मुझे कभी-कभी बहुत आश्चर्य लगता है, जब मैं 11 परसेंट जी.ई.आर. को देख रहा था, प्रवेश की स्थिति को देख रहा था, इसको पढ़ रहा था, तो मुझे लगा कि आखिर हमने ... अभी हमारे शिक्षा मंत्री यहां पर नहीं हैं, मैंने कभी उनके दर्शन भी नहीं किए। हो सकता है, बीमार हों, मैं नहीं जानता, लेकिन पब्लिक मीटिंग में वे दिखाई देते हैं, कुर्सी पर बैठकर जाते हुए दिखाई देते हैं। माननीय राज्य मंत्री जी यहां आ रही हैं, यह अच्छी बात है, कम से कम वे कुछ और अच्छा करेंगी, लेकिन मुझे लगता है कि आखिर Human Resource Development Minister बहुत हड़बड़ी में, बहुत जल्दबाजी में कि बिना हाउस में चर्चा किए हुए, इसको पास कराएं, इसके लिए वे अध्यादेश लेकर आए, तो जैसा कि अभी एन.के. सिंह जी बोल रहे थे, आखिर इतनी जल्दी क्या थी? मुझे बहुत अच्छा लगा कि मेरे यहां आपने गढ़वाल विश्वविद्यालय को केंद्रीय विश्वविद्यालय का दर्जा दिया। उसमें क्या कमी है, मैं उसके बारे में भी बोलूंगा, बहुत लंबा समय नहीं लूंगा, लेकिन आपने हेमवती नंदन बहुगुणा विश्वविद्यालय को केंद्रीय विश्वविद्यालय बना दिया, बहुत अच्छी बात है, लेकिन मंत्री जी ने क्या किया मेरे यहां एक विश्वविद्यालय बना दिया और मेरे प्रदेश की जो रीजनल भौगोलिक परिस्थिति है, उसमें जो दूसरा रीजन है कुमाऊं - वहां इतना असंतोष है कि वहां दूसरा विश्वविद्यालय - कुमाऊं विश्वविद्यालय, पिछले तीन महीनों से बंद है। वे कहते हैं कि एक बन गया, तो हमारा क्यों नहीं बना? अर्थात् एक प्रकार से जो विधेयक आप लाए, इस विधेयक को न तो आपने पूरी तरह सोचा, न समझा, न जिस प्रकार का... मैं देख रहा था, जब मैं इस विधेयक को पढ़ रहा था कि तीन विश्वविद्यालय जो बने बनाए हैं, उनको तो आपने वहां की सरकारों की या वहां की जनता की जो भी इच्छा रही हो, टेक-अप कर लिया, ले लिया, लेकिन अन्य जो 12 विश्वविद्यालय हैं, वे आप कितने सालों में खोलेंगे, कब खोलेंगे, क्या उनकी परिस्थिति होगी, यह इसमें कहीं भी नहीं है। इसका सीधा अर्थ है कि आखिर पचास साल तक आपका राज्य था, आपने कभी विश्वविद्यालयीन शिक्षा की ओर ध्यान नहीं दिया, higher education की ओर ध्यान नहीं दिया। ठीक है, प्रधान मंत्री जी ने नॉलेज कमीशन बैठाया, आपने उसकी रिपोर्ट को ध्यान से देखा, लेकिन इन लोगों ने वास्तव में, प्रधान मंत्री

जी की जो भी इच्छा रही हो, नॉलेज कमीशन की जो भी इच्छा रही हो, परंतु जिस जल्दबाजी में हमारे माननीय मंत्री जी सरकार के माध्यम से इस विधेयक को लाए हैं, मुझे तो ऐसा लगता है कि कहीं न कहीं उनका इसके पीछे कोई hidden agenda है। Agenda is hidden and the Minister is hiding from the House. ... (Interruptions)...

श्रीमती विप्लव ठाकुर: सर ... (व्यवधान)...

श्री भगत सिंह कोश्यारी: आप बहुत बोलती हैं इसलिए बोल रहा हूं। आपका हिडन एजेंडा हमसे ज्यादा है। मान्यवर, मेरा आपसे निवेदन है कि यह जो विश्वविद्यालय बिल आप लाए हैं ... (व्यवधान) ... सर, मैं बता रहा हूं, मैं जल्दी-जल्दी बोलूंगा। मेरा आपसे निवेदन है कि आपने यह विश्वविद्यालय बनाया है - केन्द्रीय विश्वविद्यालय हम भी चाहते हैं। मैं तो अपने यहां एक और विश्वविद्यालय चाहता हूं। मैं तो चाहता हूं कि मेरे यहां आप एक विश्वस्तरीय विश्वविद्यालय खोलिए, वर्ल्ड क्लास यूनिवर्सिटी खोलिए, मैं आपका स्वागत करूंगा, दूसरे राज्य भी करेंगे।

श्री ललित किशोर चतुर्वेदी: वह देवभूमि है।

श्री भगत सिंह कोश्यारी: जी। वह तो देवभूमि है। देवभूमि के अनुकूल खोलिए लेकिन हिडन एजेंडा वाला मत खोलिए, यह मेरा आपसे निवेदन है। सर, मुख्य विषय यह है कि हमने तीन विश्वविद्यालय खोले हैं। आपने स्टेटमेंट ऑफ ऑब्जेक्ट्स एंड रीजन्स में कहा कि हम उसकी क्वालिटी बढ़ाना चाहते हैं, विश्वविद्यालयों की क्वालिटी, शिक्षा की क्वालिटी के लिए हम विश्वविद्यालय खोल रहे हैं, नयी सेंट्रल यूनिवर्सिटीज खोल रहे हैं। आपके जो तीन विश्वविद्यालय तीन प्रदेशों के लिए हैं, उनके संबंध में मैं आपसे निवेदन करना चाहता हूं कि डा. हरी सिंह गौड़ विश्वविद्यालय, सागर के 89 एफिलिएटेड कॉलेज हैं। गुरु घासी दास विश्वविद्यालय, बिलासपुर के 108 ... (व्यवधान)...

श्रीमती विप्लव ठाकुर (हिमाचल प्रदेश): सर, कुछ जलने की बू आ रही है। ... (व्यवधान)...

श्री भगत सिंह कोश्यारी: आपको तो सुगंध आनी चाहिए, आप तो माता हैं। इस प्रकार का जो शब्द आप बोल रही हैं, वह अनपार्लियामेंटरी है। ... (व्यवधान)...

श्रीमती विप्लव ठाकुर: सर, मैं यह कह रही हूं कि कुछ जलने की बू आ रही है।

श्री भगत सिंह कोश्यारी: क्षमा चाहता हूं, मैं समझा कि आप मुझे कुछ कह रही हैं। ... (व्यवधान)...

श्री एस.एस. अहलुवालिया: कुछ जल रहा है। ... (व्यवधान)...

उपसभाध्यक्ष (प्रो. पी.जे. कुरियन): क्या हो गया है, चेक करिए। ... (व्यवधान)...

श्री एस.एस. अहलुवालिया: बदबू है तो बंद कीजिए। ... (व्यवधान)...

उपसभाध्यक्ष (प्रो. पी.जे. कुरियन): आप बोलिए और केवल प्वाइंट्स बोल दीजिए।

श्री भगत सिंह कोश्यारी: मैं केवल प्वाइंट्स कहूंगा। मैं आपसे निवेदन कर रहा हूं कि एक स्टैंडर्ड विश्वविद्यालय सारे देश में बने, यह आप चाहते हैं। आप क्वालिटी चाहते हैं लेकिन मुझे ऐसा लग रहा है कि इस अधिनियम को लाते समय न तो कहीं विश्वस्तरीय लैवल, वर्ल्ड लैवल का चिंतन हुआ है और कहीं राज्य स्तरीय हितों का कोई विचार किया गया है। अर्थात् मैं यह कह रहा हूं कि वर्ल्ड स्तरीय इसलिए नहीं हो सकता है, क्वालिटी इसलिए नहीं हो सकती है कि जब आपने ऐसे विश्वविद्यालय को अपने हाथ में ले लिया, बहुत अक्षर किया, हम उसका स्वागत

करते हैं, हम तो कहते हैं कि हमारे और कॉलेजिज ले लीजिए, कुमाऊं यूनिवर्सिटी को भी ले लीजिए, लेकिन हमारा कहना यह है कि आखिर आपका लक्ष्य यह है कि आप क्वालिटी एजुकेशन देना चाहते हैं, एक स्तरीय विश्वविद्यालय बनाना चाहते हैं। लेकिन जैसा मैंने बताया कि एक में 89, दूसरे में 108 और हेमवती नंदन बहुगुणा गढ़वाल विश्वविद्यालय में 148 एफिलिएटेड कॉलेजिज हैं। अब आप बताइए कि क्या वास्तव में, जहां नॉलेज कमीशन यह कह रहा है कि अधिक आटोनामी देनी चाहिए, जहां नॉलेज कमीशन कह रहा है कि आप अधिक विश्वविद्यालय खोलिए, वहां आपने विश्वविद्यालय को इस स्तर का बना दिया है। मेरे यहां सबसे बड़ी कठिनाई यह है कि जो आपने विश्वविद्यालय का अधिनियम बनाया है, इसमें धारा - 4 के "एफ" में जो वर्णन आपने दिया है, उससे सब लोगों में चिंता है कि आखिर क्या होगा। इस धारा के हिसाब से जितने एफिलिएटेड कॉलेज हैं, वे उसके साथ रहेंगे। मैं एक वाक्य पढ़ना चाहूंगा। इसमें लिखा है कि

"...and Hemvati Nandan Bahuguna Garwhal University shall stand affiliated to, or admitted to the privileges of, or maintained by, Guru Ghasidas Vishwavidyalaya, Doctor Harisingh Gour Vishwavidyalaya and Hemvati Nandan Bahuguna Garwhal University, respectively, established under this Act." इसमें कहा कि जो कॉलेज उससे एफिलिएटेड थे, उनकी जिम्मेदारी इस यूनिवर्सिटी की होगी। यह जो विश्वविद्यालय है। अब उस विश्वविद्यालय में यहां कहीं क्लिअर नहीं है कि प्राइवेट कॉलेजेज, जो एडिड कॉलेजेज हैं, उनका क्या होगा? आगे आने वाले जो कॉलेज होंगे, वे कॉलेज क्या उस क्षेत्र में या उन जिलों में जिन जिलों को उन्होंने उसमें ले रखा है, उनका क्या होगा? गढ़वाल यूनिवर्सिटी में तो इसमें आधे से ज्यादा 7 जिले ले लिए हैं। अब उनमें अगर मुझे नया कॉलेज खोलना हो तो क्या यही विश्वविद्यालय एफिलिएशन करेगा? वास्तव में यह इस प्रकार का ऐसा संदेह है कि जिसकी वजह से थोड़ी समस्या खड़ी होती है। मैं आपसे यह भी निवेदन कर रहा हूँ कि इसमें नियम कैसा बना है। इसके नियम 37(5) में लिखा है :

"Every Ordinance made by the Executive Council shall come into effect immediately." यानी, एक्जीक्यूटिव काउंसिल जो इसके नियम बनाएगी, आर्डिनेंस लागू वह इमीडिएटली इफेक्ट पर आ जाएगी। इसके अगले छठे हिस्से में है : Just see the paradox and contradiction here. इसके अगले हिस्से में कहते हैं कि "Every Ordinance made by the Executive Council shall be submitted to the Visitor within two weeks from the date of adoption." यानी पहले तो आप कहते हैं कि ज्यों ही नियम बनेगा, वह तत्काल लागू हो जाएगा और अगले पैरा में आप कह रहे हैं कि यह वहां जाएगा। अगर वास्तव में यह ठीक से बनाया होता, इसमें आप पहले कहते कि नहीं, यह पहले चांसलर या विजिटर के पास जाएगा, स्वीकृत होगा और तब आएगा। इसमें बहुत सारी ऐसी कमियां हैं, मैं उसकी डिटेल् में नहीं जाकर के माननीया मंत्री महोदया जी से निवेदन करूंगा कि इसमें स्पष्ट कर देना चाहिए कि जो बहुत से कॉलेजेज खुलेंगे, उनकी क्या परिस्थिति होगी। वर्तमान में जो मेरे यहां, विशेषकर के प्राइवेट कॉलेजेज हैं, तो उनके संरक्षण का, उनके वित्तीय प्रबंध का क्या होगा, इन सारे विषयों पर मैं सोचता हूँ कि क्लेरिफिकेशन हो जाए। मेरी अपने यहां नए कुमायूं विश्वविद्यालय की डिमांड है, कम से कम उसको आप जल्दी खोल देंगे तो मैं समझूंगा कि हिडन एजेंडा नहीं है और वास्तव में आप मेरा तथा मेरे स्टेट का हित चाहते हैं। बहुत-बहुत धन्यवाद।

MS. SUSHILA TIRIYA (Orissa): Sir, I thank you for giving me the opportunity to speak on this Bill. Sir, I will not take much time of the House, as I will just make some points here. Sir, the UPA Government has allocated a lot of funds for education in the last Budget. I think, the highest

allocation of funds for education was made in the last Budget. Sir, in this year's Budget, the hon. Minister has declared 16 Central Universities and 8 IIs. Sir, now, through this Bill, we are discussing about the 12 Central Universities and three upgraded Central Universities taken over by the Central Government. The Government has allocated Rs.2,000 crores for this purpose. So, I congratulate the hon. Minister, the hon. Prime Minister and the UPA Chairperson, Madam Sonia Gandhiji.

Sir, my first point is, the hon. Prime Minister himself has agreed that some districts are still left where the Gross Enrolment Ratio is very low, and it is below the national average. So, my point is, there are some places, like in my State, Orissa, where the GER is below the national average. Of course, I thank the hon. Minister for giving one Central University to my State. But, Sir, the place has not been finalised where the Central University will be set up. So, my point here is, there is a university called North Orissa University, located in the north part of Orissa. This university was established in 1998. The Vice Chancellor of the University has also applied for some UGC grant for upgradation of the infrastructure of that university. Sir, in this Bill, you have said that the Ministry is going to take over three universities. So, my point is, whether it is possible to take over that university, the North Orissa University to the level of the Central University. Sir, this area is in the north Orissa. Balasore and Baripada are centrally located places in Orissa.

And, that is adjoining the Jharkhand State, West Bengal and Chhattisgarh also. 63 per cent of the tribal population is there in that region. In Similipahar, there is only one Similipahar Biosphere in that area; that is called as Similipahar Biosphere reserve. So, a lot of flora and fauna is there. Medicinal plants are also there. Basically this is upgradation of the students of the needy and my point here is, if there be a research study included, or the particular university taking over that through declaring it as a Central university, this research study of Similipahar, you can uplift the students, you can give them a good training and research in this atmosphere, which includes animals, mines and industry also.

Sir, you have given a lot through NREGA, through Kasturba Gandhi Balika Vidyalaya, to empower women's education and improve the livelihood of the tribal people. In so many different meetings we have discussed in the Ministry that giving only food and cloth is not the empowerment of the tribal people of that locality and that we should give them higher education, good education, qualitative education to those people in that region, to the SCs/STs and backward people, so can empowered through education they can be strengthened to overcome socio-economic problem.

I strongly appeal to the Minister that the North Orissa University should be attached to the Central university or it should be declared as a Tribal Central University so that the people of that particular area would be highly feel obliged and they get a chance for a good research and training. That is my point Sir.

My last point is, our Vice-Chancellor has already introduced a Centre for Research in Similipahar Studies where he has introduced cultural ecology, ethno-medicinal and ethno-biology, indigenous knowledge system and ethno-musicology of the tribal community inhabiting in and around Similipahar forest eco-system and to promote development of local level museum, bio-cultural diversity as an institute of heritage conservation. So, I request, through you, the Minister to kindly consider a particular region and declare it as a Central university. Thank you.

DR. BARUN MUKHERJI (West Bengal): Thank you, Sir. I think, this is very important Bill. But, unfortunately, as it has been taken at the late hours of the evening, many of our hon. Members could not be present here. Anyway, the present Bill is mainly in respect of three universities, at Bilaspur in Chhattisgarh, at Sagar in the State of Madhya Pradesh, and at Srinagar in the State of Uttarakhand. I heartily welcome the establishment and formalisation of these universities; I would certainly welcome many more such Central universities for the sake of advancement and universalisation of education in the country. But, Sir, I would like to draw the attention of the hon. Minister about a few pertinent points which need immediate review and amendment for the sake of better participation by and harmony among the teachers and the taught, and, employees and the Central authority as well.

Firstly, it is stated in the Bill that the objects of the universities would be, "To establish linkages with industries for the promotion of science and technology and improvement of the social and economic conditions and welfare of the people, their intellectual, academic and cultural development."

While agreeing with these objectives, I feel that the Bill should have provision for more involvement of the people from the divergent fields of industry, science, society, and culture with the universities for proper implementation of aforesaid objects. But the Bill lacks this. Of course, for choosing the aforesaid people, there should not be any bias about the caste or creed, sex or religion, or even political beliefs of the persons best suited for the purpose. I hope the hon. Minister would ensure this type of involvement of eminent people from various walks of life. Secondly, the Bill has recommended appointment of eminent Visiting Professors, Emeritus Professors and others for advancement of objects of the University on contract basis. But the term 'contract' appears to be derogatory so far as the eminent persons are concerned. It is better to find out an alternative term for 'contract'. It may be said like 'for availing of their contributions for a limited time' or something like that. The term 'contract' in respect of these people should be avoided. Thirdly, it may be quite fascinating to introduce innovative courses as has been done in the Bill. But the Government cannot avoid the responsibility of ensuring proper placement of the students who would be completing courses. I am afraid the Government has not undertaken this exercise properly. Fourthly, for the sake of 'high standards of teaching and research', the Bill seeks measures of 'active participation of students in all academic activities of Universities including evaluation of teachers'. But these objectives are apprehended to be nullified with the introduction of controversial provisions like

Students Council or conditions of service of employees. The Bill says that in the Students Council 20 students will be nominated by the Academic Council while other 20 will be elected by the students. This provision is not acceptable. This 50 per cent nomination clause will be contrary to the prevailing democratic process. I am sorry to say that this has been the trend, of late, in all the Central Universities that we find. ...*(Time-bell)*... Just two minutes, Sir. Even the Universities will lose the confidence of students if they are asked before admission 'to sign declaration to the effect that he submits himself to the disciplinary jurisdiction of the Vice-Chancellor and other authorities of the University. At the same time, the provision of appointing every employee under a written contract will also have adverse effect so far as the earnest cooperation of employees is concerned. These are all very provisions, which will go against the spirit of the whole Bill. I think, this is to be given a serious thought. ...*(Time-bell rings)*... Lastly, in the name of maintenance of discipline, some very harsh steps have been recommended, as for instance, the Vice-Chancellor may be empowered to 'direct that any student or students be expelled or rusticated for a specified period or be not admitted to a College, Institution or Department for a stated period or be punished with a fine of an amount to be specified in the Order or be debarred from taking examination or examinations conducted by the University or College or Institution or Department or the results of the student or students concerned in the exams in which he or they have appeared be withheld or cancelled."

Sir, we cannot rule out the possibility of misuse of such coercive powers. This is not acceptable. We hope that for the sake of a better atmosphere or promotion of education through active cooperation and participation of all, students, teachers and employees, the hon. Minister will withdraw these harsh provisions and offer us a more challenging and innovative Bill. Thank you.

श्री राजनीति प्रसाद (बिहार): उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, धन्यवाद। हम लोग बहुत सारी बातों को लगातार दो घंटे से सुन रहे हैं। यह जो बिल है, मैं जरूर उसके समर्थन में खड़ा हुआ हूँ, लेकिन मैं आपसे एक बात कहना चाहता हूँ कि हम बिहार से आते हैं। बिहार की बहुत सारी यूनिवर्सिटीज का नाम इसमें लिखा हुआ है। यह पटना यूनिवर्सिटी, बहुत पुरानी यूनिवर्सिटी है इसमें से बहुत बड़े-बड़े लोग यहां आए हैं, राष्ट्र में बड़े नेता रहे हैं और बड़े-बड़े ऑफिसर भी रहे हैं। यह पुरानी यूनिवर्सिटी है, लेकिन हमें लगता है और हम लोगों ने इस पर कई बार चर्चा भी की है कि हमारी यूनिवर्सिटी को भी सेंट्रल यूनिवर्सिटी बनाया जाए ...*(व्यवधान)*... क्या हमारी बारी पर बोलना जरूरी है? मैं शॉर्ट में बोलना चाहता हूँ, लेकिन आप लोग ...*(व्यवधान)*... मैं आपसे कहना चाहता हूँ, मंत्री जी से निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि यह जो यूनिवर्सिटी है, यह बहुत पुरानी यूनिवर्सिटी है, परन्तु अब इसका रखरखाव ठीक नहीं है। सर, मैं बाकी सभी बातों का समर्थन कर रहा हूँ, परन्तु मैं यह निवेदन करने के लिए खड़ा हुआ हूँ कि पटना यूनिवर्सिटी को एक सेंट्रल यूनिवर्सिटी बनाया जाए। यह मेरी मांग है, क्योंकि अभी जो यूनिवर्सिटी की स्थिति है, वह बहुत खराब स्थिति है। इसकी खराब इतनी स्थिति है कि मैं बाकी सभी बातों का समर्थन कर रहा हूँ, परन्तु मैं यह निवेदन करने के लिए खड़ा हुआ हूँ कि लोगों को उस यूनिवर्सिटी को चलाने में भी बाधा हो रही है। इसलिए बच्चों के लिए, जो

लड़के वहां पढ़ते हैं, उनके लिए, जो उच्च शिक्षा प्राप्त करना चाहते हैं, उनके लिए यह जरूरी है कि उस पटना यूनिवर्सिटी को सेंट्रल यूनिवर्सिटी बनाया जाए। आपने दो मिनट का समय दिया था, घड़ी देख लीजिए, दो मिनट ही हुए हैं, धन्यवाद।

SHRIMATI D. PURANDESWARI: At the outset I would like to thank all my hon. Colleagues for having participated in the debate and for having given their valuable suggestions and also for raising certain concerns and issues. Sir, I would like to thank my Cabinet Minister, Shri Arjun Singhji for having instilled confidence in me, for having thought I was capable enough for coming here and answering the concerns of my colleagues, though my colleagues did not feel the same about it. Sir, there was a mention of a hidden agenda even as we brought in the Bill today. The hidden agenda here, Sir, is to ensure that higher education is made accessible to the children by increasing the number of universities, as has been the concern with all of us here. Sir, I would like to dispel the apprehension of my colleagues. They were very upset on why we had to bring in an ordinance. Sir, let me first dispel their apprehension. The reason why we brought in an ordinance was not because we wanted to undermine the legislative competence of the highest House of democracy but because there were procedural matters which had to be addressed because of which the ordinance was promulgated. Those pertained to identification of land, transferring of land and the appointment of Vice-Chancellors and, then, advertising for the Vice-Chancellors so that the process of selection of Vice-Chancellors could happen. So, realising fairly well that this was a time taking process, that was the reason why this was brought in, in the form of an ordinance but definitely this was not to undermine the legislative competence of Parliament.

But, definitely, it is not to undermine the legislative competence of Parliament.

(MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN in the Chair)

Sir, 150 years ago, our colonial leaders had ushered in an education system which could provide a clerical class to support their requirements and needs. After we attained Independence, as rightly pointed by many of my hon. colleagues, the University Education Commission was constituted under the Chairmanship of one of the greatest philosophers-Statesman of our country, Dr. Sarvapalli Radhakrishnan. This was, actually, to give us a direction as to what the education sector should be for a country and an education system which could respond to the requirements, needs and the growth of our country. India's educational scene, today, is at a tipping point where opportunities are abundant. But, at the same time, the challenges are also unprecedented. The Indian economy, even in the wake of global meltdown – the most conservative estimates show – is striving to grow at 7 per cent. Our higher education system needs to respond with dynamism and also with expedition to meet the challenges. As the economy seeks to grow and increasingly become knowledge-based, the country's higher education sector is put to the severest of tests, particularly because the quality and quantity of education would have a direct impact on the quality and quantity of our economic output. An effective higher education sector provides the country with globally competitive workforce

which is very critical for growth and development of any country. Sir, many have emphasized that for a country to be economically sustainable, we need to have the Gross Enrolment Ratio in higher education of around 20 per cent. Rightly pointed out by many of my hon. colleagues here that the Gross Enrolment Ratio in India is around 11 per cent and the international Gross Enrolment Ratio is 23 per cent. Therefore, it is important that we need to increase the Gross Enrolment Ratio. But, to achieve a 20 per cent Gross Enrolment Ratio is a Herculean task. Realising this, we have rightly pegged an achievable Gross Enrolment Ratio at around 15 per cent to be achieved at the end of the Eleventh Five Year Plan i.e., at the end of 2012. It is in the wake of this realisation that have thought of expanding the higher education sector manifold. Ever since we attained Independence, our higher education has grown manifold. It grew from 20 universities to 400 and odd universities, from 500 institutions to close to 21,000 institutions, from 15,000 faculty to a little over 500,000 faculty and our Gross Enrolment Ratio also from 1 per cent to 11 per cent. But, I don't think that we have to be complacent with this. We know that we have to achieve the higher Gross Enrolment Ratios. Therefore, a conscientious decision was taken to establish Central Universities. In the process of establishing Central Universities, there is also a conscientious decision taken to ensure that we try to bridge the disparities that exist in terms of geography to make education accessible to the children of our country. It was then decided that every State that do not have a Central University would, at first, get a Central University. It is in the wake of this decision, 15 States have been identified. We have written to the State Governments to either provide us the land or to write to us the State University which they would like to upgrade. It is in this process, three State universities have been upgraded and the other 12 States are getting the Central Universities for which land is in the process of identification. Sir, 5 States have already identified land and the other States are yet to identify the land and let us know.

Sir, there have been various issues raised during the course of discussion today. There were concerns raised about the quality of our higher education. Sir, quality has always been our concern and reforms in higher education system are to ensure that qualitative reforms do happen and do take place in our education system.

My hon. colleagues have rightly pointed out that 'faculty' is an important aspect of quality education. We do have shortage in the teaching faculty position. It is around 20 per cent. It has been our earnest effort to ensure that we bridge this shortage that exists today. And, it is in the wake of this that we have increased the retirement age from 62 to 65. We have also announced the pay review for the faculty. Even as I speak of faculty, there were also concerns raised about research happening in our universities; because, after all, we realise that only if we have good research happening can we have good faculty coming into our universities. Sir, 0.81 per cent of our GDP, at present, is allocated for research. And, I must apprise the House that 80 per cent of this allocation is public funds. It is a meagre percentage that comes from the private sector. We are very well aware

that we have to increase our allocations for research. But, at the same time, we would also appeal to the private sector to come forward and supplement the efforts of the Government. There were concerns raised about the six per cent allocation for education. Across the House, most of my hon. colleagues have raised the issue of the GDP allocation towards education. We do stand committed to the six per cent allocation for education. However, the six per cent allocation is simply not what the Government of India would have to allocate, but it is the public allocation, which means, both the State Governments and Central Government together needs to allocate that six per cent. Over the years, the Central Government's allocation towards the education has increased. We were around 20 per cent, initially, with the State Governments contributing 80 per cent. Today, the allocation by the Government of India has increased 23-24 per cent. But, commensurate to this, we would appeal to the State Governments, through the hon. Members, to ensure that there is no decline in the States' allocation. There has been a decline in the allocation by the State Governments.

My colleague, Shri D. Raja, had raised an issue about the University of Culture, which is a State University. And, it is here that many of the State Universities are suffering because of the lack of support from the State Governments. We have the University Grants Commission that actually provides the development funds to the universities, provided they are recognised under sections 12(p) and 2(f) of the UGC Act. We do provide the development funds to the State Universities also. But it is also the responsibility of the State Governments to shoulder the burden of State Governments because, after all, they are the universities that have been established under the State Legislature. The point that I would like to make here is that the Central Universities are completely supported by the Central Government because they are established through a central law, whereas the State Universities are supported by both, the State Government as well as the Central Government, as they are established through the State Legislature. So, my appeal, again, to the State Governments would be to ensure that their allocations for the State Universities do not decline.

There were also issues raised about strengthening our elementary education because if we do not have a good elementary education, we cannot have children transiting into higher education. We are conscious of this fact. Some of the hon. Members were saying that we were concentrating more on infrastructure in the Sarva Shiksha Abhiyan Programme, and not so much on quality education. It was a conscious effort, again, to ensure that the infrastructure was in place because unless the infrastructure is there we cannot have children coming into our schools. But, now, since we have achieved close to 90 per cent of the enrolment rate, our concentration would definitely be on quality education to ensure that elementary education is imparted to our children.

As I stated, there are about 373 educationally backward blocks in our country. The Ministry of Human Resource Development has, now, come out with a scheme to establish an institution in each

of these educationally backward blocks to ensure that the gross enrolment ratio in these educationally backward blocks, which is much lesser than our national average, would be increased and also quality education would be made accessible to our children living in these areas, deprived of access to good quality education. Sir, there was a comment made about NET/SLET. It is very important for quality faculty. Let me assure the House that NET/SLET is still mandatory. It still stands mandatory except in universities which have a recognised process and which have been recognised by the UGC. Excepting for that, otherwise, NET/SLET is mandatory.

Sir, I now come to accreditation. Even as I speak of quality, the issue of accreditation was raised, and I must say here that accreditation is very important because it kindle confidence in our children that they are going to good universities and they are going to good institutions. We have two bodies which do the accreditation for us. One is with the UGC, which is the NAG. We have the other body with the AICTE, which is the NBA. The NBA accredits the programmes and the NAG accredits the infrastructure. Therefore, whenever an institute would need the prior permission or recognition of the AICTE to establish itself, it is essential that they subject themselves to these inspections so that we are assured that we are giving our children the quality that is very essential.

There were also concerns raised about privatisation. Even as we accept the fact that the private sector did supplement the efforts of the Government in proliferating education in many of the areas of our country, particularly, in technical education, we all know that the rule of the land is that education cannot be for profiteering; it is not a commodity. There have been various Supreme Court judgements which have emphasised on this. Our national policy on education also emphasises that education cannot be for profiteering and is not a commodity.

Some of my colleagues made a reference to high fee. The Supreme Court judgement had said that there should be fee committees in place to derive a fee structure for universities and institutes in States. Many of the States do have their fee committees in place. And it is these fee committees, which, actually, derive the fee for various disciplines in the institutions. But, even to make sure that the children do access higher education and are not kept out of the portals of higher education, we have increased the number of scholarships for children and loans are made available to them. Particularly, institutions of higher learning, like IITs, are linked to banks where loans are made available to the children.

And, Sir, I must say that there was a concern raised about such State institutes which don't have proper libraries, laboratories and other facilities. Sir, the UGC has, today, come out with a particular scheme for every such institution which is not recognised, or which did not have the kind of infrastructure in place, and it enables them to avail the developmental funds provided by the UGC. The UGC would now provide all such institutes a one-time grant to upgrade their infrastructure so that they would be made eligible to avail the grants which the UGC provides them. This is a very important step taken by the UGC.

There was also a concern raised about the size of the University. This has been widely debated and is still being debated. There is no consensus on what should be the ideal size of a university. Unless there is a consensus on this, we will not be able to say that a university can have more than so many affiliating colleges. So, it is being debated across.

Sir, my colleague had made a mention of the Similipahar institute. I must say that we have established Amarkantak University in Amarkantak which is a tribal university.

And, this, I must say, Sir, has an all-India jurisdiction and can open its centres wherever there is a concentration of tribal population. One of the objectives of this University is also to protect and safeguard the native knowledge and the tribal culture. So, this is a university which has a wide scope and, probably, if the State Government is interested, then, they can always see how they can get a Centre there. Sir, there was also a mention made about the foreign universities and how our universities and institutions are tying up with foreign universities. Sir, we respect autonomy in higher education, and we have never tampered with or hampered autonomy in higher educational institutions. So, higher-educational institutions have been tying up with other Universities, but let me apprise the House that there are AICTE regulations in place, which need to be abided by in case a foreign university has to come into our country. Sir, it is because we do not have a policy in place right now. There are many foreign universities tying up with our institutions and universities here, however, the Foreign Education Bill is yet to come in, Sir. When it comes in, I hope the entire House would give us their support and help in passing the Bill. Similarly, as for reservation in faculty, I think, the Bill is up for discussion, so it would not be right on my part to say anything about it. With this, Sir, I think, I have answered many of the issues concerned and queries raised by my colleagues to the best of my capacity.

Sir, Shri Matilal Sarkar had proposed some amendments. If you want me to answer them, I can answer them now.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Yes, you can answer them right now.

SHRIMATI D. PURANDESWARI: Okay, Sir. It was about clauses 21 and 22. Sir, the Court of the University would include such number of members as may be prescribed by the statutes to be elected from among the teachers, employees and students of the Universities. Since clauses 21 (2) and 22 (2) provide that the Executive Council and the Academic Council shall include elected members of the Court, the representation of the teachers, employees and the students of the Universities as elected representatives would be assured. Similarly, he had also proposed an amendment about clause 28 of the Bill. May I apprise my hon. colleague that the Bill would contain a host of measures so as to ensure qualitative aspects of higher education which is also there in clause 6 of the Bill. This would call for collaboration and cooperation with other trades and industries to expand frontiers of knowledge. The objectives of the University would enjoin upon to establish linkages with industry which may get covered only in case we retain the word "other agencies" otherwise, it would be a little difficult.

SHRI MATILAL SARKAR: What will be the safeguards?

SHRIMATI D. PURANDESWARI: Sir, I think safeguards are provided in clause 6 of the Bill. The safeguards have already been provided there. We always talk of the wide gap that exists between the market requirements and what our universities churn up and, here, is an opportunity, actually, to bridge that gap. Sir, now I come to Clause 32. Since the Central Universities are being funded by the Central Government out of the Consolidated Fund of India and the Government is accountable to the Parliament, particularly, I would like to emphasise here that, sometimes, we call for information but we don't get it on time which is when we would not be in a position to answer Parliament. Therefore, it is imperative that the existing provisions be retained in order to enable the Government to discharge its duties towards Parliament, in particular.

Sir, as regards the statute 36, the provisions contained in the aforesaid clause have been examined in detail by the Parliamentary Standing Committee. While accepting the provisions for the Students' Council, the Committee had only recommended that the number of elected representatives of the students to the Council be made equal to the number of student nominees of the Academic Council. This has since been accepted by the Government and has been incorporated in the Bill. The Committee's recommendation, Sir, that instead of meeting only once in a year, the Student Council may meet, at least, twice in an academic year has also been accepted, and, as such, it is felt that further changes in the Statute 36 are not called for.

So, with these words, Sir, I would request him to withdraw all the amendments.
...(Interruptions)...

SHRI N.K. SINGH: Sir, I have ...

SHRIMATI D. PURANDESWARI: On Mr. Singh's concerns that he had raised on the 'not accepted provisions', Sir, instead of reading them out here, I can always have them sent across to Mr. Singh.

SHRI N.K. SINGH: I just want to say one sentence that I had moved, if you recall, Sir, eight specific amendments, not spectacular or unknown, all following the recommendations of the Standing Committee on HRD. If the Minister can just assure that these recommendations, which the Standing Committee has made, would be kept in view in the formulations of the Rules as we go along, that would be one way of assuaging the Standing Committee.

SHRIMATI D. PURANDESWARI: Sir, the Standing Committee had discussed the Bill threadbare and had sent in its recommendations. Out of them, 17 have been accepted and the others, which we have not been able to accept, there are valid reasons why they could not have been accepted.

So, with these words, I thank all my hon. colleagues who have participated in the debate, at least, hoping that I have answered many of their queries and addressed many of their concerns. I thank all my hon. colleagues. ... (Interruptions)...

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: She has replied.

SHRI MATILAL SARKAR: Sir, in her reply, she has mentioned about teaching faculty. Now, I would only mention that two years have passed and not a single faculty has been raised in the Tripura University.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Okay; she has said that there is shortage and they will work at it. Now, the Mover of the Resolution, Shri Balavant *alias* Bal Apte, is not here. So, I shall first put the Statutory Resolution moved by Shri Balavant *alias* Bal Apte to vote. The question is, :

"That this House disapproves of the Central Universities

Ordinance, 2009 (No. 3 of 2009) promulgated by the President on the 15th January, 2009".

The motion was negatived.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Now, the question is:

That the Bill to establish and incorporate universities for teaching and research in the various States and to provide for matters connected therewith or incidental thereto, as passed by Lok Sabha, be taken into consideration.

The motion was adopted.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Now, I shall take up clause-by-clause consideration of the Bill.

Clauses 2 to 20 were added to the Bill.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: We shall now take up clause 21. There is one amendment (No. 1) by Shri Matilal Sarkar. Are you moving the amendment?

SHRI MATILAL SARKAR: Sir, I am not moving.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Now, I shall put clause 21 to vote.

Clause 21 was added to the Bill.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Now, I shall take up clause 22. There is one amendment (No. 2) by Shri Matilal Sarkar. Are you moving the amendment?

SHRI MATILAL SARKAR: Sir, I am not moving.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: So, now, I shall put clause 22 to vote.

Clause 22 was added to the Bill.

Clauses 23 to 27 were added to the Bill.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Now, I shall take up clause 28. There is one amendment (No. 3) by Shri Matilal Sarkar. Are you moving the amendment?

SHRI MATILAL SARKAR: Sir, I am not moving.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: So, I shall now put clause 28 to vote.

Clause 28 was added to the Bill.

Clauses 29 to 31 were added to the Bill.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Now, I shall take up clause 32. There is one amendment (No. 4) by Shri Matilal Sarkar. Are you moving the amendment?

SHRI MATILAL SARKAR: Sir, I am not moving.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Now, I shall put clause 32 to vote.

Clause 32 was added to the Bill.

Clauses 33 to 47 and the First Schedule were added to the Bill.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Now, I shall take up Second Schedule. There are three amendments (No. 5-7) by Shri Matilal Sarkar. Are you moving the amendment?

SHRI MATILAL SARKAR: Sir, I am not moving. But I only want that full democratisation should be extended in due course.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Now, I shall put the Second Schedule to vote.

The Second Schedule was added to the Bill.

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

SHRIMATI D. PURANDESWARI: Sir, I move:

That the Bill be passed.

The question was put and the motion was adopted.

HALF-AN HOUR-DISCUSSION

On points arising out of the answer given in the Rajya Sabha on the 7th March, 2008 to unstarred question no. 831 regarding "Requirement of Wheat for Distribution of BPL families"

श्री ललित किशोर चतुर्वेदी (राजस्थान): माननीय उपसभापति महोदय, पिछले तीन सत्र से मेरा प्रयास था कि गरीब और गरीब की समस्याओं को लेकर मेरे प्रश्न ...**(व्यवधान)**...

श्री राजनीति प्रसाद (बिहार): सर, रात के 08:45 हो चुके हैं।

श्री उपसभापति: राजनीति प्रसाद जी, आप बैठिए। ललित किशोर जी, आप जल्दी पूछिए।

श्री ललित किशोर चतुर्वेदी: सर, कमाल है, यह क्या कर रहे हैं!

श्री उपसभापति: ठीक है, आप बोलिए।

श्री ललित किशोर चतुर्वेदी: मैं प्रयास कर रहा था कि आधे घंटे की चर्चा के माध्यम से मैं गरीब और गरीबों की समस्या के प्रति अपनी बात सदन में रख सकूँ, किन्तु मुझे सफलता नहीं मिली। आज भी अगर सफलता मिली है तो 05:00 बजे के बजाए 08:45 बजे और उस पर भी आप जल्दी कर रहे हैं।

श्री उपसभापति: मैं जल्दी नहीं कर रहा हूँ, हाऊस का consensus है, मैं जल्दी नहीं कर रहा हूँ, मैं तैयार हूँ बैठने के लिए।