

[Shri K. Damodaram]

the officers and the heads of departments of the universities, but also the staff and also the students. That the Education Commission has recommended that specific point on page 345 where it says :

“The visiting committees should meet not only the officers of the universities concerned and heads of departments, but also the other members of staff and the students.”

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA) : Mr. Damodaran it is time to wind up because there are so many others.

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR (Uttar Pradesh) : Let him continue. Where is the hurry to pass this Bill ?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA) : I am to regulate the debate. You need not suggest please.

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR : We can also suggest. We know how to suggest and when to suggest.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA) : I do not want any suggestions, Mr. Chandra Shekhar. Everybody has been getting a certain amount of time. Why should I give him more time ?

SHRI K. DAMODARAN : One point more and I conclude. There are hundreds of talented young scholars in our universities and hundreds of them have been engaged in research work, and with a little encouragement, with some facilities they can produce wonderful results. Yet even to write a text-book you are depending on the Americans or the Russians; you are having collaboration agreements with foreigners to sell you foreign text-books at subsidised prices. This is a definite insult to our scholarship and an insult to our nationhood.

About other points because of lack of time I am not going to say. I support the Bill but some strong amendments must be there; subject to there being the amendments I give my support to the Bill.

REFERENCE TO THE FLOODS IN GUJARAT

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL (Gujarat) : Mr. Vice-Chairman, please excuse my interrupting the proceedings for a minute. I have just heard the news of very

unprecedented floods in Gujarat. The cities of Surat and Broach are threatened with heavy floods. The flood situation all over the country has been causing us anxiety and Gujarat was supposed to be immune from such floods. And now floods have taken place in Gujarat also and we have not heard of such floods all these years in Gujarat. I would like the hon. Minister to make a statement on this. He is not present here and he can make the statement tomorrow after getting more information. I do not say that it should be made just now. But the matter is something very serious.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA) : It will be carried to the Government.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL : Also another point I want to raise in this connection. Why are warnings not sent to the States or cities from places upstream? Of the two rivers the Narmada comes from another State. Is warning being sent ahead of the floods coming because, till this morning, we did not hear of surging waters entering Gujarat. Now we have got the news that very high floods are there.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA : The Deputy Minister is here.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA) : At the proper time they will do it.

THE UNIVERSITY GRANTS COMMISSION (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1968—Continued.

SHRI A. P. CHATTERJEE : I think, Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, that this University Grants Commission Bill has been placed before us in a very ill-prepared manner, and it is not also quite understood and intelligible as to what is the reason for increasing the membership of the Commission to eleven in place of nine which it was previously.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN : He has explained it.

SHRI A. P. CHATTERJEE : I am just saying that it is not intelligible in spite of the explanation. The explanation makes the confusion worse confounded. It is no explanation at all. The Minister

gave the explanation that because the Commission's work is increasing, therefore he should increase the number of members of the Commission. Now first of all it is not quite understood whether an arithmetical increase in the membership of a particular body will really increase the efficiency of that particular body. Moreover, this theory of the hon. Education Minister is belied by the last section which he has added, namely, the proposed section 27 which has been incorporated in clause 5 of the amending Bill. Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, the Education Minister, in explaining the reason for putting in this delegation clause, namely the proposed section 27, said that you know the Commission is an unwieldy body and therefore, in order to give efficiency to the work of the body, the body must delegate its functions and powers to a person—the Chairman. Now like the famous comic character of Shakespeare, the Education Minister forget, at the end what he spoke at the beginning. He spoke at the beginning that the membership of the Commission has to be increased in order that the Commission may work successfully.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL
Which is the character ?

SHRI A. P. CHATTERJEE : I am referring to the character of Gonzalo in *Tempest*.

Now the Education Minister in the very beginning said that he is increasing the number of members of the Commission in order to increase its efficiency. And in the end he supports the proposed section 27 by saying : because the Commission is unwieldy, therefore its work has to be delegated to the Chairman. Now, if that is so, then why is this increase in number? Therefore I think that Mr. Krishan Kant's impassioned speech has got some substance and really the Education Minister is interested not in increasing the efficiency of the Commission but in increasing the number of the bureaucrats in the Commission. And the point is this, Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, that though it is said in the proposed section 5—I refer to clause 2 of the Bill—

“The members shall be chosen as follows:—

(a) two members from among the officers of the Central Government to represent that Government; and

(b) the remaining number from among—” certain interests, the motive is given away by the first proviso to that clause, and the first proviso says :

“Provided that not less than one-half of the total number so chosen shall be from among persons who are not officers of the Central Government or of any State Government:”

Now looking at sub-clause (2) (a) of clause 2 it might appear to us that perhaps in this body of eleven members there will not be more than two representatives of Central Government. It might appear like that but then from the proviso it appears not to be the case; the Government thinks otherwise and the Government means otherwise, and the Government wants to have a great number of bureaucrats.

SHRI KRISHAN KANT : And would do otherwise.

SHRI A. P. CHATTERJEE. The only safeguard is that not more than one half will be such bureaucrats. So what follows is that these different interests, industry, commerce, agriculture, legal, medical and other learned professions, educationists of repute, etc. will be represented by certain Joint Secretaries or Secretaries or certain persons who were Joint Secretaries or Secretaries or by certain persons in the IAS or ICS. That will be the position.

Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I have heard even this morning that a person is being tipped for the position of India's nominee in the International Court of Justice, a person who was a bureaucrat somewhere in the Central Government in Delhi. It is being rumoured that he is such a jurist that he must be sent to the International Court of Justice in place of such persons as were there before and who represented India at that time. I am just mentioning this, Mr. Vice-Chairman, because now the Government of India has begun to think on this pattern that if you want an educationist you need not go outside the secretariat; if you want a legal person to represent that learned profession, you need not go outside the secretariat and that is being sought to be done by virtue of this clause. In fact, this clause is in the form of a Trojan horse and under the shelter of this Trojan horse the entire University Grants Commission will be staffed by persons who are imbued and who are impregnated with bureaucratic ideas and

[Shri A. P. Chatterjee]

this University Grants Commission is supposed to control and have supervision and have charge of higher education in the country. Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, if these persons are given charge then woe to university education and woe to higher education. As you know an amendment has come and I therefore support that amendment which says that this Bill must be sent to a Select Committee. That Select Committee may give its Report within this session but this must go to the Select Committee. It cannot be left to the Education Minister. It is quite clear that the Education Minister is a victim of his Department. I am giving this much credit to the Education Minister. I am not imputing any *mala fides* to him, any negligence, any lack of skill or lack of care to him.

SHRI A. D. MANI (Madhya Pradesh) : He is a good man.

SHRI A. P. CHATTERJEE : He looks like a good man; I am not quite sure about that also; anyway he looks a good man. Therefore this has to be looked into more carefully. It is true that the Education Minister was once in charge of the Jadavpur University but Phillip drunk is much different from Phillip sober. Now that he has come here, I call him Dr. Sen drunk and I am appealing to Dr. Sen sober: let him not rush this measure in this fashion. After all the University Grants Commission has to be properly constituted.

Then, Mr. Vice-Chairman, he has said another thing. He has said that the Vice-Chancellor of a University or Head of an institution which is eligible under this Act to receive grants from the Commission shall not be chosen to be a member of the Commission. It is very good that the Head of an institution which is getting grant or the Vice-Chancellor of a University which is getting grant from the Commission should not become a member of the Commission. It is fair enough but merely this would not do because there are institutions which are not guided and controlled by merely Heads but there are certain magnates behind a chain of educational institutions and these magnates really run the institutions and often ruin the institutions. There must therefore be a special safeguard that not merely the Head of the institution which is eligible to receive grants but also the secretariat of the institution, the members of the Managing Committee and others also will not be eligible to get a seat in the University Grants Commission. Of course, I need not repeat

what has been stated by Mr. Arjun Arora in respect of the interests to be represented on the University Grants Commission. I can't understand what is meant by persons representing industry, commerce and agriculture. Am I to take it that Dr. Sen is now looking more to agriculture than to culture? Or am I to take it that Dr. Sen is now turning more to industry and commerce than to enlightenment and education which he used to do formerly? Therefore, this Bill has to be looked into very carefully. The entire Bill has got to be scrutinised very carefully; this Bill cannot be passed in the form in which this has been presented before this House. I am therefore opposing this Bill in its present form and I am supporting the amendment that it should go to a Select Committee. Let the Select Committee give its Report within this session but only after it goes to the Select Committee and after it is properly scrutinised it should be passed.

SHRI N. PATRA (Orissa) : Sir, I welcome this University Grants Commission (Amendment) Bill, 1968. The object of the University Grants Commission Act was co-ordination and determination of standards in universities. Since the passing of that Act the field of higher education in the country has got greatly enlarged and in consequence the responsibilities of the U. G. C. have also increased considerably. That is why the need for increasing the number of members of the Commission has arisen. Friends of the Opposition including some friends on our Benches have objected to the selection of members from the field of industry, commerce and agriculture and also to having representatives on behalf of the Government in the Commission. Since independence we must realise that officers serving in the different Departments, especially in the field of education, are also patriotic. We should not be allergic to our own officers who are rendering a good lot of service. This increase in the number of members from nine to twelve has been necessitated because of the enlargement of the scope of education and the increase in the number of universities and educational institutions. To inspect and supervise this large number of universities and faculties of education we want more men and unless we increase the strength of membership of the Commission it will be very difficult for the Commission to discharge its responsibilities and put education on a proper footing. Therefore I ask why our friends representing the labour field should have

any fear or apprehension. Why should they be allergic and what are they afraid of? Today many of the basic industries, the key industries, are under the direct supervision and control of the public sector and why should they be afraid? Today we have to change the content of education by bringing in people from the field of commerce, industry and agriculture. Previously the content of education was only literary. That will not do. That will not meet our present day needs. To enrich the content of education, you have to accommodate different interests. Therefore, the Minister has done a good thing by bringing in people representing industry, commerce, agriculture and persons representing legal, medical or other learned professions.

One of our friends said that he had a conscientious objection to it and that he did not agree with the first proviso :

“Provided that not less than one-half of the total number so chosen shall be from among persons who are not officers of the Central Government or of any State Government”.

Therefore, it denotes that the majority of the members will be non-officials, not Government officers. Where is the question of more Government officers represented on the UGC? Where is the objection, if we can find experts, if we can find people with experience, to come and serve the Government, unless it be that you have no confidence in the Ministry or in the Government? Why should we suspect our talented officers and experts in different fields? Therefore, on this score, there should be no conscientious objection or any objection.

I appreciate another point. The second proviso says:

“Provided further that no person, who is the Vice-Chancellor of a University or the head of an institution which is eligible under this Act to receive grants from the Commission, shall be chosen to be a member of the Commission.”

They have done a right thing here. They have removed an anomaly, the prosecutor and the judge being the same person, by this wholesome provision of disallowing the Vice-Chancellor, who may somehow get interested in the allocation of the grant. This is a wholesome feature.

Another highlight of the Bill is this. Previously the University Grants Commission was empowered to sanction maintenance grants only to the Central universities. It was just like applying oil to oily heads. These are under the direct supervision of the Central Government. They were all getting proper attention. Now, a great change has been made. The scope of the University Grants Commission has been widened. They can now give maintenance grants to scores of universities, which are badly in need of such maintenance grants. For instance, I may cite two premier colleges in Orissa, which have been badly neglected by the present coalition Government. The Ravenshaw College is a premier college, a leading college in Orissa. It is now under disrepair and it may become dilapidated for want of a grant of Rs. 4 lakhs for maintenance. The Government of Orissa could not meet this contingency. Another college, with which I am closely associated—I was a student—is the Parlakimidi College. It is also a premier college. It badly needs a grant of a lakh of rupees for repairs. Unless it is repaired, its buildings which are existing for more than fifty years, will get dilapidated. Therefore, I welcome this feature of the Bill, *viz.*, empowering the University Grants Commission to give maintenance grants in such cases.

SHRI A. P. CHATTERJEE : You are welcoming the feature about officers.

SHRI N. PATRA : Not the administrative officers, but those people, who are experts in many fields, in the education department are giving guidance. They are doing a lot of things. I do not see why our own people, who can contribute to university education and higher education, should not be given a place. We are calling experts from foreign countries, from Russia and America. We have to depend on our own experts. Why should we be allergic to them? We are deficient in so many aspects of our life. Why should we belittle our officers, always say something shady? Why not think differently of them?

In this connection, I want to refer to another matter. There is the Berhampore University and we have started a university in Sambalpur also. A delegation on behalf of the University Grants Commission recently visited the place. They have realised the importance of this University. They have realised the need for strengthening the five faculties that are now existing. They felt the need to expand the scope of the faculties to seven more for providing

[Shri N. Patra]

postgraduate courses of study. Already 350 acres of land have been selected for the purpose. It is situated in a very ideal place. It is equi-distant from Berhampore and Gopalpur-on-Sea. The Berhampore University has its jurisdiction over the tribal area of Koraput district, where we have the Dandakaranya project. Half of the Ganjam district is very backward. It is inhabited by Adivasis. Therefore, this University needs good attention. For the current improvement of the university about Rs. 35 lakhs has been estimated.

Another encouraging and most welcome thing is, it is reported that the Vice-Chancellor of the Berhamore University has invited the Prime Minister to visit the university site and lay the foundation-stone of the post-graduate buildings in the month of October. If she accepts it, she will be most welcome and it will give us a lot of encouragement in the furtherance of education.

PROF. SAIYID • NURUL HASAN (Nominated) : Mr. Vice-Chairman, I would like to support the proposition that has been put before you, that the Bill be referred to a Select Committee. I am afraid there are many things which need looking into very carefully. Since every section of the House has recognised the importance of the University Grants Commission, all aspects should be examined and then amendments may be accepted by the Minister.

I would, first of all, like to take the opportunity of bringing to the notice of the Government, through you, the fact that the high hopes of the people of India will not materialise, unless adequate funds are placed at the disposal of the University Grants Commission. After all, the principal duty of the University Grants Commission is to give grants and if it does not have adequate funds, it will not be able to perform its functions properly, and consequently, many types of problems which have arisen in the past will continue to arise. The situation might become even worse, because the University Grants Commission is taking upon its shoulders larger responsibilities, *viz.*, giving maintenance grants to select universities or departments or colleges all over the country. I welcome this feature. I think it is an excellent feature. I also think that it is a very good substitute for the idea of having Central universities in each of the States, as has been pointed out by the Education Commission. But with all these enhanced responsibilities if funds are not forthcoming, how is the University

Grants Commission to function? Sir, the University Grants Commission in my opinion is financially one of the most conservative organisations in the academic world. It demands much less than what it should. Even then it demanded an immediate Rs. 130 crores for the period 1966-71 for development other than the development of engineering and technology. This is a very modest sum. As against this, all that it received was between Rs. 55 crores and Rs. 60 crores only. I had the privilege to serve as a member of the Visiting Committee sent by the U. G. C. to a number of universities, and I know how inadequate the grants were. We examined the requirements of the universities. Some excellent work was being done. We felt convinced that it had to be supported but there were no funds. This was the time when student riots had taken place all over the country and from high places statements were made that we must provide amenities to the students. The Visiting Committees were therefore advised to see in particular the representatives of the students to find out what their requirements were. But what was the result? We recognised that a lot had to be done to provide amenities to the students. We were shocked in some of the universities about the conditions of living of the students or of their legitimate demands. But we had absolutely no funds to recommend for these universities. Therefore, I hope that the House will be able to persuade the Government to recognise that education science and research are to be treated as investments for the development of the country rather than merely as social services.

Coming to the specific features of the Bill, one justification for enlarging the membership would have been to implement the recommendations of the Education Commission and of the Committee of Members of Parliament that all education should be brought within the umbrella of the University Grants Commission. I am afraid the Minister has not given in his introductory speech any assurance that this is contemplated. I need hardly emphasize the need for it. Modern science and technology and medicine are becoming more and more inter-related; even social sciences are becoming inter-related. We can not develop either science or technology or medicine in isolation from each other or in isolation from social sciences and from humanities. Therefore, it is essential that the University Grants Commission is given the responsibility of looking after all higher education, be it

medical education or technical education. And, in any case, we should have liaison committees established between the University Grants Commission and the research bodies dealing with, for example, medical research or with higher research in agriculture or in allied fields. All these ideas should have found a reflection either in the Bill or in a statement by the Minister that a Presidential Order would be issued.

Regarding the composition, I would like to offer an explanation about an amendment which I have tabled and which has been criticised by many hon. Members, and that is regarding Vice-Chancellors. I am glad that the original clause that there shall be three Vice-Chancellors as members of the Commission has been given up. But I do not want to exclude Vice-Chancellors. I hope that at least some of the Vice-Chancellors would be men of learning engaged in the pursuit of truth, would be eminent scholars, and I would not like to rule them out. I hope that some of the Vice-Chancellors at least would be men of high moral stature who can take a detached and an objective view of the needs and requirements of other people. To condemn all of them on a suspicion of partiality is not in my opinion justified.

SHRI SUNDAR SINGH BHANDARI : He may favour his institution.

PROF. SAIYID NURUL HASAN : If a man has moral stature, he is a servant of learning and enlightenment. I belong to one institution. I am equally interested in all other institutions. I know that no subject will grow if the interest of one university is placed versus the interest of another university. We have to co-operate. We are thinking in terms of co-operative research and of greater give and take between the different universities. Furthermore, I hope that the University Grants Commission will include, as has been recommended by the Education Commission, at least one-third of the members from among the universities. If university teachers can serve on the University Grants Commission, there is no reason why the Vice-Chancellor should necessarily be excluded. I am not saying that a person should be appointed merely because he is a Vice-Chancellor. But all that I am saying is that if there is a scholar who the Government thinks should be included in his own right, he may not be excluded only on this ground.

Regarding the provision which has been attacked by many Members that up to one-half may be Government servants, I would like to draw the attention of the House to the recommendation of the Education Commission that not more than one-third shall be Government servants. Why the change? That has not been explained. The Education Commission's recommendation should not be turned down in my opinion light-heartedly. There should be a very good explanation given why it is being rejected. Further, I am worried about the clause regarding persons representing industry, commerce or agriculture, and I hope that the Minister would accept the amendment that has been tabled and withdraw this particular sentence.

I would like now to refer to two other matters, one of which is regarding institutions which have been established without the previous approval of the University Grants Commission. A reference was made to agricultural universities. There may be other universities which are established without the previous concurrence of the University Grants Commission. It would be a very sad situation if the University Grants Commission were to be debarred from giving grant to such an institution but some Ministry or other decided to give the grant. Therefore, if there is to be a restriction, it should be a restriction for the Central Government as well as for the University Grants Commission.

Finally, the University Grants Commission should not be debarred for all time to come from giving a grant to a university which may be established without its previous concurrence. There should be a provision that in case the new institution or the new university fulfilled the conditions which have been prescribed by the University Grants Commission for the maintenance of standards, it should become eligible to receive the grant.

Before concluding, Sir, I would once again make an appeal to the hon. Minister to agree to take this Bill to a Select Committee because a number of small matters require careful consideration. Thank you.

श्री सी० एल० वर्मा (हिमाचल प्रदेश) : उप-सभाध्यक्ष महोदय, विश्वविद्यालय अनुदान आयोग संशोधन विधेयक 1968 जो सदन के सामने है मैं उसका समर्थन करने के लिए खड़ा हुआ हूँ। जिस चीज की ओर मैं माननीय मंत्री जी का ध्यान दिलाना चाहता हूँ कि वह यह है कि आपने

[श्री० सी० एल० वर्मा]

बिल के अन्दर यह एक शर्त लगा दी है कि जो वाइस चांसलर है वे इसके मेम्बर नहीं हो सकते। जसा कि मुझमें पहले भी कहा गया, उनको क्यों इम बात के लिए डिबार किया जाय जबकि वे स्कालर हैं और अच्छी सलाह दे सकते हैं और क्यों उन पर हमको भरोसा नहीं है? यह सही है कि उनकी संस्था को हम माली इमदाद देते हैं। यह जरूरी नहीं है कि वह मेम्बर हो तब वह मिलती है, व हर भी हों तो भी इन्फ्लुएन्स कर सकते हैं। और माली इमदाद ले सकते हैं।

जैसा कि कल चागला जी ने कहा था, तालीम कनकरेन्ट लिस्ट में आनी चाहिए। यह तो ठीक है कि कनकरेन्ट लिस्ट में आ जाय, लेकिन जहा तक कनकरेन्ट लिस्ट का सवाल है वह स्टे 1 के लिए है, यूनियन टेरीटरीज जैसे दिल्ली है, हिमाचल प्रदेश है उनका सवाल सेन्टर का ही सवाल है। वहां पर एज्यूकेशन का क्या हाल है? वह मैं थोड़ा बहुत माननीय मंत्री जी के ध्यान में लाना चाहता हूं। सबसे पहले यूनियन टेरीटरी दिल्ली को लीजिए। दिल्ली के अन्दर आपने एक कोठारी कमीशन बैठाया, सेन्ट्रल गवर्नमेंट ने बैठाया, सेन्ट्रल गवर्नमेंट ने उसकी सिफारिशों मंजूर की। सेन्ट्रल गवर्नमेंट ने रियासतों को भी कहा, टेरीटरीज यूनियन को भी कहा कि उसको मंजूर कर ले, लेकिन जब पैसे देने की बारी आई आपने आर-पार कहना शुरू किया। मैं हिमाचल प्रदेश का खास तौर पर जिक्र करूंगा। जहा तक दिल्ली का सवाल है, वहां के टीचरों ने हड़ताल की, घरने लगाए, उसके बाद माननीय मंत्री जी ने ग्रेड माने और उनके पैसे दे दिए। जहां तक हिमाचल प्रदेश का सवाल है, वहां की हालत बहुत अजीब है। आपने यह तो कह दिया कि हम इन प्रिंसिपल मंजूर कर लेते हैं, जो हमारे एज्यूकेशन मिनिस्टर हैं उन्होंने असेम्बली के अन्दर मान लिया कि हम प्रिंसिपल को मान लेते हैं लेकिन तनखाहों को कौन दे। यह तो यूनियन टेरीटरी है। होम मिनिस्टर का एक नोटीफिकेशन है उसकी तरफ मैं माननीय मंत्री जी का ध्यान दिलाना चाहता हूं। उसका नम्बर एफ० एक-एफ

-2715/39 हिम (2), डेटेड 18 जुलाई 1959 है, जिसके अन्दर यह लिखा है कि जो एडजुडिग स्टेट है पंजाब जिस वक्त वहा की उन्ही केटेगरीज की तनखाहें बढ़ेंगी उसी वक्त आटोमेटिकली हिमाचल प्रदेश में तनखाहें बढ़ जायंगी। उसी तरह से पंजाब ने कोठारी कमीशन की सिफारिशों के मुताबिक 1-11-66 से तनखाहें बढ़ा दीं। उसके बाद हिमाचल के टीचरों ने, जिनकी तादद 20 हजार से ऊपर है, इसके लिए एजीटेशन शुरू किया। होता क्या है? जब असेम्बली का सेशन शुरू होता है तो वे असेम्बली के सामने भूख हड़ताल करना शुरू कर देते हैं। पहली हड़ताल 17 जनवरी 1968 को हुई। उसके बाद उनको विश्वास दिलाया गया कि हम सेटर में बातचीत कर रहे हैं। उसके बाद आज 43 दिन से टीचरों की हड़ताल चल रही है। 48-48 घंटे की हड़ताल वे करते हैं। करते हैं या नहीं करते हैं लेकिन उन्होंने टेन्ट जरूर लगा रखे हैं। जिस स्कूल से मास्टर आते हैं वहां तालिम का कोई इन्तजाम नहीं रहता। यूनियन उन्हें आने जाने का पैसा देती है। इस तरह से किसी का नुकसान हो रहा है तो वह तालीम पाने वालों का हो रहा है, न उस्तादों का, न गवर्नमेंट का। गवर्नमेंट भी एजीटेशन के बाद पैसे दे देगी। मैं तो माननीय मंत्री जी से इस बात का फैसला कराना चाहता हूं कि जो तनखाह का सिलसिला है, खास तौर पर जो कोठारी कमीशन की सिफारिशों पर तनखाह बढ़ी है, उसके पैसे सेन्ट्रल गवर्नमेंट को एकदम दे देने चाहिए। अगर स्टेट का सवाल है तो हमको स्टेट दे देनी चाहिए, स्टेट के लिए चू-चपड़ नहीं करनी चाहिए। एक तरफ तो कुछ देना नहीं चाहते हैं और दूसरी तरफ चाहते हैं कि हम ग्रेड बढ़ाएं। इस नोटीफिकेशन में लाजिमी है कि जब तनखाह पंजाब के अन्दर बढ़े, चाहे वह डी० ए० हो या तनखाह उसी वक्त हिमाचल प्रदेश को बढ़ानी पड़ेगी। इसलिए यह बात बिल्कुल साफ हो जानी चाहिए।

दूसरी बात यह है कि जहा तक एज्यूकेशन का सवाल है, मैं माननीय मंत्री जी से कहना चाहता हूं कि जो हमारे यहां कालेज या दूसरी

चीजे खुलती है वे सबकी सब आपकी मजूरी से खुलती है। आपका ध्यान मैं खास तौर पर शिमला की तरफ दिलाना चाहता हूँ। शिमला किसी जमाने में सेंट्रल गवर्नमेंट की कैपिटल था, गर्मी के मौसम में कैपिटल हुआ करता था, बाद में पंजाब का रहा और अब वह हिमाचल प्रदेश गवर्नमेंट की सीट है। बदकिस्ती से गवर्नमेंट का न कोई वहाँ डिग्री कॉलेज है लड़कों के लिए न लड़कियों के लिए। शिमले के वास्ते कम से कम एक कॉलेज लड़कों के लिए और एक कॉलेज लड़कियों के लिए बनाने का अगले बजट में जरूर प्रावधान करे।

पहले भी बहुत दफा कहा गया कि हिमाचल प्रदेश में कोई यूनिवर्सिटी नहीं है। यह ठीक है कि यूनिवर्सिटी ग्रांट्स कमिशन हर गर्मी में वहाँ चला जाता है, कुछ देख भी आता है। जहाँ तक जगह का सवाल है या मकान का सवाल है, 5-7 साल हुए जब राष्ट्रपति डा० राधा-कृष्णन् जी थे उन्होंने राष्ट्रपति निवास यूनिवर्सिटी के लिए दे दिया था, मगर आज तक वहाँ पर यूनिवर्सिटी का कोई इन्तजाम नहीं हुआ। हिमाचल प्रदेश में 18 कॉलेज हैं और 4,680 के करीब स्कूल हैं, लेकिन वहाँ अभी तक यूनिवर्सिटी का प्रबन्ध नहीं हो सकता। मेरी माननीय मंत्री जी से मांग है कि वहाँ के वास्ते कम से कम एक यूनिवर्सिटी मंजूर कर दी जाय। इसी के साथ साथ यूनियन टैरिटरी के लिए जो दूसरे टेक्निकल स्कूल खोलने की बात है उसमें भी यही चीज है कि जब मंजूरी देनी पड़ती है तो पहले सेंटर की स्कीम बन जाती है लेकिन जब पैसे देने की बारी आती है उस वक्त यह कहा जाता है कि वही पर इसका इन्तजाम हो जाय। यही दो-तीन बातें मुझे अर्ज करनी थी। खास तौर पर कोठारी कमिशन की तनख्वाहों का सवाल है, इसका जल्दी से जल्दी फैसला हो जाना चाहिए और सेंट्रल गवर्नमेंट को इसका रुपया हिमाचल प्रदेश गवर्नमेंट को दे देना चाहिए।

THE MINISTER OF EDUCATION (DR. TRIGUNA SEN) : Respected Vice-Chairman, Sir, I am very grateful to the

hon. Members of this House for taking a very keen interest in the Bill. This is evident from the interesting speeches made by so many Members and by the large number of amendments tabled. I am also very grateful to them for the several useful suggestions which they have made. These will be of great use to me in my work.

Sir, first of all, I must express my gratitude to my esteemed friend, the respected Shri M. C. Chagla. It was very kind of him to have been present at the time of this debate and to have made a very valuable contribution to it. Sir, I regard him as the father of the Bill. It was he who planned it fully and who also had it passed in this House. Unfortunately, the Bill could not pass the Lok Sabha and hence, I have had the opportunity to move the Bill again. I take this opportunity to thank him for all that he has done for education and for this Bill.

I find that the issues raised by the hon. Members fall in two broad categories, firstly issues which relate to higher education in general and secondly issues which relate to the amendments to this Bill. Sir, I will first deal with the general issues.

4 M.P.

SHRI SUNDAR SINGH BHANDARI : Excuse me, Dr. Sen. Some differences have been pointed out between the previous Bill and the Bill that is now being introduced. It would be better if you kindly explain them first.

DR. TRIGUNA SEN : I will take up every point that has been raised. I will try at least, and I am sure you will be convinced.

SHRI A. P. CHATTERJEE : I am not sure.

DR. TRIGUNA SEN : I am sure. Let me take up the points raised by my hon. friend, Shri Mulka Govinda Reddy. He said that all the Central Universities are situated in the North and there is no Central University in the South. I think, Sir, that he has justice on his side. I do not know when we shall be able to establish another Central University. As you are aware, we want to go slow on the establishment of new Universities in view of the limitations of finances.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M.P. BHARGAVA) : I understand, Dr. Sen, that the Mysore Government has already requested you for establishing a Central University.

DR. TRIGUNA SEN : I want to assure Mr. Reddy and you, as Mr. Vice-Chairman, that the claims of the South will be duly considered.

In this context he has also referred to the assurances that were given by Mr. Chagla. With regard to the Bangalore University, I can assure Shri Reddy that that those assurances have not been forgotten. I am pursuing them. I am afraid it will not be possible for me to say anything more at this stage but I would impress on this occasion on the hon. Members my special interest in this proposal.

The second point to which he referred was about a model Act for Universities. He pointed out some features of the Bangalore University and desired that the Ministry of Education should pursue the enactment of an appropriate University legislation with the State Government. Sir, I fully agree with him. A committee to consider the broad outline of the model Act for Universities was established under the chairmanship of Dr. Kothari. It has submitted its report. The Education Commission has also made some recommendations on this subject. Sir, I wish to assure Shri Reddy that the Ministry of Education proposes to pursue this matter with the State Governments. We are anxious to see that the Acts of our Universities are modernised.

Shri Reddy also referred to the very high capitation fees levied in some Medical and Engineering colleges in Mysore. As my friend, Mr. Chagla, said, this is black-marketing in education. I fully share his views and concern. We cannot allow this to continue. The problem, Sir, has important financial aspects which needs looking into. I assure my friend that I will take up this problem. As a matter of fact, I did take it up with the Government of Mysore.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN : When do we expect that something will be done ?

DR. TRIGUNA SEN : It depends on the initiative of the State Governments to legislate as other States are doing and I am sure as they are drafting a Bill to this effect they will also remember that it is bad, and that the capitation fees should be stopped.

Coming to the last point raised by Shri Reddy which was also raised by some other Members that education should be made a Concurrent subject. I am afraid, Sir, this is not a practical proposal at present

Shri Chagla tried to make, not the whole of education but at least higher education Concurrent. But as he said yesterday, barring one State Government, he did not receive any support. I am afraid, Sir, we will have to find ways and means other than amending the Constitution to create a working partnership between the Centre and the States for the development of education. In the Federal democracy that we have, this seems to be the only practicable course. If we take the right steps, if we are honest, if we are sincere, I do not think that it is impossible. It is in this direction that I am moving. This is my approach to this problem.

I am grateful to Prof. Ruthnaswamy for the support he gave to the Bill. I am also grateful to him for his very useful suggestions for improving the working of the University Grants Commission. I shall bring these to the notice of the Commission and try to follow them up.

I would like to make one clarification. We have increased the number of members of the Commission from 9 to 12 for two reasons, increase in work and the necessity to give representation to all the interests involved. I think this increase is very reasonable. I may draw his attention to the recommendations of the Sapru Committee where they recommended that the University Grants Commission should have 15 members. We have reduced it to 12 of whom at least 5 should be full time members. We have suggested 3 in place of 5.

Prof. Ruthnaswamy also said that the number of full-time members was reduced. This is not correct. At present there is only one full-time member, namely, the Chairman. In future, depending upon the work there may be as many as four full-time members, the Chairman and three others.

Prof. Ruthnaswamy also objected to Government's representatives on the U. G. C. The convention so far has been to appoint the Education Secretary and the Finance Secretary as members of the Commission. The House will agree that this contact between the Commission, the Ministry of Education and the Ministry of Finance is necessary and useful. We have found it of great advantage and we would like to continue it.

The hon. friend, Shri Vaishampayan ...

AN HON. MEMBER : Of Mahabharat fame.

DR. TRIGUNA SEN : ... referred to several evils in the system of higher education, namely, it is mostly urban in character, that there are a large number of small colleges and that there are many privately-managed colleges which are not functioning very well, etc. etc. I fully share his concern about the urgent need for improving University education. For reasons I have already stated I cannot share his enthusiasm to make education, or at least higher education, a Concurrent subject. I would very much like, as he suggested, to bring all higher education under one umbrella. But, Sir, for various reasons this does not seem to be practical at the moment.

He has made the very useful suggestion of paying greater attention to the administration of Universities and the development of higher education in backward areas. I agree with him and I assure him that we shall pursue these suggestions. His other observations related to the amendments which he has tabled. I shall deal with them later.

I cannot agree with my hon friend, Dr. Mahavir, when he said that the education cannot be improved by the mere passing of the law. He drew attention to some of the glaring evils of our system of higher education such as capitation fees, exploitation of teachers, vagaries of examinations, deterioration of standard, etc. He has also drawn our attention to the need of examining the problem of admissions to Delhi colleges on a long-term basis rather than on an *ad hoc* and annual basis. I can assure him that I took it up already a couple of months back. He has said that all these problems showed the need for the U. G. C. to be a more effective agency to improve higher education. Sir, let me assure Dr Mahavir that within the resources made available to it, the U. G. C. is doing very good work and when this Bill becomes law, its power and capacity to deal with higher education effectively will increase. And if we also place larger resources at its disposal, we may be able to make a break-through in higher education.

Now Dr. Krishan Kant felt that this was a bureaucratic Bill.

AN HON. MEMBER : Dr. Krishan Kant ?

SHRI MULKA GOVINDA REDDY (Mysore): When he becomes the Chief Minister of Haryana, he will get a doctorate.

DR. TRIGUNA SEN : I am afraid, Sir, he has been carried away by his youth and warm blood. Sir, the Chairman of the Commission has always been an eminent educationist so far and I can assure Shri Krishan Kant that this tradition will continue so long as this Parliament is here.

SHRI KRISHAN KANT : Mr. Vice-Chairman, I want to know from the hon. Minister, if a Secretary of the Ministry of Education retires and at 60 goes over to the U. G. C., is there anything in the law to prevent it ?

SHRIMATI YASHODA REDDY : It is a hypothetical question.

SHRI KRISHAN KANT : Mr. Vice-Chairman, Dr. Bhatnagar was Secretary of the Education Ministry

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA) : Mr. Kant, he has already explained that the convention has been that the Education Secretary and the Finance Secretary are the only two officer members. If you have any questions to ask, you can do it at the end.

SHRI A. G. KULKARNI (Maharashtra) : On a point of order, Sir In the morning to-day our Deputy Chairman advised the Members not to show their hands menacingly. The hon. Member is doing it again.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA) : Please take your seat.

SHRI SUNDAR SINGH BHANDARI : Why don't you have a legislative sanction for that also ?

DR. TRIGUNA SEN : Parliament is the guardian.

SHRI SUNDAR SINGH BHANDARI : Every time this question will come up. If you have a proper legislative sanction in the Bill itself, no further trouble will arise.

DR. TRIGUNA SEN : I or what ?

SHRI SUNDAR SINGH BHANDARI : You are taking shelter under convention that no such man will be appointed Chairman who is such and such.

DR. TRIGUNA SEN : What is the definition of "such man" ?

SHRI SUNDAR SINGH BHANDARI : Who is not an official or like that.

DR. TRIGUNA SEN : Mr. Bhandari, some of the Members praised Dr. Deshmukh when he was the Chairman of the Commission.

SHRI A. P. CHATTERJEE : That may be an exception.

DR. TRIGUNA SEN : There are exceptions. I also think Shri Krishan Kant is not right when he opposes the inclusion of representatives of industry, agriculture and commerce. Sir, I have heard Shri Krishan Kant in a different platform urging that education should be related to life and production. He also pleaded, while discussing unemployment amongst engineers, that education must have a practical bias and that there should be more liaison both with industry and commerce. Sir, such association can only enrich higher education and make it more effective, and hence it was included. It is the suggestion of Dr. Kothari who personally wrote a letter to me saying that this is necessary, since in the universities we have got different faculties dealing with these subjects, that we get expertise to represent in the U. G. C. Sir, even in the past there were only two officers on the Commission and I can assure him that we do not have any desire to increase the representation of officials....

SHRI A. P. CHATTERJEE : On a point of clarification, Sir...

DR. TRIGUNA SEN : No, I am on my feet.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M.P. BHARGAVA) : May I request hon. Members to put any questions they may have after the hon. Minister has finished?

DR. TRIGUNA SEN : Sir, I am also agreeable to accept the spirit of his amendment that there should be adequate representation of university teachers and workers. In view of all this, I hope that Shri Krishan Kant, who must have cooled down by now,...

SHRI KRISHAN KANT : No, no.

DR. TRIGUNA SEN : ...will support this Bill, especially as I am accepting changes in the composition of the Commission on the lines broadly recommended by him.

Shri Mandal, if I have understood him correctly, would like to introduce the principle of election in U. G. C. He wants to have six members of the U. G. C. out of 12 to be elected by the Vice-Chancellors, Heads of Departments, Deans of Faculties and Principals and Professors of recognised universities. If accepted, Sir, this amendment will introduce politics into the affairs and working of the University Grants Commission. This is a body which should be devoted to academic purposes. It has been charged with the great responsibility of co-ordination and determination of standards in universities. I, therefore, feel, Sir, that it will be very undesirable to bring politics into its affairs. This will be a fatal step which will bring the Commission into disrepute and lead to unnecessary public criticism. I am sorry I cannot accept his suggestion.

Shri Arora raised some important points. He referred to the possibility of Government servants being appointed as Chairman of the Commission. Let me state categorically that there is no such intention. The Chairman of the Commission has always been an eminent non-official educationist. He will continue to be so. I am as keen as Shri Arora to maintain the autonomy of the universities and of the University Grants Commission. I can assure him that this Bill will not in any way interfere with the autonomy of the University Grants Commission.

Shri Damodaran dealt mainly with two amendments. I shall deal with them a little later. He gave some personal instances on which I would not like to comment. I can assure him, however, that I fully agree with him when he stresses the need to encourage research in universities, protect the academic freedom of teachers, improve standards and exercise greater vigilance through the U. G. C. It is for this purpose that we are amending the U. G. C. Act. I am glad that on the whole Mr. Damodaran supported the Bill.

Shri Chatterjee was afraid that more and more Government servants will be appointed on the University Grants Commission. I can only assure him that there is no such intention. Even in the old Act, there were only two employees of the Government of India who were members. In the new Act, this number has not been increased. The old Act says that not more than half of the total number of members of the Commission shall be servants of the Central or State Governments. This provision has been reproduced in the bill.

I also said, Sir, while replying to Prof. Ruthnaswamy's speech, that the Sapru Committee recommended 15 members with five full-time members, and here the provision is 12 members; with three full time members. He said many things about increased numbers, but I think this may satisfy him if he has got respect for the Sapru Committee. I do not like to reply to the remarks he made about me; I had not been trained that way.

Shri Patra supported the provisions of the Bill and I thank him for that. Prof. Narul Hasan stressed one point which I consider very important, namely, the need to provide larger funds to the U. G. C. This is the crux of the matter. Sir, I feel very guilty when I realise the vast needs of our system of higher education and compare them to the funds that we actually give to the U. G. C. Sir, I can tell Prof. Narul Hasan that we have taken a policy decision that in the Fourth Plan much higher priority will be given to primary and higher education. I look forward to the House to support me in this.

Prof. Narul Hasan pleaded for bringing all higher education under one umbrella. This is necessary, but I am afraid this will not be possible immediately. The other points made by Prof. Narul Hasan related to his amendments. I shall deal with them later.

Then Shri Verma, the last speaker made only two points, one with regard to pay scales of Delhi teachers and another about the need for a new university at Himachal. We are considering those things.

Sir, I shall now turn to the points made in the course of this debate relating to the provisions of the Bill and on which a number of amendments have been tabled.

Sir, it has been suggested that the sitting Vice-Chancellors should be allowed to be members of the Commission. Sir, I gave in detail the reasons why we do not want to continue this practice. It is very important that the U. G. C. should maintain an independent and impartial character. For this purpose it is essential that heads of institutions which are eligible to receive grants-in-aid from the Commission should not be appointed as members of the U. G. C. This view is very strongly felt in the country. As I said, even the Vice-Chancellors' Conference has unanimously adopted the proposal. I would therefore request the House to accept this proposal in the form in which it has been made.

Some hon. Members have suggested that persons representing industry, commerce and agriculture need not be appointed on the U.G.C. I am afraid I cannot agree with them. It is one of the major weaknesses of our system of higher education that it does not benefit itself adequately from direct contact with industry, agriculture, trade and commerce and other learned professions. This defect has to be remedied. The proposal made in this Bill, therefore, is very necessary and I request the House to support it.

There is one point which comes out in this discussion. A fear has been expressed that in the composition of the U.G.C. the universities may not be adequately represented. Unless special care is taken, I am afraid this may happen. The draft of the Bill requires some change from that point of view. I am therefore prepared to accept the amendment under which a certain proportion of the seats is reserved for persons from the universities. I am grateful to the hon. Members who have drawn my attention to this important point.

* Alternative suggestions have also been put forward for the term of office of the Chairman and members. My hon. friend Shri Vaishampayan, feels that a Chairman should not be given a second term of office. He has therefore proposed that the term of office of the Chairman should be increased from five to six years. I am afraid I do not agree with him. If his proposal is accepted, no young man would like to accept this post. Moreover, I do not see why a Chairman, who has done outstanding work, should not be given a second term. It would be a pity if we do not have the benefit of the wisdom and services of a man, a much respected man, like Dr. Kothari. I would therefore not like to have a legal ban on the second term. In certain cases this will be necessary and in the interest of higher education.

In the same way my hon. friend, Shri Yadav, has proposed that the term of office of members should be increased to six years and that there should be no second term. This is generally the practice at present. But I am afraid that the term of six years is too long. For quicker rotation we should give a first term of three years. In deserving cases one more term of three years may be given. I feel very strongly that this is an improvement over the existing situation and I request the House to support it.

[Dr. Triguna Sen]

The second special feature of the Bill is the proposal to authorise the UGC to give maintenance grants to State Universities and to Deemed Universities. I am happy to find that this has found general support. One or two minor issues have been raised. It has been said that we should give special help to institutions in backward areas. This is the policy of Government. It has also been said that we should ensure that the funds given for a purpose are utilised for that purpose. This does not require an amendment of the Act. We have this power even now and whenever any misapplication of funds comes to our notice, we take appropriate action. I can assure the House that we shall take every care in this regard. If any specific instances of a breach of this principle are brought to my notice, I shall immediately do the needful.

The third special feature of the Bill is the proposal that the universities which will be established hereafter without the approval of the UGC or the Government of India shall not receive any grant from the Centre. This has been criticised. It is said that such a provision should not be made at all. Some hon. Members have argued that while the approval of the UGC may be required, that of the Ministry of Education is not necessary. I beg to submit that this provision is very important and necessary. The State Governments have the authority to establish universities and we do not want to interfere with it in any way. But we feel that assistance from the Central funds should not be given unless the new university is properly planned and is expected to maintain proper standards. There are two aspects to this problem, academic and financial, the UGC will look at the problem from the academic point of view, but the Ministry will have to look at the problem from the financial point of view. It is, therefore, necessary to have the approval to such proposals of both the UGC and the Government of India. Sir, it has also been suggested that the provision to refuse grants to new universities established without the approval of the UGC and the Central Government should be toned down. I am afraid this will not do. A deterrent provision is needed to prevent the unplanned proliferation of new universities; and this is what the Bill seeks to do.

Sir, I do not want to take more of your time. But before I close, I will refer to the motion proposed to be moved by my hon. friend, Shri Yadav. He desired that the Bill may be referred to a Select Committee. Sir, this is a small measure consisting of

only six clauses. A reference to a Select Committee will hardly be worth while and will only delay the passing of the Bill. You heard yesterday from Shri Chagla that this Bill was passed in this House in 1966 but as it could not be passed through the Lok Sabha, it lapsed. So we are here after two years. I have accepted the main suggestion that the academic community should be well represented. I do not think there is any other objectionable clause in it which cannot be accepted by hon. Members. I, therefore, request that the consideration of the Bill be proceeded with. Thank you.

SHRI A. P. CHATTERJEE : Mr. Vice-Chairman, two points require to be elucidated. One is this that in the proviso it is said that the Vice-Chancellors of the Universities that are getting grants and Heads of Institutions that are getting grants will not be allowed to sit in the U.G.C. So far so good. But I made a specific point that there may be institutions that are getting grants from the U. G. C. and those may be managed by certain Managing Committees or Secretaries. Will the Minister consider this also that no person belonging to the Managing Committee or the Governing Body of an institution getting such grants will also be similarly debarred as he has debarred the Vice-Chancellors and Heads of Institutions getting grants? That is one clarification I need.

Secondly, he has made this provision to represent the interests of commerce and industry. Now will he indicate his mind, as he has already indicated his mind in several other aspects, in this respect too as to how actually it is proposed to have representation of industry and commerce? Is it by taking the industrial and commercial magnates or otherwise?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA) : Shri Bhandari.

श्री भंडारी : मैं पूछ रहा हूँ कि इस विधेयक में जो प्रावधान है कि जो लोग उच्च शिक्षण संस्थानों में छात्रवृत्ति प्राप्त करने वाले हों, वे उच्च शिक्षण संस्थानों के बोर्ड में नहीं बैठ सकेंगे, यह प्रावधान वास्तव में क्या उद्देश्य साधने के लिए है? क्या यह प्रावधान उच्च शिक्षण संस्थानों के बोर्ड में छात्रवृत्ति प्राप्त करने वाले लोगों के अधिकारों को सुरक्षित रखने के लिए है? या यह प्रावधान उच्च शिक्षण संस्थानों के बोर्ड में छात्रवृत्ति प्राप्त करने वाले लोगों के अधिकारों को सुरक्षित रखने के लिए है? या यह प्रावधान उच्च शिक्षण संस्थानों के बोर्ड में छात्रवृत्ति प्राप्त करने वाले लोगों के अधिकारों को सुरक्षित रखने के लिए है?

में टाइप रिटर्न कागज जवाब के लिये उपस्थित कर सकती है तो फिर उन अवश्य शक्तियों की ताकत उस एजुकेशन कमीशन में क्या होगी, किस हद तक वे उसे प्रभावित कर सकती है और जिस के बारे में शंका उपस्थित की गयी है और जिस को दूर करने के लिये ही आज हम इस विधेयक को सेलेक्ट कमेटी में भेजने का आग्रह कर रहे हैं, उस संबंध में मैं चाहूंगा कि वे और अधिक सावधानी से इस प्रश्न पर विचार करें और इन सारी शंकाओं को दूर करने के लिये वह सेलेक्ट कमेटी के प्रस्ताव को स्वीकार करें।

SHRI MULKA GOVINDA REDDY : I would like to know from the Minister in how many Universities and in how many States the U. G. C. scales of pay for lecturers, readers and professors have been implemented and may I know whether any effort has been made to bring the scales of pay of the lecturers in the Government colleges and in the university on par with each other and whether this has been looked into? May I know what steps the Government have taken to see that these scales are implemented in all the universities and particularly in Mysore and Bangalore?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN : (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA) : Mr. Yadhav.

श्री जगदम्बर प्रसाद यादव (बिहार) : श्रीमान् उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं अपने विद्वान् मंत्री की प्रशंसा करता हूँ कि वे शिक्षा में परिवर्तन लाने का प्रयास कर रहे हैं। मैं इस सशोधन के लिये भी उन्हें धन्यवाद देता हूँ। लेकिन मैं उन से एक छोटा सा नम्र निवेदन करना चाहूंगा कि जहाँ तक इस बिल के, सोधन बिल के निर्माण करने में आप न अधिकारियों का सहयोग लिया, वह अधिकारियों का सहयोग अभी भी आप को मिल रहा है और उसी सहयोग के ऊपर ही शंका है कि उसके कारण ही आज तक विश्वविद्यालय का सुधार नहीं हो सका।

आज दुनिया में विद्यार्थी बहुत बड़ा रोल अदा कर रहे हैं और अपने देश में विद्यार्थियों का भविष्य अधिकार में है। उन विद्यार्थियों के भविष्य को बनाने में, जो इस राष्ट्र के कर्णधार

हैं, हमारे विश्वविद्यालयों का महत्वपूर्ण सहयोग रहता है और उनके द्वारा राष्ट्र जीवन को बनाने में, राष्ट्रीय शक्ति बढ़ाने में और राष्ट्र निर्माण में महत्वपूर्ण सहयोग मिलता है। यदि उसके संबंध में निर्माण होनेवाले विधेयक पर इस सदन के माननीय सदस्यों का आप सहयोग ले लें तो मैं समझता हूँ कि इस बिल को सर्वोपरि बनाने में यह बात अत्यन्त ही लाभकारी सिद्ध होगी।

आप ने अभी सदन के माननीय सदस्य ही नहीं, बल्कि राष्ट्रपति द्वारा विशेषज्ञ के रूप में मनोनीत किये गये सदस्यों के भी विचार सुने हैं। यहाँ पर उन्होंने यद्यपि यह छोटा सा सशोधन विधेयक है, उस पर भी उन्होंने जो मार्मिक निवेदन आप में किया है, उस मार्मिक निवेदन का अन्तर्गतत्व निचोड़ यही है कि इस बिल को प्रवर समिति ने सुपुर्द किया जाय। आप अगर जल्दी चाहते हैं तो इस प्रवर समिति को इस आदेश के साथ दे दिया जाय कि वह इस पर जल्दी से जल्दी अपना मन्तव्य दे। आप ने देखा श्री वल्लभ जी, माननीय प्रोफेसर रत्नास्वामी जी, नूरुलहसन जी और अन्य सदस्यों ने जो बड़े विचारक के रूप में शिक्षा से संबंध रखते हैं उन्होंने भी एकमुश्त हो कर यही विचार किया कि इस को प्रवर समिति में भेजा जाय। मैं समझता हूँ कि प्रवर समिति में भेजने का एक मात्र लक्ष्य यह है कि आप ने जो निवेदन किया है उन के द्वारा उठाये गये प्वाइंटों पर, और आप का उन पर जो विवेचन है वह आप का या सरकारी अधिकारियों का हो सकता है.....

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M.P. BHARGAVA) : It cannot be a speech. You can seek some clarifications.

श्री जगदम्बर प्रसाद यादव : तो मैं चाहूंगा कि उनके विचार आप सुनें। जो आप को ठोस कमीशन का जिक्र किया है, उस संबंध में मैं चाहूंगा कि कोठारी कमीशन का जिक्र भी मैं आप के अंगे रख दूँ और वह इसलिए कि जिस की पूर्ति कोठारी कमीशन न चाहता है उस की पूर्ति इस विधेयक के द्वारा क्या हो सकती। उन्होंने कहा है कि मोटे तौर पर विश्वविद्यालय

[श्री जगदम्बी प्रसाद यादव]
 के कार्य कहे जाते हैं वह है “नये ज्ञान की पूर्ति एवं पोषण करना, जीवन के हर एक क्षेत्र में सही किस्म का नेतृत्व प्रदान करना, ऐसे सक्षम नर नारियों को देना जो कृषि, कला, चिकित्सा, विज्ञान और टेक्नोलॉजी आदि अन्य विविध वृत्तियों में प्रशिक्षित हों . . .

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA) : You are touching new points. This cannot be done. You can plead for your Select Committee. That is all.

श्री जगदम्बी प्रसाद यादव : हम सेलेक्ट कमेटी के लिये ही तो कहना चाहते हैं कि अगर शिक्षा की संपूर्ण कमियाँ इस बिल के द्वारा पूरी नहीं हो पाती हैं और न कोठारी आयोग की सिफारिश भी। मान लीजिये कि कोठारी कमीशन ने विवेचन किया था कि 5 ऐसे केन्द्रीय विश्वविद्यालय हों जो दुनिया के किसी भी विश्व विद्यालय को बराबरी कर सकें और हमें जो आकर्षण विदेश का है वह आकर्षण प्रथम श्रेणी के शिक्षकों को और विद्यार्थियों को यहीं हो जाय ताकि शिक्षा का भारतीयकरण कर के उसे जीवनपद्धति में लाना संभव हो सके और अगर ऐसा हो कि बजाय विदेशों में भेजने के हम अपने छात्रों को यहीं प्रशिक्षित कर सकें, तो अच्छा होगा और इसके अनेक उदाहरण उन्होंने रखे। तो मैं देखता हूँ कि इन उदाहरणों का समन्वय यः समाधान इस विधेयक से नहीं होता है। इसलिये मैं माननीय मंत्री जी से आग्रह करूँगा कि यह छोटा सा विनम्र निवेदन है कि यदि आप चाहते हैं तो जल्दी से जल्दी प्रतिवेदन प्रवर समिति से ले लें जिस से इस सदन का और इस सदन के द्वारा संपूर्ण देश के विचारकों के विचार इस में आ सकें।

PROF. SAIYID NURUL HASAN: I beg to seek through you two clarifications. The first is that I did venture to suggest that in case all branches of education could not be brought under the umbrella of the U. G. C., suitable machinery for co-ordination might be established. Perhaps it escaped his attention.

The second point is that an amendment

that I had tabled has been described by the Minister as watering down. My amendment was that neither the U. G. C. nor the Central Government should be permitted to give a grant. How is that watering down.

SHRIMATI YASHODA REDDY (Andhra Pradesh) : May I know from the hon. Minister—he says it is a very small Bill and I entirely differ from him because even one clause or one line could be very important in determining things. But, Sir, the whole thing is the elimination of clause, sub-section (3) in clause 5 of the original Act where it is provided specifically that a Government officer cannot be in the UGC as a Chairman. Now the provision that 50 per cent of members can be Government Officers has given a feeling for the Members that it is more “officers-oriented” than “educationist-oriented”. Though the Minister said “Chairman” as a convention, we need an educationalist. After all one more week if the hon. Minister can allow the Members to sit in a Select Committee won't make any difference after having delayed this measure for two years. The Members will be happy to settle this matter.

SHRI M. RUTHNASWAMY : Will the Minister tell us to which category of the members of the UGC would the two Government officers be appointed—to the permanent category or to the temporary category?

DR. TIRGUNA SEN : Let me take the last question of Mr. Ruthnaswamy. It is mentioned here that the Education Secretary and the Finance Secretary are the two officers who will be there for coordination. They are wholetime Secretaries of the Government of India.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA) : They cannot be fulltime members. They are whole-time Secretaries of the Government of India.

DR. TRIGUNA SEN : The provision is, out of these twelve, the Chairman and the three others are the full-time members. Others are all part-time members. Now, Mr. Chatterjee—I think he has knack to smell something wrong in everything; even in the case of a flower perhaps he does not take his nose nearer lest there should be some worms to bite him. The whole idea of it is that the heads of the institutions which are receiving the grants should not be members of the Commission. That is clear. You can easily understand

it. If that is clear, it is the obvious understanding that the man who is managing the institution which is receiving grants, should not be a member of the Commission. That is clear.

The second question is, what he means by having members from the industry—whether I should have industrial magnates in it. I have no liking for industrial magnates. Perhaps he takes brief from the magnates and he is fascinated by them.

Now one Member suggested that I am getting all typed papers from the office and I am also directed by the officers. That was the impression. The hon. Member should know that there cannot be any typewriter here so that as soon as you speak, something can be typed out and sent to me. You can come and see my hand-written notes.

SHRI SUNDAR SINGH BHANDARI : Many speeches were delivered here after the lunch hour and you have left the House.

DR. TRIGUNA SEN : No. I am here from 2 o'clock.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M.P. BHARGAVA) : Mr. Bhandari, you are making a little mistake. All the replies he has given from his own hand-written notes. Then he has supplemented from the typed paper.

DR. TRIGUNA SEN : I have listened to the speeches of all the Members with rapt attention because I respect them. Mr. Reddy rose to know which Universities have accepted the U.G.C. grades. The facts are not with me but I can assure him that since I assumed office I have sent at least reminders three times to all the State Governments to accept these grades. Many of the States have accepted. Some are in the process of accepting. If he so wants to see the factual position, he can come to my office. I can give him all the information which is readily available.

Mr. Nurul Hasan said that a suitable machinery should be established for coordination of all branches of education. Sir, you know, in our country particularly, agricultural education is under the Ministry of Agriculture, medical education is under the Ministry of Health and so on. Of course, we are trying to have some coordination with all the Ministries but they cannot be brought under one umbrella overnight as I explained to you. Is there any other question ?

PROF. SAIYID NURUL HASAN : May I again remind him about the second point that if the new Universities are established without the permission of the UGC and the Central Government and are debarred from receiving grants from the UGC, they should also be debarred from receiving grants from the Central Government.

DR. TRIGUNA SEN : I have already explained this before.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M.P. BHARGAVA) : Now I shall first put the amendment to vote. Are you pressing it, Mr. Yadav ?

SHRI J. P. YADAV : Yes, Sir.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA) : The question is :

"That the Bill to amend the University Grants Commission Act, 1956, be referred to a Select Committee of the Rajya Sabha consisting of eleven members, namely :

1. Shri Sundar Singh Bhandari
2. Shri M. P. Bhargava
3. Shri Prem Manohar
4. Shri Rattan Lal
5. Shri Niranjan Varma
6. Shri Man Singh Varma
7. Shri Chitta Basu
8. Shri Balkrishna Gupta
9. Shri B. N. Mandal
10. Dr. B. N. Antani
11. Shri J. P. Yadav

with instructions to report by the 25th August, 1968."

May I request those hon. Members who are in favour of the amendment to rise in their seats ?

HON. MEMBERS : No, no.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M.P. BHARGAVA) : Do you want division ?

HON. MEMBERS : Yes.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M.P. BHARGAVA) : I have to tell something to the House. The Business Advisory Committee had allotted two hours for the completion of this Bill. We have taken about 3½ hours. Therefore, may I request the hon. House to have patience and sit a little longer to finish the Bill ?

HON. MEMBERS : No, no.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M.P. BHARGAVA) : If the hon. Members want latitude from the Chair they will have to cooperate with the Chair. Otherwise it will be one-way traffic. The Chair will not be able to give latitude and the Members will be the sufferers. Now there is another thing. Tomorrow the Government has lost one and half hours. That means at 3.30 a motion has been provided to accommodate the Members. That is, the Government time is from 3.30 to 5.00. Now we have to accommodate the hon. Minister. Therefore, the hon. Members should in their turn also cooperate and try to sit half an hour more so that we finish the Bill.

SHRI A. P. CHATTERJEE : May I say that as far as today is concerned, many of us have made prior appointments.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M.P. BHARGAVA) : Well, I am prepared to accommodate the Members. I am absolutely prepared to accommodate the Member today provided they agree to sit through the lunch hour tomorrow.

HON. MEMBERS : Yes, yes.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA) : That is all right. We get 1½ hours tomorrow. We sit through the lunch hour tomorrow.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA) : The question is :

"That the Bill to amend the University Grants Commission Act, 1956, be referred to a Select Committee of the Rajya Sabha consisting of eleven members, namely—

1. Shri Sundar Singh Bhandari
2. Shri M. P. Bhargava
3. Shri Prem Manohar
4. Shri Rattan Lal
5. Shri Niranjana Varma
6. Shri Man Singh Varma
7. Shri Chitta Basu
8. Shri Balkrishana Gupta
9. Shri B. N. Mandal
10. Dr. B. N. Antani, and
11. Shri J. P. Yadav.

with instructions to report by the 5th August 1968.

(The house divided.)

THE VICE CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA) : Ayes 25; Noes 45.

AYES—25

Antani, Dr. B. N.
Basu, Shri Chitta
Bhadram, Shri M.V.
Bhandari, Shri Sundar Singh
Chatterjee, Shri A. P.
Hasan, Prof. Saiyid Nurul
Kesavan (Thazhava), Shri
Krishan Kant, Shri
Mahida, Shri U. N.
Mani, Shri A. D.
Misra, Shri Lokanath
Nair, Shri G. Gopinathan
Panda, Shri Brahmananda
Panda, Shri K. C.
Prem Manohar, Shri
Reddy, Shri Mulka Govinda
Ruthnaswamy, Shri M.
Sen Gupta, Shri D. L.
Singh, Shri Devi
Sinha, Shri Ganga Saran
Somasundaram, Shri G. P.
Thengari, Shri D.
Varma, Shri Man Singh
Varma, Shri Niranjana
Yadav, Shri J. P.

NOES—45

Ahmad, Shri Syed
Baharul Islam, Shri
Chandra Shekhar, Shri
Chaudhary, Shri Ganesh Lal
Chavda, Shri K. S.
Chinnai, Shri Babubhai M.
Dharia, Shri M. M.
Dikshit, Shri Umashankar
Gilbert, Shri A. C.
Gujral, Shri I.K.
Hathi, Shri Jaisukhlal
Kaul, Shri M. N.
Khatun, Shri R. P.
Khan, Shri Akbar Ali
Kollu, Shri M. L.
Kulkarni, Shri A. G.

Mallikarjunulu, Shri K. P.
 Maniben Vallabhbhai Patel, Kumari
 Mehta, Shri Om
 Mohammad, Chaudhary A.
 Momin, Shri G. H. Valimohmed
 Neki Ram, Shri
 Pande, Shri Tarkeshwar
 Patra, Shri N.
 Pattanayak, Shri B. C.
 Phulrenu Guba, Dr. Shrimati
 Purkayastha, Shri M.
 Ramaswamy, Shri K. S.
 Ramaih, Dr. K.
 Reddy, Shri K. V. Raghunatha
 Reddy, Shri Nagi
 Samuel, Shri M. H.
 Ser, Dr. Triguna.
 Sharma, Shri Anant Prasad
 Sherkhan, Shri
 Shukla, Shri M. P.
 Siddalingaya, Shri T.
 Sinha, Shri Rajendra Pratap
 Sinha, Shri Rewati Kant
 Tankha, Pandit S. S. N.
 Tiwary, Pt. Bhawaniprasad
 Upadhyaya, Shri S. D.
 Vaishampayan, Shri S. K.
 Varmā, Shri C. L.
 Zaidi, Col. B. H.

The motion was negatived.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA) : I shall now put the Motion to vote. The question is :

"That the Bill to amend the University Grants Commission Act, 1956, be taken up into consideration.

The motion was adopted.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA) : We shall now take up the clause by clause consideration of the Bill.

Clause 2—Substitution of new section for section 5—Composition of the Commission.

SHRI S. K. VAISHAMPAYEN : I move :

2. "That at page 2, for lines 3 to 19, the following be substituted namely :—

(2) The members shall be chosen as follows:—

(a) two Members from among the officers of the Central Government to represent that Government;

(b) not less than five members from among the officers or teachers of Universities :

Provided that no person, who is the Vice-Chancellor of a University or the Head of an Institution which is eligible under this Act to receive grants from the Commission, shall be chosen to be a member of the Commission ;

(c) the remaining number from among—

(i) persons representing industry, commerce or agriculture,

(ii) persons representing engineering, legal, medical or other learned professions, or

(iii) persons who are educationists of repute or who have obtained high academic distinctions, not being persons who are officers or teachers of Universities :

Provided that not less than one half of the number so chosen shall be from among persons who are not officers of the Central Government or of any State Government."

SHRI J. P. YADAV : I move :

4. "That at page 2,—

(i) in lines 7-8, for the words 'or agriculture' the words 'agriculture or co-operative movement' be substituted; and

(ii) in line 9, after the word, 'medical' the word 'engineering' be inserted."

7. "That at page 2, line 14, after the words 'who are not officers of' the words 'and are in no way connected with' be inserted."

PROF. SAIYID NURUL HASAN: I move :

8. "That at page 2, after line 15 the following be inserted, namely :

'Provided further that not less than one-half of the total membership of the Commission shall comprise of persons actively engaged in academic work in a University'.

9. "That at page 2, line 16, for the words 'Provided further' the words 'Provided also' be substituted."

10. "That at page 2, lines 16 to 19 be deleted."

The question were proposed.

SHRI S. K. VAISHAMPAYEN : Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I had in my observations earlier said that if we look at the provisions of the Bill as such, there is the fear that those who are actively associated with the universities in teaching and research might not come in the number in which it is desired. After all, this is a Commission which gives grants and which looks after the development of universities and colleges. Therefore it is highly necessary that those who are intimately associated with the colleges and universities should find proper representation here. So in clause 2 I have made specific provision in sub-clause (b) that "not less than five members from among the officers or teachers of Universities", should be there. Now if this provision is accepted by the hon. Minister, then there will be more of academic men on this U. G. C. rather than other interests. So I commend that this amendment be accepted by the Government.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M.P. BHARGAVA) : Mr. Yadav, have you any remarks to make on your amendments?

PROF. SAIYID NURUL HASAN : I would like to move an amendment.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M.P. BHARGAVA) : You cannot move at this stage. Mr. Yadav.

श्री जगदम्बी प्रसाद यादव : माननीय उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मेरा बहुत छोटा सा संशोधन है। मैं समझता हूँ कि इस संशोधन को स्वीकार कर लेने में हमारे मंत्री महोदय कोई आपत्ति नहीं करेंगे "Persons representing industry, commerce or agriculture" उसके साथ co-operative movement या co-operative जोड़ दिया जाय। दूसरा है कि "persons representing legal, medical or other learned professions". इसके साथ engineering भी जोड़ दिया जाय। मैं समझता हूँ कि इसमें कोई अत्युक्ति नहीं है। मैं समझता हूँ कि इसपर कोई विशेष कहने की आवश्यकता नहीं है। आज को-ऑपरेटिव का युग है, सहकारिता का युग है, सारा काम हम सहकारिता के द्वारा ही करना चाहते हैं। आज जो नव-निर्माण हो रहा है वह भी बिना अभि-

यन्ता के नहीं हो रहा है। इसलिए सब चीजों में इन दोनों का महत्वपूर्ण स्थान है और उन्हें मिलना भी चाहिए। हमारे शिक्षा मंत्री को इस अमेंडमेंट को स्वीकार कर लेना चाहिए।

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M.P. BHARGAVA) : Professor Nurul Hasan.

PROF. SAIYID NURUL HASAN : I would request you to give preference to the amendment which I have moved over the amendment which the hon. Member Mr. Vaishampayen, has moved for the very simple reason that his amendment visualises officers and teachers of universities. Now, in accordance with the Acts of most of the universities "officers" include the Registrars and Treasurers, and I think that, if we have to exclude Vice-Chancellors—who in my opinion should not be excluded then we certainly not think of bringing in the Registrars and Treasurers. Therefore, Sir, I feel that it would be a better provision to have that "not less than one-half of the total membership of the Commission shall comprise of persons actively engaged in academic work in a University".

My amendment No. 9 is purely consequential.

And so far as my amendment No. 10 is concerned, it is in regard to Vice-Chancellors. The hon. Minister has been pleased to accept that at least some of the members of the Commission shall be teachers. Well, if teachers are going to be members of the Commission, they can also have their loyalty to their own institution and, therefore, it would be illogical to exclude the Vice-Chancellors.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA) : The Education Minister.

DR. TRIGUNA SEN : I accept the amendment moved by Shri Vaishampayen. I oppose the amendments moved by Prof. Nurul Hasan, and those moved by Shri Yadav.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA) : Now I will first put Amendment No. 2 by Shri Vaishampayen to vote.

SHRI S. K. VAISHAMPAYEN : Before that may I submit one thing? There is a drafting mistake in this amendment that I have moved, which I wish to point

out to you at this stage. The drafting mistake is in the first proviso which I would like you to put to vote in the following form:

"Provided that the Vice-Chancellor of a University or the Head of an Institution which is entitled under this Act to receive grants from the Commission, shall not be chosen to be a member of the Commission."

Of course, 'it won't change the meaning; only I have made it more clear. This is just a drafting error that was there.

I may also refer to another drafting error that was there in the second proviso that I have proposed, and to make it more clear I would request you to put that proviso in the following form. Instead of "so chosen", I wish that it should be "chosen under clause (c)." So these are the drafting mistakes which I would like to point out to you, Sir.

5 P.M.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M.P. BHARGAVA) : They are not drafting mistakes.

SHRI S. K. VAISHAMPAYEN : It won't make any change in the spirit of the provision; it will only make it more clear.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M.P. BHARGAVA) : What is the opinion of the Minister on this ?

DR. TRIGUNA SEN : I could not follow him exactly.

(Interruptions)

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M.P. BHARGAVA) : Mr. Vaishampayen, we will have to put the amendment as such. The question is :

2. "That at page 2, for lines 3 to 19, the following be substituted, namely:

'(2) The members shall be chosen as follows:—

(a) two members from among the officers of the Central Government to represent that Government ;

(b) not less than five members from among the officers or teachers of Universities :

Provided that no person, who is the Vice-Chancellor of a University or the Head of an Institution

which is eligible under this Act to receive grants from the Commission, shall be chosen to be a member of the Commission ;

(c) the remaining number from among—

(i) persons representing industry, commerce or agriculture,

(ii) persons representing engineering, legal, medical or other learned professions, or

(iii) persons who are educationists of repute or who have obtained high academic distinctions, not being persons who are officers or teachers of Universities :

Provided that not less than one-half of the number so chosen shall be from among persons who are not officers of the Central Government or of any State Government."

The motion was adopted.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA) : The question is—

4. "That at page 2,

(i) in lines 7-8, for the words 'or agriculture' the words 'agriculture or co-operative movement' be substituted ; and

(ii) in line after the word 'medical' the word 'engineering' be inserted.

The motion was negatived.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M.P. BHARGAVA) : The question is—

7. "That at page 2, line 14, after the words 'who are not officers of' the words 'and are in no way connected with' be inserted."

The motion was negatived.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M.P. BHARGAVA) : The question is—

8. "That at page 2, after line 15, the following be inserted, namely :

'Provided further that not less than one-half of the total membership of the commission shall comprise of persons actively engaged in academic work in a University.'

The motion was negatived.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M.P. BHARGAVA) : The question is—

9. "That at page 2, line 16, for the words 'Provided further' the words 'Provided also' be substituted".

The motion was negatived.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA) : The question is—

10. "That at page 2, lines 16 to 19 be deleted."

The motion was negatived.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M.P. BHARGAVA) : The question is—

"That clause 2, as amended, stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Clause 2, as amended, was added to the Bill.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M.P. BHARGAVA) : The House stands adjourned till 11.00 A.M. tomorrow.

The House then adjourned at four minutes past five of the clock till eleven of the clock on Wednesday, the 7th August, 1968.