

[Sh. Narayan Datt Tiwari]

Research and Development facilities for constant upgradation, and reduce costs. Details of the scheme were to be announced separately by the Industrial Development Bank of India.

The scheme has now been formulated and I have pleasure of laying a copy (in English and in Hindi version) of the Technology Upgradation Scheme on the Table of the House. A few copies of the scheme have also been placed in the Parliament Library. The scheme will be implemented by the Industrial Development Bank of India.

The Government is also keen to improve technology efficiency in certain other sectors of our industry which directly affect the common man, with a view to improving the quality and reducing the cost of products of daily use. The scope for energy saving, and thus reducing costs in several sectors of our industry, is substantial. I have asked the Industrial Development Bank of India to commission the necessary studies and identify specific areas where technological upgradation can be beneficial to the consumer. Such industries, wherever appropriate, will also be included in the programme of technological upgradation over a period of time.

12.12 hrs.

**CALLING ATTENTION TO MATTER OF
URGENT PUBLIC IMPORTANCE**

[English]

**Strike by University and College
teachers.**

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE
(Bolpur): I call the attention of the Minister of Human Resource Development to the following matter of urgent public importance and request that he may make a statement thereon:

"The situation arising out of the strike by university and college teachers all over

the country and the steps taken by the Government to settle the matter amicably."

THE MINISTER OF HUMAN RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT AND MINISTER OF HEALTH AND FAMILY WELFARE (SHRI P.V. NARASIMHA RAO): Sir, as the Hon'ble Members are aware, the pay scales of teachers in Universities and Colleges have been revised from time to time in the past with the assistance provided by the Central Government. The last such revision was from January 1, 1973, the date from which the pay scales of Central Government employees were revised on the recommendations of the Third Pay Commission. Following the appointment of the Fourth Pay Commission for Central Government employees, the U.G.C. appointed a Committee under the Chairmanship of Prof. R.C. Mehrotra, consisting of some outstanding academicians of the country, to recommend a revision of pay scales of teachers in Universities and Colleges. The Committee held extensive discussions with State Governments, educationists and teachers' organisations, and submitted its report to the UGC in May, 1986. The recommendations of the Mehrotra Committee were considered and endorsed by the UGC. The Commission requested the Government to consider the report of the Mehrotra Committee for implementation. Accordingly, a scheme of revision of pay scales of teachers in Universities and Colleges was announced by the Central Government on June 17, 1987. I would like to inform the House that in the framing of this scheme, Government has been guided very largely by leaders of the academic community.

While finalising the decision of the Government on the report of the Mehrotra Committee, the opinions expressed by teachers' organisations were kept in view. In fact, certain recommendations of the Committee on which teachers had expressed strong views were modified in the final scheme. Moreover, the Government and UGC had extensive consultations with the representatives of the All India Federa-

tion of University and College Teachers' Organisations spread over three days, from June 10-12, 1987, before the scheme was finalised. It is, therefore, unfortunate that the teachers' organisations should give the impression that the Government had finalised the scheme of revision of pay scales unilaterally.

The betterment of pay-scales of University and College teachers is, for all practical purposes, unique in the system established after the Fourth pay Commission. The pay of Lecturers will now go upto Rs. 5300; the pay scale of a Reader which was Rs. 1200-1900 has been upgraded to Rs. 1500-2250 before revision and then converted into the Fourth Pay Commission equivalent of Rs. 3700-5300, and they have been provided a senior scale of Rs. 4500-5700. Similarly, for Professors, the existing scale of Rs. 1500-2500 has been upgraded to Rs. 1800-3000 before converting it into the Fourth Pay Commission equivalent of Rs. 4500-7300. Professors of Eminence will be on a fixed pay of Rs. 8000/-. According to our estimates, the total expenditure on implementation of this scheme in the country would be about Rs. 165 crores per annum. While the neutralisation of inflation in the case of teachers is the same as for Group 'A' posts in the Central Government, the teachers in addition get an

upgradation of their existing scale of pay under the new scheme.

One of the issues which has been raised by teachers' organisations is the multiplicity of grades. It has been contended that while the Fourth Pay Commission has reduced the number of grades, in the scheme approved by the Central Government for University and College teachers, the number of grades has been increased from 3 to 7. It should first be clarified that under the earlier scheme, there were five grades, namely, (1) Lecturer; (2) Lecturer in the selection grade; (3) Reader; (4) Professor; and (5) Professor of Eminence, and not three as made out by the teachers' organisations. Under the Fourth Pay Commission the employees have, by and large, been given step-up replacement scales. There would, perhaps, have been no difficulty in continuing the earlier system and providing to Lecturers replacement scale of Rs. 2200-4000 in place of Rs. 700-1600 and a senior scale of Rs. 3000-5000 against the scale of Rs. 1200-1900. We decided to add a scale in order to take the lecturers upto the revised scale of Readers viz. Rs. 3700-5300, which is a replacement scale for Rs. 1500-2250. Moreover, under the new scheme, every Lecturer will get a step-up in his/her pay at two stages as shown below:

<i>Stage</i>	<i>Pay under the running grade</i>	<i>Pay under the new scheme</i>
9th Year	2,800	3,000
21st Year	4,125	4,575

In addition, unlike under the Merit Promotion Scheme, which has a one-third ceiling on promotions, the senior scale and the selection grade will be available to every Lecturer who qualifies for promotion, without any restriction on the number of posts. The teachers thus get a better deal under the scheme offered by the Government.

Since it is obvious that the pay of the

teachers would be better under the scheme offered by the Central Government, a question can arise why the teachers' organisations are opposed to it. Primarily the issue seems to be that the teachers' organisations would like the Lecturers to have a running grade of Rs. 2200-5000 without any scope in between for appraisal based advancement in the career. What we have provided in the scheme is exactly what the National Policy

[Sh. P. V. Narasimha Rao]

on Education envisages:

"A system of teacher evaluation-open, participative and data-based will be created and reasonable opportunities of promotion to higher grades provided. Norms of accountability will be laid down with incentives for good performance and disincentives for non-performance."

The Mehrotra Committee had made some specific recommendations regarding evaluation of teachers, and we requested the University Grants Commission to work out satisfactory methods of teacher evaluation, which should be consistent with the New Education Policy. Keeping in view the apprehension expressed by representatives of AIFUCTO, UGC has asked the Federation itself to suggest the method of teacher evaluation. I would like to assure the House that we have no intention to unilaterally impose any system of teacher evaluation; it will be worked out between the University Grants Commission and the teachers. But it would not be possible to do away with evaluation altogether in violation of the New Education Policy, accepted by the National Development Council and the Parliament for full implementation.

A point being raised by a section of teachers is that even though the system of evaluation is satisfactory, some managements may implement it in a capricious and arbitrary fashion. In this connection, I would like to draw attention of the Hon'ble Members to the provision in the new scheme for redressal of grievances, to meet such situations. The National Policy on Education envisages efforts to establish grievance removal mechanism for teachers throughout the country. In the Programme of Action, we have proposed the setting up of a system of grievance redressal at the institutional, state and national levels. Government will explore all methods of ensuring that all genuine grievances of teachers, both of individual or general nature, are redressed. With this scheme put into operation, we believe that it will be possible to ensure that

every teacher who does his/her work reasonably satisfactorily and fulfils the qualifications gets the senior and selection grades.

Apart from teacher evaluation, objection is also sometimes raised about other conditionalities, namely, the requirement that a university teacher should obtain a Ph.D. degree and a college teacher an M.Phil. degree before he/she becomes eligible to the senior scale and also the requirement of participation in two refresher courses each, before they get senior scale and selection grade. Under the previous scheme, the requirement was that a person should have a Ph.D. degree before appointment as lecturer in university and an M.Phil degree before appointment to a college. Subsequently, some time was allowed for lecturers to obtain these degrees, and they ceased earning increments till degrees were obtained. Keeping in view the importance of research in the university system, Hon'ble Members will readily agree that this requirement is indispensable. Similarly, keeping in view the explosion of knowledge and the need for systematic interaction with distinguished faculty members, we have asked for participation of teachers in two refresher courses. The University Grants Commission is making arrangements for this purpose. We have clarified that teachers will be promoted to senior scale and selection grade in relaxation of requirement of participation in refresher courses, till adequate opportunities have been provided to teachers to join these courses.

Yet another point raised by AIFUCTO is regarding the designation of Readers and Professors upon promotion. The implication of this demand is that any person who is appointed as a Lecturer should become a full-fledged Reader after 8 years of his/her service and go on to become a Professor 8 years thereafter. The New Education Policy clearly lays down that all posts will be filled on the basis of merit. This means that appointment to a post of Lecturer, Reader or Professor cannot be made merely on the basis of promotion. In fact, when the pay scales were revised in 1973, it was stipu-

lated that recruitment to all categories of teachers, Lecturers, Readers and Professors shall be made strictly on merit and on the basis of all India advertisement and selection. We are reiterating this decision. However, there is no intention whatsoever of centralising the process of selection. Hon'ble Members will agree that when we refer to a person as Reader or Professor, we have an image of one with certain academic credentials which we consider respectable and desirable. If this image is true, as I believe it is, it follows that no person can automatically become eligible to these appellations merely because he or she has taught for a certain number of years and that all that is in his or her favour is the efflux of time. While I request the House to appreciate this academically reasonable position, I would also like to add that the number of positions of Readers and Professors is proposed to be increased, and these positions introduced also in suitable colleges as far as practicable, so that adequate opportunities become available to the specially talented teachers.

As the House is aware, the University Grants Commission had decided in 1982 to introduce a Merit Promotion Scheme in the Universities and Colleges. Under this scheme, in the University Departments, lecturers were promoted as Readers and Readers as Professors. In the colleges, there was only one promotion. In the colleges, there was only one promotion, to a selection grade of lecturers. I would like to share with Hon'ble Members the views expressed by the Mehrotra Committee on the implementation of the scheme. They said.

"Owing to its mal-implementation, the scheme appears to have failed, by and large, to achieve its primary objective of rewarding merit. It has virtually culminated in time-bound promotion and the pursuit of excellence has fallen by the way-side. The edge of the incentive for hard work has got dulled and the assumptions attached to senior positions in the teaching hierarchy

have got blurred."

In the Delhi University, for example, after the implementation of the Merit Promotion Scheme, Professors account for 35% of the total teachers, Readers 45% and Lecturers a mere 20%.

The UGC had decided in 1986 that this scheme would be replaced by the proposals evolved by the Mehrotra Committee. At that time, in the context of a strike by Delhi University teachers, I had occasion to inform the House that the University Grants Commission had decided that the Merit Promotion Scheme would continue. While I stand by that statement, the new scheme as described earlier would have to be made available to those teachers who opt out for it, agreeing to the condition of evaluation attached to it. To those who prefer to remain in the old Merit Promotion Scheme, as it has been implemented, that scheme would continue to be available. However, as a logical corollary, we have also decided that those who wish to continue under the Merit Promotion Scheme would be entitled to the replacement scales of the Fourth Pay Commission, and not the upgraded scales of Readers and Professors. The simple reason for this is that the upgraded scales of Readers and Professors are part of a package which contains certain conditions of achievement and assessment which I have described a while ago.

It may be appropriate in this context to also clarify certain other issues. (1) Some apprehensions have been expressed about the recommendation contained in the report of the Mehrotra Committee regarding a national qualifying test before a person becomes eligible for appointment as lecturer. Keeping in view the observations made in this regard, we have advised the UGC to prepare a detailed scheme for conducting the qualifying test including its design, content and administration. It is our intention that the scheme when finalised could be administered at the State level specially to meet the varying demands of the media of instruction and proficiency in various regional lan-

[Sh. P. V. Narasimha Rao]

guages. It is not at all our intention to enter the field of recruitment of teachers at the national level. (2) In regard to the code of professional ethics for teachers, we are adhering to the indications given in the New Education Policy, namely, that the code be prepared by teachers' organisations in consultation with UGC, while all concerned will ensure the observance of the code. (3) In regard to the age of superannuation, although there were some suggestions for modification of the existing practice, our decision is that the status quo should continue. (4) It has been pointed out that the requirement in the scheme that the universities and managements of colleges should make necessary changes in their statutes, ordinances, rules, regulations, etc. to incorporate the provisions of this scheme will oblige university autonomy. In this connection I would like to clarify that the amendments will be necessary only where there is inconsistency between the statutes, ordinances, etc. and the provisions of the new scheme. There is no other way the new scheme could be implemented without such consequential amendment by the appropriate university authorities themselves. There is obviously no question of abridgement of university autonomy in any manner.

A large majority of teachers are in the State Universities and Colleges affiliated to them. They have some apprehensions that since the State Governments have to bear 20% of the additional expenditure, they might not be able to implement the revised scheme. The House would be glad to know that the Central Advisory Board of Education, which has representation of all State Governments at Minister's level, unanimously endorsed the scheme in its meeting on June 25-26, 1987. Judging from the reaction of the State Government to the scheme, I have every hope that the scheme would be implemented by the States and we are vigorously pursuing this matter with them.

An impression is sought to be created that the scheme seeks to impose humiliating conditions on teachers. Sir, I would respect-

fully submit that what the scheme provides for is: (1) that a measure of accountability is expected of teachers; (ii) that a system of appraisal of their performance is developed; (iii) that advancement in career is related to reasonable level of performance; and (iv) that teachers participate in programmes of continuing education. I would, in all sincerity, submit that there is, and could be, nothing humiliating in this arrangement and that it stems directly from the directions contained in the NEP. When the Policy was on the anvil, some organisations had chosen to oppose it on these very grounds earlier; eventually the Policy was approved by the Parliament and endorsed by the NDC and the country. After the Parliament's approval and Government's vigorous steps to implement the policy, any continuance of opposition to the policy itself, in any form would, I am afraid, be incongruous and difficult to countenance.

The House would appreciate that it has been our endeavour to give to the teachers the best that this country can afford. If it were merely a question of revision of pay scales, we could have left it to the State Government who meet the expenditure on the salaries of the large majority of teachers. However, as the Central Government has the responsibility for the maintenance of standards in higher education and since pay scales, conditions of service and professional development of teachers are of crucial importance in this regard, we have been taking the initiative to revise the pay scales of university and college teachers. I would like to reiterate that the entire scheme that we have formulated reflects this concern on the part of the Central Government to discharge its constitutional responsibility. It is, therefore, unfortunate that the teachers' organisation decided to go on an indefinite strike in disregard of their obligations to the students and the society. I do hope that all the Hon'ble Members of this House will join me in my appeal to the teaching community to call off their strike and resume teaching.

SHRI G.M. BANATWALLA (Ponnani):
The main issue is by-passed. You grant a

discussion. By mere clarifications questions cannot be answered. Main issues have been totally by-passed and the House is being misled.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE (Ra-
japur): His statement is itself by-passer.

SHRI P.N. NARASIMHA RAO: Now he can by-pass the statement and bring the issues?

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE: Coming from a very senior Minister the statement I can say is extremely unfortunate as well as misleading and containing half truth. Although the Calling Attention notice refers to the steps taken by the government to settle the matter amicably, the statement discloses a completely closed mind and an attitude of arrogance towards the teachers and they are characterised as Shirkers. This Government wants the teachers to discharge their duties and functions, give lectures to them but does not pay any heed to any of the issues which have been agitating the teachers and that is why they are on the All India strike for the last ten days. The stance of this Government towards the strike of the teachers, and I say this has been forced upon the teachers, show a totally insensitive approach on the part of this Government. The matter is a very vital matter concerning the country as a whole. The hon. Minister has not referred to the very important aspect that almost the entirety of the teaching community has joined this strike. Nearly 2,30,000 teachers from 5,600 colleges and over 150 universities including Central universities I say representing almost entirety of the teaching community at college and university level, are now on an indefinite strike since 4th of August.

SHRI P.V. NARASIMHA RAO: Only they have decided to go on strike. I did not give any details of who is on strike and who is not. Please let us not open that. There is much to say if that is opened.

(Interruptions)

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE: You

have no answer.

SHRI P.V. NARASIMHA RAO: I really do not want to go into that. I want to say-strike is a strike.

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE: That is our grievance and that is the teachers grievance. The Minister does not want to go into any of the basic questions.

SHRI P.V. NARASIMHA RAO: How many are on strike? How many colleges are on strike and how many are not, I did not want to open that deliberately.

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE: If the hon. Ministers want to have a running dialogue, I am prepared to do it.

This Government does not seem to be concerned when over 34 lakhs students, their future career is effected. This Government's reaction is what is the reaction-total inaction and a complete and studied silence in this matter. On the 10th day of this strike we find from this lengthy statement no attempt on the part of the Government, no attitude on the part of the Government to resolve the issues which are agitating the entire teaching community to-day. I am very sorry to say that there is complete lack of sense of urgency and willingness on the part of the government to resolve the question and it seems that the Government is on a war path so far as teachers are concerned. But at the same time there is a total inaction on the part of the Government. At the same time, a campaign of mis-information is going on, misutilising the mass media and campaign of villification is going on against the teachers and impression even in this statement which is being made-that a financial bonanza has been provided for the teachers and that parity has been brought about with Class I service to which this Government is committed.

But about which there is a conspicuous silence in the statement of the Minister. In fact, the position is instead of financial bonanza, the teachers have been very shabbily treated. I would like to go through it

[Sh. Somnath Chatterjee]
before I come to the details.

There is one very important aspect. It is not that the teachers have suddenly gone on strike without giving an opportunity or time to the Government to take some action in the matter. They have been requesting for a negotiation and settlement of these issues across the table but no action has been taken, no meaningful action has been taken. On the 11th of August, 1986, the teachers All-India organisations were given a gist of recommendations-not the report-for the first time. The Mehrotra Committee was appointed in December, 1983 and even for the appointment of this Committee, the teachers had to resort to agitational programme. In 1973 when the last pay revision was made, there was an assurance that every five years there would have to be pay revision and the matter would be looked into. But for 10 years, nothing was done. (*Interruptions.*)

SHRI G.M. BANATWALLA: Even the 1973 report was not implemented in some States. It is a mere eye wash. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE: That is true.

The time that was initially allotted to the Committee, as I understand, subject to correction, was 10 months to make a report. It took 30 months for the Committee to make the report. Even then, the report was not published and the teachers had to indulge in Dharna and to court arrest only to see that the report was published and made available to the teachers and their organisations. Sir, it was only on the 17th of December, 1986, nearly 6 months after the Committee gave its report, and even long before the Government took its decision, it was laid on the Table of the House because of the discontentment among the teachers on their demands. But since 11th of August, 1986, I wish to tell this House that so many steps have been taken by the teachers to express their grievances and request the government to take some actions. On the 6th of November, there was a march to Parlia-

ment. There was a meeting with the hon. Minister, Mr. Narasimha Rao but it seems there was only casual meeting, nothing effective was done. Then, on the 4th of December, 1986, the teachers courted arrest. On the 6th of February, 1987, there was hunger strike before the UGC office. On the 11th of February, there was demonstration before the UGC office. Again there was casual meeting with the Minister. It is because, when they come here, when demonstration is held, the Minister probably listens and takes memorandum and nothing more happens. Then on the 25th of February, 1987, all-India one day strike was resorted to by teachers and there was a march to Parliament. On the 9th of March, 1987, there was demonstration in all State capitals. On the 24th of March, nearly 5 months earlier, they gave first strike call expecting the Government to wake up but nothing happened. Between 23rd and 25th April this year, there was Dharna by teachers from all parts of India in front of the Ministry office headed by the hon. Minister. Then, there was another formal meeting with the Minister during those days. But no effective action was taken. On the last week of April, 31 Members of Parliament wrote to the Prime Minister for a negotiated settlement, but there was not even a reply. Then, between 17th and 19th of May, the all-India conference of the organisation, the federation reaffirmed the strike call but no action was taken by the Government. Only a discussion was held at the officers' level between 10th and 12th of June, 1987 as mentioned by the Minister in his statement, but there is not a single reference that the Minister ever intervened in the matter and held discussion with these organisations. Has the Minister for Human Resource Development got no time to meet the teachers' representatives for real in-depth negotiation over these issues which are agitating nearly 2,30,000 teachers in this country? It is a very very anarchical state of affairs.

On 13th June, a press conference was held by the All India Federation. They reaffirmed with strike call after the discussion with the Officers has failed. You can find the

Minister's attitude from the statement and one can understand what would be the attitude of the Officers.

DR. DATTA SAMANT (Bombay South Central): That is with all strikes.

SHRI. SOMNATH CHATTERJEE: The Government is very much upset that the teachers are agitating and that they are making their grievances known! Without any discussion with them, the government gives decision. It dictates on 17th June, 1987. This is the present attitude of the Government "Take it or leave it." Sometimes it is forced on them.

On 26th June, a statement was made by Education Ministers of several States, Assam, Sikkim, Tripura, Kerala, Karnataka and West Bengal that their Governments will have considerable difficulties without Central Government assistance and they would not be able to implement the decision of this Government without 100% assistance.

It is very important that on 16th July, the teachers of the Organisation of the Central University and of all North Indian Universities and 132 Senior Teachers like professors and Readers wrote to the Prime Minister for his intervention. But there was no response whatsoever.

It is very important but the hon. Minister does not refer to it that between 10th July and 2nd August, the Academic Councils of Visva Bharati a Central University, Central Institute of English and Foreign Languages, Hyderabad, a Central Organisations, Jawaharlal University, Aligarh Muslim University, Jamia-Milia and Delhi University decided not to endorse the notification of 17th June issued by the Government implementing these decisions of the Mehrotra Committee. Allahabad University Senate and Utkal University Senate have also endorsed the demands of the teachers and have given their views against the decision.

MR. SPEAKER: Please conclude.

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE: This is

a very important matter. Kindly allow me time.

MR. SPEAKER: I do not know what you say.

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE: One Member is absent.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: That is his first turn!

SHRI HAROOBHAI MEHTA (Ahmedabad): There are teachers from both sides of the House who are interested in amicable settlement of the issue. Let there be fullfledged discussion. It is a very important issue. It cannot be discussed by just a Call Attention. There should be elaborate discussions and cutting across party lines Members will be able to express their views so that an amicable settlement is achieved as early as possible.

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE: We have great respect for Mr. Narasimha Rao, the hon. Minister. But unfortunately I find in some matters he takes up the attitude of "Don't hear anything, don't see anything, don't speak anything." This is the attitude which is most unfortunate. The hon. Minister feels that whatever the teachers say is bad.

SHRI P.V. NARASIMHA RAO: I do not say that.

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE: Then you say what is bad.

SHRI P.V. NARASIMHA RAO: You said something. I just made a repartee to you. That is all. If that is cancelled, this is cancelled.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: He says you are respectable. But he wants you to be more respectable.

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE: I want him to be more responsive to genuine cases.

On the 17th July, the hon. Minister condescended to provide some little time to the

[Sh. Somnath Chatterjee]

teachers organisations and their leaders. He said: "I am now busy with the doctors' strike." Therefore, the discussion was over. But there was no effective discussion. "I have not been able to go through the statement," he said. The hon. Minister will correct me. I am not conversant with the details.

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO: Please let me correct him at this point. When they came to me, I was in the thick of the doctors' strike and we had to carry on the negotiations. I only requested them that since I am busy entirely in the doctors' strike, that day it will not be possible. They very happily and very readily agreed. Now I do not see.

[*Translation*]

I fail to understand why the best man is more keen than the bridegroom?

[*English*]

They were convinced that I would not be in a position to pay the attention that this thing requires. So, they readily agreed and left. This is what happened. Let him not paint any other picture here.

(*Interruptions*)

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE: At least, the hon. Minister is kind enough to intervene and help me. His intervention has helped me regarding one thing i.e. in the last meeting with the teachers-after the strike call was given-he says that he could not apply his mind to this matter. That was the end of the discussion-till the strike started. Therefore, this is the application of the mind by the hon. Minister of Human Resource.

Sir, on the 19th July, the National Executive of the AIFUCTO reiterated the strike call... You feel that my time is short, Sir. Therefore, I am not going into further details. But, three important things have come out, out of this movement and out of the situation i.e. the teachers and their organisation strived their best before they had to go on

strike to come to a negotiated settlement over these issues. They have been trying their best, have expressed their objection and opposition, on principles. But there was no response from the Government, either from the Prime Minister or from the hon. Minister Mr. Narasimha Rao and they have no time. Not even an acknowledgement from the Prime Minister has come. The second important feature we must realise is the intensity of the feeling among the teachers. That is why there is almost a total strike among the teachers. Almost cent percent teachers have joined this strike throughout the length and breadth of this country. It could not have been a simulated feeling in the minds of the Teachers.

[MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER *in the Chair*]

12.48 hrs.

Sir, the last but not the least important factor we find is that a large number of academicians, important journals, newspapers have all come out in support of the teachers demand and they have objected to, they have expressed their views against the Mehrotra Committee's recommendations and the Government's decision. Please do not forget. The House should kindly bear in mind that this Pay Revision has come after 13 years. It is nearly 14 years, if we take it with effect from 1st January 1986. So, after 13 years this revision has come, although there should have been, by this time, two Pay Revisions in between. That was not done. No attempt was even made to set up a proper agency for Pay Revision. The new pay scale does not fulfil the minimum and primary task of 100 per cent neutralisation of the inflationary trend in the economy and inflation that has taken place. But, it is only to the extent of 64 per cent and along with the 64 per cent, what we find is proliferation of grades and denial of chances of promotion. All promotions have been done away with, in the new pay-scales and the total denial of the parity with Class-I Officers of the Government. The Government is committed to maintain parity. Further, no housing facility is provided; no medical facility is provided; no

other perquisites have been provided and whatever positive recommendations that were made by the Mehrotra Committee like giving professional allowance of Rs. 1000 per year and all that, and not accepted by the Government. Even, the favourable recommendations of the Mehrotra Committee have been rejected by the Government and now a package deal has been produced before the teachers which provides for a severe down-grading of their service conditions. I do not know how Prof. Kurien feels about it...

(Interruptions)

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Whatever you feel, you say. Why are you dragging in the other people.

(Interruptions)

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE: Sir, I am sorry I have needled him. All previous Commissions such as the Radhakrishnan commission, the Kothari Commission and the Sen Committee have opposed multiplicity of grades and hierarchial structure. This is the unanimous opinion of the teaching community. The Fourth Pay Commission has rationalised grades and reduced their numbers in cases of Government employees. So far as Group 'A' services are concerned, they have come down from 45 grades to 15 grades. Then, what is the rationale applied here? This, I would like to know from the hon. Minister. The teachers would like to know what is the rationale behind increasing them from 3 to 7, or from 4-7 in case of teachers alone.

I understand that there is no...

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Please try to conclude.

AN HON. MEMBER: One Member is absent.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: There are other member also who want to speak. I have to call them.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: My time may be given to him, Sir.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Already he has taken your time also. That is the problem.

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE: Instead of providing better opportunities, what has been done is, three Grades have been split into seven; three kinds of lecturers have been thought of, two kinds of Readers and two kinds of Professors, based on a rigid system of hierarchy, without any promotion in between. This fragmentation of the Grades will create permanent barriers among the teachers and it is bound to vitiate the academic atmosphere in the different educational institutions. That is why, the teaching community as a whole-kindly consider their feelings; it is not a handful of teachers who are doing this; it is the teaching community as a whole-has rejected this fragmentation of the scheme and proliferation of the Grades, totally devoid of any promotional opportunity.

Now, it seems that Government, in their obsession with implementation of the so-called new Education Policy, which only the elitist few have accepted in this country, have thought of this kind of fragmentation of the Grades and denial of promotional opportunities.

So far as promotion is concerned, the hon Minister has not referred to so many promotion schemes which are already in existence. An impression has been sought to be given that at present there is automatic promotion and the hon. Minister has expressed his rejection of the automatic promotion theory. There is no automatic promotion as it is today. The merit promotion scheme is not an automatic promotion scheme. *(Interruptions)*

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: There are some places where it is like that.

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE: I do not know...

SHRI P.V. NARASIMHA RAO: It is only from the Mehrotra Committee Report.

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE: The Mehrotra Committee Report is being challenged. The hon. Minister should give particulars. They are trying to castigate the teaching community that they are only concerned about automatic promotion without considering the quality of education or without attaining any eminence. There are several promotion schemes. Under the Calcutta University Scheme, after six years there is promotion from Lecturer to Reader and after eight years from Reader to Professor. In all Central Universities except Delhi University and 21 institutions which are deemed Universities, this is after eight years from Lecturer to Reader and after eight years from Reader to Professor. The Delhi University Scheme is the same as the Bihar scheme: after ten years with Ph.D. or 15 years without Ph.D. from Lecturer to Reader and after ten years from Reader to Professor.

In the merit promotion scheme there is an evaluation by outside experts. The papers are sent to outside experts and a Selection Committee meeting is held. There is a rigorous test under the merit promotion scheme. But one has the prospects: the Lecturer has the prospects of becoming a Reader and a Reader has the prospects of becoming a Professor. Now, under the new dispensation which you are trying to impose on them, there is no such possibility, there are no such prospects.

The U.P. Scheme is: after 13 years with Ph.D. or 16 years without Ph.D. from Lecturer to Reader. The Bihar scheme is: after 25 years of service, every Lecturer becomes a Professor. Under the Karnataka Scheme there is internal promotion maintaining 60 per cent Lecturers, 30 per cent Readers and ten per cent Professors in every college.

Again I would like to know what is the rationale of completely obliterating or doing away with any promotion? A Lecturer, after becoming a Lecturer, remains a Lecturer for his life. Now what is the position in respect of

Class I officer in Government?

AN HON. MEMBER: Once a Lecturer always a Lecturer.

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE: Every Class I officer reaches the post of Joint Secretary in the scale of Rs. 5,900-6,700, during his career, and in the case of IAS officer, after 16 years, through purely internal promotion, whereas a Lecturer could at best enter the Selection Grade of Rs. 3700-5300 after a minimum of 20 years of service and stagnate there for the rest of his career. By these wonderful processes you want to get willing cooperation of the teachers and you want to improve the standard of teaching. By these processes, can you get best talent to come into the teaching profession?

Sir, on the question of parity with Class I officers they talk of parity which the Minister has totally avoided to mention although it is part of the Government policy. While every Class-I officers gets a benefit of at least 16 yearly increment through 4 promotions, lecturers can get at the most 2 to 3 increment benefit in the entire career.

Sir, I have got a chart here. It shows that disparity between Class-I service and the teachers...

(Interruptions)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: You put the questions whatever questions you have. I have to give opportunity to others also.

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE: Please give me another five minutes. The Minister is not going to talk to teachers, let him at least express his views here.

Sir, a lecturer on the fifth year will get a basic salary of Rs 2,500 while an IAS officer at the end of fifth year will get Rs 3,200 plus Rs 500 as special pay. Lecturer in the 9th year will get Rs 3,000 and an IAS officers Rs 3,500 plus Rs 500. At the end of 13th year, lecturer will get Rs 3,500, IAS officer Rs 4,800 plus Rs 500 special pay. At the end of

18th year, Rs 4,125 will be lecturer's pay and IAS officer will get Rs 5,900 plus Rs 500 special pay. And after 20th or 21st year, there is total stagnation. He reaches at the end of the grade i.e. Rs 5,300 and there is no prospect of promotion whatsoever.

(Interruptions)

AN HON. MEMBER: They will not listen to the sermon.

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE: As I said, so far as other positive recommendations were there, these have been taken away, namely, professional allowance of Rs 1,000 a year for purchasing books, journals, scientific equipments and conveyance allowance for lecturers not provided with staff quarters. These are the recommendations of the Mehrotra Committee which have been rejected by the Government of India.

The other most important point is the all-India implementation. Now 80% is going to be paid by the Central Government. As rightly pointed out even 1973 pay scales have not been introduced throughout India.

PROF. MADHU DANAVATE: In three States.

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE: In three States, they have not yet been introduced. What is the use of asking these State Governments when they are unable to find the money? They should not be asked to bear the expenditure.

A very interesting provision has been made in the Government notification in Clauses 5 and 6. So far as Clause 5 is concerned, "The State Government after taking local conditions into consideration may also decide under its discretion to introduce scales of pay different from those mentioned in the scheme and may give effect to their revised scales of pay from January 1, 1986 or a later date." Then it will not be a uniform emoluments throughout the country for all the teachers.

Clause 6 says, "The payment of central assistance for implementation of the scheme is also subject to the condition that the entire scheme of revision of pay scales together with all the conditions attached to it is implemented by the State Government as a composite scheme without any modification except as to the date of implementation under scales of pay as indicated above." Therefore, either take it or you don't get anything from the Central Government.

Another peculiar concept has been introduced. The Hon. Minister said, he has declared on the floor of the House that merit promotion scheme will continue. How is he providing for its continuance? Option is being given to the teachers that if you want it, you can have merit promotion scheme but at a lower scale, a lower salary. By different types of salary you are discriminating between the teachers that if some are going to have merit promotion scheme they must continue to enjoy then they will receive the lower scales of pay not the higher scale of pay. Therefore some serious questions arise—whether the opposition by the teachers is based on certain principles, whether you can deny all chances of promotion to the teaching community, whether you can do away with the chance of internal promotion as is provided for in every service, in the name of parity can you now introduce greater disparities amongst the Class-I service and the teachers as you are seeking to do, whether in the name of teaching evaluation can you split up and create different types of teachers in the same category like three types of lecturers and two types of readers, as I said earlier.

I would like to know from the Hon. Minister whether the Government is prepared at the Ministerial level to immediately start a dialogue with the teachers' association to settle the issues and give up its attitude of intransigence whether the proposed proliferation of grades be given up and three grades hierarchy restored with prospects of internal promotion, whether there will be uniform application of these decisions in all the states at the same time and whether the

[Sh. Somnath Chatterjee]

Government will bear the cent per cent expenditure necessary for the implementation of the new pay scales.

Some of the State Governments, I say subject to correction, have said that at least till the end of the 8th Plan the Central Government should bear the additional expenditure. What is the Government's decision on this? I would like to know whether their decision is irreversible that 80% and no more from 1990 and that the State Governments will have to bear the expenditure and there may not be uniform application of this clause. I would like to know whether the Government has an open mind or not on these points and whether the Government would consider and discuss this matter with the teachers associations concerned.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: What about the lunch hour, Madam?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS (SHRIMATI SHEILA DIKSHIT): I would submit that we forego the lunch hour so that we can continue with this discussion.

SHRI BASUDEB ACHARIA (Bankura): Why? We should have lunch hour.

SHRIMATI SHEILA DIKSHIT: You know that there are members who want to speak on Drought also.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: Sir, I am a teacher. Even the lunch is denied to me!

SHRIMATI SHEILA DIKSHIT: No. Lunch is not denied, only lunch hour is denied. I think it is for the House to decide because there are members who want to speak on Drought.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: There are important meetings fixed up.

(Interruptions)

SHRI P.V. NARASIMHA RAO: Let them come fresh after lunch hour. We will meet after lunch break.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The House stands adjourned to re-assemble at 2 p.m.

*The Lok Sabha adjourned for Lunch till
Fourteen of the clock*

*The Lok Sabha re-assembled after lunch
at three minutes past fourteen of the clock*

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER *in the Chair*]

CALLING ATTENTION TO MATTER OF
URGENT PUBLIC IMPORTANCE—
CONTD.

[*English*]

STRIKE BY UNIVERSITY AND COLLEGE
TEACHERS—*CONTD.*

SHRI P. KOLANDAIVELU (Gobichetti Palayam): Sir, I want to know whether we are taking up Sri Lanka issue.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Yes.

SHRI P. KOLANDAIVELU: Yesterday also I was told that it will be taken up at 4 p.m. Throughout the day we were waiting. I want some assurance when it will be taken up.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: When the discussion on drought is over then we will take it up.

SHRI P. KOLANDAIVELU: Are you taking it up today?

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I cannot assure you. As soon as discussion on drought situation is over then we will take it up. Now Mr. Baju Ban Riyan...

*SHRI BAJU BAN RIYAN (Tripura East):

* The speech was originally delivered in Bengali

Mr Deputy Speaker, Sir, the subject which we are discussing today is very important for the whole country. The issue is, what will be the pay scales and promotional avenues etc. of the college and university teachers according to the recommendations of the Fourth Pay Commission and the Government's policy and attitude thereon. On this issue the Govt. announced its policy on the 17th June last. As a protest against this proclaimed Govt policy, about 2 lakh and 30 thousand teachers belonging to 5600 colleges and about 150 universities all over the country have gone on strike.

In this connection the statement given here by the hon. Minister is very regrettable. After the Govt. policy was announced on the 17th June, representatives of the teachers discussed these issues widely and brought their problems to the attention of the Govt. But all those points which were rejected by the teachers' representatives in the interest of the teachers, the hon. Minister again referred to them in the House. That is why I wish to mark this statement as regrettable. Due to the policy of the Govt. there is a wide disparity between the scales of pay and other facilities available to the IAS officers on the one hand and the college and university teachers on the other.

The Mehrotra Committee and the Sen Committee were constituted to bring about a parity between them. According to the findings of the Mehrotra Committee and the Sen Committee on the recommendations of the third and fourth pay commissions, it is seen that even now the facilities enjoyed by the college and university teachers are much less compared to the IAS officers. In the case of promotions, the length of service required for a lecturer to be promoted as a Reader and for a Reader to be promoted as a Professor, is much more compared to the length of service required for IAS officers for similar promotions. Moreover, the promotion of these teachers is to be regulated by various methods according to the policy of the Govt. The IAS officers reach the scale of Deputy Secretary at a much less time than that required for a lecturer to reach a similar

scale. At one stage the teacher's promotions come to a standstill and they stagnate there. On these problems the teachers had time and again embarked on peaceful agitations in a democratic manner to draw the attention of the Govt. But it is unfortunate that the Govt. is adopting a rigid attitude in the matter even now. In the interest of the people and the student community of our country, I will request the hon. Minister to hold immediate talks with them. The hon. Minister has not mentioned how many teachers have participated in the strike. He has only said that the strike is on. Sir, according to my knowledge, the teachers all over the country have participated in this strike. This goes to prove that the college and university teachers of the entire country are opposed to the policy of the Govt. as announced on the 17th June. If they could accept the Govt policy, then they would not have taken this extreme step of going on strike. They are fully conscious of the loss being suffered by the students in the whole country on account of this strike. But in spite of that they have been forced to take this step and for that I will hold the present Govt. entirely responsible. To end this statement I will request the hon. Minister to hold talks with them again with a fresh and flexible attitude. With this request, Sir, I conclude.

SHRI SURESH KURUP (Kottayam): Mr Deputy-Speaker, Sir, All the important issues relating to the strike by university and college teachers have already been ably mentioned by two of my eminent colleagues. Comrade Somnath Chatterjee has mentioned that in an elaborate manner and there is nothing much for me to add to that.

For the last ten days the teachers all over the country are on strike. We are surprised at the callousness with which the Government has approached the whole problem and it is unfortunate that a Minister of Shri P.V. Narasimha Rao's eminence comes before this House with a statement consisting of half truth to which I will come a little later.

Some of the best known names in the Indian academic world are participating in this strike. The Minister should at least take

[Sh. Suresh Kurup]

note of that and this alone will vouch the genuineness of the cause for which the teachers are agitated. The sorry state of affairs is that all the negative aspects of the Mehrotra Committee report have been accepted by the Government and none of the positive aspects regarding hundred per cent Central assistance to State Governments for implementing these pay scales, residential facilities and other perks etc. have been accepted by the Government, all of them have been rejected. This Committee was appointed primarily for revising the pay scales of the teachers to overcome the evil effects of inflation. All sorts of conditions are attached to these recommendations. When normally pay scales are revised due to inflation, these kinds of conditions are never attached. I don't know why the teacher community is being singled out for this kind of a treatment. The main point is regarding promotion and the multiplicity of the grades.

Sir, here the Minister says, "Already there are 5 grades existing". It is not true. There are only 3 grades and about other 2 grades the Minister has mentioned in his Statement as the Lecturers in the Selection Grade. There is no such grade. And also 'Professor of Eminence' is not considered as grade at present. Originally, Committee recommended only 6 grades and later on one more grade is added and now there are 7 grades. At present there are only 3 grades viz. Lecturer, Reader and Professor. Now, the Government is going to multiply and make the number of grades as 7. This seriously affects the promotional avenues of the teachers and that is their main grievance.

The Lecturer post is divided into three; first is the Lecturer and after 8 years of service or after doing M.Phil. or Ph.D. he may be promoted or rather it will be career advancement, no promotion at all, to the post of Senior Lecturer. The whole concept of promotion is taken away. After 12 years of service and also on the basis of internal assessment, he will be promoted to the next grade, i.e. Selection Grade. And after that

there is no promotion. He will remain as a lecturer only, as Shri Somnath Chatterjee has pointed out earlier.

SHRI H.A. DORA (Srikakulam): Once a lecturer is always a lecturer.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE (Rajapur): Even when he joins the Parliament.

SHRI BIPIN PAL DAS (Tejpur): Just as a Professor is always a Professor.

SHRI SURESH KURUP: Regarding the Readers also there is the same sort of complaint. So, what I want to know from the Minister is why this sort of stringent condition we attached to these Pay Scales? And the funny thing is that Government has given the option, either the teachers can opt for the present promotional scheme or they can opt for the career advancement. If they are opting for the present scheme, they are not entitled to the new pay scales or anything connected with it. So, actually there are not 7 grades, 9 grades are coming into the higher educational system.

In some other statements by the officials of the Ministry an impression is created that the Teachers' organisation does not want any sort of evaluation. Sir, I tell you none of the Teachers' organisation has ever said that they do not want any sort of internal evaluation. They have never said and as far as my understanding goes; it is not their main demand also. Maybe they are against the present model that the UGC and government are proposing.

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE: They have agreed to join the task force.

SHRI SURESH KURUP: I do not know why such an impression is given in the Statement and that is why I said this statement is half true.

THE MINISTER OF HUMAN RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT AND MINISTER OF HEALTH AND FAMILY WELFARE (SHRI P.V. NARASIMHA RAO): I am not

imposing anything on them. They may work it out between themselves.

SHRI A. CHARLES (Trivandrum): How long will you allow him? There are other speakers also.

SHRI M. RAGHUMA REDDY (Nalgonda): I want to know who is controlling the House.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order please.

SHRI SURESH KURUP: Another important recommendation is about the national test. Sir, the very idea of a centralised bureaucratic test to test one's teaching ability is very ugly. I do not know whether the teacher's organisations are stressing this point or not. It destroys the autonomy of the universities.

SHRI A. CHARLES: What is this running commentary Sir?

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: Who is making a running commentary?

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: You listen to him, Mr. Charles. Mr. Kurup, you please be brief.

SHRI SURESH KURUP: It gives an impression that it is the bureaucrats and not the university who can be the best judge to decide about one's teaching ability. And given the social realities in our country, it will cater only to the needs of the urban elite. As everyone know, elitism has already become synonymous with the New Education Policy. It will further be consolidated if this recommendation is accepted in to.

Regarding refresher course, I do not know as to who is going to conduct this course and how it is going to be conducted. Reports say that the Indira Gandhi Open University, which is a non-starter, is going to conduct the refresher course. I would like to know why the concerned Minister is reluctant to call the teachers' organisations for a dialogue, when they have been agitating all

these days.

Why does the Government insist on the multiplicity of grades for teachers, when all the important Education Commissions, including the Radhakrishnan Commission and the Sen Commission had categorically recommended that the number of grades should be reduced? The recommendations of the Pay Commission are also on the same lines, and the Government has even accepted the recommendations. But when it comes to teachers, they want to give a different sort of treatment. I do not understand it.

I would also like to hear from the Minister why the teaching community alone is singled out for denial of promotional avenues. In all the other services, promotional avenues have been provided by the Pay Commission as well as other commissions.

I think, these are the main and most important points on which the teaching community all over India are agitated. The points that are mentioned in the statement are actually not at all important. So, I would like the hon. Minister to give a categorical reply to the points raised in this House and also by the teachers outside.

SHRI UTTAM RATHOD (Hingoli): Sir, after 1984 having seen the chaotic condition in the educational field, the Government of India decided to have a New Education Policy which we discussed here and recommended. We know the challenges that we had to face. For the first time we also incorporated in our Education Policy, modernisation and industrialisation. As such, I think the duties of all the sections have been multiplied. I do not know, when these are the challenges before us, why the Government should have allowed the teachers' strike to go on for such a long time? There might be some truth in what they say; there can also be some truth in the statement that has been given by the Minister. But I do not know why this Ministry of Human Resource has been always avoiding meeting the people, whether it is the Doctors' strike or whether it

[Sh. Uttam Rathod]

Is the teachers' strike. That is one thing which I want to ask. When you are trying to inculcate a new feeling among the whole section, is it not your duty to take all the people into confidence? If you do not do, then you are mistaken. You know that teachers are not very good-I mean some teachers. You will have to pat them; you will have to punish them and you will have to give them whatever they want and make them teach.....

SHRI SHYAM LAL YADAV(Varanasi):
Who can do it?

SHRI UTTAM RATHOD: Of course Mr. P.V. Narasimha Rao. You don't know Shyam Lalji. Now, you please don't disturb me. Mr. P.V. Narasimha Rao is a responsible man. He had been in charge of the Education Department in Andhra Pradesh and he is a very capable man. He knows the difficulties of the Teachers. Why should he not help them? Why is he delaying? I have got a paper which was given by a teacher that they have been trying to see the Minister. They have submitted memoranda. They have tried to see the Minister. They met the Minister between November 1986 and July 17, 1987, thrice. And every time, he said, "I am yet to study or I am just looking into the matter." How can the Minister in charge of the Human Resource afford to neglect such an important aspect? I remember a book in which it was emphasised that in all the developing countries, if anything is neglected, it is the human resource development. And I am happy and I congratulate the Prime Minister that for the first time, he has started this Ministry and he has given the charge to Mr. P.V. Narasimha Rao. But Sir, Mr. P.V. Narasimha Rao belongs to the same feudal state to which I belong. I do not know why he wants to have the Riyath and Raja relations. These people saw him on the 17th July i.e. the teachers. On June 12, 13 and 14, the teachers had a talk with the Secretary Mr. Anil Borodia and they were told that a Cabinet decision has been taken. May I ask, if it is a fact, how is it that on 13th July, the hon.

Minister did not know of it? How is it that he could not tell them? Why this discrepancy? Why create a doubt in the minds of the people and then later on go on telling them, expressing it by writing notes and giving publicity in the Press? Why do we do all that? We first create unrest about ourselves and then we try to do away with that. I think this thing is going to go against us. I would like to have a reply as to why the Government has hesitated to meet these people and why they have not started negotiations with these people. Are the teachers far away from doubting the bonafides of all the State governments? Is it not a fact that the recommendations that were made in 1973 were not implemented? Is it not a fact that there are still States which have not accepted 10+2+3 system? So when you have these discrepancies and if some of your employees feel that they are neglected, should they not expect a promise from you, a word of appreciation. The Minister could say "Okay, I will do it, don't worry." It was not done in the case of Doctors and I am afraid, the something will happen here. So I want the hon. Minister to come out with a categorical statement that he is prepared to discuss-he can do it with the teachers and their representatives-and that if they have any misgivings, he would try to dispel them. If that type of an atmosphere is created, I am sure we are certainly going to go to the 21st century with flying colours. (*Interruptions*)

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: We are going to go to the 24th century also.

PROF MADHU DANDAVATE: You are going three centuries ahead of the Prime Minister.

SHRI UTTAM RATHOD: Have some mercy on me. I was also busy with the doctor's strike. (*Interruptions*) I said, 21st century; did you hear it as 24th century? (*Interruptions*)

So, I think these doubts are also genuine. The Minister should sit across the table with them and try to dispel them. This is my request. Thank you.

MR DEPUTY SPEAKER: Mr Syed Masudal Hossain is not here. Now the Minister.

SHRI HOROOBHAI MEHTA (Ahmedabad): We expect a reply which might break some ice, and not a stereotyped reply.

THE MINISTER OF HUMAN RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT AND MINISTER OF HEALTH AND FAMILY WELFARE (SHRI P.V. NARASIMHA RAO): Sir, I really do not know what is a stereotyped reply. I can only say I can make a reply which I am capable of. Every hon. Member is free to look at it as he wishes to.

I do not see any particular necessity to deal with the question basically, because I have not seen any new point being raised, apart from the points which were raised, which have been raised by the teachers themselves. We will come to the peripheral points of who meets whom, and who met whom, later; but I will start with the pith and kernel of the matter. As I understand, the demands of the teachers were the following:

- (1) There is a multiplicity of grades;
- (2) Making training a pre-condition for promotion;
- (3) Centralized selection of lecturers;
- (4) Omission of Tutors-Demonstrators from the scheme of revision &
- (5) Introduction of Professor's grade only in autonomous colleges.

To start with, these were the things; and, of course this 80% *versus* 100%.

These, I understand, were the main grievances or complaints whatever they had. These were the points-complaints. Making training and evaluation etc. a pre-condition for promotion-I think that is comprehended in that. These points have been clarified, and they no longer remain points of

complaint, such as introduction of professor's grades only in autonomous colleges. There was an impression-when it was said that professor's grades would be introduced in certain selected colleges, they immediately concluded that they must be autonomous colleges. It has been clarified that this is not so. There is no linkage between the autonomous college on the one hand, and a college with a professor's grade on the other, and it is entirely possible for a college to have a professor's grade in spite of the fact that it is not being treated as an autonomous college, or it has not been converted into an autonomous college. So, the selection of colleges for introduction of professor's grade will have no necessary relationship with the selection of autonomous colleges. This has been clarified; and to that extent, there should be no difficulty.

So far as centralized selection of lecturers is concerned, I have very elaborately stated that they will be selected at the level at which they are wanted, but according to a pattern which is laid down by the U.G.C.

Now if a Lecturer in Marathi has to be selected, if there is a person in Assam who knows Marathi so well that he can teach Marathi, it should be possible for that man from Assam to apply to this post. But we are not going to make a selection sitting in Delhi. The authority which makes the selection will continue to make the selection. What we have said is that the post will be advertised all over the country and selection will be made on the basis of applications received from all over the country. (*Interruptions*) I do not see why not?

SHRI SATYENDRA NARAYAN SINHA (Aurangabad): By whom?

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO: By the selecting authority. If it is a university, it is the university; if it is a management, it is the management. Whatever it is, the UGC will make full rules, complete rules for the implementation of this; and this has been accepted as a principle; this is reflected in the new policy; this has always been there. I

[Sh. P. V. Narasimha Rao]
have just read that even in 1973 and from
1973 this has been the principle.

SHRI Y. S. MAHAJAN (Jalgaon): This
policy has been there.

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO: Yes.
Omission of tutors and demonstrators in the
scheme of revision has been made good;
they have been included. As for making
training and assessment pre-condition for
Promotion, I am afraid, it is not possible to
reverse in view of the new education policy
and in view of the need to have an assess-
ment. If you say, assessment is different,
promotion is different, then I do not see how
any assessment can become affective; it
has to have a relationship with his forward
movement in his profession, and that is
absolutely clear to me. I just do not see how
these two things can be delinked and still
maintain with the importance that they de-
serve; they have to be linked. If there are
other methods of linking them, that is a
different question. The UGC and the govern-
ment have agreed that this is the method of
linking them. I have not found an alternative
method of linking them; the method which
has been found is being assailed, criticised.
I do not see any rationale for that criticism.
So, they have to be linked. The only thing
that remains is the multiplicity of the grades.
(2) Why did you not allow promotion to a
Lecturer from the Lecturership to Reader-
ship and from the Readership to Professor-
ship. Now, these two, I would like to say, are
linked with the implementation of the new
education policy. Now, if I am told that any
Lecturer, after 15-16 years, should auto-
matically become Professor, I beg to differ.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: That is
not the idea.

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO: There-
fore, if that is not the idea, if a Professor is to
be selected on an all India basis, then by
definition it is a selection post, there should
be no promotion to it. Naturally, even a
Lecturer with five years experience, who is
several cuts below, if he is brilliant, he can
become a Reader tomorrow. So, what we

have done is, according to the policy which
says that there should be incentives for good
performance and disincentives for non-per-
formance, according to that principle, it has
been said that Professors and Readers will
be selection posts. Now, whatever the con-
ditions that are fixed, it is quite apparent that
a Professor is going to be from the teaching
community; a Professor normally, may be 99
percent is from the teaching community. A
Reader is going to be from the teaching
community. He has been teaching as a
Lecturer and so on. Therefore, no outsiders
are generally coming in except perhaps in
the case of scientists who could otherwise
be found to be qualified; but, generally, no
one from outside is coming. But we would
like to say that at these selection levels, merit
only should count and competitive merit
should count. Those who are Readers, can
certainly come and compete; and if they are
found good, if they are found to make the
grade, they will certainly be taken. Now what
is the idea of saying there was no grade. You
call it a Lecturer selection grade; you call it a
grade and say it is not a grade. There was a
grade available in colleges. That was the
only higher grade available to the lecturers.
Now we are making other grades available
to them, for the first time and Mr. Kurup said
that there was only one lecturer's grade. It
was not one lecturer's grade. There were
two. Now, what we have said is that a second
grade will be there, the selection grade will
be there. But there will be senior scale. Now
what we have added in effect is one grade at
the reader's level.

SHRI SURESH KURUP: There was
never any selection grade for lecturer.

SHRI P.V. NARASIMHA RAO: Why do
you call it a grade then? It was named a
grade and you do not say that it is a grade!

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE: You
are calling a selection grade and we are
calling... (*Interruptions*)

SHRI P.V. NARASIMHA RAO: There is a
selection grade. I will tell you. There is no
difficulty about that. But in any case, we
would like assessment to be linked with

advancement. Assessment and advancement cannot be delinked according to the policy. I am not prepared to do so. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI SURESH KURUP: That is not the question. Teachers are not against assessment.

SHRI P.V. NARASIMHA RAO: But it should not be linked with advancement, that is what they say.

SHRI SURESH KURUP: They are not against assessment.

SHRI P.V. NARASIMHA RAO: Okay. Let us think of any other method of linking advancement and assessment.

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE: There should be assessment and chances of promotion.

SHRI SURESH KURUP: You are cleverly diverting the issue.

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE: Not cleverly, crudely.

SHRI P.V. NARASIMHA RAO: There is one concept of assessment, another concept of advancement. Should the two be delinked? I say, they should be linked. Whatever method of linking we have though is this one with the concurrence of the UGC here. You can find out if there is any other method which is better than this. Well, certainly, but for this they need not go on strike.

SHRIMATI GEETA MUKHERJEE (Panskura): That is precisely the point. We are requesting the Minister to sit with them to find out what is their view on assessment and advancement.

SHRI P.V. NARASIMHA RAO: That is precisely my point.

SHRIMATI GEETA MUKHERJEE: That is why you should sit with them.

SHRI P.V. NARASIMHA RAO: There has never been any communication gap with the teachers on the one hand and those who are dealing with this, on this points. The point is, we have not come across and we have not been able to find if there is a better method. We have thought that this should be all right. (*Interruptions*) Now, with a full sense of responsibility I am informing the House that several hon. Members of Parliament themselves are taking interest in this. Let us see if we can find a better method. There is no use simply saying that the Minister should sit with them. That is not going to help because there are so many other educationists-the Chairman of UGC himself is there-very much engaged in this exercise. We are not sleeping over the matter.

I would like to assure the House that if there is anything better within the principles, within the four corners of the New Education Policy, we will see. (*Interruptions*) But what I would like to say is that there is no justification for the strike, if they are agreed on the principles.

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE: It is a matter of ministerial prestige.

SHRI P.V. NARASIMHA RAO: There is no prestige. If they are agreed on policy, if they are agreed on basics, if they are agreed on what would be better, even now the Members of Parliament have agreed on the policy Parliament has already accepted it. The NDC has accepted it. If I go against the policy anywhere you can certainly attack me.

SHRIMATI GEETA MUKHERJEE: What is so sacrosanct about these seven scales?

SHRI P.V. NARASIMHA RAO: That is what I am saying. According to our lights, that is what we consider proper as a good linkage between advancement and assessment, we have put here.

SHRI SURESH KURUP: Why do you include advancement and assessment in one grade?

SHRI P.V. NARASIMHA RAO: Certainly, that linkage is absolutely indispensable under the new policy. *(Interruptions)*

Sir, on that there is a basis difference. they think that advancement should be different and assessment should be different.

SHRI SAIFUDDIN CHOWDHARY (Katwa): We never said that! We never said that!

SHRI P.V. NARASIMHA RAO: You say so now. You are linking it up with the seven grades.

SHRI SURESH KURUP: Will you please clarify?

SHRI P.V. NARASIMHA RAO: I am not saying that there is anything sacrosanct. I have said seven grades and gave reasons. *(Interruptions)*

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: Sir, this can be sorted out.

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE: Two lakh thirty thousand teachers are on strike and you are..... *(Interruptions)*

SHRI VAKKOM PURUSHOTHAMAN (Alleppey): What is your answer for implementing in Kerala? *(Interruptions)*

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE: What did you Government do? *(Interruptions)*

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Please order. Let the Minister finish.

SHRI P.V. NARASIMHA RAO: Let them not try to make up for the deficiencies in the arguments by excess of passion. It is not necessary.

(Interruptions)

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE (Rajapur): We are discussing about the University Teachers.

(Interruptions)

SHRI P.V. NARASIMHA RAO: Sir, as I said there are seven grades. Two grades have been added. Whether they are three are made five; four are made six; five are made seven-whichever way you look at it, one at the Lecturers level, one at the Readers level. There is nothing more. These two have been added in order to link assessment with advancement. This is my short answer. This is my short reply to the objection. Now the rationale is that I want to link them both. That is the rationale.

(Interruptions)

SHRI BASUDEB ACHARIA (Bankura): There is no rationale Sir.

SHRI P.V. NARASIMHA RAO: It is incumbent on me, while implementing the New Education Policy-what is say 'as incentives for good performance and disincentives for non-performance. It has not stopped with incentive.

SHRI SAIFUDDIN CHOWDHARY: That is good.

SHRI P.V. NARASIMHA RAO: That is my Bible. It emanates from that and therefore I cannot go against it. If there is any method other than this, which is in conformity with the principles and if it is more acceptable to the teachers, to me and to everybody, we will certainly.....

(Interruptions)

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: If you sit with them, you will find that on the question of evaluation, basically there is no difference at all. It can be sorted out. Only the *modus operandi* has slightly to be different.

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE: Kindly clarify. What is the necessary relationship between the assessment of merit and seven grades?

SHRI P.V. NARASIMHA RAO: Two

additional grades are introduced for linking them.

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE: It is misleading.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: If it is misleading, then please give it in writing.

SHRI P.V. NARASIMHA RAO: I am very sorry Sir. I cannot match their anger. What I want to say is that there are educationists who are trying to apply their mind whether there is a better method of conforming to the principles and basics. I would like to submit to the House and to the teachers that for that exercise, strike is not the answer and strike is not necessary. Therefore, let them withdraw their strike. About other allowances.....

(Interruptions)

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I can't allow others to go. Let the Minister finish.

SHRI P.V. NARASIMHA RAO: Let me finish.

(Interruptions)

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Mr. Datta Samant, I am not allowing you. Please order. Now, you listen to the Minister.

SHRI P.V. NARASIMHA RAO: If you do not listen, what can I do? We are making effort to convince them.

(Interruptions)

SHRI SAIFUDDIN CHOWDHARY (Katwa): Why they are going on strike? You have to give an answer.

(Interruptions)

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Please order.

SHRI P.V. NARASIMHA RAO: We are making every effort to convince the teachers. that is what we are doing.

There are certain other allowances recommended by the Mehrotra Committee—House Rent Allowance, Building Advance, Interim Relief, etc. Always these allowances are to be paid by the State Government and we have recommended them. We have not rejected them. It is an extraordinary statement to say that the HRA of a teacher in a State University should be paid by the Centre. Is it ever done, I would like to know.

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE: What is your responsible to the Mehrotra Committee's recommendations?

SHRI P.V. NARASIMHA RAO: Only one recommendation we have not found it possible to accept and that is the professional allowance. I do not know what professional allowance is to a person who is already in profession. that we have not been able to accept. *(Interruptions)* giving of all the allowances would have to be looked into by the State Governments. We have recommended and brought these things to their notice. Let us see how they react...*(Interruption)* Coming to 80 per cent and 20 per cent, I would very respectfully submit that whatever happened in 1973, I have every hope that that will not be repeated. We have been in constant touch with the State Governments. They say that they find it difficult. But since they have already agreed, they are trying their very best to fall in line. So, it is a premature to say that the State Governments did not find money. Some Ministers have spoken to me. I have spoken to some others. This is in a stage of consideration still. I am quite hopeful that it will be possible between the Central Government and the State Governments to sort this out. I would certainly appeal to the teachers to withdraw their strike. If there are any variations in the principle...

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: You sit with them and use your human resources to see that the matter is settled.

SHRI P.V. NARASIMHA RAO: I will sit with you. There is no problem in sitting with you. I am sitting with everyone who is sitting

SHRI G.M. BANATWALLA: We all appeal to you to sit with the teachers. You only give appeal but you do not sit with them and look into their problems. It is the wish of the House....*(Interruptions)*

SHRI P.V. NARASIMHA RAO: They have had their say. Now if it is going to be made the central point whether I am going to sit with somebody or not, it only means that they have nothing else to say.

I would appeal to the teachers to withdraw the strike and go back to work. there is really nothing going to be lost by their going back to work and probably nothing is going to be gained by continuing the strike. *(Interruptions)*

PROF. P.J. KURIEN (Idukki): Please allow me to seek a clarification.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: I cannot allow you. Shri Sangma.

PROF. P.J. KURIEN: Please allow me to seek a clarification.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Under the rules, I cannot allow you. In the Calling Attention, no Member, whose name is not there, can be allowed. That is the problem.

PROF. P.J. KURIEN: I am a teacher. I want a clarification.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Shri Sangma.

14.55 hrs

STATEMENT RE : CONSTITUTION OF A
NATIONAL COMMISSION ON RURAL
LABOUR

[English]

THE MINISTER OF STATE OF THE

MINISTRY OF LABOUR (SHRI P.A. SANGMA): Hon'ble Members are aware that the Prime Minister in his Budget Speech for the year 1987-88 had announced the constitution of a National Commission on Rural Labour. Accordingly, a Resolution has been issued constituting the Commission. Shri Jinabhai Darji will be the Chairman of the Commission and following persons are its members.

1. Shri H. Hanumanthappa, M.P.
2. Shri R.P. Panika, M.P.
3. Shri Keyur Bhushan, M.P.
4. Dr. P.C. Joshi
5. Dr. Pradhan H. Prashad
6. Shri Suresh Mathur, Member Secretary.

2. I also place on the Table of the House a copy of the Resolution No. U-24012/1/87-RW dated 11.8.87 which gives the terms of reference, names of members and other essential information.

15.00 hrs

MATTERS UNDER RULE 377

[Translation]

(I) **Need for a long term plan to control floods in North Bihar .**

PROF. CHANDRA BHANU DEVI (Balua): Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, I submit the following important matter before the House under Rule 377

There may be hardly any year when North Bihar has not to reel under the devastating floods. The Ganga, Bagmati, Narayani and Kosi rivers are in spate every year and thousands of persons are killed and property worth crores of rupees is lost every year as a result of this. It is true that the Government has taken several steps during the last few years to control the floods but in spite of that, people have not escaped the fury of the floods. I suggest that a long-term