

Shrimati Jyotsna Chanda, Shri Tridib Chaudhuri, Shri Darbara Singh, Shri V. Shanker Giri, Shri Jitendra Prasad, Shri Purushottam Kakodkar, Shri Bibhuti Mishra, Shri Jagannath Mishra, Shri Srikishan Modi, Shri Surendra Mohanty, Shri S. T. Pandit, Shri Chintamani Panigrahi, Shri H. M. Patel, Shri M. T. Raju, Shri Sukhdeo Prasad Verma, Shri Vayalar Ravi, Shri mati Sushila Rohatgi, Dr, Saradish Roy, Shri S. C. Samanta, Shri Satpal Kapur, Shri Ram Sheikhar Prasad Singh, Shri satyendra Narayan Sinha, Shri R. V. Swaminathan, Shri Tula Ram, Shri V. Tulsiram, Shri G. Viswanathan, Shri Y. B. Chavan, and 15 from Rajya Sabha;

that in order to constitute a sitting of the Joint Committee the quorum shall be one-third of the total number of members of the Joint Committee;

that the Committee shall make a report to this House by the first day of the next session;

that in other respects the Rules of Procedure of this House relating to Parliamentary Committees shall apply with such variations and modifications as the Speaker may make; and

that this House do recommend to Rajya Sabha that Rajya Sabha do join the said Joint Committee and communicate to this House the names of 15 members to be appointed by Rajya Sabha to the Joint Committee."

The Motion was adopted

14 49 hrs

UNIVERSITY GRANTS COMMISSION (AMENDMENT) BILL

THE MINISTER OF EDUCATION, SOCIAL WELFARE AND CULTURE (PROF. S. NURAL HASAN) : Sir, I beg to move :*

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

The University Grants Commission Act was passed in 1956 to provide for, among other things, the determination of standards of higher education and for providing suitable grants to institutions of higher education and learning in the country. On the basis of the working of the University Grants Commission Act, it was felt that there was a scope for bringing about certain organisational changes and widening some of the provisions of the Bill. This feeling was reinforced by the recommendation made in July, 1964 by the Committee of Members of Parliament under the Chairmanship of Shri P. N. Saprú, which examined the provisions of the Constitution regarding the responsibility of the Centre in the field of higher education. After examining the matter in all its respects, the Bill to amend the University Grants Commission Act was introduced in the Rajya Sabha in 1966 and it was passed by the Rajya Sabha in August 1966 but it lapsed on the dissolution of the Third Lok Sabha.

Meanwhile the education Commission (1964—66) submitted its report making certain recommendations about the working of the University Grants Commission. After taking into account the recommendations of the Education Commission, a new Bill was introduced in 1968 in the Rajya Sabha.

The main features of the Bill which was then introduced in 1968 were as follows; Firstly, the numbers of members of the Commission was increased from 9 to 11, out of whom not more than three could be appointed as wholetime members. Secondly, serving vice-chancellors and heads of educational institutions receiving grants from the U. G. C. were excluded from the membership of the Commission. Thirdly, provision was made in the Bill enabling members of the Commission to elect a vice-chairman from among themselves. Fourthly, the term of office of the chairman was fixed as five years and the term of office of the other members of the commission was reduced from

*Moved with the recommendation of the President.

[Prof. S. Nurul Hasan]

six years to three years with eligibility for reappointment for a further term. However, the total period for which a member could hold office was not to exceed the period of six years. Fifthly, the commission was empowered to give assistance to non-central universities for the maintenance of their special activities like centres of advanced study. Next, the commission was barred from making grants to any university established without the previous approval of commission and the Central Government. Then the commission was empowered to give grants to institutions deemed to be universities in pursuance of a declaration made under section 3 of the U. G. C. Act for development or for other specified purposes. Lastly the commission was empowered to make regulations regarding the delegation by the commission to its chairman or whole-time members or officers its power of general superintendence and direction over the business transacted by or in the commission, including the powers with regard to office expenditure and other matters relating to internal administration of the commission.

The Bill, after having been passed by both the Houses of Parliament, received the assent of the President on 3 June 1970. According to section 1 (ii) of the amending Act, it was to come into force on such date as Central Government may by notification in the official gazette appoint. Before the Central Government issued such a notification, certain serious difficulties which might have arisen in the functioning of the new Act were brought to the notice of the Central Government which considered it its duty to give serious consideration to these points.

Among the matters that were raised was that a university which had been established without the previous approval of the Central Government of the advice of the U. G. C. was permanently debarred from receiving any grant at any time. This was a very serious matter. It is possible and I think desirable that we have some sort of discipline introduced in the country that universities should not be established light-heartedly without due reparation. But I think the House will agree that this absolute bar for all times to come is a very serious

matter. Maybe at any given time some state Government or State legislature may decide to establish and incorporate a university. Maybe when the university is established the conditions and circumstances which are desirable for the establishment of a university do not exist, but subsequently the situation undergoes a change and those conditions are fulfilled. Therefore, that university, after having fulfilled those conditions should be entitled to receive the grants from the U.G.C.

There was another matter. Suppose there is a well-established college which has been as a college affiliated to a well-established university in receipt of regular grants from U.G.C. Suddenly an Act is passed by a State legislature by which compulsory that well-established college is transferred from the jurisdiction of a well-established university into a new university which has been established without consultation and without the approval of U.G.C. and the Central Government. This well-established institution would have been debarred for ever and ever from receiving any grants from the U.G.C. This was a very serious matter.

Secondly, it was felt that while there was a great deal of justification for ensuring that Vice Chancellors do not come into the UGC as a category, it would not be proper to debar Vice-Chancellors because they happen to be Vice-Chancellors. For example, the Act passed in 1970 provided and rightly so, that university teachers should be made members of UGC. Supposing one of the teachers, after having become a member of UGC were to be invited to become the Vice-Chancellor of some university, he would be compelled to resign from the UGC straightway. This, it was felt, was not a very proper thing. Another difficulty was that the UGC Act provided for 3 whole-time members. But it was possible that the Vice-Chairman may not be one of the whole-time members, because the Vice-Chairman was supposed to be an elected person by the Commission. That would have created a controversy or conflict of jurisdiction where none need exist. In any case, many of the persons who were sounded to become members expressed their unhappiness that there was going to be two categories of members, some sitting perman-

ently in the UGC office and therefore in a better position to influence the functioning of the UGC and the others who would be part-time members coming to give their advice. Therefore, it would be really discriminatory.

15 hrs.

Then the question was whether a vacancy could be filled only for the residue of the term. That would have created a great deal of difficulty. At the same time, no provision exists for a sudden vacancy arising in the office of the Chairman. What is to happen if the office of the Chairman were to fall vacant rather suddenly? All these difficulties were felt. Then the matter was under discussion and, finally, on the basis of a discussion which was held between the Chairman of the UGC and some eminent educationists in the Ministry of Education last October, a number of proposals were formulated, and these proposals are now before the House. It was felt that in view of the difficulties that had been created, it would be better to repeal the Act of 1970 and bring in a new Act which brings in all the salutary provisions of the 1970 Act, but as amended, in order to get over the difficulty.

So far as the membership under the new Act is concerned, it will be as follows: the Chairman appointed by the Central Government, as he was; a Vice-Chairman, also a whole-time salaried officer, appointed by the Central Government; four teachers of the universities four other persons who may be teachers, who may be persons well-versed in agriculture, in professions and so on; and two officials of the Central Government, which is an old thing, which is being continued from 1956.

Apart from the Chairman and the Vice-Chairman there is no distinction between the rest of the members. They are all part-time members and they are all on equal footing. I have already said that Vice-Chancellors are not debarred from the membership of the Commission. This change is in accordance with the recommendation of the Education Commission. We have provided that in the case of a casual vacancy for the office of Chairman of the UGC, the Vice-Chairman should act as the Chairman for the remainder of the term of the outgoing Chairman. At present, when a casual vacancy arises for the office of

the Chairman, it can be filled only for the residue of the term of the outgoing chairman. Normally, you cannot invite a distinguished educationist, which I hope a Chairman will always be, to come and take over the office of the Chairman for less than a full term. It is, therefore, proposed that if a casual vacancy arises in the office of the Chairman, or he is unable to discharge his functions owing to illness or incapacity, the Vice-Chairman should act as Chairman for the remainder of the term of the outgoing Chairman, or until such time as another person is appointed as Chairman for a full term. In case there is no Vice Chairman at the time when the casual vacancy arises, the Central Government should have the power to appoint any member of the Commission to act as the Chairman for a period not exceeding six months. A provision to this effect has been included in this Bill.

At present vacancies among the members of the Commission are filled for the residue of the term of the outgoing members. For the reasons which I have stated, a provision has been made in the Bill that such vacancies will be filled for a full term, and not for the residue of the term.

Then, as in the case of the amending Act of 1970, the present Bill also contains provisions empowering the Commission to give assistance to non-Central universities in the maintenance of their special activities, like, the centres of advanced study and also to give grants to institutions deemed to be universities under Section 3 of the U. G. C. Act for the maintenance of their special activities or for development or for other specified purpose.

The amending Act of 1970 contained a provision that the Commission shall not give a grant, as I explained at length, to a university at any time which was established without its approval and the approval of the Central Government. Now this has been modified in the present Bill. It is stated that the Central Government or the UGC or any other organisation financed by the Central Government will not give any grant to any university which is established after the commencement of the Act unless such university has been declared by the UGC to be fit for receiving such grant. That is to say, we are now making what I consider to

[Prof S Nuril Hasan]

be a much more reasonable legislation in which it is possible, after a university has fulfilled the basic criteria laid down by the U G C to receive grants, whether from one source of the Central Government or from another source of the Central Government

Section 14 of the original Act provided that if a university were to fail to comply with recommendations made in Sections 12 and 13 of the U G C Act then, after taking into consideration the explanation, if any, furnished by the university, the U G C could withhold from the university grants proposed to be given outside the funds of the Commission

At the same time, there was in the rule-making power, under Sections 25 and 26 of the U G C Act, certain provisions regarding inspection of university returns required to be furnished by universities to the U G C and certain other matters which were useful for ensuring the determination of standards. It was felt that the provision of Section 14 should be applicable in case there was a failure on the part of a university to comply with the directives given under Sections 25 and 26 of the U G C Act

As in the amending Act of 1970 a provision has been made in the present Bill empowering the Commission to make regulations regarding the delegation of these powers to the Chairman or the Vice Chairman or officers of the Commission for the general superintendence, office expenditure and matters relating to the internal administration of the Commission

Sir these are the principle features of the Bill and I hope, the House will be pleased to accept them

MR DEPUTY SPEAKER Motion moved

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

SHRI JAGADISH BHATTACHARYYA (Ghatal) Mr Deputy Speaker Sir, the U G C has been subjected to severe criti-

cism so many times in this House and even outside. Really speaking, its performance in the matter of providing university education and in the matter of betterment of the conditions and the future of universities and their constituent colleges, is far from satisfactory. In the face of all this, a new Bill has been brought before the House

Generally, we expected that this new University Grants Commission (Amendment) Bill was to cater to the needs of the higher education. But the form in which it is presented before the House is neither radical nor there has been any appreciable improvement on the existing set up of the Commission. No noticeable change has made practically in it. The only change is in the number of the members of the Commission and about the appointment of a new Vice-Chairman. I do not think that, by raising the number of members of the Commission and by appointing a Vice-Chairman, there will be any appreciable change in the working of the Commission so that it may expedite the heavy load of work that is already before it and may come before it. Particularly, the Commission which has to look after higher education of the country should be of a democratic character as all the members of the Commission including its Chairman and Vice-Chairman are to be appointed by the Central Government. There is no scope for any elected member in this Commission from anywhere. There should be some sort of representation of college teachers of Vice-Chancellors, of the members of the Governing Body of the constituent colleges, etc. So that they might be elected there and not appointed by the Government as has been the case here in this Bill. So we find that the democratic character of the Commission which ought to have been there is completely absent.

India is a big country with a large number of universities and it is very hard for a single commission of this type to cope with the huge tasks that will come before them. The result will be that there will be inordinate delay in the execution of plans and programmes that might come before it and they will not be in a position to pay proper attention to each and every problem that concerns

the universities or the teachers of the constituent colleges. That is why, a large section of college and university teachers and many educationists wanted to have separate U.G.C. for each State so that the Particular Problems of each State can be looked into very carefully and the solutions of these Problems can have a quick attention of the Commission and they can be expedited. This is not possible for a Commission like this which will be entrusted with the work of looking after something like 80 universities. The Bill has given very little power to the Commission. It will practically be a special wing of the Central Secretariat and it will have all the vices of bureaucracy. Really speaking, this will be used merely as a rubber stamp to put a seal on what the Central Secretariat wants to do. This situation will be there. So, I think, this Commission, in its present form, will not be able to cope with the heavy load of work it will be faced with. The result will be that education, and particularly the teachers of universities and constituent colleges will go on being neglected as it was being done in the past.

SHRI H. N. MUKERJEE (Calcutta North East) : I am afraid that, perhaps, again in the name of expedition of Parliamentary business, we are having to rush through a piece of legislation to which, I feel, much greater thought ought to have been given. For this kind of Bill, I am sure, a reference to the Select Committee is generally called for even though it is amendment of an original Bill, which had been very carefully thought out, but I wonder if there had been any special meeting of the Informal Consultative Committee of the Ministry of Education where on a special agenda this kind of Bill could have been discussed properly and the views of the Members elicited. I say it because the University Grants Commission is an institution in which high hopes had been placed for a long time. I remember when it was first discussed by this House in the first Parliament, and it was discussed in the Joint Committee which examined the provisions of the original Bill, men like the late Maha-Mahopadhyaya P. V. Kane and Dr. Zakir Husain and so many others whom I need not mention—I am mentioning only two who are dead—were members of the Joint Select Committee which produced the University Grants Commission Bill. However, the University Grants Commission has turn-

ed out, I regret to have to say, a disappointment. Its original objective had been not only the maintenance of our academic standards in so far as higher education is concerned, but also the promotion of those standards and I do not see, if I look around the country to-day, that the results have been in any light, commensurate with our hopes.

The UGC has naturally to look after the Central Universities as a priority item in their charge. But we know how the Central Universities have been faring. The Banaras, Aligarh and the Viswa Bharati are all in doldrums and are in a most peculiar mess which has got to be straightened out. Heaven knows how and only there is the University of Delhi which in spite of set-backs, does continue to carry on in a fairly satisfactory manner on the whole but, in so far as the record academic of the four Central Universities are concerned, there is nothing very much to write home about and, generally speaking the entire academic atmosphere of this country has not been positively assisted to the extent that was expected of it by the working of the University Grants Commission.

I know from time to time the reports of the University Grants Commission are discussed in this House, but it is done rather in a lackadaisical fashion and it requires a great deal of mud-digging out, and my grouse is that during the last two decades so many reports have appeared and in so far as they relate to higher education, there have been very important points. If we take the Education Commission's report, for example, it is now being sheltered in the archives of this country. Nobody knows what the Education Commission reported after three or four or five years of labour, producing a voluminous document which the Ministry is now printing in instalments and that sort of things. But substantial things are not done. Nothing is done to follow up the recommendations of the Commission, and in so far as the Education Commission's recommendations are concerned, I should say that the problem of the use of our own Indian languages for the purpose of higher education, this problem continues to be shelved. It was only Dr. Triguna Sen when he was Minister for Education who made a special effort to do something about induction of

[Shri H. N. Mukerjee]

Indian languages as a genuine medium of instruction at the higher academic level, but we have wanted all these reports starting from Dr. Radhakrishnan's report of 1948 and Dr. Triguna Sen when he was Minister was trying to do something. He got together the Members of Parliament and produced another report, but nothing gets done because in the academic community of today, plagued as it is by a multitude of problems, or whatever other reasons may be the reason is that a single-minded devotion to the idea of the advancement of learning, the idea that knowledge is power and the boundaries of knowledge have got to be expanded if this country is to grow and if humanity is to have fulfilment, is not there.

There is nothing like a passion in regard to the advancement of education because if it was there then in our country now free for 25 years and more we would have tried to get our people into the picture in so far as higher education was also concerned, and we would have made sure about our own languages being the media of instruction, but we have not done so because we really do not care.

The knowledge which we imbibe through a language which is not our own, a language which we did not learn at our mother's knee is knowledge which never becomes part of ourselves, and that is why most of us are secondhand persons, intellectually speaking, unoriginal, absolutely secondary individuals who cannot make their contribution to the creative advance of humanity, and we find the universities going down-hill all the time. My hon. friend the Minister knows very well how wherever he looks he would see that the picture in the universities is dark and dismal. I find also at the same time that some special prize-posts are created by the establishments and those who are near it, which some times redounds to the discredit of academic advancement. I find for example that the institution of certain scholarships or professorships or whatever you call them, the Jawaharlal Nehru memorial fellowships, fellowships they are called, is one such example. I am myself on that committee and so I have the mortification of having to see these things, where scholars are chosen by a coterie from all over India

and paid Rs. 3000 a month, with Rs. 10,000 a year for expenses in regard to their special educational purposes. This is discrimination, which I am sure is resented by the generality of teachers in the different academics of our country. But these prize things are put up at a particular place because of the establishment wanting to have its empire run in a particular fashion. I have wanted to find out how much real genuine academic work has been done by these people who get all the plums from the establishment. They vitiate the entire atmosphere of academic work. I could expand it for any length of time, but I need not do so. But I feel that the UGC has not satisfied the expectations made of it. I feel that Government has also never had a continuous examination of the work of the UGC so that its academic work could be checked and remedies found for whatever deficiencies were there. Government comes now with a few bureaucratic proposals which might be good or might not be good, which might not be absolutely essential, and which we could even do without, that is, we could do even without whatever changes are made because it would only mean that the UGC would oscillate between Tweedledum and Tweedledum and nothing very much would happen.

I only participated in this debate to give expression to my feeling, my anxiety and my misgivings which have grown over the years that in so far as academic idealism is concerned, we have said good-bye to it, and all this talk about the UGC and eminent scholars heading it and becoming this or that is so much utter waste of breath, and that is why unless you can go back to a fundamentals, unless in this twenty-fifth year of Independence of this country, you can try to make up your mind about remoulding the entire basis of education, giving education as a property of the whole people, unless we can make up our mind about it, unless you can take to the idea of advancement of learning as something which touches the deepest cords of our heart, unless we can bring about that kind of exhilaration which we should be having, whatever kind of education is bureaucratically supplied to us, generally in a foreign language and imbibed in an absolutely secondhand fashion is not going to do us much good. This is the

picture in the context of which the hon. Minister has come forward with certain proposals; they may be good or may be bad, but they do not interest me to a very considerable extent.

What I feel is that this Bill should have been prepared after very much more careful preparation, and discussion should have preceded it, but that not having been done, I can only express my regret and my grouse over it.

SHRI Y. S. MAHAJAN (Buldana): I rise to support the University Grants Commission (Amendment) Bill brought forward by the hon. Minister.

SHRI MANORANJAN HAZRA (Arambagh): Support anarchy in education.

SHRI Y. S. MAHAJAN: The UGC came into existence as a result of an executive order in 1953, and it became a statutory body in 1956. It is mainly an allocating body which is concerned with giving grants. It is a disbursing body. It has also two important functions which are given in the Act, namely that it has the general duty to take all such steps as it may think fit for the promotion and for the coordination of higher education and for the determination and maintenance of standards of teaching, examination and research in the universities, and it has also the duty to be guided by instructions for the purpose of general national educational policy which may be given to the commission by the Education Ministry. It is an autonomous body and it functions in a peculiar way. It cannot be identified with the normal channels of Government departments. Because of its organisation, because of its functioning, it has created confidence, and gained the trust and respect of the universities. During the last 16 years, it has done great service to the cause of higher education, and we can see, if we can go to any campus of a university or a college, that it has expanded the facilities and has done its best to improve the standard of teaching and examination all over India.

There is some truth in what Prof. Mukerjee has said, that in spite of the great efforts of the University Grants Commission we find that in many campuses we do not

get the atmosphere which should be full of curiosity, eagerness to advance knowledge, full of eagerness to carry out fundamental research. I do not think we can blame the University Grant Commission for that. If at all the blame is to be levelled, we have to blame the teachers in the different universities or those who are responsible for running the different educational institutions in the whole country. The University Grants Commission has done what it could in this field.

The present amendment gives the commission to a wider basis, gives it an elastic structure and puts on it an additional responsibility. For instance, it says that the commission will be empowered to give grants in future for maintaining special activities of the universities, such as advanced centres of research. Secondly, it will be able to give maintenance grants to certain institutions which are deemed as universities. These are the additional responsibilities placed on the shoulders of the University Grant Commission. Still, the note says that the normal budget will be sufficient. I hope the Minister will explain why additional expenses will not be required.

Then, the Statement of Objects and Reasons, says that in future, if a new university is established, it will not receive grants unless it fulfils certain criteria laid down by the University Grants Commission. I wish the Education Minister had explained these criteria in this speech. I think we have to keep in mind here what the Gajendragadkar Committee has said namely that no university should have more than 30 or 60 colleges affiliated to it. If the number of colleges is more, then it becomes a more conglomeration and it is not possible to run the affairs of the universities smoothly, efficiently and profitably. If, bearing this in mind, the University Grants Commission lays down in future the criteria to be satisfied for establishing a university, I think it will be doing something which is essential for the cause of education. At present, in our country we have universities that have lakhs of students or more than two lakhs of students in some cases; every year, the number of students increases by three lakhs, *i. e.* by 13 or 14 per cent, whereas the number of universities is not increasing in the same proportion. I am of the view that a university, like any other organisation, has an optimum size. If

[Shri Y. S. Mahajan]

the actual size goes beyond that, its working becomes inefficient. Part of the malaise in the field of higher education is due to the fact that universities are too big. The Vice-chancellors cannot properly look after the colleges that are affiliated to their universities. I know of Vice-Chancellors who have never visited the colleges affiliated to their universities. Therefore, as regards the proper size of the universities, the conditions under which they can be established, if these can be determined by the University Grants Commission for guidance of the State Governments, it will be doing which is urgently necessary

I would not refer in detail to the question of improvement of the quality of education, as Prof. Mukerjee has so eloquently spoken about it.

The need for expansion of higher education in India is great and in the present condition we have to make higher education available to sections of the community which have never had the opportunity of receiving it in the past. Therefore, we have to make for a large expansion of higher education. The UGC can do its work of co-ordination by having at least one city university in each State. As regards the process of expansion it can persuade more universities to undertake correspondence courses. It should also think whether we can have an open university in this country. In England they have a university on the air. Mass media have been utilised for giving higher education to people who never had the opportunity in their life to attend a college or a university on account of financial or a other difficulties. If mass media are used, in this way the UGC shall have rendered yeoman service in promoting and expanding higher education in the country. With these remarks, I support the Bill.

SHRI R.P. ULAGANAMBI (Vellore) :
I am sorry to say that the hon. Minister has brought this Bill towards the very end of the session, without giving adequate time for Members to study the provisions of the Bill. The President's sanction was received on 24 May and it was circulated yesterday and today it has come up for discussion. What is the reason behind the urgency of the Bill ?

It is said in the Bill that there will be a chairman, a vice-chairman and ten other members. If the office of chairman falls vacant by reason of his death or resignation or he is unable to discharge his functions owing to illness, the vice-chairman will act as chairman. There is a provision in the Bill to this effect. In case there is no vice-chairman at the time of a casual vacancy, the Central Government will have power to appoint any member of the commission to act as chairman for a period not exceeding six months. When there is this power, what is the need for appointing a vice-chairman ? I also want to know the reason for increasing the number of members from 9 to 12 ? He said that it was recommended by a committee. What was the need for increasing the number ? What is the reason for creating a new post of vice-chairman when the Central Government has got the power to appoint a chairman when he dies or is unable to discharge his duties ? The burden to the exchequer on account of these increases will be Rs 40,000 per year.

What is the main function of the UGC ? What has it done ? It is getting money from the Government and distributing it to various universities and institutions. As far as I know, it does not devote serious attention to changing the system of education. You know, Sir, that our present educational system only produces clerks. From the first class to the higher classes, our students are being taught Mahabharata, Ramayana, Shastras and other things which are not based on reason, but which give blind belief and which are not applicable to the present age when man has landed on the moon and we are still teaching our students that Hanuman lifted the mountain to protect people from the rain ! Such an educational system must be dispensed with and a system with a scientific approach should be introduced. Then only our society will change and economic development will be expedited. We expect the University Grants Commission to do something in this regard.

Government have appointed so many committees and commissions in the past and so many valuable recommendations have been made by them. What is the use of appointing committees if their recommenda-

tions are not implemented? The commissions take so much time to go into the problems and make recommendations but the fruits do not reach the people. Therefore, I request the minister to see that those recommendations which are useful to the teachers, students and the country in general should be implemented.

श्री शिवनाथ सिंह (झुन्झुनु) : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, यूनिवर्सिटी ग्रांट्स कमीशन अमेंडमेंट बिल इंटीडयूस करते समय माननीय मंत्री जी ने कुछ मुद्दे हमारे सामने रखे। 1970 में इसी तरह का एक अमेंडमेंट बिल पास हुआ था। इसी पार्लियामेंट ने पास किया था और दो साल के बाद में वह प्राविजन्स अच्छे नहीं रहे, दूसरे प्राविजन्स हमारे सामने आ गए। मैं उन प्राविजन्स की अच्छाई में जाना चाहता हूँ न इनकी बुराई में जाना चाहता हूँ। उस वक्त उन प्राविजन्स के पक्ष में दलील दी गई थी, आज इनके पक्ष में दलील दी जा रही है। यूनिवर्सिटी ग्रांट्स कमीशन एक संस्था है, ऐसी संस्था है जिसे हमारे हायर एजुकेशन के प्रोमोशन में मदद करनी चाहिए। आज जिस प्रकार की स्थिति हायर एजुकेशन की है वह हमसे छिपी हुई नहीं है और देश के नागरिक इस बात से संतुष्ट नहीं हैं कि हायर एजुकेशन जिस प्रकार की होनी चाहिए वह हो रही है। यूनिवर्सिटी ग्रांट्स कमीशन एक तरह से यूनिवर्सिटीज पर कंट्रोल करता है। यूनिवर्सिटीज अपनी आटोनोमी पर बहुत निर्भर करती है। अपनी स्वायत्तता के लिए बहुत प्रयत्नशील हैं। स्वायत्तता उनमें है भी लेकिन यूनिवर्सिटी ग्रांट्स कमीशन को देखना चाहिए कि यूनिवर्सिटीज की कितनी स्वायत्तता रहे। आज हम देखते हैं कि यूनिवर्सिटीज कितना कंट्रोल करती हैं अपने कालेजों को और अपने सिस्टम आफ एजुकेशन को और जिस प्रकार का सिस्टम हम देश के लिए चाहते हैं उसमें हम कितना कर पाए हैं यह देखने की चीज है। आज 25 साल के बाद भी मीडियम आफ एजुकेशन क्या हो, किस प्रकार का एजुकेशन हो, हायर एजुकेशन, फर्स्ट ईयर सेकंड ईयर, थर्ड ईयर, पी० यू० सी० कितने हमने प्राविजन कर

रखे हैं, उनमें कौन-सा सूटबल है हमारी कंडीशंस के लिए, कौन-सा सूटबल नहीं है, इस प्रकार की बातों पर कमीशन सोचे, निर्णय ले और रास्ता दिखाए तो अच्छी बात है। आज यूनिवर्सिटीज में जिस प्रकार की संस्थाएँ जो काम कर रही हैं उनसे किसी को संतोष नहीं है। उनके टीचर्स में संतोष नहीं है, टीचर्स में आपस में असंतोष है, पार्टीबार्जी है, धड़े बंटे हुए हैं। कहीं वाइस-चांसलर और स्टूडेंट्स का झगडा होता है। आए दिन यूनिवर्सिटीज बन्द होती हैं। वह किम लिए? वह अपनी स्वायत्तता नहीं खोना चाहतीं। स्टेट का इंटरफीयरेंस नहीं चाहतीं, किसी असेम्बली या पार्लियामेंट, का इंटरफेरेंस नहीं चाहतीं और खुद अपनी व्यवस्था कर नहीं सकती। हमने जोधपुर की यूनिवर्सिटी के संबंध में देखा।

वहाँ के वाइस-चांसलर को उनके आफिस में जाकर पीटा गया, मारपीट की गई। सरकार का एक दृष्टिकोण है, यूनिवर्सिटी का दूसरा दृष्टिकोण है और पुलिस का तीसरा दृष्टिकोण है। उदाहरण के लिए मैं कहना चाहता हूँ राजस्थान की यूनिवर्सिटी को दो या तीन साल पहले प्री-मेट्रिकल टेस्ट जो होता है उसका एक काम दिया गया। पहले यह सोचने थे कि सरकार इसमें इंटरफीयरेंस करती है, इनके मलेक्शन में भेदभाव होता है, इसलिए यूनिवर्सिटी को यह काम दिया गया। आज मैं आपका ध्यान दिलाना चाहता हूँ। राजस्थान की असेम्बली में तीन चार रोज पहले एक बहुत बड़ा हंगामा हुआ इस बात पर कि यूनिवर्सिटी जिसको हम एक निष्पक्ष संस्था कह सकते हैं गजामिनेशन को कांडक्ट करने के लिए, उसके अन्दर भेदभाव होता है, जो स्टूडेंट फर्स्ट क्लास अपने कैरियर में रहते हैं वह प्री-मेट्रिकल टेस्ट में असफल होते हैं। इस प्रकार की हमारी यूनिवर्सिटीज की कंडीशन है। मैं आपसे निवेदन करना चाहूँगा कि हम चाहे चेयरमैन रखें, वाइस चेयरमैन रखें, मेम्बर्स को बढ़ायें या घटायें, हमसे यूनिवर्सिटी ग्रांट्स कमीशन कोई बड़ा काम कर सकता हो, मैं ऐसा नहीं मानता। हूँ

[श्री शिवनाथ सिंह]

यूनीवर्सिटी ग्रांट्स कमिशन को रुपया देने, ग्रांट्स देने और उसका अच्छी तरह से यूटीलाइजेशन हो रहा है या नहीं हो रहा है, सिर्फ इसी बात को देखने तक सीमित नहीं रखना चाहिये, इसके क्षेत्र को बढ़ाना चाहिये। देश में किस प्रकार की एजुकेशन को हम लाना चाहते हैं, देश के करोड़ों बच्चे ऐसे हैं जो हायर एजुकेशन नहीं ले सकते, क्योंकि यूनीवर्सिटी की पढ़ाई इतनी महंगी हो गई है कि वे आगे आ ही नहीं सकते, किस तरह से एजुकेशन को सस्ता किया जाय ताकि देश के करोड़ों बच्चों को हायर एजुकेशन मिल सके—ऐसी व्यवस्था करनी चाहिए। कमिशन का रूप इस तरह का बनाना चाहिये ताकि यूनीवर्सिटीज को रास्ता दिखा सके। आप आज एक प्रावधान लाते हैं, कल दूसरा लाते हैं, इससे फर्क नहीं पड़ता, हम तो यह चाहते हैं कि हमारा एजुकेशन मिस्टम बदले, हमारी टेकनीकल एजुकेशन अच्छी हो, एक यूनीवर्सिटी का स्टैण्डर्ड दूसरी यूनीवर्सिटी के बराबर हो। कमिशन का फंक्शन यूनीवर्सिटीज के बीच कोआर्डिनेशन का होना चाहिए। आज एक यूनीवर्सिटी एक स्टूडेंट को 80 परसेंट मार्क्स देती है, दूसरी यूनीवर्सिटी उमी तरह स्टैण्डर्ड के छात्र को 60 परसेन्ट मार्क्स भी नहीं दे पाती, इससे जो रेकॉर्ड होता है, उसमें डिफिकल्टी आती है। एजुकेशन में किस प्रकार का स्टैण्डर्ड रहे, पाम-मार्क्स क्या हों, फर्स्टक्लास का क्या स्टैण्डर्ड हो, इस प्रकार का कोआर्डिनेशन तमाम यूनीवर्सिटीज के बीच होना चाहिए और उस पर कमिशन का कंट्रोल हो—इस तरह की व्यवस्था होनी चाहिए। हमें कमिशन को अधिकार देना चाहिए ताकि वह देश की एजुकेशन के स्टैण्डर्ड को बढ़ा सके, उनमें समानता ला सके। इस तरह से एक अच्छा दृष्टिकोण हमारे समाने आ सकेगा तथा देश के भूखे-नंगे और गरीब बच्चों के लिए हायर एजुकेशन का इन्तजाम हो सकेगा। ऐसे कमिशन का हम स्वागत करेंगे। हम आप के इस प्रावधान का स्वागत करते हैं, अगले दो

वर्षों में आप फिर इसको बदलेंगे, कोई झूरा प्रावधान लायेंगे तो फिर हम उसका भी स्वागत करेंगे।

THE MINISTER OF EDUCATION, SOCIAL WELFARE AND CULTURE (PROF. S. NURUL HASAN): Sir, I am grateful to the hon. Members for the points that have been raised by them. Of course, hon. Members took this opportunity, and I am very glad that they did, to express their dissatisfaction with the present system of higher education in the country. I am certainly not a person who will refuse to share their correct sentiments. Just now we had a plea that the real purpose before the country should be that the higher education should reach the children of our masses and that it should be of the highest standard. Professor Mukerjee now, as always, give a scintillating speech. But the purpose of this Bill is rather limited. It is not a general review of the functioning of the University Grants Commission. I would like to clarify two or three points and will not take much of your time.

First of all, a point was raised by Professor Mukerjee, which is a misunderstanding, and I must clarify it, and that is about Jawaharlal Nehru Fellowships. These Fellowships are not granted either by the UGC or by any Indian university. These are Fellowships which are granted by the Jawaharlal Nehru Memorial Fund. Therefore, members should not get the impression that either the UGC or any of the universities is connected with these fellowships. Of course, those to whom this fellowship is granted may be government servants, university teachers or members of the public but it is not the UGC which finances this particular fellowship.

It has been suggested that there should be a separate UGC for each State. In one State, an experiment was tried, that is, in Bihar. When I had the honour to visit Bihar as a member of the visiting Committee sent by the UGC, all teachers and students whom we met made one particular recommendation saying, "Would you please advise the abolition of all State UGCs?". Before that, Uttar Pradesh had a UGC. At one

stage, even I was made a member of it. But because none of the teachers felt that it would be in the best interest of the teaching community and of the universities, this particular institution was not given.

It was suggested by my hon. friend, Shri Jagadish Bhattacharyya, that the UGC is a rubber-stamp of the secretariat. I personally do not think a rubber-stamp of the secretariat is a bad thing at least so long as I consider myself to be a person putting a rubber-stamp. I think, I have the educational values. But, factually, it is incorrect. We all respect the autonomy of the UGC. We dare not make any suggestion which is not acceptable to the UGC. I think, this attitude of the Central Government to treat the autonomy of the UGC with great respect has been in the best interest of the country. Therefore, I would like this to be clarified.

The functioning of the UGC has been explained by me once before and I would repeat that most of the work of the UGC is done through a number of *ad hoc* committees. In these *ad hoc* committees, they seek to involve teachers from different parts of the country and from different universities. Therefore, by and large, more than 200 or so teachers of various universities are involved in any given year with the functions of the UGC.

So far as the question of the defining of criteria for the establishment of universities is concerned, I hope that the UGC will, as I am told, it is applying its mind to the question of planning of higher education. We need today a great deal more of planning of higher education as well as making efforts to improve it.

I also welcome the suggestion about open universities. I may state that I have requested some of the academics to examine this question in great depth. As soon as this examination is over, I will make the report available to the UGC for their consideration.

As regards the question, if you have a Vice-Chairman, why you are providing for a contingency. I may say, sometimes, it might happen just by chance—after all, we are all human-beings—that at any given point of time, something may happen to both the

Chairman and the Vice-Chairman and they are unable to function. Therefore, a law must provide for a contingency. This is only a contingency.

So far as the question of increased number is concerned, the House had already approved of the increased number in 1970, from 9 to 12.

With these words, I request the House to give its approval to the Bill.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : The question is :

‘That the Bill further to amend the University Grants Commission Act, 1956, be taken into consideration.’

The motion was adopted.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : We now take up the clause-by-clause consideration of the Bill. There are no amendments whatsoever to any of the clauses of the Bill. So, I put all the clauses together to the vote of the House.

The question is :

‘‘That Clauses 2 to 10, Clause 1, the Enacting Formula and the Title stand part of the Bill.’’

The motion was adopted

Clauses 2 to 10, Clause 1, the Enacting Formula and the Title were added to the Bill

PROF. S. NURUL HASAN : I beg to move :

‘‘That the Bill be passed’’.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : The question is :

‘‘That the Bill be passed’’.

The motion was adopted.