

[Shri Biswas]

which should go into the Bill. That means this Bill has got to be referred to the other House and that means further loss of time. That point of view may also be kept before the House.

**Mr. Speaker:** That point was also considered and it was thought that it will expedite the disposal of the Bill much earlier by having a Committee of this House only. If the other House wants, it is free to have its own Committee. There is no difficulty about it.

**Shri T. S. A. Chettiar:** If you want to decide that the Bill may be referred to the Select Committee. I would like to make an amendment, when it comes for consideration after the report of the Select Committee, that it should be given at least three hours for consideration after the Select Committee report is received. This is an important matter.

**Mr. Speaker:** We shall settle the time later. There is one thing on which I want an assurance from the hon. Members of this House. It may not be possible to circulate the report of the Select Committee immediately, before the Bill comes for consideration and the final passing stage. That is the difficulty. We shall adjust the timings when the Bill comes up when the motion for reference to the Select Committee is passed and when the Select Committee report is presented to the House.

**Shri N. C. Chatterjee:** If the final discussion on the passing of this Bill takes place on Friday, then there will be no difficulty, I think we will be able to spare one hour on Friday.

**Shri Satya Narayan Sinha:** That will go against the decision which we arrived at in the Business Advisory Committee. We had agreed in the Business Advisory Committee that the whole thing should be finished on Thursday.

**Mr. Speaker:** Taking into consideration all these facts, what difference

will 24 hours make? The other House is sitting up to the 23rd; Friday will be 2nd December and even in the non-official day we get 2½ hours and we can pass the Bill on that day. Even if we accept some kind of amendment later, we can divide the time as two and two. We can have 2 hours for the first stage and 2 hours for the final stage. This can be done by sitting longer for the Private Members' Business. We can adjust the timings like that.

**Shri Satya Narayan Sinha:** I agree.

**Mr. Speaker:** The only question is about the division of the time.

**Shri T. S. A. Chettiar:** We can have 2 hours and 3 hours respectively.

**Mr. Speaker:** We will have 2 hours and 2 hours. So, the report — it is not yet before the House — will stand amended to this extent. Instead of the general discussion being for 3 hours, it will be for 2 hours, and the clause-by-clause consideration—there will be only one clause—will take 2 hours. That is how the division of time will be made. We will have the Select Committee's report on Friday. The Select Committee, it is understood, will not apply for extension of time.

**Shri Jaipal Singh (Ranchi West—Reserved—Sch. Tribes)** I would like to make a submission, because my name has been indirectly brought in. The hon. Minister of Parliamentary Affairs stated that it was practically agreed that the Bill would be straightway taken and disposed of. I humbly submit that he suggested this and, it was I who opposed it and said that any amendment to the Constitution, even if it be to change a ful stop into a comma, must go to a Select Committee. That was the position.

#### UNIVERSITY GRANTS COMMISSION BILL

**Mr. Speaker:** The House will now proceed with the further clause-by-

clause consideration of the Bill to make provision for the co-ordination and determination of standards in Universities and for that purpose, to establish a University Grants Commission, as reported by the Joint Committee. In this respect, I should like to invite the attention of the House to an important aspect. The House had adopted the report of the Business Advisory Committee which had fixed 13 hours in all and it was agreed also that we should have one hour for the third reading stage. The difficulty has been that the clause-by-clause consideration has not yet been finished and out of the time allotted, we have got only 45 minutes left, including the third reading stage. Therefore, there are two alternatives now. One is to apply the Guillotine from now on in respect of all the remaining clauses; otherwise it will not be possible to keep to the time schedule. Hon. Members know that we are striving against time. There is one other alternative also and that is that as a clause is called out, only such amendments as are important may be mentioned. There may be short speeches and in a few minutes we might finish the clause-by-clause consideration, leaving half an hour for the third reading stage.

**Shri Raghavachari (Penukonda):** Half an hour may be allotted for the clause-by-clause consideration and 15 minutes for the third reading.

**Mr. Speaker:** If we really want to mean business, we must make it a point that we stick to time. Otherwise, the effect will be that all the extra time that is now taken will to that extent be reduced from the time allotted for the discussion of the S.R.C. Report. That is how it will turn out.

**Shri T. N. Singh (Banaras Distt.—East):** This is a very important Bill and we can have half an hour more for this Bill.

**Mr. Speaker:** The time was allotted taking into consideration all that kind of thing. The maximum time asked for in the Business Advisory Com-

mittee by various parties was allotted. We have to adjust ourselves to the requirements of time.

**Shri T. S. A. Chettiar (Tiruppur):** On the previous day, it might have been calculated that we began at 12, whereas actually we began at 12-20.

**Mr. Speaker:** All that has been taken into consideration and only the actual time has been calculated. It is not that any time even a minute less than 13 hours is going to be allotted.

**Shri T. S. A. Chettiar:** I feel that we should extend the time by at least half an hour.

**Mr. Speaker:** I think it will be a bad precedent.

**Shri T. S. A. Chettiar:** We never have precedents in this House; every time we decide afresh.

**Mr. Speaker:** I think there is something which binds us and by which we should go.

**Shri H. N. Mukerjee (Calcutta North-East):** I am very much for sticking to the time-schedule, but in view of the nature of the discussion so far as the University Grants Commission Bill is concerned and also in view of the fact that today the agenda is rather sparse and the next item is perhaps likely to take lesser time than the scheduled time—that is my anticipation — can we have half an hour extra for the third reading stage? This Bill is really very important.

**Mr. Speaker:** We shall have half an hour extra, all right. We shall have half an hour from now on for the clauses. Half an hour from now will mean 1-10 P.M. So, the Guillotine for the clauses will be applied at 10 minutes past 1 O'clock. We will have half an hour for the third reading; that means, till 1-40 P.M.

We will now take up clause 13. There are two amendments Nos. 49 and 50.

**Clause 13— Inspection.**

**Shri V. P. Nayar (Chirayinkil):** I beg to move:

(1) Page 5, line 22—

omit "after consultation with the University".

(2) Page 5—

omit lines 26 to 29.

**Mr. Speaker:** Amendments moved:

(1) Page 5, line 22—

omit "after consultation with the University".

(2) Page 5—

omit lines 26 to 29.

**Shri Meghnad Saha (Calcutta—North-West):** Clause 13 imposes a very important function on the University Grants Commission, the function of ascertaining the financial needs of a University or its standards of teaching, examination and research. As far as I find the Bill is very defective and it does not provide any machinery for doing all these things.

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

We have got about thirty universities. The University Grants Commission has to enquire into the standards of these thirty or thirty-five universities or more which may be coming into existence, and so forth. But as regards the administrative machinery for undertaking all these investigations, I have again and again repeated that the Bill as it stands is very defective in this respect. I was in the University Grants Committee which was there in 1948, which never worked, because all the members were honorary and there were no whole-time men. Members used to come once in six months, and they never read the agenda, and no business was done. It was merely an appendage of the Education Ministry.

If you examine the structure of the University Grants Commission in England you find that the University Grants Commission there is not a

Commission of the Education Ministry at all. It is merely a committee of the Treasury, that is the Finance Department. It gets a certain amount of grant and, after performing its duties and examining the needs of different universities, it disburses this amount of money. And it has worked very well.

As the Bill now stands, I am sorry the Members of the Joint Committee have played into the hands of the Education Ministry. They have given all the power to the Education Ministry.

The objective of the Radhakrishnan Commission of which I was a member — and I had taken a part in drafting the report of that Commission — was that this University Grants Commission should be an entirely autonomous body. It will have very little to do with the Education Ministry at all, and it will carry on its work just as the Public Service Commission does, without reference to any Ministry whatsoever. I think that unless the Bill is amended in the way I have indicated, this measure would be absolutely defective.

The Second Five Year Plan is allotting quite a large amount of money, about Rs. 35 crores, I am told, for the improvement of the universities in the next five years. The mere allotment of money is not sufficient. You must have a body of experts who will examine from day to day how this money has to be well spent. Otherwise the money may run into the gutters, money may be given to places which do not deserve it, and the whole objective of the University Grants Commission will be defeated.

I have therefore pressed for an amendment that in addition to the whole-time Chairman of the University Grants Commission, which the Education Ministry had the good sense to accept, there should be four other members of the same brand as the Chairman.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** The hon. Member has been referring to it on many occasions in this Bill. He lost it in clause 5. He is repeating it again and again.

**Shri Meghnad Saha:** A large amount of burden has been imposed on the Commission by this clause.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** The principle was not accepted. His suggestion was not accepted. He is saying it again and again. It is only that suggestion which will rectify it. But the House has come to an opinion on it, and it is useless repeating it.

**Shri Meghnad Saha:** In the course of the discussion in the House the other day there was a good deal of support to the point of view put forward by me. Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava, Shri T. S. A. Chettiar and many others supported my point.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** The opinion may be in favour, but the main point has not been accepted by the House. It is an ordinary rule of procedure that if on a particular point an opinion has been expressed by the House or a decision taken at one stage, there is no good canvassing the same thing at another stage and it cannot be done. We are not reviewing it. If he has other arguments to advance, by all means he can do so.

**Shri Meghnad Saha:** You will find that in the Bill you have put in clauses which strengthen my argument. Will you not allow a discussion on that?

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** But we are not going to review the previous clause.

**Shri Meghnad Saha:** It is only in connection with clause 13 that I am putting forward my point of view, because clause 13 imposes quite stringent duties on the University Grants Commission.

Here you are setting up a body which is going to be a sort of super-university, which will enquire into, say, the standards of scientific teach-

ing in this country. There are thirty universities. Who is going to organise all this study? Do you mean to say that an officer of the Education Ministry can do it, or any number of officers there can do it? I have been told by the sponsors of this Bill that they can appoint any officer. You have not fixed any standard for that officer.

Therefore, I would still press upon the Government to accept my amendment which will make this University Grants Commission a really effective body.

**Shri T. S. A. Chettiar:** I wish to point out only one thing. The hon. Member said that the Joint Select Committee has played into the hands of the Ministry. I do not think the Ministry itself feels that way. Originally the Bill was such a stringent Bill. We have incorporated provisions so that the independence of the universities may be safeguarded in various ways. The old clauses which he refers to have been amended, and the latter portion of original clause 13 (1), which looked like a penal clause, has been entirely omitted. Even sub-clause (2) which provides that the university must be associated with the enquiry, is something new. So to our mind this Bill is considerably better than the original one in the way it guarantees the association of the universities concerned, in these enquiries.

We entirely agree with the hon. Member that more than one whole-time person will be necessary. But, as has been pointed out, the Bill provides compulsorily for one whole-time Chairman. But the Bill also provides that by rules the Government can allow the University Grants Commission to appoint more than one full-time officer for these purposes.

To my mind the present amendments are merely negative amendments which cannot be accepted by the House, for if they are accepted the consequence will be like this. Clause 13 (2) provides that the university concerned must be associated with the enquiry. Amendment No. 50-

[Shri T. S. A. Chettiar]

seeks to omit that clause. That means the representatives of the university need not be associated. That will be against the very thing for which he is speaking, and so I think this amendment should not be accepted.

**Shri D. C. Sharma (Hoshiarpur):** Though on the whole I do not find this Bill to be as good as I wish, the inclusion of clause 13 is very very satisfactory. In the first place, as has been pointed out, it is conducive to the academic freedom of the universities. We all have been talking about that on the floor of the House, and this clause does strengthen the hands of those who have been arguing for that.

Secondly, I do not think the University Grants Commission can have all kinds of specialists, whether whole-time or part-time. There are so many subjects taught in the Universities. There are so many new subjects that are going to be taught in the Universities. I do not think it will be possible for any whole-time person to go and inspect any University at any time concerning any of these subjects. What happens in the Universities is this. We appoint *ad hoc* inspectors. For instance, in the Punjab University we want to inspect the colleges. But, we do not have whole-time inspectors. We get hold of a specialist and send him as an inspector.

**Pandit K. C. Sharma:** (Meerut Distt.—South): That is also done in other Universities.

**Shri D. C. Sharma:** Everything is done in our University; only you are not there.

What I was saying was, so far as inspectors are concerned, they can be taken from a pool which will consist of professors of all the Universities of India.

**Shri T. S. A. Chettiar:** May I point out clause 9 (1)?

**Shri D. C. Sharma:** This is a very good thing. I feel that there has been a great improvement. When an ins-

pection is going to be made, the particular University is going to be associated with it. This, again is something which will be useful for the University to place its case before the Inspection committee. Therefore, looking at it from an objective point of view, and without saying that the point of view put forward by Shri Meghnad Saha was not good—it was very good in some ways—I would say that clause 13 is very satisfactory and it should be passed as such. This is, perhaps, the only clause about which I do not have any differences with the framers.

**The Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Education (Dr. M. M. Das):** There are two amendments that have been moved by my hon. friend Shri V. P. Nayar about this particular clause. By his first amendment he wants that the Universities should not be consulted when the University Grants Commission will visit them or make any enquiry.

**Shri V. P. Nayar:** It is not 'should'; you have not properly understood it.

**Dr. M. M. Das:** By the second amendment, he proposes that in that inspection or enquiry, the University should not be associated. The speeches of my hon. friend Shri H. N. Mukerjee, the Deputy-Leader of the Communist Party are still ringing in my ears. He is a staunch supporter of the autonomy of the Universities. Here are two amendments of Shri V. P. Nayar which propose to take away substantial powers from the hands of the Universities. I am confounded and I do not understand what is the matter between them. Perhaps, this is an example of where the head does not know what the limbs do. I do not propose to accept these amendments.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** The question is:

Page 5, line 22—

Omit "after consultation with the University".

*The motion was negatived.*

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** The question is:

Page 5—

omit lines 26 to 29.

*The motion was negatived.*

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** The question is:

"That clause 13 stand part of the Bill."

*The motion was adopted.*

Clause 13 was added to the Bill.

**Clause 14—(Consequences of failure of Universities to comply etc.)**

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Hon. Members will kindly remember that by 1-10 all the clauses will have to be disposed of. At 1-10, the third reading will start and close at 1-40. Guillotine will be applied to all the clauses willy-nilly at 1-10.

**Shri Shree Narayan Dass (Darbhanga Central):** I beg to move:

Page 6—

after line 6 add:

"Provided that the whole matter of withholding grant under this section shall be placed before both Houses of Parliament."

This is a simple amendment. Clause 14 says that if any University does not comply with the recommendation of the University Grants Commission, the grant may be withheld from that University. Nothing has been provided by way of appeal either to the Government or anywhere else. It may be that the reasons which the University Grants Commission has withheld the grant may not be reasonable. It should be known to the House whether the grounds for which the grants were withheld were sound or not. Therefore, I have sought to provide in my amendment a proviso that the whole matter of withholding of a grant should be placed before both Houses of Parliament. It will come to the notice of the representatives of the people whether the grounds on which the grants have been withheld are reasonable or not. It is only for the sake of information that this

statement should be laid on the Table of the House giving the reasons for which the grants were withheld. That is the only purpose.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Amendment moved:

Page 6—

after line 6, add:

"Provided that the whole matter of withholding grant under this section shall be placed before both Houses of Parliament."

**Dr. M. M. Das:** According to the provisions of this Bill, the University Grants Commission is nothing but an advisory or a recommendatory body. It has no power to enforce its decisions upon the Universities. The only power that is given to the University Grants Commission is that the Commission can withhold the grants which they propose to give. The hon. Member's amendment says that before withholding the proposed grant, the whole matter should be placed before both the Houses of Parliament.

**Shri Shree Narayan Das:** Not before. It is for the University Grants Commission to take action. After action is taken, the statement will be laid on the Table of the Houses in certain circumstances where grants are withheld, only for the sake of information.

**Dr. M. M. Das:** I am sorry, I cannot accept the amendment. So far as this House is concerned, the annual report will be placed before this House and hon. Members will get an opportunity to discuss this report. If anything of this sort happens where a University is prevented from getting the Grants or the University Grants Commission refuses to pay on certain grounds to a University, it will be mentioned in the report and hon. Members of this House will find an opportunity of going through it and discussing it. I am sorry I cannot accept the amendment.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** The question is:

Page 6—

after line 6 add:

“Provided that the whole matter of withholding grant under this section shall be placed before both Houses of Parliament.”

*The motion was negatived.*

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** The question is:

“That clause 14 stand part of the Bill.”

*The motion was adopted.*

*Clause 14 was added to the Bill.*

*Clauses 15 to 17 were added to the Bill.*

**Clause 18.— (Annual report)**

**Shri Shree Narayan Das:** I beg to move:

Page 6, line 29—

after “previous year” insert:

“as also an annual report on University education in India for the same period.”

Clause 18 is going to provide for the submission of an annual report with regard to the activities of the University Grants Commission. It is one of the functions of the University Grants Commission to collect information on all matters relating to University education in India and other countries as it thinks fit. I would like to insert here a provision that it should also be duty of the University Grants Commission to prepare an annual report on University education in India for the same period. It is one of the functions of the University Grants Commission to prepare an annual report describing its activities. While it is one of the duties of this Commission to collect information, it is the fitness of things that the Commission should also prepare an annual report on University Education in India side by with the report on its activities. I think the Government will accept my amendment.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Amendment moved:

Page 6, line 29—

after “previous year” insert:

“as also an annual report on University education in India for the same period,”

**Dr. M. M. Das:** The University Grants Commission is going to be created for a limited purpose, with limited functions. So far as the annual report on University education in India is concerned, that responsibility has been taken up by the Central Government. Moreover, as the House knows, there are some Central Universities and a member of State Universities. So far as the Central Universities are concerned, the Central Government knows the facts. As regards the State Universities, we have to collect the facts from the State Governments. That responsibility has been taken up by the Central Government. Every year, so far as I remember, this report on University education in India is published. I do not think it will be proper to encumber the University Grants Commission with this additional responsibility.

**Shri Shree Narayan Das:** On a point of information, will the Parliamentary Secretary indicate what is the year for which the latest report is available with the Central Government.

**Dr. M. M. Das:** I think reports are available.

**Shri Shree Narayan Das:** I want to know the latest year.

**Dr. M. M. Das:** I cannot say of hand. There are reports. I may also say that sometimes it takes time.

**Shri V. P. Nayar:** The latest report is of 1950-51 published in 1956.

**Dr. M. M. Das:** It may be that the State Governments took some time to supply the information to the Central Government.

**Shri V. P. Nayar:** I have it here. Why blame State Governments?

**Shri T. S. A. Chettiar:** I am very much in sympathy with what Shri Shree Narayan Das has said, but I do not know whether we can ask them to do a job which is more than what their business is. Their job is to help the universities to the extent possible. This job of giving a report on all university education is something much wider, and I do not know whether we can statutorily ask them to do it.

**Shri Shree Narayan Das:** One of the functions of the Commission is to collect information on all matters relating to university education in India and other countries also. When this is one of their functions, why can they not prepare a report?

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** What is the meaning of sending an annual report five years or ten years after the year is over? It is for the purpose of guiding the future, is it not?

**Shri T. S. A. Chettiar:** The point is that the report of the Commission must be presented to the Parliament within one year of the year for which the report is intended. That is the real point which he wants. I entirely agree about that. We get statistics from the Government of India which have become very old, because they are five years old. So, I think there is certainly a case for speeding up the reports. If there is any amendment which says that the report should be submitted within 12 months of the year of the report, that is a point that may be put in if the House thinks fit.

**Shri T. N. Singh:** The Minister could have given some assurance that the reports would be placed as early as possible.

**Dr. M. M. Das:** So far as the University Grants Commission is concerned, the provision is there. The activities of the Commission will be submitted to Parliament. So far as uni-

versity education in the whole country is concerned....

**Shri T. S. A. Chettiar:** When will you send that report? It may be we will get the report for 1955-56 in 1960-61.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** That is the point.

**The Deputy Minister of Education (Dr. K. L. Shrimall):** May I suggest that it is a matter of detail and the Commission will lay down its own procedure and its own rules as regards its work? The Commission will certainly lay before both the Houses the report of its activities. As regards what other reports the Commission should prepare or not prepare is a matter which should be left to the Commission itself. The Ministry of Education is already preparing the reports and they are being circulated.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** One other thing also cropped up. If the report for 1950-51 is submitted in 1955 what is the object of placing it before Parliament? Why not the Minister say that it will be submitted within a year or two years at the most, but not beyond that? If even that is not possible, the object is frustrated. Ten years later it may be placed before Parliament. What is the object of it?

**Shri T. S. A. Chettiar:** Now, it is too late to make an amendment. The clause says that the Commission shall prepare once every year, in such form and at such time as may be prescribed, an annual report etc. If the Government gives an undertaking that under the rules they will say that the report must be prepared within six months after the close of the year, that will meet the wishes of the House.

**Dr. M. M. Das:** I think these matters are usually dealt with under the rules.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** They are not dealt with because 1950-51 is the latest report available.

**Dr. K. L. Shrimall:** He is referring to the report which has been produced by the Ministry of Education.

**Shri V. P. Nayar:** We do not want that to happen again in the case of this University Grants Commission. For your information I may submit that this report is very valuable because it contains so many figures and the figures were collected in 1950. Here I find the preface of Mr. Humayun Kabir dated 22nd October, 1954 in which not a word is said about the reasons for the delay also.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** We are not discussing that report.

**Shri V. P. Nayar:** We do not want the same thing to happen in future reports.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** That is all right.

**Shri D. C. Sharma:** I am amazed at the utterance made by the Deputy Minister. He said "Leave it to the rules." The unfortunate thing is that the gentlemen who are in charge of the Bill are not in a position to commit themselves anywhere, and therefore it is no use asking them. I would say that this is a very innocuous thing, that, for example, the report for the year 1955-56 should be submitted to Parliament by the end of 1956-57. There should be a year's time-lag, but I am sorry these gentlemen are not in a position to commit themselves even to that. So, I think it is up to you to come to our rescue and see that this simple, innocuous, harmless amendment is passed which does not involve any work for the Ministry.

**Dr. M. M. Das:** Where is the amendment?

**Shri T. S. A. Chettiar:** What is the difficulty for the Minister to assure us that the report will be submitted within a year or six months and that rules to that effect will be

framed? Where is the difficulty in giving that assurance?

**Dr. K. L. Shrimall:** The clause as it is, reads:

"The Commission shall prepare once every year, in such form and at such time as may be prescribed...."

The intention is that the report should be submitted every year. Of course, the time is not fixed. Is it not possible to leave that to the Commission itself? Sometimes there may be very heavy work for the Commission.

**Shri T. N. Singh:** To that we are also a party as Parliament and we want to get the reports. Certainly we must have a say in the matter. We have got the right to say that we want these reports early. Where is the difficulty for the Minister to give the assurance?

**Shri T. S. A. Chettiar:** If you will kindly waive notice, I would suggest that after the words "every year" the words "within twelve months of the completion of the year" may be inserted.

**Shri V. P. Nayar:** Why 12 months? The information is not collected next year.

**Dr. K. L. Shrimall:** I am prepared to assure the House that the report will be completed within 12 months.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** So far as the amendment is concerned, it is different.

The question is:

Page 6, line 29—

after "previous year" insert:

"as also an annual report on University education in India for the same period."

*The motion was negatived.*

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** The question is:

"That clause 18 stand part of the Bill"

*The motion was adopted.*

*Clause 18 was added to the Bill.*

*Clause 19 was added to the Bill.*

*Clause 20 (Directions by the Central Government).*

**Shri Shree Narayan Das:** I beg to move:

Page 7—

lines 18 and 19—

for "the decision of the Central Government shall be final" substitute:

"the whole question shall be placed before Parliament and the decision of Parliament shall be final."

This clause refers to a very important subject and I think it was discussed during the general discussion. It has been stated in the Bill that if there is a difference of opinion between the Commission and the Government as to whether a particular question relates to national purposes or not, the decision of the Central Government shall be final. I think the decision of Parliament should be final. I think it is for this Supreme body to decide whether a question is of national importance or not. The Central Government is the executive authority of this Parliament and there is a difference of opinion between the Commission and the Government, the matter should come up before the House and the House should decide it. I hope the Government will accept my amendment.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Amendment moved:

Page 7, lines 18 and 19—

for "the decision of the Central Government shall be final" substitute:

"the whole question shall be placed before the Parliament and the decision of Parliament shall be final."

**Dr. M. M. Das:** There can be no doubt that the Central Government are a creature of the Parliament, and that the power exercised by the Government of India is the power of the Parliament. So far as the amendment of my hon. friend Shri Shree Narayan Das is concerned, we do not think that it is necessary to give this deciding power in the hands of Parliament; it is not because we do not want to give it in the hands of Parliament but because we do not think that it is necessary to do so. The Central Government will formulate the policy. They are responsible for running the State, and therefore they should decide whether a particular question is a matter of policy or not. Of course Parliament is above them.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** The question is:

Page 7, lines 18 and 19—

for "the decision of the Central Government shall be final" substitute:

"the whole question shall be placed before Parliament and the decision of Parliament shall be final."

*The motion was negatived.*

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** The question is:

"That clause 20 stand part of the Bill."

*The motion was adopted.*

*Clause 20 was adopted to the Bill.*

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** It is now 1.10 P.M. So, I shall put the remaining clauses to vote together.

The question is:

"That clauses 21 to 26, clause 1, the Enacting Formula and the Title stand part of the Bill".

*The motion was adopted.*

*Clauses 21 to 26, clause 1, the Enacting Formula and the Title were added to the Bill.*

**Dr. M. M. Das:** I beg to move:

"That the Bill, as amended, be passed".

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Motion moved:

"That the Bill, as amended, be passed."

**Shri T. S. A. Chettiar:** The University Grants Commission Bill is a landmark in the growth of university education in this country. Many fears have been expressed that this Bill may interfere with the autonomy of the universities. But to my mind, as has been put very well in the happy phraseology of the Radhakrishnan Commission, nobody can be absolutely independent in personal or public life: it is a matter of co-operation at the highest level. We do hope that the large amount of help that will be necessary for the development of education in this country will come from the University Grants Commission, and when it comes, it will not come with fetters but with enlightenment and guidance. On the other hand, we must also remember that there are universities and universities; certain universities will require a little more guidance than others. I hope healthy conventions will be developed, which will provide for the growth of universities and university education in the best manner possible.

One other matter which has been disturbing the minds of the public is the scope of the Bill. The Bill as introduced was confined only to the constituent colleges, but later on it was amended by the Joint Committee to include such colleges as may be approved by the University Grants Commission on the recommendations of the University. Further, in the course of the debate, an assurance has been given that it will apply to all post-graduate institutions. This in my opinion is a very welcome thing.

That does not mean that it is not necessary to apply the provisions of this Bill to the affiliated colleges.

Nearly 90 per cent. of our students study in the affiliated colleges, and a real improvement of university education, can come about only if the Bill is applied to the affiliated colleges. So, I do hope that what has been done is only a beginning, and as has been explained by Dr. M. M. Das, the door will be open for the inclusion of these colleges also. I hope with improvement in the finances of the country, they will also be able to get help from this Commission.

In the end, I would like to refer to clause 20, which we were discussing only a little while ago. Some people have been really disturbed as to what matters of national policy may mean. I would congratulate the Ministry and the hon. Minister for the statement that they have made that they will categorically provide in the rules that the matter of adopting Hindi as the medium of instruction is not a matter of national policy and that each university is free to adopt its own regional language as the medium of instruction. I hope they will state it categorically in the rules so that later on there may not be scope for interpretation this way or that way.

I do hope that in future the conventions will grow in such a way that while we shall provide funds and certainly take care to see that the funds are spent properly, at the same time we shall also see that a certain amount of latitude and autonomy is left to the universities concerned, so that they will develop and serve the country in the best manner possible.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Now, **Shri H. N. Mukherjee.**

**Shri Shree Narayan Das:** May I point out that a large number of Members wanted to participate in the general discussion, but they were not given a chance? Again, we find that the same Members who participated in the general discussion, are being given a second chance.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Did the hon. Member not participate in the general discussion?

**Shri Shree Narayan Das:** No. I tried my best, but I could not get a chance.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** All right. The hon. Member may speak now. After him. I shall call Shri H. N. Mukerjee.

**Shri Shree Narayan Das:** It was in 1948 that the University Education Commission was set up to look into matters concerned with university education. That Commission made a number of recommendations, but those recommendations could not be carried out owing to stringency of funds. Time and again, when we put questions to the hon. Minister of Education, he used to reply that owing to financial stringency, the recommendations could not be implemented either by the Centre or by the several universities. Now that the University Grants Commission is going to be created under this measure, I hope the Central Government would come forward with sufficient amount of funds and place them at the disposal of the University Grants Commission for distribution to the different universities for various purposes connected with the implementation of the recommendations made long ago by the Radhakrishnan Commission.

Doubts have been raised in the course of the discussion in this House that the Commission that will be set up under this measure may interfere with the independence and autonomy of the universities. In fact, the setting up of this Commission was itself recommended by the University Education Commission, but it has taken a number of years for the Central Government to appoint this Commission. I hope that before the proposed Commission start functioning, and start issuing instructions and directives to be carried out by the universities, they will lay down the principles on which they will work. I hope those principles will be based on the idea of least interference. Since

the power of the purse is going to be entrusted to this Commission, and since that power will be very effective, I would like to caution Government and also Parliament that they should be careful to see that that power is not used as a pressure on the executives of the universities to do certain activities which in the opinion of the universities will be considered as interference.

With regard to the functions of the Commission also, certain suggestions were made by the University Grants Commission. One of them was that this Commission should be entrusted with the work of making recommendations to the President in regard to the creation and development of new universities, by issuing charters, but that suggestion was rejected. I feel that the University Grants Commission should create facilities in the country and also encourage and advise the public, voluntary and Government institutions to make efforts for collecting local contributions for the purpose of creating new educational institutions in the country. If it is only left to the Central Government, it will be difficult for them to do anything. So, it will depend largely on the charitable contributions made by the public. If local efforts are made to collect such voluntary contributions, the University Grants Commission should encourage them and also help them by giving grants for the development of higher education in rural areas.

I hope the University Grants Commission that is going to be constituted under this Bill will do all that is necessary for carrying out the recommendations of the University Education Commission, which were made long ago.

**Shri H. N. Mukerjee:** This Bill, which is going to be passed in a short while, is a limited measure and, like the proverbial curate's egg, it is good only in parts. But I hope that its results may be better than I fear they will be.

[Shri H. N. Mukerjee]

I have several regrets in regard to the form of the Bill as it passes this House. One is in regard to affiliated colleges, whose condition I am very well aware of on account of close association. I know they have got very scant mercy under clause 2(f) of this Bill, which provides that at least a very few and select affiliated colleges might be chosen by the University Grants Commission for its benevolence. But I wish that the recommendations of the Radhakrishnan Commission were taken more earnestly into account by Government when formulating this Bill. I know that the Radhakrishnan Commission, of which my friend to my left, Shri Meghnad Saha, was a distinguished member, went round the country, visited most of these affiliated colleges and recommended that some very definite steps in regard to financial assistance to these colleges should be adopted. I thought that when the University Grants Commission was being set up on a permanent foundation, some measures would be adopted by Government in this direction.

I have another regret and that is in regard to the fact that determination of standards is a job which has been foisted upon this nine-man body, the University Grants Commission. This, again, is, I feel, against the spirit of the Radhakrishnan Commission's Report. In Chapter XIII, section 19 of its Report, the Radhakrishnan Commission recorded a clear finding. It said:

"We have considered the *pros* and *cons* of prescribing additional duties for the Commission besides the allocation of grants, and we have decided against it".

I feel that, as in England, the University Grants Commission should have trusted our academic institutions a little more and should have left the determination of standards to be done by the Universities concerned or by such agencies of academic consultation as the Inter-Universities Board.

I have another regret, and that is that in the long title of the Bill as well as in the formulation of the Bill, I find that there is no emphasis— which was very necessary — on expansion, as against the other aspect, determination of standards. Now, I say this because when this Bill was first presented to this House, in the Statement of Objects and Reasons there was a statement that the problem (of higher education) has become more acute recently on account of the tendency to multiply Universities. According to the Directory of Universities, 1953, published by the Government, I find that the present number of Universities in India is 39, while there are 17 Universities in the UK, which is of the size of one of our bigger States. I feel there is ample scope for the establishment of many more Universities. In this connection, I want to refer to a matter which I mentioned earlier in the course of the discussion, and that is the report given by Professor Bernal in regard to the position in China. He wrote in the *New Statesman and Nation*, a British periodical, on the 26th March and the 2nd April 1955. He said that in Peking there are Universities of Aeronautics, Agricultural Engineering, Geology, Mining, Petroleum and Metallurgy, and he found also that there they plan according to what the country needs. Universities have to subserve the interests of the country and, therefore, the country has to find out how many engineers, how many technicians, how many academicians in different spheres are wanted and on that basis, you go ahead. How many of them we want has first to be formulated, and then we can go ahead. There the emphasis is, on the one hand, on the very highest quality, of top-class education, and on the other, on the production of qualified people as engineers, as doctors, as technicians of varying descriptions who would not be truly top-class. For example, a medical course of four years instead of six years or more would perhaps produce in this country a sufficient

supply of people who can go into our villages and man our essential medical services. A similar proceeding can be adopted in regard to the other technical courses necessary for us. Therefore, what is wanted is a kind of plan where there would be a co-ordination of very top-class high quality higher education, and at the same time, the production of cadres of our people who would be able to go into the country and carry on the work of educational reconstruction or of health recreation and all that sort of thing.

I have no time, because of the limitation of our schedule, to go into detail, but I find that in Peking there are three great colleges of Geology, and also—they have set up a Geology Ministry under a geologist—a whole Ministry under a geologist. And Prof. Bernal reports that there are 200,000 scientists, engineers and doctors in training in China and this, he says, is some five times the number in Britain and about a third as many per head of the population as in Britain.

Now, I want my country to go ahead faster than China. I have heard the Prime Minister say that in regard to medical education, we are better off than China. It is very good that we are better off than China, but if we are in that position, let us go ahead faster. And China, as Prof. Bernal says, is an example to the countries of Asia. Let us better that example; let us go ahead much faster than China is doing today. Let us realise that today what is wanted is the rapid bringing out of the latent knowledge and ability of the whole people, and not merely of a privileged few, of a traditional elite. And it is from that point of view that I wish that the University Grants Commission should see about its work. But I fear, Sir, that there are so many limitations and there are so many peculiar provisions redolent of the atmosphere of yesterday that all these hopes that I am giving expression to in regard to the educational reconstruction of our

country are perhaps doomed to disappointment. All the same, this is a measure which brings some limited improvement to the state of things in our educational life today and to that extent, I am prepared to welcome it.

**Shri Meghnad Saha:** The University Grants Commission Bill is now being passed. Speakers have already pointed out its defects; I have had my say and I will not repeat them. I would only say this. There is nothing now further to be done in the Bill. But if you take clause 25, the Central Government have been asked to do a lot of things. If you read through that clause, you find that quite a lot of burdens has been imposed on the Central Government. I do not know when the Central Government will have the power to do it. As my hon. friend, Shri V. P. Nayar, said, the Central Government here means the Education Ministry. He said that something was placed in the hands of the Education Ministry to be done in 1951, and it came out in 1954. So I hope that all these rules which have to be made will be made very quickly. The Chairman of the University Grants Commission may be given staff of sufficient calibre to do all that work, and this work should be placed before the country as early as possible.

I might dispel certain assertions which have been laid to the credit of the Radhakrishnan Commission. It was never the intention of the Radhakrishnan Commission that affiliated colleges which had only upto BA and BSc courses should come within the scope of the benefit of the University Grants Commission. Otherwise, what is left for the State Governments to do? The Commission only said that the University Grants Commission's effort should be limited to post-graduate education in arts and science, to medical education, to professional education like that of engineering and technology. I am sorry to find that medical education is being taken away from the purview of the University Grants Commission. That is not the

[Shri Meghnad Saha]

right thing. The Ministry of Health should busy itself with questions of public health, with hospitals, public health matters and so forth. It should not take upon itself the burden of medical education because education has a technique of its own which cannot be handled by a Ministry, however efficient it might be. So, I hope very much that medical education will also be placed under the University Grants Commission. As a matter of fact, the Radhakrishnan Commission went through all the medical colleges in this country and found there is a lot to be done in the matter of the improvement of medical education in this country. They have also made certain suggestions; and, if you take away medical education from the hands of the University Grants Commission, I do not know whether medical education will ever be improved in this country.

The greatest amount of work which the University Grants Commission has to do is to improve the standards in humanities, in science and in technology. I hope, while appointing the staff under the University Grants Commission, we shall have the services of experts, those who have intimate knowledge of education in the different branches of arts, sciences and humanities and in different kinds of engineering. It is not very easy to get men of that type. Probably, one man would not do and you will have to appoint a leader in each one of these and give him staff who will go on studying the subject all over the country.

For instance, take engineering education and technology. The standards of these is very low in this country. That is because the engineering colleges which we had in this country were only meant to turn out foremen and maintenance engineers. We never expected that they will turn out engineers who can design bridges or railways, a higher type of engineering which means design and execution. We have no post-graduate

courses in engineering in this country. As a matter of fact, there is no engineering research in this country except some work which was done by Sir M. Visweswarayya and that too probably half a century or three quarters of a century ago. The greatest difficulty will be to raise the standard of technical education in this country. Here, I feel that unless the University Grants Commission has got suitable staff under it, it cannot leave this matter entirely to the Universities. Engineering has been expanding very rapidly. As science progresses, new types of engineering follow. For instance, you had no communications engineering just 40 years ago; you had no refrigeration engineering a number of years ago. Now, you have atomic energy engineering also. For all this technical and engineering education, the country is very ill-prepared. Sometimes, you find the Central Government in a very funny position. It is asked by the country to undertake the production of some kind of engineers. They find out some kind of engineers to do supervision work of some scheme and that is very defective.

For example, I was reading about the formation of a Gas and Petroleum Technology Division. It has been formed by the Ministry of N R. & S. R. This matter is being talked about for 7 years. I have told this country that the best way to form a good batch of technicians and scientists in the Gas Technology Division was to have a Central Geophysical Institute, because you cannot ask a man who has been trained as a geologist or trained as a physicist to take to this. This work was developed in America during the last war and even England, Germany and France have not been able to produce this type of technical engineers. It was only after the war that they had a Central Geo-Technological Institute and got together a team of experts who

can undertake this work. As a result of that, in France and Germany, where no oil was supposed to exist, now, as a result of prospecting they have got a good lot of oil. As a matter of fact, Prof. Ducoi—he is the head of the Scientific and Technological Division of the Government of France—told me that by using new methods they have obtained in the south of France almost as much oil as they need and that it will go on for several decades. Unfortunately, this principle of involving their own technologists has not been accepted by the Ministries. They are getting their geologists from here and there and they are getting experts from France and Germany and so on. They seem to think that they can so form a division which will do miracles in 5 or 6 years. I think this is an attitude which has to be very much decried.

I would give another example, the example of rain-making. Some experiments on rain-making have been tried during the war in America and Australia also. They have been going on making experiments on rain-making and without any result. But Britain is much more sagacious and wise. A division was started for rain-making. But the people said, 'we do not know the fundamentals of rain-making; first of all, give us something for carrying on experiments in the laboratory and after we are sure of our fundamentals, we shall carry on this work on a wider scale'. Unfortunately, the Ministers on the Government side say that they want to impress the country by performing miracles, miracles in atomic energy, in petroleum technology and in everything, and they are being guided by one or two ambitious scientists, who lead the Government on wrong lines. I think this ought to be stopped. Science is a matter of many minds; there is no such thing as super genius in science. A scientist very good in one subject may be an absolute fool in another subject. If technology and science is

to be improved in this country, we have to organise the scientists, we have to take the brains of many people and evolve a method for applying science to this country. I think the University Grants Commission has a very great function to perform and unless they appoint the right type of men who can guide the country, this Commission would not ever work and it will simply be an appendage of the Education Ministry.

I would very much like to impress upon the framers of this University Grants Commission Bill that whatever defects we have discovered in this Bill should be remedied by the rules which they frame, in the appointment of the men, in the powers which are to be given to men and also in the standard of the men who will be appointed.

**Shri T. N. Singh:** I do not know whether I can say a few words.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** I have no objection provided the hon. Member finishes in two or three minutes.

**Shri T. N. Singh:** I will take only two minutes

I have a feeling that there are certain short-comings in the Bill and that probably we shall learn with time and improve upon them.

I have my own views in regard to the determination of standards by the Commission and I think it may be not quite desirable and it may not work well in practice. But, apart from that, I feel that whatever the measure, much depends upon the way it is worked. And, I have got one or two requests to make to the Government because it is on the conventions and the lead which the Government can give to this Commission much will depend. I feel that there is no sounder principle than the principle of the autonomy of the University. I want that to be jealously guarded. It must be protected if our future generation is to get the right education. I have my fears because the Universities which train so many of our young

[Shri T. N. Singh]

students have today become the hot-bed of political intrigue. To say that only some persons in the Congress are trying to influence the Universities is wrong because I feel that all kinds of political parties are having their finger in the pie. That must be prevented and it is essential to do so. I am saying this because I am one of those who hold that any Minister, whether in the States or at the Centre, holding a position in the executive administration of a University is wrong. I opposed it tooth and nail as I have my fears about it. And in two provinces this kind of thing is happening. This is tantamount to a political party interfering in University education. So I humbly appeal that it is the duty of us all, the public, the Government, the body which will shortly come into being and the political parties, to see that the autonomy of the Universities is jealously guarded and maintained. I would like the Minister, when he replies, at least to touch upon this aspect in a firm manner so that he may see by the method of convention that nobody who is connected with the Government or very actively connected with any political parties is allowed to interfere with the autonomy of the Universities.

**Shri Barman** (North Bengal—Reserved—Sch. Castes): May I also say a few words in welcoming this measure? It is my feeling—I do not know whether I am correct—that so long the Central Government has had no say in the matter of Universities excepting the Universities administered by the Centre. This is a measure which gives responsibility as well as power to the Central Government for having a say in the matter of university education all over the country, and I think this is necessary. On this Commission, apart from the University representatives, there will be Central Government servants or officers of the Government of India. By this way there will be co-ordination between the efforts of

the universities in the matter of academic standards and other things and it will be the responsibility of the Central Government to build up the nation through the Universities. There is a saying that he who pays the piper has a right to call the tune. There is a complaint throughout the country that the standard of teaching that obtains in the different parts of the country is not only different but that it does not give the result that the nation wants in building the future of this country. The Central Government is now being associated with the powers of the purse that will be disbursed to the various Universities in India, and I hope that by getting this power, the Central Government will direct and promote the policy which the nation wants so that the Universities of all parts of India will turn out youths as desired by the nation. They shall not only consider the academic side of the University products but also the moral side and they will frame their policy along with the co-operation of the Universities in such a way that the desired results may be had from the Universities. I welcome this Bill.

**Dr. M. M. Das:** I am extremely grateful to the hon. Members of this House for the support that they have given to this measure. There has been some difference of opinion about some clauses, but we think that on the whole this measure has received blessings from all quarters of the House.

More than 20 hours of the precious time of this House have been spent in a detailed and threadbare discussion of this measure and I dare say that these discussions have not only expressed the great concern that is felt by hon. Members for improving the university education in this country, but they have also proved to be immensely beneficial and profitable both to the Government of India and to the University Grants Commission. I can assure the House that the views that have been expressed by hon.

Members on the floor of this House and the suggestions that have been put forward by them will be given serious consideration both by the Government of India in formulating their policies and by the University Grants Commission in the implementation of those policies.

The idea of having a University Grants Commission first occurred to the Central Advisory Board of Education in the year 1944, but it was the University Education Commission, that is, the Radhakrishnan Commission that convinced the Government of India of the absolute necessity of creating a body like the University Grants Commission with wide powers so that they may be able to look after the higher education in this country. The unco-ordinated and irregular development of the Universities resulting in unnecessary duplication and overlapping and consequent waste in resources on the one hand and the low standard of teaching, low standard of examinations and research on the other, perturbed the Radhakrishnan Commission and they recommended the establishment of a body such as the University Grants Commission. The necessity of a body like this can never be over-emphasised. The very fact that thousands of our young students and young men have to go abroad every year for higher studies is an insult to the prestige of India as a free nation. Not only in subjects of science and technology in which the West is far ahead of us, but also in humanities, education is not considered in this country to be complete without a foreign degree and the degrees of our own Universities are considered by ourselves to be inferior to those of foreign Universities.

**Shri V. P. Nayyar:** Not by us.

**Dr. M. M. Das:** Even the Research degrees, Ph.D., Doctorate and others of Indian Universities are considered by our people as much inferior to the ordinary Master's degree of foreign Universities.

**Shri Meghnad Saha:** May I interrupt for a moment? Many of the big educationists and scientists of this country had no foreign education or degrees. Sir C. V. Raman had no foreign education or degrees; Dr. K. S. Krishnan had no such degrees; and if you consider me a scientist, I have no foreign degrees; the same is the case with Shri Jadunath Sircar.

**Dr. M. M. Das:** These are the exceptions proving the rule. I am not saying that without foreign education no man can rise to greatness. That is not my point, but I am only saying that foreign degrees....

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** What Dr. Das means is that the education that we receive in this country is itself foreign education!

**Dr. M. M. Das:** More importance is attached to foreign degrees than to our own degrees in this country.

**Shri Meghnad Saha:** He is acting under an illusion.

**Dr. M. M. Das:** I have seen doctors receiving M.D. degrees here, going to England for M.R.C.P. etc.

**Shri Meghnad Saha:** If I may say so, foreign degrees may be banned by an Act of Parliament. I met a number of Japanese students going to foreign countries and I asked them whether they had come there to take foreign degrees and they said, "if we take any foreign degrees, our scholarships will be stopped, and we are not allowed by law to accept any foreign degrees; we have come here only for study and not for taking our degrees."

**Dr. M. M. Das:** A great injustice will be done to me if hon. Members think that I want that our students should go to foreign countries and get degrees. That is what I do not want. I have already stated that sending Indian students abroad for higher studies and for specialised training is an insult to our national prestige.

**Shri Meghnad Saha:** Then, let him prevent it by an Act of Parliament.

**Dr. M. M. Das:** I have already stated that it is an insult to our prestige. It is because we have permitted our universities to lower their standard. The future of our country depends on our universities. The statesmen of the coming generation who will have to shoulder the burdens of this States; the administrators who have to tackle thousand and one problems of millions of our people; the engineers and technologists, who will have to man our growing industries, will be the products of our own universities. We cannot afford to send every year thousands of our students to foreign countries for specialised training. That is a blot upon our universities; it is an insult to our national prestige. We have, therefore, to build up our universities so that they may be equal to the task which they will be called upon to perform in the immediate future.

The establishment of the Grants Commission is a true step towards the reconstruction of our universities, if I may be permitted to use that word 'reconstruction'. Viewed from that angle, the present legislation which this House will pass within a few minutes is one of the most important legislations that the Union Parliament has passed upto this date. It is a measure which is designed to play a vital role in building up the future of our country. Let us hope that the Commission which is going to be set up under this statute will realise its responsibility and prove itself equal to the task which it will be called upon to undertake. Let us not anticipate the worst, and prejudice the future working of the Commission by unpleasant remarks. Let us have confidence in our universities; let us have faith in the eminent men and women—eminent in their status, eminent in the field of education—who will be the members of this body. I have not the least doubt in my mind that the Commission will

prove itself equal to the task which it will be called upon to perform in the immediate future and that the members will be able to discharge their responsibilities to the satisfaction of all concerned.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** The question is:

"That the Bill, as amended, be passed."

*The motion was adopted.*

#### SECURITIES CONTRACTS (REGULATION) BILL, 1954

**The Minister of Finance (Shri C. D. Deshmukh):** I beg to move:

"That the Bill to prevent undesirable transactions in securities by regulating the business of dealing therein, by prohibiting, or by providing for certain other matters connected therewith, be referred to a Joint Committee of the Houses consisting of 45 members, 30 from this House, namely:—

1. Shri Chimanlal Chakubhai Shah, Shri Bhawanji A. Khimji, Shri Khushi Ram Sharma, Dr. Jayantilal Narbheram Parekh, Shri Shivram Rango Rane, Shri S. S. Natarajan, Shri C. P. Matthen, Shri C. R. Basappa, Shri R. P. Navatia, Shri Radhela Vyas, Shri Bhupendra Nath Misra, Swami Ramanand Shastri, Shri Sarju Prasad Misra, Choudhary Raghubir Singh, Shri Krishnacharya Joshi, Shri B. R. Bhagat, Shri Banarsi Prasad Jhunjhunwala, Shri Jagannath Kolay, Shri Lokesh Mishra, Shri Tek Chand, Shri Ghamandi Lal Bansal, Shri Radheshyam Ramkumar Morarka, Shri U. M. Trivedi, Shri Tulsidas Kilachand, Shri M. S. Gurupadaswamy, Shri Jaswantraj Mehta, Shri Narayan Rao Waghmare, Shri Kamal Kumar Basu, Shri T. B. Vittal Rao and the Mover,