

12.25 hrs.

ELECTION TO COMMITTEES

INDIAN CENTRAL SPICES AND
CASHEWNUIT COMMITTEE

The Minister of Agriculture (Dr. P. S. Deshmukh): I beg to move:

"That in pursuance of paragraph 4(13) of the Ministry of Food and Agriculture (Department of Agriculture) (I.C.A.R.) Resolution No. F.27-12|60-AIII, dated the 7th September, 1961, the members of Lok Sabha do proceed to elect in such manner as the Speaker may direct, two members from amongst themselves to serve as members of the Indian Central Spices and Cashewnut Committee."

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

"That in pursuance of paragraph 4(13) of the Ministry of Food and Agriculture (Department of Agriculture) (I.C.A.R.) Resolution No. F.27-12|60-AIII, dated the 7th September, 1961, the members of Lok Sabha do proceed to elect in such manner as the Speaker may direct, two members from amongst themselves to serve as members of the Indian Central Spices and Cashewnut Committee."

The motion was adopted.

12.26 hrs.

INSTITUTES OF TECHNOLOGY
BILL—Contd.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: We now take up further consideration of the following motion moved by Shri Humayun Kabir on the 24th November, 1961, namely:

"That the Bill to declare certain institutions of technology to be institutions of national importance and to provide for certain matters connected with such institutions

and the Indian Institute of Technology, Kharagpur, be taken into consideration."

Shri T. B. Vittal Rao (Khammam): We are discussing this very important Bill at a time when the various industrially advanced countries have achieved considerable technological and scientific progress. When we see certain figures, we will be amazed to see to what extent we have to make up the leeway in order to catch up with the other industrial nations. For instance, we have about nine degree-holders for every million of the population as against 500 in the Soviet Union and the U.S.A.

Not only that. In order to derive the benefit of technological and scientific advance for the building up of the economy of our country and for the development of our industries, it is very necessary that we should train as many technical people as possible. In order to exploit the immense natural resources of our country, it is very essential that we should turn out as many technical graduates as possible.

I would now touch upon the question of admission to these four institutes of higher technology. These are institutes entirely financed by the Central Government, and I would suggest that admissions should be on an all-India basis and on merit. Otherwise, I am afraid that the wastage which is said to be 33 per cent today in these technical institutions would only be a loss to the country, a loss on the investment that we are making.

It may be argued on behalf of the Government, and I agree, that certain backward communities have to be given some preferential treatment in the matter of admission to these institutions. The Constitution also lays down that some sort of protection should be given to certain communities in the matter of admission to these institutions. I would earnestly urge upon the Minister and the Government to see that the Institute takes

care to provide some extra classes to such students so that they can also come up to the mark. Otherwise, there will be a terrible wastage.

In clause 5 it is stated that the terms and conditions of service of the employees of these institutes can be varied and that if they do not agree to the changed terms their services can be terminated by giving them a certain remuneration like three months salary. I should think this is a very unjust provision. When the conditions of service are varied and if a professor or a lecturer in the institute feels that the new conditions are disadvantageous to him, it is but proper that he should be allowed to exercise an option. Option should be given either to opt for the old conditions of service or for the new. There should be no termination at all. This is what is being done in various governmental undertakings. Therefore, I would like the Minister to see that this clause is suitably amended, providing for the option.

Then, in the case of disputes between the employees and the management of the Institutes, a provision is being made for a tribunal of arbitration. Representation is also given to the aggrieved employee to nominate one on the tribunal. But there is a subsequent clause which says that the decision of the tribunal shall be final and shall not be questioned in any court of law. Generally, arbitration is binding on both the parties. I would like the Minister to examine this sub-clause to see whether it does not run counter to the fundamental rights guaranteed under the Constitution.

I make this point specially because a similar question was discussed in various conferences convened by the Labour Minister, with regard to the question of taking the decision of the National Tribunal or the Industrial Tribunal to the High Court or the Supreme Court. It was the desire of so many people, especially the representatives of labour, that the decision of the Industrial Tribunal or the

National Tribunal shall be final and there shall be no appeal to the High Court or the Supreme Court. But the employers said that it will go against the fundamental rights guaranteed under the Constitution if you take away the right to go in appeal. We were asking for the decision to be made final because when the issue goes to the High Court or the Supreme Court there are long delays. Therefore, we suggested that it should be put an end to. But, we were told on behalf of Government by the Labour Minister that it is not possible and that it will go against the Constitution. So, in that context, I am asking the Minister to examine whether this does not go counter to the fundamental right guaranteed by the Constitution.

Here I want to cite the instance of a Professor who was Head of the Mining Department in the Institute of Technology, Kharagpur. He was one of the eminent professors in our country; he was head of the Coal Mining Department. He happened to give evidence in a great mine disaster in the Chinakuri mines. On the mere ground that he had not obtained the permission of the Director to go and give evidence before that enquiry, his services were terminated. Assuming he had committed an act of indiscretion, the punishment meted out to him was out of all proportion to the mistake he had committed.

The country today is short of several experts. In this connection I may point out that this professor.....

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: There is one thing which I might bring to the notice of the hon. Member, that it is the practice—and a very wholesome one—that if some individual cases are to be referred to prior notice should be given so that the Minister might be ready with facts.

Then, again, there is the second thing. When the hon. Member takes

{Mr. Deputy Speaker}

up a particular case, then, it appears as if a special representation is being made on behalf of a particular person or persons and the position of the Minister or the Government becomes rather difficult in that respect. Therefore, care should be taken that, unless it is very necessary, individual cases should not be referred to because it becomes rather embarrassing in this House. It is broadcast everywhere and it is a representation on behalf of one individual employee. It can be taken up with the Minister or Government. But, so far as the practice is concerned, prior notice is also necessary.

Shri T. B. Vittal Rao: I may submit that Government are fully aware of this. It is not as if they are not aware of it.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: That is a different thing altogether. But the fact whether the Minister has come prepared with that case or not should also be taken into consideration. If no suitable reply is given, it may be presumed that, perhaps, that representation was a just one or that something unjust had been done to the individual.

Shri T. B. Vittal Rao: I am not raising any policy question. I am referring.....

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: When it is said that the officer was very good and very efficient, then, probably, the Minister might have some materials and might say he committed that wrong or this indiscretion and all that would become a subject of controversy. That should also be avoided.

Shri T. B. Vittal Rao: In this case the notice of termination was given. Anyhow I do not want to pursue that. I only say that in view of the great shortage in our country of qualified personnel, they should be treated leniently and opportunity should be given to them to place their case before Government.

Then I come to the question of scales of pay. I want to know whether the scales of pay as recommended by the All India Council of Technical Education and accepted by Government have been implemented in these institutes. I am not aware of it. Let us be a model for others—before we ask the State Governments to implement these scales.

There is a provision for the exchange of professors with other countries. I welcome this because it is very healthy. It will enable professors of various institutions to go abroad and also enable those institutes to receive professors from abroad; it will be mutually beneficial.

I have not much to say about the constitution of the Board, the Senate and the Council because I am not aware of the procedures of the various universities which have been established. These institutes are going to be put on the same level as the other universities with regard to the grant of degrees. I am not questioning the status because they are going to award degrees in research also.

I want a section in every one of these institutes to be entirely devoted to research activities.

I now come to clause 31(k). In this provision has been made for the nomination to the Council of three Members of Parliament, two from Lok Sabha and one from Rajya Sabha. This is a very important body which will go into every question connected with the Institute; for example, the development of the institute, research in this institute, the syllabii, the duration of courses of study etc. Therefore, I consider this a very important body; and I would like more Members of Parliament to be associated with this Council. For this purpose I have tabled an amendment that instead of three Members of Parliament there shall be six nominated to this Council. This Council will be responsible for co-ordinating the activities of the

four institutes. We are going to spend some Rs. 6 crores per year and subsequently we may be spending about Rs. 10 crores per year. The association of more Members of Parliament would enable them to exercise a proper check and contribute to the development.

I have given notice of another amendment but that does not seem to have been circulated; I do not know whether it is not admissible. I wanted one of the professors to be nominated to represent the interests of the teaching staff and others employed in the Institutes. That will enable the professors to put their point of view in this body. The council is a very important body.

With these few words, I welcome this measure. It will have a far-reaching importance in the development of the training of the technical personnel and in the industrial advancement of our country.

Shri Naushir Bharucha (East Khandesh): The Bill before the House which wants to place the institutes of technology on a sound footing and invest them with the character of national importance is undoubtedly a welcome measure, though I am of the opinion that in certain important matters it does not go far enough. It provides a structure of framework for the institutes. All the four institutions will be independent and there is no co-ordination in so far as their educational activities are concerned. The Bill invests each of them with corporate existence and provides the framework for each of them, namely, board of governors with chairman, senate, etc. But what is there to co-ordinate their work and to see that the activities of these four institutions are co-ordinated? So far as the Council is concerned, which is supposed to co-ordinate the activities of the four institutions, it is totally ineffective. What are its functions? It says: 'to advise on matters relating to the duration of the courses'. It does not refer to the syllabus as my hon. friend, Shri Vittal Rao, put it. It will say that such and such course

should be of such and such duration. What is going to be taught? The Council has no concern at all about it. It appears as if each institute may teach whatever it likes in any manner it likes. The Council will advise on the degrees and other academic distinctions to be conferred by the Institutes, as if it is some other academic distinctions to be conferred by the Institutes, as if it is some thing very great. It also says that it will 'lay down policy regarding cadres, methods of recruitment and conditions of service of employees, institution of scholarships and freeships . . . These are administrative activities, totally different from educational activities. It is also to examine the development plans of each institute and to approve such of them as are considered necessary . . .' It means the opening of a building here or there. It is 'to examine the annual budget estimates of each Institute and to recommend to the Central Government the allocation of funds for that purpose. This is an important activity; they may say: grant more to this institute or that institution, without being able to control the activities of these institutions. It is to advise the Visitor, if so required, in respect of any function to be performed by him under this Act. The Visitor means the President. It is also 'to perform such other functions as are assigned to it by or under this Act.' How can any function be assigned to them beyond such as are prescribed in this Bill?

It is not enough to invest these Institutes with corporate character and to provide them with a board of governors or a senate or to provide for the procedure. These are all administrative matters. The basic thing, namely, co-ordinating the educational activities, is throughout absent in the picture. There are four institutes. Kharagpur may, for instance, start one course duplicating and over lapping that of Bombay; or, it may prescribe a course which is materially different from the course prescribed by the other Institutes for the purpose of the same degree. What authority is there to co-ordinate?

[Shri T. B. Vittal Rao]

That is a very big flaw in the Bill. After all, let us not forget that India is one country and unless the course of studies is co-ordinated and correlated, one institute may well manage its affairs and it may acquire a name for itself as the Massachusetts Institute has done. The other institutions may just drag along. Therefore, my submission is that the Government should send this Bill to the Select Committee to thrash up this important aspect because people who pass out of these institutions will be employed all over India. Today, already in universities there is difference. In the case of Bombay State, somehow or the other the graduates from that university are regarded as more efficient and more well-versed in their subjects than some from other universities which I would not like to name. I do not want the same thing to happen in the case of these technical institutions. With regard to the rest of the things, I have got nothing to say. In this important respect, there is a flaw and I hope the Government will look into it.

Shri Aurobindo Ghosal (Uluberia):
Sir, I welcome this Bill which has been brought to co-ordinate the activities of the four institutions. But my only apprehension is about the machinery set up for running the administration of these institutes. So many committees have been brought into existence. There is a council for co-ordinating the work of the four institutes; for each of them there is a board of governors, a senate and so on. I do not know how this triumvirate will function properly without clashing and how the institute will function smoothly. Besides that, the President has been named the Visitor and he has also been given some powers under clause 9 for nominating some members to the council and also to appoint committees to go into the working and administration of the institutes independent of these committees. The point is whether they will not clash with each other, whe-

ther so many committees, independent committees can work harmoniously and function in a co-ordinated way.

The next is the conferment of degrees. It has already been stated that these four institutes are going to work as universities and generally universities confer degrees. These institutions have been authorised under clause 6(1)(c) even to confer honorary degrees which function comes under the exclusive jurisdiction of the universities. It is not proper that these technical institutes should award honorary degrees to the persons who are entitled to get them, because that is the exclusive function of the universities.

Regarding the statement made by the hon. Minister that the outturn of engineers is quite in keeping with the requirements of the country, I would like to know whether it is not a fact that there is a dearth of engineers and that the number of seats in the colleges has got to be increased. A month ago, I visited the Heavy Electricals, Bhopal. I found that about 30 per cent of the engineers' posts are still lying vacant because we are not getting engineers. We were told that in the new expansion programme, they will be feeling great difficulty in filling up the posts of engineers because adequate numbers of engineers are not coming up.

In Rourkela, we were told that for want of engineers, they are not able to operate the machines. In Durgapur, I have seen personally that the apprentices are running the machines. When we asked the manager there, he said because of the want of engineers the machines were run by apprentices. This is the position as regards the dearth of engineers. I do not know how the hon. Minister can say that there is sufficient number of engineers, who are receiving training in the institutes.

Regarding mines, there is great difficulty in securing engineers. About 40

per cent of the posts of Mines Inspectors are still lying vacant, and this matter was discussed at the safety in Mines Conference. We were told that there was lack of mining engineers and because of that the Government are not able to fill up the posts. About a month ago, in regard to the administration of the DVC, we learnt that the West Bengal Government has not taken up the responsibility of running the DVC. We were told that for want of engineers they are not able to take up the administration of the DVC. This is the position. So, how can it be said that there are sufficient engineers who are being trained in these institutes?

I understand that we are not able to train the apprentices also. According to the opinion of experts, about 13,000 apprentices are required for the country every year, whereas we are getting only 2,000 per annum. I do not know what the requirements of engineers are and what is their outturn from the institutes. I admit that unemployment and dearth of the engineering staff are going hand in hand. That is a fact. That is due to want of plan and the existing maladjustment. I want to know whether a plan has been prepared before-hand for the training of engineers according to the needs of our industries. It may be difficult to know the requirements from the private sector. But when we have got a plan and when we know that so many engineers in such and such industries are required for the third Five Year Plan, it should be easy to proceed. But I want to know whether we have a plan so that we may know the outturn of engineers in those sectors and the number of engineers who are being trained in the different institutes.

Many engineers are also out of employment. That is found in the employment exchanges. A few years ago, I saw Bevin boy who went to England to take training. I saw him selling pakodas. Such thing happen because of the maladjustment, and for want of plan. I want to tell the hon. Minister that a suitable plan should

be there and the training of the engineers should be according to the needs of our industries.

Lastly, I would like to mention the difficulties in the Kharagpur Institute. There have been many occasions when discussions about the lack of facilities like water, etc., in that institute had taken place in the House. The hon. Minister should make it a point that all sorts of facilities should be provided in all these institutes for the students and teachers, because we have got the experience of the difficulties in the Kharagpur institute in the past.

With these few words, I resume my seat.

Shri Bal Raj Madhok (New Delhi): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, there can be no two opinions on the need for greater opportunities for technical education in the country. In the last few years, a number of institutions have been opened in different parts of the country, and they are doing good work too. This Bill is meant mainly for a new kind of institutes that are being opened—indeed they have been opened—which will be different from the other institutes. This difference lies only in one important respect, that these institutes will not be under the jurisdiction of the existing universities. In this Bill, a special provision has been made, defining the nature of the governing bodies of these institutes. New names have been given such as the Board of Governors, Senates, etc. Actually, they will be new universities. The place of a Chancellor in the university is taken by the Chairman of the Board of Governors. The place of the Vice-Chancellor will be taken by the Director. Of course, the President of India continues to be the Visitor. So, the question arises as to what is the need for opening new universities. In respect of the universities, one can say that they are autonomous bodies, having Vice-Chancellors and others, but these institutes will have the same kind of powers and regulations

[Shri Balraj Madhok]

as the universities but they will be under greater official control. The Director will be appointed by the Government; the Deputy-Director will be appointed by the Government; the Chairman will be appointed by the Government. If this is to be done, then one might ask why separate Boards of Governors should be there, and why not the same Board function for all these four institutes? There is a provision for a Council. Why not one Council control all these four institutes? As it is, there are four Boards and four Directors, one for each institute. I feel that these four institutes, instead of improving the situation in regard to technical education, will create more confusion. Already, there is the Roorkee Engineering University, for giving engineering degrees, and engineers are coming out of this university. Then there is the Jadavpur university. Even at present, in the matter of selection and appointment of technical personnel, distinction is made between graduates of one institute and those of another institute. Of course, this is true of the universities also; but it is bad. Actually, ours is one country, and there should be a uniform standard of education, and there should be no distinction made on that basis. Now more distinctions will be made by creating these four institutes. Therefore, you will find further classification of the engineers themselves.

The real purpose of these institutes should be not one of awarding ordinary degrees and training the students for ordinary degrees, but post-graduate courses. Actually, we have now about a hundred degree colleges in engineering. If these four institutes also have to provide the same degree and the same standard of engineering education, there will be no purpose in maintaining them. The main purpose should be to provide post-graduate courses. In that respect, what is required is, these different institutes should specialise in giving post-graduate education in particular

branches of engineering, as for example, mechanical engineering, civil engineering, metallurgical engineering and so on. But we find that in almost all the institutes, similar kind of courses are being taken up every year. As a result, there is only duplication, without any kind of real specialisation, and we will be required to send more and more men, as is happening now, to foreign countries for getting specialised education.

There is another aspect of these four new institutes. The overhead charges are very high. In the Kharagpur institute, there is a Board of Governors, a Chairman, a Director, a Deputy Director, a Registrar and so many other posts. If you compare the expenditure on the Kharagpur institute and the Bombay institute with the expenditure on the engineering colleges at Chandigarh or elsewhere, you will find that the different is two to three times. Is this extra money which is to be spent on these institutes worthwhile? Why should we spend more money on overhead charges? If you have got extra money, why not spend it on improving the equipment and the laboratories or open more institutes? To my mind, it appears to be rather superfluous and it is creating a new avenue for official patronage.

13 hrs.

Power has been given to the Boards to confer honorary degrees. Confering of honorary degrees is a curse which has come in this country. Everybody who happens to be a Minister or somebody become a doctor, because the honorary degree is conferred on him. That is very wrong. According to me, honorary degrees should not be conferred at all. For an engineering institute to confer honorary degrees is not at all correct.

Then, power has been given to the directors in the matter of appointment. Only appointments carrying a

salary of more than Rs. 600 will be made by the Board; all other appointments will be made by the director. The director himself will be an official. I know there are already complaints of nepotism about the Kharagpur University. When one man is entrusted with powers of appointment, complaints will definitely increase.

Therefore, I do not agree with the opening of these institutes at all. These institutes should be associated with the universities—the Bombay institute should be associated with the Bombay University, the Madras institute with the Madras University and so on. To make them separate universities, increase the overhead charges and give them the powers of a university without giving them the autonomy of a university is a retrograde step. In view of these observations, I suggest that the Bill may be reconsidered.

Shri L. Achaw Singh (Inner Manipur): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, this is a very important Bill and obviously our object is to provide better facilities for advanced work and research for post-graduate courses in science, engineering and technology. The Central Government had already undertaken to establish four higher technological institutes, one in each region in east, west, south and north. The object of this Bill is to retain the individuality of these institutes by declaring them institutions of national importance and to make provision for the co-ordination and regulation of the affairs of the four institutes. The object has been clearly stated in the Statement of Objects and Reasons. These institutes were to give training to the highest possible grades of technologists in order to meet the present and future needs of our industry. All the four institutes provide first degree courses in addition to facilities for post-graduate studies and advanced research.

The four institutions have been started according to the recommendations of the Sarkar Committee.

While we extend our full support to the objects of the Bill, we find that certain conditions laid down by the Sarkar Committee have not been fulfilled. The Sarkar Committee observed that if these institutions were to fulfil their functions efficiently, they must be able to draw upon students with the appropriate training. It involves both establishment of junior technical institutions in each region and an increase in the number of technological high schools. I feel that this condition has not been fulfilled. Almost in all the States, we find that adequate number of technical institutions have not been established. That is why this condition has not been fulfilled.

The committee also observed that the selections for appointment should be made purely on merit and no provincial quotas should be allowed. The committee also observed that some proportion of the seats should be reserved for the educationally backward classes, so that in due course, the general level of education throughout may be raised. We find that in many of the technical institutions that principle is not followed and too much stress is laid on the provincial quota. Those coming from the backward and under-developed regions like NEFA, Manipur and Nagaland are deprived of proper and adequate number of seats in these technical institutions. They have got no quota and when they go to any technical institution, they say there is no reservation for them. So, they suffer a lot. This is a very serious draw-back in our technical educational system.

I would like in this connection to refer to the White Paper issued by the Minister of Education in England last January. It is quite relevant for our country. In that White Paper, he drew the attention of all concerned that there was need for changes in technical education. The reasons stated were that it had not kept pace with changes taking place in industry and in particular the urgent need for

[Shri L. Achaw Singh]

more and better trained technicians. Secondly, he said there has been a huge wastage and a large number of failures in the technical institutions. He has also suggested that changes for technical study by more individual attention to the students as well as other developments in teaching methods of selection of students. I think we should also consider these points and reorient our technical education on these lines.

It has already been stated by some hon. Members that there has been lack of co-operation between the technical institutions and industry. There has been a great time-lag between the inventions made by our technical institutes and their application to industry. I am also of the opinion that our technical institutions, specially the higher ones, should be adapted to the needs of our modern industry.

I would also like to sound a note of warning regarding the development of these institutions. Our experience is there has been a rapid expansion in our technical institutions and this is accompanied by several difficulties regarding shortage of staff. I am told in some of the higher institutions only 40 to 50 per cent of the sanctioned strength are working and the shortage is of the order of 50 per cent. It will be very difficult during the third Five Year Plan to fill up all these shortages.

There is another problem in regard to training personnel of high calibre. In most of the technical institutions, we find the emoluments of the instructors are not at all attractive. They are paid better in other countries. If they are offered a higher salary, we can remove at least some percentage of the shortage in these institutions.

The Ministry appointed a Committee on Post-Graduate Engineering Education and Research and they have submitted a report. I would like to

read an extract from it regarding this problem:

"The Committee wishes to emphasise that unless the problem of staff is adequately solved, it will be futile and even dangerous to expand technical education any further. The foundation for post-graduate studies and research is laid in the first-degree courses."

"If the standard of under-graduate courses falls due to inadequate teachers in the institutions the foundation becomes weak and progress at the post-graduate level suffers."

This remark is very significant and the Government have to take proper and adequate steps to remove this difficulty.

Then a word about the constitution of the Board of Governors and the Senate and other bodies. For the membership of these bodies, it has been provided in the Bill, that there should be the principle of nomination in most cases. I want that the principle of election should be adopted and adequate representation should be given to the teaching staff also. The principle of nomination is a retrograde one and should be avoided, as far as possible.

Lastly I would like to say something about research facilities. In most of the institutions we find that there is not enough provision for equipment. From the Bill we find that Rs. 5 crores have been provided for these institutions, especially for buildings and equipment. The Committee on Post-Graduate Technical Education has also observed that the question of provision of equipment at these institutions is a very complicated one. I urge upon the Government to make adequate provision for equipment at these institutions so that there may be better research facilities in them.

Dr. Melkote (Raichur): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, I welcome the introduction of this Bill. I feel it is most timely. India is a vast country and her developmental programme during the first and the second plans and much more so in the Third Plan is so vast that it calls for more and more men with adequate technical knowledge. For the past ten or twelve years we have increased our intake in these engineering colleges from about five or six thousand to nearly sixty thousand students per year. Many of these students belong either to the ordinary technical colleges or to the graduate courses in the universities. Sir, it was in 1957 for the first time that the Government of India took a decision to institute post-graduate course in technology.

Shri Humayun Kabir: In 1951.

Dr. Melkote: But India is a vast country. Some of our States are as big as some countries in Europe. We now have four Central technical institutions; even so, the need for technical personnel is great. Many of these technological colleges do not produce merely engineers for construction work, but technical personnel of various types. Research is a very important type of work which has to be undertaken by people who have not merely the equipment, but also the patience and perseverance to follow the course. In the various departments of administration we have been feeling the paucity of higher technical personnel. So far we have been sending our students either to England or to America to equip themselves for this type of post-graduate work. Many of them have returned. But the amount of expenditure incurred on them in foreign countries is so great, that with almost the same amount of expenditure we could train more students here, provided we get the necessary technical personnel who could teach these post-graduate students and guide them in their research. That is why I understand that these colleges have been started. But, as I said, our developmental programme is

so great that these three or four institutes that have come into existence would not serve our needs and there is necessity for starting one such institution in each State to keep up with the demands of our country. It is therefore necessary that expansion of the existing institutions should be taken in hand.

The types of students who are admitted to these institutes are those who have sat for an All-India competitive examination and the very first classes are being taken here. Many of these students being first classes, the percentage of failures in these colleges are also very meagre. Even so, I do not understand why there should be failures at all, unless it be that there has been neglect on the part of the students, or due to some physical ailment of the students, which ought to be attended to. The course has become very expensive and the money spent by the exchequer should be safeguarded properly.

There is another aspect of the question which I should like to bring before the Ministry. In many of the foreign countries—I had occasion to visit a few of these institutes in Europe—as in Zurich, England and other places, I understand that the professors and others who teach, though they are called permanent members of the institute are not allowed to continue if year after year they do not produce sufficient research work to their credit and if their teaching falls below their standard. They are immediately given to understand that they should quit, as they are not doing any useful work. But in our country once a person gets into the teaching profession he continues for years. Such a measure ought to be introduced in these institutions that people of competence are continuously brought in to help the students produce better type of research.

Technical personnel in our country are produced both for the sake of the public sector and private sector undertakings. Today the private sector

[Dr. Melkote]

has been engaging many of these people on higher emoluments. In many of the public sector undertakings as also in government service the scales of salary are low. So, many of these people will be drawn away into the service of the private sector. Oftentimes we hear, even in this House, the private sector accusing the Government for lack of enthusiasm and initiative shown by the private sector undertakings. Part of this is due to the poor type of recruits being recruited to the public sector undertakings. Therefore, I personally feel that if proper types of recruits are to be attracted to the public sector undertakings, their emoluments should be enhanced. Today, if many of these graduates who seek employment are to start their own industries or undertakings, they could earn in thousands and unless we increase their emoluments, the right type of personnel would not be induced to opt themselves to public sector undertakings.

My next point is, institutes of this type are autonomous. They are considered as good as universities. They confer degrees. While this is good and they get the independence to arrange for the syllabi, the standard of education and with regard to other matters pertaining to education, it is necessary that some kind of a body should be set up to find out whether the standards obtainable are really as good as we envisage. I do not know what the hon. Minister has in mind in regard to these things; otherwise, many of the universities who claim that they are quite good and competent up to the standards in other universities in foreign countries may not come up to the standards. Unless there is a continuous vigil kept over the functioning of these colleges, these technical colleges, they may fall short of our expectations. I personally feel that some such measure ought to be taken up.

Sir, I have nothing more to add except to welcome this Bill and to say that many more of these national

colleges should be started in each State.

13.22 hrs.

[SHRI JAGANATHA RAO in the Chair]

The Minister of Scientific Research and Cultural Affairs (Shri Humayun Kabir): Mr. Chairman, Sir, I am grateful to the House for the welcome it has given to this Bill and I also welcome the many valuable and constructive suggestions that have been made. As I said in my opening remarks, I consider this to be a very important but a very non-controversial Bill, and to a very large extent the course of the debate has justified that assessment. Of course, my other expectation that the Bill would be through in 15 minutes has not been justified. For that I am not very sorry because it shows that the hon. Members of this House are interested in the programmes of technical education in this country.

Dr. M. S. Aney (Nagpur): And also intelligent to help you.

Shri Humayun Kabir: Yes, they are anxious to help me. I welcome that. There have been a few criticisms, friendly but, I think, on the whole, if I may be permitted to say so, uninformed.

First I shall take up the points made by my hon. friend Shri Supakar, who did not want different types of technical institutions in this country. He wanted that all should be of exactly the same category, with the same kind of staff and with the same kind of courses. He forgot that in any system of education there would be institutions of different standing catering to different types of needs, and particularly in the field of technical and scientific education we must have many types of institutions of different characters. To expect that the higher institutions of technology should be of the same standard and manned by the

same kind of staff as polytechnics or the junior technical schools would be, to my mind, lacking in a proper appreciation of the importance of very highly qualified staff in this scientific age. Some kind of difference has to be there; we just cannot ignore that.

My hon. friend Shri Supakar also referred to the absence of election in these bodies. I frankly confess that we have tried to eliminate election as far as possible in the governance of educational institutions. Democracy is very good in political and other matters, but in the running of educational institutions, in the framing of courses etc., very often the introduction of the elective principle brings in considerations other than that of research, merit or academic standards. Therefore, we have tried to follow the practice of some of the leading educational institutions in different parts of the world and in countries so widely divergent in their social outlook as, let us say, USA and the USSR, the United Kingdom and Italy and France. In all these countries, in all these parts of the world, educational institutions try to avoid elections and, on the whole, the atmosphere is much cleaner and much more conducive to research on that account.

My hon. friend, Shri T. B. Vittal Rao made certain very interesting observations. He has always taken a special interest in technical education, and therefore we value his suggestions more. But in this particular case I find that he was not as well informed as he usually is. He asked us whether the conditions of service in these four higher institutes were satisfactory. If he had looked at them he would have found that they are as satisfactory as we can make them in existing circumstances in India. The staff are highly qualified persons, and we are very happy that the staff by and large are competent, satisfied and highly efficient.

He referred to the question of scales also. Obviously, the scales which 1429 (Ai) LSD—7.

the Government of India accept are first applied to these four institutes and in certain cases the scales in these four institutes are even higher than the scales which we have recommended to other institutions. If we want to make these four institutes the apex of technical and scientific education in the country and comparable to the finest institutions anywhere in the world, obviously we will have to attract the best talents, and steps have been taken for that.

I do not know where he got the idea that there was any shortage in any of these four institutes. There is no shortage in these institutes; occasionally there may be a few vacancies here and there, but by and large these institutes are carrying on well and we do not feel any difficulty about that.

Then he raised the question of their all-India character. I do not know where he got the idea of lack of all-India character and wastage. There has been very little wastage in any of these higher technical institutes. About the three institutes at Bombay, Madras and Kanpur it is too early to speak because one was started in 1958, the other in 1959 and the third only in 1960 and even the first batch has not yet gone out; but in the case of the Kharagpur institute which has been in existence for about 11 years—it started in 1950—the wastage is not more than 10 to 15 per cent; and 10 per cent wastage in an institution of this kind is considered to be a very satisfactory situation which compares favourably with the position in almost any country in the world. I do not think there is any country in the world or any institution of this type which has a lower wastage. If we think of even very highly developed institutions in the United States of America or USSR or the United Kingdom, the wastage in many cases will be as much as 20 per cent or even more. Therefore, I do not know where he got this idea of wastage.

[Shri Humayun Kabir]

So far as his point about all-India character is concerned, I think I have already mentioned that these institutions recruit students from all over the country on the basis of merit through examinations. I have here the figures before me. Out of the 938 admissions in 1961-62 there are students from all over India and there is on the whole an equitable distribution. But it is only to be expected that at the Madras institute there will be more students from the southern region than from the other regions, there will be, similarly, a few more students from the eastern region in the eastern institute and so on in the western and northern institutes.

My hon. friend's last point was about Members of Parliament, that instead of their number being 3 on the governing councils it should be 6. I am sure my hon. friend will agree with me that Members of Parliament are such high-powered personalities that even one of them is quite enough to place his point of view adequately before a governing body of this kind and if we have three there we will be having three times more than what is necessary. Therefore, I do not think there will be any particular purpose in increasing the number; it will only make the body un-wieldy.

Then I will take up the comments made by my hon. friend, Shri Bharucha—he has just now disappeared from the House.

Dr. M. S. Aney: Is there any restriction upon the admission of students?

Shri Humayun Kabir: Admissions are on the basis of examinations and these examinations are held throughout India. It is on merit excepting that a certain number of students who belong to Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes are given admission. In their case also there is the competitive examination and they also have to sit for the examination. Those who come in at the very first list through the open competition are admitted immediately,

but if we find that there is any undue shortage of students from Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes, then cases of those candidates who have sat for the examination are considered again. Their results are scrutinised a second time and we try to make up the quota, but we insist that no one below a certain standard comes to any of these institutions.

One hon. Member—I forget his name at the moment—said that the admission of such students may lower the standards. That has not been our experience. In Kharagpur it has been found that students from the Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes, who initially were a little inferior as compared to some of the other students, given proper teaching and proper coaching, within about a year or a year and a half, were able to hold their own with other students. That also justifies the general feeling that we have that very often these students are backward not because of lack of intrinsic ability but because of lack of opportunity, and in these institutions we are trying to ensure that proper opportunities are given to them.

An Hon. Member: Follow it up.

Shri Humayun Kabir: Certainly, we shall.

Then, coming to my hon. friend, Shri Bharucha, obviously, I think he is not an educationist because, if he was, he would not have laid it down that the Council should control the institutions. We do not want the Council to control the institutions. We want the institutions to be autonomous, and that is why as much powers as possible have been given to the Board of Governors. If you look at the Bill, you will find that the different clauses have been framed very carefully. In the case of academic matters, the Council will advise. In the case of administrative matters, salary scales, cadres etc. the Council will lay down the policy. We made

that distinction quite deliberately, because we feel that in the case of academic matters the institutions must have greater flexibility and must have autonomy. But in the case of general administration of budgeting, in the case of appointments, number of staff, building, material and administrative matters, the Council will have definite powers of co-ordination.

I would like this House also to remember that these institutions have a very interesting background. Kharagpur institute is built up entirely through our own efforts, of course, with the help of UNESCO and a number of distinguished professors from different countries of the world. It is primarily an Indian effort. In the case of the Bombay institute, it has been patterned to a certain extent after Soviet institutions. To a large extent, it has been helped through UNESCO by the USSR and, therefore, it is natural that the methods of training and teaching there will, to some extent, incorporate elements from the Soviet system. In the Madras institute, substantial help has been given by the Federal Republic of Germany and a number of teachers from Germany are working there. Therefore, again, it is inevitable and natural, and I think desirable, that in the Madras institute some of the practices and principles of German education will be incorporated. At Kanpur, it is being built with the assistance of the USA. Therefore, it is inevitable that it will incorporate certain American principles. I have never concealed this fact and, in fact, I want these four institutions to have a kind of friendly rivalry. On Indian soil, we are trying to establish these four different patterns and see which gives us the best results, because each has certain advantages and certain strong points. Therefore, the idea of my hon. friend, Shri Bharucha, that they should all be controlled from one centre in Delhi, they should all be stereo-typed and there should be a steam-roller going over the four institutions is, to my mind, completely contrary to our ideas and would be contrary to the interests of the country.

Dr. M. S. Aney: May I ask of the hon. Minister whether these four institutions are having teaching courses, each different from the other?

Shri Humayun Kabir: Science is the same throughout the world and technology is the same throughout the world. Therefore, they will have a very large degree of basic agreement, but there are certain differences in procedure. There are certain differences in the methods of teaching. The methods followed in the Soviet Union are not the methods followed in the United Kingdom or West Germany. Therefore, while there will be a basic unity of approach, there will be room for a certain flexibility, and we believe that this flexibility and this divergence will be to the advantage of India. Therefore, the main point of Shri Bharucha that the Council should control these institutions and administer them is, to my mind, a point which this House should not accept.

My hon. friend, Shri Ghosal also talked about co-ordination. What I have said about the point of view of Shri Bharucha applies to his point also with equal force. Then he was rather worried that the Visitor should appoint committees. I do not know why he should be so afraid of the power of the Visitor. The Visitor will appoint committees if the need should arise. It is a reserve power which the Visitor keeps to himself. We also desire that at certain intervals there may be reviewing committees. We have already had a reviewing committee for the Kharagpur institute. These reviewing committees which are appointed after a lapse of 5, 10 or 15 years will give an opportunity to us to survey the work of the institutions and to plan their future progress. Therefore, I think that this power which has been reserved to the Visitor should be welcomed, rather than criticised.

My hon. friend also referred to the want of engineers and he said that supervisors were doing the work of engineers. I may be wrong, but my own impression based on information

[Shri Humayun Kabir]

is just the contrary. In India, in many cases, we use engineers where the work in other countries is done by supervisors. In fact, till very recently, there was such a disproportion between engineers and diploma-holders, that in very many cases engineers were doing the work which, in other countries, diploma-holders perform, of which I shall give a few figures very soon. Very recently when this Ministry went into this question we found that the proportion of diploma-holders to engineers was before independence almost 1:1 whereas the proportion in a country like the United Kingdom is about 1:5. In the United States, I believe, it is even higher, probably 1:6 or 1:7. Therefore, it is not a fact, I think, that supervisors are doing the work of engineers, but it is *vice versa* and the engineers are utilised to do a job which the supervisors should be able to do.

Then he mentioned about the facilities which should be created. In the first institute at Kharagpur, there were certain difficulties in the beginning because, we had gradually to find out certain things. These will be avoided and, in the case of the three other institutions, I do not think any of these problems will arise.

I did not deal with the remark made by Shri Vittal Rao, because the Deputy-Speaker himself had adequately disposed of it. But I may inform him that no professor of any of the four institutions has been dismissed, either in Kharagpur or in any other institution. Therefore, I do not know from where Shri Vittal Rao got his facts. We should not go into this controversy here. He should not have raised it at all. I am mentioning it because he raised it.

I now come to my hon. friend, Shri Madhok, who is himself an educationist. He seems to have a rather curious idea about education. He thinks that all universities should have exactly identical standards. This is a

thing which has never happened anywhere in the world and cannot happen. In the same university, you cannot have identical standards in all subjects. It depends on the teachers and students. Certain subjects attract a better calibre of students; certain professors are distinguished. If we are to accept the principle enunciated by Shri Madhok, then it could be done only by lowering the standards. Obviously, a less distinguished professor cannot reach the standards of a more distinguished professor. But you can pull down a more distinguished professor and ask him not to teach up to his full capacity, but only to the capacity of some of his less qualified colleagues. Similarly, in the case of students, there will be differences and there have been differences. Any idea that equality of opportunity means equality of achievement is, I think, completely wrong. It will never be justified. All that democracy means is only equality of opportunity; it never means equality of achievement and if we try for equality of achievement it will be a poor day for the world.

I was very sorry that without knowing the facts, he had spoken of nepotism at Kharagpur. I do not know from where he got his information. In fact, all the reports we have had from these different institutions speak of the high integrity, the exceptionally high qualifications of the directors; they have set new standards, they have earned the respect, esteem and affection of their students and their colleagues. It is very unfortunate that an hon. Member of Parliament, without knowing the facts should cast aspersions on a distinguished individual, a distinguished scientist who is not present in this House.

I am very grateful for the remarks of my hon. friend, Shri Achaw Singh. He obviously has made a careful study of the whole subject. I am also glad to find that he referred to the Sarkar Committee. His two major points of criticism were that there has

not been increase in the number of technical schools. There has been, as I shall in a moment indicate to the House, a very large expansion in technical education in this country—an expansion which can probably compare favourably with the expansion in almost any country in the world.

He referred to the view that in these higher institutes we should only take students from technical schools or polytechnics. I think there he is wrong. He should not also forget that the Sarkar Committee reported some 16 or 17 years ago, that is, in 1944 or 1945. There have been many changes since then and the conception of technical education is changing in the whole world today. Even in the Reviewing Committee which was appointed for the Kharagpur Institute within five or six years found that there was a certain change in the trend. Today the emphasis is far more on science than on technology. This greater emphasis on pure science in technical institutions is giving a new character to technical education in all the advanced countries of the world. Therefore, Kharagpur and these three other institutes are in line with one another and with the progressive nations throughout the world in attracting highly qualified students of science rather than students who have gone through a polytechnic or a technical school.

He also referred to the question of admission by merit. I was a little surprised because he was obviously well informed and he had made a study of the question. But he did not remember the fact that since 1955 all admissions have been on the basis of merit and on the basis of examinations held in different parts of the country. Therefore, this question of their being any improperly qualified students just does not exist.

He then referred to the very large expansion and sounded a note of warning. I would not call it a note of

warning. We have to be careful. I do not deny that. The expansion has been large in recent years, specially I think in the last four years, and we should be careful, but we have not yet reached a stage where we need retard the rate of development of technical education in the country.

He was not correct when he said that there was any shortage of staff in these institutes or that there was any shortage of equipment. These institutions are well provided. Since three of the institutions are receiving very large help from other countries who are providing the equipment, the question of shortage of equipment simply does not arise.

I am very grateful to my hon. friend, Dr. Melkote, for his extremely interesting and constructive remarks. Only I would plead with him that the time has not yet come to think of one institute of this type in every State. We have four today in India. There was none eleven or twelve years ago. We should go a little slow in starting institutions of this type in every State, but we have taken an intermediate step already. We have assured that before the end of the Third Plan every State will have one regional engineering college which in terms of the number of students, equipment and admissions from different parts of India stands half-way between an engineering college in a State and a higher technological institute of all-India character.

I also welcome his suggestion about scholarships. We are trying to increase the number of scholarships. In fact in the case of the four higher technological institutes we have said that for all post-graduate students there will be scholarships. Formerly there were scholarships for 50 per cent., but now they will be for all post-graduate students. In the case of the undergraduate students there will be quite a large proportion of scholarships. It has been our constant endeavour to try to increase the number of scholarships.

[Shri Humayun Kabir]

I think we have increased them considerably in the course of the last three years. I do not have the figures before me at the moment, but I think I have told the House already that in the course of the last three or three and a half years probably the scholarships have been increased by about 1,000 or 1,500. I do not have the exact figures, but if necessary I can place them before the House whenever any question is asked on that subject.

There is one other point which Dr. Melkote raised and which is of great interest but very controversial. He wanted that professors in these institutions should be appointed on the basis of a tenure. He was perhaps thinking primarily of the experience in countries like the USSR. There is a contrary experience in Universities, like Oxford, Cambridge or London, where the appointment is almost for life. I do not know if it can be said that that is less satisfactory than the method which is followed in the Soviet Union. In the Soviet Union, professors are appointed only for five years. After five years the man may be thrown out. Some very distinguished professors have told me that while for a younger man this uncertainty has sometimes acted as a spur, for a person with a family and a little older in age this sometimes has caused a great nervous strain and they have therefore undertaken, merely in order to show that some researches have been done, to produce work which they themselves knew were not up to their own highest standards. A very interesting article appeared recently in this connection where I had discussed this question in some detail with the President of the Soviet Academy of Sciences. He largely accepted my criticism and this was published in the Soviet papers. This is, therefore, a very controversial question. In India itself, till very recently, the Council of Scientific and Industrial Research had these six-year contracts, but now we find from experience that many

scientists cannot give of their best if they are constantly under tension and pressure. Of course, those who will not work will not work. You cannot do anything with them. Those who will work will work because they love the subject. It is a matter for debate. I do not say that Dr. Melkote's suggestion is not important, but on this I would not like to give any opinion one way or the other definitively till far more studies have been undertaken.

Dr. Melkote also referred to the improvement of salary scales for technical teachers generally. I think in the last three years, we have taken certain major steps in that direction. Today the salary scale and prospects of a teacher in a technical institution compare not unfavourably with service anywhere else. A young man can start on Rs. 410 and can go up to about Rs. 2,500 if he is good enough. I think Rs. 410 to Rs. 2,500 in our country is not a bad scale. We should now be able to attract better people.

We have also taken another step in which these higher institutes will be of great help to us, that is, in providing training for teachers of technical institutions. Formerly we used to send people for training only to countries outside India, but now these institutions and a number of other institutions have provided the necessary facilities.

Before I conclude, I want to give a few figures which, I think, will be revealing to this House and, I hope, satisfactory. As I said a moment ago, the expansion in technical education in this country has been, if I may say so, almost phenomenal. In 1947 there were 38 engineering colleges which had an intake of 2,940 students. Just before the First Plan, in 1951 this had increased to 49 institutions with an intake of 4,120 students. When the

Second Plan began there were 65 institutions with 5,890 admissions. The target in the Second Plan was to increase the number by nine institutions and the number of intake to 7,390. Our actual achievement was much greater. In 1961, we had 100 institutions with an intake of 13,585. When the Ministry of Scientific Research and Cultural Affairs was forced there were 74 institutions with an intake of 8,760. In the course of $3\frac{1}{2}$ years, in 1962, today, there are 107 institutions with an intake of 15,250. In other words, in less than 4 years, the intake has been almost doubled and the number of colleges has been increased by over 50 per cent.

In the case of polytechnics and diploma institutions, the progress is even more striking. There were 53 institutions with an intake of 3,670 in 1947. In the beginning of the Second Five Year Plan, there were 114 institutions with an intake of 10,480. The proposals for the Second Plan were that there should be 21 additional institutions with an increase of 3,000 in the intake: In other words, 135 institutions with an intake of 13,080. The position in 1961 was, we had 196 institutions with an intake of 25,570: in other words, almost double of what had been provided in the Second Plan. Again, if I may refer to the date of the formation of this Ministry, there were 129 institutions in 1958 with an intake of 15,000 students. Today, there are 210 institutions with an intake of 27,350: almost a 100 per cent. increase both in terms of institutions and in terms of intake. To some extent, we have also been able to rectify the imbalance which existed in the past. In the past, the ratio was 1:1 so far as engineers and diploma-holders were concerned. Today, the ratio is about 1:2, which itself is not fully satisfactory, but, it is certainly an improvement on what it was even $3\frac{1}{2}$ or 4 years ago.

Before I sit down, I would just like to add that I was happy that Shri L. Achaw Singh referred to the Sarkar Committee, because the Sarkar Com-

mittee did very valuable work. But for the broad vision and the imaginative plan that the Sarkar Committee had drawn up, which has since been worked upon by the All India Council of Technical Education, we would not have been able to achieve the targets which have been achieved. Certainly, we could not have established these four institutions which from every point of view compare with the highest institutions anywhere in the world. We are grateful to the Government of the USSR which has promised us help of about Rs. 2 crores in the establishment of the Bombay Institute and paid a substantial part of it, to the Government of Germany which has also promised assistance of about Rs. 2 crores and paid a substantial part of it and to the Government of the USA which has promised assistance of almost about Rs. 10 crores and paid almost Rs. 2 crores. To all these friendly nations, we are grateful and I am sure the House would join with me in expressing our appreciation of the help that they have given us in this behalf.

Mr. Chairman: Now, I shall put this motion to the vote of the House.

The question is:

"That the Bill to declare certain institutions of technology to be institutions of national importance and to provide for certain matters connected with such institutions and the Indian Institute of Technology, Kharagpur, be taken into consideration."

The motion was adopted.

Mr. Chairman: We proceed with the clause-by-clause consideration. Clauses 2 to 30: there are no amendments. I shall put them together. The question is:

"That clauses 2 to 30 stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Clauses 2 to 30 were added to the Bill.

Clause 31—(Establishment of Council)

Shri T. B. Vittal Rao: I move:

Page 13,

(i) in line 11—

(a) for "three" substitute "six";

(b) for "two" substitute "four".

(ii) in line 13—

for "one" substitute "two" (1)

My amendment is to clause (k) where it is provided, three Members of Parliament, of whom two shall be elected by the House of the People from among its members and one by the Council of States from among its members. I have asked for an increase, that is six Members of Parliament, four from the Lok Sabha and two from the Rajya Sabha. I specifically ask for this. Though the hon. Minister has very ably answered, one point remains. Placed as we are in this House, generally, the opposition does not find a place in these councils. If the figure is a little more and we adopt the system of single transferable vote, some of the opposition members also may be represented. I am not making a political issue. But, generally, in all these councils, unless and until the Minister for Parliamentary Affairs obliges, the opposition cannot find a place, placed as we are. Therefore, my intention was to increase the number of Parliament Members in this policy-making body, which is really a very important council so that the opposition may be given a chance to come in. That is my amendment.

Shri Humayun Kabir: I find that my hon. friend is very despondent about the chances of his party and fears that there will be no Opposition in Parliament. If not just now, sometimes there will be an Opposition. We should not legislate because there happen to be only 25 members in a particular party and there are so many different parties. I oppose the amendment.

Mr. Chairman: I shall now put the amendment to the vote of the House.

The amendment was put and negatived.

Mr. Chairman: The question is:

"That clause 31 stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Clause 31 was added to the Bill.

Clause 32— (Term of office of, vacancies among, and allowances payable to, members of Council.)

Shri T. B. Vittal Rao: I move:

Page 13, line 18—

for "three" "substitute two" (2).

I move my amendment to sub-clause (1) of clause 32 wherein the tenure of office of the Members is provided for as three years: for members who have been nominated to the Council. I want to make it two years. Three years is a very long period. I want the Members who are nominated to these important bodies should effectively function. If they do not effectively function, the trouble is, for three years nobody can dislodge them, because there is no provision for that. Therefore, by having two years, there will be some check. If the Members are effectively functioning in this council, they will be re-elected for another term of two years. Otherwise, they can be replaced. That is why I have put in two years. Moreover, in the Rajya Sabha, biennial elections are held, once in two years. For these reasons, I want the amendment making the tenure of office two years instead of three.

Shri Humayun Kabir: I have often heard of art for art's sake. I have never heard of amendment for amendment's sake. I think my hon. friend the Mover himself in his speech has indicated that this is an amendment

for the sake of an amendment. If a Member has really to function, he takes about a year to get familiar with the work of the institution. If he goes the second year, we lose his services. Three years is not a very long term. In this House we have five years. He referred to the Rajya Sabha. There also, the term is six years. If a Member is there, he will be there for three years. I hope he is not pressing his amendment.

Shri T. B. Vittal Rao: I am not pressing it.

Mr. Chairman: Has the hon. Member the leave of the House to withdraw the amendment?

Some Hon. Members: Yes.

The amendment was, by leave, withdrawn.

Mr. Chairman: The question is:

"That clause 32 stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Clause 32 was added to the Bill.

Clauses 33 and 34 were added to the Bill.

Clause 35—(Power to make rules in respect of matters in this Chapter)

Shri Aurobindo Ghosal: I beg to move:

Page 15, after line 10, insert—

(3) Every rule made under this section shall be laid as soon as may be after it is made before each House of Parliament while it is in session for a total period of thirty days which may be comprised in one session or in two successive sessions, and if, before the expiry of the session in which it is so laid or the session immediately following, both Houses agree in making any modification in the rule or both Houses agree that the rule should not be made, the rule shall there-

after have effect only in such modified form or be of no effect, as the case may be; so however that any such modification or annulment shall be without prejudice to the validity of anything previously done under that rule." (3).

This is a technical amendment. I am moving this amendment as a Member of the Subordinate Legislation Committee.

Shri Humayun Kabir: We have been advised that this Bill as it stands is quite in conformity with the rules that have been passed. I have no very strong feelings in this matter. If the House wishes that this amendment should be adopted, I have no objection. I do not consider it necessary, but I leave it to the House.

Shri Aurobindo Ghosal: The convention on behalf of the Subordinate Legislation Committee is that this provision should appear for incorporation in the Bill.

Shri Shree Narayan Das: The rule-making powers are limited to the rules regarding the Councils only. In other Bills, large powers are delegated. Therefore, it is not necessary. The amendment suggested is not necessary in this Bill at least.

Mr. Chairman: Is it necessary to put the amendment to the vote of the House?

Shri Aurobindo Ghosal: It is not necessary to put it.

Mr. Chairman: Has the hon. Member the leave of the House to withdraw the amendment?

Some Hon. Members: Yes.

The amendment was, by leave, withdrawn.

Mr. Chairman: The question is:

"That clause 35 stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Clause 35 was added to the Bill.

Clauses 36 to 39 and the Schedule were added to the Bill.

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

14.00 hrs.

Shri Humayun Kabir: I beg to move:

"That the Bill be passed".

Mr. Chairman: The question is:

"That the Bill be passed".

The motion was adopted.

14.01 hrs.

MOTION RE: WORKING OF PANCHAYAT RAJ

Shri Tangamani (Madurai): I beg to move:

"That the situation arising out of the working of the Panchayat Raj be taken into consideration".

I would crave your indulgence for certain quotations and references from some of the literature supplied to us by the Ministry, and I do hope that the hon. Minister in the course of his reply, will be able to tell us whether assessment has been made generally or in reference to particular States.

I want to make it clear that I do not propose to deal with the history of the panchayats. That probably will be a very long story. Particularly, persons coming from the south pride themselves on having been the originators of the panchayats. Historians know that the panchayat system functioned at the time of the Chola Kingdom, and there are also several references to them in history.

My purpose here in moving this motion is to deal not with the panchayats as we knew then, but with the panchayat raj which has been

introduced as a result of the report of the Balwantrai Mehta Study Team, which made useful recommendations on this subject. As the House is aware, this is a three-tier system consisting of the panchayats at the base, the panchayat unions or the panchayat samitis in the middle, and the zilla parishads or district development councils at the top. This three-tier system has now been introduced in many States and periodically, we are told how this system has been functioning in the different States.

I must congratulate some of those States which took the initiative, and more particularly, the State of Rajasthan. After Rajasthan, it was left to Andhra Pradesh to take up this issue, and they have now completed two years of panchayat raj administration. The Madras State has been following a phased programme, and from 2nd October, 1961, almost all the villages are covered by panchayats, and all the blocks have been converted into panchayat unions. The Ministry have supplied to us very valuable and useful material on this point.

With your leave, I would like to mention that as a person who has taken interest.....

The Deputy Minister of Community Development and Co-operation (Shri B. S. Murthy): Very keen interest.

Shri Tangamani: ...in the working of both the community development blocks and also the panchayats, as a member of the consultative committee here and also the State Advisory Committee and also as a regular attendant at the meetings of the District Development Council, I would like to make certain observations which may be of a critical nature. That does not mean that I do not take into consideration the achievements of the whole concept itself; I am saying this at the outset, because otherwise it may go on record now, that I have not taken into account the achievements.