

PROF. SHER SINGH : There is provision for licensing in the parent Act. We are following a progressive policy and the State Governments are giving licences either to public sector or co-operative societies, not to individual owners.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : The question is :

"That the Bill further to amend the Rice-Milling Industry (Regulation) Act, 1958, as passed by Rajya Sabha, be taken into consideration."

The motion was adopted.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : The question is :

"That Clauses 2, 3, and 1, the Enacting Formula and the Title stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Clauses 2, 3, and 1, the enacting Formula and the Title were added to the Bill.

PROF. SHER SINGH : Sir, I move :
That the Bill be passed."

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : The question is :

"That the Bill be passed."

The motion was adopted.

15.15 hrs.

STATUTORY RESOLUTION RE : DISAPPROVAL OF DELHI UNIVERSITY (AMENDMENT) ORDINANCE AND

DELHI UNIVERSITY (AMENDMENT) BILL

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : We now take up the Statutory Resolution by Shri Hemendra Singh Banera seeking to disapprove the Delhi University (Amendment) Ordinance, 1972 and also the Bill further

to amend the Delhi University Act, 1922, as passed by Rajya Sabha. The two will be discussed together.

SHRI R. V. BADE (KHARGONE) : Mr. Banera is not here. I am moving it.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : All right. Mr. Bade.

SHRI R. V. BADE : I beg to move :

"That this House disapproves of the Delhi University (Amendment) Ordinance, 1972 (Ordinance No.5 of 1972) promulgated by the President on the 22nd June, 1972."

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मेरा निरमोहन का प्रस्ताव इसलिये है कि जो छात्रिनेस राष्ट्रपति जी ने जारी किया उस की क्या जरूरत थी, समझ में नहीं आया। क्यों कि छात्रिनेस तो तब जारी होते हैं जब कोई जरूरत होती है, कोई समस्या होती है ? लेकिन जब यूनिवर्सिटी बन्द थी तब छात्रिनेस इम्बू किया और बाद में यह बिल लाये हैं। पहले स्वीकर ने कहा था कि छात्रिनेस इस प्रकार में पास नहीं होना चाहिये। ऐसी कौन सी जरूरत थी, घसटोष था या मिमनेजमेन्ट था कि एक हफ्ते से छात्रिनेस जारी कर के सम्मोचन किया गया। मेरी राय में इस छात्रिनेस की कोई जरूरत नहीं थी। इसलिये मैं ने यह प्रस्ताव दिया है।

साथ ही मेरा निवेदन है कि यह बिल मैं ने देखा तो माजूम पड़ा कि शासन द्वारा इस बिल को क्यों लाया गया है ? वह इसलिये लाया गया है कि उन का ऐसा कहना है कि गवर्नमेन्ट कमिशन ने रिपोर्ट दी है कि :

"There is another observation we would like to make before we part with this topic. We think that apart from Delhi University, the Central Universities should function as "unitary teaching universities", that is, these should not have affiliated colleges.

[SHRI R. V. Bafol]

में छात्रा कर रहा था कि माननीय मंत्री की इस रिपोर्ट पर ज्यादा धरोसा रखते हैं इसलिये कुछ बातें हैं। गवर्नर-इन-कमीशन ने वह सभी यूनिवर्सिटीयों के लिये पेज 18 और 19 पर लिखा है, लेकिन दिल्ली यूनिवर्सिटी के बारे में विशेष रूप से उन्होंने कहा है कि—

“In Delhi, for historical reasons, the university has both teaching and affiliating functions. In our view and taking into account the pattern of development of Delhi University, it would on the whole be an advantage if the present character of the university is maintained.”

शायी जब रिपोर्ट में लिखा है कि दिल्ली विश्वविद्यालय को वर्तमान कैरेक्टर में रखा जाय। तो फिर इस बिज को लाने की क्या जरूरत पड़ गई। जब आप कमीशन नियुक्त करते हैं और उन्होंने ऐक्सपर्ट कोषीनियम दी है फिर आप क्यों इस को खेंच कर रहे हैं? ऐसी कौन सी जरूरत पड़ गई?

15.57 hrs.

[SHRI K. N. TIWARY in the Chair]

बैठे सिर्फ सिप होता है, बैठे ही मंत्री जी धलीगढ़ यूनिवर्सिटी बिल लाये, उस के बारे में काफी प्रसंतोष हुआ। अब यह दूसरा बिल आप ले लाये। तो जिस तरह से फायर बिस्केट धाग बुझाने के लिये पीछे पीछे घूमता है, इसी प्रकार से हमारे मंत्री जी ने धलीगढ़ यूनिवर्सिटी बिल लाकर अपने ऊपर आफत ले ली और अब वह दूसरा बिस्केट ले लाये। इस प्रकार का बिल लाने का उद्देश्य क्या था? धाम कालेज काउंसिल बनाना चाहते हैं, कालेज के बितने टीचर्स हैं उन्होंने उस के विरोध में स्ट्राइक कर रही हैं, और अभी तक काउन्सिल में स्ट्राइक है और टीचर्स यूनियन में भी स्ट्राइक है। पार्लियामेंट के सामने ये अपना प्रतिनिधि बंधन लाये, उन का कहना है कि इस प्रकार डीमिक्शन ही वांछनीय। शायी मैजिस्ट्रेट और क्लर्क मैजिस्ट्रेट प्रत्यक्ष-प्रत्यक्ष हो जायेंगे। यह उन का पहले कहना था। मुझे भी यह तथ्य मालूम

है क्योंकि यहां पर बार-बार हवाएं टोकनी हैं और पैसठ हवाएं के लगभग स्टूडेंट्स हैं। प्रत्यक्ष-प्रत्यक्ष कालेज हैं लेकिन वह कालेज दिल्ली यूनिवर्सिटी से अफिलिएटेड हैं। उन को प्रत्यक्ष करने से मैं समझता हूं कि डिमिक्शन हो जायेगा। यहां पर क्लर्क मैजिस्ट्रेट कालेज भी हैं और पोस्ट-ग्रेजुएट कालेज भी हैं जो कि दिल्ली यूनिवर्सिटी के क्लर्क हैं। उन को प्रत्यक्ष प्रत्यक्ष-प्रत्यक्ष करने उस का क्लर्क कैरेक्टर टोकने की इच्छा मंत्री महोदय की मालूम होती है। उन्हीं यूनिवर्सिटी को है उस का भी क्लर्क कैरेक्टर है। वह बहुत सुन्दर तरीके से चल रही है। इसी तरह से दिल्ली यूनिवर्सिटी भी बहुत सुन्दर तरीके से चल रही है। सब जगह उसकी प्रशंसा है। एक दम से उस का क्लर्क कैरेक्टर तोड़ कर आप उस का डिफरेंसियेशन कर रहे हैं। मेरी समझ में नहीं आता कि इस से मास्टर्स का क्या फायदा है या विद्यार्थियों का क्या फायदा है। सिर्फ मंत्री महोदय के मन में एक बहम आ गई है कि जिस प्रकार से धलीगढ़ यूनिवर्सिटी को कर दिया है उसी तरह से यहां भी होना चाहिये। That is only the whim of the minister.

इस में किसी का कोई फायदा नहीं है। जितने पोस्ट ग्रेजुएट और क्लर्क मैजिस्ट्रेट स्टूडेंट्स थे वह भी इससे सैटिस्फाइड नहीं हैं। वह कहते हैं कि यदि यूनिवर्सिटी से हमारा तात्सुक रहता है तो हमारा स्टैंडर्ड बढ़ जाता है। क्लर्क-ग्रेजुएट कालेजों के प्रत्यक्ष होने से यूनिवर्सिटी से हमारा कोई तात्सुक नहीं रहेगा। इस लिये मैं समझता हूं कि क्लर्क-ग्रेजुएट और पोस्ट-ग्रेजुएट दोनों कालेजों पर यूनिवर्सिटी का कंट्रोल होना चाहिये। यूनियन के क्लर्क बाइस प्रिंसिपल का कंट्रोल होने से सभी का फायदा हो जायेगा।

16 hrs.

इस के बाद मैं कहना चाहता हूं कि आप ने यूनिवर्सिटी में प्रत्यक्ष-प्रत्यक्ष तरह की कौंसिलें रखी हैं। अकैडेमिक काउंसिल है, कालेज कौंसिल है, एग्जिक्यूटिव कौंसिल है। बाकिर इन तीनों तरह की कौंसिलों का उद्देश्य क्या रहेगा? बिना बाइस के

रेलवे में बीच हाथों होते हैं उसी तरह के इस में भी हाथों रखे गये हैं। इस का कोई छात्र-वेदी समझ में ही आता। इस बाबत में रेजोल्यूशन बिना है कि कालेज कौंसिलों को अलग अलग करने से कोई फायदा नहीं होता है। गजेन्द्रगढ़कर कमीशन की रिपोर्ट में भी है कि दिल्ली यूनिवर्सिटी का जो काम चल रहा है वह बहुत सुन्दर है और उस को तोड़ना ठीक नहीं है।

भाष का कहना है कि वाइस चांसलर इसके लिये तैयार थे, लेकिन वाइस चांसलर ने प्रैस में अपना बक्तव्य दिया है :

"The Minister's statement refers to the Report of the Vice-Chancellor of UGC Committee presided over by the Vice-Chancellor of the Delhi University. This report in its final version contains some features which the Vice-Chancellor found unacceptable. The Report, therefore, was withdrawn from circulation at the instance of the Vice-Chancellor himself."

वाइस चांसलर के इस बयान के बाद गजेन्द्रगढ़कर कमिशन ने उन की रिपोर्ट भी नहीं। यदि गजेन्द्रगढ़कर कमिशन की रिपोर्ट कालेज कौंसिलों के फेवर में नहीं है तो कालेज कौंसिलों की जरूरत क्या है ?

मैंने मंत्री महोदय का राज्य सभा का भाषण पढ़ा है। उनका कहना है कि इसमें फेडरल कैरेक्टर टूटता नहीं है। लेकिन उन्होंने कहा है कि कानेजों की तरफ से एक मेमोरैण्डम सब मेम्बरस को भेजा गया है जिस में उन्होंने लिखा है कि :

"The Dean of the Administrative division is responsible.....but this new arrangement should be made keeping in view the proposed change in the total structure of the university."

"The College Council has no administrative function. So, no amendment was quite necessary for delegating the power to implement

decisions. It is a semi-autonomous body for under-graduate education with powers relation to purely academic matter."

वह ऐसा कहते हैं कि सेंट्रल एग्जिक्यूटिव कौंसिल का निर्माण किया जाये, उस को अलग-अलग न किया जाये। फिर उन्होंने कहा है कि :

The teachers referred to the disparity of service conditions and emoluments.

भाषने राज्य सभा में कहा है कि एमालुमेंट्स में कोई फर्क नहीं होगा। हम भी समझते हैं इसका कोई झगड़ा नहीं है।

"The college councils would bring the colleges closer to the university."

उस में उनका कहना है.

"There are no zonal problems facing the university. Problems are later to areas of functioning; not zones. Besides, problems pertain to both the colleges and the Departments (i. e. under-graduate and post-graduate wings). Therefore, by separating the administration of colleges, no solution would be achieved"

"The Delhi University Teachers' Association expressed its fear in February, 1972 and the Ministry of Education gave an assurance. But the Ordinance was issued when the University was closed."

मन्त्री महोदय ने एश्योरेस दिया था लेकिन उसके बावजूद भी आडिनेस जारी किया गया वह बड़े ताज्जुब की बात है। मैंने उनके बक्तव्य को पुरा पढ़ा है। उससे कुछ पता नहीं चलता है। ऐसा मान्य पड़ना है कि ये जो फाउंडेशन का बनाने जा रहे हैं इस में भाष अपने आदमी रखेंगे कि उस में पाबिलिटिज बुलैडुने का कालन का इरादा है। अब तक ऐसा पाबिलिटिज नहीं था। विचारियों में भी अमान्ति है। भाषने इस में लिखा है :

[Shri R. V. Bade]

Four persons to be nominated by the Visitor.....

वे सब बातें जो हैं इन से मालूम पड़ता है कि इस में आपका पालिटिक्स घुसेड़ने का इरादा है। बिज तरह से प्रसीगढ़ में प्रशान्ति पैदा हुई है उसी तरह से यहां भी आप प्रशान्ति पैदा करना चाहते हैं। प्रसीगढ़ में भी प्रशान्ति का बही कारण था जो यहां है। मुझे डर है कि जहां-जहां के बास्ते आप इस प्रकार का बिल लायेंगे वहां-वहां उस यूनिवर्सिटी में झगड़े शुरू हो जायेंगे।

"It is an integral link between undergraduate education and post-graduate education which has to a great extent gone to make Delhi University a major Centre of learning recognised for its relatively higher academic standards."

बिल्सी यूनिवर्सिटी का स्टैंडर्ड बहुत हाई है। क्या कारण है कि दूसरे लोग इस यूनिवर्सिटी का काफी धावर करते हैं? इसकी वजह यह है कि वहां पालिटिक्स नहीं था। अब झगड़े शुरू हो जायेंगे। कालेज काउंसिल, टीचर्स काउंसिल, बिल्सी यूनिवर्सिटी की एग्जिक्यूटिव काउंसिल आदि काउंसिल्स जो हैं उस में आपस में झगड़े शुरू हो जायेंगे। इस बीज के बारे में बिल्कुल भी कोई डिटेल्स नहीं दी गई हैं। आप यह जो बिल लाये हैं इसका इस बास्ते में विरोध करता हूं। आप ने जो प्रॉब्लिम्स प्रामलनेट किया था उसका भी हमने विरोध किया था। मैं चाहता हूं कि मंत्री महोदय अपने भाषण में यह बतायें कि कालेज काउंसिल स्थापित करने से आपको कौन सा लाभ होगा? कौन सा इससे टीचर्स को लाभ होगा? उन्होंने जो वक्तव्य दिया था उससे हम सैटिसफाइड नहीं हुये। चूंकि इस बिल में जो कुछ है उससे आपस में झगड़े शुरू हो जायेंगे इस बास्ते हम इसका विरोध करते हैं। यह सिंकिंग शिप में आप बैठे हुये हैं। आप जहां भी जाते हैं वहां इस में उधर करते जाते हैं और इसका नतीजा यह होगा कि शिप डूब जायेगा।

इन शब्दों के साथ जो प्रॉब्लिम्स है इसका मैं विरोध करता हूं।

MR. CHAIRMAN: The resolution is before the House.

Now, the hon. Minister.

SHRI SAMAR MUKHERJEE (Howrah): Why is the Minister insisting to pass the Bill in this session despite the serious opposition by teachers? There is the strike.....

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, order. This is not the time to put questions.

SHRI SAMAR MUKHERJEE: This is a serious thing. The Delhi University is in a deadlock. The teachers have resorted to strike. There is a strong opposition to the Bill.....

MR. CHAIRMAN: I have called the Minister.

THE MINISTER OF EDUCATION, SOCIAL WELFARE AND CULTURE (PROF. S. NURUL HASAN): If the hon. Member is going to interrupt me, I seek your protection, Sir.....

SHRI SAMAR MUKHERJEE: There is a strike; there is a deadlock in the University.....

MR. CHAIRMAN: He is speaking without my permission. Nothing will go on record.

SHRI SAMAR MUKHERJEE: **

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

"That the Bill further to amend the Delhi University Act, 1922, as passed by Rajya Sabha, be taken into consideration."

Sir, I would like to make a few references to the points that have been raised by the hon. Member, Shri R. V. Bade. The first

question that he raised was, in my opinion, an extremely pertinent question as to why an Ordinance had to be issued, what was the need for it; what was the urgency for it. I entirely agree with the hon. Member that an Ordinance should not ordinarily be issued and, particularly, an Ordinance should not be issued, as far as possible in the case of Universities.

So, on that point of view there is no difference of opinion. But, in spite of holding rather strong views in the manner that I have indicated, I advised the President to promulgate an Ordinance and my reason for that was as follows.

The University had been growing at a very rapid rate. Since the beginning of last year, the authorities of the University were feeling deeply concerned about the expansion of the University and the difficulties that it was creating in the administrative functioning of the University. The number of students was increasing and consequently the number of teachers was increasing and the number of colleges was increasing. The University at one stage—this trouble started about two years ago—thought that it might set up a second campus and it sent a proposal to the University Grants Commission. The University Grants Commission appointed a committee to go into the whole matter. Ultimately the University itself came to the conclusion that establishing a second campus would not be conducive to the solution of the problems with which the University was faced. Thereupon, the Vice-Chancellor felt that it might be better to set up yet another university. That idea of setting up another university was not acceptable to Government for a variety of reasons—I will not go into these at this stage because it is not absolutely germane to the issue before the House. The University, thereupon, started thinking of ways and means of solving the problem.

Now, Sir, the increase in the number of students is, by itself, not something about which one would feel worried. If the standard of admission goes down, naturally there is cause for anxiety, but merely the increase in the number of students is not a cause for anxiety provided, of course—and that is an important proviso—that suitable facilities for higher education can be made available. If the number of teachers increases, then it becomes possible for a university to go in for greater specialisation, to have more cooperative teaching, to have more cooperative research, particularly inter-disciplinary research which is now becoming more and more significant and important in the Seventies and is likely to become even more so in the Eighties.

Small units are unable either to have a sufficient numbers of teachers to cope with all the new specialities by themselves or to organise inter-disciplinary function. Therefore, here was a body of students which expanded now to something like over a 100,000 and a body of teachers which is now about 4,000. But for administering, there was only one Executive Council, a fairly small Executive Council with no college teacher represented on it. Now one Executive Council has to deal with the whole lot of problems and, therefore, it becomes difficult for an executive council to look individually into the various types of problems that are bound to arise if greater attention is to be paid to the needs of the colleges . . . (Interruptions)

I wish the hon Member has bothered to understand the problem. He is speaking from his brief. Therefore, he can say anything. I accept it. The only difference is that I know it. I am not hearing for someone and having a crack at the expense of the House.

The point to be understood is that with this increase in the numbers, some organisational decentralisation was absolutely

[Shri S. Nurul Hasan]

vital in order to ensure that when we admit new students in the University, they are not left uncared for which has been happening year after year. It was, therefore, with this particular objective in view that the Vice-Chancellor requested the Minister of Education, yours truly, to advise the Visitor to issue this Ordinance so that, as soon as possible, with the commencement of the new academic session, it would be possible for a body with sufficient authority to go into the problems and see that the students' basic needs and requirements and the basic needs and requirements of teachers are duly considered before the session gets going. Therefore, it was felt that if an Ordinance could be issued, then it would be possible for the University to go ahead with this particular scheme. Now, that was the reason for issuing the Ordinance.

I will now very briefly deal with some of the points which the hon. Member has raised. Firstly, he has referred to the Gajendragadkar Committee's report and its recommendations that its present character should be maintained. Now, Sir, I happen to be one of the signatories of that report and I stand by it and I have attempted to clarify in this house and the other House that anything that I am proposing for the consideration of this august House does not militate against the basic character, the present existing character of the University. That is No. 1.

Secondly, I have clarified in no ambiguous terms that I would consider any proposal for delinking as a retrograde step for the reasons I have just now explained that I think academically, it would be wrong. Now, the principal link of the University which maintains the apex control,—after all, what is the main function of the University? It is the academic function—teaching learning and research,—now the apex body is given in Sec 7 of

the parent Act which has not been amended and there is no intention on the part of the Government to take away this power of the Academic Council. With your permission, I would read this section ; sub-clause (1).

“(1) All recognised teaching in connection with the University courses shall be conducted under the control of the Academic Council by teachers of the University and shall include lecturing, laboratory work and other teaching conducted in accordance with any syllabus prescribed by the Regulations.”

Therefore, to say that there was any question of delinking when I made this categorical statement in this House and which I made it with a due sense of responsibility, I had this section in mind that the control of the Academic Council is also absolute and is not likely to be in any way affected or altered by the proposal which I have ventured to place for the consideration of the House.

I would not like to waste the time of the House in saying that I want to pursue any politics in the University. I only wish the hon. Member had carefully studied the statutes. Out of 17 persons, there would be two in the existing statutes which now will have to be changed in the light of the amendments approved by the Rajya Sabha. Out of 17 members of the College Council, there were only two educationists who were to be nominated by the Visitor. There were five Principals, five teachers of colleges two teachers nominated by the Academic Council, two educationists not in the service of the University, nominated by the Executive Council and the Chairman of the Council. This was the status which was framed. It would, therefore, be very clear that there is no question of the Visitor attempting to dominate the college council with his nominees.

I would also like to make a factual statement. In February, the delegation of the Delhi University Teachers Association met me. At that time, although did not I give an assurance, I told them this, that if they offer any suggestion, I would be glad to consider them. Now, from February till the month of June, no suggestion were given to me by the Delhi University Teachers Association, and therefore, Sir, it is not that I had given any assurance.

SHRI R. V. BADE : They have given one suggestion that there shall be a Central Executive Council. That suggestion was given to you, I think.

PROF. S. NURUL HASSAN : This has not been given ever till this day.

SHRI S. A. SHAMIM (Srinagar) : This comes from Mr Bade. You can take it up.

PROF. S. NURUL HASAN : I have given a categorical assurance. I do not believe in separation of post-graduate and under graduate education. I think that it would impoverish under graduate education which is very important. Sir, those who think that under-graduate education does not have high-enough importance, are those who are, I beg to submit, entirely mistaken. Under-graduate education, post-graduate education and research, all the three are equally important for any university if its academic life is to thrive and therefore I would be the last person to wish to separate under-graduate education from post graduate education and from research.

I would like to take a few minutes of your time to explain the main provisions.

SHRI R. V. BADE : I want to just ask him whether he has received the Delhi teachers Association Memorandum.

PROF. S. NURUL HASAN : I have not received.

42 L.S.S./72--11.

SHRI S. A. SHAMIM : Failure of the postal department.

PROF. S. NURUL HASAN : The first provision states that the colleges conducting courses of studies in the professional faculties would declare as 'autonomous colleges, with the consent of the colleges concerned determined in a manner specified by the Academic Council. I am not saying in what manner this should be determined. I am not even suggesting that this honourable and august House may say in what manner the consent should be obtained. I leave it to the body exclusively of the teachers, the Academic Council, to decide in what manner the consent is to be taken.

With regard to the whole concept of autonomous colleges, I wish to say this. The autonomous colleges concept was recommended by Kothari Commission, by Gajendragadkar Committee : it has been recommended by the University Grants Commission. There are innumerable teachers throughout the length and breadth of the country including Delhi who feel that a certain degree of experimentation should be permitted to each of the colleges, because, after all, academic autonomy is basically an autonomy of the teacher, and the researcher and the student, to learn the research and to conduct research.

Originally in the Ordinance we had provided for a College Council. But, because apprehensions were raised, we have now accepted in the Rajya Sabha an amendment saying that these will not be called College Councils, but that these will be called College Administration Councils, to make it absolutely clear that their functions are administrative functions. That power can be delegated to them by the Executive Council but not by the Academic Council. Academic functions can only be advisory functions but executive functions can be exercised by them as the authority of the university to the extent that these are given to them by

[Shri Nurul Hasan] the statutes. In this regard, the Vice-Chancellor has made this statement in writing. I have given this assurance in the House that so far at the statutes are concerned the university would be willing to hold discussions with the teachers so that as a result of these discussions something which is basically in the interests of the teachers,—and it is my submission that this proposal is in the interests of the teachers—emerges. The Vice-Chancellor has further said that he would not go ahead with further implementation, and that he would freeze the situation, hold discussions and then only act, and this is, as the Vice-Chancellor has stated, and the House will observe, an enabling provision so that if the executive council and the academic council of the university agree, it would be accepted.

Section 4 changes the procedure for making statutes. Originally, the statutes used to be made by the executive council with the approval of the court and the approval of the visitor. But then academic thinking developed to a point when it was felt that any statute-making power should not be vested in the court where there were so many non-academics. The non-academics have a place in a university, but mainly their function should be to give advice, to hold consultations, to deliberate on policy matters and to make certain recommendations either to the university bodies or to the Government. But this principle that the court should not have the statute-making power has been accepted by this House in the case of the Jawaharlal Nehru University;—and as far as my memory goes, I have checked up records of the Joint Committee, there was no difference of opinion in the Joint Committee on this procedure; then, it has been accepted in the case of Banaras, in the case of Viswabharati and recently in the case of Aligarh. So in four out of five universities, the power of the court to make statutes has been taken away. It was only in Delhi University

that it remained and it was felt that this should be brought on pass. But in the other House, one hon. Member proposed an amendment, and this was in line with a resolution which was passed by the Academic Council itself, that in so far as academic matters are concerned, the executive council may make statutes or make or amend statutes only with the concurrence of the academic council. The academic council is a body exclusive of teachers; they are not necessarily college teachers; but as college teachers themselves agree with me, it would be wrong to discriminate between college teachers and university teachers; they are all teachers of the university, and they do not have any nominated element; let me also make it absolutely clear. Therefore, the concurrence of the academic council makes it absolutely certain that whatever measures to amend the statutes are taken would be in the best academic interests of the university.

This is all that there is in the Bill, and I would commend it to the House. I would take this opportunity of making an appeal to the hon. Members here that if they show good will and explain that this measure in no way and by no stretch of imagination.....

SHRI SAMAR MUKHERJEE : Why is he hurrying through with this Bill?

PROF. S. NURUL HASAN : Because the session is coming to an end... goes against interests of the teachers, then I am sure that this position will become clear to the teachers and the situation would change.

SHRI SAMAR MUKHERJEE : What prevents him from postponing this Bill and holding discussion?

MR. CHAIRMAN : Motion moved:

"That the Bill further to amend the Delhi University Act, 1922, as passed by Rajya Sabha, be taken into consideration."

This motion as well as resolution are now before the House for discussion together.

SHRI JAGADISH BHATTACHARYA (Ghatal) : At the very outset, I would like to oppose the very consideration of this Bill by this House on grounds which I consider legitimate. In the statement of objects and reasons in the Bill introduced in the Rajya Sabha, it has been stated...

PROF. S. NURUL HASAN : May I draw the attention of the hon. member to the fact that the Rajya Sabha has amended the Bill considerably? What this House is now considering is the Bill, as amended by the Rajya Sabha.

SHRI JAGADISH BHATTACHARYA :
The statement says :

"After consideration of the recommendations of the said Committee and the views of the Vice-Chancellor. ..."

It has been stated that this Bill has been framed according to the recommendations made by a Committee set up by the University Grants Commission. This Committee was presided over by the Vice-Chancellor, Delhi University. Now, we do not find that we have been supplied with the recommendations or report of the said Committee. That report is not with us. When we have not gone through that report, it is not possible for us to judge whether this Bill introduced here has been according to the report of the said Committee, because in the statement of objects and reasons only some of the recommendations supposed to have been given by the Committee have been mentioned. But we have reasons to believe that there has been divergence of opinion, and even the Vice-Chancellor, Delhi University, disagreed with the recommendations of the said Committee.

Sometime ago, in reply to a statement made by the hon. Education Minister, the Vice-Chancellor, Delhi University, issued a press release, from which I quote :

"The Minister of Education made two statements in Parliament during the last two days concerning the University of Delhi. Of these two statements, I should like to make a brief comment on the one made by him in the Rajya Sabha on Thursday on the circumstances that led Government to issue an Ordinance about Delhi University. The statement made certain references that have led to serious misunderstanding. The Minister's statement refers to a report of a UGC Committee presided over by the Vice-Chancellor, Delhi University. This report in its final version contains some features which the Vice-Chancellor found unacceptable. The report was, therefore withdrawn from circulation at the instance of the Vice-Chancellor himself."

So the Chairman of the Committee insisted that this report should be withdrawn from circulation. It is on the strength of that very report, on the recommendations of that very Committee, whose circulations has been withdrawn by the Chairman of that Committee, that this Bill has been introduced here and we are going to discuss it.

Next he says :

"The Minister's statement has come at a time when the issue has become deeply and explosively controversial. It makes the situation still more difficult because in effect it attributes to the Vice-Chancellor a position which is virtually opposed to that actually held by him. As

[Sh. Jagadish Bhattacharyya]

one who has taught in Delhi University for over 30 years, I wish to solve the problems of the University through direct consultation with my colleagues. In view of the complications that have "arisen, I hold that the interests of the University would be best served if the entire question of its governance was studied a fresh by the academic community of Delhi University itself with a view to formulating and recommending changes in the law governing the working of the University".

This was the statement issued to the press by the Vice-Chancellor of the Delhi University.

Even after that, we have information that the Vice-Chancellor of the Delhi University has written to the University Grants Commission in connection with this report,—and we do not know whether it is a fact or not—and we have the information that that letter written by the Vice-Chancellor was destroyed by some officer of the UGC. In this present context, this Bill is going to be discussed and so it will be better if this Bill is dropped at the initial stage, and a fresh, comprehensive Bill is brought forward after consultation with the entire academic life of Delhi and elsewhere.

Besides this, I am constrained to say something. The situation has now arisen, because some 3,500 teachers of the Delhi University, and all the students and all the karmacharis have gone on strike, protesting against the introduction of this Bill. I do not know for whose interests this Bill is going to be discussed. Is it for the teachers? Is it for the students? Is it for the karmacharis, and if they all protest vehemently against this Bill, how is it that it is being discussed here? We cannot say that the interests of the university, the interests of education is the monopoly of the Educa-

tion Ministry only, and that the teachers, the karmacharis and the students and other academic bodies in Delhi have nothing to do with it.

The Minister imposes the Bill on the people without consulting them in the face of their opposition, and still, he pretends to be a democrat, and I do not think that it is fair for anybody who at least holds the position that the hon. Minister holds.

Next, I refer to the provision for the representation of teachers and particularly students. It was said, and it was demanded that they should have representation on the policy-making bodies of the university. But we find that their demand has been fully ignored, and not even the teachers and the students have got any representations on the policy making body.

Moreover, this Bill has become undemocratic in character, because of the dictatorial behaviour of both the Vice-Chancellor of the Delhi University and the hon. Minister himself, and they have compelled the teachers and the karmacharis to take such a stand as they have done for the first time in the history of this university. The teachers deserve the thanks of every democratic minded section of the people for setting up this example by holding up their democratic rights. This decentralisation in the administration which the hon. Minister calls administrative decentralisation might have been done, I think, within the framework of the existing Act. We do not know how the existing Act comes in the way of the sort of administrative decentralisation that the hon. Minister is thinking of. It does not come in its way. The college administration council, it has been stated, will be for safe-guarding the interests of the teachers. I do not think it will do so. The present governing bodies of colleges are not delivering the goods.

They are being run by some private trusts including some monopoly houses. While we are all, even the Minister, speaking of safeguarding the interest of teachers, some teachers of Rao Tula Ram College stand dismissed, I do not know what the hon. Minister is going to do in this respect. College administrative council is meant to give more power to the governing bodies comprising private trusts including some monopoly houses. Some sort of a diarchy will prevail because we find from the Statement of objects and reasons, the same duties and same powers will be exercised by the Executive Council as well as the college administrative councils. Forming these councils without proper consultations, without proper thinking is not to be encouraged. It was suggested that taking over of colleges under the Delhi Administration should have been there as a first step; the Minister should have begun with this by including colleges under the Delhi Administration. This is according to the recommendations of a high-powered committee set up by the Vice Chancellor on March 1, 1972 but that has not been done. It is a lame excuse that the college council is necessary as teachers have no representation on the executive council. The present Academic Council is not a body exclusively of teachers. The definition of teacher in the Act is "Teacher of a University means a person appointed or recognised by the University for the purpose of imparting instruction in the university or in any other college." In the Council we find the Vice Chancellor, the pro Vice-Chancellor, the Registrar and the Minister himself. How can they be termed as teachers according to this definition? The Ministers should take steps for repealing this Ordinance and withdraw this Bill and the University should be asked to repeal the statutes which they have framed under this Ordinance. Heavens will not fall if the work of decentralisation is deferred for

a few months. Let a comprehensive Bill be brought before Parliament after proper consideration. That is the only democratic course for any Government having any democratic pretensions.

Like the Aligarh Muslim University Act it is also going to be steam-rolled through this House showing complete disregard of the wishes of teachers, students and kama-charis while the consist demand of Delhi education Act is being ignored.

Therefore, I strongly feel that this Bill has a sinister design behind it and so it deserves to be dumped in the waste-paper basket.

श्री सुधाकर पांडे (बंबोली): समादरणीय सभापति जी, मैं इस बिल का और अध्ययन का समय बनाना चाहता हूँ। किसी के लिये भी यह बिल को वापस ले लिया जा सकता है कि शिक्षा शास्त्री हड़ताल पर जायें इस बिल को ले कर और शिक्षा शास्त्री ही केवल हड़ताल पर नहीं गये हैं बल्कि कर्मचारी भी हड़ताल पर गये हैं। जैसा कि बड़े साहब ने कहा है इसे राजनीति का विषय नहीं बनाया जाना चाहिये। मैं और मेरा दल तो सदा से यह मानते आ रहे हैं कि शिक्षा को राजनीति का विषय न बनाया जाये बल्कि वह तो वह तो शैक्षणिक की संरचना का विषय रही है और ऐसा ही विषय वह बनी रहे और हमी के माध्यम से भावी भारत की रचना होगी। उसी भावी भारत की रचना के क्रम में बिना पश्चीम वहाँ से शिक्षा के मार्ग की खोज हो रही है। यह काम करना था हमारे देश के कविल और कला सौगों, को, संस्कृतियों को। मैंने भी अपना जीवन शिक्षा के क्षेत्र में बिताया है और बिता रहा हूँ। रास्ता खोजना चाहिये या अध्ययन को अध्ययन को न रास्ता खोजने का यत्न भी किया, किन्तु उन्हें रास्ता नहीं मिल रहा है। ऐसी स्थिति में यदि विश्वविद्यालय की, जो एक स्वायत्त संस्था है, ऐकैडमिक कौंसिल या शिक्षा परिषद और कार्यकारी परिषद यह कहती है कि हमारे कल्याण के लिये श्रेष्ठ कार्य किया जाये और यदि सरकार

[श्री सुधाकर पाण्डे]

उस, कार्य को विश्वविद्यालय की स्वायत्तता की रक्षा और उस के विकास के लिये करती है, तो वह कौन सा अघराध करती है, वह मेरी समझ में नहीं आता है। मुझे ऐसा लगता है कि राजनीति तो हम नहीं कर रहे हैं, किन्तु जो लोग राजनीति करना चाहते हैं, वे उल्टा ओर कोसवाल की बाटे की कहावत की खरितार्थ कर रहे हैं। (व्यवधान) जितनी बातें भी बड़े ने कही हैं, वे सभी शब्दों: राज्य सभा में आ चुकी हैं। हमारे अन्य मित्रों ने भी जो बातें कही हैं, वे सब राज्य सभा में आ चुकी हैं। वहाँ पर हमारे शिक्षा मंत्री ने प्रायः उन सब बातों की मान लिया था, जो सुजनात्मक या निर्माणशील थीं, या जिन की आवश्यकता थी। यह तो किसी का भी ध्येय नहीं हो सकता है कि अध्यापक को निकाला जाये, या उस पर ऐसी कार्यवाही की जाये, जिस के माध्यम से शिक्षा की व्यवस्था में असंतुलन उत्पन्न हो, या शिक्षकों की स्वतन्त्रता में किसी प्रकार की बाधा हो।

एक समस्या हम लोगों के सामने यह रही है—मैं अधिभाषकों की ओर से बोलना चाहता हूँ, क्योंकि हमारे बच्चे दिल्ली विश्वविद्यालय में पढ़ते हैं—फिर बार सौ, पाँच सौ अध्यापक एक विभाग—डिपार्टमेंट—में हैं और विभाग का अध्यक्ष यह नहीं जानता है कि उस के विभाग का अध्यापक कौन सा है। वह विश्वविद्यालय का प्राचार्य है, किन्तु उस की यह हस्ती नहीं है कि वह किसी अध्यापक की कोई ऐसा कार्य करने से रोक सके, जो शिक्षार्थियों के स्वार्थ के विरोध या विलोम में है। कौन ऐसी स्थिति को बनाये रखना चाहते हैं?—वे, जिन का स्वार्थ इस बात में है कि शिक्षा संस्थाओं में राजनीति रहे और वे राजनीति का अच्चाड़ा बनें।

जो लोग कहते हैं कि शिक्षा राजनीति का अच्चाड़ा न बने, उन्हें मैं बताना चाहता हूँ कि कुछ लोगों ने काशी हिन्दू विश्वविद्यालय की राजनीति का अच्चाड़ा बनाया। हम ने उन से वह स्थान वापसी नहीं कराया, बल्कि हम स्वयं धार० एस० एस० की परेड के प्रश्न को ले कर कोर्ट

में गये और कहा कि उन्हें वहाँ पर जबर्जस्त परेड करने का अधिकार नहीं है। शिक्षा के क्षेत्र में राजनीति हम सा रहे हैं या वे सोच जा रहे हैं जो इस प्रश्न पर ठंडे विल से विचार करने के लिये तैयार नहीं है, जब कि शिक्षा मंत्रालय और कुलपति इस बात के लिये तैयार हैं? वे हमें एक प्रयोग करने दें। वे स्वयं कोई रास्ता नहीं बताते हैं और जब हम किसी रास्ते पर चलते हैं, तो वे अवरोध उत्पन्न करते हैं।

हम जो एक प्रयोग कर रहे हैं, अगर उस के माध्यम से सफलता नहीं मिलेगी, तो हम स्वयं उस को उठा लेंगे—उस में दूसरे लोगों की सहायता भी आवश्यकता नहीं पड़ेगी। हम सेवा में विश्वास करते हैं। कानूनों में या किसी जिद्द में हमारा विश्वास नहीं है। हम और हमारा दल, कांग्रेस, सेवा के माध्यम से जीवित हैं।

श्री लखर गृह (कन्दाई): दिल्ली यूनिवर्सिटी में भी कांग्रेस था नहीं।

श्री सुधाकर पाण्डे: मैं अध्यापकों से निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि वे ठंडे विल से सोचें। वह कौन सी हड़ताल है कि विश्वविद्यालय के कुछ अध्यापक और वरिष्ठ अध्यापक जो है उन की ऐसी दुर्गति की जाय, कल जो उन की दुर्गति हुई थी... (व्यवधान)... उस से वह बहुत दुखी थे और उस में डीन स्तर के लोग थे, वह मेरे पास इसलिये आये थे, कि वह काशी के हैं। क्या शिक्षा शास्त्री इसी प्रकार की शिक्षा देते हैं कि अपने ही भाई और बन्धुओं की वह जलीस करते हैं इसलिये कि वह हड़ताल में शामिल नहीं होना चाहते हैं। शिक्षा शास्त्रियों की तो स्वतन्त्रता देनी चाहिये और शिक्षा का संगठन ऐसा होना चाहिये कि यदि उस के अध्यक्ष ने एक आवाज दे दी तो सारे विद्यार्थ्य बन्ध होने चाहिये। लेकिन यह भी जबर्जस्त हड़ताल कराई जा रही है यह मेरी समझ में नहीं आता कि शिक्षा के किस सिद्धान्त के आधार पर ऐसा किया जा रहा है।

एक और बात में आप को बताऊँ इस सम्बन्ध में कि की शिक्षा के विशेषज्ञ हैं या की शिक्षा

शास्त्री हैं या जो अध्यापक हैं वे उस गरीब कोटि जनता का ध्यान नहीं रख रहे हैं जिन की कमाई के बल पर उन के घर में दीप जल रहे हैं, जिन की कमाई के बल पर आज उन के घर रोशन हैं। एक रिफ्टा खींचने वाले, पिन भर पानी में, धीष्म में, आतप में झुलसने वाले जो लोग हैं उन से जो पैसा घाता है वह इन शिक्षाविद्यालयों को दिया जाता है और देखने में यह भा रहा है कि शिक्षा के क्षेत्र में काम करने वाले जो हैं अधिकांश उन में ऐसे हैं कि तब तक ही वह अध्ययन और अध्यापन करते हैं जब तक उन को नौकरी नहीं मिल जाती। उस के बाद तो कुछ ऐसी राजनीति में उलझ जाते हैं कि काम न करना पड़े और कमाई होती रहे, अधिक से अधिक धन उन्हें प्राप्त होता रहे। जब शिक्षा मंत्री ने यह कहा कि किसी प्रकार का उन का बिलयाव नहीं है, जो स्नातकोत्तर शिक्षा है और जो शिक्षा स्नातक कलाओं की है उस में अध्यापक के वर्तमान अधिकार पर किसी प्रकार का रोक या किसी प्रकार की पाबन्दी लगाने की बात नहीं है और यह भी कहा गया कि ऐकेडेमिक कोसल या शिक्षा परिषद सर्वोच्च सस्था होगी जिस की मर्जी के खिलाफ एग्जीक्यूटिव भी, प्रबन्धकारिणी भी सक्रमण नहीं कर सकेगी, ऐसी स्थिति में मेरी समझ में नहीं आता है कि क्यों इस प्रकार की बात की जाती है और निश्चिन्त रूप से यह लगता है कि ये सारी बातें राजनीति प्रेरित हैं।

अन्त में मैं पुन शिक्षा शास्त्रियों से यह आह्वान करना चाहता हूँ, जो हड़ताल में शामिल हैं और जो उस से बाहर है उन से भी कि बैठ कर ठडे बिल से यह सोचें कि हमारी शिक्षा का स्तर देश में गिरा है और उच्च शिक्षा का स्तर बहुत गिरा है। हम ने ज्ञान दिया है, आचरण नहीं दिया है। केवल ज्ञान के दान के ही शिक्षा का कल्याण नहीं हो सकता है। उस में आचरण की पवित्रता आनी चाहिये और उस में वह जोब कीर्त्य और तेधी भी आनी चाहिये जिस के माध्यम से हमारे भविष्य की रचना हो सके। मेरा यह आग्रह है कि इस सत्र में से कि वह हमारे कवि और कला

वर्गों। ट्रेड यूनियन या नेबरहोदी में जिस तरह के बहुत सी ऐसी बातें होती हैं जो अवांछनीय हैं उन के माध्यम न बनें। इसी के साथ साथ विद्या-विधियों की राजनीति का भ्रम न बनाया जाय। लोग प्रायः विद्याविधियों की राजनीति का भ्रम बनाना चाहते हैं। उन की पढ़ाई की तरफ तो उन का ध्यान नहीं आता है, जब उन्हें कीचड़ में डालना होता है तब उन्हें वह से आते हैं और उन का भविष्य जब खराब हो जाता है तो उन भविष्य की सचरना में उस के कल्याण में कुछ काम नहीं करते हैं। सोचते हैं कि हमारे बल में कुछ वालंटियर्स और मिल गए। तो मैं यह आग्रह करूँगा विद्याविधियों से भी कि विद्यार्थी किसी के बहकावे से न धावे क्यों कि हमारा उद्देश्य पवित्र है। हम किसी आदर्श के लिये यह कह रहे हैं। इस में हमारा कोई भी स्वार्थ निहित नहीं है। अगर स्वार्थ हो सकता है, तो सारे देश के कल्याण का हो सकता है, भविष्य की सचरना का स्वार्थ हो सकता है, विद्याविधियों के कल्याण का स्वार्थ हो सकता है, शिक्षा का और ज्ञान के प्रसार का स्वार्थ हो सकता है।

SHRI C K CHANDRAPPA (Telli-cherry) : Sir, at the very outset let me make certain positions very clear. The position of my party regarding, the Ordinance was made very clear in the other House. We are totally opposed to it. We quite appreciate that in the Bill introduced here there are certain changes. But it is the cruse of our educational system that those who are in power and authority always try to bring about reforms piecemeal. I may be excused for saying that the reforms visualized by introducing this Bill are also piecemeal. I would have gladly welcomed a Bill if it had been introduced here, in this House, for the comprehensive reform of the Delhi University administration. But I am sorry to say that this is not of that type.

Then, even after hearing the speech made by the Minister, I am not so much convinced of all that he has tried to say or the friend from the other side has also tried to say.

[Shri C. K. Chandrappan]

Today, when we are discussing this Bill, it should be remembered that the teachers of the Delhi University are on strike. The students are also supporting the teachers who are on strike. It is also a fact that the *karamcharis* of the Delhi University are also opposed to this Bill. I wonder for, whom then the Bill brings benefit if it is not for the students, if it is not for the teachers, if it is not for the *Karamcharis*. I understand, the Government will have the satisfaction that they tried to introduce a Bill. That is the situation with regard to this Bill.

Now, the Minister, while moving the Bill said that the college councils which were very much opposed by the entire teaching community, the students and the *karamcharis* of the Delhi University, have been changed into college administrative councils. I would like to know whether this change has also satisfied the people concerned who are today in the thick of an agitation in the Delhi University.

I will not agree with my friend who tried to say that it is all politically-motivated. You can always say that. But it is not all politically-motivated agitation which is taking place in the Delhi University. Look at it that there may be excesses; their demands may be extreme. You can say that. As a matter of fact, the agitation is a part of the bigger movement in the country for the democratisation of our education. That is a fact which we all have to reckon with.

While speaking on this Bill and also while speaking about the Aligarh Muslim University Bill, from the Government side, it was said that all the proposals that they are making are based on the recommendations of the Gajendragadkar Commission on the governance of the University, as if that is the ultimate word, the last word, about education and the governance of the

University. We cannot accept that position. It is rather regrettable to say that the Gajendragadkar Commission's Report was never placed before the House for a discussion. It was referred on many occasions but never a comprehensive, threadbare discussion was allowed in this House.

PROF. S. NURUL HASAN : The report was placed on the Table of the House. I do not remember the hon. Member putting forward any motion for its consideration.

SHRI C. K. CHANDRAPPAN : The Report was placed on the Table of the House. I do not deny that When your predecessor was the Education Minister, Shri Sidhartha Shankar Ray who is now the Chief Minister of West Bengal, he proposed a Motion for the discussion of the U.G.C. Report along with the Gajendragadkar Commission's Report last year. To our surprise, we were given a slip saying that discussion was dropped. That is regarding the Gajendragadkar Commission's Report.

17 hrs.

Now, when you say that this is the biblical truth, we cannot accept it.

What about the powers of the court which he is visualising? What about the powers of the executive council which he is visualising on the basis of which you are now proposing amendments to various University Acts. Of course, he says, it is a deliberative body. They are trying to make it a deliberative body. But a deliberative body does not mean a totally powerless body—only to have a useless deliberation on everything under the Sun. It must have some powers. On the basis of the Gajendragadkar Commission's report these reforms are being introduced which are undermining the powers vested on the university court. What the students, teachers and *karamcharis* in the Delhi University wanted was—and even today what they demand is—a democratic court where adequate representations to the teachers, students and *karamchari*

are there so that the academic community of the Delhi University will have a say on matters regarding education. That is the thing basically which is denied. Even when you give nominal representation to teachers and students—and *karamcharis* you often exclude from those bodies—they are only going to participate in the deliberation; it is not a decision making body. May be, Gajendragadkar Commission had its reason, but it is not the reason to convince every body who is concerned about education. I am not an educationist, not I am a teacher, but I try to understand the problems of education.

Then I come to the College Council which is now called College Administrative Council. I can understand, I can rather appreciate, the position taken by the Minister that a certain amount of power which was visualised in the original Ordinance is not given today to the Administrative Council. But he should realise that that is also not to the satisfaction of the teachers, students and *karamcharis* of the Delhi University. They can always say that they cannot satisfy every body. When you bring about such reforms which will have far-reaching consequences, at least do not rush through like this. It is not a very good practise in democracy. All the reform measures in education came to this House on the last days of Parliament, and then the argument would come, "There is no time" the Chair would ring the bell and we would be asked to keep quiet and you would get the Bill adopted because you have got a wonderful majority in the House. But that does not justify everything. So, what I suggest is this. You have yourself accepted that you are vulnerable when serious discussions take place. In the Rajya Sabha you accepted amendment. That shows that there is again need for amendments. Why not refer the Bill to a Select Committee of both Houses? If you refer the Bill to a Select Committee of both Houses, then all con-

cerned people will have a chance to express their views about the Bill, the Minister will have time to think about it, and we will have time again to discuss and take a wise decision about it.

With all respect I would tell the hon. Minister that I was not satisfied when he said that the teachers of the Delhi University, in spite of his asking, did not give representations to him—memorandum or their suggestions to him. Why not give chance in the normal fashion? Heavens will not fall down if we do not accept this Bill by tomorrow. (Interruption) It has not fallen and that is why it will not fall tomorrow also. You may refer the Bill to a Select Committee of both Houses and if you, by that way, show respect and regard to the teaching community, the students and *karamcharis* of the Delhi University, it will only add glory to that side.

With these words, I conclude.

बीकरी लुब्धा बीकरी (बादनी बीक) : सम्मानित महोदय, जो बिल [आज मदन के नामसे है उस का समर्थन करने के लिये खड़ी हुई है। कुछ और सभासदों की बातचीत सुन कर के कि यह प्राइमस न आता और न आज बिल लाने की जरूरत पड़ती, तो मैं तो सिर्फ इतना ही कहना चाहती हूँ कि मंत्री जी से यह सही है कि अगर एक ही बार कामग्रीहेसिब बिल आता तो जिन को मौका मिल गया है और जो गिवाही मौके की नाक में रहते हैं कि कोई मौका मिले और गलतफहमी फैला सके उन को मौका नहीं मिलता। कम से कम इतना फायदा तो जरूर होता।

आज तो परेशानी है, यह सब बात है कि अध्यापकों के दिल में बहुत से शक मुबहान पैदा हो गये हैं और कुछ पैदा कर दिने गये हैं, और उन में से बहुत से अध्यापकों से बात करने का मौका मिला, ऐसे बहुत कम अध्यापक मिले जिन्हें बिल के बारे में पूरी जानकारी हो, किन्हीं

[गीतमती सुमित्रा बोली]

बिल को पढ़ा हो, स्टेट्यूट्स या प्रावर्निंस को पढ़ा हो। यह बहुत ही अफसोस की बात है कि जिन अध्यापकों पर बच्चों को पढ़ाने की जिम्मेदारी है, जो पढ़े लिखे हैं

SHRI SAMAR GUHA 'So many professors are in the street You have not mentioned the same I belong to that profession and I strongly protest This is a slur cast on the highest intelligentsia of our country

MR CHAIRMAN Order, Order This will not be recorded

SHRI SAMAR GUHA **

गीतमती सुमित्रा बोली मुझे अफसोस है इस बात का कि जिन लोगों के कंधों पर पढ़ाने की जिम्मेदारी है उन को कम से कम जो कानून अपने से ताल्लुक रखता हो उस को तो पढ़ लेना चाहिये था।

चार हजार के करीब टीचर्स हैं, अगर वह उन कानून को भी न पढ़े और स्टूडी भर लोग जो फायदा उठाना चाहत है वह स्टेट्यूट्स के बारे में बोलें, प्रावर्निंस के बारे में मिसलीड करें ता यह हमारे भविष्य के लिए अच्छी बात नहीं है। आज हमारे शिक्षा मंत्री जो कि इस बात को भी देखना पड़ेगा कि टीचर्स को भी एजुकेशन का काम करना पड़ेगा और उन को समझाना पड़ेगा। क्योंकि चाहे कोई सियासन का फायदा उठा रहा हो, यूनिवर्सिटी से मियासन का प्रस्ताव बनाने की कोशिश कर रहे हो, फिर भी सरकार को चाहिये कि जिनके लिये यह कानून बनाया जा रहा है उनको ज्यादा से ज्यादा समझाया जाय। यह जिम्मेदारी सरकार को लेनी चाहिये।

यह सही बात है कि दिल्ली में यूनिवर्सिटी स्टूडेंट्स की तादाद बहुत बढ़ गई है—एक लाख के करीब हैं और साठे सौ या चार हजार के करीब टीचर्स हैं, 50 के करीब कॉलेज हैं। जो स्पेसिफाइड सम्प्लेक्स हैं, जैसे एम० ए० प्रान्स, उन के लिये तो ठीक इंतजाम है। पर नान

स्पेसिफाइड सम्प्लेक्स के लिये धनी तक माफूस इंतजाम नहीं हुआ है। और इस को देखते हुये माफूस होता है कि दिल्ली के लिये, सारी ऐजुकेशन पोलिसी के लिए कोई ठीक से कानून बना चाहिये और एक कामग्रीडेंसिब बिल और पोलिसी उस के लिये बननी चाहिये।

इतनी तादाद विद्यार्थियों की हो गई है कि इस से वा राखे नहीं है कि इस का डीस्टेन्डेंस-जेशन होना चाहिये ताकि ज्यादा से ज्यादा इंतजाम हो सके। आज जो टीचर्स हैं उन्होंने बहुत सारे स्टेट्यूट्स तो पढ़े ही नहीं हैं कि क्या टीचर्स की मांगें होनी चाहिये और अकैडेमिक कौंसिल में उन्हें कितनी जगह दी गई है, कहा पर उन का रिप्रेजेंटेशन दिया जाय, कहा न दिया जाय, कहा ज्यादा दिया जाये। इस पर तो टीचर्स आते ही नहीं हैं, वह सियामत में फासे जा कर, स्यासी बातों में कि इस का हटाओ, उस को हटाओ के चक्कर में ज्यादा पड़ जाते हैं।

मैं यह भी कहना चाहूंगी कि इस बात की बड़ी चर्चा है कि जो यह एजिटेशन बना उसने देखा यह गया कि कई कई जिम्मेदार लोगों की तरफ से बड़े गैर-जिम्मेदार बयान आते रहे। कुछ का जिक्र एक माननीय सदस्य ने धरपी किया। प्राब्लर क्यों यह सवाल उठ रहा है, क्या वाइस चांसलर ने कहा और क्या ऐजुकेशन मिनिस्टर ने कहा। ऐजुकेशन मिनिस्टर का जो बयान हुआ इस सभा के सामने, उस के लिये वाइस चांसलर ने कही कह दिया कि मैंने यह नहीं कहा था अगर ऐजुकेशन मिनिस्टर ने कोई बात कहा हो तो जो हमारे विपक्षी दल के माननीय सदस्य बोल रहे हैं वह यहाँ पर प्रिविलेज मोशन ला सकते थे और इस सभ्य की बीज से उन को लाना चाहिये। लेकिन इस बात की भी सफाई होनी चाहिये कि इस सभा के प्रब्लर या इस के वाइस, ऊपर से नीचे से, किसी कोने से जो भी जिम्मेदार बोलें हैं, उन्हें बयान देने से पहले सोचना चाहिये और जिम्मेदारी से

बतान देना चाहिये क्योंकि इस बात की बहुत चर्चा है कि कोई कमेटी भी जिस ने डिसेंट्रलाइजेशन के बारे में अपनी बहुत सी तजवीजें पेश की हैं। अगर उसको भी साफ किया जाय कि वह रिकमेन्डेशन कोन सी है तो जहाँ तक मेरी जानकारी है अगर उस रिकमेन्डेशन को पूरी तरह से मान लिया जाता सरकार द्वारा तो दिल्ली यूनिवर्सिटी का बहुत नुकसान होने वाला था। फिर भी जो रिकमेन्डेशन करने वाले थे उन चेचारों को यह मालूम होना चाहिये कि जो रोग एजिटेशन को लीड करने वाले हैं उनके अपने ब्यालात क्या है इन चीजों के बारे में जिन का विरोध करने के लिये आज वह खड़े हुये हैं।

श्री बटे ने बहुत सी बातें कही, लेकिन मालूम होता है कि उन्होंने इन चीजों का बहुत कम अध्ययन किया है, न कोसिल का, न स्टैट्यूट का, न बिल का और न दिल्ली की जो पुरानी प्रादमियत है उस का ही कोई अध्ययन उन्होंने किया है। पर यह बात सही है कि स्टैट्यूट का बोझ बहुत अध्ययन मँने किया है। ऐसी कोई भी चीज नहीं है जिस में सब चीजें होती हैं, हर चीज को बेहतर बनाने की गुंजाइश होती है। फिर भी चाहे यह बात सही हो या नहीं, कुछ माननीय सदस्य समझते हैं कि हर बात में मुझ को तो जन सच को कुछ कहना ही है, पर आज जो यूनिवर्सिटी एजिटेशन का हाल है उस को देख कर यह सिद्ध हो गया है कि जनसच की पैदाइश और तरक्की जो है वह मिसग्रन्डरस्टैंडिंग मिसइन्फार्मेशन और मासेसनेस से हुई है क्योंकि इतना भ्रम उन्होंने इस कानून के बारे में फैलाया है कि जो यूनिवर्सिटी के अध्यक्ष है वह भी इस बात को जान लेंगे। दरअसल उन लोगों ने कोशिश की है और वह इस बात पर धा गये हैं कि यूनिवर्सिटी में जा कर अपने पंजे कहा फैलाये जायें। आज भी बड़े ने जिक्र किया अलीगढ़ का

श्री आर० भी० बड़े: यह गलत बात कह रहे हैं (स्वभावात्)

श्रीमती सुचरा बोली: जब इतना बड़ा आन्दोलन चल रहा है तो हो सकता है कि येय उन्हें बिल रहा हो उस का। अभी भी बड़े ने अलीगढ़

का जिक्र किया। मुसलिम अधिसि और जनसंघ के बहुत से बड़े बड़े लोगों के समझौते हो गये हैं। अलीगढ़ यूनिवर्सिटी में वे साथ हो गये हैं और उनका विरोध कर रहे हैं और शिमला समझौते में भी वे शामिल हो गये हैं और अब दिल्ली यूनिवर्सिटी बिल के मामले में भी उनके साथ मिस गये हैं। इस तरह में यह मालूम होता है कि उनकी कोशिश यह है कि यूनिवर्सिटियों में जो हायर एजुकेशन होती है, उसको सैकोटाज किया जाये, उसका बिगाड़ा जाये। शायद उनकी मूठेजी में यह चीज शामिल हो गई है.....

एक माननीय सदस्य गलत बात है।

श्रीमती सुचरा बोली: उनका ब्याल यह है कि हिन्दुस्तान में लोग ज्यादा अगर पढ़ लिख जायेंगे तो वे तो गलतफहमियां फैलाने हैं, उनका शिकार वे नहीं हो सकेगे। हम चाहते उनको बिगाड़ने की आज हर मुमकिन कोशिश कर रहे हैं.....

SHRI SAMAR GUHA: On a point of submission. I do not know whether the hon. lady Member is understanding the implications of what she is saying. She is implicating almost hundreds of teachers who belong to the post—graduate and under-graduate teaching departments by saying that are being made the tools of some party. She does not understand the implications of what she is saying....

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member will get an opportunity to speak, and he can refute whatever she is saying, when his turn comes.

श्री सगर गुहा: (जनाब मेयरजीन साहिब) माननीय सदस्या सब टीचर्स को इम्प्लिकेटिंग कर रही हैं। मंत्री पर वह यह दोष लगा रही हैं। आर० एस० एस० का टूल उनको बता रही है। उनकी सभ्या साढ़े चार हजार है। क्या इनका विभाग नहीं है.....

MR. CHAIRMAN: Nothing that he says will go on record. He cannot just go up and begin a speech, without my permission.

SHRI SAMAR GUHA : **

बीजती सुभाषा बोसी : लोक सभा के सदस्य इस बात का ध्यान लया सकते हैं कि मैंने क्या कहा है कि किस तरह से इन्होंने उसको तोड़-मरोड़ कर पेश करने की कोशिश की है और किस तरह से यूनिवर्सिटी टीचर्स में भ्रम फैलाने की कोशिश की है। मैंने इस लिये कहा है कि शिक्षा मंत्री को इसको करने की सख्त जरूरत है कि हमारे अध्यापक जो हमारे बच्चों को पढ़ाते हैं अगर ये लोग जो पढ़ने लिखने के खिलाफ हैं, हाइज एजुकेशन के खिलाफ हैं ताकि लोग इनके बचकर में पड़ते रहें, वे भी इनके बचकर में पड़ गये तो यह ठीक नहीं होगा। इसलिये उनको अच्छी तरह से समझाया जाना चाहिये और बताया जाना चाहिये कि किस तरह से इस बिल के बारे में ये लोग भ्रम फैला रहे हैं और इन्होंने भ्रम फैलाये भी हैं। मैं यह भी कहना चाहती हूं अभी माननीय सदस्य ने कहा है कि वह अध्यापक रहे हैं। मैं उनको बतलाना चाहती हूं कि मुझे भी इस बात का फायदा हुआ है कि मैं बच्चों को पढ़ाऊं और इसका मौका मुझे भी काफी मिला है। मैं इसीलिये कहती हूं कि पड़े लिखें का नेतृत्व पड़े लिखें लोग ही करें और पड़ लिख कर करें तभी उनको फायदा है। अगर उनको इस तरह से सियासत का भन्दा बनाया जायेगा तो अध्यापकों का सब तरह से नुकसान होगा, ऐसा मेरा विश्वास है।

SHRI G. VISWANATHAN (Wandiwash) : When we are discussing the Delhi University (Amendment) Bill, it is unfortunate that one of the best universities in the country remains closed. About 4,000 teachers of Delhi University are on strike and another 4,000 non-teaching staff have also joined them.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE (Kanpur) : And the President also.

SHRI G. VISWANATHAN : It is a question concerning the future of a lakh

of students. Government have now come with a Bill. Government have bungled in regard to many universities before. I do not want them to bungle in Delhi Universities also.

AN HON. MEMBER : How can they help bungling?

SHRI G. VISWANATHAN : This Bill has gone through the Rajya Sabha. I am glad the Minister accepted certain suggestions which have improved the Bill. I hope he will accept a few more here and make the Bill acceptable to all concerned in the University.

When I went through the statement of objects and reasons, I was surprised to find that it contains nothing but DMK philosophy, namely, autonomy and decentralisation. I am glad at least some institutions accept the DMK principle. There are genuine apprehensions among the teachers of Delhi University. They think that the constitution of college administrative councils will lead to delinking the colleges from the University and teachers will be divided according to a two-tier system; one will be elevated to the university level and the other will be assigned to the autonomous colleges. They think this will be discrimination. I am glad to hear from the Minister that these things will not happen after the Bill is passed. But I want to know from him why so far Government have not taken any steps to meet the teaching staff and the non-teaching staff and come to a settlement. Government think they have taken a stand on which they want to stand as a matter of false prestige. I would tell Prof. Hasan that it is not too late. He can still make an approach, meet the teachers and come to a settlement.

Already a suggestion has been made that the Bill can be sent to a Joint Committee.

If this is not acceptable, I will make an alternate suggestion. The session has been extended by a day. We have two more days. We can postpone consideration of the Bill today. We will have two days for consultation with the Vice-Chancellor, teachers and *karamcharis*. Government can come to a settlement acceptable to all sides. If Government want to have this Bill passed this session, we can still do so on 2nd September. I think Government should accept this suggestion. They should not bungle in Delhi University also. We saw the Government bungled in Aligarh Muslim University. We wanted the Bill to go to a Select Committee. Government did not agree. Result? We saw demonstrations everywhere throughout UP. Finally, there were police firings and 25 people died. We should not play into the hands of unruly and unsocial elements in Delhi. We saw what happened in Shahdara. A small incident flared up into a big demonstration and disorder. Let us not bungle again in Delhi. Let the Minister accept the suggestion to postpone the Bill for two days and after coming to a settlement with the teachers, we can pass this Bill on 2nd September.

MR. CHAIRMAN : SHRI PILOO MODY -- not rising. Your name is sent. I do not know. (*Interruptions*) SHRI SAMAR GUHA.

SHRI SAMAR GUHA (Contd.) : Mr. Chairman, Sir, if I had the mind to play mischief on the ruling party, perhaps I would have hailed wholeheartedly the speeches made by the representatives elected by the people—perhaps the intelligentsia is also included in the people—to the perverse speeches made by the MPs for Delhi. These speeches are nothing but politically motivated, as I said, in a perverse way, and they will affect them. They should understand what they say. The whole of their speeches, by their speeches, they have alienated the intelligentsia from them

and they have isolated themselves from the intelligentsia. They have declared on the floor of this House that in Delhi, all the university teachers, the college teachers—their number will be about 4,000—and also the students who follow them, none of them have any faith in them and they are completely isolated from the intelligentsia of Delhi, the teaching profession of Delhi, the student community of Delhi. That is exactly what they were saying on the floor of this House.

I shall use a strong word; in a vulgar way, they were attacking the teaching profession, as if 4,000 teachers of the Delhi University and the Delhi colleges have become tools in the hands of the Jan Sangh. If I thought that these teachers, these professors are played upon politically by any political party, be it Jan Sangh or any other party, as one belonging to the teaching profession, I would have refused to say anything in their favour or in their defence.

I have had opportunities of meeting many of the teachers. I did not ask whether any of them belonged to any political party or whether they have any political backing. I did not discuss any thing of their political affiliation with this party or that party, but most of the teachers, I found, have no political affiliation.

SHRI PILOO MODY: (Goaharu) There are Swatantra.

SHRI SAMAR GUHA : It is extraordinarily vulgar attribute political motives to the teachers, that they have launched this agitation to sabotage higher education, to sabotage post-graduate education. I cannot believe that one elected Member from Delhi can dare to attribute such motive, this vulgar motive, to the highest community of intelligentsia, the teaching profession.

I am really surprised to find one thing. Prof. Nurul Hasan is of course a well intentioned man; a very good man he is. I frankly say that I feel hesitant to criticise and attack him but I do not know what has hap-

[Shri Samar Guha]

pened to his wisdom. Why are you so keen Prof. Hasan being a teacher, being in their profession, belonging to that community and having enjoyed a long period in that community—now you are a Member of the Government why are you trying to ride roughshod on the intelligentsia, on the teachers, on their emotion, and their sentiment ?

I also see a rare phenomenon of absolute unity of all the teachers of all the colleges and of the university. Such a phenomenon in the intelligentsia is not always, I should say, common.

It is a characteristic of the intelligentsia; two intellectuals cannot see eye to eye and they will argue and differ and create so many groups among themselves.

MR. CHAIRMAN : Order, order, now it is 5.30. We have to take up half an hour discussion. The Mover had written that it should be postponed; he does not want it to be taken up today. I want to take the sense of the House whether we can continue with the subject that we are now discussing.

SHRI G. VISWANATHAN : No, Sir.

MR. CHAIRMAN : when he has given in writing, it means that it will lapse.

SHRI G. VISWANATHAN : There are four other names.

MR. CHAIRMAN : That is for putting questions. Now we can continue. Prof. Samar Guha.

SHRI R. V. BADE : On a point of order. The Order paper says : ".....as soon as the preceding items of business are disposed of." At 5.30 half an hour discussion has to be taken up.

MR. CHAIRMAN : But he has withdrawn it.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE : (Rajapur) Is it to facilitate the bonus discussion that he has withdrawn ?

SHRI G. VISWANATHAN : According to the Order Paper, the half an hour discussion should be taken up at 5.30 or as soon as the preceding items of business are disposed of whichever is earlier.

MR. CHAIRMAN : That discussion is still continuing. It was the demand of the hon. Member that at that time it should be taken up. So, it was mentioned in the agenda "...whichever is earlier". But that business is not finished. On the other hand the Mover of the half an hour discussion has withdrawn it; it lapses.. (Interruptions) Yesterday also we discussed in similar way; discussion under 193 was taken up later on.

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA : (Begusarai) Sir, I rise on a point of order.

SHRI R.D. BHANDARE : (Bombay Central) I draw your attention to the Order Paper. About the discussion under Rule 193, it says :

"To be taken up at 6 PM or as soon as the preceding items of business are disposed of, whichever is earlier,....."

So, it is "preceding items" not "preceding item". The preceding item is continuing and let it continue.

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA : There is a particular sequence in the agenda and that has to be maintained. There was half-an-hour discussion preceding the discussion under rule 193. That has not come off. Now how is the sequence going to be maintained ? Had the member been present here, this would have gone according to the schedule, or as we have been seeing now a days that many arbitrary developments take place, probably that would have been pushed aside. We have always been submitting to the Chair that we should strictly adhere to the schedule.

Is it your pleasure to say that at 6.0' clock this discussion would be interrupted and the discussion under Rule 193 would start ?

SHRI S.M. BANERJEE : The half-hour discussion is not taking place. So far as discussion under Rule 193 is concerned, I have got it after arguing in the Business Advisory Committee. I do not want it to be postponed to the 1st because I have got the List of Business for the last with me here. It says, half-hour discussion and on the next page it says, Discussion under Rule 176 to be initiated by Shri Bhupesh Gupta and some Rajya Sabha members. So, on the 1st after 5.30, Shri Bhupesh Gupta is going to address this House.

THE MINISTER OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS AND SHIPPING AND TRANSPORT

(SHRI RAJ BAHADUR) : It might be a misprint. Sir so far as the discussion under rule 193 is concerned, as rightly pointed out by Mr Bhandare, it is to be taken up as soon as the preceding items are disposed of. If the discussion on Delhi University Bill had been finished and this item had been disposed of, we should have certainly taken up the discussion under Rule 193. But the preceding item is still on the anvil of the House. Regarding the sequence, if at all the sequence is that the earlier matter has got to be disposed of first and not the later matter. But I will accommodate them. Let the discussion under item Rule 193 start immediately and go on for one hour. These 10 minutes which have been taken in the miscellaneous discussion may be taken out. After one hour, we will again resume discussion on the Delhi University Bill and continue till 7 o'clock, because we have decided to sit till 7 o'clock. Sequence means first come first served. The first item is the Delhi University Bill and not the discussion under Rules 1934.

There is no earthly reason why we should disturb the sequence. The

sequence demands that the Delhi University Bill should be disposed of first.

SHRI R. D. BHANDARE : As you have rightly suggested and put it to the House, the discussion on the Delhi University (Amendment) Bill should be continued.

SHRI PILOO MODY : The suggestions that have been made are not quite accurate. As 5.30 p.m. you in your good sense asked Shri Guha to sit down and said "how the 5.30 discussion". That means the discussion on the Delhi University (Amendment) Bill has come to a conclusion for the day. You had called the next item on the agenda, which is the half an hour discussion. Now, it so happens that the Congress Party has succeeded in browbeating one of its members to withdraw the half an hour discussion in order to save half an hour for legislative business.....(interruptions?). They want to utilize that half an hour for the consideration of this somewhat fishy Bill. Sir, I do not think you should pay countenance to what they are saying. The rules are very clear. The half an hour discussion starts at 5.30 p.m. The concerned Member decides not to press the discussion. So, the next item may be taken up.

SHRI SAMAR GUHA : Sir, on a point of submission. You will recollect that when I was continuing my speech you asked me to resume my seat. You also said in your wisdom that the half an our discussion would be taken up. That means immediately item No. 26 is taken up.

MR CHAIRMAN : You are not making any new point.

SHRI SAMAR GUHA : So, item No.26 should be taken as the business of

the House Then it is disposed of What does disposal mean ? A matter can be disposed of with or without discussion Item No 26 is disposed of (interruptions?)

MR CHAIRMAN Since so many hon Members are standing up and speaking nothing will go on record If any member speaks without my permission it will not go on record ? (interruptions) ? According to the Rules, if the member is making a new point then only he can be accommodated Otherwise not

SHRI K D MALAVIYA As I understand it, the points made by the Minister of Parliamentary Affairs were very relevant He made a certain offer and, unfortunately the Opposition Members are not willing to accept the offer

SOME HON MEMBERS We accepted it

SHRI K D MALAVIYA (Dowarganj) They have conditionally accepted it Because the differences are irresolvable there can be no agreement I propose that the Chair take a final decision in the matter (Interruptions)

MR CHAIRMAN I will not allow anything more now My decision is this At 5 30 P M I said there was a Half an-Hour discussion but the gentleman concerned had withdrawn it That is on the record That is what I said specifically at the same time I also said that the subject which we are discussing that is the Delhi University Bill will continue

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA How can it be ? (Interruptions)

MR CHAIRMAN Order order, please take your seat

Now, I do not agree either with the Minister of Parliamentary Affairs or with the Members on this side This item,

Not recorded .

that is, the Delhi University Bill will continue upto 6 O'clock At 6 O'clock, we will take up the other discussion which is on the List of Business The Delhi University Bill will be taken up on some other day when it comes on the agenda Mr Samar Guha to continue his speech (Interruptions)

SHRI SA SHAMIM What happened to the offer made by the Minister of Parliamentary Affairs and accepted by us ?

SHRI G VISWANATHAN He made an offer There was an offer from the Treasury Benches and we accepted it What about that ? (Interruptions)

MR CHAIRMAN Order, please You have taken 20 minutes for nothing Mr Samar Guha to continue his speech (Interruptions)

श्री हुकम चन्द कछवाय (मुरेना) सभापति महोदय

सभापति महोदय जो कुछ माननीय सदस्य कह रहे हैं वह बेकार पर नहीं जायेगा।

श्री हुकम चन्द कछवाय **
आप मझ न नागज क्या है। मैं आप से एक प्रायना छाटी सी करना चाहता हूँ।

सभापति महोदय जी नहीं

श्री हुकम चन्द कछवाय माननीय सभापति जो पूछनीय सभापति जा। मझ को आपने सुना है मझ क्या नहीं सुनना चाहते हैं।

सभापति महोदय आप हाउस का चलने दीजिए। हाउस को डिस्टर्ब न कीजिये।

श्री हुकम चन्द कछवाय मैं कन हाउस को चलने से रोक रहा हूँ। आप मुझे सुनें ?

सभापति महोदय नहीं सुनें।

श्री हुकम चन्द कछवाय क्यों नहीं सुनें ?

सभापति महोदय : आप बैठ जाइये मेहर-
बानी करके।

श्री हुकम चन्द कछवाय : इतने समय में मैं
खत्म भी कर देता। बाधा मिनट मुझे चाहिए
था।

सभापति महोदय : आप इसी तरह से हाउस
को डिस्टर्ब करेंगे तो मुझे आपकी नेम करना
पड़ेगा।

श्री हुकम चन्द कछवाय : हमेशा इसी की आप
धीम देते हैं। आप बेकार नाराज होते हैं।

सभापति महोदय : श्री समर गुह (व्यवधान) आप
बैठिये।

श्री हुकम चन्द कछवाय : सुन तो ले मैं कहना
चहता हूँ। सुनेंगे नहीं ?

सभापति महोदय : नहीं। श्री समर गुह।

श्री हुकम चन्द कछवाय : क्यों नहीं सुनेंगे।
आप न सब को सुना रहे।

सभापति महोदय : हाउस चलने देगे या नहीं।

श्री हुकम चन्द कछवाय : सब को आपने
सुना है, मौका दिया है। मैं भी आपकी आज्ञा
माग रहा हूँ।

सभापति महोदय : बड़ मामला खन्म हो गया
है।

श्री हुकम चन्द कछवाय : खत्म कैसे हो गया
है।

सभापति महोदय : श्री समर गुह। (व्यवधान)

Hon. Member, Shri Hukam Chand
Kachwai is not allowing the House to
function. He should be named.
(Interruptions). He is not allowing
the House to function. The non. members
are sitting tight. They are not asking
him that he should allow the House to
function.

AN HON. MEMBER : Please allow
him to say, Sir.,

42L.S.S./72—12.

MR. CHAIRMAN : That matter
is finished. I have called Mr. Samar
Guha.

SHRI JAGDISH BHATTACHARYYA :
On a point of order. We were given
to understand that his speech had been
finished; the item was over.....

MR. CHAIRMAN : Please sit down.
There is no point of order. Mr. Samar
Guha may continue his speech. We must
carry on the business of the House serious-
ly; otherwise, we would be laughed at
by the public. MR. Samar Guha.

श्री हुकम चन्द कछवाय : आपने मुझे सुना
नहीं। मैं बाहर जा रहा हूँ।

SHRI SAMAR GUHA : I think,
you will take pity on me. Before I could
continue my speech three or four minutes,
there was din in the House. Naturally
Sir, now I have almost forgotten what
I was speaking. I do not want to go into
politics; I have no political motives at
all; I want to go into the matter seriously
and want to make some contribution, in
resolving the problem that has arisen
Therefore, I would request you to begin
the discussion under rule 193 and allow
me to speak the next day so that I can
speak calmly.

MR. CHAIRMAN : No, please.
(Interruptions)

SHRI SAMAR GUHA : Amidst all
these interruptions, can I speak anything
Sir. ?

MR. CHAIRMAN : If you do not
finish, then you will continue. But I
cannot ask you to continue when you
are not speaking and then there is still time
.....(Interruptions).

SHRI R. D. BHANDARE : You can
call other persons if he is not prepared
to speak.

SHRI SAMAR GUHA : No Sir, I can continue for hours. If they want to hear me, I will make the speech.

What is the miracle, what is the magic wand—I want to know, from Prof. Nurul Hasan—that has brought so many thousands of teachers in one solid phalanx, in one confederation? Is it possible, particularly among the intelligentsia? I have said two intellectuals do not meet together. When two intellectuals meet, there will be a third point in their arguments. Therefore, I only want to draw your attention that as I used the word—without trying to ride rough-shod over the sentiments and intelligence and judgment of the profession of education, you should go deeply into the causes, as to ascertain why they have combined. Why? They are united? There are certain basic reasons. There are certain basic motives behind that. That motive, some people simply attributed it to some sabotage, some, I should say to conspiracy, engineered by the Jana Sengh or some other political Party. I should say, so much credit should not be given either to the Jana Sangh or the RSS or to any other political Party. That way you will be undermining the intelligence and the judgment of the four thousand teachers of the Delhi University....

MR. CHAIRMAN : You may continue the next day. Now we are taking up the discussion under Rule 193.

[**SHRI R. D. BHANDARE** in the Chair]

17:58 hrs.

DISCUSSION RE : PAYMENT OF BONUS TO WORKERS

MR. CHAIRMAN : Mr. Banerjee.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE (Kanpur) : I would like to initiate a discussion on the payment of bonus, particularly, raising the quantum of bonus paid to the workers from 4% to 8.33%.

I am happy that Mr. Khadilkar is here and I remember how the workers felt happy when Khadilkar formula was announced and I was seriously thinking whether the Government should take a decision themselves without referring this matter to the committee and raise the minimum quantum of bonus from 4% to 8.33%, and also remove the ceiling of 20%. So, the question of raising the minimum bonus from 4% to 8.33% is agitating the minds of all sorts of workers, whether in the public or the private sectors and I am confident that there is going to be a wave of strike before the Puja holidays if no decision is taken by the Government to raise the quantum of bonus. The hon. Minister is aware that there had been strikes in Bombay recently and their main demand was that the quantum of bonus should be raised to 8.33%. Even in to-day's newspapers you will find that the textile workers of Bombay have taken a decision that over two lakhs of workers in the Bombay textile mills will go on a strike on 2nd September to press their demand for a minimum bonus of 8.33%.

18 hrs.

MR. CHAIRMAN : I may bring to the notice of the House that only one hour has been allotted for this discussion. We must conclude this discussion at 7 O'clock. Those who want to take part in the debate may kindly remember this time factor. The hon. Minister has to reply to the debate. This will be closed exactly at 7 O'clock. Mr. Banerjee, please continue.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE : As I was saying, the textile workers of Bombay have taken a decision to go on strike. The textile workers of Kanpur who went in token strike in July, 1972 have also taken a decision to go in for an indefinite strike if this question of minimum bonus is not settled. The Khadilkar formula caught the imagination of the workers only because