

14.56 hrs.

**INSTITUTION OF CHARTERED
ENGINEERS BILL**

Shri Goray (Poona): Sir, I beg to move:

"That the Bill to provide for the reconstitution of the Institution of Engineers (India) be taken into consideration."

Sir, I am moving this Bill in the hope that the Government will not oppose this Bill simply because it is being moved by the Opposition....

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Order, order. Those hon. Members who have to leave can do so quietly and allow the hon. Members to continue the work.

Shri Goray: I had expected that the Government themselves would come forward in this matter and take steps to give a charter to the Institution of Engineers which has been doing very good work in this country for the last so many years. This particular institution which is working under a Royal Charter today has a long history. It was in 1920 that it started its work and it was at the request of the President of the institution, Sir Thomas Guthrie Russell, that in 1935 a Royal Charter was given to this Institution. It has a membership of nearly 7,000 engineers coming from different branches of engineering: mechanical, electrical, civil and general engineering. The Institution is at present imparting education to about 14,000 students throughout the country and has nearly 16 branches and it has very good connections with similar institutions in Europe and other countries of Asia. It is also connected with many universities in this country and is represented on nearly 50 Governmental committees. I am giving you the details because I think that there should be proper appreciation of the work that this Institution is doing at the present moment.

Just now the position of this Institution is a bit anomalous. Even after Independence, it is still working under

the Royal Charter and its legal position creates a good deal of difficulty and also litigation.

Clause 18 of the Royal Charter stipulates that its bye-laws would be valid only after they have been allowed by the Privy Council. It says:

"The Corporate Members or the majority of such Members present in person or by proxy and voting at any duly convened General Meeting of the Corporate Members with respect to which notice shall have been given of the matters to be taken into consideration thereat, shall have power from time to time to make such bye-laws of the Institution as to them shall seem requisite and convenient for the regulation, government and advantage of the Institution, its members and property and for the furtherance of the objects and purposes of the Institution and from time to time to revoke, alter or amend any bye-law or bye-laws theretofore made so that the same shall be reasonable and not repugnant to these Presents or to the Laws and Statutes of India; Provided that no such bye-law, revocation, alteration or amendment shall take effect until the same has been allowed by the Lords of Our Privy Council of which allowance a Certificate under the hand of the Clerk of Our Privy Council shall be conclusive evidence."

15 hrs.

Now, so far as our Constitution is concerned it has no provision to deal with such cases. So, every time it has to make a bye-law or to bring about any change in the bye-laws that exist, it has to go to the Privy Council for allowance. I think that from another point also it is very important, very necessary that this Parliament enacts a law which will dispense with the necessity of this institution working under the Charter. In a way it derogates from the dignity of this country

also, that there should be an institution in this country which is working under a Royal Charter. The engineers and the Institute have repeatedly approached the Government. They have tried to persuade the Government that this anomaly should be done away with, and a suitable legislation brought forth by Parliament.

Sir, so far as I know, the Government in 1951 and afterwards were themselves thinking on these lines and they had appreciated that a charter should be given to this institution.

[SRI BARMAN in the Chair]

15-02 hrs.

I do not know why they have taken such a long time over this simple matter. It may be argued that there are other institutions representing other sections of engineering. But I would like to point out that even those sections are represented adequately in this institution, and the Institute of Engineers have repeatedly said that they would leave it to the Government to make such provisions as they think fit to safeguard the interests of other engineers, other sections of engineering which in their opinion were not adequately represented in this institution.

It may be argued that there are various schools of engineering now coming up like the tele-communication engineering, atomic energy engineering etc., and they may perhaps like to have their own institutions. My argument is that such small institutions will not be able to discharge their duties in an efficient, manner, because this particular institution happen to have a large amount of funds, they have got their own buildings, they have got their own administrative machinery and they have been doing very good educative work for the last so many years. The tendency outside also is to have a single institution for all sections of engineering.

Sir, I may point out that the Conference of the Engineering Institutions

of the British Commonwealth which met in Australia in 1958 also passed a resolution saying that it is not good to have too many institutions, because they simply mean repetition of work. The resolution that they passed was on these lines:

"The Conference recognises that the community and the engineering profession as a whole benefit from the closest possible co-operation between the various branches of engineering, and recommends that where there are one or more national institutions already providing for the whole profession the formation of new specialist societies is not in the best interests of the community or of the advancement of the science and practice of engineering."

So I think, Sir, that the Government will be well advised not to encourage these fissiparous tendencies, not to say that the engineering profession is not united or is not presenting a homogeneous demand. They should tell the other sections of engineering that there must be a single institution for this country, and that adequate measures, adequate steps will be taken to see that their special interests are safeguarded.

Sir, the Bill that I am moving makes ample provision for representation of all these different sections in the engineering profession. Therefore, I would urge upon the hon. Minister to take early steps to see that this particular Bill which I am moving is implemented by the Government. If he thinks that it will be possible for the Government to come forward with a similar Bill in the near future, if he is in a position to give a firm assurance on these lines, well, it is quite possible that I will reconsider whether I should press this Bill. But that firm assurance should be there.

One more point that I want to bring to the notice of this House is that what I am asking the House to do today is only implementation of the

[Shri Goray]

Scientific Policy Resolution that we passed last year. Last year, we said that we know how valuable the service of the engineers and the technicians is; rather, we said that it is these engineers and technicians who are likely to develop this country in the near future because they have the skill and they have the know-how. Once we say it, it is our duty to see that the engineering profession about which we talk so highly is given a charter. By giving a charter we put it on a firm foundation and give them a position from which they will be able to do their duty better and to train up the new generation of engineers.

You will find, Sir, that 14,000 students are being trained by these people. If this institution is given the status on the lines of the Institution of Chartered Accountants, I think they can go about their work with more vigour and more confidence. It is really surprising that while the Institute of Engineers is being denied this privilege, the accountants have been already given this privilege of having a charter from this Parliament. May be, Sir, it is symptomatic of the times that the accountants get priority over the engineers though we talk so much about the engineers and at every stage it is the engineers who are helping the country to develop.

Therefore, I would once again request the hon. Minister in charge of Scientific Research and Cultural Affairs to adopt a constructive approach, not to say only that because this Bill is coming from the opposition they shall have nothing to do with it, and not to follow in the footsteps of the hon. Minister who just now opposed even the introduction of a Bill. I should say Sir, he should adopt a more constructive approach, if possible support my Bill, and if it is not possible at least give an assurance that they will be bringing a Bill on these lines.

Mr. Chairman: Motion moved:

"That the Bill to provide for the reconstitution of the Institution of Engineers (India) be taken into consideration."

Shri Nawabir Bharucha (East Khandesh): Mr. Chairman, Sir, I think my hon. friend, Shri Goray, has rendered a distinct service in bringing forward this Bill and focussing our attention to an anomaly which has been existing in the Institution of Chartered Engineers. Sir, it was quite a revelation to me when I first saw the Bill, that even so late in the day, after having attained independence, for framing of bye-laws any institution in our free and independent Republic of India had to turn to the Privy Council of the United Kingdom.

Sir, the fact is this, that after attaining independence and after having started upon various Five Year Plans the entire outlook in the matter of engineers has changed. The needs have changed and, therefore, it is imperative that there should be a reorganisation of the Institute of Engineers according to the needs of the people, according to the basic requirements of our industrial growth, also to fit in with the plans of a growing economy and the demand for technical skill in the course of the various plans that we are bringing forward. Sir, if we depend even for framing of bye-laws and for guidance in these matters on a foreign country, which may not be able to visualise our requirements it is obvious that we shall have a foreign growth in the midst of our country and it is necessary, therefore, that some such steps as have been suggested in this Bill should be taken.

The Bill has been drafted with great care, though I cannot say that it is free from all defects. There are two or three defects to which I shall presently refer. The scheme of the Bill is, first, to create an institution

which will be a corporate body having a perpetual existence. There are various authorities in the institution, for instance, the Council, which is the supreme governing body; the Executive Committee, the schools of engineering, membership, etc. The functions of the institution have been laid down more or less generally, and they can always be improved upon. The institution is intended to promote and advance the science and practice of engineering, to establish associations to disseminate information, promote the study of engineering, establish colleges, regulate examinations, give facilities for ascertaining the views of engineers, encourage the inventions and promote efficiency; and also there are supplementary provisions about holding property and entering into contracts, raising funds, etc. The Council will be the supreme governing body.

The Bill has to be carefully looked into, apart from this basic structure of the institution, as suggested in the Bill, the other provisions of the Bill are on the whole sound. I think the Government should not oppose it because it comes from the Opposition side and therefore they should not think that it has got to be thrown out. But they can take this Bill as a basis and if necessary bring in another Bill which the Minister might have in view.

Why is it that this Bill is necessary? Why is it that a reorganisation is necessary? First, we have to adapt our institutions to our existing structure, to the new conditions and requirements of Independent India. Secondly, we have got to promote organs suited to our genius, of engineering technique and skill on sound lines. So, it has been an accepted fact—and in so many other countries where the desire to advance engineering skill and technical practices and progress—that the first thing to be done when you organise a body which will look into these things, is to realise that it is a technical subject. Engineering is essentially a technical

subject. The Government themselves are incapable of looking into these matters and therefore, an organised body is necessary. Such a body can also establish the code of conduct and etiquette. For instance, we have got a Bar Council in India to look after the etiquette and the code of conduct also. It is also necessary to safeguard the interests of the profession by maintaining a high level of tests and qualifications required. As we proceed further and further, with more projects of expenditures of great magnitude, it is obvious that our professional skill, so far as our engineers are concerned, must be of a high order. That can only be built up by an institution of this type.

It is also necessary to provide the mainspring from which can emerge the dissemination of technical information and technical standards. I am not aware of the number of journals this institution is publishing. But apart from that, there is vast scope for several journals by an institution like this, an institution of a specialised character, in different branches of engineering.

It is also necessary to provide a source for giving reliable information to Government and local authorities in the matter of projects. What is our experience today? Vast projects in which hundreds of crores of rupees are sunk are taken up. Later on, the House is told that this mistake was committed and that mistake was committed. There is a revision of estimates which becomes necessary and the revised costs are high. Surely, if we can have a body of people who know and understand and to whom the Government can turn for advice and guidance, we will be able to save several crores of rupees.

There are some defects in the Bill to which I come now. First, there is no provision for laying down the sources of revenue for the institution. Personally I am always of the view that whenever a corporate body is created, unless the statute which creates that body provides for the sources

[Shri Naushir Bharucha]

of income, usually such types of bodies tend to remain stagnant and useless. Usually such an institute dies an unnatural death or it remains merely on paper. Therefore the Bill is defective in that the sources of revenue have not been provided for.

Secondly, I do not know what the intention of the Government is. I am also of the view that huge sums by way of grant-in-aid will be required from the Government. An institution like this cannot survive from fees collected—may be a few thousand rupees—from its own members. Therefore, huge sums will be necessary by way of grant-in-aid. Technical and scientific education have got to be encouraged in this country, and it is part of the duty of the Government to do it. I think there should be a provision in the Bill for Government aid. Of course, correspondingly, there must be provisions for check, though they should not impinge upon the autonomy of the body.

I am not satisfied with the provision of the Bill; other provision is not made for encouragement of research. It is true that it has been mentioned:

“to encourage inventions and investigate and make known their nature and merits”;

But I would rather put down certain sound provisions for the necessity to carry on research in certain directions and such research to be financed partly by industries, as is done in several other countries and partly by Government.

The final point that I am making is this. Even with regard to the scheme of the Bill, the functions of the institution and the governing body—all these clauses will require careful scrutiny. But the basic material for the formation of the institution is there. I would, therefore appeal to the Government that, as the hon. Member has said, consistent with our national sentiment and national dignity, there

has got to be a complete reorganisation.

I should like to know the views of the Government. I want to know whether they intend to bring in a Bill. And if that is so, there is no harm in their upbringing one. If the Government does it, I am sure it will be a monumental measure. Not only that, it will serve as a landmark from where you will find that our technical and engineering skill will emerge and be placed on a firm foundation.

My appeal, therefore, would be to treat this Bill as a basis and accept the principles of it even though the Government may not accept the Bill in all its details.

श्री श्री नारायण दास (हरमगा) :
सभापति महोदय, श्री माननीय सदस्य श्री मोरे जी ने सभा के सामने जो प्रस्ताव रखा है उसका तो मैं समर्थन नहीं कर सकता, लेकिन इस बिल के पीछे जो सिद्धान्त है उसका मैं पूरे तौर से समर्थन करता हूँ।

भाज की अवस्था में इजिनियरिंग के विषय का बहुत जबरदस्त स्थान है। समाज के जीवन में और राष्ट्र के जीवन में इसकी आवश्यकता दिनोदिन बढ़ती ही जा रही है। यह कोई साधारण ज्ञान नहीं है कि जिसकी कोई समाज उपेक्षा कर सकता है। इजिनियरिंग का जो पेशा है वह भी बहुत महत्वपूर्ण है और इस व्यवसाय की शिक्षा के नियमन के लिए, इस पेशे के व्यवहार के नियमन के लिए और इन सभ्य में पवित्रता बनाये रखने के लिए या उस व्यवसाय में पवित्रता बनाये रखने के लिए इस बात की जरूरत है कि इसमें जितने काम करने वाले लोग हैं, या उसके जितने विशेषज्ञ हैं, उन लोगों का एक सस्था हो जो बिना किसी सरकारी दबाव के और बिना सरकारी दस्तन्दाजी के अपने पेशे को शिक्षा का नियमन करे।

वह तो साधारण ही बात है कि जिस विषय का जिसको अधिक ज्ञान रहता है उस

नियमन और उसका संचालन वह ज्यादा अच्छी तरह से कर सकता है। आज हम देखते हैं कि सरकार का कार्यक्षेत्र दिनों दिन बढ़ता जा रहा है। और जीवन के विभिन्न अंशों में उस कार्य का नियमन करने के लिए हम यहां और राज्यों में सरकार को अधिकार दे रहे हैं। विभिन्न कामों के संचालन के लिए, उनके नियमन के लिए और उनमें अनुशासन कायम रखने के लिए हम सरकार को अधिकार दे रहे हैं। लेकिन यह कोई स्वास्थ्य बर्बक धारा नहीं है स्वास्थ्यबर्बक धारा तो यह है जैसे हमने उच्च शिक्षा के नियमन के लिए पार्लियामेंट के जरिये से या विधान सभाओं के जरिये से विश्वविद्यालयों का निर्माण किया लेकिन उनके काम को चलाने के लिए उन लोगों को ही रहने दिया जो कि शिक्षा के विशेषज्ञ हैं या जो उस में काम करने वाले लोग हैं। उस काम का संचालन करने का भार उनको ही दिया यह बात सही है कि सरकार का भी उस में कुछ थोड़ा सा नियमन रहता है।

पंडित गोविन्द आलबीय (सुल्तानपुर)
इस देश में नहीं।

श्री भीनारायण बासू : लेकिन यदि अधिक से अधिक अधिकार और उत्तरदायित्व, जहां तक हम दे सकें, अगर उस पेशे के विशेषज्ञों, काम करने वाले लोगों, उस पेशे को चलाने वाले लोगों को दिए जा सकें, तो वह भागे के लिए स्वास्थ्य-बर्बक होता है एक हैल्दी साइन होता है। इसके आचार पर हम न यूनिवर्सिटीज का कानून बनाया है। इसी तरह हम ने दूसरे संस्थान बनाए हैं। बार एसोसियेशनज का काम हमने ऐसे संस्थान को दे रखा है और चार्टर्ड एकाउंटेंट्स के लिए एक संस्थान बन चुका है। अभी कास्ट एकाउंटेंट्स का जिस हमारे सामने आने वाला है। इन सब में हमने ज्ञान के बर्द्धन के लिए, व्यवसाय के नियमन और संचालन के लिए संस्थाओं का निर्माण किया है। हम यह नहीं समझते हैं कि इस में कोई विरोध की

बात है कि इंजीनियरिंग की शिक्षा के लिए और उस व्यवसाय के संचालन, नियमन और नियंत्रण के लिए अगर एक संस्थान का निर्माण किया जाये, तो देश के लिए अच्छा होगा; न केवल देश के लिए अच्छा होगा, वरन् देश की विभिन्न प्रकार की शिक्षा के संचालन के लिए, उस शिक्षा के सम्बन्ध में होने वाली परीक्षाओं के संचालन के लिए, पेशे में लगे हुए लोगों के भाचरण और कार्यवाहियों का नियमन करने के लिए और उन के ज्ञान-वर्द्धन के लिए अगर एक संस्था होगी, तो वह इन सब विभागों का को आइनेशन कर के उस काम को बहुत भागे बढ़ायेगा। इसी लिए इस विधेयक के पीछे जो उद्देश्य है, जो कि माननीय सदस्य ने सदन के सामने रखा है, वह उद्देश्य समर्थन करने लायक है। हम समझते हैं कि सरकार को इस पर सहानुभूतिपूर्वक विचार करना चाहिए। लेकिन हम अभी तक देखते आए हैं कि इस प्रकार के संस्थानों का निर्माण सरकारी विधेयकों के द्वारा होता आया है और अगर इस विषय में भी सरकार विभिन्न पहलुओं का ब्याल कर के, पूरे तौर पर विचार कर के, अगर बिल का निर्माण करेगी, तो अच्छा होगा।

मे नहीं कह सकता कि इस विधेयक में जितने प्राविजन्ड है, उन को मैं ने पढ़ा है, लेकिन जितना मैं पढ़ पाया हूं, मैं समझता हूं कि इसमें खामियां हैं। अगर सरकारी विधेयक आए, तो वे खामियां दूर हो जायेंगी और वह इस सदन के लिए भी मन्जूर करने लायक हो जायेगा। इस विधेयक के पीछे जो सिद्धान्त हैं, उन को सरकार मानेगी, ऐसा मेरा ब्याल है। हम तो मानते हैं और उस में कोई शक नहीं है। लेकिन अगर सरकार बिल लाए, तो वह बिल भी अगर समिति को सौंपा ही जायगा। जब कभी सरकार जल्दी से जल्दी इस प्रकार के बिल को लाए, तो इस बिल को भी उसी प्रकार समिति के सुपुर्व किया जाना चाहिए। अभी ०० मोशन रखा गया है, यद्यपि में उस का समर्थन नहीं

[श्री. श्रीनारायण दास]

कर सकता, लेकिन जैसा कि माननीय सदस्य ने कहा है, इस प्रकार के संस्थान के निर्माण के लिए सरकार की तरफ से धामदार बनाना चाहिए और सरकार जल्द से जल्द इस के सम्बन्ध में पूरा विचार कर के सदन के सामने इस तरह का बिल लाए और मैं उस का स्वागत करूँगा ? इन शब्दों के साथ मैं इस बिल के पीछे जो सिद्धांत हैं, उन का मैं समर्थन करता हूँ ।

The Minister of Scientific Research and Cultural Affairs (Shri Humayan Kabir): Sir, while I have every sympathy with the purpose which has prompted my hon. friend, Shri Goray, to move this Bill, I regret I cannot accept this Bill in its present form and must oppose it, not because it has been moved by a member of the Opposition, as he said, but, as I hope to show, for certain reasons intrinsic to the nature of the Bill and for certain other reasons arising out of the situation in which we are in the country today. I feel sure that when he has heard the full statement about the position, he will himself agree that the Bill, instead of helping, may hinder the object which he and I have in common.

I need not go into the history of the Institution of Engineers, which was established in 1920 and given a Royal Charter in 1935. I would agree with him about its work and I would like to pay a tribute to the institution for the very fine work it has done and is doing. I think my hon. friend Shri Bharucha, was a little less than fair to the institution when he said that it did not encourage research and might develop its activities further in that direction. However, after India became free, this institution approached the Government of India in March, 1950 and said that it wished to surrender its Royal Charter, as this was not in keeping with the present status of the country. The institution requested that it should be given, in lieu of the Charter, statutory status by an enactment of Parliament.

My hon. friend, Shri Bharucha, referred to the difficulties which the institution is facing. In fact, it is not facing any difficulties at all. I have seen the opinion which the institution had obtained from the Attorney-General. The Charter has the force of law and only in regard to certain by-laws they have had certain difficulties, which also they have been able to overcome. In any case, if they surrender the Royal Charter they would immediately be governed by the Societies Registration Act in terms of which they had been registered before this Charter was obtained. I think there is really no reason to connect the surrender of the Charter and the enactment, but we should judge actually what is needed for the country.

The Government of India, however, was in sympathy and in December, 1951, accepted in principle that a Bill might be introduced to give statutory recognition to this body. When the draft Bill was being prepared, before it reached its final stage, our legal advisers pointed out that the surrender of the Royal Charter could not by itself be regarded as sufficient justification for an enactment and conferment of statutory status by Parliament. It was then held that the Bill would be justified only if certain exclusive functions were assigned to this institution and this could be done by a statute. No such function could be allotted to the institution and that proposal, therefore, did not proceed any further.

About this time, there was an independent proposal made about the compulsory registration of engineers in the country. A draft Bill with this object was prepared by the Ministry of Works, Housing and Supply and was referred to the All-India Council for Technical Education. The Council held that in the existing situation in the country, such compulsory registration was not necessary and might, in fact, be harmful. The Institution of Engineers, to whom also the question was referred, had at first sug-

ported the proposal for compulsory registration and had suggested that this work may be allotted to the institution. But when it was pointed out to them that the two questions need not be mixed up—the question of Parliamentary enactment and the question of compulsory registration—the institution itself came to the same conclusion as the All-India Council for Technical Education.

In November, 1955, the institution again approached the Government from a slightly different point of view. They asked that it might be recognised as an institution of national importance and the Ministry of Law agreed that this could be done without assigning any functions whatever. But you, Sir, can yourself judge whether it is necessary to have a parliamentary statute just for the sake of recognising an institution as one of national importance, or whether Parliament should give such status only when certain specific requirements are met.

It, further, became clear that such enactment would lead to certain complications, as the Institution of Engineers is not the only engineering society in this country, nor does it represent fully and exclusively the various branches of engineering like civil engineering, mechanical engineering, electrical engineering, tele-communication engineering, chemical engineering, metallurgy, mining engineering and aeronautical engineering. There are other bodies like the Institution of Chemical Engineers, Institution of Tele-communication Engineers and certain other bodies—I can give a long list of them—who are also doing very good work. They are recognised scientific and professional bodies. While the Institution of Engineers may be the largest and oldest, these bodies also have certain claims to our recognition.

Shri Goray: Are they all registered?

Shri Muzayam Kabir: I cannot speak for every one of them, but most of them are registered and they have a definite professional and scientific status in the country. Some of them

are also recognised outside the country. We found that there was a possibility that there may be conflict between these organisations and the Institution of Engineers in India if the latter alone was given statutory recognition for the whole field of engineering. It was, and is, however, recognised that there should be co-ordination between these organisations by the establishment of a central body for the whole field of engineering.

The Institution of Engineers has recognised this fact and successive Presidents have urged that a scheme may be formulated for bringing together all the engineering organisations into a common fold. They have also agreed that one central body should be incorporated by an Act of Parliament for co-ordinated promotion and development of all branches of engineering on a national level. And since the Institution of Engineers have themselves agreed that there should be one co-ordinated body, I think it would defeat our purpose, and perhaps put the day off, if there be any attempt to give that institution itself such parallel recognition.

We in the Ministry requested the Institution of Engineers to take the initiative in the matter, discuss with the other bodies and put up agreed proposals. A conference was held in August, 1957, in which all the engineering organisations, including the Institute of Engineers, participated. But they could not come to any final agreement on the various issues; some of them remain unsettled. In October, 1957 the Institution of Engineers requested that the Central Government should take the initiative for convening a conference of all engineering organisations in the country. This was done after some preliminary negotiations and a conference was actually held on the 26th of June 1958. In this conference agreement was, for the first time, reached and all the organisations agreed that a national organisation for the engineering profession as a whole may be set

[Shri Humayun Kabir]

up by an Act of Parliament and that the Central Government should formulate a detailed scheme for the purpose.

I wish to refer to three of the major recommendations of this conference, because I am sure that it would convince my hon. friend, Shri Goray, that his present Bill may defeat the object which he himself has in view. It was agreed at this Conference that there is need for a national organisation for the engineering profession as a whole. That is first recommendation. Secondly, the national organisation should not supplant the existing professional societies functioning in the country for the various branches of engineering but should bring them together into a common fold for co-ordination of activity. Thirdly, the national organisation should entrust specific branches of engineering to existing suitable societies for their advancement and should not initiate parallel activity in these respective branches.

In view of all this, it is clear that the Central Government is as anxious as my hon. friends, both on this side of the House, and the other to set up by an Act of Parliament a Central engineering organisation which will not only give the much-needed status to engineering societies functioning in the country but also bring about co-ordinated development of engineering sciences and profession in all its aspects. The result of the last conference encourages the hope that soon an agreement will be reached between all the existing organisations, and I have been pressing that this agreement should be reached as quickly as possible so that Government can take necessary action in the matter and bring forward its own comprehensive Bill on the whole subject.

In view of this, I am sure my hon. friend will not press his Bill, as it is likely to negate the efforts made by Government to bring together the different engineering organisations, because some of the other organisations may become suspicious and they may

resile from the agreement to which they have already arrived. I may also point out that some of the provisions in the draft Bill are objectionable. I am grateful to Shri Bharucha for pointing out some of the defects. There are some other defects of a very serious nature, which make it difficult for the Government to accept the present Bill even as a basis. There will have to be a fairly radical reconstruction of the before it can be a Government Bill. Some of its provisions cut across the authority of universities, State Governments and Central Government and other organisations in respect of establishment, maintenance and running of technical institutions.

I do not wish to go into the details, but I would point out that clause 4(e) cuts across the authority not only of the universities, State Governments and the Central Government but also of the University Grants Commission set up by an Act of Parliament. In fact, I have grave doubts that clauses 4(e), 4(f) and 4(i) may contravene some of the provisions of the Constitution itself. The same objections would apply to clause 10(1), 11(e), 11(h) and 14(1). In fact, clause 14(1) would tend to undo all the work that has been done till now in bringing together the different engineering organisations and is likely to retard progress by creating fresh suspicions in the minds of all other organisations.

In these circumstances, I would request my hon. friend to withdraw his Bill. But on behalf of the Government I would give an assurance that as soon as agreement is reached between the different bodies, on the basis of the conclusions of the conference of June 1958—and substantial agreement was reached and only a few details had to be settled—Government will themselves bring forward a Bill to set up a central national engineering organisation.

Shri Goray: I am happy that the hon. Minister has given a categorical assurance that on the basis of the

agreement that was reached last year they are thinking of having an enactment of Parliament as soon as possible. Some of the things that he said are not correct.

He said that the Bill in its present form is likely to harm the interests of the institution and create some suspicion in the minds of the engineering institutions which belong to different categories. I would only point out that though there are other categories of engineers, many of them are members of this institution also. For instance, there is the Institution of Tele-Communication Engineers, and the Chairman of that particular branch of engineering is a member, and a very prominent member too, of this institution also. The other instance that I would like to point out is that of the Chairman of the Aeronautical Engineering Section, Dr. Ghatge, who is also a prominent member of this institution. I would not like to go on giving these instances. But what I wanted to say was that so far as this particular institution was concerned, the different engineering branches have been well represented and there is some sort of interlocking arrangement between this institution and the institutions that are being separately run. Therefore, there should not be any suspicion.

What I want the Government to do is to take an active role in bringing these categories of institution together, because it is accepted that such an institution is necessary. Whether you give a charter to the existing institution or not, I am not bothered about it. But if you want to have a national institution as the hon. Minister was kind enough to point out, then necessary steps should be taken early. I am quite sure that the Institute of Engineers, which has a right of Charter just now, will be very happy to surrender its charter and to pool its resources and its knowledge with the other categories of engineers.

In view of the very categorical assurance given to the House by the hon. Minister, I withdraw the Bill.

Mr. Chairman: Does the hon. Member have the permission of the House to withdraw the Bill?

Some hon. Members: Yes.

The Bill was, by leave, withdrawn.

15 28 hrs.

EQUAL REMUNERATION BILL

Mr. Chairman: The House will now take up the consideration of the Equal Remuneration Bill.

Shrimati Renu Chakravarty (Basirhat): I beg to move:

"That the Bill to introduce equal pay for equal work for women workers be circulated for the purpose of eliciting opinion thereon by the 30th September, 1959."

I am sorry that neither of the Ministers in charge of Labour and Employment are present in the House.

The Minister of Scientific Research and Cultural Affairs (Shri Humayun Kabir): I may say that for the time being I am looking after this Bill.

Shrimati Renu Chakravarty: Thank you very much. It shows....

The Minister of Parliamentary Affairs (Shri Satya Narayan Shaha): I did not foresee.

Shrimati Renu Chakravarty: Now I am a little more frightened, because I thought that at least some more serious consideration would be given to this matter....

Shri Humayun Kabir: I may humbly submit that this is an uncharitable and undeserving reflection.

The Minister of Parliamentary Affairs (Shri Satya Narayan Shaha): The Minister concerned is on his way.