

THE UNIVERSITY GRANTS COMMISSION (AMENDMENT) BILL

1968—Continued

SHRI M. RUTHNASWAMY (Madras): When I looked at this new University Commission Bill I recognised from its features that it was an old friend of ours, and I was wondering why a Bill that had been passed by our House came to us again. But the mystery was solved yesterday when Mr. Chagla informed us that it had to come back to us because the other House had been dissolved. And our old friend, this Bill, has been thrown out as a result. So it has come to us as a refugee and we have to rehabilitate it. We have been used for some time to dealing with refugees and rehabilitation. So this second presentation of this Bill does not offer much difficulty. But it is a mixed gruel that the Minister has offered us, and he should not be surprised if it gets a mixed reception, and there are some good features in the Bill like the one prohibiting sitting Vice-Chancellors from being appointed as members of the Commission. It is a very sound rule because, as Mr. Chagla pointed out, people who are interested in getting grants from Government should not be on the University Grants Committee. It was an old suggestion, one of the suggestions I made in probably my first speech on the University Grants Commission, and I am glad that after some time it has been adopted. But there are other unwelcome features in the Bill. For instance, the number of members of the Commission has been raised from nine to twelve. This asking for more is a very common feature of our administrative departments. The Deputy Chairman and Members of this House are familiar with a common disease of modern civilisation. I hope they are familiar with it not from actual experience but from academic knowledge on the subject, and that is the disease of duodenal ulcer. One of the treatments suggested by doctors for this disease is to feed the beast that is to say whenever the patients who suffer from duodenal ulcer feel any pain they are asked to eat something so as to stop that pain. Now that is the disease from which our administration seems to suffer. They always ask for more and more posts in their offices and unfortunately the Ministry of Education has also fallen a victim to this disease. But while they increase the number from 9 to 12 they have reduced the number of whole-time members. Only three are whole-time members while nine are to be part-time. In consideration of the important work entrusted to the University Grants Commission which is supervision of

the whole of the university education I think three whole-time members are not enough. There is a variety of work to be done; there are so many sections of work to be done. The chief sections, if I may point out, are finance, courses of study, student's problems, teacher's problems etc. Each of these requires a whole-time member for the consideration and solution of the difficulties. If necessary periodically consultant members may be chosen for the consideration of any special subject that may crop up but we must have a corps of a certain number of whole-time members who would be able to perform the duties of the University Grants Commission and do justice to the work.

Another unfortunate feature of the composition of the University Grants Commission is the presence of two Government members. The first question that I would ask is, are these two Government members to be out of the three permanent members or out of the nine temporary members? And I question the whole policy of having Government members on the University Grants Commission. The University Grants Commission is an academic body charged with the duty of academic supervision over university matters. What on earth have persons in Government service got to do with it? It may be argued that the Government members are to be members of the University Grants Commission because they would represent the Government point of view, especially in financial matters. But the University Grants Commission has certain money allotted to it and they are entrusted with the duty of distributing that money in the shape of grants to universities according to the needs of universities and there is a danger that would grow from the presence of the Government members. They would present the Government point of view and they would say that so much money is all that the Government can spare, that the Commission cannot have anything more, that the Commission cannot have money for this or for that or for any special need of universities and the decision of the University Grants Commission would thus be prejudiced by the presence and activity and arguments of these Government members. In the English University Grants Commission there are no Government members present. It is a purely academic body which gives advice. It has financial powers and it advises the Treasury on the amount and nature of grants to be given.

In spite of all these unwelcome and unfortunate features of the Bill it is a Bill

[Shri M. Ruthnaswamy]

that deserves to be passed by this House and by the other House but while wishing it Godspeed, although this is not the occasion when I should discuss the working of the University Grants Commission, I hope the Minister will give us an opportunity in the future of discussing the latest Report of the University Grants Commission. It is some time since we had an opportunity of discussing the University Grants Commission but I should like to say before that opportunity occurs that the University Grants Commission when it is constituted should pay attention to some of the chief problems which concern universities and university administrators.

First of all, the autonomy of these universities should be protected even from the University Grants Commission. The University Grants Commission is charged with the duty of allotting moneys to the universities and in allotting that money the Commission should take care not to press its views or the views of the Government upon the universities. They should not dictate to the universities in what language they should teach or what should be the medium of examination, etc. All this should be left entirely to the universities. It is only thus that the autonomy of the universities can be maintained. Education especially is an experimental process and each university must be allowed to develop according to its own ideas, according to the ideas of its own academic bodies; it should not be dictated to by Government Departments.

And in this connection I should like to deal with the arguments of the former Minister of Education, Mr. Chagla, when he contended that university education and education in general should be a concurrent subject. It was for good and sufficient reasons that the makers of our Constitution made education primarily and principally the concern of State Governments. As I said only a little while ago, education especially is an experimental process and each State should be allowed to develop its educational system, its educational processes, according to the needs of the State, according to the needs of the people of the State. In every federal system education is a local subject because it is very intimately concerned with the welfare of the people of the different States and it should be a State subject. It may be argued that after all education is sought to be made only a concurrent subject but in respect of a concurrent subject upon which the Central Government has power to legislate it would be acting like a big brother towards

a small brother and especially as the financial resources of the Central Government are much greater than and superior those of the State Governments there is always the danger of the views and ideas of the Central Government being forced down the throats of the State Governments. It would be a dangerous thing for the State to allow education to be concurrent subject and I am glad that all the States have instinctively felt that it would be a great erosion into their powers as autonomous members of the Union to make education a concurrent subject.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN (Andhra Pradesh) : But would you not like that there should be some uniform standard in education throughout the country to inculcate the national spirit?

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL (Gujarat) : Uniformity is certainly not regimentation.

SHRI M. RUTHNASWAMY : Certainly, there should be a uniform national policy, but it should be evolved; it should come from the various parts of the country by discussion: by deliberation, by communication between the States. There should be a national policy evolved and not imposed upon the States by the Central Government.

Another important duty with which the University Grants Commission is entrusted is raising the standard, not only maintaining the standard of university education. But the standards must be maintained not after the students are admitted to the universities but at the time of the admission of the students. What has the University Grants Commission done so far to stiffen and to improve the standards of education? We find in every university the number of students admitted every year are going up by leaps and bounds and that is why there is so much unemployment among the graduates of the country. The concern of the University Grants Commission should be not only at the time when the students are admitted to the universities but even before that. Why are students flocking in such large numbers to universities?
1 P. M. It is because they have no other avenue of education. They have no other way of getting training for their livelihood. There are not enough subordinate technical schools and technical institutions. There are no institutions where

students who are not fit for university education, who have not the aptitude or who have not the intellectual equipment for university education, could be siphoned off into these middle and higher technical schools. The Government and the University Grants Commission should attack this problem at the source and not when problems have been created within the university.

There are such things like this. The University Grants Commission should supplement the educational work and the educational expenditure of the State Governments. There are certain branches of education like adult education, which receives a step-motherly treatment at the hands of the States. We cannot wait for all the children of the nation to become literate in fifteen to twenty years to make the present-day adults literate. That should be one of the aims of the University Grants Commission, *viz.*, giving aid to these things.

Then, the social work and service done at the universities also should be aided by the University Grants Commission. Students take to all kinds of undesirable activities because there is not enough work for them. They have not only not enough academic work, but also they have not enough social service outlets. That also is a branch of work and education which the University Grants Commission should attend to.

With these remarks, Madam Deputy Chairman, I will commend the Bill. In spite of all its deficiencies and defects, it is a Bill which has to be passed and I hope, while wishing it godspeed, they will take up the suggestions that I have made. Especially the University Grants Commission should adopt the portfolio system. Each whole-time member should have some subject allotted to him, so that he can go and inspect the universities and university colleges from time to time. There should be one annual inspection undertaken by each of these members, entrusted with finance, with amenities for students, their comforts and conveniences, especially the hostels of students which are crying slums at the present moment. They are not hostels; they are academic slums. So, you should have a full-time member looking into each of these aspects of university education. With these improvements in the working of the University Grants Commission and the work that is contemplated for the Commission, I commend this Bill.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: To facilitate work on Government Bills, we shall cut down our recess by half an hour. So, the House will reassemble at

The House then adjourned
2. P.M. for lunch at four minutes past one of the clock.

The House reassembled after lunch at two of the clock, **THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA)** in the Chair.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M.P. BHARGAVA): Before I call the next speaker, may I request the hon. Members to restrict their remarks to ten minutes as I have got a very large list before me. Mr. Vaishampayan.

SHRI S. K. VAISHAMPAYEN (Maharashtra): Mr. Vice-Chairman, I rise to give my full support to this measure even though in certain respects I am not fully satisfied with some of its provisions. I hope that this House will give its unanimous support to a measure which is necessary from the point of view of higher education.

Education in India is an ill-fated subject. It is uncared for. With all the good intentions it is confronted with one difficulty or another. As has been pointed out earlier, this measure was to come up before this House two years before, but it lapsed and today it is before us after a delay of about two years. I hope this measure will not be delayed any further.

The hon. Education Minister has in his introductory observations explained in a very precise manner the aims and objects behind this Bill. I am in full agreement with those aims and objects. But this Bill needs to be viewed from the background of the expansion that has taken place in the field of higher education. My hon. friend there, Mr. Mulka Govinda Reddy, had yesterday quoted certain figures. I think we must keep before us this background of the expansion that has taken place in the field of university education. I do not want to add to the figures that have been quoted by him, but I would like to pinpoint certain other facets of higher education which from my point of view are very necessary to be understood and from that point of view this Bill should be viewed. Today from

[Shri S. K. Vaishampayan]

the reports that are there of the University Grants Commission, what I find is that 10 to 15 per cent of the universities are in semi-urban areas; more than 50 per cent of the colleges are almost in the rural areas. Out of the 2056 colleges in 1965, 922 colleges are there which have an enrolment of students below 300. That means about 44.8 per cent of the total number of colleges are below the subsistence level; it is necessary that there should be a minimum number of students in each college so that the college becomes self-sufficient. I do not think 300 or less is a number which will give that self-sufficiency to a college. Out of the total of 2,360 colleges in 1965, 1,686 colleges are under private management which forms 72 per cent of the total, with all the advantages and disadvantages, vagaries and good and bad practices which are attached with private management.

In this connection my friend there had pointed out to the capitation fee that is being charged in private medical colleges. Today there is a news in the papers that some sort of donation is being collected in some Punjab college for admission of students. An enquiry has been instituted by the Vice-Chancellor there. We are hearing about 'pagries' being taken when we have got to get some house in a big place like Bombay or Delhi, but this 'pagri' is there even for appointment as teachers in certain colleges.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN : Really?

SHRI S. K. VAISHAMPAYEN : This is a fact which has come to my notice. There are then favouritism, parochialism and other things that accompany all these private managements.

The enrolment in science, medical and engineering colleges has almost come on par, I will say, one per cent more than in arts. Today the figure is that 41.7 per cent of the total enrolment of students is in science, engineering and medical colleges, and 40.9 per cent of the total enrolment is in arts faculty. This is a fact which is to be noted. I am giving all these facets of higher education in order to pinpoint the huge task the University Grants Commission has to face. The University Grants Commission has been facing this situation for the last decade. It has done a very excellent work up till now. I do agree and I join the hon. Member, Shri Chagla, in paying tribute to the work that the University Grants Commission is doing. At the same

time looking at the expansion that has taken place, looking at the various facets of higher education which I have pinpointed, it is necessary that this University Grants Commission should be further strengthened. They must be given more powers. That is exactly what the Sapru Committee has suggested in the report. This is exactly what the Bill is aiming at.

Therefore, Mr. Vice-Chairman, I feel that this Bill is a necessary measure. Though there has been a delay due to the lapse that has taken place in drafting the Bill, the Government has the benefit of even the recommendations of the Kothari Commission report before them, and therefore this Bill has been drafted or has been prepared and brought before Parliament after careful consideration, even though in certain respects I myself feel not very much satisfied. There are certain very basic features which should have been incorporated and considered by the Government. One feature which has been referred to here yesterday was about making Education a concurrent subject. I think this is a subject on which we should try to think more seriously now and we should see that at least Education is made a concurrent subject. If I have to quote, I will only take the time of the House. I will only submit that the Radhakrishnan Commission which went into the various phases of university education has recommended that Education should be made a concurrent subject. The Sampurnanand Commission has also recommended in the interests of national integration that Education should be made a concurrent subject. Now, similarly, the Sapru Committee also, looking to the larger responsibilities that there are with the Government and the University Grants Commission, said that it is desirable that this education should also be made a concurrent subject.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA): The Sapru Committee has recommended that university education should be made a concurrent subject, not the whole education.

SHRI S. K. VAISHAMPAYEN : I agree there, it is the higher education that is suggested, it is not in general. But this Bill does not seem to take note of this very important recommendation. Therefore I feel that the hon. Education Minister should consider as to how we can bring the States to this point of view and see that

at least higher education as recommended by the Sapru Committee is made a concurrent subject.

Secondly, there is another recommendation which is of a very basic character and that is the recommendation about taking an integrated view, a total view, of higher education as such. We know that higher education means the faculty of art, the faculty of commerce, the faculty of law, the faculty of engineering, the faculty of medicine, etc. All these faculties should be brought under one jurisdiction. The Sapru Committee has recommended that the University Grants Commission must have jurisdiction even on the faculties of medicine, engineering, law, etc. But this has not been done. This Bill does not bring about that jurisdiction which is necessary according to this recommendation.

The third thing which is a recommendation from the Kothari Commission is about the administration and management of these universities. Certainly we should see that the autonomy of the universities is maintained. But at the same time, because of the autonomous character of the universities, it is becoming rather a sort of stagnant affair in some of the universities. There is need for some dynamic techniques to be developed within the universities. Therefore, the Kothari Commission has suggested that there is need for dynamic techniques of management and organisation. Up to now, as far as my knowledge goes, the University Grants Commission has been merely helping the development of the universities; that is, in the academic part of the universities. It has not actually gone into it, or it might have gone to a certain extent. But it has not gone to the extent that is necessary today. Universities have grown in number, there are about 62 or 64 in the country. They have their own administration and management and their own problems. It is necessary in the interests of higher education, that this particular aspect of university education should be taken note of and something should be done with regard to the administration and management of the universities.

I will make a few observations with regard to certain features of this Bill. This Bill envisages the enlargement of the University Grants Commission. But in doing so, it has done well to see that the serving Vice-Chancellors are not made members of this Commission. But at the same time it has proposed that the various interests are there, persons from different walks of life with experience in industry, in agriculture and in the field of education, that

they are brought in. But I am afraid, in making a proposal of that kind, those who are intimately associated with the university's affairs, namely, the professors and the teachers in the university may not be included in this composition. Therefore, I feel that it is one of the deficiencies. I am not saying that they will be excluded... (Interruptions) ... I am suggesting that professors and teachers of the university who are really connected with it should be in the composition that has been suggested. I am afraid that those who are very intimately associated and connected with the university teaching, research and other things may not find a place in—one or two may find a place, a few more may find a place—or may not be associated with the University Grants Commission.

Then, a new feature of this Bill is, Sir, previously the University Grants Commission was not giving grants at all for the maintenance of non-Central universities. Now, the Bill provides that maintenance grants should be given even to non-Central universities. In this connection, I only wish to submit for the consideration of the hon. Minister of Education that he should see that special care and attention are given to the universities and institutions in areas which are backward. This should be a matter of policy for the Ministry of Education that in the interests of the advancement of higher education in areas which are determined as backward, special care and attention should be given by the University Grants Commission to see that the institutions and the universities in these areas come up to the level of those which are in the advanced areas.

With these observations, I think it is high time that we see that this Bill is passed and no more delay is there. I give my support to the Bill.

DR. BHAI MAHAVIR (Delhi) : Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, as I stand to speak on the University Grants Commission (Amendment) Bill, I do not find much to disagree about in the Bill as it exists. The hon. Education Minister while presenting the Bill explained the reasons which have led him to provide for a larger membership of the University Grants Commission. And he said that the greater responsibilities qualified for a larger membership. My feeling is that there is no direct and necessary relationship between a larger membership and greater output in the form of work. It may be that large bodies do precious little work and small bodies are able to put in or produce much more valuable work in

[Dr. Bhai Mahavir]

dimension and size also. But anyway, if he has felt that in that body as it exists the present membership is too small, we should welcome the proposal to enlarge it in order to enable it to cope with the work which it is supposed to shoulder. But when I come to think of this, I feel that the mere passing of a Bill to enable a larger University Grants Commission to be set up will not be a sufficient step. If that were to be sufficient, merely passing a law would suffice, and we might as well pass a law that there will be no uneducated person or that everybody must be an intelligent person. And by merely passing a law, we might be able to think or hope that everybody would become intelligent. Just as that is not the case or cannot be the case, similarly here also, I am afraid, and I would like to make one or two observations, and I would suggest how the University Grants Commission should function in order that it becomes a more effective medium for moulding the future generations of this land.

The University Grants Commission is the agency through which the Ministry of Education functions and that is the agency which guides and controls the universities of the country as also the institutions which are to be deemed to be universities. I do not know how a distinction is made between the two. But in any case what I would suggest is that there are many avenues of exploration and research over which the authorities of the University Grants Commission would do well to ponder and see if the role which the University Grants Commission is expected to play is being played effectively enough. I would suggest one or two things to the hon. Education Minister in this connection. For example, yesterday it was mentioned here that for the purpose of admission some capitation fee or something else is demanded of the students. And another friend yesterday was mentioning to me that in Kanpur itself, a particular college or a particular individual charges something like Rs. 2,000 for a seat in the M.Sc. class. If that is so, well, it is certainly something to be looked into. Not only that, I know of a case ...

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN : Is it a private college?

DR. BHAI MAHAVIR : Well, private means not Government colleges; but it is recognised, of course.

I would say that there are numerous instances of under-payment to the staff. Where

payment is concerned, a lesser amount is paid to them and a receipt is obtained for a higher amount. It is expected that the balance is taken to be a sort of donation, a compulsory donation one may call it. They are being compelled to voluntarily donate a part of their salary to the institution. I remember another case. A friend, who is a retired Principal, narrated a story to me. He appointed a particular Lecturer and gave him an appointment letter. The Lecturer asked him if should also give him a resignation letter. He was stunned and asked what did he mean by that. He said that in the previous college where he was serving as soon as he joined and got an appointment letter the authorities asked him to give an ante-dated letter of resignation also which they said would become effective at the end of the academic year when the summer vacations would start because after the summer vacations a fresh appointment is given. He said that persons who were appointed were to serve till the end of the term when they were asked to fend for themselves. Where such things are happening, I suppose there is plenty for the U.G.C. and the educational authorities in this country to do.

Coming to Delhi itself, I would not like to go into the details of it. But I would like the hon. Education Minister to study the educational affairs of Delhi itself. Here the University made an experiment and split up the B.A. Pass examination into two parts. This was the first year. But soon after the results were declared certain things happened and the students who had been declared failures, through one enactment they were promoted to the next class. As a result of this most colleges in Delhi are facing a straight and direct challenge from the students. If the University permits boys who have failed in the University examinations, without rhyme or reasons, how can any college afford to declare a student in the previous class a failure? This question is coming. I do not want to go into the pros and cons. I do not want to go into the merits of the case. But what I am suggesting is here is an instance where I would suggest the U.G.C. to take active interest and to find out what is at the root of such a situation because if this thing starts in Delhi there is no reason to hope that it will be confined to Delhi; it will spread to other cities and to other Universities and we do not know where it will end up.

There is another instance from Delhi itself. This year at the time of admissions—

it was no secret; it came out in the papers—something like a thousand students were denied admissions although they were eligible and fulfilled the required condition in science courses, and among them there were students who had secured as high as 62 or 63 per cent. marks. I had occasion to speak to the Education Minister on this subject and I suggested that he might appoint a committee to consider the question of admissions in Delhi from a long-range point of view to project the needs of Delhi's growing population, the boys and girls who are expected to come from schools, what their needs and requirements over the next five to ten years would be.

Sir, we talk of planning. We talk of progress. We talk of orderly development of the country. But from what we are doing it appears to me that there is very little of planning and we succeed only in making a mess of things.

Every year when admissions come there is a hue and cry. There are deputations. There are processions and various types of demonstrations. Boys come in large numbers as well as in small deputations and somehow we try to find a way of immediately tiding over the crisis which has come up. This repeats itself year after year. The U. G. C. is expected to look after the educational standards. The functions of the Commission have been spelled out in the Act. It is said that they will take—

“...all such steps as it may think fit for promotion and co-ordination of University education and for the determination and maintenance of standards of teaching, examination and research in Universities...”

Whereas the U. G. C. is expected to do all this, there is unrest among students and there are difficulties in colleges. Universities proceed on lines which do not contribute to a healthy or a proper academic life in the country. All these matters point to the need for a more effective functioning on the part of the U. G. C. I would suggest to the hon. Education Minister, therefore, to look at the problem from this angle because it is not merely an enlargement of the U. G. C. which will solve all problems. Problems will remain if nobody comes forward to tackle them.

I know of a case—I will not mention the University or the college; it is a Central

University, if I may be permitted to say so—where there were charges of misappropriation of funds to the tune of something like Rs. 15,000 or Rs. 20,000 just in one year. Now the position is that the Governing Body is going to bell the cat. The Governing Body is considered to be autonomous, therefore, the University will not intervene. The University is autonomous, therefore, the U. G. C. will not intervene and because the U.G.C. is autonomous, therefore, the Ministry of Education will not intervene. So there is rot at the bottom of this ladder and the authorities above either feel helpless or they find it very difficult to tackle such a serious challenge which should not be allowed to remain unchecked or uncorrected.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA) : Under clause 13 of the Act the U. G. C. can act.

DR. BHAI MAHAVIR : That is what I am suggesting to the hon'ble Education Minister. He can advise the U. G. C. to act rather than merely trying to have a larger membership.

So far as the provisions regarding disqualification of Vice-Chancellors are concerned, I suppose it is a healthy change and the people who are likely to have vested interests in getting larger grants for the Universities should not sit in judgment over the claims of their own Universities. This is certainly an improvement. But apart from that, as the education policy enunciated recently or the statement circulated by the Education Department shows there is need for moral and social education also. I think the moral and social education is something which has gone by default all these years because of some wrong emphasis or over-emphasis on what is considered to be secularism. Secularism is not something immoral. It is not something irreligious. Of course, we do not want religion to be taught ...

SHRI ARJUN ARORA (Uttar Pradesh) : Secularism is something very noble.

DR. BHAI MAHAVIR : Yes, it is something very noble.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA) : It is time, Dr. Mahavir, to wind.

DR. BHAI MAHAVIR : My submission is that true religion contains the essence of secularism.

SHRI A. P. CHATTERJEE (West Bengal) : What do you mean by true religion ?

DR. BHAI MAHAVIR : This is not the forum. But if you are an earnest seeker you can certainly find people who will be able to tell you what is true religion.

SHRI A. P. CHATTERJEE : Not here. You will find them in the Himalayas.

DR. BHAI MAHAVIR : No, You can find them in the plains itself. There are lots of things which you are yet to learn and this is one of them.

My submission, therefore, is that the U. G. C. should be advised to look to the needs of toning up the moral and social qualities of our education so that we are able to inculcate proper discipline, check the tendencies which are today spelling a danger to the very social fabric of our economy as well as of our educational standards. It is not long ago that we had student riots all over the country in various parts. It is something which should be heeded. It is not the effects but the causes which should be solved. There are things beyond this Bill which need proper attention, and I would urge the hon'ble Education Minister to pay proper attention to them and to see that the U. G. C. acts firmly, effectively and in the right direction.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA) : May I request that hon'ble Members again to try to restrict their remarks to ten minutes?

SHRI KRISHAN KANT (Haryana) : Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I am rather constrained that I cannot support this Bill. I feel this Bill will remain a black Bill in the name of Dr. Triguna Sen who has allowed education to rot. The very person who stands for bureaucracy, who must have seen in the Ministry of Education how the bureaucrats function, I think... *(Interruption by Shri A. P. Chatterjee)*... he is doing a positive disservice to education in India. Mr. Vice-Chairman, after going through all the trouble of scanning through the Education Commission report and getting the report through Parliament and the Cabinet he is bringing forward a Bill which might have been passed by the Rajya Sabha much earlier. This is a black day in the history of Indian education which will strengthen the top-heavy bureaucracy in education permanently.

AN HON. MEMBER : Will you vote against it ?

SHRI KRISHAN KANT : Yes, I have told my Whip; I do not know whether Dr. Triguna Sen's conscience allows him to go ahead with this Bill; at least my conscience, to be true to Indian education, does not allow me to vote for this Bill, for this clause 5 at least. The new section which is to be substituted for section 5 says :

"The Commission shall consist of—

(i) a Chairman, and

(ii) eleven other members, to be appointed by the Central Government."

Now I do not know whether it is correctly worded or not because it is not quite clear as to who will appoint the Chairman. The old provision in the Act says :

"The Central Government shall nominate a member of the Commission, not being an officer of the Central Government or of any State Government, to be the Chairman thereof."

Now, Dr. Triguna Sen, I am just asking you, how a man of education like you, who has served the cause of education ...

SHRI ARJUN ARORA : Please address the Chair.

SHRI KRISHAN KANT : I am addressing him through the Chair. How could he agree to this thing that an official of the Ministry of Education could be nominated Chairman? It was a very healthy provision in the old Act.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA) : Mr. Krishan Kant, will you please look towards me only ?

SHRI KRISHAN KANT : Yes, yes, Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, Mr. Ruthnaswamy will probably agree with me that this was a healthy provision, that "The Central Government shall nominate a member of the Commission, not being an officer of the Central Government or of any State Government, to be the Chairman thereof." Now the present amending Bill permits that any official of the Central Government or of a State Government can be nominated the Chairman of this Commission.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA : Or retired Government servants.

SHRI KRISHAN KANT : Anybody can be nominated. Therefore, I think the drafters of the original Act were wise enough to include this proviso. I do not know whether Dr. Triguna Sen can say that he agrees with this clause in the amending Bill. Does he not know how our Indian bureaucracy works and how the Ministries work? I am sure Dr. Triguna Sen himself will see the consequences later on. Now we have an eminent man like Dr. Kothari, of whom anybody in this country or in the world will be proud. He is an eminent scientist, a great educationist, and a man of great traditions and a man of great values who would bring enlightenment wherever he goes. But this new clause which you are substituting will bring in die-hard bureaucrats into the University Grants Commission. I do not know whether Dr. Triguna Sen, after leaving the Education Ministry, will see what he has done. I would appeal through you, Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, to Dr. Triguna Sen, to re-draft this clause, to refer the Bill to Select Committee and not go ahead with this in hurry. Otherwise, this will remain a black and bureaucratic day for Indian education, especially higher education in the country, and that, too, through the hands of Dr. Triguna Sen, who has devoted all his life to the cause of education.

Now, Mr. Vice-Chairman, the present clause in the amending Bill says about the composition of the Commission:

"The members shall be chosen as follows:—

(a) two members from among the officers of the Central Government to represent that Government ; and

(b) the remaining number from among—

(i) persons representing industry, commerce or agriculture,

(ii) persons representing legal, medical or other learned professions, or

(iii) persons who are educationists of repute or who have obtained high academic distinctions;"

Now it has become a fashion with us that we should have everybody. I think the University Grants Commission is going

to be a market place where things will be decided and not according to the views of persons whose have involvement with and commitment to education. I want to ask Dr. Triguna Sen whether he is satisfied with the clause as has been drafted in this Bill. I do not know when the Bill was drafted. Mr. Vice-Chairman, you were a member of the Sapru Committee and you will remember that the report of the Sapru Committee has given certain recommendations. Now it is stated in the Statement of Objects and Reasons in this Bill that the recommendations of the Sapru Committee are going to be implemented. Mr. Vice-Chairman, that is not correct. As my friend, Mr. Vaishampayan, has said, the main thing was higher education should be made a Concurrent Subject. That is not there in this Bill. They have accepted only one or two things mentioned in that report, e. g. Vice-Chancellors with vested interests should not be there. But on the pretext of implementing the recommendations of the Sapru Committee, they have added this clause for certain interests to be represented. I think some official in the Ministry—some official in the Law Ministry or some official in the Education Ministry—has put in this thing and they want us to accept it. And if through Dr. Triguna Sen it becomes part of the statute book, then it will remain a black day in the life of Dr. Triguna Sen and a black day for education in India. I will still appeal to him to reconsider it, re-draft it, send it to a Select Committee and correct this thing. I hope his conscience will not allow him to go ahead with the Bill as it is. Let him not be weighed down by official and other things. Let him come forward and say truthfully whether he agrees with it or not. Otherwise, let it go to a Select Committee. We can sit for about ten days and review the provisions of this Bill. We are prepared to sit for a day or two longer and pass it. The working of the University Grants Commission will not be stranded because some more officers are not there because some more members are not there.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA (Orissa) : Will you vote it down ?

SHRI KRISHAN KANT : I have told my Chief Whip and the Deputy Whip that I will not be true to my conscience in regard to Indian education if I vote for this clause.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA) : Please speak on the Bill

SHRI KRISHAN KANT : Yes, Sir; the hon. Member wanted to be enlightened about my stand and I am enlightening him.

SHRI M. M. DHARIA (Maharashtra) : He does not want to be enlightened. He only wants you to be surcharged.

SHRI KRISHAN KANT : Yes, I want to be surcharged on this clause.

SHRI SUNDAR SINGH BHANDARI (Rajasthan) : There is an amendment for referring it to a Select Committee. You support it.

SHRI KRISHAN KANT : Mr. Vice-Chairman, then in your report you have recommended that three members of the Commission shall be of the status of Vice-Chancellors. But it is not made clear in this Bill. And the way has been made clear for officers of the Education Ministry to be members of the University Grants Commission. I think that is not the correct approach. This means bureaucracy and officialdom is sneaking in through the backdoor. It will be a bad day if that happens.

Then in clause 4 of the amending Bill, it is said :

“Provided further that the Commission shall not give any grant to any University which is established after the commencement of the University Grants Commission (Amendment) Act, 1968, without the previous approval of the Commission and of the Central Government.”

It is a good clause that those universities which are not up to the standard should not be recognised and the University Grants Commission should not give grants to them. But we know that all universities are not established by an Act of Parliament. The State Governments are free to establish universities. So on this the clause is not very clear. Suppose an agricultural university is established by an Act of the State; agricultural universities are established by Acts of State Governments. They will go to the Ministry of Agriculture and get grants from there. Is there any check on that? There is no check. My friend, Prof. Nurul Hasan has given an amendment which clarifies this better, but still I am not satisfied; it does not give a very clear clarification of this matter.

About the provision regarding the term of members, I am not satisfied. I support

the ideas given by Mr. Vaishampayan because I do not want to take much time on this. Now I would come to a very important thing that is given here—that grants will also be given to those institutions which are deemed to be universities. In this connection, the Estimates Committee has very clearly said... I do not know whether Dr. Triguna Sen is having consultation with the Minister of State or is listening to what I am saying.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA) : Dr. Sen, he wants you to hear him.

SHRI KRISHAN KANT : If you want to talk with him, you can talk. Now I was speaking about the institutions deemed to be universities. There is no clarification in the Bill about this. The Estimates Committee in one of its reports has said; “No principles have so far been laid down for deeming an institution as a university under the University Grants Commission Act all these years.” Mr. Vice-Chairman you know what is going on in the School of International Studies. We have raised that question many times in this House and we are also going to have a discussion about it. Was it not proper for them to mention something in this Bill or provide for rules somewhere that only such and such institutions should be deemed to be universities?

Another point is we should have specialised universities. Of course, there are some Advanced Schools, but I think there should be certain universities which could be called advanced in certain subjects and which could give more fillip to the study of those subjects. We know about the M. I. T. and the Delhi University and all that. But special attention should be paid by the University Grants Commission to this question so that specialised universities will be built up with better standards.

In the end, Mr. Vice-Chairman, I again appeal to his better conscience, not official conscience, not political conscience but his better conscience of education, that no harm will be done and the Commission will not stop its work if the Bill goes to the Select Committee or he may call a meeting of M.Ps., sit with them and discuss it and then go ahead with it. I think the whole House and Parliament would be with him if he can see to it that proper modifications are made in this Bill and then make it part of the statute book, rather than do it now by sheer majority.

श्री बी० एन० मंडल (बिहार) : उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, जो विधेयक हम लोगों के सामने संशोधन के लिये प्रस्तुत किया गया है उसमें मैंने भी कुछ संशोधन दिये हैं और मैं चाहता हूँ कि हाउस उनको पास करे। संशोधनों को पेश करने के पहले मैं कुछ बातें कह देना चाहता हूँ।

शिक्षा सम्बन्धी संस्थाओं के संचालन में, अधिक से अधिक स्वायत्तता की गुंजाइश रखनी चाहिये, इस विधेयक की प्रवृत्ति इसके विरुद्ध है। विश्वविद्यालय अनुदान आयोग के प्रधान का चुनाव पहले गैर सरकारी सदस्यों के बीच से, आयोग के सभी सदस्यों द्वारा जिन की संख्या पहले नौ थी, होता था। अब सदस्यों की संख्या ग्यारह कर दी गयी है और प्रधान का मनोनयन अलग से, केन्द्रीय सरकार द्वारा होगा। मेरा सुझाव है कि राष्ट्रपति द्वारा यह हो। इस विधेयक के पास हो जाने पर, प्रधान अब कोई आफिसर भी हो सकता है।

केन्द्रीय सरकार ने यह अधिकार लिया है कि आयोग के तीन सदस्यों तक को वह पूर्ण कालिक सदस्य बना सकती है। यह अधिकार आयोग या उसके प्रधान के जिम्मे नहीं रहने दिया गया है। आयोग या प्रधान के जरूरी नहीं समझने पर भी ये नियुक्तियाँ केन्द्र की सरकार द्वारा हो सकेंगी और इसमें राजनीतिक प्रभाव भी काम कर सकता है।

किसी संस्था को विश्वविद्यालय घोषित करने का अधिकार केन्द्रीय सरकार ने अपने हाथ में लिया है और अब आयोग उसको आर्थिक मदद दे सकेगी। मैं चाहता हूँ कि किसी संस्था को विश्वविद्यालय घोषित करने का अधिकार, आयोग को रहना चाहिये।

रेगुलेशन बनाने के पहले केन्द्रीय सरकार की मंजूरी पहली शर्त बना दी गई, यह भी स्वायत्तता में घातक है।

इस विधेयक के पास होने के बाद, नये विश्व-विद्यालय को तभी अनुदान मिल सकेगा जब तक कि विश्वविद्यालय ने अपने जन्म के पहले, आयोग

और केन्द्रीय सरकार की मंजूरी नहीं प्राप्त कर ली होगी। मैं जन्म के पूर्व मंजूरी को गलत समझता हूँ और अगर ऐसी शर्त रहे भी तो केन्द्रीय सरकार से मंजूरी का कोई सरोकार नहीं रहना चाहिये। ऐसा होने पर राजनीति घुस सकती है।

केन्द्रीय सरकार ने आयोग की स्वायत्तता को संकुचित किया है और दूसरी ओर आफिसरों को अधिक संख्या में आयोग के संगठन में घुसाने की कोशिश की है।

विधेयक के खंड 2 में एक परन्तुक के माध्यम से कहा गया है कि ग्यारह सदस्यों में आधे से अधिक आफिसर नहीं रह सकेंगे। इसका नतीजा यह हो सकता है कि दो आफिसर तो अनिवार्यतः रहेंगे ही, लेकिन तीन आफिसर और भी आयोग के सदस्य रह सकेंगे। इस आयोग में आफिसरों की सदस्य संख्या पांच तक जा सकती है। गैर आफिसर सदस्यों की संख्या छः रहेगी। प्रधान अगर आफिसर हो जाये तो आफिसर और गैर आफिसर छः छः की संख्या में रहेंगे। और प्रधान के अतिरिक्त वोट से आफिसरों की ही बात रहेगी। पुराने कानून में, गैर सरकारी सदस्यों का ही बहुमत था।

उपप्रधान के पद की क्यों सृष्टि की गई है और प्रधान और उपप्रधान के काम का बटवारा क्यों पहले से ही प्रिस्क्राइब्ड रहेगा, इसका कारण नहीं बताया गया है। शायद सरकार को प्रधान या आयोग पर पूरा विश्वास नहीं है। उपप्रधान वेतन भोगी या गैर-वेतन भोगी होगा, यह भी साफ नहीं है। उपप्रधान सरकारी आफिसर या गैर सरकारी व्यक्ति होगा, यह भी साफ नहीं है।

वाइस चान्सलर्स या दूसरे अनुदान पाने वाले को सदस्यता से अलग रखना तर्क से असंगत है। मैं चाहता हूँ कि उनको अपना प्रतिनिधि भेजने का अधिकार हो।

इन सारी बातों को देखने से यही मालूम पड़ता है कि सरकार शिक्षण संस्थाओं में स्वायत्त

[श्री बी० एन मंडल]

नहीं आने देना चाहती है। सरकार अपने अधिकार में विस्तार चाहती है। इसलिये यह विधेयक प्रतिक्रियावादी है।

अध्यक्ष की पांच वर्ष और सदस्यों की तीन वर्ष, यह जो अवधि रखी गई है यह भी गलत मालूम पड़ती है। जैसा पहले छः वर्ष था वैसा ही अब भी रहना चाहिये।

इसके अलावा जो एडमिनिस्ट्रेशन चल रहा है उसके सम्बन्ध में भी मैं कुछ कह देना चाहता हूँ। जब राधाकृष्णन् आयोग बना था उस समय से हिन्दुस्तान में यह हो गया है कि हायर सैकेंड्री और थ्री ईयर्स डिग्री कोर्स चल रहा है। लेकिन मेरा अपना भी यह अनुभव है और शिक्षण संस्थाओं में काम करने वाले जो व्यक्ति हैं उनसे भी बात करने से यह मालूम होता है—चाहे वे खुल कर न कहें—कि इतने एक्जामिनेशंस बढ़ गये हैं कि पहले मैट्रिक में बोर्ड का एक्जामिनेशन होता है, फिर प्री-यूनिवर्सिटी का एक्जामिनेशन होता है और फिर बी० ए० पार्ट i और बी० ए० पार्ट ii का यूनिवर्सिटी होता है और इसका नतीजा यह होता है कि किसी भी क्लास में अच्छी तरह से पढ़ाई नहीं हो पाती है और बराबर एक्जामिनेशंस के चक्कर में रहना पड़ता है। इसको उठा कर के पहले जैसा अंग्रेजों के जमाने में था वैसा ही रहना चाहिये। इन्टरमीडिएट का दो वर्ष का कोर्स हो, बी० ए० का दो वर्ष का कोर्स हो और एम० ए० का भी दो वर्ष का कोर्स हो जैसा कि पहले था और मैं समझता हूँ कि यही अच्छा है।

इसके अलावा बिहार में टी० पी० कालेज जो मधेपुरा में है वह बहुत पिछड़े इलाके में है। वहाँ की आबादी भी पिछड़े लोगों की अधिक संख्या में है। वहाँ के पिछड़े लोगों ने सौ सौ रुपया दे कर के एक लाख रुपया जमा किया और उससे वह कालेज बना है। जिस खपरैल के मकान में वह कालेज शुरू हुआ आज भी उसी मकान में वह चल रहा है। वहाँ पर छात्रों की संख्या भी बढ़ कर 1200 से बेशी हो गई है। भागलपुर यूनिवर्सिटी ने भी वहाँ पर एक कालेज

खोलने के लिये रिकमेंड किया है और 12 लाख रुपये वहाँ पर पक्का मकान बनाने के लिये चाहिये जिस में लड़के रह कर के पढ़ सकें। मैं मंत्री जी का ध्यान इस ओर दिलाना चाहता हूँ कि यूनिवर्सिटी ग्रांट्स कमीशन के सामने यह बात आई है। मैं चाहता हूँ कि मांग को मंजूरी दे दी जाय जिस से वहाँ पर एक अच्छा मकान बन सके।

अब मैं बनारस हिन्दू यूनिवर्सिटी के सम्बन्ध में कुछ कहना चाहता हूँ। आज देश में इस बात की बराबर चर्चा है कि साम्प्रदायिकता के वातावरण को हटाना चाहिये, लेकिन उस यूनिवर्सिटी के एरिया में आर० एम० एस० का आफिस है। उसको क्यों नहीं वहाँ से हटाया जाता है यह बात मेरी समझ में नहीं आ रही है।

श्री निरंजन वर्मा (मध्य प्रदेश) : यह आपके समझ में आने वाली बात नहीं है।

श्री बी० एन० मंडल : साम्प्रदायिकता के वातावरण को हटाने के लिये जो वहाँ आर० एस० एम० का आफिस है उसको हटाना चाहिये अगर यूनिवर्सिटी उसको न हटाये तो सरकार को ग्रांट रोक कर के उसको हटवाना चाहिये, यह मेरा कहना है।

वहाँ पर जो एक व्याकरण विभाग था उसके प्रधान अध्यापक को हटा कर के उसके स्थान पर दूसरे को बैठाने में, जब असफलता मिली तो यूनिवर्सिटी ग्रांट्स कमीशन से ग्रांट बन्द करवा कर के उस इंस्टिट्यूशन को ही खत्म कर दिया गया है। यह बहुत गलत बात हुई है।

एक अमेरिकन एकाडेमी भी उसी यूनिवर्सिटी में है। वह जिस यूनिवर्सिटी के मकान में है उसका किराया उससे सिर्फ 120 रु० लिया जाता है जब कि मार्केट में उसका किराया दस हजार रु० से कम नहीं होगा इतना बड़ा वह मकान है। दिल्ली में जो श्यामलाल कालेज है उसकी बिल्डिंग के लिए ग्रांट दी गई थी, लेकिन वहाँ की मेनेजिंग कमेटी ने उस रुपए को गड़बड़ कर दिया। जब इस बात की चर्चा की जाती है तो मिनिस्ट्री की तरफ

से, यूनिवर्सिटी ग्रांट्स कमीशन की तरफ से कहा जाता है कि हम लोगों में इतनी शक्ति नहीं है कि इस काम में दखल दे सकें। मैं चाहूंगा कि शिक्षा मंत्री इसको भी देखें।

SHRI ARJUN ARORA : Mr. Vice-Chairman, I agree with Shri Krishan Kant when he advocated the reference of this Bill to a Select Committee. There is an amendment to this effect and I take this opportunity to request the Education Minister to accept that and refer this Bill to a Select Committee so that it can be properly worded. Mr. Krishan Kant correctly pointed out that the Bill opens up the undesirable possibility of an official of the Government becoming the Chairman of the Commission. I do not know if the framers of the Bill and the Education Minister had that intention but the Bill, as worded, opens up that possibility and that is a very dangerous thing. The Minister can of course give an assurance to the House that such a contingency will not arise and no official of the Government will become its Chairman. Of course I am more afraid of retired Government servants than of the functioning Government servants. It appears that we are adopting a procedure under which the so-called retired official is more powerful, is more gainfully employed than the officials themselves. The Minister should certainly give an assurance to the House that it is not his intention, whatever the wording of the Bill, to open the possibilities of Government servants or retired Government servants being appointed as Chairman of the Commission.

There is one other very grave drafting error and that, I am afraid, is deliberate and that is in clause 2(b)(i) where it is said: "The remaining members of the Commission will be from among persons representing industry, commerce or agriculture". Many sins are being committed in the country in the name of agriculture but why does the Minister want to commercialise the U. G. C.? Why does he want to import representatives of industry and commerce in the U.G.C.? Why does not he mention labour? Why does not he mention literature? Why does not he mention art? He has mentioned only 3 specific categories—industry, commerce or agriculture. I am sorry that such an enlightened Minister as the present one is sponsoring a Bill which wants to import into the U.G.C. illiterate industrialists and speculators whose only qualification is that they have either inherited

money or who have by means, fair or foul, amassed some wealth. The industry and commerce in this country is not enlightened and unlike in many other countries it does not contribute to the funds of universities or education. So for the Minister to sponsor a Bill which will bring into the U.G.C. and shape our country's education, men from industry, commerce or agriculture is not a good thing. Where will the Minister find people from industry and commerce who have not indulged in black-marketing or unfair practices? Where will he find them? It is difficult to find such people in the country. That is again a grave error because of which I feel referring the Bill to a Select Committee will not be a bad idea. The independence, the autonomy of the U.G.C. is something which should be treated as sacred. When the first Chairman of the U.G.C. was appointed a person of the stature of Dr. Deshmukh was persuaded to become its Chairman and as long as he was the Chairman, the U.G.C. was not only autonomous but it did not allow the functionaries of the Education Ministry to interfere in its work. We remember that the then Education Minister, Dr. Shrimali, who is now a Vice-Chancellor of a reputed University in the country, when he failed to control Dr. Deshmukh and through him the U.G.C., a rather unsavoury controversy about the age of retirement of Dr. Deshmukh was brought into being and letters were exchanged. Those letters were published and Dr. Deshmukh retired at the age of 65. Now in this Bill the Government proposes to give the Chairman two terms of five years. Will that age-limit of 65, because of which the U.G.C. lost a person of the stature of Dr. Deshmukh, be still adhered to and nobody who has crossed 65 will be allowed to remain the Chairman or member of the U.G.C.? I want the Minister to say so clearly because the Bill says nothing about it. In view of the controversy over the age of Dr. Deshmukh and the circumstances in which he had to retire, a clear-cut provision should have been made in this Bill. That has not been done. The Minister should come forward with a forthright statement that it is not his intention to make the U.G.C. a dumping ground of old, senile people who have crossed 65. Then during the last few years there have been attempts on the part of the functionaries of the Ministry of Education to interfere in the work of the U.G.C. I have the highest respect for Dr. Kothari, who was the Chairman of the University Grants Commission. A quarterly publication of the Ministry of Education called the "Education

[Shri Arajun Arora]

Quarterly" in 1961—it is a good journal and it was being sent to all the Members of Parliament; but now it is being sent only to those who are educated or who are interested in education—published a funny sort of thing saying that the Chairman of the University Grants Commission, Dr. Kothari, was permitted by the Government to attend the meeting of the American Academy of Sciences and he was also permitted, according to that quarterly, to stay in the United Kingdom for one week for studying the working of the University Grants Commission of the United Kingdom. Now, if the University Grants Commission is as autonomous as it is claimed to be, why should its Chairman...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA) : Mr. Arora, your time is over. Please wind up.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA : Why should its Chairman, who is a distinguished educationist, a well-known scientist and a devoted worker, have to seek the permission of some minor official in the Ministry of Education to attend the meeting of the Academy of Sciences in the United States and to spend the long duration of one week in the United Kingdom? There is a tendency to curtail the autonomy of the University Grants Commission. I hope by increasing the number of members of the University Grants Commission the Minister is not making it possible for retired Government servants of the Education Ministry or any other Ministry to overcrowd the Commission and thus make it a limb of the Secretariat.

SHRI K. DAMODARAN (Kerala) : Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, the Bill provides for the increase in the number of members of the Commission, the University Grants Commission. In view of the growth in the number of Universities and in view of the increasing responsibilities of the University Grants Commission, I think, it is to be welcomed. I am also in agreement with the exclusion from the Commission of all Vice-Chancellors. The Parliamentary Committee on Education also has recommended that. But I am unable to agree with the proposal to change the composition of the Commission. Just now some honourable Members spoke about the Chairman. I am in favour of retaining clause 5(3) of the principal Act in this Act, in this amending Act. Then clause 2 in this amending Bill provides representation to industry, commerce and agriculture. Mr. Arjun Arora spoke about it just now. Mr. Ruthnaswamy suggested

that even Government officer should not be there because it is an entirely purely academic affair. What business have the Government officials to do in a body which deals with academic affairs? Here representation is given to industry, commerce and agriculture. I have given an amendment to delete that clause. No such provision exists in the principal Act. I do not know why you want big industrialists to be in control of our education. I can understand the educationists participating in the management of industries. That may be useful. But I cannot understand industrialists managing education. That must be removed.

Then sub-section (iii) of clause 2. This sub-section provides for persons who are educationists of repute or who have obtained high academic distinctions to be chosen as members of the Commission. That is how it is worded. The word "or" creates some confusion. As it is it means that educationists of repute need not necessarily have academic distinctions to their credit. It may be interpreted that way. I want that "or" to be removed. There must be an educationist of repute who at the same time is a man of distinction.

What is the criterion of repute? I ask this question because persons of doubtful academic distinctions by some mysterious process rise to the top, establish an oligarchy, inter-linking all educational empires and control a number of academic institutions and thus become educationists of repute. To make this point clear I may give you some example. Take any person; you can call him X, Y or Z. But to make it concrete I will call him Mr. Khosla. But the name is immaterial. What is important is his repute and what is important is his academic distinctions. Mr. Khosla is the Director of the Indian Institute of Public Administration. He is the Chairman of the Indian Institute of Cultural Relations. He is a Member of the Executive Board of International Studies. He is in the Delhi University's Political Science Department. He is in the Indian Institute of Advanced Studies and he is in the Institute of Mass Communication, in the National Institute of Health Administration in the Advisory Board on Technical studies, etc. etc.—one man. I made some enquiries about his reputation as an educationist and about his academic distinctions because he controls the postings of hundreds of teachers and students in about a dozen institutions. What are his qualifications? His record as an educationist is

unknown except that he was an obscure teacher in a Lahore college and then in the Punjab University's Camp College in Delhi. But then something mysterious happened and he got some diplomatic assignment and the same mysterious force pushed him upwards to the top of so many other institutions. What are his academic distinctions? Mr. Vice-Chairman, I can assure you that there is not a single published work to his credit. The only contribution he has made during the last decade is an article published in his own school journal. Yet he is a reputed educationist in control of the academic world. I can bring to your notice some other instances also; but I do not want to take your time and I do not want to go into them now. The point is, these gentlemen have come to the top often by unhealthy methods and by back door manoeuvres, establish an oligarchy and divide the educational empire between them and then establish links with the bureaucracy. What is more dangerous is that our academic freedom is being threatened by these self-appointed ex-officio educationists. The Education Commission's Report speaks very much about the academic freedom in the Universities. I shall quote a few sentences from page 326 of the Education Commission's Report. About academic freedom the Commission says :

"This freedom implies that a teacher cannot be ordered or required to teach something which goes against his conscience or conflicts with his conception of truth. In this connection, we would also like to emphasise the freedom of teachers to hold and express their views, however radical, within the class-room and outside provided they are careful to present the different aspects of a problem without confusing teaching with 'propaganda' in favour of their own particular views. A teacher should be free to pursue and publish his studies and research, and speak and write about and participate in debates on significant national and international issues. He should receive all facilities and encouragement in his work, teaching and research, even when his views and approach be in opposition to those of his seniors and the head of his department or faculty."

And again there are so many paragraphs about academic freedom in universities—I do not want to quote more. But how is this recommendation of the Education Commission implemented? How is

academic freedom in our universities preserved? How are our teachers encouraged in their research? How are they given facilities to do more work? I shall give you only one instance. Take the case of one Mr. A. K. Roy, a young scholar. He was taken in by the Indian Institute of Public Administration for a specific period, that is, up to the end of a financial year as it is usually done. But he was given an undertaking that his tenure would be extended as a matter of course and he was assured of it even two weeks before the expiry of his tenure by the Director himself. (*Time bell rings.*) Two or three minutes more.

Meanwhile this young scholar conducted an investigation into the Meerut riots along with a fellow research worker. His research reports on Meerut and Karimganj riots earned much appreciation, and it was reflected in the columns of the press. And on the basis of his reports he was invited to present a working paper on communalism in the parliamentary convention held in Delhi, in which the Prime Minister and many others participated. But then suddenly something happened; some person in the bureaucracy wrote a letter to the head of the institution and the research scholar lost his job; he cannot get a job in any other institution because all this is inter-linked, because the man who sits in judgment on him is the same person. A regular witch-hunt, Mr. Vice-Chairman, has been going on in our universities against independent-minded hard working intellectuals. I can give you many instances but due to lack of time I do not go into them.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA) : It is time to wind up.

SHRI K. DAMODARAN : But the point is this. The U.G.C. has to make enquiries and find out what has happened to our academic freedom. Under subsection 13(1) of the U.G.C. Act the Commission has power to inspect any department of any university, and under section 14 the Commission can withhold grant from any university which fails to comply with the recommendations of the Commission. These are wide powers and the U.G.C. can use them to improve our universities. Of course the U.G.C. appoints visiting committees. But this takes place once in five years. I think it must be more often, at least once in two or three years. And I want to suggest that the visiting committee must meet not only

[Shri K. Damodaram]

the officers and the heads of departments of the universities, but also the staff and also the students. That the Education Commission has recommended that specific point on page 345 where it says :

“The visiting committees should meet not only the officers of the universities concerned and heads of departments, but also the other members of staff and the students.”

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA) : Mr. Damodaran it is time to wind up because there are so many others.

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR (Uttar Pradesh) : Let him continue. Where is the hurry to pass this Bill ?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA) : I am to regulate the debate. You need not suggest please.

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR : We can also suggest. We know how to suggest and when to suggest.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA) : I do not want any suggestions, Mr. Chandra Shekhar. Everybody has been getting a certain amount of time. Why should I give him more time ?

SHRI K. DAMODARAN : One point more and I conclude. There are hundreds of talented young scholars in our universities and hundreds of them have been engaged in research work, and with a little encouragement, with some facilities they can produce wonderful results. Yet even to write a text-book you are depending on the Americans or the Russians; you are having collaboration agreements with foreigners to sell you foreign text-books at subsidised prices. This is a definite insult to our scholarship and an insult to our nationhood.

About other points because of lack of time I am not going to say. I support the Bill but some strong amendments must be there; subject to there being the amendments I give my support to the Bill.

REFERENCE TO THE FLOODS IN GUJARAT

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL (Gujarat) : Mr. Vice-Chairman, please excuse my interrupting the proceedings for a minute. I have just heard the news of very

unprecedented floods in Gujarat. The cities of Surat and Broach are threatened with heavy floods. The flood situation all over the country has been causing us anxiety and Gujarat was supposed to be immune from such floods. And now floods have taken place in Gujarat also and we have not heard of such floods all these years in Gujarat. I would like the hon. Minister to make a statement on this. He is not present here and he can make the statement tomorrow after getting more information. I do not say that it should be made just now. But the matter is something very serious.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA) : It will be carried to the Government.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL : Also another point I want to raise in this connection. Why are warnings not sent to the States or cities from places upstream? Of the two rivers the Narmada comes from another State. Is warning being sent ahead of the floods coming because, till this morning, we did not hear of surging waters entering Gujarat. Now we have got the news that very high floods are there.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA : The Deputy Minister is here.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA) : At the proper time they will do it.

THE UNIVERSITY GRANTS COMMISSION (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1968—Continued.

SHRI A. P. CHATTERJEE : I think, Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, that this University Grants Commission Bill has been placed before us in a very ill-prepared manner, and it is not also quite understood and intelligible as to what is the reason for increasing the membership of the Commission to eleven in place of nine which it was previously.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN : He has explained it.

SHRI A. P. CHATTERJEE : I am just saying that it is not intelligible in spite of the explanation. The explanation makes the confusion worse confounded. It is no explanation at all. The Minister