

SHRI D. L. SEN GUPTA : Madam, any good social legislation is not a good social security measure by itself unless it is properly implemented. What I want to convey is this. The employers have not deposited the provident fund money. So, on that ground, many workers do not get it, and they do not get it even in their lifetime. What I say is this. You have to get Rs 51 crores from them. You are unable to collect it from the employers. Because of slackness or because of lack of vigilance on the part of your department, they have failed or neglected to deposit the money. It is for you to re-imburse the employees, to pay from your Reserve Fund, those Rs. 51 crores, and that should be the attitude. Otherwise, this scheme will be an utter failure.

SHRI D. THENGARI : I want some clarifications. Firstly, I want to know what technical difficulty stands in the way of extending the provisions of the Payment of Bonus Act to the coal-mine workers. That, in express terms, the hon. Deputy Minister has not said so far. Secondly, I want to know whether his Ministry proposes to take over the administration of the Coal Mines Labour Welfare Fund also. At least, has the Ministry worked out the implication in terms of efficiency and economy of the administration of any such proposal ?

SHRI JAGANATH RAO : Madam Deputy Chairman, the first point raised by my friend in the Third Reading is, why not integrate both these Provident Fund Schemes ? I replied to it in the main debate when the hon. Member was not present here. What I say is that this Coal Mines Provident Fund is entirely different from the Employees' Provident Fund. How can we have these two Schemes integrated and have them under one management ? That is the difficulty which I submitted.

Secondly, about the composition of the Board of Trustees, he has asked why the Central Government should have separate representation for itself, for the State Governments, for the employers, for the employees and for unrepresented labour. The Central Government approves the budget of the Board and the State Governments are in charge of the realisation of the arrears because the recovery proceedings have to be undertaken by the State Governments.

Employers' representatives are there. They are appointed by the Central Government in consultation with their Federation of Industries or whatever it is. There is also the labour, the INTUC, the AITUC, the Hind Mazdoor Sabha and the UTUC—so many hosts of labour organisations. Well, there is a quarrel in every industry as to which union should be recognised. That is common knowledge of every labour leader. Therefore, what is the Government to do ? It is also common knowledge that some employees are not members of any labour union. They go on unrepresented. Therefore, this is a scheme which is for the benefit of every employee, whether he is a member of a recognised union or not. These are provisions already in existence under the bonus scheme. Only we are putting them, in the Act. Nothing new has been done in this regard.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : The question is :

“That the Bill be passed.”

The motion was adopted.

THE JAWAHARLAL NEHRU UNIVERSITY BILL, 1964

THE MINISTER OF EDUCATION
(SHRI M. C. CHAGLA) : Madam Deputy Chairman, I beg to move :

“That the Bill to establish and incorporate a university in Delhi, as reported by the Joint Committee of the Houses, be taken into consideration.”

The first question that I have got to deal with is the name of the University. There is a very learned minute of dissent by my friend, Prof. Mukut Behari Lal, and I have got to deal with it.

He has spoken of the personality cult. Now, no one is more opposed to personality cult than myself. I think democracy and personality cult are inconsistent. You cannot have democratic institutions and at the same time have a personality cult. But what does personality cult mean ? Personality cult means that a person who is alive wants to build up a personal following, that he wants to exercise his power, that he wants

[Shri M. C. Chagla.]

to have praise and adulation. My friend remembers the times of the Romans when the Roman Emperors used to get themselves deified and statues raised after them. But how can you talk of personality cult in the case of a person who is no longer with us? As far as I know—and I knew Jawaharlal Nehru fairly well—no one was more opposed to personality cult than he was. He was always opposed to having any institution named after him. But we are trying now to name an institution when he is no longer with us. He cannot exercise any power, he cannot have a following or people who would shower praise and adulation on him. So, how does this question of personality cult arise? Surely, it cannot be said that we should not raise a memorial to him, a memorial worthy of him. Surely, it cannot be said that he was not one of the greatest sons of India. And what we are trying to do is to remember him, so that his memory should always be alive. Does my hon. friend there feel that we should not remember him or that we should forget him or that we should not be loyal to the ideals for which he stood? I make bold to say that the ideals for which he stood are the ideals which have become national ideals, which have become part of our national legacy and heritage, and therefore, there is no substance whatever in the contention that in calling this University Jawaharlal Nehru University we are perpetuating the personality cult.

The other objection which is more substantial is that it is not right to name a university after individuals. As a general principle, I agree. The Ministry has taken a decision and the University Grants Commission has supported that decision, and I entirely agree that it will be wrong to name universities after donors or after some local magnates or local industrialists. But we have made an exception to this principle; when we have men of outstanding stature, not only of national fame but international fame, we can name universities after them. Men like Gandhiji, men like Tagore, men like Jawaharlal Nehru, they do not fall in the same class or category as ordinary local magnates, political or otherwise. And therefore, I op not think there is any substance in that argument either.

The third argument that was advanced was that this is one more university. We have about 70 universities in India and we are constituting another university. This will be a duplicate of other universities, a copy of other universities, and it is not fair to associate the name of Jawaharlal Nehru with an institution like this. Now, if what we are trying to do by this Bill was just to have an ordinary university, I do not think that Jawaharlal's name should be perpetuated by being associated with an ordinary university which affiliates colleges, examines students and confers degrees. I shall presently satisfy the House that what we are trying to set up, after the Bill has emerged from the Select Committee, is a university of an entirely different and new type, a university which, if it functions properly, will be a real memorial to Jawaharlal Nehru.

Now, may I draw your attention, Madam, to the objects of this University, which you will find in the First Schedule. That will give us an idea of what we want to achieve through this University. This is what it says :—

“To be worthy of its name, the University shall endeavour to promote the study of the principles and fulfil the ideals that Jawaharlal Nehru stood and worked for during his lifetime, namely national integration . . .”

Now this is not something which was peculiar to Jawaharlal Nehru, in the sense that it has not become part of our national philosophy. He emphasised it. He worked for it. Gandhiji gave his life for it. But now it has become part of our national philosophy. Because he did so much for it, we are associating this particular concept with his name.

Then it says “social justice”. His socialism really meant social justice. There is then “secularism”. If there are two Indians who will always be remembered in this country for the support they have given to the cause of secularism, they are Mahatma Gandhi and Jawaharlal Nehru. Gandhiji became a martyr in the cause of secularism. Jawaharlal Nehru throughout his life was incapable of thinking communally, parochially or regionally.

SHRI S. S. MARISWAMY (Madras) :
Let there be a University in the name of Gandhiji.

SHRI M. C. CHAGLA : We can always have a University in his name. If we start a University in the name of Gandhiji, nobody would disagree. I will be the first to support it. But that is no answer to starting a University in the name of Jawaharlal Nehru. Gandhiji's name might be perpetuated in some other way. . .

SHRI M. RUTHNASWAMY (Madras) : Better way.

SHRI M. C. CHAGLA : That is a matter of opinion.

Then "democratic way of life, international understanding and scientific approach to the problems of the country."

It further says :

"Towards this end, the University shall—

(i) promote the composite culture of India and establish, departments or institutions as may be necessary for the study and development of the various Indian languages;"

Today we are attaching great importance not only to Hindi, our official language, but all the Indian languages.

SHRI P. N. SAPRU (Uttar Pradesh) : Regional languages including Urdu.

SHRI M. C. CHAGLA : Yes. I do not know why my friend emphasises Urdu. It is one of the 14 languages in the Constitution. Urdu is as much an Indian language as Marathi, Gujarati, Tamil or Telugu.

SHRI P. N. SAPRU : That is what I wanted you to say.

SHRI M. C. CHAGLA : I do not forget it. I know my Constitution.

Then,

"(ii) take special measures to facilitate students and teachers from all over India to join the University and participate in its academic programmes;"

We do not want this to be an institution for the city of Delhi alone. We want this to be a real all-India institute—

"(iii) promote in the students and teachers an awareness and understanding of the social needs of the country and prepare them for fulfilling such needs;"

This is our present objective and the objective that should be in our country. Students should be aware of the social needs. They should not be divorced from society. They should not live in ivory towers, they should work for the society. Further it says :—

"(iv) make special provision for integrated courses in humanities, science and technology in the educational programmes of the University";

Now, this is something quite new. No University is doing it. This is a modern idea to have "intergrated courses" in science and humanities, not to divorce them, not to separate them, but to have inter-disciplinary courses. If the hon. Members will study the curricula of the new universities started in England during the last five or ten years, they will find that more and more emphasis is being put upon inter-disciplinary courses. Where have you got these Universities today ? You either take science or take history or take languages or take Mathematics or philosophy. Knowledge is one and it should be integrated, and a man should be an all-round man. He should not merely know the humanities, he should know something of science. A man who is doing science should also read the humanities and the culture of his country.

Then—

"(v) take appropriate measures for promoting inter-disciplinary studies in the University";

I have already dealt with this—

"(vi) establish such departments or institutions as may be necessary for the study of languages, literature and life of foreign countries with a view to inculcating in the students a world perspective and international understanding;"

Well, I attach great importance to this. We have just opened an institute of Russian studies. It will be part of the Nehru University. But we do not want to stop at Russian. We want different European languages being taught. Spanish—we do not realise the importance of Spanish. It is the language of the whole of Latin America. It should teach Italian, French and all other languages. It is only by study of languages of different countries that we can promote international understanding, and—

(Shri M. C. Chagla.)

“(vii) provide facilities for students and teachers from other countries to participate in the academic programmes and life of the University.”

In other words, we will also invite students and scholars from outside, have visiting professors, have visiting teachers, have research scholars so that there should be an international atmosphere in this University.

Madam, my friend, Mr. Mukut Behari Lal, has given an amendment because he thinks that it is something part of Jawaharlal Nehru, and the country is bigger than Jawaharlal Nehru. I agree that the country is bigger than Jawaharlal Nehru. But what is there in this which, as I said, has not become part of our national philosophy? I should like to know if there is any hon'ble Member here who can tell me that he does not accept any of the principles and ideals which we have laid down in the First Schedule. If that is so, I do not see why we should not associate this with the name of a person who during his seventeen or eighteen years of Prime Ministership did his utmost to promote these principles.

SHRI P. N. SAPRU : He symbolised those ideals in his unique person.

SHRI M. C. CHAGLA : I entirely agree with Mr. Sapru.

Now, Madam, may I draw the attention of the House to some of the important changes that have been made in the Select Committee? In the original scheme of this University, there was a division of the jurisdiction between the present Delhi University and the new University which is to come into existence. Ajmeri Gate was the boundary line. And the understanding was that all colleges, barring the Maulana Azad College, to the south of the Ajmeri Gate should be affiliated to the new University, and the remaining colleges should continue to remain affiliated with the old University. Now we have changed all this. It was pointed out in the Select Committee, I think, with considerable force—and I have accepted that point of view—that if this University was to start with about 17 or 18 colleges affiliated to it, the standard would immediately go down. It will have to carry a terrible burden from the old University, and it would become like any

other University. Therefore, we decided that this University should not be an affiliating University, that the colleges which stand affiliated with the old University should continue to remain affiliated to it. But, as you will see from the statement of aims and objects, one of the objects of starting this University was to relieve the burden upon the old Delhi University. And, we came to the conclusion that the proper way to do so was not to take over the existing colleges but to set up and establish colleges, to run colleges which will not be affiliated colleges, but colleges which will be University colleges and which will be maintained by the University.

Now there are two advantages in that. You cannot have a university which is a purely post graduate university. You must have an under-graduate base. The under-graduate base must feed the post-graduate courses. The other advantage is that in these new colleges we can have different kinds of courses, not the courses that are taught in the 2,000 odd colleges in India. Let me give you an instance. In this connection I am particularly interested in a course which is started in Oxford, which is popularly known as PPE—politics, philosophy and economics.

SHRI P. N. SAPRU : Modern greats.

SHRI M. C. CHAGLA : A student takes philosophy, politics and economics and specialises in any one of these three subjects. This is an excellent course which we can start in one of our under-graduate colleges. Then we can have a combination of subjects as between humanities and science. We can have philosophy and mathematics. I can think of many permutations and combinations where we can have inter-disciplinary courses even in the under-graduate study.

PROF. B. N. PRASAD (Nominated): Are not such courses being taught in the existing universities?

SHRI M. C. CHAGLA : I am not aware of any college or university where you have these subjects, the PPE.

PROF. M. B. LAL : We also have in the Banaras University.

SHRI M. C. CHAGLA : Is that so?

PROF. M. B. LAL : Yes, in the Banaras University for many years now there is a combination of PPE given to the undergraduate students.

SHRI P. N. SAPRU : Is there any PPE course corresponding to what I would call the modern greats in B.A. ? So far as M.A. is concerned. . .

PROF. M. B. LAL : M.A. is meant for specialisation and a person has to specialise in one of the three subjects but for graduate education all these are allowed.

SHRI P. N. SAPRU : Do you have an M.A. degree course which permits you to take political science, economics and philosophy as possible subjects ?

PROF. M. B. LAL : It seems Dr. Sapru has forgotten the purpose of an M.A. degree. At that stage there is specialisation.

SHRI P. N. SAPRU : In Oxford there is . . .

SHRI M. C. CHAGLA : If Banaras is teaching it, may compliments to it.

PROF. M. B. LAL : Not only in Banaras but in many other universities also.

SHRI M. C. CHAGLA : I do not think so.

PROF. B. N. PRASAD : I say. . .

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : You need not explain, Prof. Prasad.

SHRI M. C. CHAGLA : If that is so I stand corrected and I compliment those universities which have these diversified courses. I only gave one instance but there are several other diversified courses which we can have and even with regard to post-graduate studies, I wish to assure this House that we will not duplicate post-graduate work which is being done in other universities. In many new important subjects, specially in science, knowledge has come out which can be taught, which is not taught in the universities to-day. Therefore the attempt will be not to make this University a replica of other existing universities. It follows therefore from what I have stated that the jurisdiction of both the Universities will be concurrent. Instead of giving half to the old University and the other half to

the new University, both the Universities will have concurrent jurisdiction in the Union Territory of Delhi but the difference will be this that whereas the old University can go on affiliating more colleges if it desires, this University will not affiliate any college but will establish and maintain its own colleges.

Then another important and new idea which emerges from this Bill is the association with institutions which exist in Delhi. We have many important institutions which are not affiliated to any university. Take, for instance, the Institute of Medical Sciences or the Institute of Agricultural Research or the school of International Studies or the Institute of Technology. Now the idea is that these institutes will maintain their autonomy but at the same time will be associated with the Jawaharlal Nehru University. I will tell how this association will work for the benefit both of this University and all these Institutes. Take the Institute of Medical Sciences which, we all know, is one of the finest institutes we have in India. You cannot divorce medicine from science, you cannot divorce medicine from chemistry, physics and even electronics these days. Therefore the great advantage to those institutes is, if the students there were to come to the Jawaharlal Nehru University and study other subjects, it would be of equal usefulness and importance to the Jawaharlal Nehru University students if they could go and study certain subjects in the Institute of Medical Sciences. Take the School of International Studies. They are teaching many subjects and those subjects can be complemented by what the Jawaharlal Nehru University could teach and on the other hand, the students of the Jawaharlal Nehru University can go for their post-graduate courses to the School of International Studies. But I wish to make it clear, lest these Institutes should feel that their autonomy is being undermined, that we will fully maintain their autonomy. We do not want to interfere with their autonomy. All that we want is to associate or to collaborate. Instead of the Jawaharlal Nehru University starting courses which are already being taught in these Institutes, for economy, for more compactness and so on, it will be much better if there is an association between the University and these autonomous independent associations.

SHRIMATI SHARDA BHARGAVA (Rajasthan) : May I know the meaning of recognised institutions and what will be the basis of recognising? That is not clear in the Bill.

SHRI M. C. CHAGLA : This will be worked out after the Bill is passed. This question was considered in the Select Committee and we cannot give any details at present. We will have to deal with different Ministries. For instance the Medical Research is under my colleague the Minister of Health, and I do not expect much difficulty because if we assure the Minister that the autonomy of the institute under her will not be interfered with, we can bring about some machinery whereby an association will be possible but I am sorry I cannot oblige the lady Member with details at this stage.

Then there is another new idea with which we are going to start this University and that is, we are going to have an academic advisory body. My intention is, as soon as this Bill is placed on the statute book, to appoint a Vice-Chancellor and to give him an academic advisory body, not following the example of appointing a Vice-Chancellor after the University is established. The reason is this. The Vice-Chancellor, in consultation with the advisory body, will work out the plans for the new University. He will be in charge and we will also know what he wants and we will give him an advisory body of six or seven finest educationists in this country so that they will draw a plan, lay down the policy as to how the University should develop, etc. I am not in a hurry that this University should develop in a slipshod or haphazard manner. There must be a great deal of thinking given to it, a great deal of planning and therefore, the idea is to have the man who will be in charge of the University sitting down with six or seven experts and think out what the building should be like, what should be the amenities given to the students, which Department should start first, etc.

4 P. M.

The other mistake we make in our country is, we start a department and then try to look for the man who will run the department. I suggest, Madam, for the consideration of this House that the better method

is to find the man, or the woman, and then build the department round the man or the woman. And this would be the task of this advisory body.

Then we have also provided in the Bill a machinery for reviewing the progress of the University. You will find in many of the Statutes this provision for review from time to time. Now most of our university legislation does not provide for any such review. We have here provided that the Visitor may appoint a person or persons to review the working of the University, inspect the University and make a report to the Visitor. And then, on the basis of that report, the Visitor may issue directives to the University, which will have to be carried out. Now for instance, if it is found that there is mal-administration, or that the finances are not properly utilised, or the accounts are not properly kept, or various other things, on that report the Visitor will have the right to set things in proper order.

Now, Madam, there are about 123 amendments tabled and the time that is allotted for this Bill is 3½ hours. So I do not want to use up much of this time myself. My only appeal to the Members of this House is that if a question is covered by any of the amendments, then an explanation should be given at the time when the amendment is moved because, at present, we are in the consideration stage, when we are only considering the general aspects of the University. Well, Madam, I have every hope that, after the Bill is carried through this House and the other House, we will have in the capital of India a very great University, a university with new ideas, with modern ideas, a university which will be a fitting memorial to one of the greatest sons of India, who spent so many of his years in this city of ours.

The question was proposed.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL (Gujarat) : Madam, I have heard the speech of the hon. the mover, and have tried to go through the Report of the Select Committee. It is very clear that there is divergent opinion on a matter of principle. There is no difference on many other matters, but the main point is the naming of a university after a person.

Madam, as one who has been a humble soldier in the struggle for freedom along with

many others who are in this House and those who are not, we honour the memory of Jawaharlal Nehru, not only Jawaharlal Nehru, but his family, his great father, his wife who, in spite of failing health, followed him to jail, which brought about her early end in this earth. Yet I am afraid I cannot agree, in spite of the pleadings of the hon. the Education Minister, with the proposition that what he is doing is right. In principle I would not be even opposed to naming a university after a person, for instance, as we did in the case of another university in this House recently, where the person had given his whole life, had built up a university on a new model, had worked it so well and, so to say, had given his life for it, and where the people who run the university after him would be entitled to rename it after him. But in this case it is not so. I would give another reason that deters me from supporting this, and it is that there is already a university in Delhi. Now, if the Minister in charge of Education feels that that is not good enough, why not reform it? I know that there are more than one university in certain large cities in the world. For instance, New York has five or six universities. But have we come to that situation where we can afford to have more than one university in one city? Perhaps Calcutta has more than one—Calcutta is a very big place. But Bombay is still struggling with one university and is not able to accommodate more students. I am not satisfied with the reasons that have been associated here. I do not see much force in the reasons that have been associated here. The hon. the Education Minister talked of integrated courses. This is not a new thing. Integrated courses have been taught in many many places. I studied in the Gujarat Vidyapit founded by Mahatma Gandhi, where I studied economics and politics together along with other things. I have also seen some of the modern universities that the hon. Minister referred to. Last year, when I had the opportunity of going to England, I saw the Sussex University, which is run by people who were associated with this country. But that university runs on large donations from people. Yet it is not named after anyone.

Madam, I would like not to be misunderstood. I am not against any memorial for Jawaharlal Nehru. We have so many

of them. Even the house that he occupied in this city has been turned into a museum by this Government. We have his coin. We have his stamp. I am not against the memory of a person who has given so much of his life in the service of the country. But the idea of naming a university like this and the reasons given by the hon. Minister are not convincing. It was rightly pointed out that we have no university named after Gandhiji. Gandhiji gave the biggest idea to the modern times, the idea of non-violence, resistance to evil by non-violence, non-violence without prejudice, without heat. I think basically that is the biggest idea that Gandhiji gave. Jawaharlalji went forward a step. We have nothing of this kind to commemorate Gandhiji. Perhaps in our enthusiasm, or in the enthusiasm of some people to build up memorials for Jawaharlalji, we are forgetting what Gandhiji gave us. And are we not forgetting what he gave us? Are we not seeing how we have gone wrong? And many of our present ills are there because we did not follow what he told us to follow.

Madam, I heard the Education Minister tell us that he was going to put a Vice-Chancellor in charge of this in the first instance, that the Vice-Chancellor was going to find his team and then work out the University in time. Then the idea was to integrate the different institutions in this city of Delhi to come under this University. It means actually that you are going to bring all these institutions within the ambit of this University. I do not see what difference it is going to make. It is going to become as any other university. Instead of the medical department of the university being on the campus, you will have the All-India Institute of Medical Sciences attached to it. Similarly there are the two or three institutions which he mentioned. So you are going to have another University in Delhi spread over the place with so many other institutions that will be attached to it. I do not see the difference that he is trying to make out, what it will be.

The idea of social justice also Gandhiji gave us, also the idea of trusteeship he put before us. The idea of social justice, however, is sometimes confused with the idea of socialism and the socialist pattern that the Congress so much talks about. I think

[Shri Dahyabhai V. Patel.]

There needs to be a revision at least in the ideas of some friends on the other side on this matter. After all, what is the purpose of all this talk about this socialism? Is it not to give a better way of life, a better set of conditions of living to the poorer people? Or is it just a doctrinaire socialism with ownership? What is the objective? To my mind, the Congress party and many friends in this country need to revise their ideas on this, just as socialists in Germany, in France and in Norway, in fact in all the Scandinavian countries, have revised their ideas and have accepted that ownership is not necessarily a part of socialism, that the State need not own everything, but you can recognise private ownership, provided it is able to bring the benefits that it is required to bring to the workers and to the people at large. Controls may be necessary perhaps, proper education and the rule of law, all that should really be there, to see that the people who have wealth, people who have the power to produce wealth do not exploit the poor people too much. But that is what Gandhiji taught us all his life and that is why he always said he was against controls. Are we going to give it up? What is this University going to teach us in this matter?

The Vice-Chancellor, I believe, according to what I heard the hon. Minister say, is going to be the king-pin of this project. I do not know where the Education Minister with all his zeal and enthusiasm will be able to find such a Vice-Chancellor. We have had discussions on some universities. I know some things of other universities. Where the Government used to appoint the Vice-Chancellor, what has happened? I have known a defeated Deputy Minister being appointed Vice-Chancellor of one of the best universities in this country, because the man who built up that university was not in the good books of the Government. And when the term of that ex-Deputy Minister was over, the principal of a high school because he was a Congressman, was appointed Vice-Chancellor. Does this in any way inspire confidence in our minds that what the hon. Education Minister genuinely wants to do is going to come about?

I do not know whether the objectives as stated here in the Schedule :

“to promote the study of the principles and fulfil the ideals that Jawaharlal Nehru stood and worked for.”

would be fulfilled. Have we done that in the case of Gandhiji I do not say that because we have not done it in the case of Gandhiji, we need not do it in the case of Jawaharlal. By all means do it if it is necessary. But are there not two opinions about it in this country and in this very House? There is a large section that does not accept the principles and ideals that he stood for. For instance, though the Congress party may say that non-alignment has succeeded, there are many who say that it has not, that it does not exist at all. The day the senior partner to that pact of non-alignment came out with aggression on our country, that non-alignment was dead. Similarly, we have this too much reliance on Russia. I am not against the people of Russia, but I only do not like their regimented way of life. If for instance our country accepts Russian aid when necessary, and their technical aid when necessary, but not the communism that comes along with all that, then I would not quarrel very much with the Government. But my quarrel is because along with all that there is too much of communism coming into this country and certainly I am opposed to that, and I also know that many others in this House are opposed to it. Gandhiji also was opposed to it because there is a basic difference in principle and also in the methods of operation. The methods are more objectionable. Jawaharlal Nehru was willing to compromise perhaps on that. Perhaps he was willing to shut his eyes to some of the undesirable aspects of their methods. We feel that it was a mistake, for instance, to have shut our eyes to the encroachment on our borders and on the building of the border roads again and again, and that is why we have got into this trouble ultimately. Madam, I would again repeat that I have nothing against the people of Russia. I know they have been friendly to us and that is the one government which has tried to understand us. I have no quarrel with the government of Russia also. But certainly I do not want the methods, the totalitarian methods that obtain in Russia to come here. Are we going to get that along with this Institute of Russian Studies? I hope not.

SHRI P. N. SAPRU : You keep clear of Russian studies.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL : I am sorry if I am not able to make Mr. Sapru

[Shri Dahyabhai V Patel]
 understand me. Perhaps my expression is not clear enough. I will try to make myself clearer, if only he will be a little patient. Here is this Institute of Russian Studies. I welcome the friendly hand of Russia if it is coming, but I do not accept the communist method of Russia which is totalitarian. And anybody, particularly an educationist, would know that totalitarianism is against growth. Why do we have the Montessori methods for children? Why have we given up or forgotten the old method of the rod? You know the old saying: Spare the rod and spoil the child. But we don't do that now. Why is that? That is because we do not believe in regimentation. Regimentation is not conducive to growth and the development of the human being, and that is what is objectionable in the Russian system of government—regimentation. I repeat—and I have said it two or three times—and I hope I have been able to make it clear to all friends in this House, that I have nothing against the people or government of Russia. I also know that Russia has been supporting our cause politically and we are grateful for that. But that does not mean that we should import their methods, their method of government and their ideology into our country. I think Gandhiji gave us something that was superior to anything else and we should teach that. Madam, we need more colleges and we need more teaching institutions and there is no doubt about that. But I dare say that this is not the way of dealing with that matter. If you say that you want this as a memorial to Jawaharlal Nehru, well, there are so many other things that could be said about it. There are always two sides to a question. We cherish the memory of Jawaharlal Nehru, the fighter for freedom who sacrificed everything but there is the other side. We feel sorry that he should have let down Tibet.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: How does it become relevant here?

SHRI DAHYABHAI V PATEL: Madam, the objective is to commemorate the principles and ideals that he stood for. Was it an ideal thing to have let down a friend or a person whom we were pledged to oblige another friend, a doubtful friend? I have only mentioned one case. There are many others. I was only hinting that when you come down to politics, there

are many things which could be, objected to, for instance, the way in which he defended Pratap Singh Kairon.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: We are not discussing politics. We are discussing education, University education.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V PATEL: Exactly, the ideals he stood for. What did he stand for? That is what I am trying to put before you. I am trying to support the minute of dissent and the view discussed in the Joint Committee.

SHRI P N SAPRU: He believed in fair-play.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V PATEL: Was letting down Tibet fair-play? Was condemning the shooting of one Nagy right while turning a blind eye to the shooting of another Nagy? I agree with the principles of justice and fair-play but in politics, if it were not one hundred per cent. I would rather not go blindly and say that it was right. If we make compromises in politics, that would not be a right ideal to teach. Politics is politics all over the world. When we have also been like the people all over the world, is it necessary to have a University of this type? Indeed, if you want a memorial, there are memorials and memorials and is not the Kashmir problem a memorial that will remain in history? When six hundred States integrated one State, when Jawaharlal Nehru interfered, renounced un-integrated and this country is paying through the nose for it and getting a bad name all over the world for that one little thing, for that one obstinacy and obsession of his.

SHRI P N SAPRU: I welcome this Bill. I would like to explain my point of view. The hon. Mr. Chagla very rightly said that he was opposed to the personality cult. I am also very much opposed to the personality cult. I know that we in this country have a tendency for hero worship but I think it cannot be said fairly that so far as this Bill is concerned it encourages the personality cult. Jawaharlal Nehru is no longer in the land of the living, he is dead. He worked for this country and served it as its first Prime Minister with certain ideals and with certain ways of looking at things. Dr. Kothari made it clear that he was opposed to Universities being named after certain individuals but he said that the case

[Shri P. N. Sapru.]

was different so far as this Bill was concerned. Dr. Kothari described this as a special University and said:

"I hope it will function differently from the other Universities. Regarding the naming of Universities, there was no Committee as such by the UGC but there was a reference from the Education Ministry. It said that ordinarily a University should not be named after individuals and the Commission agreed with that. The view of the Commission is that Universities should not be named after individuals unless the individual is not only an all-India figure but also is an international figure, one who will continue to inspire not only the present generation of students but also the generations to come; if I may mention a name, like Rabindranath Tagore or Mahatma Gandhi or Jawaharlal Nehru."

Now, Jawaharlal Nehru belongs to that category of individuals who achieved an international position for themselves in the world. The ideals of Jawaharlal Nehru which are set forth do not have any reference to the policies he followed. We are not concerned with the actual policies followed; we are concerned with certain ideals for which Jawaharlal Nehru worked and I would like to know whether there is anyone in this House who says that he differs from those ideals. Those ideals are set forth in the First Schedule. What are those ideals? The first is national integration. I doubt whether there is any one in this House who is opposed to national integration. We all claim to be good nationals. Next is social justice. Well, the term 'social justice' I must say is rather a vague one. The conservatives too today claim that they are working for social justice. Mr. Edward Heath would say that he accepts the concept of the welfare State and that he is working for social justice. I would frankly support in this matter the memorandum of Mr. Kumaran and use the word 'socialism'. Now, socialism is a vast doctrine. It was the doctrine which was preached by Marx and Engels. Ruskin too used to call himself a Tory Socialist and I do not see any reason why we should fight shy of the word "socialism". Of course it can be said that studies in socialism will

PROF. M. B. LAL : It is such a vast subject that here you would have to write Nehru Socialism.

SHRI P. N. SAPRU : I do not think you need to write Nehru Socialism. He stood for certain basic ideas which underlie socialism. It was not doctrinaire socialism. Therefore I frankly confess that I find myself in agreement on this point with my friend, Mr. Kumaran. Then secularism. Well, we all, I think, claim to be secular. We are secular in the sense that we have no established Church. We are secular in the sense that we treat all religions impartially. Then democratic way of life. I think we have made it clear here that we are opposed to the totalitarian way of life. The democratic way of life is different from the totalitarian way of life. Mr. Patel was talking as if we were favouring a totalitarian way of life. He has indeed objection even to such an innocent thing as the Institute for Russian Studies. Probably he would banish the study of Russian from this country. International understanding; all men of goodwill in the world accept international understanding and this is one of the principal themes on which Jawaharlal Nehru used to dwell. Scientific approach to the problems of the country; do we want a superstitious approach to the problems of the country? We want a reasoned approach to the problems of the country and the word 'scientific' must be understood to mean a reasoned approach to the problems of the country. Well, we have defined in more or less precise terms what are the ideals for which we think Jawaharlal Nehru stood and we have defined in this Schedule which of the ideals for which Jawaharlal Nehru stood should be studied and made the subject of research. Therefore I think that there is no valid objection to the name which has been proposed for this University. We are no doubt commemorating the memory of a great Indian but we are not, I suggest, indulging in any way in hero worship by giving to this University the name of one of the architects of Indian freedom, of one who has supplied this country with a philosophy of life which will enable her to find a place in the world of today and tomorrow.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA (Orissa) : What are your views on the establishment of a University commemorating the name of Gandhiji?

SHRI P. N. SAPRU : I have no objection.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA : Not that you have no objection; are you sponsoring one?

PROF. M. B. LAL : He is not enthusiastic about it though he has no objection to it.

SHRI P. N. SAPRU : I would be as enthusiastic about it as I am about the Jawaharlal Nehru University.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA : But you have avoided that point mentioned by Mr. Patel while you take the point that suits you.

SHRI P. N. SAPRU : What have I avoided ?

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA : You mentioned about the banning of Russian language but you did not mention anything about the establishment of a University in the name of Gandhiji which was mentioned by him specifically

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Mr. Sapru, you have limited time; you please continue with your arguments

SHRI P. N. SAPRU : Therefore I would think that there is need for a University of a new type in this country, of a type which would enable our big Institutes to be associated with it in a somewhat informal manner. I had the privilege of working in the Bhoré Committee which recommended the establishment of the All India Institute of Medical Sciences and I would like that great Institute to maintain its autonomy. I think it is possible to devise methods whereby it can maintain its autonomy and yet be part of a larger whole. This association with other scientific institutions may be of benefit both to science generally and the institution itself

Certainly this University is not going to solve the problem of congestion in the Delhi University. Delhi University has become a vast University and its work is increasing every day. This Bill will enable us to establish new colleges. It may not enable us to take over the colleges from the Delhi University and affiliate them to this University but it will enable us to establish new colleges and we do need to establish new

colleges in Delhi. We do need to establish new colleges all over the country and . . .

PROF. M. B. LAL : All affiliated to the Nehru University.

SHRI P. N. SAPRU : Mr. M. B. Lal has a Nehru complex and . . .

PROF. M. B. LAL : As much as you have.

SHRI P. N. SAPRU : I have no complexes at all.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA : You have a pro-complex and he has an anti-complex.

SHRI P. N. SAPRU : I have neither a pro-nor an anti-complex. I am just viewing the whole question from the point of view of fundamental principles and I have made it clear that I am not in favour, as a general rule, of naming Universities after the names of particular individuals. But there are certain exceptional men who leave a permanent impression on the sands of time and this is one of those cases. Jawaharlal Nehru is certainly one of those men who can be said to be the architect of freedom not only of India but also of the African and Asian countries generally.

Now I should like to say a word about the Vice-Chancellor and the advisory Academic Committee of seven which will advise him. I hope that the Vice-Chancellor will be an academic person of the very highest distinction. It is necessary that our Vice-Chancellors should be persons who inspire respect in the world of scholarship, who are capable of giving inspiration to our teachers and our students so far as scholarly work is concerned. I hope also that this advisory Academic Committee will be wisely chosen and that it will consist of men of recognised standing in the world of scholarship. We do not want this University to become a political forum for the propagation of any ideals of any particular Party. We want it to become a university where it would be possible for our young men and young women to receive the highest education possible. We want, therefore, faculties or departments or schools—I use the word school here—of languages in this University. We want to have an integrated course such as they have at Oxford. I was reminded of this integrated course when Mr. Chaglia was speaking on this Bill. We know that at Oxford for the honours degree—and this is my answer to Prof. Mukut Behari Lal

[Shri P. N. Sapru.]

who asked whether there was any such course here—which is equivalent to your M.A. or even higher than your M.A.

PROF. M. B. LAL : Question.

SHRI P. N. SAPRU : Of course, 'Yes'.

PROF. M. B. LAL : You are insulting our degrees when you say that the B.A. (Hons.) degree of Oxford University is better than the M.A. degree in our universities.

SHRI P. N. SAPRU : I am not used to, I am not suffering from national vanity and also . . .

PROF. M. B. LAL : You are suffering from Oxford phobia.

(Interruptions)

SHRI P. N. SAPRU : You are suffering from a worse phobia than I am.

PROF. M. B. LAL : You are Oxford-phile, not phobia.

SHRI P. N. SAPRU : I say that our universities should maintain standards as high as those of Oxford or Cambridge or for that matter of any university in the world. And I would say that you have the modern greats. It is a very first class course. You have the Oxford literary course . . .

PROF. M. B. LAL : May I point out, Dr. Sapru, that in the Lucknow and Allahabad Universities, there is the three-year honours course, where these subjects are taught, with specialisation in one subject at a later stage?

SHRI P. N. SAPRU : I beg your pardon, I know that.

DR. TARA CHAND (Nominated) : In Delhi also.

SHRI P. N. SAPRU : But the B. A. (Honours) course does not correspond with the honours course in Oxford or Cambridge. The honours course in Oxford or the honours course in Cambridge corresponds with what you call your M.A. degree.

HON. MEMBERS : No, no.

SHRI P. N. SAPRU : Of course.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : It is a matter of opinion.

DR. TARA CHAND : Absolutely not.

SHRI P. N. SAPRU : You know it in your heart of hearts.

(Interruptions)

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Order, order.

SHRI P. N. SAPRU : I say in all humility that it is necessary for our educationists to develop a sense of humility to understand that there are countries for which . . .

PROF. M. B. LAL : Does Dr. Sapru feel that merely by associating the name of Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru this University will attain the stature of the students of Oxford University ?

SHRI P. N. SAPRU : I never said anything of the kind.

PROF. B. N. PRASAD : Do you know that there are other universities in the world whose standard is not less than that of Oxford ? Why are you mentioning only Oxford ?

SHRI P. N. SAPRU : Probably Dr. Badri Nath Prasad belongs to one of them and he wants us to take it for granted that he is better than any graduate of Oxford University.

(Interruptions)

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Let Dr. Sapru continue, please. It is a matter of opinion.

PROF. B. N. PRASAD : He is making statements which are questionable and it is our duty to point out that he is making such statements which cannot bear scrutiny.

PROF. M. B. LAL : Casting aspersions.

PROF. B. N. PRASAD : What does he know so much about universities ? Certainly we know more about universities.

SHRI P. N. SAPRU : I question it.

PROF. B. N. PRASAD : You may question it.

SHRI P. N. SAPRU : I question the authority of Dr. Badri Nath Prasad to speak with authority on universities. In his own University, when he was Professor, he never achieved the highest . . .

(Interruptions)

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN . Order, order. No interruptions please.

PROF. B. N. PRASAD : I was in the University of Paris, which is the pioneer of Oxford and Oxford took . . .

(Interruptions)

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Order, order. No further interruptions. Let Mr Sapru continue.

PROF. M. B. LAL : An Indian University produced Dr. Radhakrishnan.

SHRI P. N. SAPRU : And Dr. Radhakrishnan is proud of the fact that he was a Professor at the Oxford University.

PROF. M. B. LAL : And we are also proud that an Indian product was accepted as a Professor in Oxford University

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : I find that all the Professors cannot contain themselves today. Please, I will not permit any further interruptions. Dr. Sapru has to finish his speech. Let him continue.

SHRI P. N. SAPRU : The more I see of my country the more is my despair for its future. I think we are developing jingoistic tendencies, we are developing chauvinistic tendencies. We are not developing a proper sense of humility. We have no desire to do research into unknown realms of knowledge and we just flatter ourselves with the belief that we have achieved all that the great thinkers of the world have taken generations to achieve.

SHRI M. P. SHUKLA (Uttar Pradesh) . You want us to be apes and imitators only

SHRI P. N. SAPRU : No, I do not want that.

SHRI M. P. SHUKLA : Always you praise Oxford and Cambridge. That is the general way in which you proceed. It is a slur on our patriotism.

SHRI P. N. SAPRU : I do not want our people to become imitators, but I want our people .

(Interruptions)

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN No more interruptions.

SHRI P. N. SAPRU : I want our people to be genuine researchers I want our people

to be genuinely interested in the advancement of knowledge. I want our people to be what the scholars, teachers and professors are in the best universities in the West and in the East. I cannot take a narrow view on this question. I think even in regard to our own history, we have discovered from the writings of some of the Western thinkers I would like my friend who is a very great student of Hindu culture to read a book which I think most of us would enjoy doing. I would like him to read Dr. Basham's book "The Splendour that was India". It is a great tribute to the culture of this country, and a book of that character has yet to be produced by the so-called historians in this country.

(Interruptions)

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : No more interruptions.

SHRI M. P. SHUKLA : Jawaharlal Nehru fought the British throughout his life.

SHRI P. N. SAPRU : Jawaharlal Nehru fought the British . .

SHRI M. P. SHUKLA : Everything British

SHRI P. N. SAPRU : He did not fight everything British.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN I do not think running commentary is necessary I request Members to allow him to go on without running commentaries.

SHRI P. N. SAPRU : I cannot argue with fanatics.

SHRI M. P. SHUKLA . After what the British people have done, after the way they behaved towards us in our conflict with Pakistan, it is an insult to go on praising their ways.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN . Order, order. Let Mr. Sapru carry on uninterruptedly. I am amazed that the Professors cannot contain themselves.

SHRI P. N. SAPRU : I claim my right to speak about any country that I admire, about any people that I admire. I have an admiration not only for British scholarship, I have an admiration for Russian scholarship, and I would like our country to

[Shri P. N. Sapru.]

approach these educational problems from the point of view of humility. I think we in this country are lacking in humility, and that is why the scholarship suffers in this country.

PROF. B. N. PRASAD : For example ?

SHRI P. N. SAPRU : You are an example. You have done tons of research in mathematics. I do not know what the value of that research is. I do not know what the people of the world think of it. You are completely self-satisfied.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Mr. Sapru, you must not reflect on the Members.

SHRI P. N. SAPRU : I am only pointing out . . .

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Please come to the Bill. There is no time left for you.

SHRI P. N. SAPRU : I would like to say that in the Court there is adequate representation of academic interests. But there should be more adequate representation of non-academic interests also. For example, I know the composition of this House and I know the scholarship which we as Members of this House and the other House possess. But even so I would plead that we should have more representatives of Parliament in the Court of the university. I would suggest that the number should be Six, two from the Rajya Sabha and four from the Lok Sabha, I think.

PROF. M. B. LAL : That is what is proposed in the Bill.

PROF. B. N. PRASAD : It is already embodied.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Anyway, you go on to the next point.

SHRI P. N. SAPRU : I would like to have a Court which is representative of all educational and public interests. I would like that so far as discipline is concerned, it should remain vested in the Vice-Chancellor.

PROF. M. B. LAL : There you are.

SHRI P. N. SAPRU : He should have a representative Council of students elected

by the students to advise him in regard to questions affecting the grievances of the students.

PROF. M. B. LAL : May I ask how the Vice-Chancellor is selected in the Oxford University and what powers he exercises over students ?

SHRI P. N. SAPRU : I will tell Prof. Mukut Bihari Lal that, learned as he is, I am not so ignorant as he thinks.

PROF. M. B. LAL : I am sorry, when I asked this question, I did not wish to question his intelligence. I wish to get from him whether the Vice-Chancellor there is selected in a way different from ours.

SHRI P. N. SAPRU : How the Vice-Chancellor is selected or elected, I can tell all about it and the various other bodies of the Oxford University or Cambridge University. I am not sure that in a written test Prof. Mukut Bihari Lal will score over me. I throw a challenge.

PROF. M. B. LAL : I have no intention to score over my teacher.

SHRI P. N. SAPRU : Madam Deputy Chairman, let there be a question paper on the constitutions of the universities of the world; ask Prof. Lal to answer that; ask Prof. Prasad to answer that; ask me to answer that; I will not include in this my friend, Dr. Tara Chand, and Prof. Wadia, for whom I have the highest respect and veneration.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Mr. Sapru, you must finish your speech by 5 p.m. There are only two minutes left.

SHRI P. N. SAPRU : I think the University will have power to affiliate institutions from outside Delhi also. There is no radius prescribed for it. It should therefore become possible for this University to integrate all the various research institutions, all the post-graduate institutions which are working in different parts of the world. It will be able to bring together great scholars of all parts of the world within its fold.

Finally, Madam Deputy Chairman, I would repeat what I said that while as a matter of principle I am not in favour of

[Shri P. N. Sapro.]
naming universities after individuals, there are exceptions to the rule, and Jawaharlal Nehru belongs to the class of exceptions. With the exception of Gandhiji, there is no one who had done so much for the freedom movement in this country, and by establishing this University we shall be commemorating the memory of a great Indian.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The House stands adjourned till 11 a.m. tomorrow.

The House then adjourned at five of the clock till eleven of the clock on Thursday, the 2nd December, 1965.