

[Shri Manubhai Shah.]

the Tariff Commission Act, 1951, explaining the reasons why the documents referred to at (i) and (ii) above could not be laid within the period mentioned in that sub-section.

[Placed in Library. See No. LT-5243/65 for (i) to (iii).]

- III. (i) Report (1965) of the Tariff Commission on the continuance of protection to the Electric Motor Industry.
- (ii) Government Resolution No. 5(1)-Tar/65, dated the 18th November, 1965.
- (iii) Statement under the proviso to sub-section (2) of section 16 of the Tariff Commission Act, 1951, explaining the reasons why the documents referred to at (i) and (ii) above could not be laid within the period mentioned in that sub-section.

[Placed in Library. See No. LT-5244/65 for (i) to (iii).]

- IV. (i) Report (1965) of the Tariff Commission on the continuance of protection to the Non-ferrous Metals Industry.
- (ii) Government Resolution No. 9 (1)-Tar/65, dated the 19th November, 1965.
- (iii) Statement under the proviso to sub-section (2) of section 16 of the Tariff Commission Act, 1951, explaining the reasons why the documents referred to at (i) and (ii) above could not be laid within the period mentioned in that sub-section.

[Placed in Library. See No. LT-5245/65 for (i) to (iii).]

- V. (i) Report (1965) of the Tariff Commission on the continuance of protection to the Sheet Glass and Figured Glass Industry and grant of protection to Wired Flat Glass Industry.
- (ii) Government Resolution No. 6(1)-Tar/65, dated the 18th November, 1965.

[Placed in Library. See No. LT-5246/65 for (i) and (ii).]

MESSAGE FROM THE LOK SABHA

THE KERALA APPROPRIATION (No. 5) BILL, 1965

SECRETARY : Sir, I have to report to the House the following message received from the Lok Sabha, signed by the Secretary of the Lok Sabha :

"In accordance with the provisions of Rule 96 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in Lok Sabha, I am directed to enclose herewith a copy of the Kerala Appropriation (No. 5) Bill, 1965, as passed by Lok Sabha at its sitting held on the 30th November, 1965.

2. The Speaker has certified that this Bill is a Money Bill."

Sir, I lay the Bill on the Table.

RELEASE ON PAROLE OF SHRI P. RAMAMURTI

MR. CHAIRMAN : I have to inform Members that the Chief Secretary to the Government of Madras has, in a letter dated the 26th November, 1965, intimated that Shri P. Ramamurti, Member, Rajya Sabha, who was detained in the Central Jail, Vellore, has been released temporarily on parole for a period of one month to enable him to attend on his ailing wife at New Delhi.

THE JAWAHARLAL NEHRU UNIVERSITY BILL, 1964—continued

PROF. M. B. LAL (Uttar Pradesh) : Mr. Chairman, to begin with, I must offer my apologies to my teacher, Dr. Sapru, for such intervention of mine as hurt his feelings. I may assure him that I have no desire whatever . . .

AN HON. MEMBER : He has not heard your speech.

PROF. M.B. LAL : . . . to compete with any teacher of mine in wisdom or learning.

SHRI A. B. VAJPAYEE (Uttar Pradesh) : His feeling was never hurt.

PROF. M. B. LAL : Nor do I intend to cast any reflection on the Oxford University. Of course, I only objected to certain sweeping remarks with regard to the de-

gresses of Indian universities in general. I would surely welcome the establishment of a university on the model of the Oxford University in this country also and I would surely have welcomed the Bill under consideration if it had proposed to establish a university on the model of the Oxford University. My regret is that no attempt in that direction is made. I beg to submit to the Education Minister that the introduction of a few courses of study like PPE, which are allowed in almost all Indian universities where art subjects are taught, will not convert this university into an Oxford University. If we compare the constitution of the Oxford University with the proposed constitution of this university, we will notice that the proposed constitution is absolutely repugnant to the basic principles on which the Oxford University is based.

SHRI SUDHIR GHOSH (West Bengal) : How can anybody build a university like the Oxford University? The Americans with all their resources tried it and failed. It requires six centuries to build a university like Oxford University.

PROF. M. B. LAL : My dear friend, all I know is that yesterday he talked of the Oxford University and that we are building an Oxford University here.

THE MINISTER OF EDUCATION (SHRI M. C. CHAGLA) : May I say a word? I never suggested that this University was modelled after or based on the Oxford University. On the contrary, I said that the ideas, which are quite different now and which have helped to produce the new universities in England, have been taken into consideration in framing this Bill.

PROF. M. B. LAL : I am very glad to note that the Education Minister, though educated in the Oxford University, is prepared to be benefited by model experiences in the educational systems of the world. I, however, beg to submit that the Oxford University model is not a model which needs to be rejected even in modern times and I am going to point out . . .

SHRI ARJUN ARORA (Uttar Pradesh) : You want to have it both ways.

PROF. M. B. LAL : My dear friend, I must profit by the experience of the Oxford

University and must also profit by the experience of the other universities of the world, including the experience of my own country. Now, Sir, as we all know, in the Oxford University the Vice-Chancellor is not appointed by the Central Government on the recommendation of any committee or out of a panel of persons. In the Oxford University the Vice-Chancellorship goes by rotation among the Principals of colleges known by different names. The Vice-Chancellor is first among the equals. He exercises only constitutional powers so that the university may function as a unity. Under this constitution not only the Vice-Chancellor is appointed by the Central Government but he may not be a teacher of the university concerned, he may not be a teacher at all, and more than that the Vice-Chancellor is empowered with powers unknown at least in Britain. He will have the power to suspend teachers including Principals of colleges. He will have power to appoint the Dean. Sir, I do not know any Indian university where Deans are appointed by the Vice-Chancellor. They are either elected by the Faculties, called here as Schools of Studies, or the Deanship goes by rotation in accordance with the principle of seniority.

Sir, I felt much honoured when the Education Minister started his speech with a reference to my minute of dissent, and I may assure him that if I have been convinced by his arguments, I will have not only withdrawn my opposition to this Bill but I would have apologised to this House for writing a strong minute of dissent, just as I apologised to my teacher, Dr. Sapru. It is true, Sir, that in modern times the personality cult of a leader ends with the death of that leader. Stalin's example is the most glaring example in this connection. But I regret to say that our Education Minister intends to perpetuate the personality cult even after the death of Prime Minister Nehru. I think he knows that while in modern times the personality cult of a leader ends with the leader, the personality cult of a prophet continues and is built up by his followers even after his death, and my regret is that here in the year 1965 an attempt is made to convert a political leader into a prophet, to defy him and to call upon the University to fulfil the ideals of that great prophet or leader.

[Prof. M.B Lal]

Sir, I have spent my life as a student and as a teacher. I have never come across any mention anywhere that the object of the university will be to fulfil the ideals or the principles of a particular person. Universities are organised to disseminate knowledge, to make advancement of knowledge, to build up the character of its students. Universities are not intended to fulfil the ideals of a particular person however big and great he may be. And here it is said that the University will be organised to fulfil the ideals that Jawaharlal Nehru stood for and worked for during his lifetime. I beg to submit that there is no State university, there is no secular university in the world where the name of a person is associated with the university. . .

SHRI R P N. SINHA (Bihar) What about the Washington University ?

PROF. M. B. LAL : . . . and the university is required to work for the ideals and ideas of that particular person. A great friend of mine talks about the Washington University. After President Washington, a State was named as Washington, and the Washington University is named after the State of Washington.

DR. TARA CHAND (Nominated) : It is called George Washington University.

PROF. M B LAL : Whether it is a private university or State university, I beg to submit that the most important example thereof is the Harvard University. It is named after a person. It developed out of a small institution known as Harvard School. It is a private institution, it is not a State university.

SHRI SYED AHMAD (Madhya Pradesh) : What about Lumumba University ?

PROF. M. B. LAL : One member says about Lumumba University. I feel diplomacy does not permit me to examine in detail why that university is named by the Government of the Soviet Union as Lumumba University. The purpose is different from an academic one.

SHRI R. P. N. SINHA : May I inform my friend that the Washington University is known as George Washington University ?

MR. CHAIRMAN : That has been pointed out already.

PROF. M. B. LAL : Even when there are a few universities in the world which are named after certain persons, there is not a single prospectus of any university saying, that the purpose of the university would be to fulfil the ideals of the particular person.

SHRI M. R. SHERVANI (Uttar Pradesh) . My hon friend agreed with the recommendation to associate the name of Malaviya with a certain university in India.

MR. CHAIRMAN : All minor differences need not be pointed out while he is speaking.

PROF. M. B. LAL : It is said that I myself recommended the name. I opposed the association of that name with that particular university. In spite of my opposition, the Education Minister said that there was a general consensus of opinion, and I kept quiet. Even today he will pass it as Jawaharlal Nehru University Act. What will I do ? Experience has proved that the association of that name neither honoured that person nor solved the difficulties which Parliament wished to be solved. I am told by very responsible persons that the addition of that name to that university made the situation much more difficult to be handled, and I am told otherwise also by responsible men that in the Lok Sabha the general idea was that the name should be dropped and it should be called only as Kashi Vishwavidyalaya. I beg to submit that we added the name of a big man to one university and involved him in the controversy. Now we are adding another big man's name to another university and involving him also in the controversy. Sir, I beg to submit that I have as much regard for Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru as anybody can have, and yet there are many of us including myself who are opposed to associating his name with the University. That indicates that we are unnecessarily involving the name of the great man in that controversy and doing nothing more.

I beg to submit, Sir, further that the Education Minister referred to an idea that I proposed, the deletion of the First Schedule, and what is wrong in it ? The Education Minister might have seen that in my

minute of dissent I did not object to the ideas embodied in the First Schedule. I only said that while the first part of that Schedule deserved to be embodied in the Act, the other parts of the Schedule deserved to be incorporated in Ordinances. The Education Minister also must have seen that some of the objects that are enumerated in the first part of the Schedule are proposed by me to be incorporated in the Bill when the powers of the University are to be enumerated. I beg to submit that the ideals which are enumerated here are mostly good—I have difference of opinion over one or two with which I will deal when I deal with the particular clause—and they are national ideals, not the ideals of a particular person. The concept of social justice is a concept interpreted in their own ways by different thinkers in Europe from the days of Plato to this day, and also in India that word has been interpreted by different thinkers. A university loses its universality, loses its nationalism, loses its dynamism, if that university is required to fulfil the ideas and ideals as propounded by a particular person. There is no idea which is static in character. With the change in life, there is a change in ideas, and the university must be the first to consider critically all ideas and be prepared to modify and propound new ideas. If Jawaharlal Nehru was a great man, Newton was surely a great scientist. But the cause of science would have suffered if the university had been told to stick to Newton's conception of gravitation and if the university had not been allowed to teach the subsequent changes introduced by the German scientists and now by our Indian scientists with regard to gravitation. There, I feel, you are converting the university into a church or a seminary of a church when you call upon a university to propagate, to further, the ideals held by a particular person at a particular stage of India's development or India's national life.

As far as the other things are concerned, many of these things can easily be embodied in the Ordinances under the proposed legislative measure. Firstly, the Ordinances are to be passed by the Vice-Chancellor with the sanction of the Central Government and very easily those things can be embodied in the Ordinances. But if the Education Minister has no patience, just as he included

a Schedule containing certain Statutes, he can also include a Schedule containing certain Ordinances.

Now, Sir, it is said that the University is to be a unique university because the University will also do these things enumerated in Schedule I. Do you mean to say that the other universities are not required to do so? The other day when the Banaras Hindu University Bill was under consideration, I proposed that we should require the Banaras University to promote education in democratic citizenship, in secular nationalism or in secularism and nationalism. The Education Minister asked me, rather appealed to me, to withdraw that amendment of mine. Now, what does he mean? He is bringing all these things here. So that this University may be a unique university in India, does he wish that none but this University should educate the students in democratic citizenship, in secularism and in nationalism and that the students of all other universities of India should be deprived of that education? If education in democratic citizenship, in democratic ways of life, in secularism, in nationalism and in social justice is necessary for the growth of social personality in India among Indian citizens, that education is to be imparted to all the students at all levels and should not be confined only to the students of the Jawaharlal Nehru University.

Then, Sir, what are the other things that they have given, on the basis of which it is said to be a unique university? It is said—

"provide facilities for students and teachers from other countries to participate in the academic programmes and life of the University"

I do not know whether the Education Minister is aware of the fact or not that there are many foreign students studying in the Delhi University, in the Banaras University, in the Lucknow University, in the Aligarh University, in the Allahabad University, in almost every university, and in these days, in almost all the Indian universities there is the exchange of one foreign professor or the other. So, this is not a unique feature of the University and it should not be a unique feature of any university, it should be a universal feature of all universities in the same way—Sir, I do not know

MR. CHAIRMAN : Is this uniqueness a part of the Bill or a part of the speech ?

PROF. M. B. LAL : It is a part of the speech, on the basis of which they are going to make it a unique institution.

Leaving that aside, I will invite your attention to a certain uniqueness which is a part of the Bill. What are the unique features of the Bill ? The first feature is, as I pointed out to you before, the association of a State University not only with the name of a particular person but also with the ideas and ideals of that particular person. The second unique feature of the University is that it has not defined territorial jurisdiction. Its territorial jurisdiction extends to India and it may extend even to countries outside India if somehow they come under the legislative jurisdiction of this Parliament. The third important, unique feature is that there will be dual academic jurisdiction over the institutions maintained and recognised outside the Union territory. I know, Sir, that every university is subject to the laws of the land. And a university set up by the Central Government or by Parliament is subject to the general laws of the Union as well as the general laws of the State. But so far as academic matters are concerned, it is subject to the rules and regulations of one authority. Now, here what does it say ? The clause runs like this—

“7. Notwithstanding anything contained in section 5,—

(a) where any institution or body established outside the Union territory of Delhi seeks recognition from the University, or

(b) where the University establishes and maintains any institution or body outside the Union territory of Delhi, then the powers and jurisdiction of the University shall extend to such institution or body subject to—

(i) the laws in force in the State within which, and

(ii) the rules and regulations of the University within whose jurisdiction, the said institution or body is situated.”

So, you may establish an institution under the Jawaharlal Nehru University subject to the jurisdiction of two authorities—the rules and regulations which you may

pass here or which may be passed under this particular Act, and the rules and regulations which may be passed concerning the university of that particular State by the State concerned. I am not a student of law. Therefore I do not know much about the decision concerning the conflict of jurisdictions. But I feel that there is bound to arise a conflict of jurisdictions when a single university or institution is subject to the rules and regulations passed by two different authorities in academic matters. (*Interruptions.*) Sir, my knowledge of law is very limited. I have studied only a few laws as a student of political science and the knowledge of the Education Minister in regard to law is very vast. But I would like to know whether there is any Act in the world where provisions are enacted in the way the First Schedule is given here. I will read it out to you and, Sir, you yourself, as a great educationist, will be able to make up your mind.

What does it say ?

“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, social justice, secularism, democratic way of life, international understanding and scientific approach to the problems of the country.”

Is it, Sir, a provision of law, or is it a manifesto or a resolution which political parties every day pass ? That is another unique feature of this particular Bill.

Then, Sir, the other academic thing is “association of academic institutions with the university”. There are universities which maintain institutions organised by the university, which admit to the privileges of the university certain institutions and colleges, which affiliate institutions to the university, and perhaps there is a provision that institutions may be recognised. But there is no question of the association of an academic body or of an academic institution to a university. This is another unique feature. And what will be that wonder of this association ?

We have today an Institute of Medical Sciences. It has its own importance, its own character, its own stature. Now

it has to be associated with the University which we are going to establish. Now it will cease to have an independent stature of its own and will have the stature of an associated institution. With a view to raising the stature of this University, we will be lowering the stature of many important institutions that are established or are proposed to be established in this country.

SHRI P. K. KUMARAN (Andhra Pradesh) : They can also be raised.

PROF. M. B. LAL : Another important feature of this thing is "co-operation with non-academic institutions". This is an important clause which deserves your consideration.

MR. CHAIRMAN : I would like to know how long you will take ? Our time is limited.

PROF. M. B. LAL : I will finish in five minutes. Rest of it I will say another time. Another important feature is :

"to co-operate with any other University, authority or association or any other public or private body . . ."

Mark the word "public or private body."

" . . . having in view the promotion of purposes and objects similar to those of the University for such purposes as may be agreed upon, on such terms and conditions as may, from time to time, be prescribed ;"

Suppose the Congress Party says that they also stand for the fulfilment of the ideals and ideas of Pt. Jawaharlal Nehru. Therefore, should the Jawaharlal Nehru University be prepared to co-operate with the Congress Party ? What will happen to the University which begins to co-operate with the public and private bodies like the Congress Party, or the Socialist Party or any other party ?

Sir, another unique feature of the University is the Dean's appointment by the Vice-Chancellor. I need not dilate more upon it because I have already dealt with it.

The most wonderful feature of this University Bill is that there is no provision with regard to the Board of Studies. In the whole Bill, the Board of Studies is conspicuous by its absence. It may be said that the School of Studies may appoint the Board of Studies. But, Sir, in this Bill

the School of Studies, which are usually called as faculties, are not empowered to appoint any committee. So they cannot appoint the Board of Studies.

PROF. B. N. PRASAD (Nominated) : They may be set up by Ordinances.

PROF. M. B. LAL : Another unique feature of the Bill is that the Bill provides for more than one Rector. When you say more than one Rector, it may be any number of Rectors. Unless that Rector happens to be a Principal of a college, you may have any number of Rectors. Here the word "Rector" is not used by them.

Lastly, the Vice-Chancellor's autocratic powers with regard to discipline. I will dilate upon them subsequently when that particular clause comes. Perhaps the Benares Hindu University Bill and this Bill are unique Bills where it is provided whether the students will have voluntary organisations or compulsory students' union. With these words, I take my seat.

श्री भगवत नारायण मागंव (उत्तर प्रदेश) : अध्यक्ष महोदय, इस बिल का मैं हृदय से स्वागत करता हूँ और शिक्षा मंत्री को इसके लिये बधाई देता हूँ। यह विश्व-विद्यालय न केवल भारतवर्ष के लिये महत्व का होगा; बल्कि मैं तो कहता हूँ कि अंतर्राष्ट्रीय महत्व का यह विश्वविद्यालय सिद्ध होगा।

मुझे दुःख है इस बात का कि लोगों को यह फ्रीबिया हो गया है कि जो कुछ दूसरे देशों में होता है वही हमारे यहां भी होना चाहिये और अगर कोई बात दूसरे देशों में नहीं हुई है तो वह हमारे देश में भी नहीं होनी चाहिये। अगर हमारे देशों में सत्य और अहिंसा का आदर्श नहीं माना जाता है तो हमारे देश में भी महत्मा गांधी ने और जवाहरलाल जी ने बड़ी गलती की जो वे सत्य और अहिंसा के मार्ग पर चले। जो ये शब्द बार बार दोहराये गये हैं कि इस यूनीवर्सिटी की यूनीक व्यवस्था हो, तो मैं यह समझता हूँ कि वास्तव में यह यूनीवर्सिटी बन कर, काम करके अपने को संसार में यूनीक सिद्ध करेगी।

[श्री भगवत नारायण भागवत ।]

मैं यह समझता हूँ कि इसके नाम का विरोध इसलिये होता है कि जवाहरलाल जी कांग्रेस के लीडर थे । अगर इसमें किसी जनसघ के लीडर का या पी० एस० पी० के लीडर का नाम लगा दिया जाता तो इतना इसका विरोध नहीं होता । यह कहना कि ससार में ऐसे विश्व-विद्यालय नहीं है, यह बात बिल्कुल गलत है । कितने ऐसे विश्वविद्यालय ससार में हैं जो साधारण व्यक्तियों के नाम से चल रहे हैं । प्राचीन काल में हमारे विद्यार्थी होते थे और वे आचार्यों के नाम से चलते थे । आज भी अरविन्द आश्रम को यूनीवर्सिटी ग्रांट्स कमीशन ने यूनीवर्सिटी का स्टेटस दिया है और जो डा० कोठारी ने यहाँ इस सम्बन्ध में कहा है, वह भी मैं बना देना चाहता हूँ

“ 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 is also 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 ”

और बाद में जाकर वे कहते हैं

“ The Commission has given its approval that Shri Aurobindo Ashram be deemed as a university under the U.G.C. Act retaining that name ”

अब सिर्फ इसमें उन्होंने कहा है कि मदर की क्या पाबर हो वहाँ, यह रह गया है । जो आदर्श उनके होंगे, उन्हीं आदर्शों का प्रसार और प्रचार होगा । इससे कोई इन्कार नहीं कर सकता कि सारे ससार के बड़े-बड़े नेताओं ने जवाहरलाल जी को एक अद्वितीय पुरुष बनाया है । हमारे देश में ही नहीं, सारे ससार के देशों में इतनी प्रतिष्ठा किसी दूसरे की नहीं है । भारतवर्ष के आदर्शों में और जवाहरलाल जी के आदर्शों में कोई अंतर नहीं है । इसमें जो आदर्श रखे गये हैं, वही भारतवर्ष के आदर्श हैं और भारतवर्ष के आदर्शों का प्रसार और प्रचार इस विश्वविद्यालय द्वारा होगा ।

इसमें पहले शेड्यूल में जो मन्तव्य रखे गए हैं उनके सम्बन्ध में मैं एक बात कहना चाहता हूँ । हम सब लोग जानते हैं कि जवाहरलाल जी का सारा का सारा जीवन देश की सेवा में व्यतीत हुआ । जितना त्याग उन्होंने किया उतना किसी दूसरे व्यक्ति ने नहीं किया । उनकी जो धारणा थी वह यह थी कि देश में समाजवादी ढंग के आधार पर समाज का निर्माण किया जाये । मैं यह निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि जो ध्येय पहले शेड्यूल में रखे गए हैं उनमें शोशलज्म का अवश्य जिक्र आना चाहिए था । समाजवादी समाज का हमको निर्माण करना है और अगर उस ध्येय को हम सामने रखें तो ज्यादा अच्छा होगा । इसको आन्जेक्टिक्स में हमें रखना चाहिए ।

यह विश्वविद्यालय, जैसा कि प्रोफेसर साहब ने कहा, कालेज्ज देश में, विदेश में स्थापित कर सकता है, यही इसकी अद्वितीयता है, इसकी विशेषता है । मेरा निवेदन है कि इसके अन्तर्गत आल इंडिया इस्टीट्यूट हो सकें और अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय इस्टीट्यूट हो सकें तथा देश के सभी भागों के विद्यार्थी इनमें भर्ती हो सकें । दिल्ली में तमाम विद्यार्थी मारे-मारे फिरते हैं, सारी यूनिवर्सिटी दिल्ली के विद्यार्थियों से ही न भर जाए । जैसे बनारस यूनीवर्सिटी है, अलीगढ़ यूनीवर्सिटी है, उनमें बाहर के विद्यार्थी आते हैं । हमें कुछ समय के लिए ऐसा अवश्य करना होगा कि हम हर स्टेट का कुछ कोटा नियत करें और उस कोटे के आधार पर अच्छे से अच्छे ब्रिलियेंट से ब्रिलियेंट विद्यार्थियों का चुनाव किया जाये । मेरा निवेदन है कि चुनाव केवल इसके ऊपर न हो कि फर्स्ट डिवीजन में है या डिस्टिक्शन आया है । कुछ यूनीवर्सिटीज में यह देखा गया है कि अपने विद्यार्थियों को प्रायः फर्स्ट डिवीजन दे देते हैं । इसलिए हमारे उपायों से करना चाहिए जिससे हम वास्तव में अच्छे, बुद्धिमान् और जिनमें ज्ञान के लिए तीव्र इच्छा हो, ऐसे विद्यार्थियों का इसमें ले सकें ।

मेरा निवेदन है कि यूनीवर्सिटी में प्रदेशों की ओर से ऐसे होस्टल्स बनाए जाएं जिनमें विद्यार्थी आकर रह सकें। ऐसा न हो कि उत्तर प्रदेश का होस्टल है तो उसमें उत्तर प्रदेश के ही लोग रहे। हर होस्टल में भिन्न-भिन्न भाषाओं के विद्यार्थी रहे जिसमें एक दूसरे से मिल सकें, एक दूसरे से विचार-विमर्श कर सकें। इसका एक अतिरिक्त लाभ यह होगा कि भिन्न-भिन्न भाषाओं के लड़के एक होस्टल में रहेगे तो एक दूसरे से भाषा का भी आदान-प्रदान होगा और जो हम चाहते हैं कि एकता हो, वह उद्देश्य भी पूरा हो सकेगा।

इसके बारे में प्रोफेसर साहव ने बार-बार कहा कि यूनीवर्सिटी है। मैं भी कहता हूँ कि यूनीवर्सिटी है। इसके लिए मेरा सुझाव यह है कि वाइस चांसलर इस यूनीवर्सिटी का इलेक्ट्रेड हो, अपाइन्टेड या नामीनेटेड न हो। उसको जो अधिकार दिए गए हैं उसमें कोई आपत्ति नहीं है, परन्तु अगर वह इलेक्ट्रेड हो जाये तो यह भी उसकी यूनीवर्सिटी होगी और इस प्रकार जो निर्वाचन का अधिकार है, उसको भी महत्व देंगे।

भाषा की जो संस्था रखी गई है उसमें अवश्य ही लिग्निस्टिक आइडेंटिटी के ऊपर रिसर्च होनी चाहिए जिससे कि सभी भाषाओं का सम्मेलन सा हो सके। कुछ दिन पूर्व शिक्षा उपमंत्री जी ने बताया कि इस बात का उद्योग कर रहे हैं कि लिपि के जो मिश्रित्व है उनमें एकरूपता आ सके, इस ओर हम अग्रसर हो रहे हैं। तो उस उद्देश्य की पूर्ति भी इससे हो सकती है।

एक बात मैं कहना चाहता हूँ स्टूडेंट्स और स्टाफ के रेशो के बारे में। प्रायः देखा गया है कि विद्यार्थियों की ओर उतना ध्यान नहीं दिया जाता जितना दिया जाना चाहिए क्योंकि अध्यापकों की संख्या कम होने के कारण उसका अनुपात 1:17 या 1:20 के करीब है। जो हमारे पुराने विश्वविद्यालय होते थे उनमें बिलकुल निकट की स्थिति होती

थी। साथ ही साथ विद्यार्थी और टीचर अलग अलग नहीं बल्कि एक भावना में, एक स्तर पर, एक साथ चलते थे, एक साथ खेलते-कूदते थे और एक साथ विचार-विमर्श करते थे। इस भावना को रखते हुए मैं निवेदन करूंगा कि हमारे यहाँ 1:4 या 1:5 का रेशो विद्यार्थियों का हो सके तो बहुत अच्छा हो।

दूसरी बात जो इस विश्वविद्यालय के लिए कहूंगा वह एक यूनीवर्सिटी की बात है। वह यह कि विश्वविद्यालयों में गरीबों के लड़कों के पढ़ने की कोई ठीक व्यवस्था नहीं है। गरीब लोग ऊंची शिक्षा पा नहीं सकते, इतनी अधिक फीस होती है, इतना अधिक खर्च होता है कि वह उसे पूरा नहीं कर सकते। इसलिए यह नहीं कि केवल फीस माफ कर दी गई या कुछ वर्जीफा दे दिया जाये, इसके लिए कुछ ऐसी व्यवस्था की जानी चाहिए जिससे जो गरीब लोग ब्रिलियन्ट हैं, जो इस विश्वविद्यालय में भरती होने के योग्य समझे जायें उनको न केवल वर्जीफा दिया जाये, बल्कि कुछ आर्थिक सहायता भी दी जाये जिससे कि वे अपनी शिक्षा का पूरा प्रबंध कर सकें।

जिन विषयों की शिक्षा देने का प्रश्न है, सेलेक्ट कमेटी ने उनमें दो और बढ़ाए हैं—सोशल साइंसेज और एप्लीकन्स। मैं निवेदन करूंगा कि इसी के साथ साथ अगर डिफेंस और इंडस्ट्री भी बढ़ा दिया जाये तो एक और आकर्षक बात होगी। यह तो ठीक है कि हमने एक जनरल बात कह दी कि सब विषय पढ़ाए जायेंगे। उससे विदेशों को भी पता नहीं चलता, हमारे देश को भी पता नहीं चलता। शिक्षा-मन्त्री जी ने, जब एवीडेन्स हो रहा था, एवीडेन्स के 47वें सफे पर इस बात को कहा था

"We shall have specific provision with regard to defence, industry, technology and production also."

यह बात उन्होंने कही। इस पर शायद विचार हुआ या नहीं हुआ, परन्तु यह बात बिल में न आ सकी अतएव यह कि डिफेंस

[श्री भगवत नारायण भार्गव]

और इंडस्ट्री का इसमें अवश्य उल्लेख होना चाहिए और हमको प्रोडक्शन और इकानामी के प्रति और देश की रक्षा के प्रति भी सतर्क होना चाहिए।

एक बात मैं वाइस चांसलर के सम्बन्ध में यह भी कहूंगा कि इस पद पर कोई रिटायर्ड आई० सी० एस० या रिटायर्ड हाई कोर्ट के जज न रखे जायें; बल्कि ऐसे व्यक्ति को रखा जाय जो शिक्षा-शास्त्री हो, जिसका अध्यापकों से, विद्यार्थियों से जीवन में सम्बन्ध रहा हो, जो विद्यार्थियों की भावनाओं, उनकी मान्यताओं का आदर करता हो। ऐसे व्यक्ति को रखा गया तो उससे विद्यार्थियों की विशेष उन्नति हो सकती है और विश्वविद्यालय की भी उन्नति हो सकती है।

टेक्स्ट बुक्स के सम्बन्ध में मेरा निवेदन यह है कि विश्वविद्यालय के अन्दर ही कोई ऐसा प्रावधान करना चाहिए जिससे वही से अच्छी से अच्छी टेक्स्ट बुक्स निकाली जा सकें; क्योंकि अगर वहाँ के अध्यापक इसमें दिलचस्पी लेंगे तो वह काम बहुत उच्च कोटि का होगा।

एक बात मैं और निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि विद्यार्थियों को हमें गर्वनिंग बाडीज़ में रिप्रेजेंटेशन देना चाहिए। उनको हम नीचा न समझें; यह न समझें कि अध्यापक ऊँचे हैं, अधिकारी वर्ग ऊँचा है और विद्यार्थी नीचे दर्जे के हैं। विद्यार्थियों में भी बहुत से ऐसे मिलेंगे जो वास्तव में इसके प्रशासन में पूरा सहयोग दे सकेंगे। तो अगर विद्यार्थियों का किसी रूप में, कितनी भी संख्या में, किसी भी मात्रा में उनका प्रतिनिधित्व गर्वनिंग बाडीज़ में रख सकें तो अच्छा हो। जो एवीडेन्स हुआ है उसमें यह भी बात आई कि कुछ विश्वविद्यालय ऐसे हैं दूसरे देशों में, जहाँ विद्यार्थियों को प्रतिनिधित्व दिया गया है। हमें विद्यार्थियों को अच्छा नागरिक बनाना है। इसके लिए आवश्यक है कि हम उसम इनका भी रिप्रेजेंटेशन रखें।

इसके अलावा हमें भारतीय संस्कृति पर बल देना चाहिए। भारतीय संस्कृति एक डायनेमिक संस्कृति है, प्रगतिशील संस्कृति है। इस संस्कृति के ऊपर हमें इसमें जोर देना चाहिए।

मैं चाहता हूँ कि इसके द्वारा शिक्षा में जो हमारे एम्पिरेशन्स हैं उनको आगे बढ़ा सकें, नए मूल्य दे सकें, नए एटिट्यूड दे सकें, हम सत्य के ऊपर और अहिंसा के ऊपर, पर्सनल इन्टेग्रिटी के ऊपर और नेशनल यूनिटी और नेशनल अंडरस्टैंडिंग के ऊपर भी बल दे सकें।

1 P. M.

MR. CHAIRMAN : We shall sit till 1-30. Mr. Thengari.

SHRI D. THENGARI (Uttar Pradesh) : Sir, I welcome some of the unique features of this proposed University, for example, its truly national character, introduction of some inter-disciplinary courses, its non-affiliating character, association of some eminent organisations without their losing in the least their much-prized autonomy or their dignity, constitution of the academic advisory committee and machinery for reviewing the progress of the University.

[THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN in the Chair]

While these according to me, are some of the welcome features, there are others which are not quite as welcome. Proposing to take the first question last— that is about the name of the University— I will just touch some of the points, because in clause by clause consideration we will take them up in detail.

To my mind the post of Chancellor is really superfluous. After apportionment of the top responsibilities between the Visitor and the Vice-Chancellor, I wonder what exactly is left behind for the Chancellor to do. There is a trend, and it is a healthy trend to do away with merely ornament or decorative posts, and therefore I think that this University can dispense with the post of Chancellor.

We also should not provide for more than one Rector. I feel that an increase in the number of Rectors will reduce the efficiency of administration. I can understand

the utility of decentralisation of administration, but in the case of a university or any educational institution unified supervision and unified management would be more helpful.

I do not subscribe to the view that only teachers should be entitled to become Vice-Chancellors, but at least it should be an educationist who should be a Vice-Chancellor and also the powers of Vice-Chancellor should not be as unlimited or autocratic as they have been laid down in the present Bill.

In the Second Schedule the power of the Registrar to take disciplinary action should be subject to subsequent approval of the Vice-Chancellor, and if that is not done, at least the employee should be given the right to appeal to the Vice-Chancellor, not only in cases of the penalty of the withholding of increment, but also in cases of all penalties, penalty of every variety. Similarly, an employee should have a right to appeal to the Executive Council against the order of the Vice-Chancellor, whether the penalty imposed is that of dismissal or of a less severe type. It has been laid down that "a person shall be disqualified for being chosen as, or for being a member of any of the authorities of the University if" among other things "he has been convicted by a court of law of an offence involving moral turpitude and sentenced in respect thereof to imprisonment for not less than six months". Now this qualifying clause seems to weaken the main purpose of this provision. If he is convicted of an offence involving moral turpitude, that should suffice. About the duration of the sentence there should be no qualifying clause, because moral turpitude is moral turpitude, and if we want to set an example of any ideal before the students it is necessary that we should be very strict in this respect.

Regarding removal of teachers on the ground of 'misconduct', I am all for it, and I would urge upon the authorities to be very strict on this point. But may I suggest that the term 'misconduct' is so vague and it is likely to be misused? The term must be properly defined, at least as properly as it is possible, lest any member of the teaching fraternity should be discriminated against. The same holds good in the case of the non-teaching staff also.

I welcome the provision for voluntary membership of students' organisation and also the provision of the constitution of a council of students' affairs consisting of teachers and students. This would go a long way in establishing cordial relationship between the teacher and the taught. In this context, I should like to insist on the proper maintenance of the teacher and the taught ratio, that is 1 : 20.

Now I come to the First Schedule. It is stated that this University is expected to fulfil the ideals that Jawaharlal Nehru stood and worked for during his lifetime. Now all of us have a very high regard for the late revered Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru. He was one of the greatest leaders of humanity and scientific outlook was his special characteristic. Now through this wording I think we are trying to create almost a church out of the theories or ideals that he stood for. This task, however noble, comes hardly within the legitimate jurisdiction of a university. This is the work of a church, not of a university. The University should be expected to encourage the study of and to conduct research in the philosophy of Pandit Nehru, but not to "fit in the ideals" he stood and worked for. Madam, through this fulfilment of the ideals through the medium of a university, I fear we will be carving an 'ism' out of his philosophy, and this is something damaging to the personality of the late revered Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru. This is very unfortunate because, as all of us know, Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru's thinking was dynamic, not static, and every 'ism' is necessarily, invariably and inevitably a closed system of thinking. The moment it ceases to be closed, it ceases to be an 'ism' and therefore, to carve out Nehruism would be doing some damage to the grand dynamic personality of Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru. In this connection, it is worth noting that Lord Buddha has said something very relevant, and we all know how Pandit Nehru respected Lord Buddha. Now he says— I am quoting a translation by Dr. Arambekar— "Do not believe what your Teacher tells you, merely out of respect for the Teacher. But whatsoever, after due examination and analysis, you find to be conducive to the good, the benefit, the welfare of all beings—that doctrine believe, and cling to" and take

[Shri D. Thengari]

as your guide" "Be Lamps unto Thyself", that was his last advice to his disciples. Buddha, whom Pandit Nehru respected so much, was opposed to scripturalism, and also to the personality cult. He observed,—and again I am quoting Dr. Ambedkar's translation—"If principle needs the authority of man, it is no principle. If every time it becomes necessary to invoke the name of the Founder to enforce the authority of Dhamma, then it is no Dhamma."

On this ground Buddha refused to appoint his successor. He said "Dhamma must be its own successor". As Dr. Ambedkar points out, Buddha—whom, I again repeat, Jawaharlal Nehru respected so much—kept his teachings separate from his personality. Principle, Buddha remarked, must live by itself, and not by authority of any man, not even of himself. That is why I feel that none of us can respect Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru more than what Kassyappa, the President of the first Buddhist Congregation held after the death of Buddha, praised and respected Lord Buddha, and in that first Congregation Kassyappa conducted only two enquiries to the august assembly, about the Dhamma of the body and about the Vinaya of the body, and nothing about his personal biography or life. I think that this spirit is necessary for maintaining the dignity of the personality we are going to respect.

Regarding the name of the University, much has been said. I need not repeat the decision taken by the Ministry regarding the naming of the University, also the endorsement of the decision by the University Grants Commission, but I may only say that Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru himself would not have appreciated or liked the idea of naming any university after his own name for the simple reason that we all know how sincerely, how earnestly he respected the late revered Mahatma Gandhi. But still, during his lifetime, he never tried to set up—he could have done it had he wanted to—any university after the name of Mahatma Gandhi. We also know that in our India, also in the Buddhist tradition, which Nehruji loved so much, universities had been set up. But they were not named after any particular individual, howsoever great the individual may be. We have had the Nalanda University. It was not named

after Buddha or Ashoka. As Carlyle said, "No truly great religious teacher ever intended to found a new sect." Did Pandit Nehru teach any thing which was not part of our national culture?

[THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA) in the Chair]

I agree with the hon. Education Minister when he says that whatever was taught to us by Pandit Nehru has become a part of our national culture. I want to supplement it by adding that whatever he taught was also a part of our national heritage, and in this sense I think that, if we tried to name the University after Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, we would be trying to degenerate the dynamic personality of Pandit Nehru into the status of a sectarian leader because, as we have seen in a number of cases, in times historical and modern, out of the misguided over-enthusiasm of followers, persons who stood for rationalism, for scientific outlook, have been reduced to the status of leaders of ordinary sects. I think that this injustice should not be done to the late revered Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru.

SHRI KOTA PUNNAIAH (Andhra Pradesh) : Mr. Vice-Chairman, I rise to give my wholehearted support to the Bill now before the House. It is good that a university is being constituted in the name of an illustrious son of India and beloved leader, the late Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru. There is no need for me to explain the greatness of one of the world's greatest men, who devoted his entire life for the betterment of humanity. Whatever we may do for him would be very little if we take his services to our country into consideration. I would like to congratulate the hon. Education Minister and the Government for bringing forward this Bill to commemorate the memory of one of the foremost democrats of the world who believed in democracy and worked for it throughout his life. As an educationist and a democrat, Panditji firmly believed in the spread of education among the masses as the very foundation of a strong secular democratic society. Time and again Panditji reminded educationists and educational institutions to meet the urge in the common people for enlightenment. In the fast changing society now science and technology have assumed an

enormous proportion of importance affecting the day-to-day life of the people. Hence it is gratifying to note that the new University would not only devote its energy to spread knowledge in the different sciences but also for teaching the humanities. Panditji was a humanitarian. It is fitting to name this University after Pandit Nehru.

On this occasion we must seriously consider how best we will be able to propagate his teachings so that we may develop the social philosophy of our nation in consonance with his ideology. What is the role of a university? Universities have a tremendous role to play in this country and this University must take early steps to make Pandit Nehru's teachings a part and parcel of the curriculum in the Universities so that the student community may be benefited. The Education Minister has to deal expeditiously with this matter. The students of science and technology, engineering and medicine should also have some lectures in humanities so that we can build up personalities with technical training not in a vacuum but with a social philosophy as a guiding light. If we look at the past history of India, we feel that the various systems of Indian philosophy have influenced our thinking in India and during this technological age we should have a firm policy which should guide our thinking and action. Nehruji's teachings, I believe, provide the necessary social philosophy for our nation and it is the duty of every Indian citizen to get himself trained in absorbing that philosophy. While I hope that this University will devote its attention in this respect, I would like several other universities in this country to undertake this task of providing facilities for the study of the teachings of Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru. Thank you.

SHRI K. DAMODARAN (Kerala) : Mr. Vice-Chairman, neither from the Bill nor from the statements and speeches of the spokesmen of the Government has it become clear to me at least whether the Government itself has made up its mind as to what exactly should be the governing characteristics of this proposed new University. On the one hand, they have said that the new University has become necessary because of the phenomenal rise in the student population of Delhi and because the existing Delhi University is not able to fulfil the demands and it has also become unwieldy and cumbersome. On the other hand, they say

that the new University will be a fitting memorial to our departed leader, one of the greatest men produced by the twentieth century, Jawaharlal Nehru. I do not know what exactly the Government has in its mind, whether it wants only a replica of the old university or to break new ground in the system of university education in our country. If their approach to the recent happenings in the Banaras University is a pointer, then I am afraid they will be incapable of fulfilling the ideals of Jawaharlal Nehru. Of course, the hon. the Education Minister yesterday asserted that the new University will not be a mere addition to the existing universities of the country. He said that the new Nehru University will be of an entirely new type and will be unique among Indian universities. But how he is going to make it unique is not yet made clear.

Of course, the First Schedule has spelt out some of the features of the new University. For example, there should be special provision for integrated courses in humanities and the sciences, for promoting interdisciplinary studies, establishing 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, and to provide facilities for students and teachers from other countries to participate in the academic programmes and life of the University. All these are good. But I still feel that something is lacking here. Where is that integrated outlook of Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru? Where is his philosophy and where is his world outlook? In the first paragraph where they give what Nehru stood for, I do not know why the Government or the hon. Education Minister has avoided the use of the word "socialism". Of course, Nehru stood for all these things all his life, for national integration, social justice, secularisms, democratic way of life, international understanding and scientific approach to the problems of the country and so on. All this is correct. But why say "social justice"? Did he not stand for socialism? Why not use the word "socialism"? Nehru's life, according to me, harmonises the blending of patriotism and socialism, just as he defended a blending of ancient and modern cultures. Nehru

represented a new outlook in history, a new outlook of culture, a new outlook to world problems. His contributions are not only to international understanding, non-alignment and secularism but also to socialism. His contributions to socialism are well known. The Government and the country have declared socialism to be our aim. Even the leader of the Swatantra Party has no objection to socialism if by socialism is meant the existence of private capitalist ownership of the means of production and distribution. But the vast majority of our people have taken seriously to socialism in its right meaning. Yet, look at the curricula of the University colleges. We do not find much of this great ideal in the books taught there. Many of the textbook writers are dominated by some form of hostility to socialism, hostility to anything new. It appears that they still live in the good old days and imitate the dead by-gone past. I suggest that the proposed University should give special facilities for the study of socialism, the history of socialism, the philosophy, etc. I do not say that only Marxism should be given a place there. Nehru himself said that Marxism opened up a new outlook for him. It is, therefore, necessary to give a place for Marxism also. It is also necessary to appraise the students with the experience of the socialist countries, their weaknesses as well as achievements. We must commend socialism on the basis of our own tradition, culture and our own experience.

Speaking about tradition, I may point out that only the reactionary and unhealthy traditions are being exaggerated and the progressive and healthy traditions of our country are all but forgotten. Our students are being kept under some obscurantist bond. Recent events in the Banaras University are an eye-opener. The depth of the omnipotence of obscurantism and the surrender of Government before the forces of obscurantism are seen there; I am sorry to say that. I suggest that the new University should give special emphasis to the study of our history, our traditions and our culture in the way Nehru understood them. You will find that even today our history books are divided into Hindu, Muslim and British periods as if the Muslims and the Hindus are two separate nations.

Such history books, I feel, will only foster separatism and obscurantism. It is forgotten that ours is a composite culture, not an Aryan culture. Even the Aryans were Indianised by our culture, the roots of which lie in the remote past, thousands of years before the advent of the Aryans. Ours is a great country not only of different religions and philosophies but of numerous languages and regional cultures. A real history of India on the basis of a study of these different regional cultures is yet to be written but national integration demands that. It is necessary to have a new orientation, a new cultural and historical approach. I suggest that the new University should establish a Department of Indology with this idea of national integration in view.

I do not want to make many more suggestions. Of course, many suggestions may be made but the most important thing is that the Government must make up its mind as to what should be the unique feature of the University and how to implement it. They say that the ideals of Nehru should be implemented through this University but they have not yet made it clear as to how exactly the ideals of Nehru will be implemented through the functioning of this University. I hope the hon. Minister will rise to the occasion and will succeed in his efforts.

Thank you, Sir.

श्री देवकीनंदन नारायण (महाराष्ट्र) :
आदरणीय उपसभाध्यक्ष जी, जिन हालतों में यह यूनीवर्सिटी बनना तय हुआ है उसकी ओर भी हमको ध्यान देना चाहिये। दिल्ली की आबादी दिन प्रति दिन बढ़ती जा रही है और 7 लाख से 30 लाख आबादी हो गई है। जहाँ पहले दिल्ली के कालेजों में 5 हजार विद्यार्थी पढ़ते थे वहाँ अब 28 हजार विद्यार्थी हो गये हैं, जहाँ पहले 7-8 कालेज थे, वहाँ अब 31 कालेज हैं और यही कारण था यह सोचने का कि यहाँ पर एक और नई यूनीवर्सिटी खोली जाये।

1960 में यूनिवर्सिटी ग्रांट्स कमीशन ने सिफारिश की थी कि दिल्ली में एक नई यूनीवर्सिटी खोले जाने की बहुत आवश्यकता

है और दिल्ली यूनीवर्सिटी ने भी बहुत जोरों से इस बारे में मांग की और हमारी सरकार ने इस मांग को बबल किया। बाद में हमारे माननीय मंत्री जी स्वर्गीय पंडित जवाहरलाल नेहरू जी से मिले और अपनी कल्पना उनके सामने रखी कि यहां पर एक नई यूनीवर्सिटी बनानी होगी और हम चाहते हैं कि आपका नाम इस यूनीवर्सिटी को दिया जाये। पंडित जवाहरलाल नेहरू जी ने इस सुझाव को पसंद नहीं किया और इतना ही नहीं, इसका साफ विरोध किया। बाद में पंडित जवाहरलाल नेहरू गुजर गये और हमारे मंत्री महोदय ने तय किया कि पंडित जी के नाम से ही यह यूनीवर्सिटी खोली जाये और हम कल से यहां पर देख रहे हैं कि इस नाम पर एक विवाद खड़ा हो गया है और इस तरह का विवाद होना स्वाभाविक भी है। किसी संस्था को किसी बड़े आदमी का नाम दे देना, इस तरह की परिपाटी हमारे यहां चली आ रही है और आज इस तरह कई विश्वविद्यालय और कई कालेज बड़े बड़े आदमियों के नामों पर हम देखते हैं। मथुरा में पंडित जी के नाम का एक कालेज है, दिल्ली में मौलाना आजाद के नाम पर मेडिकल कालेज है और महात्मा गांधी जी के नाम पर, यदि मैं भूलता नहीं हूं, हैदराबाद में एक मेडिकल कालेज है। तो इस तरह नाम रखने की आदत हमारे हिन्दुओं और हिन्दुस्तानियों में बहुत पहले से चली आती है और हर एक संस्था को बड़ा नाम देने की कोशिश करते हैं।

श्री रमेश चन्द्र शंकरराव खांडेकर (मध्य प्रदेश) : जबलपुर में भी पंडित जी के नाम पर एक एग्रीकल्चरल कालेज है।

श्री देवकीनन्दन नारायण : मैंने तो एक उदाहरण दिया और इस तरह के अनेक और उदाहरण दिये जा सकते हैं। मेरे कहने का मतलब यह है कि यहां पर जो विवाद खड़ा हुआ है और योग्य है, वह यह है कि आप स्वर्गीय पंडित जवाहरलाल नेहरू के याददाश्त के लिए यह नाम नहीं दे रहे हैं। इस यूनीवर्सिटी

का जो आब्जेक्ट है उसका संबंध जवाहरलाल जी के नाम से जोड़ा जा रहा है और यह कहा जा रहा है कि जवाहरलाल नेहरू जी जिन आइडियल्स, जिन आब्जेक्ट्स के लिए जिये या मरे, उनकी अभिव्यक्ति इस यूनीवर्सिटी में होनी चाहिये। मैं यह जरूर चाहता हूं कि आप इस यूनीवर्सिटी को पंडित जवाहरलाल नेहरू का नाम देना चाहते हैं तो उनकी याददाश्त में जरूर दे दिया जाय, परन्तु आब्जेक्ट्स के साथ उनका नाम जोड़ना, आब्जेक्ट्स को उनके नाम का बंधन लगाना या मर्यादित कर देना, मेरे ख्याल से ठीक नहीं है। मेरे ख्याल से ज्ञान, 'नालेज' और 'विजडम' की कोई मर्यादा नहीं हो सकती और कोई यह नहीं कहेगा कि पंडित जी was the last word on knowledge and wisdom. इस तरह से 'नालेज' और 'विजडम' पर कोई बंधन लगाना या मर्यादा लगाना ठीक नहीं है, यह मैं मानता हूं।

दूसरी बात मैं माननीय मंत्री जी से यह कहना चाहता हूं कि मुझे इस बात का डर है कि आगे रोजाना इस बारे में विवाद खड़े होंगे और पंडित जी के आइडियल्स के तरह तरह के इन्टरप्रिटेशन होंगे, तरह-तरह के अर्थ किये जायेंगे और बहस होगी। एक कहेगा कि उसका मतलब यह है और दूसरा कहेगा कि उसका अर्थ वह है; यानी हम एक बहस-मुबाहिसा के लिए जगह पैदा कर देंगे। यदि पंडित जी का नाम आब्जेक्ट्स के साथ जोड़ा जायेगा; यह मेरी दूसरी आपत्ति है। वैसे आप जानते हैं कि पंडित जवाहरलाल जी के प्रति मेरे दिल में आदर-भक्ति और किसी से कम नहीं है। मैं उनका 40 वर्ष से सिपाही रहा हूं और उन्हीं के चरणों में बैठ कर मैंने देशभक्ति और देश-सेवा सीखी है, इसलिए मेरे दिल में उनके प्रति आदर और किसी से कम नहीं हो सकता है, यह मुझे यहां पर कहना है। नालेज एण्ड विजडम प्रोइंग एण्ड एक्स-पैडिंग होते हैं। सोशलिज्म, सिक्वोलरिज्म और डेमोक्रेसी की परिभाषा मर्यादित नहीं

[श्री देवकीनन्दन नारायण]

है, वह बढ़ती जाने वाली है। जिस तरह से गीता के हर एक शब्द का अर्थ बढ़ता जाता है, उसी तरह से आइडियल्स और आब्जेक्टिव्ज की परिभाषा बढ़ती जायेगी और विकसित होगी। इसलिए उन पर कोई बंधन लगाना, मर्यादा रख देना, मेरे ख्याल से ठीक नहीं कर रहे हैं।

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री महावीर प्रसाद भार्गव) :
अब आप दोपहर के बाद कहियेगा।

The House stands adjourned till 2 30 p m

The House then adjourned for lunch at thirty minutes past one of the clock.

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

श्री देवकीनन्दन नारायण उपसभाध्यक्ष जी, मैं यह कह रहा था कि नाम से उद्देश्यों को बाधा न जाये। उद्देश्यों को समय के साथ-साथ बढ़ते देना चाहिये, उनका विस्तार होने देना चाहिये। कल माननीय शिक्षा मंत्री जी ने कहा कि मैं इस यूनीवर्सिटी को बहुत ऊँचे दर्जे की, हाई स्टैडर्ड की यूनीवर्सिटी बनाना चाहता हूँ। यह बहुत अच्छी बात है, मगर मैं यह नहीं समझ सका कि माननीय मंत्री इस यूनीवर्सिटी के साथ इतने पाशियल क्यों हैं? माननीय मंत्री तो हिन्दुस्तान के मंत्री हैं। सेंट्रल यूनीवर्सिटीज भी एक नहीं कई हैं। और भी यूनीवर्सिटीज को उनका मार्गदर्शन मिलता है। तो यह कह कर ईर्ष्या पैदा करना है और यूनीवर्सिटी वालों के दिलों में कि इस तरह हमारे मंत्री पाशियालिटी दिखा रहे हैं। और फिर बात यह है कि किसी भी यूनीवर्सिटी को लीजिए, वहाँ की पढ़ाई को लीजिए, उनके उद्देश्यों को लीजिये, उनमें बहुत फर्क नहीं है। वही पढ़ाया जाता है, वही उद्देश्य है, वही सब बातें हैं, परिणाम क्या है? यह बात अलग है। वे यह चाहते हैं

कि यह ऊँचे स्टैडर्ड की यूनीवर्सिटी बने और इसका विस्तार भी खूब करना चाहते हैं, तो यह बात माननी चाहिये कि विस्तार में गहराई नहीं हुआ करती। विस्तार में गहराई बहुत कम होती है। आप इस यूनीवर्सिटी को बहुत चौड़ा करना चाहते हैं। यदि आप इस यूनीवर्सिटी को ऊँचे दर्जे की बनाना चाहते हैं, तो मैं यह कहूँगा कि गहराई बढ़ाने का मेरा मतलब यह है कि इसे यूनीवर्सिटी रेजिडेंशियल यूनीवर्सिटी बनाइये, जहाँ शिक्षक और विद्यार्थी एक जगह रहें, अपना नित्य का जीवन, सुबह से शाम तक वा, परस्पर देखे और एक दूसरे को अपना सके और शिक्षक विद्यार्थियों पर कुछ असर डाल सके। वृक्ष की परीक्षा उसके फल से होती है और यह यूनीवर्सिटी माधन है, साध्य नहीं। It is not an end but a means. हमें यह देखना चाहिये कि हमारे इन विद्यालयों में से, हमारे इन विद्यापीठों में से किस तरह के विद्यार्थी बाहर आते हैं, किस तरह के नागरिक हमें मिलने वाले हैं। हमें चरित्रवान् नागरिकों की जरूरत है, हमें आदर्शवादी नागरिकों की जरूरत है। हमें उन भावी नेताओं की जरूरत है कि जो शैक्षणिक, नैतिक और आध्यात्मिक मामलों में देश का नेतृत्व कर सकें और आज हमारे देश की जो जरूरतें हैं, उनको पूरा कर सकें। मुझे डर है कि ये बातें कही हो नहीं रही हैं। यह सोचना चाहिये कि क्या कारण है कि आज के शिक्षा का परिणाम और फल जो हम चाहते हैं वह क्यों नहीं मिल रहा है। मुझे डर है कि वही बात होने वाली है। 'योर मोस्ट ऑबीडिएन्ट सर्वेन्ट्स' की संख्या बढ़ने वाली है। मैं यह पूछना चाहूँगा कि आज शिक्षितों की जो बेकारी बढ़ रही है, उसको किस तरह से आप रोकेंगे? आप कौन सी शिक्षा विद्यार्थियों को देंगे जिसमें हमारी यह बेकारी दूर हो और 'योर मोस्ट ऑबीडिएन्ट सर्वेन्ट्स' की संख्या बन्द हो? यह मैं जानना चाहूँगा। आप एग्जीक्यूटिव ही लीजिए। एग्जीक्यूटिव ग्रैज्युएट्स आज इस देश में 25 हजार से ज्यादा हैं।

Hardly two per cent are doing agricultural farm work. All others are engaged in some service or other of Government or semi-Government. तो यदि फल से वृक्ष की परीक्षा होनी है तो आप की यूनिवर्सिटी की परीक्षा भी इससे होनी है कि यूनिवर्सिटी से बाहर निकलने वाले विद्यार्थी किस चरित्र के, किन आदर्शों के और किन उद्देश्यों के हैं और देश को, समाज को, कैसा नेतृत्व देने वाले हैं, जिनसे देश आगे बढ़े और देश का उत्कर्ष हो। बात यह है कि शिक्षा की अभिव्यक्ति नित्य जीवन में होनी चाहिये। आज शिक्षा और जीवन में पार्थक्य है। शिक्षा जीवन में व्यक्त नहीं हो रही है और यही कारण है उसका जो कुछ मद्रास में हुआ और अभी कुछ दिन पहले बनारस में हुआ। क्या आप यह मानते हैं कि जो कुछ हुआ वही वहां पढ़ाया जाता है, वही वहां की शिक्षा का परिणाम है, वही शिक्षा का उद्देश्य था? फिर यह क्यों हो रहा है? कारण यह है कि शिक्षा का जीवन में कोई सम्बन्ध नहीं है। इसलिये मैं कह रहा हूं कि रेजीडेंशियल यूनिवर्सिटी बनाइये जिससे वहां के नेतृत्व का सुबह से रात के सोने तक जीवन पर असर हो, उनको सजीव शिक्षा मिले, उनके सामने ऐसे उदाहरण पेश हों जिससे वे चरित्रवान बन सकें।

दूसरी बात सोशल जस्टिस की कही जाती है। आज आप जानते हैं कि क्लामेज और मासेज में गल्फ बढ़ता जा रहा है, कम नहीं हो रहा है। सोशलिज्म की बातें बहुत हो रही हैं, परन्तु क्लामेज और मासेज में अंतर बढ़ रहा है। उसका क्या कारण है? सोशलिज्म की बातें हैं, सोशल जस्टिस की बातें हैं, डिमोक्रेसी की बातें हैं, परन्तु ये नमाम बातें अखबारों में हैं, जुबान पर हैं, अतःकरण में नहीं हैं, जीवन में नहीं हैं। इस लिये मैं आपसे चाहूंगा कि ये बातें जीवन में आवे और इसके लिये आप क्या शिक्षा-व्यवस्था कर रहे हैं?

आपने कारेस्पॉन्डेंस कोर्सज भी इसमें रख दिये हैं एजुकेशन थ्रू पोस्ट आफिमेज।

मैं नहीं समझता कि आपके उच्चादर्श, उच्च स्टैंडर्ड के अनुरूप यह बात कैसे हो सकती है?

पंडित जी का नाम लिया जाता है, बहुत अच्छी बात है। प्रातरमरणीय है पंडित जी, रोज़ सुबह हमें उनको याद करना चाहिये। पंडित जी विज्ञान के बहुत बड़े भक्त थे, परन्तु यह भी पंडित जी पहचानने लगे थे कि विज्ञान बड़ी डिजास्ट्रस बात है, इसके परिणाम बहुत बुरे होते हैं और हो रहे हैं। इसलिये आखिर में वे कहने लगे थे कि विज्ञान और अध्यात्म की युति होनी चाहिये, मिलाप होना चाहिये। वे यह कहने थे कि विज्ञान जहां पढ़ाया जाये, वहां अध्यात्म भी पढ़ाया जाय। जहां विज्ञान को अध्यात्म का साथ-आधार नहीं होगा वहां विज्ञान सर्वनाशक बनेगा। जहां अध्यात्म को विज्ञान का साथ नहीं मिलेगा वहां व्यवहार दूर हो जायेगा। इसलिये विज्ञान और अध्यात्म, ये दोनों बातें जहां सिखलाई जायेंगी वही विज्ञान का परिणाम उत्तम होने वाला है, अध्यात्म भी जीवित रहने वाला है जो कि इस देश की प्राचीन संस्कृति है। इसलिये मैं यह कहूंगा कि इस यूनिवर्सिटी में विज्ञान के साथ अध्यात्म की शिक्षा जोड़ी जाये जो कि पंडित जी चाहते थे।

इसके बाद एक बात और पंडित जी चाहते थे जिसके लिये मैं प्रार्थना करूंगा माननीय मंत्री जी से कि वे उसको इसमें दाखिल करें। वे यह जानते थे कि हमारे विद्यार्थी डिग्री पाने के बाद समाज के किसी काम में नहीं आते। इसलिये उन्होंने कई दफा यह कहा था कि परीक्षा पाने होने के बाद और डिग्री देने से पहले हर विद्यार्थी को वर्ष या दो वर्ष सोशल सर्विस कम्पलमरीली करना चाहिए। मेडिकल रिसर्च इंस्टीट्यूट की फाउन्डेशन स्टोन सेरीमनी के वक्त उन्होंने कहा था कि मेडिकल स्टूडेंट के लिये यह कम्पलमरी होना चाहिये कि उसको जब डिग्री दी जाये उससे पहले वह साल, दो साल गांवों में जाकर सेवा करें। मैं यह चाहूंगा कि ऐसी कोई व्यवस्था इस

[श्री देकीनन्दन नारायण]

बिल में की जाये, ताकि डिग्री पाने से पहले वह कुछ प्रत्यक्ष सामाजिक शिक्षा ले जिससे उसके भविष्य के व्यवहार में सोशल जस्टिस की आशा दिखाई दे, कुछ लोगों की सेवा करे, कुछ समाज की सेवा करे। विद्यार्थी परीक्षा में तो पाम हो जाता है, परन्तु पढ़ने से गुनने की बात अलग होती है। पढ़ने के बाद उनका प्रत्यक्ष गुण भी देखा जाये और तब उनको डिग्री दी जाये।

इसके बाद एक बान और कहना चाहता हूँ। इस तमाम विधेयक में कहीं मीडियम का जिक्र नहीं है। हम चाहते हैं कि इस देश की भाषा हिन्दी हो। आखिरी में इस देश की भाषा हिन्दी होने वाली है। यह नई यूनीवर्सिटी है और यहाँ आप हिन्दी से शुरुआत कर सकते हैं। आप यह कहें कि आज यह बहुत विकसित नहीं है, तो आखिर तक आप इसको ऐमा ही पायेंगे। अंग्रेजी तो जा ही रही है। वैसे उसमें और अंग्रेजी में अंतर रहेगा ही, वह कम होने वाला नहीं है, बहुत जल्दी कम नहीं होगा। तो मैं आपसे यह प्रार्थना करूँगा कि आप हिन्दी मीडियम यहाँ शुरू करें। आप की सिलेक्ट कमेटी के सामने बहुत से वाइस चांसलरों ने कहा कि ह्यूमेनिटीज के लिये हिन्दी माध्यम कर दी जाय। मैं अपनी ओर से यह नहीं कह रहा हूँ, बड़े बड़े विद्वानों ने आपकी सिलेक्ट कमेटी में कहा कि

Humanities at least should be taught through the medium of Hindi. आप शुरुआत करें। यदि आप ऐसा नहीं करेंगे तो लोगों का ऐमा खयाल होगा कि आप कहते कुछ हैं और करते कुछ हैं। आप हिन्दी चाहते हैं, परन्तु हिन्दी को माध्यम बनाने का जब मौका आता है तो आप उसका फायदा नहीं लेते। मैं तो बहुत शिक्षित नहीं हूँ, हालांकि कालेज देखा है, 4 वर्ष कालेज में बिताए हैं। कहा जाता है कि आक्सफोर्ड में जो डिग्री लिखी जाती है, वे लटिन में लिखी जाती है। फिर हमारे यहाँ जो डिग्री क्यों न संस्कृत में लिखी जाये, हिन्दी में लिखी जाये;

वे क्यों अंग्रेजी में लिखी जाये? प्राचीन संस्कृति की हम रोजाना स्तुति करते हैं, बड़ाई करते हैं। हमारी संस्कृत भाषा जो हमारी संस्कृति की, परम्परा का जननी है, उस संस्कृत भाषा में अगर डिग्री लिखी जाये, तो बहुत अच्छा हो। यह भी एक नया तरीका होगा। बहुत सी नई बातें आप करने को जा रहे हैं, एक नई बात यह भी शुरू करें।

आखिरी बान यह है कि जो कि मुझे विचित्र मालूम देती है। आपने इस विधेयक में चांसलर का इलेक्शन लिखा है। "He will be elected by the Court." एक तो चांसलर को कोई पावर नहीं। वह बहुत बड़ा डिगनिटरी होगा। अगर उसको इलेक्शन के झड़ट में डालेंगे, कोर्ट के जहाँ सौ, डेढ़ सौ सदस्य होंगे तो उस बेचारे की बड़ी खींचतान होगी, उसकी डिगनिटी कहा तक रहेगी? इसलिए मैं चाहूँगा कि अगर आप इस चांसलर की जगह को बहुत महत्व की मानते हैं, बहुत बड़ा उसे डिगनिटरी मानते हैं, उसका महत्व भी कायम रखना चाहते हैं तो उसको इलेक्शन के झड़ट से बचाइए और इलेक्शन की चक्की में उसे न डालिए। इतनी ही मेरी आखिरी प्रार्थना है।

SHRI G RAMACHANDRAN (Nominated) : Mr Vice-Chairman, may I begin by saying that I am always a little nervous when you are in the Chair ? You look much too grim for a timid fellow like me. But I am very grateful you have broken into a smile already. I want to begin by paying a tribute to Prof. Mukut Behari Lal, who entered the lists like a gallant knight-errant tilting with all his strength of arms and lance against the idea that the university is to be named after a person, however great. I confess I listened to him with a certain amount of intellectual admiration and appreciation and I very much wish I could join hands with him in this tournament of tilting against a name. But I want my friend to realise that it is not logic that always decides a great issue. Logic is on his side, irresistible logic, and he brought an array of facts and figures to back up his logic, but there is such a thing as the sentiment of a people and the

feelings of reverence of a great nation. He himself would on another occasion in regard to some other issue, develop nothing less than the fervour of sentiment and emotion. We attach sentiment and emotion to something or other, after having made up our mind about something in advance, and then bring up logic to support it. If somebody had asked me before anything was done about this University, 'Shall we call this university after the name of one of the greatest men of our country in this century?', I would have said 'No'. I would have said 'No', because to attach the name of a man to a university is to do something very unpredictable. Look at what is happening in the Aligarh University and the Banaras Hindu University. One was founded by Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya and the other by an equally great Indian, Sir Syed Ahmed Khan. They started with noble ideals. What is happening in these Universities today? How are we going to sit here and foresee what will happen in the next ten, twenty or thirty years in the Jawaharlal Nehru University? Things might be happening which might be completely contrary to the ideals, thoughts and programmes of Jawaharlal Nehru. So, if somebody had asked me in the beginning, I would have said, avoid this name.

I understand—and I am hoping I am not letting out any secret—that when the Education Minister approached Pandit Nehru, as he himself admitted on the first day, our great departed leader said, 'No' and then he added, now that Pandit Nehru is no more, he is not bound by his wishes. It sounded a little strange to me that we respect the wishes of a man when he is alive and do not give the same respect to his wishes when he is no more. Gandhiji himself had said something like this, once. So, he is in good company. Pandit Nehru himself if I remember rightly, had suggested the name of "Raisina", because Raisina was the village on which New Delhi is now built. But now one of us can go back on what has happened. So much has gone forward. You have brought forward this Bill. You have taken this great name and attached it to this University and there is a good deal of consensus in favour of this, because we are today moved by our depth of sentiment and reverence for the unique leader, who is no more. If today

we go back on this, it would be a tragedy, pure and simple. You have brought it up. The revered and beloved name has been bandied from mouth to mouth. It would be discussed on the floor of the other House, every newspaper would be writing about it and the news about this will go out to the whole world. Having gone so far, I do not think we should ever think to go back on this. It would be either a deliberate or undeliberate act of inexcusable irreverence. So, now that it has been put forward, I want not only those who are in agreement with the name, but I want even my friend, Prof. Mukut Behari Lal, to say 'Yes'. There is such a thing as the sentiment of a nation and the reverence of a nation. There may be many pitfalls ahead of us. I would like to know which big step we can take in any direction in this country today without big pitfalls in front of us all the time. But we can guide ourselves, control ourselves, shape ourselves as we go forward. So let us be unanimous today, absolutely unanimous, in joining hands in reverence, to have this name for this University. Let me add that the Education Minister is taking on a tremendous responsibility by calling this the Jawaharlal Nehru University and I know nobody realises this better than he.

When this Bill first came before the House I had certain things to say and I said them without reservation. Then, the matter went up to the Joint Select Committee. I wish to unequivocally congratulate this Committee on the first class work that it has done. It has knocked out quite a number of things which were at one time very close to the heart of the Education Minister. Now the knocking out of these by the Committee was good. But it speaks also volumes for the Education Minister, that he kept an open mind and accepted several changes. Now, what has come back from the Joint Select Committee is, in some ways, totally different from what was the original picture of this University. Let us be grateful to the Joint Select Committee and ever more to the Education Minister that he accepted the amendments and has now brought forward the amended Bill which looks so much better than it was originally.

Having said that, there are one or two remarks I would still like to make. I begin with what is called the First Schedule.

[Shri G. Ramachandran]

There are many things said in it which are of vital importance and which even at the start gives to this University a new tone and a new colour, a new and variegated programme of study and research. But in my opinion one very serious thing is missing in the whole of this statement of objects and aims. I am thinking of something which was stated by Pandit Nehru himself, again and again, and particularly during the last six or seven years of his life, i.e., the absolute necessity in the modern world to reconcile the claims of the human spirit with the claims of advancing science, the reconciliation of spirituality and science. I would like to give an anecdote in this connection. The first man who said it in India—and when he said it, it took the breath of many people away—was no less a person than Acharya Vinobha Bhave, that the days of politics and religion are gone and the days of spirituality and science will and must come. When he first said that and I read that he had said that, it did not strike me as something wonderful to say. Others had said the same thing often before in different words. But Pandit Nehru picked this up and repeated it more than once. When he once spoke at the Bolshoi Theatre in Moscow, he referred to this and said: "One of the greatest saints of my country has said that the days of politics and religion are gone and the days of spirituality and science must now come." He said it with great approval. You will agree, Sir, that in the whole of our educational programme in this country the biggest gulf, the most disastrous gulf, is the gulf between what I would call the claims of the human spirit and those of advancing science. They are going almost in opposite directions and the tragedy of civilisation arises from this dichotomy between these two imperatives. Shall we not make an effort in this University to reconcile the highest claims of the human spirit, the highest spirituality—let me use that word thoroughly unashamedly the claims of the highest spirituality with the claims of advancing science? If we will not reconcile them in this University, where is it going to be done? And you have everything else in the Schedule except this. I would like this to be added in the place where you say "make special provision for integrated courses in humanities, science and technology" etc. "and the reconcilia-

tion of ethical values with scientific advance"

Sir, one of the major points that some of us made in the original debate was that you must not pick up all the colleges in the surrounding area and put them into this University and call it the Nehru University. The Joint Select Committee seems to have stood firm on this point with the result that you have given up the idea of taking up existing colleges and putting them inside this University. But having done that, you have done something which in my opinion brings this picture back again in an indirect way. You have provided for the establishment of what you call University colleges at the undergraduate level. I think this is a very serious mistake to commit in the Nehru University. I pleaded hard, Sir, that this University must remain a postgraduate university without reservation, and the phrase used now is, in order to build a base for the postgraduate sections there should be a few under-graduate colleges called University colleges. I plead that this base must not be in half a dozen under-graduate colleges which you will put into this University, but this base must be looked for, searched for and discovered in every university in India, so that the deep base of the Jawaharlal Nehru University must be found, in its own appropriate way in every university in this country and even perhaps in universities outside. What do I mean? I have said also that we must not be carried away with the fascination of numbers in this University. I now discover from a document which I have here that Prof. V. K. R. V. Rao also pleaded before the Committee very vigorously not to take in several thousands of students in this University. I suggested when I originally spoke here on this Bill that we should confine this University to not more than one thousand students—the best selected from every university in India under any procedure you might lay down, all of them post-graduate students—and the University should be a residential university with a campus the like of which India has never known before. It is that kind of a picture I had in mind, but the moment you bring in through the other door—I am not calling it the backdoor, because Mr. Chagla is not a person to do anything through a backdoor—under-graduate colleges in to this

University, it defeats the very point for which we argued when we said "Don't go and pick up existing colleges in Delhi and put them into this University" I do not want this University to be preoccupied with under-graduate studies in any form or shape. But you pick up from every university of India, by any selective process at your command, a thousand of the best students of this country, you can keep it at nine hundred so that you can have one hundred from the rest of the world. I am pleading with all the strength in me, let education in this University be one hundred per cent free for a thousand of the best young people we can select. *Make* education completely free like what Tagore said in his immortal poem: "Where the head is held high, where knowledge is free." Let there be one seat of learning in this country fulfilling the dream of Rabindranath Tagore where knowledge will be free. Then what happens? Instead of asking talented boys to pay to sustain the University, the University will pay the highest talent in the country to come and make what you wish it to be. So what should this University be? Post-graduate, no under-graduate in the campus, a residential university restricted to one thousand students of the highest calibre, learning and working and pledged to carry out the ideals which Nehru stood for.

Prof M. B. Lal said: "You call it the Jawaharlal Nehru University. Then you say this University is to carry out his ideals." His logic was almost irresistible. If you call it the Jawaharlal Nehru University, he said, then this happens. So he did not want that name and he did not want the university to simply carry out the mission of a person however great. But this is going to be a new type of university. We are breaking new ground. Having said that, how are we going to create a unique institution if we go along the beaten track? Then where are you? You accept this idea that this will be something unique, magnificent, the like of which India has not known before. It is that kind of a thing we must create in the name of our great leader establishing this not merely for study and research but for carrying out the great ideals for which he stood. Somebody said that this is a dangerous thing to do. When the world is growing, knowledge is advancing,

science is expanding, ethics are changing from decade to decade, if you attach yourself and your students to carrying out certain ideals of a person, what will happen? The one unique, absolutely unique thing about Nehru which was not true even of Gandhiji is this, that he was never tied down to a formula. Gandhiji was tied down eternally to certain formulae. I read again and again Pandit Nehru's utterances. In nothing did he tie himself down to a formula. The broadest, the widest, the deepest human outlook—this is the Nehru way of life. There is no danger in our saying that this University will carry out the ideals of such a giant of our history.

3 P M

And what is all this talk about the University being merely a kind of intellectual place where you study, you do research and all that? Then afterwards what happens is nobody's business. I think the new idea of a university integrated together for a great purpose and providing for the execution of that purpose is a completely new idea and we must welcome this idea.

There is only one flaw in the whole of this picture. Suppose after ten years or after twenty years this University goes off the track, who is to bring it back on to the track? You may keep something written in your book but your book will not live. You may have a constitution. I am therefore suggesting that a provision of some kind, a suitable formula, which the ingenuity of our best educationists can evolve, be put into this University Act which would ensure that once every ten years, a National Education Assessment Commission at the highest level will find out how far the University is going on the proper track. It is not a question of somebody coming as the Visitor of the University or as a normal University Grants Commission. I am here thinking of a National or International Commission at the highest level which once every ten years would look at this University and see whether this University is working and advancing along the lines contemplated in the Bill. If this check is made from time to time, may be, there will be an opportunity to correct any wrong drift in the University.

So, I welcome the idea of the Jawaharlal Nehru University. I have certain regrets,

[Shri G. Ramachandran.]

on some points in my mind but it is too late in the day to press home those regrets here. We are almost at the end of the debate. But I want to say this that a tremendous amount of responsibility rests on the Education Minister. How long he will be the Education Minister is a question-mark before everybody. With change of Ministers, policies also tend to change. It can be guarded against by putting a suitable formula in the Act. Let us put in all the safeguards to the extent humanly possible. I do admit that it is impossible to work out absolute guarantees. But let us do our best to take care.

I hope that this University will serve the purpose for which it is intended and all these big brave words which we are now using—'unique', 'absolutely new', etc—will be justified by what happens.

Thank You

SHRI K V RAGHUNATHA REDDY (Andhra Pradesh) : A prominent question that has been raised on the floor of this House is whether a university can be associated with the name of a particular man. In other words, the question of personality cult has been raised and arguments have been advanced in support of the statement that personality cult should not be perpetuated on the ground of various sociological theories.

Mr. Vice-Chairman, this question of personality cult has been dealt with by various historians like Toynbee, Plekhanov and other social theorists. But there is no historian or social theorist who has denied the role of man in history. Whatever might have been the phases of history, the role of man as a guiding factor in the development of history has not been denied, though man himself or the hero himself may be the product of history or historical conditions. In this context, a distinction has been drawn between hero worship and the contribution made by a man of science or a man of knowledge to the various disciplines both in sciences and in humanities. To illustrate my point, if we take the history of economic thought or the history of social thought or the history of ethnology or the history of mathematical thought, no study of the history of thought would be complete unless we refer to the contributions made

by the various thinkers on these subjects. For instance, no study of mathematics or the theory of relativity would be complete without studying Einstein, and no theory of economics would be complete without a study of Ricardo. Similarly, any study in jurisprudence in law would be incomplete without reading Roscoe Pound or the very early jurists in this field. If we draw a distinction only in relation to a name, it would form part of the hero worship, and then it would certainly amount to personality cult. To look at it from a different angle, if a person had made a contribution to the theory of knowledge or to the history of ideas, then there is nothing wrong in trying to study the history of his ideas or the contribution he has made to the theory of the various social processes which had helped and guided him, to develop the ideas based on them. In that case, is there anything wrong in associating the name of such a person in such a context of intellectual activity? For instance, if a Ricardo school of economics develops, certainly there is nothing wrong in it. And even in England, I am told, there is the Laski Institute of Political Science named after the illustrious thinker, Prof. Laski. If an institution is created not to perpetuate the name of Laski but to pursue the ideas enunciated by him, and if incidentally his name is associated with it, I think there is nothing wrong in it.

If we accept this major premise, that if a person had contributed towards the theory of knowledge, to the history of ideas and to the social thought in relations to theory as well as practice, one can justifiably associate his name to an institution meant to propagate his ideas. Then let us examine whether Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru had made any contribution to those aspects of intellectual activity and whether, in that context, his name can be associated more in relation to his contribution to knowledge rather than to his personality itself.

If we take this into consideration, there are a lot of conflicting ideas in the contemporary world like the peaceful transition to socialism from capitalism or the difference between a welfare State and a socialist State or the difference between the dynamic element and the static element in law, about which the Education Minister would be more

competent to speak. If we take all these aspects of intellectual life into consideration, Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru had certainly made a contribution in drawing a distinction that democracy by itself has no meaning, that under democracy there might be formal equality as in England, and that democracy with socialism alone will provide real equality. In other words, formal equality under democracy should transform itself into real equality under socialism. But these two ideas of democracy and socialism have always been used in juxtaposition with each other and understood more in conflict and in contradiction rather than in unison. Pandit Nehru coined the expression 'democratic socialism' and expounded it, not in terms in which the British thinkers have done, because the British thinkers' concept of socialism, as propounded by writers like Prof. McGregor or even the present-day Minister, Mr. Douglas Jay, is different. They also had used this expression 'democratic socialism'. But Pandit Nehru had given a real content to it, in the sense, that socialism is inevitable but to achieve socialism it must be through the triumph of democracy and not through the tyranny of dictatorship. When he came to the ends and means of achieving it, he had clearly shown now the end could be achieved by democratic means, that is, by parliamentary democracy and not otherwise. Therefore, he had really made a contribution to this concept of 'democratic socialism' in relation to the doctrine of equality, to the doctrine of ends and means and to the various phases through which we will have to go through.

Next, the concept of a welfare State—in other words, loosely used as 'social justice' in the First Schedule is known not only to the socialist world but also to the capitalist world. And we often use these terms 'social welfare' or 'welfare state' without trying to understand the real import. Pandit Nehru had made it very clear in one of his speeches. Take the capitalist states like England and America. Nobody can accuse America of being a socialist state. Even there, in the days of Roosevelt, there was the New Deal which no doubt created a lot of excitement and opposition. In America, the ideas of a 'social welfare state' have taken some form and shape. The Beveridge Report

during the Second World War, even, introduced this concept in the capitalist structure of both England and America for the purpose of alleviating certain grievances, troubles and privations which the citizens of those countries had undergone.

But to equate a welfare state to a socialist state, as Pt. Nehru had stated, is a misnomer. A socialist state might contain all the elements of welfare, but a welfare State is certainly not a socialist State, because even a capitalist state can have all the elements of social welfare without solving the problem of economic equality. In a capitalist state, even with measures of social welfare, the economic inequalities between man and man might grow. In the concept of socialism, as far as possible, the economic inequality or social inequality should be brought down to the minimum possible. Therefore, he had clearly drawn distinction between a welfare state and a socialist state.

Now, when we come to the question of law and jurisprudence, he had dealt with the static element and the dynamic element in law. In one of the speeches, while moving an amendment to article 19 of the Constitution he had stated that the directive principles of the Constitution, constitute the dynamic elements where as the fundamental rights constitute the static element in law, and if there is a conflict between the static element and the dynamic element, the static element must yield place to the dynamic element. Mr Vice-Chairman, on this occasion I might quote various writers on this subject like Friedman who, in his book, "Law in a changing Society" and Roscopound in his book on "Jurisprudence" had dealt with this question of dynamic element and static element in the field of law. Therefore, if we have to study Pt. Nehru, we will have to study Pt. Nehru's contribution in various aspects, for instance, in relation to law, in relation to social science, in relation to the study of history, international relations, the doctrine of non-alignment as a part of international relations and development of international law. These will have to be understood in theory.

Then also in relation to state capitalism and state socialism and the rise of fascism, we have to study his works; state capitalism and socialism may look somewhat alike,

[Shri K. V. Raghunath Reddy.]

but they are different in relation to content and form relating to control of state. Therefore, Mr. Vice-Chairman, in the field of political theory, in the field of social theory and in the context of legal theory, Pt. Nehru has made a tremendous contribution to the history of ideas and history of thought. In that setting, the First Schedule to this Bill must come into force.

Pt. Nehru's ideals will have to be examined not as a static phenomenon. As Mr. Ramachandran said, Pt. Nehru was always against statism. He always believed in dynamism. After all, human thought can never be static. And when we study Pt. Nehru in this context, we will have to understand the contemporary contribution of various writers. We have to compare how his thoughts and others' thoughts helped each other's contribution. If we examine the various writers' thoughts and Pt. Nehru's writings, we come across quotations from the writers like Prof. R. H. Tawney. For instance, a student taking a post-graduate course in the Nehru University can very well undertake a doctoral dissertation on how one could influence socialist development under Nehru's directions, how Pt. Nehru had viewed the doctrines of equality by Prof. Tawney and how he developed them further for the purpose of introducing them for practical application.

Now, Mr. Vice-Chairman, when we deal with technology and science, there cannot be any technology and science in a vacuum, and to quote Mr. Eric Ashby a Vice-Chancellor of one of the universities in Canada, he had coined a phrase "technological humanism". By technological humanism, in other words, it should be understood that technology should be studied in relation to human values, not in dissociation with human and social values. A person who specializes in technology, medicine or any other branches of science, must also have sufficient knowledge in relation to social values that govern a nation and the needs of a nation. In that context Pt. Nehru had made a tremendous contribution when he dealt with the question of science and technology and also the administrative services, and how the administrative services must deal with this question with a sense of consciousness but not as members of the red tape.

Having said all this, Mr. Vice-Chairman, I consider it relevant to raise a question on this occasion. I am in perfect agreement with Dr. Sapru that the usage of the expression "social justice" in the First Schedule remains rather vague. We should not have felt shy to use the word "socialism" because after all, in the ultimate analysis the concept of socialism must comprehend in itself not only social justice, economic justice, but real equality and other highest values of life. There is no need at all to feel shy of using that phrase "socialism" because Pt. Nehru himself has used it several times. If we read the various Addresses to the joint Sessions of Parliament by the President of this country, starting from the last Address of Dr. Rajendra Prasad to the latest Address by Dr. Radhakrishnan, those Addresses have clearly used the expression "socialist society". Therefore if once the President in a joint Session of Parliament has used that expression, there is no need to feel, in any way, shy to use the expression, "socialism" in the Schedule to the Bill.

I might also state one more thing on this occasion, Mr. Vice-Chairman. While it is good that this University should undertake to perpetuate the ideals, philosophy and principles propounded by Pt. Nehru, the task that the country has to face and the task that the people have to face is so enormous that one University alone in this country would not be adequate. Therefore, may I humbly point out to the Education Minister, the necessity for creating a consciousness among the educated classes, so that lopsided personality may not develop. Every University should undertake as a part of their curriculum to provide one paper at the post-graduate level and to provide some questions at the under-graduate level on the teachings of Pt. Nehru so that the coming generations might have a social consciousness based on the principles of philosophy and teachings of Pt. Nehru in order that a harmonious Indian personality might develop and they might act as real soldiers in the cause of principles which Pt. Nehru had stood for.

SHRI M. M. DHARIA (Maharashtra) : Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, at the outset I would like to pay my compliments to our able Education Minister who not only guided us while working in the Select Committee, but it is because of his flexibility in

accepting the various progressive ideas in the Joint Committee that now we are here having a nice Bill which will definitely be a nice memorial for our late departed leader, Pandit Nehru.

I have gone through the speech and the remarks made by Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Dahyabhai Patel. I would not like here to bring in any sort of political discussion, but all the remarks that were made by Mr. Patel, if they are to be replied in his own words, it would take me long. But with your permission, Sir, I would like to refer to the debate in the Rajya Sabha which took place on 29-5-64. It was an obituary reference to our departed leader. This is what Mr. Dahyabhai Patel had said —

"The life of Jawaharlal Nehru has been a life of long and dedicated service not only to his country but to the human race. The urge for freedom that grew in India was symbolised, particularly as far as the youth of this country was concerned, in the personality of Jawaharlal Nehru. The country will remember for many generations his sacrifice, the many years that he spent in jail, a better part of his younger age, in the service of the motherland. He was one of the freedom fighters along with his great father, his distinguished sister and his devoted wife, who was a picture, a model, of Indian womanhood and stood shoulder to shoulder with him in the struggle. His great sacrifice won him love of our great leader whom we call the Father of our Nation. After attainment of independence he devoted himself to building a new India, a society free from exploitation of the weak and the poor and building up industry to provide employment and a fair standard of living to the teeming millions of this country. At the same time he was working to rid the world of colonial domination and exploitation and the evils that follow. He was working to eliminate war and the horrors that near leaves behind. In this he truly carried out the work of his great leader. He worked strenuously for diminishing tensions, tensions between nations, which were the cause of war. He worked for building up better understanding and his contribution to the United Nations in the matter will also remain a great memorial to him."

M1RS/65—5

The very speech of Mr. Dahyabhai Patel is an answer to what he said yesterday. At the same time while going through the debate, I would also like to refer to the speech made by Mr. Vajpayee. He said :

"सभापति जी, एक सपना था जो अधूरा रह गया ; एक गीत था जो गूँगा हो गया , एक लौ थी जो अनंत में विलीन हो गई। सपना था एक ऐसे ससार का जो भय और भूख से रहित होगा , गीत था एक ऐसे महाकाव्य का जिसमें गीता की गूँज और गुलाब की गंध थी ; लौ थी एक ऐसे दीपक की जो रात भर जलता रहा, हर अधरे से लड़ता रहा और हमें रास्ता दिखा कर एक प्रभात में निर्वाण को प्राप्त हो गया।

"सभापति जी, जिस स्वतंत्रता के वे सेनानी और संरक्षक थे, आज वह स्वतंत्रता सबटापन्न है। सम्पूर्ण शक्ति के साथ हमें उसकी रक्षा करनी होगी। जिस राष्ट्रीय एकता और अखंडता के वे उन्मायक थे, आज वह भी विपद्ग्रस्त है। हर मूल्य चुका कर हमें उसे कायम रखना होगा। जिस भारतीय लोकतंत्र की उन्होंने स्थापना की, उसे सफल बनाया, आज उसके भविष्य के प्रति भी आशकाएं प्रकट की जा रही हैं। हमें अपनी एकता से, अनुशासन से, अपने आत्मविश्वास से इस लोकतंत्र को भी सफल करके दिखाना है। नेता चला गया, अनुयायी रह गए। सूर्य अस्त हो गया, तारों की छाया में हमें अपना मार्ग ढूँढना है। यह एक महान् परीक्षा का काल है। यदि हम सब अपने को समर्पित कर सकें एक ऐसे महान् उद्देश्य के लिए, जिसके अन्तर्गत भारत सशक्त हो, समर्थ और समृद्ध हो और स्वाभिमान के साथ विश्व-शान्ति की चिर स्थापना में अपना योग दे सकें, तो हम उनके प्रति सच्ची श्रद्धांजलि अर्पित करने में सफल होंगे।"

It is in accordance with the desires not only expressed by the Members of the party in power but also by the leader

[Shri M M Dharia]

of the opposite side that we thought it necessary to have a memorial which could definitely be in a position to take the idea forward, the idealism of Panditji. It was urged here yesterday regarding Tibet and Kashmir but I am really sorry that the leaders who oppose or criticise have not taken proper care to look at the schedule itself. The First Schedule 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 life-time,"

We have defined what those principles are and that is material, namely, national integration, social justice, secularism, democratic way of life, international understanding and scientific approach to the problems of the country. Then we have enumerated what are the other things that should be done in order to fulfil the aims and ideals. Now I would like to mention reason why we came to the conclusion. The House may be aware that the Bill was envisaged in the year 1964 when Panditji was alive and naturally the aims and objects of that Bill stated various reasons and one was about satisfying the need of Delhi city. There was no mention in the Statement of Objects and Reasons as to why we are trying to have this name for the University. As you are aware, the Statement of Objects and Reasons could not come before the Lok Sabha as part of the Bill. Naturally it was necessary to mention somewhere as to why we have taken this step and why we want a university of this character and it is from that point of view that we have attached this Schedule which clarifies the whole position. Now the point is regarding the character of the University. This House may be aware that the original Bill was meant to satisfy the needs of the growing city of Delhi. It was discussed threadbare in the Select Committee. There was an unanimous opinion, barring one or two Members, who all insisted that this University should not be a university to fulfil the needs of Delhi city. If this University is to be named after Pandit Nehru, then it should be a university of a national character, that not only that it should be a university which

should be a matter of pride to our whole country but it should be a university or an institution of international standard as well, and students from foreign countries should also take it as a matter of pride and privilege to belong to this University and it is from this point of view that we have tried to bring in various provisions in the Bill. When we say we shall strive hard for the aims and ideals of Pandit Nehru and for their fulfilment, it is not for the fulfilment of any objects of any particular political party. We look at Pandit Nehru not as a leader of the Congress Party. He was a leader of the country. He was the leader of the world and from that point of view we have tried to bring some unique features in this Bill as it has come from the Select Committee. We feel that for maintaining the high standard, the jurisdiction of the University should not be limited to Delhi only and that is why we have taken away that part of the original Bill. If we look at clause 6(1), it says :

"The jurisdiction of the University shall extend to all Colleges and recognised institutions."

[THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN in the Chair]

It is meant for the whole of the country, not for any part of Delhi. Of course, we are aware of the constitutional provision that if we have to affiliate any institution to this University the sanction or permission of that State shall be necessary and after obtaining that permission only it may be possible for this University to affiliate the colleges and other institutions.

PROF. M. B. LAL : There is no provision for affiliation under this Bill.

SHRI M. M. DHARIA . Affiliation of institutions is there and I shall point it out. It says here

"(2) Notwithstanding anything contained in clause (13) of section 5, the Jawaharlal Nehru University shall not grant recognition, either in whole or in part, to any institution which has already been recognised by the University of Delhi unless the Central Government, after consultation with the University of Delhi, authorises the Jawaharlal Nehru University to do so.

(3) On and from the date of the recognition either in whole or in part of an institution by the Jawaharlal Nehru University under sub-section (2), the University of Delhi shall to the extent of such recognition cease to have jurisdiction over that institution."

In clause 7, it says :

"(a) where any institution or body established outside the Union territory of Delhi seeks recognition from the University, or."

Here it comes

PROF. M. B. LAL : There is a difference between recognition and affiliation.

SHRI M. M. DHARIA : Yes, that is right. We can recognise, we cannot affiliate, an institution from outside. I was referring to this point regarding the unique character of the University and I would like to say that this University will be having a standard which cannot be compared with other Universities that are established here. It is true that we have tried to go into the details of the various universities but we have not tried to copy either the Oxford or Cambridge or any other university. This University is unique because it is having altogether a different character whether compared to do the Oxford University or any other institution in this country.

My request to this House would be that there is no doubt that there is need for a memorial in memory of Pandit Nehru. What sort of memorial that should be and what would be the fittest memorial in memory of Pandit Nehru is the question and I feel that this would be the best possible memorial. It is through this institution that we can impart those ideals among the younger generation, those ideals and aims for which Jawaharlal Nehru stood, for which we all stand. [I think it will be possible for us to fulfil those ideals without having any political bias and without entering into those political controversies. I feel that the Members should look at it from an unbiased point of view and they should also support the Bill as it stands before the House to day.

PROF. B. N. PRASAD : Madam Deputy Chairman, I am thankful to you for allow-

ing me some time to make some observations on this Bill.

Having been in a university and having been in intimate touch with the various university activities for over forty years, naturally, I am going to make my observations not from any sentimental point of view, but mainly from the university point of view.

The hon the Minister of Education, while introducing the Bill, made very powerful references to certain provisions contained in the Bill. He showed to us that, when this University would come into existence, it will be an ideal one. He made a distinction between cult and democracy and tried to show that the provision as it is given in this Bill is not inconsistent with this principle.

So much mention has been made of the name, of the University of Oxford and, in fact, if I am correct, I feel that our Minister of Education, who had the privilege of being educated at Oxford, had been too much influenced by the ideologies of the Oxford University in proposing the present Jawaharlal Nehru University Bill. May I tell this House an interesting thing ? The noble person with whose name this University is going to be associated, was not a man of Oxford. He was a man of Cambridge.

PROF. M. B. LAL : Everybody knows it.

PROF. B. N. PRASAD : And everybody knows also this thing, that there is quite an exciting type of rivalry between the University of Oxford and the University of Cambridge. Therefore, to have made mention of the name of any particular university, and especially of university with which the person was not associated, might not have been very helpful to the discussion.

All the arguments that have been given in favour of certain provisions of the Bill, I am afraid, to say, have not proved very convincing to me. They appear rather airy and sound rather like platitudes when critically examined. There is dire need of introducing a number of modifications in the provisions of the Bill as it has come out. A good deal of time of this House

[Prof. B. N. Prasad]

has been taken about the discussion of the name of the University. I would like to say, coming as I do from the town of Allahabad, from which also our late lamented leader came, that I have known him as I did for over forty years and I am second to none in any personal respect for him. I knew him and I had the privilege of doing certain work especially in the organisation of Science Societies and Science Congress in close touch with him, and I was really, earnestly and very sincerely devoted to the noble qualities that he possessed. Yet, if I make certain observations which may not be agreeable to some of my friends in the House, it should never be understood that I have less respect for the dignitary with whose name this University is going to be associated.

SHRI SYED AHMED : It will be surely misunderstood

PROF. B. N. PRASAD : Well, if a person is determined to misunderstand another person, it cannot be helped. Now I was saying that I am not against the name of Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru being associated with the proposed University. I am quite in favour of this, but the way in which the arguments have been advanced in favour of this proposal does not appeal to me. Even if such a line of argument were to be followed then, to be consistent, a university to promote the principles and ideologies of Mahatma Gandhi should have first come into existence. But the basic fact is that the object of a university is primarily the creation and dissemination of knowledge. The principles and ideologies of illustrious personalities may very well come into its purview to be promoted, but the basic and primary object and purpose of a university cannot be only the promotion of those objectives, however noble they may be.

Questions have been raised regarding the existence of universities associated with the names of personalities. There is no doubt that there are some such universities in India and also elsewhere. But their number is extremely small, almost negligible, compared to the vast number of universities unassociated with names of personalities. The crux of the problem, however, is that even these universities were not established

with the avowed object as set forth in the First Schedule of this Bill, only to perpetuate and promote the principles and ideals of the persons with whose names they have been associated.

I would, therefore, like to make a suitable suggestion and I appeal to the hon. Minister of Education and to this august House to give a little consideration to this. Let this proposed University be established incorporating all the high principles and ideals, including also those of our late lamented leader, Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru without mentioning them in a specific manner, as is done in the First Schedule, that the chief object with which this University is being established is to promote his ideologies. And after it is done, let us all welcome the idea that the noble name of Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru be associated with this proposed modern and unique University.

If the hon. Minister of Education could agree to such a suggestion, I hope the acceptance of the proposed name of the University will be done in a very graceful manner without any controversy. This will add dignity both to the University and to the illustrious personality with whose inspiring name the University will be associated.

Then there are certain provisions contained in this University Bill on which I may make some passing observations. We find that the jurisdiction of the University can extend to the whole of India. Now it is quite easy in a Bill to say that there is a university which will have its jurisdiction over the whole of India. After all, when there is a university, there are various Faculties in which the work of the university is being done. Then there are certain academic ways incorporated in the constitution by which care is taken whereby the standard maintained in the various institutions may be regulated and may remain of a satisfactory order. Suppose you locate the seat of a university here in New Delhi and suppose there is an institution near Rameswaram, where, say, research in biology is being done, how will it be possible, in practice, to have a careful watch over the standard that is maintained there? Then there would be meetings and other things normally connected with university

work. So it would not be possible, I would even say it would be impracticable, to have a proper type of supervision over institutions in the whole of India

Much discussion has been made about the First Schedule. I personally feel that the various clauses which are mentioned in the First Schedule require serious revision and consideration. There are a number of ideas which, I feel, should not be incorporated in the Act. Such things we find in the constitution of the university or they are mentioned here and there, in Ordinances or in connection with the Board of Studies. But these are not the type of things to be properly included in the main Act. Next, I may just put before the Education Minister one aspect which should come along with all these things. Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru was very deeply interested in scientific activities. I know personally that for decades every year he agreed to take part in the Indian Science Congress. He used to go in for so many activities and I know from personal experience that he was always for encouraging science and scientific workers.

PROF M B LAL He was a student of science

PROF B. N PRASAD Well, not a student of politics like your goodself. You have mentioned here

"establish departments or institutions as may be necessary for the study and development of the various Indian languages ;"

and

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

and so on. Here I suggest there should be a clause like this, to say—

"impart special stimulus to the promotion of scientific and technological researches"

SHRI SYED AHMAD You should then give an amendment.

PROF B N PRASAD : I will give the amendment also. Why do you interrupt me ? Why not try to listen ?

Now, I was just putting before the hon Education Minister that if he considers it fit he may incorporate here one such clause

like the one I indicated, in order to specially emphasise the scientific aspect

There is the provision that a number of local institutions will be associated with this proposed University. Well, to me it seems that possibly this will not be a matter of great benefit either to the University or to those institutions. Now, take for instance this Indian Institute of Technology at Delhi. There are also four other Institutes of Technology in India elsewhere. They are all on a par. Let me tell you that for admission into all these five Indian Institutes of Technology, there is only one common examination. All the admissions are made on the basis of that one common examination. Now you pick up one of these and say that that one would be associated with this new University. Then what will be the fate of the other four Institutes ? In that case will they be on a par ? These Institutes have got the power and the right to confer their own diplomas and degrees. If you attach one of them to this University, then there might be some sort of discrepancy or irregularity or whatever you may call it. Similarly if you join to this University the All India Institute of Medical Sciences, I feel no useful purpose would be served. Therefore, without going into details in all these matters, I would only say now that these provisions should be carefully examined to see whether these will really increase the utility of the proposed University or only make it a jumble of so many colleges and so many institutions joined together. After all, this University has got to be a sort of residential university and that is a primary thing for this University. If you just bring all these institutions and colleges and jumble them together, no useful purpose would be served. I shall now leave this and other discussions to the stage when we will be going through in detailed consideration of the Bill, clause by clause. Thank you

श्रीमती शारदा भागवत (राजस्थान) :

उपसभापति महोदया, सब से पहले मैं शिक्षा-मन्त्री महोदय को इस बात के लिये बधाई देना चाहती हूँ कि उन्होंने इस यूनीवर्सिटी का इतना सुन्दर नाम रखा है। अभी श्री रामचन्द्रन् साहब ने एक बात कही कि शिक्षा-मन्त्री महोदय ने जब जवाहरलाल जी जिन्दा

[श्रीमती शारदा भार्गव]

थे तब उनसे बात की थी कि मैं आपके नाम पर यूनीवर्सिटी का नाम रखना चाहता हूँ, तो उन्होंने कहा कि जिन्दा आदमियों के नाम पर यूनीवर्सिटी का नाम रखना मैं पसन्द नहीं करता हूँ और रामचन्द्रन् साहब ने कहा है कि उनके मर जाने के बाद उनकी भावना के खिलाफ यह नाम क्यों रखा गया? तो मैं यह कहना चाहती हूँ कि उनकी भावना के खिलाफ नाम नहीं रखा गया है; क्योंकि उन्होंने यह कहा था कि जीवित व्यक्तियों के नाम पर यूनीवर्सिटी का नाम नहीं रखना चाहिये, पर उनके निधन के बाद उनके नाम पर यूनीवर्सिटी का नाम रखा गया। तो, यह उनकी भावना के खिलाफ नहीं; बल्कि उनकी भावना के अनुकूल ही है। इसलिये मैं उनको बधाई देना चाहती हूँ। दूसरी बात यह है कि प० जवाहरलाल जी एक विशिष्ट व्यक्ति थे तथा मैं समझती हूँ कि वह हिन्दुस्तान के ही नेता नहीं थे; बल्कि कई बातों में उन्होंने विश्व का नेतृत्व किया, इसलिये जब कि वह विश्व का नेतृत्व कर सकते थे तो सब से अच्छा उनका स्मरण उनके नाम पर विश्वविद्यालय का नाम, रखना होगा।

दूसरी बात जो मैं आपसे कहना चाहती थी, वह यह है कि आरंभ में जब इस यूनीवर्सिटी को बनाने का प्रश्न था आया तब इसका उद्देश्य यह था कि दिल्ली में इतने कालेज हो गये हैं कि उनके लिए एक यूनीवर्सिटी काफी नहीं है, इसलिये दूसरी यूनीवर्सिटी बनाई जाये, तो मेरे मन में एक प्रश्न उठता है और वह यह है कि यह यूनीवर्सिटी तो एक विशिष्ट यूनीवर्सिटी बना दी गई, जो कि मैं समझती हूँ—मारे दिल्ली की बात छोड़िये—सारे हिन्दुस्तान की ही नहीं, बल्कि विश्व के लिये एक यूनीवर्सिटी बन रही है, अतः मैं आपसे यह पूछना चाह रही हूँ कि दिल्ली के लिए जो दूसरी यूनीवर्सिटी की आवश्यकता थी, उसको पूरा करने के लिये आपने क्या उपाय किया है? मुझे डर यह है कि कुछ दिनों के बाद जो दूसरी यूनीवर्सिटी बनाने

वाले थे, जिसकी बहुत आवश्यकता है—उस आवश्यकता की पूर्ति इस यूनीवर्सिटी से न की जाने लगे। मुझे इसका उत्तर मिल जाये कि उस आवश्यकता की पूर्ति किस प्रकार से की जायेगी? तो मेरे मन में संतोष हो जायेगा।

जवाहरलाल जी विश्व-बधुत्व तथा सह-अस्तित्व में विश्वास करते थे, इसीलिये इस यूनीवर्सिटी में जब तक कि सारे संसार के विद्यार्थी और अध्यापक न आ सकें, तब तक मैं यह नहीं मानती कि यह कोई विशिष्ट यूनीवर्सिटी होगी और जब तक कि इसको विश्व की यूनीवर्सिटी न बनाया जाये, तब तक न इस यूनीवर्सिटी को और न इसके नाम को आप सार्थक बना सकेंगे। इसलिये मेरा अनुरोध है कि इस यूनीवर्सिटी को एक ऐसी विशिष्ट यूनीवर्सिटी बनाया जाये जो कि संसार की यूनीवर्सिटी बने, न कि केवल हिन्दुस्तान की या केवल दिल्ली की ही बन कर रह जाये। अभी प्रोफेसर मुकुट विहारी लाल जी ने आपत्ति उठाई कि पंडित नेहरू के नाम पर इस यूनीवर्सिटी का नाम क्यों रखा गया और मैं समझती हूँ कि जिन मदस्यों ने उन्हें उत्तर दिया वह भी बेकार ही रहेगा; क्योंकि कुछ विरोधी सदस्यों का तो केवल एक ही एक उद्देश्य है कि कांग्रेस या सरकार जो भी बात करे; और चाहे वह कितनी भी अच्छी क्यों न हो, उसका विरोध करना ही है, तो फिर उनकी बातों का जवाब कहाँ तक दिया जा सकता है? जवाहरलाल जी कांग्रेस के लीडर थे, यह बात सही है, मगर दुनिया जानती है कि वह कांग्रेस के ही लीडर नहीं थे; देश के लीडर थे और जैसा कि मैंने पहले कहा संसार को भी उन्होंने कई बातों में नेतृत्व दिया। तो आज अगर प्रोफेसर साहब यह कहते हैं कि ऐसे व्यक्ति के नाम पर क्यों यूनीवर्सिटी बनाते हैं, तो मैं समझती हूँ कि उनकी इस आपत्ति का कोई जवाब दिया भी जायेगा, तो वह उसको मानने को तैयार नहीं होंगे।

शेड्यूल 1 में जो इसके उद्देश्य दिये गये हैं, उसके लिये मैं समझती हूँ कि उसे शेड्यूल

में न दें कर के यदि मेन ऐक्ट में या स्टैट्यूट में कोई इस प्रकार की चीजें होतीं, चाहे वह संक्षेप में ही होतीं, तो वह यूनीवर्सिटी के ज्यादा लाभ की होतीं।

मैं कहना चाहती हूँ कि जब यह बिल बना था, उस समय जो इसका उद्देश्य था, उसके अनुसार बिल बहुत अच्छा बना हुआ था, परन्तु जिस ऊँचे उद्देश्य को लेकर बाद में इसका सेलेक्ट कमेटी ने अमेन्ड किया है, वह संतोषजनक नहीं है; बल्कि मैं मानती हूँ कि कई जगह एक दूसरे के विरोधी तत्व भी आ गये हैं और एक कंफ्यूजन सा हो गया है। ऐसा क्यों हुआ, इसका कारण मुझे नहीं मालूम। परन्तु मेरा अन्दाजा यह है कि यह सब जल्दी के कारण हुआ। सेलेक्ट कमेटी के सभी निश्चय करने में जल्दी की गई है। मैं नहीं जानती कि क्या जल्दी थी? सेलेक्ट कमेटी के जो चेयरमैन हैं मिस्टर पाठक, उनकी विद्वत्ता में मुझे बहुत विश्वास है, परन्तु शायद उनके पास समय नहीं था या एजुकेशन मिनिस्ट्री ही बहुत जल्दी चाहती थी। मुझे आश्चर्य है कि हम एक इतनी विशिष्ट यूनीवर्सिटी बनाने जा रहे हैं, उसके लिये आपके पास सिर्फ दो व्यक्तियों के स्मरणपत्र आये। सारे संसार से स्मरणपत्र आ सकते थे, पर हिन्दुस्तान के विद्वान भी जाने कहाँ चले गए, बल्कि उनको बक्सर ही नहीं दिया गया; क्योंकि 25 सितम्बर को तय हुआ कि स्मरण-पत्र मंगाये जायेंगे और 10 अक्टूबर, लास्ट डेट' दी गई। अब जग सोचिए, 15 दिन के अंदर क्या स्मरण-पत्र आ सकते थे? इसलिये मुझे दुःख

कि इतनी जल्दी की गई और अधिक स्मरण-पत्रों को आमंत्रित करने की चेष्टा नहीं की गई। अगर पर्वाह नहीं थी, तो स्मरण-पत्र मंगाने की बात ही नहीं उठानी चाहिये थी। इतनी बड़ी यूनीवर्सिटी के लिये दो स्मरण-पत्र आएँ, इससे अधिक खेद की बात कोई नहीं हो सकती। ओरल इविडेन्स भी, मैं समझती हूँ, कम ही इन्वाइट किये गये, और सेलेक्ट कमेटी की भी कुल पांच ही सिटिजन्स हुईं। मुझे इसका आश्चर्य है। वैसे पांच सिटिजन्स

में इससे ज्यादा और क्या काम होता है? मैं जानती हूँ, मैं बनारस हिन्दू यूनीवर्सिटी बिल की सेलेक्ट कमेटी में थी, कि कितनी कान्फ्रेंसियल बातें होती थीं, वितने एक दूसरे के मतभेद थे, कितनी दफा हमने सिटिजन्स कीं। फिर भी मैं अपने दिल से कह सकती हूँ, जो प्रवर समिति से बनारस हिन्दू यूनीवर्सिटी का बिल बन कर आया था, मैं उससे पूरी संतुष्ट नहीं थी। तो मैं यह कहना चाहती हूँ कि इस विधेयक के लिये अधिक टाइम देना चाहिये था, ताकि एक ऐसा सुन्दर और दृढ़ बिल बनता जिसके बाद में कोई लूपहोल नहीं रह जाता। तो मैं यह कहना चाहती हूँ कि जो प्रवर समिति से यह विधेयक निकल कर आया है, वह संतोषजनक नहीं है।

आगे मुझे यह कहना है कि जब यह एक विशिष्ट यूनीवर्सिटी बनने जा रही है, तो उसमें विशिष्टता ऐसी होनी चाहिये जिससे जो व्यक्ति इसे देखे तो वह देखते ही समझ ले, हा, यह विशिष्ट यूनीवर्सिटी है। पर इसमें भी वही पुरानी बात चम रही है—चान्सलर, वाइस चान्सलर, रजिस्ट्रार, रेक्टर—उसी तरह से जैसे दूसरी यूनीवर्सिटीज में है। जो हम कह रहे हैं, जवाहरलाल नेहरू के उद्देश्यों को लेकर यूनीवर्सिटी बन रही है, मुझे डर लगता है, बाँडे दिन के बाद दूसरी यूनीवर्सिटीयों की तरह यह भी हो जाने वाली है।

चान्सलर की यहा क्या जरूरत है? सिखा है, इलेक्ट्रेड चान्सलर होगा, वह ही कन्वोकेशन को प्रेसाइड करेगा। न तो चान्सलर को कोई राइट्स दिये हैं, न ड्यूटी दी है। एक चान्सलर होना चाहिये, इसलिये कि दूसरी यूनीवर्सिटी में भी होता है। मैं कहती हूँ, इसकी क्या जरूरत है? वाइस चान्सलर ही क्यों नहीं कन्वोकेशन को प्रेसाइड कर सकता है, जब कि वह है? मगर प्रश्न यह उठता है कि चान्सलर के दिना वाइस चान्सलर कैसे होगा? तो मेरा सुझाव है कि चान्सलर और वाइस चान्सलर दोनों नामों को हटा कर, जैसा बहुत ही अमेरिकन यूनीवर्सिटीज में है, एक पद हो और इसका नाम

[श्रीमती शारदा भार्गव]

प्रेसीडेंट रखा दिया जाये, नाकि देखते ही मालूम पड़ जाये कि यूनीवर्सिटी विशिष्टता रखती है। चान्सलर एन्ड वाइस चान्सलर की जगह खास तौर पर वाइस चान्सलर की इयूटी करने वाले व्यक्ति को प्रेसीडेंट कहा जाये। मैं यह भी कहना चाहती हूँ, रजिस्ट्रार नाम भी बदल दीजिए, रजिस्ट्रार के मानी रजिस्टर करने वाला है, मगर यूनीवर्सिटी रजिस्ट्रार की सबसे बड़ी इयूटी यूनीवर्सिटी की बातों का सीक्रेट्स रखना है, यूनीवर्सिटी में एग्जामिनेशन और दूसरी चीजों का सीक्रेटली रखना उसका परम कर्त्तव्य है। इसलिये उसको सेक्रेटरी आफ दी यूनीवर्सिटी कहा जाये, तो मैं समझती हूँ, उसका ठीक नाम होगा; अन्यथा वही आप सारी यूनीवर्सिटियों की तरह करे जा रहे हैं और देखने वाले और सुनने वाले पर भी कोई विशिष्टता की छाप नहीं पड़नी, मैं यह कह देना चाहती हूँ।

आगे आपने कहा है, रेक्टर एक से ज्यादा होंगे। मेरी समझ में नहीं आता कि कितने रेक्टरों की जरूरत होगी? क्या एक रेक्टर कम है? मेरी राय में एक रेक्टर से ज्यादा उसमें कोई जरूरत नहीं है।

मेरे खयाल से हमारी प्रवर समिति न माडल ऐक्ट कमेटी की रिपोर्ट के सुझावों और सप्रू कमेटी की रिपोर्ट पर कोई ध्यान नहीं दिया। उसमें कई अच्छी-अच्छी बातें बताई गई हैं, मगर इस संयुक्त प्रवर समिति से जो बिल निकल कर आया है, उसमें मैं समझती हूँ उनके उद्देश्यों का बिल्कुल ध्यान नहीं रखा गया है। इस विधेयक में विजिटर को कई जगह बहुत सारे पावर्स दिये गये हैं। ठीक है, विजिटर माने प्रेसीडेंट आफ इन्डिया। मगर मुझे तो पता है, चाहे वह पर्सनल अनुभव से कहिये, चाहे कैसे भी, कि विजिटर असल में कोई डिस्मिशन करने वाला नहीं होता। एजुकेशन मिनिस्ट्री के क्लर्क्स, आफिसर्स, ये सब मिल कर के जो बना देते हैं, "प्रेसीडेंट आफ इन्डिया हैज़ टु साइन दैट"।

शिक्षा मंत्रालय में उपमंत्री (श्री भगत दर्शन) : आफिसर रहते हैं।

श्रीमती शारदा भार्गव : बलकं नहीं सही, आफिसर ही सही, यहाँ तक मुझको मालूम है कि प्रेसीडेंट उससे एग्री करे या न करे, मगर न एग्री करने का प्रश्न इसलिये नहीं उठता है क्योंकि बहुत सी चीजों को समझने का उनको मौका ही विधान के अनुसार नहीं मिलता। इवन एजुकेशन मिनिस्टर के बारे में कह सकती हूँ, वे भी पूरी फाइल वगैरह नहीं देख सकते हैं। अगर एजुकेशन मिनिस्टर या प्रेसीडेंट खुद डिटेल में कुछ देख कर अपनी निष्पक्ष राय दे सके, तो विजिटर को पावर दी जाये। मगर वे ऐसा नहीं करते हैं, यह मुझे मालूम है। इसलिये आपको विजिटर को पावर देते समय इन सब बातों का ध्यान रखना चाहिए। इसमें एक क्लॉज देख कर मुझे बड़ा आश्चर्य होता है तथा हमी भी आती है। पेज 5 पर जो क्लॉज जोड़ा है सेलेक्ट कमेटी ने, क्लॉज 8(2) कि—

"The visitor may, from time to time, appoint one or more persons to review the work and progress of the University and to submit a report thereon; and upon receipt of that report, the Visitor may take such action and issue such directions as he considers necessary in respect of any of the matters dealt with in the report and the University shall be bound to comply with such directions."

मैं कहती हूँ, क्यों इस बात की जरूरत पड़े कि विजिटर या गवर्नमेन्ट या एजुकेशन मिनिस्ट्री साल दो साल में यूनीवर्सिटी के मामलों में दखल दें।

SHRI M. SATYANARAYANA (Nominated) : Madam, in the course of the exposition of her case, the hon. Member said that the President signs often whatever is given to him even by the clerks. It is not fair. According to me, it is not the President to be blamed but it is the Education Minister, whoever is responsible for, against whom she has got a grievance. Therefore, I consider that this is not only unwarranted but is irrelevant also.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Yes, continue.

श्रीमती शारदा भार्गव : मैंने क्लर्क वंड को वापस ले लिया है, जैसे ही डिपुटी एजुकेशन मिनिस्टर ने कहा। आप उसमें न जाइये कि क्लर्क मानी क्लर्क ही होता है—एजुकेशन मिनिस्ट्री का कर्मचारी कह दीजिए, आफिसर्स कह दीजिए, कुछ भी कह दीजिए, वे करते हैं, करेंगे और . . .

डा० तारा चन्द : मिनिस्टर करते हैं।

श्रीमती शारदा भार्गव : मिनिस्टर करते होंगे और मैं यह भी कहती हूँ, क्लर्क भी . .

SHRI M. SATYANARAYANA : You attack the Minister, not the President.

SHRIMATI SHARDA BHARGAVA : I am not attacking anybody. I am only trying to say that these powers should not be given like this

मैं यह सिर्फ इसलिये कह रही हूँ क्योंकि यह सही माना गया है कि यूनीवर्सिटी में आटानामी होनी चाहिए। आटानामी के माने क्या हैं? हर साल बाद विजिटर के नाम पर गवर्नमेंट उसको देखे और समझे कि यह ठीक किया है या नहीं किया है, ऐसी बात नहीं करनी चाहिए। Time bell rings इतनी जल्दी क्यों?

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Only fifteen minutes. There are many more speakers.

श्रीमती शारदा भार्गव : मुझे पता नहीं लगा कि इतना टाइम हो गया, मैं घड़ी नहीं देख रही थी। तो मैं कुछ बातों को छोड़ दूंगी। मेरा सुझाव यह है कि यूनीवर्सिटी का विधान इतना मजबूत बनाया जाये कि बीच-बीच में गवर्नमेंट को उसमें दखल न देना पड़े।

फिर आगे क्या किया है कि एक बार तो वाइस चान्सलर के लिए पांच साल की टर्म निश्चित की है और दूसरी ओर यह भी कहते हैं कि अगर उसके बाद दूसरा वाइस-चान्सलर न एपॉइंट हो सके तो उसको ही टर्म की समाप्ति पर भी काम करते रहने दिया जाय। मैं इसको बहुत गलत मानती हूँ; क्योंकि

जो वाइस चान्सलर चुनने का तरीका है, उसके हिसाब से असल में वाइस चान्सलर की राय से एक्जीक्यूटिव काउंसिल के एजेन्डा में दूसरे वाइस चान्सलर के चुनने का आइटम रजिस्ट्रार लाता है। अतः यदि सिटिंग वाइस चान्सलर चाहे तो अगले वाइस चान्सलर के चुनाव की बात पोस्टपोन करता रहे। यह मैं अपने अनुभव से कह रही हूँ। डा० सप्रू भले ही नाराज हो जायें; क्योंकि उनके मित्र की बात कहती हूँ, तो उनको सुनने में बुरा लगता है; क्योंकि डा० सप्रू एजुकेशन को खूब समझते हैं, पर अपने मित्र को नहीं समझते हैं। तो राजस्थान यूनीवर्सिटी का मैं एग्जाम्पल देती हूँ कि 1962 में वहाँ के वाइस चान्सलर की टर्म 31 अक्टूबर को खत्म हो रही थी, उन्होंने कमेटी नहीं, बनने दी, ताकि कहीं दूसरे व्यक्ति का वाइस चान्सलरशिप के लिए मेलेक्शन न हो जाये—उन्हें यह भी डर था कि वहाँ का सिंडीकेट उन्हें दूसरी टर्म नहीं देगा। इस डर से उन्होंने सिंडीकेट में इस विषय को लाने ही नहीं दिया और काम चलाते गए और जब उनका टर्म खत्म हो गया, उस वक्त गवर्नमेंट से कह कर ऐक्ट बदलवा लिया और एक ऐसी कमेटी बनवाई जिसने उन्हें दोबारा चुन लिया। अब उनका 4 जनवरी को कान्फ्रेन्स खत्म होने वाला है। उन्होंने चार महीने की छुट्टी लेने के लिये अर्जी दी थी और उस चार महीने में उन्होंने कमेटी बनाने का प्रोपोज़ल ही एजेंडा में नहीं आने दिया। उन्होंने सोचा कि यदि नये वाइस चान्सलर का चुनाव नहीं होगा तो उनकी छुट्टी मंजूर नहीं होगी और छुट्टी मंजूर नहीं होगी तो वह लास्ट बेट तक काम करते रहेंगे। मैं अपने इस कटु अनुभव से कहना चाहती हूँ कि इस विधेयक में वाइस चान्सलर की पांच साल की टर्म निश्चित की है, तो पांच साल के टर्म के बाद उसको कन्टिन्यू करने देना, मैं समझती हूँ, गलत बात है। उसे अपनी पांच साल की टर्म समाप्त होने पर रिटायर हो जाना चाहिये और आवश्यकता पड़ने पर वाइस चान्सलर का काम, और यदि रेक्टर भी नहीं हो, तो

[श्रीमती शारदा भार्गव]

सीनियर मोस्ट मेम्बर आफ दी एक्जीक्यूटिव काउंसिल करे। रजिस्ट्रार को भी वाइस चांसलर की अनुपस्थिति में काम करने का अधिकार दिया है कि वह भी वी० सी० की ड्यूटी करी करता रहे। Time bell rings. मैं इसके खिलाफ हूँ। टाइम नहीं है, दूसरी घटी बज गई है। मेरे पास कहने को बहुत सी बातें थी लेकिन नहीं कहूँगी। मैं अंत में फिर यह कहना चाहती हूँ कि इस तरह की पावर रजिस्ट्रार को नहीं दी जानी चाहिये बल्कि, सीनियर मोस्ट मेम्बर आफ दी एक्जीक्यूटिव काउंसिल जो है, उसको यह अधिकार दिया जाये कि वह वाइस चांसलर की ड्यूटी तब तक करे आन करे जब तक कि दूसरा वाइस चांसलर वहाँ पर न आ जाये।

4 P M

DR TARA CHAND Madam . . .

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN . I am sorry you will have to restrict yourself to fifteen minutes.

PROF M B LAL I think more time should be given to him. Educationists must express their views fully

DR TARA CHAND Madam, I am afraid the discussion has been so prolonged that my friends must be tired by this time. I will therefore be as brief as possible. In the first place I wish to join my friend, Prof. Mukut Behari Lal, in expressing my regret to my esteemed and dear friend for whom I have the highest respect and affection for some words which fell from my lips yesterday and I hope in this generosity he will forgive and forget

As regards the Bill that is before us, it is not necessary to repeat the arguments in regard to the naming of the University. I personally do not think that there is any impropriety in giving the name Jawaharlal Nehru to the new University which is being established in Delhi. Not only are there precedents for giving personal appellations to the names of Universities but on a point of principle I may say that giving the name of a person to a University is merely acknowledging our debt to the personality whose name is being given. It is nothing more

than that. Here we are expressing our gratitude for the unforgettable services which this great man rendered to this country. It is therefore in the fitness of things that an institution like a University in Delhi should be called after the name of Jawaharlal Nehru. The University is an institution of an abiding nature. We hope that it will live in perpetuity and we hope that this will be a centre of the highest type of learning and knowledge. Therefore there is nothing inappropriate in associating the name of this great man to the institution which has such high functions to perform.

The reason why I think there has been a certain amount of apprehension and discussion and debate in regard to the giving of this name appears to me to be the First Schedule. I think legitimately it is being felt in some quarters in this House that this University is going to pursue, to instruct, to study the principles and ideals of Jawaharlal Nehru and this University has been peculiarly commissioned to carry out this assignment. I think this ought not to be so. The purposes of a University are well known. Universities are established for dissemination of knowledge, advancement of knowledge, for the building of the character of the young men who come to the University, imbuing them with high moral and intellectual ideals and this should be a sufficiently large purpose for any University to fulfil and it is not necessary to give in detail what a particular individual stood for or what a particular individual desired to achieve. If you do that then you lay yourself open to the charge that you are in some manner or other trying to build up a cult. I am sure there is no desire on anybody's part that a Jawaharlal Nehru cult should be established in this country. Cult or hero worship means that we take all the ideas and all the actions of a particular individual as sacrosanct. Nobody here holds that everything that Jawaharlal Nehru said or everything that Jawaharlal Nehru did is so supremely true that all these should be studied, pondered over and taught in this University. Even in this Schedule only certain selected ideals and principles of Jawaharlal have been mentioned. Jawaharlal had many other things to say and followed many policies with which many people did not agree and therefore it is, I think, an exaggeration to say that this University has

been established to develop a Jawaharlal Nehru cult. I personally think that nothing will be lost if the First Schedule is dropped. What does it say? What it says to my mind is no more than a certain explanation of what is already included in the Constitution of India. The words in the Indian Constitution are that we establish a State—for what purpose?—for liberty, equality, fraternity and justice. Take these four words: they include everything that is said in this First Schedule. What is the point then in saying again this that or the other? Take democracy, democracy is based upon liberty and equality. Take secularism; secularism is based upon liberty. If there is liberty of conscience, if there is liberty of worship, if there is liberty to propagate your religion, if there is liberty for every religion to flourish in this country, then there is secularism. Therefore the term 'secularism' and the term 'democracy' are both included in the terms 'liberty' and 'equality'. Take justice; now the word 'justice' is very comprehensive. All kinds of justice are included in the term 'justice'—social justice, economic justice, political justice, legal justice. All justice is included in the term 'justice' and it is not necessary to spell it out as social justice or economic justice or as social welfare society or socialism. The University, we must realise must live for many years, for many centuries. The various kinds of movements that are popular or fashionable today are not necessarily going to remain fashionable or popular tomorrow or the day after. Take the universities in Europe. They started in the thirteenth century when Europe was under the sway of theology and the universities were teaching theology. Then came the renaissance and the universities taught new subjects which came up with the renaissance. Then came other changes and those changes affected the universities. Now, today we are passing through a phase of human history when socialism, well, is a popular movement, but who can say what kind of social movement is going to arise in twenty years or thirty years or forty years and if we put down socialism here what will happen thirty or forty years hence? I, therefore, feel that it is not necessary at all to try and pin down the university to these objectives. The large objectives before any university are already included

in our Constitution and nothing more is needed.

I may also say one other thing and that is a great deal has been said about the uniqueness of this University. By uniqueness I only understand that there are going to be certain improvements in this University over the universities which exist today in India. But to say this University will be entirely different from all the other universities that exist in this country or outside is, to my mind, tall talk, which has no meaning at all. You cannot establish a university or an institution which is completely divorced from everything that exists. We are thinking in terms of a Vice-Chancellor, who will be a heaven-born person. Nobody knows one like him in this country. Where is he to come from? We want sort of unique philosophers, professors and teachers for this University, unique human beings. Where are they going to come from? If they are going to come from India, we know the sort of people that we have and by establishing this University in the month of March or April 1966 you are not suddenly going to get out of this country such marvellous people as will make this University an ideal and unique institution. Although I hold that this kind of talk is self-deception, I also hold that it is possible to make improvements. By all the human efforts that we can make, we may collect together a good staff, as far as possible first class staff for this University. There are first class men in other universities, in the Delhi University, Madras University, Bombay University, Agra University, Allahabad University and so on. Therefore, it may be possible to do it, but I would not like that all the first class men who are scattered in this country, should be collected here and other universities should be impoverished of their talent. Therefore, what you will have in this university probably will be an improvement upon the various universities that exist, but those improvements do not mean that we are going to have a sort of an ideal university.

I have great sympathy for what Mr. Ramachandran said, but I am afraid it is altogether impractical. There is no question that this university can become a centre of what he called spirituality. In the first place,

[Prof. B. N. Prasad]

I am a very materialistic human being and I do not very much understand what spirituality means and, if I may say so, knowing Jawaharlal Nehru as I do, if you had put to him this question, what is spirituality, he would certainly have said : 'I do not know'. I say so because in my presence he said to a Christian missionary, who had come to discuss with him this matter : 'Mr. so and so, you talk about religion. I am afraid I do not know anything about it.' Therefore, whatever spirituality is, one ought not to be irreverent in these matters and I do not speak with irreverence on this question, but I think to expect that these universities, worldly institutions as they are, will perform these godly functions is trying to do something which is hardly possible. Now, therefore, although from my point of view it is right and proper that this university should be named the Jawaharlal Nehru University, neither should we expect too much from this university, nor should we make this university purely a replica of the universities that exist.

Having said all this, may I draw your attention to some of the provisions in this Bill ? The first thing, to which I have already referred, is the First Schedule. Now, it is most unhappily worded so far as I can see. It starts with the words : "To be worthy of its name." Now, that means that you question the possibility of this institution to be worthy of its name. To start questioning the worthiness of the university, about which you entertain such high hopes, is, to my mind, very odd. I, therefore, strongly feel that such words as these should not be used in connection with the aims and objects of the University.

Then, again, as I have already stated, the objects, which are given, are merely a sort of repetition. They do not add anything that we can call new or vital to the aims of this University. Therefore, whether the First Schedule stays or does not stay, is, to my mind, quite immaterial. If it does want to say something, then I hope its language will be changed and such words as "to be worthy of" and so on will be omitted.

My second point is in regard to the character, functions and structure of the University. As I read this Bill, I believe that this University has, in the first place, the

function of teaching. 'Teaching whom' is not quite clear, but I take it that it has got the function of teaching at two stages. One stage of teaching, study and research is the postgraduate stage. The second one is the undergraduate stage. The University undertakes more or less direct teaching at the postgraduate stage. The University at the same time contemplates the undertaking of studies at the undergraduate stage by instituting and maintaining its own colleges. I hope I am correct in interpreting the provisions in this Bill. While I entirely agree that both these functions are worthy functions for any university to fulfil—and I do not agree that a university should become merely an institute for postgraduate studies—I cannot understand why this University, which is being set up, cannot associate and recognise colleges where undergraduate instruction is being given, colleges which are not instituted by this University but which are instituted by other bodies and societies. The University can lay down rules and regulations in its Ordinances and statutes, if necessary, regarding the conditions on which such colleges would be recognised. The danger is that there are fifteen, twenty or twentyfive colleges in Delhi which the Delhi University wants, I understand, to shed. These colleges will not be as good as they ought to be for this University which we are establishing. That danger is there. That can be obviated by laying down proper conditions for recognition and if those conditions are fulfilled by any college, which is today affiliated to the Delhi University, it may be recognised tomorrow by the Jawaharlal Nehru University. Then, that danger will not exist. I do not see any reason why this University should shut its door upon colleges which by reason of fulfilling the conditions laid down by the University itself deserve to be associated with the University.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : How much more time do you want to take ?

DR. TARA CHAND : As much as you can give me.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Another five minutes.

PROF. M. B. LAL : He should be allowed to speak in some detail. He is a prominent educationist.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : You carry on, Dr. Tara Chand.

DR. TARA CHAND : Thank you Madam. The second function that this Jawaharlal Nehru University has placed before itself is the association of recognised Institutes, and again I understand that the term "recognised Institutes" includes, for instance, the new Institute of Russian Studies. It also includes so far as I understand such Institutes as the Indian Institute of Medical Science and Research, the Indian Institute of Technology, the Indian Institute of Agriculture, and so on. Here I am in complete agreement with the Bill that Institutes of this description should be associated with this University, and I say so because in my opinion the association of these Institutes with this University will be of benefit both for the Institutes and for the University. The Institutes will benefit because they will participate in the larger intellectual life of the University. The students, for instance, of the Medical Institute coming into contact with the students of the University and teachers and professors of the University are likely to profit by that contact. The University will in its turn benefit because these institutes will bring their own point of view, their own scholarship and their own learning to the notice of the members of the University. It is to my mind always an advantage that a university should have as diversified a circle as possible of Institutes which are established for various kinds of disciplines. Therefore, I am all in favour of this provision of the Bill that the recognised Institutes should share the amenities of the University.

There seems to be a third function that this University is supposed to fulfil and that is of associating with itself Institutes which are situated outside Delhi. I think it was my friend, Prof. B. N. Prasad, who pointed out the difficulty of association of the Institute of Marine Biology in Madras or Trivandrum or some Institute of Anthropology which is somewhere in Assam or some similar Institute, say, relating to nuclear science in Bombay. Now it is all very nice to say that all these Institutes should be associated with this University here. But what machinery is this University going to possess in order to look after the

interests of all these scattered Institutes ? These Institutes are not going to be ordinary colleges. They are not merely Institutes teaching under-graduate classes or carrying out research of a very low order. They are very highly specialised Institutes. Therefore, looking after such highly specialised Institutes requires a very highly specialised machinery, and I doubt whether it is practical to contemplate the establishment of such machinery at the Delhi centre.

I do not agree with my friends who seem to think that unless this Jawaharlal Nehru University is permitted to associate colleges or institutes all over India and permitted to give the privileges of the University to all kinds of institutions scattered about, it will not be an all-India institution. It is a completely wrong idea. Oxford and Cambridge Universities are not merely Oxford and Cambridge Universities. They are all-England universities. In fact they are all-world universities. To the Harvard University young men from all parts of the world gather, and nobody says that because Harvard University is situated in the Cambridge County it is therefore a local university. The character of a university depends upon what kind of teaching and standards it maintains. I hope, and I am sure that the Minister wants to do it, that this should be an institution with the highest standards. Then its standards will make it an all-India university. Its standards will make it an all-world university. We never proclaimed in the old days that Nalanda was a world university. But to Nalanda came students from Japan, from China, from Iran, from Central Asia, from all over the world, because there were teachers in Nalanda whose fame spread all over the world, and they attracted pupils from all over the world. People go to Paris or Oxford or Harvard not because these universities can recognise or affiliate or hand over their privileges to various parts of the world, but because their teaching and studies and their researches are so famous that students from every part of the world wish to go to them. I think that it would be desirable that instead of spreading ourselves out like this we concentrated our energies in making this place so good and so highly specialised and possessing of such high standards that people from all over India and people from

[Dr. Tara Chand]

abroad should be attracted to it. Therefore, of the three functions which this University is supposed to perform, the first and second I think everybody will approve. But so far as the third function of recognising institutions outside Delhi is concerned, I think it will be desirable to leave that out.

Then, may I say one word about the University as a body administered by the academic people? I cannot make out clearly the position because things have not been detailed out as to what sort of Court, what sort of Faculties or what kind of administrative bodies will be set up, but I do hold very strongly that we should say goodbye to this lack of trust in our teachers. There is too much of distrust by one group of people of another group. I may tell you I feel so hurt when I sit among my friends who are all the time talking that this Minister is so bad, that Minister is so foolish, the third Minister is so corrupt, and so on and so forth. No trust in the Government or the Ministry; no trust in the Legislature; no trust in the universities and their teaching staff; no trust in the Vice-Chancellors. What is going to happen to this country? If we are all the time thinking in terms of the bad qualities of each one of us, what is going to happen? I am full of defects, I know. But perhaps I possess some good things also. There is my friend over there with white, grey hair—that might be a defect. But surely he has got some virtues in him. The teachers of the universities are not angels; they are not super human beings. They are human beings, they are Indians like all of us. If we are not going to trust them, whom are we going to trust? On the one hand, we expect our teachers to develop the highest qualities of morality and intellect among the young men who are coming into contact with them. On the other hand, we do not trust them. We say, you are not good enough. God alone knows what will happen if the administration of the University is handed over to you. If the Vice-Chancellor is given two terms, we say that during his first term he will like to look around for getting the second term; we think as if he is such a despicable human being that he must be asked to quit or otherwise, he will fish for the salary or the power or the position of the Vice-Chancellor

again. I most earnestly desire that both the Government and this great House, this august Chamber, should realise that this is an evil which is eating into the vitals of our country, and it is the duty of our leaders, our Ministers, our Government, to see that this kind of psychology, this kind of distrust, is destroyed as soon as possible and that mutual trust, mutual confidence, is established. You know what is going to happen if you do not trust the teachers. I understand—I hope it is wrong—that in the Banaras University, the agitation which has been carried on is due to the staff of the university.

PROF. M. B. LAL : No, Madam. Something higher than the staff.

DR. TARA CHAND : Higher or lower—all are staff. I am not going to particularise, but it is there. And the teachers of the university feel frustrated. If they feel that they are not being given their due in the administration of the university, how are they going to have the heart to run the university properly? Therefore, it is very unwise. There may be difficulties; there may be among the staff people who cannot be trusted. I have been connected with universities for forty years and I know the conditions of the universities. There are bad people. But that does not mean that the group as a whole, that the profession as such, should be branded as unworthy of the trust of the Government and of the Legislature.

Therefore, my point is that when you are spelling out the administrative details of the University, you must be extremely careful that you do not create further distrust and disappointment among the staff of the University. I recall that I read perhaps two or three days ago in papers that a great hullabaloo took place in the Andhra University because the Government of Andhra Pradesh wanted to take away the powers—I do not know what powers—of the university bodies and therefore the Vice-Chancellor said that he was going to resign and the teachers said that they were going to resign. And I understand that the Minister of Education intervened and, well, some peace was brought to the University.

Therefore, I again urge that these matters are important. The character and the

functioning of the University depend upon the trust that you place in the teaching staff of the University, they depend upon the arrangements that you make for dealing with the students of the University. Some friend over there made this point that greater trust should be put in the students. I entirely approve of that sentiment. The students that are coming to the University are not children, they are grown-up people. After three or four years they will be settled in life and they will have to take decisions and do things. Why not begin to take interest in them as men, not as boys and girls, but as men and women. And therefore why not develop in the University such bodies and institutions as will give a chance to these young men and young women to have their say on matters which will, after all, affect them most intimately?

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN I think you should wind up now.

DR. TARA CHAND I will now, according to your wishes.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN You will have occasion to speak again because you have amendments.

DR. TARA CHAND I will wind up. I should not speak any more, I have taken more time than I ought to.

I will just say that you have my best wishes for the establishment of the Jawaharlal Nehru University. But I do hope that some of the points which I have raised will meet with the approval of this House and that what I consider to be the defects will be removed.

SHRI M. RUTHNASWAMY (Madras) Madam Deputy Chairman, I am afraid that the Jawaharlal Nehru University Bill in its passage through the Select Committee has fallen from the frying pan not into the fire when it would have been burnt out but into the cinders and ashes around. Some part of it has been burnt out completely, namely, the original provision allowing the affiliation or the recognition of the sixteen odd colleges already in existence in South Delhi.

The claim has been made that this is a unique University. It is going to be a unique University and there are going to be

unique features of this University. I am afraid the word 'unique' must be used in the Pickwickian sense because it is only in that sense of the word unique that this University that has been thought of, the University that is shaping under our hands, will be. For instance, the area of the University is to be identical with the area of India. That is indeed a unique University because it will be a university having jurisdiction over more than one million square miles. I do not think that any other university has such an imperial range. It is against all modern trends in university development. The Minister of Education has insisted more than once that a modern university in India should be residential. Now, there is only one part of this University that will be residential, namely that part which is situated in New Delhi. There cannot be any corporate life or any communication between the teachers and the students or between the students of the different faculties or between the different schools and those institutions which will belong to this University, outside the Delhi area, after the passing of this Bill. It is unique also in the sense that there are certain institutions which are already in existence which are to be recognised. It is also unique in the sense that the Bill does not provide for their actual incorporation with the University. The Minister hopes that by negotiation, by persuasion, he would be able to persuade the authorities of the institutions like the All India Institute of Medical Sciences and the Indian Institute of Technology to be recognised by this University. Just now, they are all disembodied spirits, it will take time for them to become actual members and parts of this University. In order to give prestige to this University, the provision has been made for the incorporation of these institutions of all-India importance. It looks like what is known in law, legitimate post nuptium. That is to say the prestige comes first and then later on the institutions are to be incorporated.

There is another unique feature of this University and that is that in the very bill itself where provision is made for the kind of instruction that is to be given, the University shall give instruction including correspondence courses. I do not think any University Act in the world

[Shri M. Ruthnaswamy]

provides for correspondence courses in a University. Correspondence courses are associated with exam institutions for the examinations of higher civil services or which prepare students for commercial courses. But a University providing for correspondence courses seems to be going against its very spirit, against its very traditions. What distinguishes University education is its scholarship pursued in a society, which means a social life. What social life is possible in correspondence courses when instruction is passed from the teacher to the student and the student sends his answers? Is there a living contact between the student and the teacher? Correspondence courses come by side winds. But to put it in an Act for all the world to see, I think, lowers the very prestige of the University.

Another unique feature of the Bill is that faculties are replaced by schools. What is the difference? It is another name for schools. Still another unique feature is that there is an Academic Advisory Committee provided for in clause 14, but the work of this Academic Advisory Committee is only temporary. Till such time as its advice is necessary it is required. After a certain time the Visitor may terminate the existence of this Academic Advisory Committee. One would have thought that when an Academic Committee is necessary at the beginning, it must be necessary throughout because a University is a developing institution, and if the advice of a highly competent body helps the University at the initial stages, it should help the University throughout.

The crowning uniqueness of this new University is the provision made in the First Schedule for the propagation and the teaching of the ideas of the great man after whom this University is named. Here again in no University in the world is a provision made in so many words in so many paragraphs for the propagation of the ideas of one single man. Even in the medieval Universities of Europe which were dominated by the Christian Church although theology was taught there, other sciences also were taught, although Aristotle was the dominant figure, other philosophies were also taught, Platonism developed during the middle ages.

Then you get into difficulties because, for instance, the First Schedule speaks of —

“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, social justice, secularism, democratic way of life, international understanding”

Now secularism is a very controversial word. Hon'ble Members in this House and others call the Indian Constitution a secular Constitution, the Indian state is a secular state. But do they really know what the meaning of secular and secularism is? If they look into the Oxford Dictionary, they will find that secularism means anti-religionism. Only that state is a secular state which prohibits the preaching of religion, which prohibits the dissemination of religion, or which puts obstacles in the way of religion. That is what secularism means. The most perfect secular state is Russia where all religions are opposed.

DR. TARA CHAND: America is a secular State.

SHRI M. RUTHNASWAMY: The Indian Constitution expressly provides for the profession, the dissemination and propagation of religion.

In other articles also provision is made for the encouragement of denominational institutions. The pride of India, the pride of the Indian Constitution, is that India is a free State, not a secular State, and to preach secularism in a university will land you in difficulties. No doubt, Pt. Nehru was a great man, he was also a party leader. He prided himself on being a party leader. Throughout his life he devoted himself to the propagation of one particular philosophy, socialism. Is that going to be preached in this University? Is it going to be the first socialist University in the free world? There are socialist professors in other Universities who preach socialism. But socialism is also criticised and opposed by other professors and teachers. So, Madam Deputy Chairman, I think we are entering very stormy seas when we provide for the dedication of a University to the propagation of the ideas of one single man.

Madam, I fail to see where the uniqueness lies. From many of the provisions made in the Bill, it resembles any other university. Under-graduate instruction is provided for. You will have a number of colleges. Although the seventeen colleges are not to be recognised straightway, provision is made for recognising them in due course. With the permission of the University, with the permission of the Central Ministry of Education, these colleges may be recognised by the University. The word used is "staggering", staggering the admission of these colleges. It may be that these colleges may eventually stagger the University itself.

Of course, much is made by the Minister of the new schools that are going to be established, school of Indian Languages, School of European Languages. Well, they could be established in any University. There are some Universities which are already providing for the teaching of certain European Languages. One would have thought that this would at least be a post-graduate University, where men of mature minds, students of mature minds, would be admitted and make research and contribute to the advancement of knowledge. If under-graduate students, especially Intermediate students, are also admitted into the campus of the University, by their very numbers they will lower the standard of the University, not to speak of the discipline of the University. So all things considered, Madam Deputy Chairman, I do not think this University that is being set up, is worthy of Jawaharlal Nehru's memory. What would have really immortalised his memory would have been the establishment of a higher scientific and technological institution like the Massachusetts Institute of Technology. Why should it be believed in India that we can enhance the prestige of an institution by giving it the name of University? We are so obsessed with the excellence of the word "University" as if it were the most important unique educational institution. If you want to honour agriculture, you must found an Agriculture University; if you want to raise the prestige of engineering, you must found an Engineering University, whereas the word "University", by the application the term has received, means an institution where all human knowledge is studied and provided for. The Minister, in his opening speech

as well as when he first introduced the Bill, referred to a conversation he had with the late Prime Minister when he wanted his permission to name the University after him and it was refused. Now that he is dead, I wonder if he would approve of it. If in the course of human destiny, the Minister of Education—and may the day be as distant as possible—proceeds on his path to the Elysian Fields and meets the spirit of Jawaharlal Nehru, I wonder what kind of greeting he would have. I imagine—and I do not think I am making a wild guess—that with his clenched hands and blazing eyes, he would greet the spirit of the Minister with these words: "What did you mean by naming this University after my name? This University in spite of all the changes that have been made, is not a worthy memorial to Jawaharlal Nehru. I part from this Bill in sorrow rather than in anger, in sorrow because I feel that it is not a worthy memorial of him. But I sit down with the consolation that the memory of Jawaharlal Nehru is so great and so endurable that it will survive even the Jawaharlal Nehru University."

SHRI M. SATYANARAYANA : Madam, after the volcanic eruption created by my colleague, Prof. M. B. Lal by opposing this Bill firstly on the question of name and secondly on the various other provisions, I feel that a good deal of reply has already been given. I am sure that even he is now reconciled to it. Now it is not a question whether the University should be named after Jawaharlal Nehru but it is a question whether we will be able to live up to the standards which we have envisaged and which we thought we should keep up by establishing this University and working up to those levels. While discussing these provisions, the Joint Select Committee has rightly taken out the whole University from the purview on which it was conceived to a larger purview not only from the point of view of the provisions for academic standards and for other things that are incorporated but also even for jurisdiction. Originally the jurisdiction was only to New Delhi and near-about the Union territory. Now the jurisdiction has been mentioned. It can be as big as the whole of India. This is to some a welcome feature, to some it is a very ambitious programme. To me, it is a very welcome

[Shri M Satyanarayana]

feature. It is because, Jawaharlal Nehru does not belong to New Delhi alone and he belongs to the whole of India

SHRI M RUTHNASWAMY To the whole world

SHRI M SATYANARAYANA or to the whole world, which you cannot reach. If I can reach the Institute I will and if I have the funds and resources, I can reach the Jawaharlal Nehru University even to Washington which I cannot but I can, as far as India is concerned, as far as this Parliament is concerned. Therefore, my own feeling is that it is in the right direction that the jurisdiction has been expanded and now it is no longer limited but while doing it, we have also tried in the Joint Select Committee, to introduce certain provisions by which this University can associate itself with institutes already existing in the various domains of culture and education and also can establish centres for higher education or such centres by which the academic standards can be promoted. My own feeling is, I would have very much liked if New Delhi had not been mentioned as the headquarters. I would have very much liked that a new campus somewhere in the valley of Narmada should have been thought of for establishing a big university for higher learning in this country. That should have been promoted and complete freedom should have been given to that institution to evolve such standards which will be in consonance with the greatness of Jawaharlal Nehru. This would have been a very appropriate memorial for him. The whole controversy to day that we are listening to is because we have begun to compare with the maladies from which we have been suffering, the pessimism from which we are suffering or the mistakes that we have been making in these days and the various troubles that we are now being confronted with every day in every University. All these things are forcibly coming before us and therefore everybody, whoever has thought, whoever has seen, whoever has imagined what this institution would be like, is now confronted with the problems that there will be a good repetition of what we have been suffering from and it is not possible for us to live up to those ideals. Therefore I would very much like—even now it is no too late for

the Ministry of Education—to think in terms of establishing a very big campus for promoting those ideals, ideas and programme for which Jawaharlal Nehru stood and then work *de novo* in a new campus and a new area. I have purposely mentioned the valley of Narmada for the reason that geographically it is a very highly central place, and when you develop a new campus in the area of Narmada, it will not only be accessible to all the people in the north, in the west, in the east as well as in the south but that will be a central place where a new university should be established and it should be tried.

A good deal has been said as to whether we should have the First Schedule in order to find out whether we will be able to live up to those ideals of Nehru in the course of which certain enumerations have been made. This was really discussed in the Select Committee but ultimately it was agreed that we must have certain guidelines. Unless and until we have certain guidelines how can we work? After all what is said is more or less a kind of repetition of the Directive Principles in the Constitution. There is nothing new, it is true. There is nothing dynamic, it is quite true. There is nothing which we have thought of which we have not worked up to or we are not thinking of working up to, it is quite true but even then these guidelines are necessary for not only promoting those ideals but even for implementing the programmes that we have before us. Let us not forget that we are handing over this University to the future generations. We are too near to what exactly is happening and what exactly has been happening till now. Therefore all these things may not be new to us but they will be new after ten, fifteen or twenty years when actually the future generations will begin to think that even the interpretation of these ideals, the interpretations of these Directive Principles will undergo a lot of change in relation to the social environment, in relation to human evolution, in relation to intellectual calibre, in relation to the understanding of our basic problems in our science and humanities. Therefore we thought in the Select Committee that it is necessary that we should repeat some of these ideals for which Nehru stood. It is not said that they are Jawaharlal Nehru's ideals. It is

not said that it is his programme. It is said that they are what he stood for. What he stood for was only what was stated in the Indian Constitution by way of Directive Principles which every day we are repeating and we are swearing by it. Therefore there is nothing wrong in repeating what had been said. It was also said that this institution should be exclusively confined to post-graduate studies alone. I am not at all in favour of such a proposal. A university or an educational institution should be such in which there must be provision for boys and girls belonging to various ages to come and take full advantage of the environment as well as the facilities offered to them for the purpose of education. Therefore, if you

confine yourself, as far as this University is concerned, only to post-graduate studies, it may not be possible for us to promote what is considered to be our culture, the starting point of which should not at all be confined only to those at the age of twenty-two or twenty-three. It should be from the fourteenth year itself. Therefore I am not at all in favour of that.

As far as the other provisions are concerned, my own feeling is that they are only the result of what we have in our mind. As far as university constitutions are concerned, it is not possible for us to think in terms of a change now. It is not possible for us to think in terms of a change in the nomenclature, or whether we should have a Vice-Chancellor or a Pro-Chancellor, or the President or the Visitor, or this or that. All these things will come only when we make a change not only for the purpose of evolution of the larger purview of the University but also a change in the medium of instruction. As to medium of instruction, my own feeling is that the regional languages should be tried in this new

University, and unless and until we have them, there is no complete uniqueness in this. But then, as far as the Union languages are concerned, I do not say that all the languages should be there, but the Central language, Hindi, which we have accepted, should be tried side by side with English. It should be a double media. It need not necessarily be multi-lingual media, but the media should be at least bi-lingual, the languages being English and Hindi, and they should be tried as the media of instruction for purposes of promoting higher learning and also for raising the academic standards. If we give a fair chance to this University for the purpose of developing Indian languages, it should be possible for us not only to have a developed Indian language, but also to have a larger number of people who will come within the purview of the integrated concept of Indian culture, and it will make a very large contribution to the culture that we have in mind, namely the composite culture.

With these words, Madam, I support this Bill and I wish that whatever has been said on this in the course of the debate should be carefully studied, and I hope that efforts will be made for the purpose of not only lifting up the standards but also for the purpose of implementing the programmes of research and so on contemplated in the Bill.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN The debate is closed. The Minister of Education will reply on the next occasion.

The House stands adjourned till 11 A M tomorrow.

The House then adjourned at two minutes past five of the clock till eleven of the clock on Friday, the 3rd December, 1965.