

Regulations, 1965, under sub-section (5) of section 46 of the Agricultural Refinance Corporation Act, 1963. [Placed in Library. See No. LT-4717/65.]

THE CUSTOMS AND CENTRAL EXCISE DUTIES EXPORT DRAWBACK (GENERAL) SIXTEENTH AMENDMENT RULES, 1965

SHRI B. R. BHAGAT: Sir on behalf of Shri Rameshwar Sahu, I beg to lay on the Table a copy of the Ministry of Finance (Department of Revenue) Notification G.S.R. No. 1178, dated the 21st August, 1965, publishing the Customs and Central Excise Duties Export Drawback (General) Sixteenth Amendment Rules, 1965, under section 159 of the Customs Act, 1963, and section 38 of the Central Excises and Salt Act, 1944. [Placed in Library. See No. LT-4718/65.]

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE TO SHRI RAMPRASANNA RAY

MR. CHAIRMAN: I have to inform Members that the following letter, dated the 26th August, 1965, has been received from Shri Ramprasananna Ray:

"I had to undergo a surgical operation recently and therefore, have been advised by my surgeon to take complete rest for a month. As a result, it may not be possible for me to attend the current session of the Rajya Sabha. May I, therefore, request you to move the House to allow me leave of absence for the current session and oblige."

Is it the pleasure of the House that permission be granted to Shri Ramprasananna Ray for remaining absent from all meetings of the House during the current session?

*No hon. Member dissented.*

MR. CHAIRMAN: Permission to remain absent is granted.

#### ALLOTMENT OF TIME FOR CONSIDERATION OF THE MOTION RE. THE STATEMENT ON THE OIL POLICY

MR. CHAIRMAN: I have to inform Members that under rule 172 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in the Rajya Sabha, I have allotted two hours for the consideration of the motion regarding the statement on the oil policy.

#### THE JAWAHARLAL NEHRU UNIVERSITY BILL, 1964—contd.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA (Orissa): Sir, the Education Minister is not here. How can we proceed?

MR. CHAIRMAN: There are other Ministers. It was Question Hour and he is in the other House. He will be coming. Shri Vijaivargiya.

श्री गोपीकृष्ण विजयवर्गीय (मध्य प्रदेश): अध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं जवाहरलाल नेहरू यूनीवर्सिटी बिल को ज्वाइन्ट मिलेक्ट कमेटी के सुपुर्द किये जाने के प्रस्ताव का समर्थन करता हूँ। यह बिल हमारे सदन में शुरू हो रहा है, यह प्रसन्नता की बात है।

राजधानी में एक यूनीवर्सिटी पहले से है और अच्छी चल रही है, लेकिन शहर बढ़ रहा है, यहां की आबादी बढ़ रही है, और कालेजों और यूनीवर्सिटी में इतने विद्यार्थी आते हैं कि वे ओवर-फ्लो हो रहे हैं, यानी उनकी तादाद से भी ज्यादा लड़के बढ़ पड़ रहे हैं। इसलिए दिल्ली में एक दूसरी यूनीवर्सिटी होने की मख्त जरूरत है। पहले कालेजों में करीब चार हजार स्टूडेंट्स रहा करते थे, अब 28 हजार तक पहुँच गये हैं और हर साल दो हजार ज्यादा विद्यार्थी कालेजों में प्रवेश मांग रहे हैं। ऐसी हालत में यह बहुत मुनासिब है कि हमारे देश की इस राजधानी दिल्ली में एक दूसरी यूनीवर्सिटी बने। इस बात की बड़ी खुशी है कि मिनिस्टर साहब ने इस यूनीवर्सिटी के साथ में पंडित जवाहरलाल

## [श्री गोपीकृष्ण विजयवर्गीय]

नेहरू के नाम को जोड़ना भी मुनासिब समझा है।

मैं समझता हूँ कि सब तरह की प्रगति में, तरक्की में, विद्या की तरक्की में हमारे ज्यादा जरूरी है। इसलिये हमारी इस गजबानी में जो एक नई यूनीवर्सिटी बन रही है, उसका साथ नेहरू जी के नाम का जोड़ा जाना बहुत मुनासिब है। यूनीवर्सिटियों की जरूरत तो देश में बहुत ज्यादा है। असल में जितनी प्रगति हुई है, उससे भी ज्यादा प्रगति की जरूरत है। पंडित जी ने अपने भाषणों में कई बार यह बतलाया था कि औद्योगिक क्रांति और हर प्रकार की टेक्नोलॉजिकल क्रांति जो हमारे देश में हो रही है या तरक्की हो रही है, वह ठीक है, लेकिन हमारे लाखों और करोड़ों बच्चों का पढ़ना भी एक ऐसी क्रांति है जो हमारे देश को बहुत आगे ले जाने वाली है। इसलिये दूसरी यूनीवर्सिटी का होना बहुत मुनासिब बात है। अमेरिका और दूसरे ज्यादा प्रगतिशील देशों में तो हर शहर में यूनीवर्सिटियाँ हैं और कहीं-कहीं एक से ज्यादा यूनीवर्सिटियाँ हैं। इसलिये हर शहर को बहुत खशी होगी कि दिल्ली में दूसरी यूनीवर्सिटी शुरू हो रही है।

अब यह जो बिल पेश किया गया है, इसमें जो एक मामूली यूनीवर्सिटी के लिये नियम होने चाहियें वे सब दिये हैं। अब इसके चान्सेलर, वाइस-चांसलर, और दूसरे आफिशर मुकर्रर कर दिये जायेंगे, उनके बाद यूनीवर्सिटी अपने नियमों का प्रचार काम करना रहेगी। सभी यूनीवर्सिटियों में बहुत से सबजेक्ट्स कामन होते हैं। लेकिन जब नेहरू के नाम की यह यूनीवर्सिटी है, तो यह खास स्पेशलाइज्ड यूनीवर्सिटी होनी चाहिये और इसमें कुछ खास विषय पढ़ाये जाने चाहियें। अगर यूनीवर्सिटी ग्रांट्स कमिशन और गवर्नमेंट इसके लिये काफी रायदा नहीं देगी और नेहरू का नाम जोड़ने के बाद भी अगर यह यूनीवर्सिटी मामूली

तरह की ही रही, तो यह कोई बहुत अच्छी बात नहीं होगी। इसलिये जब इस यूनीवर्सिटी के साथ नेहरू का नाम जोड़ा जा रहा है, तो इसको ज्यादा रूपदा दिया जाना चाहिये और इसमें रिसर्च वगैरह का ज्यादा इन्तजाम रद्दना चाहिये और कुछ ऐसे सबजेक्ट्स इसमें पढ़ाये जाने चाहियें जो ग्राम तौर पर अभी बहुत सी यूनीवर्सिटियों में नहीं पढ़ाये जाते हैं। एरोनाटिक्स या स्पेस फ्लाइट वगैरह के कुछ ऐसे सबजेक्ट्स हैं, जिनके लिये मेरे खयाल से किसी दूसरी यूनीवर्सिटी में इन्तजाम नहीं है। इसी तरह अटॉमिक फीजिक्स, हायर केमिस्ट्री और ऐसे ही खास टेक्नोलॉजी और टेक्निकल विषयों के लिये विशेष रूपदा रखा जाना चाहिये जो हिन्दुस्तान में वही और नहीं है। आजकल बहुत सी माइसेज डेवलप हो रही हैं, जिनके लिये इसमें प्रबन्ध किया जाय। इस तरह जब यह खास किसम की यूनीवर्सिटी होगी और इसमें स्पेशलाइज्ड सबजेक्ट्स होंगे, तब ज्यादा मुनासिब होगा। जैसे रुडकी यूनीवर्सिटी सिर्फ इंजिनियरिंग के लिये है, उसी तरह की यह भी होनी चाहिये। नेहरू जी, जो कि साइन्स और टेक्नोलॉजी में ज्यादा विश्वास करते थे, उनके नाम की इस यूनीवर्सिटी में इस तरह के ज्यादा काम किये जाने चाहियें।

दूसरा सवाल यह है कि जो इसमें लेक्चरर, प्रोफेसर और दूसरे स्टाफ के लोग रखे जाय वह भी बूढ़ करके अच्छे रखे जायें। हमारे यहां की सब यूनीवर्सिटियों में से जो अच्छे लोग हैं, वे इन यूनीवर्सिटियों में रखे जाय और बाहर से भी बुलाये जायें।

एक सवाल यह भी होता है कि यूनीवर्सिटियों में अक्सर स्टुडेंट्स का डिस्प्लिन कायम रखना बहुत मुश्किल होता है। और यूनीवर्सिटियों का भी तजुर्बा यह है कि बहुत ज्यादा पालिटिक्स बढ़ा आ जाती है और बहुत से पालिटिकल झगडे वगैरह जो हैं, वे प्रोफेसरों की गटबन्दी की वजह से शुरू होते हैं।

इसके अकेडेमिक एटमास्फीयर ठीक रखने के लिये प्रोफेसरों का चुनाव अच्छी तरह से होना चाहिये।

एक बात यह है कि लड़के जो इसमें भरती किये जायें, वे हाई मार्क्स पाने वाले और ऊँचे दर्जे के हों। इस तरह उनके एडमिशन में सख्ती का जाय और उसमें ऐसा एटमास्फीयर रखा जाय जिससे वह तरक्की कर सके।

इन बातों के साथ, मैं इस बिल को ज्वान्ट सिलेक्ट कमेटी में भेजने के प्रस्ताव का समर्थन करता हूँ।

**SHRI JAIRAMDAS DAULATRAM** (Nominated): Sir, I would like to be exceedingly brief in response to the request of the Education Minister yesterday that we should enable him to discharge his duties in the other House. I would like first to congratulate him on his sponsoring and his association with the first important institutional memorial to one who was one of the greatest men of the world of this century and whose measure will be properly assessed in due time hereafter. I will be, I believe, possibly suggesting something unusual when I propose that the name of the institution should not be Jawaharlal Nehru University but simply Nehru University. I have knowledge of many institutions styled after Mahatma Gandhi, and today they are only known as M. G. institutions. So also in the case of Motilal Nehru, today, some of those institutions are known as M. N. institutions, and as the Education Minister knows, various Phirozeshah Mehta institutions in Bombay are sometimes known as P. M. institutions. Thus the object of commemorating a name is lost as time passes.

The other suggestion which I would like to make to him is that special efforts should be made to maintain very, very high standards of teaching in this University if it is to be associated with Panditji's name. Also,

special efforts should be made to maintain the best atmosphere in the University. The relations between the teachers and the students should be such that nothing should happen which will reflect on the name of the University. When we decide to give this name to this University, we undertake very great responsibilities, and I think Parliament will go the whole way out and support the Minister, both with regard to financial backing, and otherwise, in seeing that both the teaching standards and the atmosphere of the University are maintained at a high level.

One other suggestion of mine is that we should have in this University also a department of international studies. Also, we should have an institute for foreign students. I would concentrate in this University all students who are invited from foreign countries for studying in India, and that should be the best and most special feature of this University which will be associated with Panditji's name, because he, probably more than any other statesman, laboured to bring about international friendliness in this world. These are my brief suggestions and I hope the Select Committee and the Minister will consider them.

**SHRI M. RUTHNASWAMY** (Madras): Mr. Chairman, it is with regret that I rise to oppose the formation of a university of the type with which we are familiar, more so because the honoured and honourable name of Jawaharlal Nehru is associated with it. From the wording of the clauses of the Bill we find that this new University is going to be the usual kind of Indian university with whose recent developments and with whose recent products we are all too sadly familiar. From the Bill before us we find that it will be a common or garden university of the type with which we have been familiar. There will be the usual large number of students and small number of teachers. The present ratio of teacher to students in Indian universities is 1 : 15

[Shri M. Ruthnaswamy.]

to 20. In spite of all the hopes and aspirations of the Minister to make this new university something new in its character, the political pressure, the pressure of public opinion, will be so great that the new university will be something like the universities to which we have been accustomed. There will be large number of students, it would be difficult to reduce the large number of students except under very drastic measures of admission; the standards of admission must be much stricter than they have been in Indian universities in recent times.

In spite of all the assurances given by Ministers of Education and the Chairman of the University Grants Commission, the number of students that have been admitted to universities has been growing year by year. We are told, the Minister of Education himself said the other day in the course of one of his speeches here that with so many knocking at the door of the university, how can we shut them out? They are asking for knowledge, and how can we keep knowledge away from those students? But is it real knowledge that the students in our universities get? It is more information that is pumped into empty minds to be reproduced in the examination halls. And if we are to get the right type of students, we must raise the age of admission, from the present 15 to 16, it must be raised to 17 or 18. Neither the University Grants Commission, nor the Ministers of Education at the Centre or in the States have done anything to raise the standard of admission. If the new University will be the same as any other Indian university, it will cater to the needs of under-graduate students; intermediate students will be preponderant in the University, and you know what these numerous intermediate students have done with the standards, with the discipline and with the general atmosphere of our universities. And then, this University starts with a handicap of 17 exist-

ing colleges—colleges which have been started on the lines on which colleges are started in India, started anyhow, with little endowments, with no endowments for teacherships, with no endowments for scholarships for students, living mainly on their fee-income. And these 17 colleges will set the pace and the standards of the new University. It is a great handicap with which this new University is starting. And there are no new ideas that I can detect in the Bill that is before us, except the atrocious idea that correspondence courses are to form an important feature of the University. Correspondence courses, Mr. Chairman, are against the very tradition and idea of a university. Not only Cardinal Newman, but a hard-headed economist like Bagehot has said that "what distinguishes a university is the atmosphere of disputation and argumentation, the impact of young thought upon young thought, of fresh thought upon fresh thought, the free play of the mind—the mind of the student and of the teacher—upon one another." And these correspondence courses, with which the Minister of Education seems to be fascinated, are against the very idea and traditions of university life. The Minister in his introductory speech said that this University will be somewhat on the lines of the new Sussex University in England. But the Sussex University has laid down strict standards and fixed the numbers that it will admit. It started with 500 and it proposes not to raise the number beyond 3,000.

Again, has the Minister contemplated the cost of this new University? He has suggested that in the very first year Rs. 25 lakhs will be spent. But would that be enough? There will be at least one crore of rupees required to start the University, to find the necessary buildings for the departments, for the new lecture rooms, for the administrative offices, and another crore will be required for the medical college, and yet another crore for the engineering college.

And if this University is to be along the lines to which Jawaharlal Nehru was used, remembering his Trinity College days, it would have to be wholly a residential university. That is to say, halls of residence will have to be found for all the students of the University and that will cost another crore.

Is this the time to incur this heavy expenditure on a university which will not differ from other universities in India, especially when the whole cost of it will have to be borne by the Central Government which is already bearing the cost of the Banaras University, the Aligarh University, the Delhi University, the Vishwa-Bharati and other Central technical institutions? On the top of that will come the burden of the cost of this University. When literacy is so low in our country, this is the time when all the money that is available for education must be spent on primary and adult education so that the rate of our literacy may be raised from the miserable low level of 25 per cent.—that it is today—to 70 per cent. or 75 per cent. which the economic and social needs of our country require. As far the education of girls it is in a deplorable condition. The progress of girls education is only half of that achieved by the boys.

It is not by such a university, Mr. Chairman, that the memory of Jawaharlal Nehru will be honoured. It must be a new institution, a new educational institution that will really commemorate his name. A Nehru College specialising in high science and technology in the Delhi University on the lines of Churchill College in Cambridge University would be more worthy of the memory of Jawaharlal Nehru than a university of the usual Indian type. The Education Minister, being an Oxford man, should be aware also of All Souls College, Oxford, where it is not undergraduate students, it is not even post-graduate students that are admitted, but fellows and teachers are admitted and

there they do research work, work that will make a university notable.

SHRI A. D. MANI (Madhya Pradesh): All Souls College?

SHRI M. RUTHNASWAMY: Yes, All Souls College of Oxford. There is at Princeton in the U.S.A. also an institute of higher intellectual thinking where there are no undergraduate students, not even post-graduate students but teachers and fellows of the university gather in order to undertake research work. It is such a centre of thinking and research that would really commemorate the name and memory of Jawaharlal Nehru.

I am surprised, Mr. Chairman, that even in these educational matters, even in the matter of raising an educational memorial in the name of Jawaharlal Nehru, Government and the hon. Minister should resort to State enterprise. Would it not have been possible to issue and appeal to the whole country to raise funds in such large amounts that a worthy memorial to honour the name of Jawaharlal Nehru might be raised? It is on account of these considerations that I am painfully driven to the step of not giving my support to the proposed University. Not that the memory of Jawaharlal Nehru should not be handed down to posterity, but because his name and work cannot be commemorated by a university of the usual Indian type, it is hardly worthy of his name and of his memory.

SHRI N. SRI RAMA REDDY (Mysore): Mr. Chairman Sir, I am very happy that the name of the illustrious son of India, Jawaharlal Nehru, is proposed to be immortalised by the establishment of a university after his name. Certainly, Sir apart from the sentiments involved in this affair, a second university in Delhi is a great necessity. The population of Delhi has increased to 26 lakhs and it is an enormous number. And the number of boys and girls seeking college education is increasing

[Shri N. Sri Rama Reddy.]

enormously. It is said in the Statement of Objects and Reasons that every year the college-going population is increasing by 2,000. If that is so, then the present 31 colleges under the Delhi University would not be able to cope up with the problems arising out of the enormous number of pupils who are seeking college education. Therefore, it is in the fitness of things that another University should be thought of, and I really congratulate the Education Minister for proposing to give the University a name that is near and dear to every son of the soil.

Mr. Chairman, with regard to the various provisions contained in the present Bill, I would not go into the merits or demerits of those provisions. Anyway, the Joint Select Committee is being proposed and I am sure this Joint Select Committee will contain eminent men of this House and they will go into the matter very deeply and propose such provisions as are found necessary, apart from the ones that have been proposed in the measure before us.

I would like to take this opportunity to recall to my mind the thoughts and actions and the behaviour of this great and illustrious son of India. Sir, first of all, it should be made clear that what constitutes the greatness of a country is not merely the number of its people. The elements and factors which go to make the power of a country depend on its education. Certainly, education should occupy the first place and in this education, science and technology, in the present stage, have the very first place, the foremost place. It is this progress in science and technology which has opened up limitless treasures of data for the benefit of mankind. This is responsible for the substantial progress made in mitigating the hard lot of the masses and it is the advance of science and technology which improves the health of the nation and the lives of the people and the lives of their children. By this

means their stature grows and their security against misfortunes is multiplied. Therefore, the need for education and the need for education in science and technology in this country is very great. Without it, probably, we cannot make the life of human beings happy. But I do not know for what specific reason, in the Statement of Objects and Reasons that has been given here in this Bill, only "advancement of knowledge and research" has been mentioned. I very much wish that advancement of science and technology also had been stated. Of course, it may be stated that knowledge includes science and technology. But I want this to be specifically mentioned. We all know how very dear this subject of science and technology was to this great son of our country, a man the like of whom is not born even once in many centuries. Therefore, I wish it were still made possible to say that this University should be a specialised place for science and technology. That is my ambition because this was nearest and dearest to his own heart. He felt that it was only through science and technology that the prosperity of this country has got to be achieved, that it could not be done so long as the people were lacking in the scientific temper. I know, once when inaugurating the Parliamentary Scientific Committee he said the scientific temper should be spread, because without that, whatever might be the other aspects of our attempts at solving our problems, nothing much could be done, that without the scientific temper—which according to him meant the advancement of science and technology—this country cannot be made happy.

THE MINISTER OF EDUCATION (SHRI M. C. CHAGLA). I do not want to disturb my hon. friend, but I would only point out that in clause 4 this is already mentioned—

"The University shall have the following powers, namely:—

(1) to provide for instruction (including correspondence cour-

ses) and research in the Humanities, Science and Technology, . . . ”

So it is specifically mentioned.

SHRI N. SRI RAMA REDDY: I am very thankful to learn that it has been mentioned. All the same, a pre-eminent place must be given to it. It is not to be clubbed along with so many other subjects, but a pre-eminent place should be provided to science and technology and if that is given, I will not have anything more to say on that.

This great man was a veritable volcano of knowledge and inspiration and that is what this University should stand for. It is often said that the eaten bread is forgotten and I am sure the hon. Minister and the nation behind this Government is belying this proverb. In so many other ways I would like millions of Jawaharlal Nehrus to come up in each corner of this country and that is the basis on which further progress has got to be achieved in this country. He was heir to splendid possessions. I recollect, Sir, that he was only a man of agitation, action, sympathy, learning, knowledge and all these things till he came to the Government. Once he came to the Government, he hurled himself into the business of Government with excessive energy and remained so till the last day of his life in this world. This is the type of man whose memory is proposed to be commemorated by the establishment of this University. I wish this University all success. Let its life be glorious and let it live till eternity in glory as the independence of this country. That is my wish, Sir.

In this connection, I would like to recall a small *sloka* which I had learnt long before, in which, I am sure, Jawaharlal Nehru believed:

“विद्या नाम नरस्य रूपमधिकं प्रच्छन्नगुप्तं धनम् ।

विद्या भोगकरी, यशःसुखकरी, विद्या गुरुणां गुरुः ॥ ”

This is said to have been written thousands of years ago in our ancient scriptures. I need not dilate upon it but this is what it says:

“विद्यानाम नरस्य रूपमधिकम्”

There is nothing which gives glory to the personality of a human being except education. It is not the ornaments, it is not the dress, it is not the way you make up your body, but it is only education that gives personality to a human being. This education is a *gupta dhan*, a very secret treasure. Therefore, “विद्या भोगकरी, यशःसुखकरी” if you want to live in this world, if you want to enjoy fully in this world, you must have the backing of education without which life is not complete. If you want fame in this world, you can get it only through education, not through the possession of wealth, not through the possession of property, not through the possession of a big dynasty and all that sort of thing. Therefore, Sir, it is in the fitness of things that an educational institution, a university in the name of this great personality should be set up. I lend my entire support to the hon. Minister for the step he has taken.

SHRI MULKA GOVINDA REDDY (Mysore): Mr Chairman, I would like to make some observation on this Jawaharlal Nehru University Bill. It is unfortunate that the Central Government has forgotten its obligations to the common man in not having made proper efforts to implement the constitutional obligations with regard to the question of imparting primary education to the children between the ages of six and eleven. Mr. Chairman it is the fifth Central university that the Government is going to establish through this Bill. There are already four universities, one in Delhi, the second in Banaras, the third in Aligarh and the fourth in West Bengal, the Vishwa-Bharati. Time and again, we have been pressing that in order to achieve national integration, a university should be started in the South. The Education Minister inaugurated the

[Shri Mulka Govinda Reddy.]

Bangalore University some time ago and it was pointed out at that time that the Bangalore University should be converted into a Central University. Mr. Chairman, there seems to be favoured treatment with regard to Delhi. It is true that the population of Delhi has gone up to twenty-six lakhs but it is equally true that the population of Calcutta is nearly six to seven millions and that of Bombay is nearly four to five millions. Before taking up this question of a second university for Delhi, it should have been the primary duty of the Central Government to have suggested to the Governments of West Bengal and Maharashtra to start additional universities in the cities of Calcutta and Bombay. Instead of doing that, they have started another University in Delhi, may be because Delhi is a centrally administered area and as such is the responsibility of the Central Government.

Mr. Chairman, it is time Government reconsidered the question of reviving the Intermediate and two-year degree course. Many universities, I understand, are having a rethinking on the question of three-year degree course; they are thinking of having a two-year degree course instead. It is time that the Intermediate course and the two-year degree course were re-introduced.

In this University, all the colleges should come under the direct administration of the University. There should not be University colleges and Government colleges whereby a distinction is made with regard to scales of salaries given to the University lecturers and professors and the lecturers and professors in the Government colleges. It is creating ill-feelings among the members of the staff. In order to maintain standards and in order to have that University atmosphere, there should not be any Government college. All colleges should be under the jurisdiction of the University, both academic and administrative. Then alone would the proper atmosphere be created

and the students and the teachers would have better opportunities of mixing together and learning what is expected of them.

Mr. Chairman, lastly, I doubt very much whether it is proper to name a University after any person however great he may be. It may be desirable to reconsider that question.

KUMARI SHANTA VASISHT (Delhi): Mr. Chairman, Sir, I wish to extend my welcome to this Bill and I think it is going to fulfil a very great need of Delhi and it has not come up too soon. There was a very great demand for more and more colleges which were opened every year. Each year we saw, at least two to three colleges were being opened in Delhi for men as well as women. Also, a large number of students were going to have their education in colleges in Gurgaon, Sonapat, Ghaziabad and other nearby towns where they could get admission. So I am very glad that this new University is going to be established here and I feel personally that there is need for one more university in the Shahdara area. The present University is in the north of Delhi; it is a very outstanding and very good University of which we are very legitimately proud, and this is going to be in the south of Delhi. And it has a very good location in the area where the land has been earmarked and where it is going to come up soon. But I think the land is not enough; it is just 300 acres or so. Even the College of Engineering which is almost next door to this has been given already 300 acres of land. So, to have a university after the name of a very great man of India with an equal amount of land is not right. It may not be sufficient considering the plans that the hon. Minister has in view about the size and type of this University. But I am very glad that it is coming up. As I said, a third university would be necessary in the Shahdara area and I would like the hon. Minister to consider it as soon as possible be-

cause it is an area cut off by the Jamuna river and communication and transportation across the Jamuna river has been exceedingly difficult and students who would have to come from Shahdara either to the Delhi University or even to this University would find it very difficult. For various other reasons also it is necessary—considering the population there and the fact that there are already one or two colleges existing in that area—that some plan will have to be made for that area.

I may also point out my personal reservation in this matter of calling it after the great leader of India, that is, Jawaharlal Nehru. Sometimes we associate very great names of people whom we want to pay homage, whom we respect very much, whom we like very much, but the institutions do not always show such good results and that makes one very unhappy. You have various places, for instance many townships, called after the great leaders of India like Rajendranagar, Kamla Nagar etc. Many of the slums are also named after the great leaders India; some of the worst slums are named after Mahatma Gandhi or Rajkumari Amrit Kaur or some other people. And you feel very bad when you see that the state of affairs in those places is not as good as the name is. You feel bad about the association of very great names with an institution or a place which may not always possibly justify our feelings towards such persons. So much as I appreciate the great desire of all of us actually to have this University named after Pandit Nehru, I have my own personal reservations. The Banaras Hindu University was started with very great ideals and ideas and very great names of the country are associated with that but unfortunately when trouble started there, it has been seen in the last few years that it has become a sad experience to see that the University started by such great men, organised by them and run by them, has come to a stage

where you feel sorry about it. So personally I would not like his name to be associated but since it is the dominating sentiment of the people probably all over the country and particularly in Delhi, I can only express my own personal views in this matter.

About the plans that the Ministry has for having various Departments and various institutes—even associating or affiliating the existing ones and then establishing many more—the natural demand of the people is that those students who are very poor, either poor second class or third class students, who are going to the adjoining areas of Punjab and U. P. for their education, should be given seats here. They take it that when a second University is started, obviously the idea is that those students would be able to get admission in this University. They are ordinarily poor second class or third class students and they go in for arts education, not for science. Actually the present University would not take them in the Science Department; they would not be taken even in the arts colleges in Delhi and that is the reason why they have to go elsewhere. So, if that natural demand is going to be diverted into this University, the expectation of the Ministry that this will have a very high standard may not possibly materialise because the quality of the students who will be coming in here will be poor. They will be those who are not getting admission in the Delhi University today. Therefore that will be a very great limitation and restriction on the quality of this University that you do want to have here.

Secondly, I would like to point out one thing. When the Central Government wants to start certain projects—I am sorry to say—the very fact that the Capital is here, that the Central Government Ministers are here, that the leaders are here, goes against their success. Unfortunately in the atmosphere of Delhi, in the

[Kumari Shanta Vasisht.]

atmosphere of the Capital, things tend to become show-pieces and we make out a lot of show-windows. A lot of things are started with nice labels and nice designations and they are very attractive to be seen by the Ministers and the leaders and also to be shown to the foreigners who are always coming to the Capital of India but somehow it is very difficult to maintain quality. I may even give a few examples. Some Departments or Institutes were started by the Government of India at the Delhi University and the students there as well as the staff members including the Vice-Principal told me, "though our Institute is in a favourable position with regard to the Central Government, the Education Ministry, and though it has a very good name in the whole of India as an Institute, it is only a show-piece." The students do no work; the staff has no work and it is only just exterior, nothing inside. And if we are only going to have a large number of show-pieces—and we import a large number of ideas from outside and graft them here—they would not always do very well and we shall be losing the substance. We are very much in the habit of taking up new ideas and new labels in our plans but we never implement them in the spirit in which they require to be implemented, not because the officials in the Ministry or the Ministers do not do much but somehow or other things are lacking, may be the quality of students, may be the quality of teachers. Because of the very fact that it has to become or it becomes a show-piece, it cannot survive; it cannot maintain any standard. The main trouble here is that the trend is such, the atmosphere is such that things here tend to become show-pieces and we never get the substance or the quality that is necessary to make out a really good programme. From this point of view, I think the less a thing becomes a show-piece or an exhibit for outsiders, the better it is for the qualitative growth of that thing and its

general progress. This I think is a very great danger that if we start anything in Delhi it tends to become a show-piece and that is the tragedy of the whole thing because everything becomes a failure after that.

I may also point out that this University should not also become a mere conglomeration of all the arts colleges as most of the demands may be for arts colleges, but this should be for science and applied subjects. I have seen in American universities where everything has to be applied to something or the other, whether it is industry or farm or even the social work. Everything is applied and principles have been reduced to certain formulae. So, I think we should also have our emphasis not so much on academic teaching or learning or academic pursuits but on the side of application as far as possible to our conditions in India. We are a very academic people. Our working, our thought, our approach, is academic and I think the emphasis should change from academic thinking to the applied side.

Now, it is the Ministry's thinking that it will have a Department or Institute of Russian Studies. I think it is very important that we must also have Studies in African Languages as a separate Department, not along with the other Departments, because people should know a number of foreign languages which we sadly lack. We are lacking not only in the matter of foreign languages but we also lack in the matter of our own languages. So also, I think a separate institute has to be established for other Asian languages for the simple reason that we have very poor communication and contact and relationship with other countries in the region of Asia or Africa, though there are a large number of Foreign Language Schools in Delhi, one run by the Defence Ministry, one by the University and probably one or two other institutions for teaching Russian, French, German, Italian, Chinese and so on.

So, I think, we may give a little more emphasis to the various languages in Africa and a separate institute for Asian languages, along with other languages. Training should be given to a large number of our people in these languages. This is all I have to say. There is a very great demand for land in Delhi. Even the land for the university area is practically appropriated by the engineering college and other institutes of various Ministries. The Ministries themselves want them to be out here with the result that the peasantry is going out of Delhi. Boys from all over India are coming into Delhi. I think it is very necessary that we should have more land, even a bigger area for this university to make it of a size and type that we would like it to be.

I thank you very much and congratulate the Minister on bringing forward this measure and I hope that it will have a great name and great status. Thank you.

**SRI G. RAMACHANDRAN** (Nominated): Sir, I am happy that the Education Minister is in his seat because it is good that when we have his reactions, we get them straight from him in response to whatever we might have to say on the floor of the House. The Minister is a brave man, a man of vision and courage, but yesterday he said that he hoped that this was not a controversial measure. I hope also that too much controversy will not be woven round the discussions on this Bill. There can be controversies of two kinds. There can be controversy which rejects the basis of a proposal and then finally rejects the proposal itself. My friend, Mr. Ruthnaswamy, the experienced Vice-Chancellor of a University as he is, has stated his reasons and rejected the proposal. That is one way of raising a controversy. There is another way that is, in a constructive way. You accept the basis of a proposal and then point out that in the manner in which you are seeking to implement the proposal there is something that some of us

have to say. Then it is good you take into consideration such criticism as you go ahead with shaping the proposal.

I realise now, with a sense of some disappointment, that what you are seeking to do is to affix the name of Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru to a University which, in any case, would have come into existence. If you look at the Statement of Objects and Reasons, you will find that the first three paragraphs indicate the need for setting up a university in this area. For example, there are too many students seeking admission, and then there are these remarks about the Delhi University that it has become unwieldy and cumbersome etc. The academic standards are in danger of deterioration in the Delhi University. There is then inadequacy of the present arrangements and so on. All these indicate the absolute necessity for a new university and that university would have come into being whether you call it the Jawaharlal Nehru University or by some other name. I also see that being what you are, profoundly loyal to the concepts for which Pandit Nehru stood and the present Government equally loyal to these concepts, that having made up your mind to affix the name of Nehru to the University, you are fully seized of the need for establishing that university in some form which would be worthy of the great name you affix on the University. All this I grant. But looking at the picture as a whole, I have the fear in my mind that what you are going to do is to merely create another big amorphous university with innumerable departments of studies and so on. There is no guarantee in such a scheme as this that this University will worthily bear the stamp of the ideas of Pandit Nehru, or it will embody the things for which he stood.

In paragraph 5 of the Statement of Objects and Reasons, there is something which gives us some inspiration and Mr. Chagla's name is at the bottom of it. He has said that the pro-

[Shri G. Ramachandran.]

posed University will embody a unique synthesis of the humanities, the sciences and technology worthy of the great son of India and so on. This kind of thing has been said every time a new university has been started. I remember the starting of the Kerala University long ago. I knew very clearly what was happening when the Annamalai University was being started. Great claims were made. I remember, on the floor of the Kerala Legislature, it was said that what was going to be started would kindle the lamp of Kerala culture and that the light of that lamp will shine across the world. When the Annamalai University was started, it was said that the genius of the Tamil language and culture will be brought out by this University and that it will be presented as a great offering to the rest of the world and so on. There is even a more classical example, my old *ama mater*, the Vishwa-Bharati University. No less a person than Rabindranath Tagore started it and in the constitution, the first sentence was that the object of the Vishwa-Bharati was to study the mind of man, to bring the cultures of India together into a great working unity and then attempt the unity of the cultures of the world. I was a student there for four years. I go back sometimes to the Vishwa-Bharati and I know what is happening. All those dreams are gone. The normal pattern of a university has come in and there is now not much to distinguish the Vishwa-Bharati today from the Delhi University, for instance. The Delhi University also has a department of music under very able people and there is the classical music of both the South and North, taught there.

When you say that this University will enshrine a unique synthesis of the humanities, the sciences and technology worthy of Pandit Nehru, I would like to ask you: How do you guarantee that this will happen? You are programming for 14,000 students. There are already seventeen to eighteen colleges which are functioning,

which have got their own traditions, which have set their own patterns of development. You are putting them into this basket and maybe you will add more. You have made a kind of artificial division of Delhi, holding up something at the Ajmere Gate and then allowing something else to happen on the other side of Ajmere Gate. How are you going to keep the fourteen thousand students true to the great ideals of a Nehru University? This is a vast thing and will become just like any other normal university. I have seen the pattern of administration and everything else that you have in this Bill. It is exactly like any other university. How do we know that in five, seven or ten years this is not going to settle down into the normal pattern of an ordinary university?

Now, let us think of Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru and his ideas. I have heard many high adjectives used here today. Probably there is no adjective good enough for this great man of destiny who lived in this country, worked in this country and lifted up this country so much in so many ways. We can use as many adjectives as we like. But what are the unique things for which he stood, and will these things be represented in this University? First of all, he was the symbol of the composite culture of this great country. No one symbolised in this century the composite culture of this land as Pandit Nehru did. What does this composite culture mean? There are thirteen great languages, and each language is the vehicle of a great culture. Will something be done in this University to bring all the thirteen languages and their culture together through a study of the cultures of these great languages so that the over-all unity of the culture of India becomes the first step towards the realisation of our great composite culture? The Bengali is very proud of his language. He says: "There is no other language like mine." You ask my friend, Mr. Annadurai, and he will tell you that there is no language like Tamil. Every language is a great language. There are hundreds

of years of development behind these languages. Will they all come in to make a study of the composite culture of India in this University?

Then there is the dynamic secularism for which Nehru was a symbol. If he had not stood as the sentinel of that secularism, where would India have been today? And yet, in our universities, there is not a trace of the inculcation of these tenets of secularism in the minds of the young people. Secularism is either dismissed as materialism or it is considered as some political device. What is secularism if it is not the deepest humanism deriving all its strength, all its inspiration from the heart of every philosophy and religion and then giving it concrete shape in terms of the realities of India? Who will look after in this University this great tradition of secularism which came from him?

Then, Sir, I cannot imagine another man in our recent history who represented the synthesis between science and ethics like our leader. Mahatma Gandhi was a supreme symbol of the spiritual and the ethical, but this man represented the synthesis between science and ethics as no other man of our generation. Now what will this University do to enshrine this synthesis and develop it?

Then again, when you look at Pandit Nehru, he reconciled individual freedom with collective good, an amazing thing to do, because people who talk of the sanctity of the individual are often people who deny the dynamics of collective action. But Pandit Nehru reconciled wonderfully in his thoughts and in his deeds, of which we are so familiar in this country, the sanctity of individual freedom with the equal sanctity of the collective good which meant a new type of socialism altogether. The kind of socialism that Pandit Nehru represented, is a unique type of socialism. It is not Russian socialism; it is not Chinese socialism; it is not British socialism: it is Indian socialism deriving its strength from the roots of India's history.

He was a reconciler of individual freedom and collective action for collective good.

Finally, he stood for world peace as no other statesman of the modern age. Now, peace is as big a subject in the world today as any other subject. The structure of peace, the constituents of peace, the alphabet of peace, the methods of peace-making are matters for profound study. I was present, Sir, at a meeting here in Delhi which was addressed by Mr. Attlee. Mr. Attlee was expounding the need for a world federal arrangement. Pandit Nehru spoke at that meeting, and I can still remember the sad and brooding way in which he said: 'How I wish that we could advance towards a World Federal State through disarmament', and so on. These are things which were vital to his philosophy. Everything for Pandit Nehru ultimately led up to a peaceful world, a world with a federal Government or a federal arrangement based on disarmament. Will this University enshrine in a department of its own the study of problems of world peace? If we are not doing all this, then this thing that you have promised to achieve—a unique synthesis—will remain a myth. I do not want that it should remain a myth. I want it to come to life.

May I make, before I sit down, Mr. Chairman, just a few brief suggestions? I agree with my friend Mr. Ruthnaswamy and it is not often that I agree with him—that it would be good that this University is a residential University. Please do not take upon yourself the task of affiliating all kinds of anomalous and amorphous colleges and then get caught up with their set patterns of administrative and academic affairs. Let this be—if I can make this suggestion now and if the members of the Joint Select Committee will take heed,—a residential university. Let us admit nobody excepting post-graduates into this University. Let it be a post-graduate residential university. Let us limit admission to a thousand selected, best, talented students from the whole of

[Shri G. Ramachandran.]

this country. Let this thousand live together in a free community of teachers and students, living together and applying their minds—because they are at the post-graduate level—to these great problems confronting India and the world. Let us create a residential university, a post-graduate university, restricting admission to a thousand students and these thousand students to be selected most carefully as the best from all the universities of India, and let this University be a National University. I would not like Rs. 9 crores of the Central Government to be put into this University. Even if Rs. 20 crores have to go into it, I would not mind but this money must come from all over India. The States must be asked to support this University as a national institution of the highest importance.

Then, Sir, about examinations. The Minister knows that I am against the present system of examinations, the policeman system of examinations. Let not that policeman system of examinations come into this University, whether you accept my proposal or you carry out your own proposal, because this type of examination is the greatest enemy of student life in this country.

Finally, let us experiment with university-making. I am afraid, Mr. Chagla is too much caught up with the British tradition of university-making. There are people here who are caught up with the American system and there may be a few caught up with the Russian system. But we have long had our own great university traditions in this country. I remember listening to lectures at Vishwa-Bharati by some of the greatest scholars of India who said that in the Universities of Nalanda and Taxila it was the student who decided when exactly his course should terminate. As soon as the student felt conscious and certain that he had learnt everything he wanted, he went to his teachers and said: "May I go now"? I am just giving an illustration. I

would like this University more to be a students' university than a professors' university or lecturers' university. The students must be allowed a full hand in the shaping of the curricula, of the syllabi and the entire work and life inside the University so that ultimately in the name of Pandit Nehru we establish a unique institution, in the name of a unique person functioning in a unique way and particularly as a Students' Republic.

Thank you.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA (West Bengal): Mr. Chairman, Sir, we have heard some speeches, especially from the Congress Benches. I do not think it is necessary to talk about this University in order to settle the name of a personality in history. We are told that the name of Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru would be immortalised by this particular University as though that is how we are now going to immortalise him; otherwise, according to them—it seems to meet he would not be immortal. I think this is an entirely wrong approach. It is understandable if hon. Members take the opportunity of expressing certain good and noble sentiments for their leader and for, undoubtedly, a very great man. But we are here discussing the specific proposal for a university, and let us not try to waste much time on the name itself, although points were made about him, or the biographical sketch of Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru was drawn. What we should do here is to look at the problem and examine the question that is before us on merits. We are having another university in Delhi as indeed we should have got one much earlier. Delhi's requirements of higher education are not squarely met and Delhi certainly deserves to be given a university by the Central Government and arrangements for providing higher education by the Central Government should have been made. That was not done. Naturally, people have suffered and our education has suffered here. Mr. Chairman, therefore I am happy that Delhi will perhaps

have a larger scope for higher education in humanities, in science and in technology. But it is a pedestrian way in which the Bill has been conceived of by our esteemed friend, Mr. Chagla. One should have thought that when you are giving this name to this University and are being guided by certain sentiments which would be cherished, undoubtedly, honestly you would have also introduced some new ground in the matter of approach. But what we have is just a commonplace legislation which more or less repeats the picture of the universities that we have in our country. There is nothing particularly new in it, nothing particularly exciting in it, nothing particularly hopeful in it. That is what I wish to say.

The very first thing that comes to my mind in this connection is, for whom we are arranging this education. Yes, technological education, scientific education and other educational facilities should be extended. We agree, but preferences should be given; especially when income disparities continue in the country in a very serious manner, when we find that the young boys and girls coming from the poorer classes do not have the opportunity or wherewithal to enter the portals of our university, naturally the question arises whether this University is going to be open for them, those who do not have enough money or whose families do not have enough money or whether it is going to be just another one which will be accessible only to the sons and daughters of the rich. This question is a very important question and has to be answered and settled from the standpoint of those who need the care of the country most. Still, we talk about the Oxford University and so on. I do not know how long it will take—perhaps another five centuries we will require at this rate—in order to forget the Oxford and Cambridge Universities. There is my friend who is presently asleep, Shri Ruthnaswamy.

SHRI M. RUTHNASWAMY: I wish to God I was.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I am very glad that he is waking up to the realities of parliamentary life; I should have expected him to wake up to the realities of our academic life, also. Had he done so, the hon. Member would not have perhaps brought in the name of Oxford University and the analogy of Churchill College.

SHRI M. RUTHNASWAMY: That has got you . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: These are very often meant for people who have got ideologically anglicised.

SHRI G. RAMACHANDRAN: The name of Churchill would be to him like a red rag to the bull.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Churchill would not be a red rag; neither is he a red rag nor am I a bull.

The trouble is; you see, still we think in these terms. We are now discussing this matter. Perhaps reports will appear in some paper as usual . . .

SHRI SUDHIR GHOSH (West Bengal): To which college did Mr. Bhupesh Gupta go?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Bhupesh Gupta passed the Intermediate and B.A. examinations from the detention camp under the British and then he went to the London University. And he was not particularly upset that he had not gone to Oxford or Cambridge University.

Mr. Chairman, let us not go into all these things. These are very pedantic, high-sounding and perhaps very, very attractive to those people who have, in the corner of their hearts, still a lingering admiration for everything that is Anglo-Saxon. I am not one of those people. Certainly, there are a lot of things to be got from every country, and England is not excluded from them. But why cannot the problems of our universities be considered from the stand-

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta.] point of the requirements of our country in the light of the experience about education in the contemporary world? And I think the contemporary world points to one thing and it is this that the type of educational system that we have in Oxford and Cambridge in modern times, with very high-flown expenses and with a different set-up of values and functions of our people or any people for that matter, does not meet the requirements of the situation. That is what I wish to say. Therefore, let us not go into it. Here, Mr. Chagla should consider for whom the University is intended. Why should we like more money to be given to this without any assurance given by the Government that this University will particularly cater to the needs of the poorer classes and poorer people?

SHRI SUDHIR GHOSH: Does the hon. Member know that at present 85 per cent of the undergraduates at Oxford and Cambridge are the sons of poor men who go to universities there on scholarships?

Miss MARY NAIDU (Andhra Pradesh): Because our people cannot go to Oxford, we are going to bring Oxford to India to educate the poor.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I would be very happy if there are less interruptions because we have very little time and I want to conclude the debate.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Mr. Chairman, let us not have Cambridges and Oxfords and Princetons and Harvards here; let us create universities and colleges that our people need, that our development needs, for the re-making of our material and cultural being. That is what I say and therefore the first thing is to ensure that the sons of the working people, the workers, the peasants and the middle classes, do have the doors of the universities thrown wide open to them. That is the first

thing and for that you have to provide not only money but also a different outlook. Money must come; we must have subsidised education; it must be highly subsidised because the investment that you will be making in imparting higher scientific and technical education to the poorer sections of the community will have been repaid in course of time in creative and even constructive labour which would go to the benefit of the entire society. That is how I view this matter. But Mr. Chairman, if the cost of education becomes expensive—from Rs. 125 to Rs. 200—I should like to know how many even of the great officers of the Government would be in a position to send their sons to these universities. That is what I would like to know. We know of those days when the tuition fee in the colleges was Rs. 10. Now, to go to the college, one requires to spend Rs. 30. That is the position. Then, we pay the tuition fees and spend on books and other things. Therefore, if Mr. Chagla feels and hon. Members who expressed good sentiments about Pt. Jawaharlal Nehru feel that he had some socialist ideas and a socialist way of looking at things, let the emphasis be shifted from the upper classes to the classes that are economically at the bottom layers of the society. This is the first suggestion.

Secondly, the University should be run on a broad basis. I would not like the bureaucratic set-up to come in. The autonomy should be completely guaranteed. I think we can give autonomy in a larger measure to a university of this kind. Since Jawaharlal Nehru's name is associated with it, I feel, there should be a faculty which educates the students in the spirit of world peace. Now, we have got all faculties. We have got Domestic Science and various other things, we believe, in some of the colleges here. Girls from upper classes are taught, among other things, how to decorate their houses in a beautiful way to do

well attractive, not only themselves but the houses also. We want, therefore, in a university of this kind a special faculty to be created that would impart learning and education in the spirit of the world-wide struggle for peace because nothing today is so novel and great as that one which teaches our younger generation in the image of the struggle that humanity is waging for peace. Therefore, this thing should be there. Let there be a new faculty Show some originality, Mr. Chagla. Why are you going down the beaten track? If you had adopted this approach people would have made suggestions. There are new faculties to be created. That is a matter for the Select Committee to consider. Maybe it is not possible to include everything in a Bill. But an indication should be there. That is what I say.

Then, Mr. Chairman, I should also like this University to educate students in various matters connected with development of democratic institutions and democracy in the country. This should be a special subject. It should be there in other universities also.

Sir, many names are taken here. We find, special faculties in a given situation are brought into existence in order to educate the people in special branches of learning so that students may become useful, enlightened citizens when they are educated in world affairs and the affairs of the State. Therefore, I say such suggestions should also be considered.

Some hon. Members talked about student indiscipline. Sir, we are elder people. Therefore, we can talk about student indiscipline. But, Mr. Chairman, let us look at the ruling class and at the elders in a particular State from which Pt. Jawaharlal Nehru came, I see the greatest indiscipline going on among those teaching about discipline to the students. Take the example of U.P. What is happening there? Among the leaders, as you

know, they talk glibly about student indiscipline. Sir, by and large, I do maintain that our student community are a fine lot, a very disciplined body. We know the student communities in other countries also and we should have no hesitation in extending to the student community as a whole our best feelings and deep appreciation of the manner in which they conduct themselves. There will be some bad people. And where there are not bad people, I should like to know. If you take percentages, you will find a much higher percentage of bad people in the Treasury Benches than in any college or university in the country. Therefore, let us not talk about this business. Sir, students should have ideals before them. I should like this University to have a clear faculty, I maintain, for the studies of scientific socialism. And why should it not be there? Everybody talks about socialism. Mr. S. K. Patil talks about socialism. Mr. G. D. Birla talks about socialism. Mr. J. R. D. Tata talks about socialism. Mr. Haridas Mundhra talks of socialism when he gives money to a particular election fund. Everybody these days talks of socialism. But one does not know what it is. We know what we know. You also know, Mr. Chairman.

SHRI P. N. SAPRU (Uttar Pradesh). It did not begin with Marx and it did not end with Marx.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Whatever it is. It is for you to decide. Let it be decided.

SHRI M. C. CHAGLA: Sir, it is always a pleasure to listen to my hon. friend. He is always eloquent. He has always a sense of humour. But may I appeal to him that if the hon. Member tries to finish the debate, it will help the Chair and myself to finish it as soon as possible.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I am finishing. So, there should be a faculty for the study of scientific socialism. And why not? (Interruption). Somebody says I have not heard about it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I hope the hon. Members would help him to finish.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Therefore, have a faculty for the study of socialism. I know, in the post-graduate courses Marxism is taught but the books are a ways from the United States of America which display no knowledge of Marxism at all. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I should like a faculty to be created to impart proper education of this kind.

As far as other things are concerned, I do not wish to say anything because we will have another chance, I believe when the thing comes back from the Select Committee. But I think the poor should be kept in view. Noble ideas should be kept in mind. And certainly when Parliament has declared for the establishment of, what they call, a socialist State, socialism should be studied as a special subject, as it prevails in this country, in this particular University. I think we will thereby be paying not a small tribute to some of the good teachings of Pt. Jawaharlal Nehru which at least in the Treasury Benches are getting very rapidly forgotten.

Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Thengari. Since you insist on speaking, I hope you will be very brief.

SHRI D. THENGARI (Uttar Pradesh): Sir, today we read in the newspapers that the University Grants Commission has asked the proposed Raipur University not to name itself after the late Pt. Ravishankar Shukla. Now, the University they have suggested in this Bill should not be named after personalities. We know they are particular about the decision of the Government regarding the Raipur University. Therefore, what I suggest is that we should not adopt double standards.

Secondly, the size of this University is also important. True, Delhi

requires another university. But, at the same time, the question of raising a memorial to Pt. Jawaharlal Nehru should not be confused with the problem of ever-increasing student population of a big city. Delhi is already a problem city with so many problems—problem of accommodation, problem of water, problem of electricity and all that. Therefore, a more appropriate thing would be to situate this. University in a place like Allahabad. I think Allahabad is better suited for this particular purpose.

Yet there was another subject which always fascinated Pt. Jawaharlal Nehru, the problem of national integration. I feel that it is necessary to conduct scientific research in the problem of Indian culture. The word 'culture' denotes a trend of impression on the mind of the society which is peculiar to itself. It has a cumulative effect towards passion, emotion, speech and action throughout its history. The problem of national integration has become extremely difficult in the absence of scientific research in Indian culture. I think if such a study is undertaken, it will bifurcate culture from religion so that the compact national culture of India, which is the outcome of its history of thousands of years, will be properly brought forth.

Thank you.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN (Andhra Pradesh): If you permit me, Sir, I will just say two sentences. Those are suggestions.

Sir, my request is that so far as the suggestions of hon. Shri Ramachandran are concerned, I hope the Select Committee will consider them and I hope he will be called as a witness to discuss the matter with the Select Committee.

I suggest that the Committee may also consider requesting Acharya Vinobha Bhave to be the Chancellor of this University and failing that, Shri Jayaprakash Narayan.

**SHRI P. N. SAPRU:** I want to say only one word. The Bill has my support and I need not say that, but I will invite your attention to clause 8(3) where it says that there shall be one or more Pro-Vice-Chancellors in the University. Mr. Chagla knows that the question whether there should be a Pro-Vice-Chancellor or not is a controversial one. In another Bill, we have suggested that for the word 'Pro-Vice-Chancellor', the word 'Rector' should be substituted. Here it has been made mandatory that there shall be a Pro-Vice-Chancellor. I hope that the Select Committee will bear this in mind.

I would also like them to remember that in their final draft of the Bill the Court should be the supreme authority in the University and its powers should not be limited in any way at all.

**SHRI M. C. CHAGLA:** Mr. Chairman, Sir, I am very grateful to you and to the House for the great indulgence they have shown to me by trying to sit overtime to complete the debate. I do not want to take up the time of the House except to say that every suggestion made in the debate will be carefully considered and weighed in the Select Committee. I am sure that when the Bill comes back from the Select Committee, the House will have full opportunity to discuss the report of the Select Committee. I would therefore ask you to put the motion to vote.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The question is:

"That the Bill to establish and incorporate a university in Delhi be referred to a Joint Committee of the House consisting of 30 members: 10 members from this House, namely:—

1. Shri M. M. Dharia
2. Dr. Shrimati Phulrenu Guha.
3. Shri P. K. Kumaran
4. Prof. M. B. Lal
5. Miss Mary Naidu

6. Shri G. S. Pathak
7. Shri Sadiq Ali
8. Shri M. Satyanarayana
9. Shri Sundar Mani Patel
10. Shri M. C. Chagla (mover); and

20 members from the Lok Sabha;

that in order to constitute a meeting of the Joint Committee the quorum shall be one-third of the total number of members of the Joint Committee;

that in other respects, the Rules of Procedure of this House relating to Select Committees shall apply with such variations and modifications as the Chairman may make;

that the Committee shall make a report to this House by the first day of the next session; and

that this House recommends to the Lok Sabha that the Lok Sabha do join in the said Joint Committee and communicate to this House the names of members to be appointed by the Lok Sabha to the Joint Committee."

*The motion was adopted.*

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The House stands adjourned till three in the afternoon.

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

The House reassembled after lunch at three of the clock, the VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN) in the Chair.

#### MOTION RE. STATEMENT ON THE OIL POLICY

**SHRI MULKA GOVINDA REDDY (Mysore):** Mr. Vice-Chairman, I beg to move:

"That the statement on the oil policy, laid on the Table of the