

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

**THE DELHI UNIVERSITY (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1961**

THE MINISTER OF SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH AND CULTURAL AFFAIRS (SHRI HUMAYUN KABIR): Sir, I have great pleasure to move:

"That the Bill further to amend the Delhi University Act, 1922, as passed by the Lok Sabha, be taken into consideration."

Like the Bill which this House passed earlier this morning this also is a very non-controversial Bill and it seeks to give effect to a demand which has often been voiced in this House and elsewhere that there should be provision for the spread of higher education even among those who do not have the opportunity to go for regular instruction in universities. This is the main purpose of this Bill and it is non-controversial and I hope that like the other Bill, this Bill also will be passed without any controversy and with unanimous support.

PANDIT HRIDAY NATH KUNZRU (Uttar Pradesh): Is a degree to be conferred on these people? Will they appear for an examination and will degrees be conferred on them? Or will they simply get a certificate to say that they have received higher education by correspondence?

SHRI HUMAYUN KABIR: They will get degrees after a regular correspondence course and after a proper examination.

DR. NIHAR RANJAN RAY (West Bengal): I believe the examination will be the same for all. But the course of instruction instead of two

years, may be for 3 years or 4 years, whatever it may be, for the correspondence course.

PANDIT HRIDAY NATH KUNZRU: We would like to know definitely what the Government's intention is with regard to this class of people. After this period of two years or three years, are they going to appear for the same examination as the ordinary students of the university? Or will they be required to study for a longer period before they appear at the examination?

SHRI HUMAYUN KABIR: I trust that they will sit for the examination of the University. As far as I am aware, the University will have the same examination, though the courses may be longer. These will be determined by statutes by the University later. At present the University has no power to give any degree or to admit to examination any person who has not been a student of a college or hall of residence. This Bill seeks to give this power. After that, proper statutes will be framed and they will define these conditions. We do not wish to interfere with the autonomy of the University. I think we should leave it to the universities concerned, which in consultation with the University Grants Commission, will lay down the duration, method of examination etc. We do not propose to go into these things in this Bill.

PANDIT HRIDAY NATH KUNZRU: But the Committee that was appointed under the chairmanship of Dr. Kothari, made certain recommendations on the subject, and it is in pursuance of those recommendations that this Bill has been brought forward. What has that Committee recommended on the subject?

SHRI HUMAYUN KABIR: As far as I am aware, the Committee's recommendation is to give this power of examination to the University and to conduct correspondence courses. I

am not sure if these details have been worked out by that Committee, because I think that would also probably go beyond the powers of a committee of that type. Universities are autonomous institutions and I am sure my hon. friend, Dr. Kunzru, would be the first to protest if a committee were appointed by Government and that committee gave directions to the universities as to how courses should be organised and what should be the period of the courses and so on. That would certainly be interference with the autonomy of the universities.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN (Andhra Pradesh): But what was the purpose of that Committee?

SHRI HUMAYUN KABIR: That is obvious. As I said till now in our country we do not have any correspondence courses. There are affiliating universities, of course, where students are not attached to the constituent colleges of the University. But even those students go to some particular college. Here, for the first time an attempt is made to see if correspondence courses could be provided through which students who do not go to a college could still get the benefit of higher education. Such courses are in existence in other countries in the world. They are there in the United Kingdom, the U.S.A. the U.S.S.R. and in certain countries on the European continent. Such correspondence courses have been in existence for a long time in those places. As to what the duration should be, all these are matters of detail which, I would submit, would not be proper for a committee of this type to consider.

SHRI SANTOSH KUMAR BASU (Wes' Bengal): May I invite the attention of the hon. Minister to what is stated in the Statement of Objects and Reasons attached to the Bill? There it is stated:

"The Expert Committee appointed by the Central Government

under the chairmanship of Dr. D. S. Kothari to finalise the details of this scheme has, with the concurrence of the University of Delhi, recommended that correspondence courses be introduced under the University of Delhi from January, 1962."

Therefore, this Committee has presumably, gone into the details of this scheme and I would request the hon. Minister to find out from his papers whether such details are available to the House at the moment.

*The question was proposed.*

SHRI K. SANTHANAM (Madras): Sir, I have only one thing to say. I see the hon. Minister discussing with his Secretary there. When I spoke on the other Bill this morning, I mean the Visva-Bharati (Amendment) Bill, objecting that a residential university should not be allowed to go out and have examinations, the hon. Minister justified it by saying that those examinations were not degree examinations but only extension courses for which certificates would be issued, and therefore, he said, there was nothing inconsistent with a unitary university and extension courses. But here in this Bill now before us, it is not an extension course. Here we have got the degree courses. But I submit that in the case of a residential university, the main part of education consists in the residence there, and in the absorbing of the atmosphere of the university. Otherwise there is no meaning in having residential universities. You can have affiliating universities or no university at all. Now here correspondence courses are to be conducted and degrees are to be conferred for the same examinations. I am not objecting to the correspondence course itself. But I think such courses should be organised by a separate body or institution. I think it is wrong for the Delhi University to venture on it. The purpose for which the Delhi University is meant should

[Shri K. Santhanam.]

be kept intact. By all means let them have a body of educationists formed or a separate university started by a charter and let them have these correspondence courses all over the country. Why should the Delhi University which has been set up for a particular purpose at the centre and in the capital of India, why should it go astray and enter into these matters? I am not objecting to correspondence courses. But I feel it is a misfit to have correspondence courses in a residential unitary university and I think the whole thing is a mistake.

PROF M. B. LAL (Uttar Pradesh). Sir, the question of the universalisation of knowledge has been engaging the attention of social thinkers for about two hundred years. About the end of the eighteenth century, in the midst of the French Revolution, the great French socialist Babeuf invited the attention of the world to the fact that knowledge was power and unless facilities for getting education were extended widely and knowledge was made available to all, an egalitarian society could not be established. Obviously, this could be done only by a public authority like the State because the parents were in many cases too poor to provide to their children facilities for education. Some social thinkers like Herbert Spencer were not prepared to extend the scope of the functions of the State to the extent of allowing the State to make provision for education. According to him, the function of the State is that of a hurdle of hurdles. This idea was not acceptable to other social thinkers like Prof. Green who maintained that ignorance was a great hurdle to the moral development of man and that a State must try to remove that hurdle in the way of the growth of the people. Even those who were conservative in outlook ultimately realised that for democracy dissemination of knowledge was very necessary and Lord Beaconsfield said, "Let us educate our masters"

soon after the Reforms Bill of 1867 was passed. Even the industrialists who were not well disposed to promote welfare measures through the State ultimately admitted that for running modern industries they needed people, workers, who got some elementary knowledge of things other than the use of their own hand. And, therefore, the idea of free and compulsory education was accepted by all sections of the society but in course of time it was realised that the knowledge of the three R's was not sufficient and educationists began to maintain that the scope of knowledge was so wide that a citizen could not discharge his duties properly if he were only educated in the three R's. It is, therefore, being realised today that at least for eight years, free and compulsory education must be given to all children and the farmers of our Constitution also laid down that within ten years, arrangements for free and compulsory education should be made for all children up to the age of fourteen years. In other parts of the world, we notice that educationists and statesmen are not satisfied with free and compulsory education of eight years. Arrangements are being made of post-school extension education for such students, for such young men and women who are not able to prosecute their studies in higher schools and who have to take up certain jobs. Ultimately, the system of correspondence course has been introduced especially after the first World War in many countries of the world. Now, Sir, therefore, much can be said in favour of the introduction of this correspondence course. The socialists in India have always stood for the universalisation of knowledge and in their policy statement of 1955, they definitely favoured the idea of imparting education to industrial workers and to other sections of the working people through correspondence courses. I must, however, beg to submit that the mere introduction of the correspondence course would not serve the purpose which we have in view. As things stand today, most of the workers in

the business enterprises and industrial undertakings have not got enough knowledge to entitle them to have the benefit of University education through correspondence courses and if today we introduce correspondence courses, only a small section engaged in clerical work may be benefited from this course. If we really wish to achieve the objective which the socialists had in their mind when they advocated correspondence courses, we shall have to see that proper arrangements are made for the education of all up to the high school examination stage. Anyhow, the socialists have no reason to grudge the introduction of this course for the benefit of a small section of those engaged in clerical work. I am sorry, Sir, the Government has not dealt with this question in all seriousness. We all respect the autonomy of the University and above all, I, being an ex-teacher of a University, have every right and every duty to be jealous of the autonomy of the University but I do feel that when a University approaches us to enable it to introduce some special course, it is our duty to have the exact nature and character of the course concerned before us.

**SHRI HUMAYUN KABIR:** In Parliament?

**PROF. M. B. LAL:** Parliament, of course, cannot grant the right to introduce the correspondence course without knowing what that correspondence course is going to be. That is the reason why perhaps the Education Ministry appointed a Committee under the Chairmanship of the Chairman of the University Grants Commission and I feel that the Report of that Committee should have been circulated to Members of Parliament. Otherwise, why was that Committee appointed? I feel that it would have been better for the authorities of the Delhi University to have given us some sketch of the scheme of the correspondence course which they wish to introduce. That was very neces-

sary because I feel that if proper care is not taken, the correspondence course may be reduced to a farce and may lead to a lowering of the standard of education. I know, Sir, that in the Soviet Union there is a correspondence course but before workers are admitted to the correspondence course, there is a qualifying examination. Then, soon after admission, for a fortnight or so, the students are required to attend regular classes. In these classes, an attempt is made by the teacher to convey to the students some general idea of the subject and these students are told as to how they are to benefit themselves from the correspondence course. Then, Sir, every year before examination those workers are granted one month's leave with full pay to prepare themselves for the examination. Then they have in the Soviet Union a system of submitting a thesis for graduation, a dissertation for graduation, and everyone is allowed two or three months' leave on full pay for the preparation of the dissertation under the guidance of some teacher or the other at the headquarters. Now, unless some such arrangements are made, the correspondence course is not likely to benefit the people concerned and it is likely to lower the standard of education in this country. If we really wish to be serious about the dissemination of knowledge, about universalisation of knowledge among all sections of the people let us be sincere. In this particular matter, let us see that those who wish to benefit from this course, who are qualified for this course, are given leave on full pay for some time for the preparation of their studies. With these words, I beg to support the Bill under consideration.

**KUMARI SHANTA VASISHT** (Delhi): This is a Bill which seeks to introduce correspondence courses in the University of Delhi. Delhi University, I think, is one of the best

[Kumari Shanta Vasisht.]  
 universities in the whole of India if I may say so. It has very high standards in various fields; in the science department and in various other departments it is one of the very good universities. It has a very good standard of education and proficiency and there is also very good discipline in this University of which I think we can be proud. The Government, I think, has been of two minds regarding higher education for the people at large in the sense that they are very anxious that the educated people should not become unemployed, that we should not have a very large number of educated unemployed. For this purpose the Government also formulated certain schemes to provide jobs, etc. to people so that they may not feel frustrated and remain unhappy. It was a very good idea. But they have also tried to follow a policy, with a view to restricting or keeping down the number of educated unemployed, whereby higher education—and this policy is followed in other countries also—is pursued by a very small number of people and specialised learning or higher education is given to a very very restricted number of people. The Government, it seems to me, want to do that. We have people here who have done their B.A. and who say, 'What is the use of doing M.A.? We will still be unemployed.' If they can they will do the M.A. and join the Ph.D. classes. When some young people talk like this, it is a very sad thing. Sometimes they are ashamed to tell people that they are out of job. If any person wants to keep himself occupied he takes up M.A. and Ph.D. so that some day it might be useful. Nevertheless a large number of people are not being encouraged to pursue higher education in Delhi as probably they have the opportunity of doing so in other States. The result is this. These young people are not really being restricted by the policy of the Government. They may not be pursuing higher education in Delhi itself but they go to Meerut, Ghaziabad, Gurgaon, Sonapat and

other nearby places and get admission in Punjab or U.P. I think there is a very strong wave in India on the part of young people to go in for higher education if they can afford and I think it is an extremely good thing for people's mind to be open to higher education and, if the correspondence course is to be there, I think it is more a compromise measure if I may say so rather than an idealistic policy which is that people should be in the university campus, taking advantage of all the facilities available in the universities and colleges. They should have the benefit of companionship of their fellow-students, as well as the relationship with their teachers and professors. But unfortunately in this correspondence course all this is not available; you give only the teaching material which is really watering down what we want to give them, bringing down our goal—the benefits of the University and the *alma mater*—and giving them some sort of education through correspondence courses which I think is really unfortunate. I think under the circumstances which prevail today in India, with the desire of the people for higher education and the desire of the Government to make education available to as large a number of people as possible, to make it available to one and all as a matter of fact so that nobody should be deprived of the opportunity for higher education merely because the person does not have the means to join a college, has not the money to pursue higher education, this correspondence course is a sort of a compromise to meet the situation and I cannot, therefore, give my wholehearted support to the measure, but I do realise that under the circumstances this is the best that can be done for people who cannot join colleges and spend two, four or six years. Such people can depend on these correspondence courses, and from that point of view I do certainly welcome this Bill because it makes education available to a vast number of our people and thereby education and knowledge become the property of one and all.

whosoever is interested, so that economic handicap does not stand in the way. But I should certainly want that the standards of the University should be maintained; they should not be lowered by any means whatsoever in the Delhi University particularly which has a very good place among the universities and which has very high standards at the present time. I want that those high standards should be maintained and the correspondence course should not blur our goal before us or the ideals before us which is that education should give the best that it can to the people. With these words I support the Bill.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI NAFISUL HASAN): It is 3 o'clock now. There is another business fixed to be taken up at 3. We have to postpone discussion on this Bill till tomorrow.

3 P.M.

**MOTION RE ANNUAL REPORT OF  
THE INDUSTRIAL FINANCE COR-  
PORATION OF INDIA**

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA (West Bengal): I move:

"That the Thirteenth Annual Report of the Board of Directors of the Industrial Finance Corporation of India on the working of the Corporation for the year ended the 30th June, 1961, laid on the Table of the Rajya Sabha on the 29th November, 1961, be taken into consideration."

Sir, my purpose in moving this motion is to raise certain policy matters in this discussion, with regard to the manner in which the Industrial Finance Corporation in the country is functioning today. Sir, as you will remember, in 1952 this House and the other House had an elaborate discussion about the malpractices, corruptions and misdeeds of the Industrial Finance Corporation after which a committee was appointed to go into this question, and the committee, known as the Sucheta Kirpalani

Committee, which is actually called the Industrial Finance Corporation Enquiry Committee, submitted its report in 1953. Many of the charges that were made in this House and in the other House were proved, and the Committee made certain recommendations. Nowadays we do not recall what the said Enquiry Committee said in its report—almost a decade has passed since that time—at least 8 years have passed since then. Now, Sir, the very first thing that I would like to say is that whereas 8 years ago the Industrial Finance Corporation became an instrument of crude money-grabbing on the part of certain favoured industrial concerns—multi-millionaire houses—now it has become a streamlined and calculated instrument for building up monopoly capital in our country; what was done somewhat crudely and recklessly is done now with great deliberation and in a manner which generally does not reach the eye of the common man. In this connection let me begin, Sir, with a reference to the speech made by Mr. T. T. Krishnamachari in the other House in 1957. At that time he was the Finance Minister—he seems to be again coming somewhere near there. Anyway, Sir, this is what he said:

"We have served this country well and in doing so we have served the poor man ill, because we served the vested interests extraordinarily well, because we wanted the wealth of this country to grow. I knew that money was going into the black market. I knew that taxes were not being paid. I knew huge profits were being made because we gave quantitative protection of a blanket nature."

This is what Mr. T. T. Krishnamachari, the Finance Minister of the time, said on the 23rd March, 1957, in reply to the General Discussion on the Budget. Since that time the I. F. C. as an instrument of monopoly capital is serving them still better, than what Mr. T. T. Krishnamachari ever thought of, and I shall presently