

(2) A copy of the Messages exchanged between the Prime Ministers of Canada and India and the Statement published in both countries on the occasion of the signing of the Agreement.

[Placed in the Library. See No S-174/56 for (1) and (2).]

EIGHTH REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON PETITIONS

SHRI JASPAT ROY KAPOOR (Uttar Pradesh): Sir, I beg to present the Eighth Report of the Committee on Petitions, dated the 8th May 1956, in respect of the twelve petitions which were remitted to it relating to the States Reorganisation Bill, 1956. In view of the fact that these petitions are identical in language and prayer to the petitions already circulated as papers to the States Reorganisation Bill 1956, the Committee has directed that only this report need be circulated to the hon. Members, and it be also forwarded to the Chairman and Members of the Joint Select Committee.

THE ALL-INDIA INSTITUTE OF MEDICAL SCIENCES BILL, 1956— *continued*

Mr. CHAIRMAN: We shall take up clause by clause consideration.

*Clause 2—Definition**

Dr. W. S. BARLINGAY (Madhya Pradesh): Sir, I move:

4. "That at page 1, after line 13, the following be inserted, namely:—

"(ce) 'Medical Sciences' include Allopathic, Ayurvedic, Unani and Homeopathic systems of medicine;"

(The amendment also stood in the name of Dr. Shrimati Seeta Parmanand.)

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Both the clause and the amendment are before the House. *(After a pause)*. If there nobody who is prepared to speak.....

Dr. W. S. BARLINGAY: Sir, I must apologise that I did not get up because it was really Dr. Shrimati Seeta Parmanand who was going to move this amendment, but since it has fallen to my lot, I do so. This is an important amendment and I want to make it perfectly plain that at any rate, as far as I am concerned, at a later stage, I am not going to press this amendment. That is for the very simple reason that we belong, after all, to the Congress Party, and we do not want to embarrass the hon. Minister in any way. But I might say this at this stage: we have heard the hon. Minister with great patience and with great attention and she is an extremely reasonable person. We have got great respect for her. But at the same time, I do wish to make it plain that as far as I am concerned, I am not convinced—not fully convinced at any rate—that justice is being done to Ayurveda and Homeopathy in this country. As our Prime Minister is always fond of saying, and quite rightly, in a democratic country such as ours, it is extremely important to remember that the methods by which we try to achieve results are at least equally important, as important as the results themselves, and therefore, although there may be disagreement between myself or those who are the protagonists of Ayurveda or Homeopathy and the hon. Minister, we do not want to make an attempt to gain a point and lose a friend. As Rajkumariji herself has said, she is a friend of Ayurveda and we want to explore in a very reasonable way further possibilities of discussions with her so that whatever we want to gain for Ayurveda may be properly and gracefully gained.

There are, if I may say, Sir, two or three things which we have got to remember so far as these systems of medicine are concerned. In Ayurveda there are certain things which seem to me very important; and one is that there are certain medicines of very very great value, and investigations

[Dr. W. S. Barlingay.]
I have got to be undertaken to assess and ascertain the value of these medicines. Secondly, there is a large body of medical practice in Ayurveda that has developed in this country and all this experience of medical practice, which this country has gained during the past several centuries, cannot be simply thrown away. Whatever may be of value in that volume of experience has got to be absorbed. Then, there are two very important points again to which I want to invite the attention of the hon. Minister. One is, that this is a very poor country and the prescriptions of the Ayurvedic vaidyas, or for that matter of the Homeopaths, are very cheap as compared with the amount of money we would be required to spend if we want to take the allopathic medicines. The Ayurvedic herbs and medicines are easily available in our villages. There is no reason on earth why, when these herbs are efficacious—if they are not, we should give them up, but if they are efficacious, if these remedies are efficacious, I do not see even the allopathic practitioners shoi to these medicos irm in that, I don't understand.

I am one of those who believe that the doctrines of Ayurveda ought to be integrated into the modern medicine. I have never been able to understand the doctrine, that the medical science can be either of the allopathic colour, or of the ayurvedic colour, or homeopathic colour. I don't see any justification, I don't see any sense, in saying that, for instance, anatomy could be either allopathic or ayurvedic or homeopathic. What sense is there in talking like this, I, for one, am unable to see. I don't understand what would be meant by saying this pathology is ayurvedic pathology, and this would be homeopathic pathology. After all, these are propositions which we make with regard to Nature in the largest sense of the term, and these propositions are either false or true, and if they are false, we must discard them, but if

they are true, then a way must be found out for integrating all those various true propositions into one harmonious system of medical science.

Sir, you will readily agree that what I am propounding now is not something which is new to this country. You will remember the great Badra-yan who propounded the jra-[^]-g'trfipr[^]f, and there is a brilliant commentary on that Sutra by no less a person than the great Shri Sankara himself. What was the problem before him? The problem before him was one of *samanvaya*, or integration or synthesis. That was the problem before Shri Sankara. He tried to syn-thesise the various propositions that were found in this or that Upanishad and some of these, propositions were either discard or explained away, or they were incorporated and integrated into a body of harmonious knowledge about the Brahman. I suggest that this is really what the Allopaths have to do today, with regard to the medical sciences. I must say that there is no science in the world which has so much fallen on bad days. What I really wish to say is that Allopaths should today learn Charak and other works. They made certain propositions with regard to Nature, with regard to the constitution of the human being, with regard to the effect of certain drugs or medicines, of certain herbs etc. on the body. All those propositions refer to parts of the objective world. Modern scientists also have propositions for these very parts of Nature. Therefore, why is it not possible to effect an integration of all these" various propositions, those, for instance, made by Charak, those made by some of the Chinese physicians and those made by the modern scientists? If these propositions are examined properly in a proper scientific and critical spirit, a *samanvaya* or integration or synthesis of them all, and a harmonious synthesis too, can be effected. And if this sort of work is undertaken by this Institute, then this Institute will be an ornament not merely to this country, but to the whole world.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, we have had on this point much general discussion

DR. SHRIMATI SEETA PARMANAND (Madhya Pradesh): Yes, about the acceptance of Ayurveda, Unani etc.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We have had the general discussion, and all that I am anxious about is that when you talk about the amendments, you may state

DR. SHRIMATI SEETA PARMANAND: all the reasons for them.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes, but not the reasons that have already been stated.

DR. SHRIMATI SEETA PARMANAND: Sir, I would like to say that there has been enough discouragement to participating in any further discussion on this Bill in the second reading stage, inasmuch as the hon. Minister for Health yesterday, even before the second reading stage had begun, was pleased to give a reply to the second reading debate in one sentence and that at the end of the first reading, by saying that she was not prepared to accept any of the amendments. So, even without hearing what the reasons for the amendments were, if the hon. Minister has decided that she was not going to accept any amendment—and she has said so on the floor of the House—then I submit, that there is no point in further discussing this Bill. In fact, if that is the attitude taken up, then I am afraid, there is no point even in bringing up Bills to this House; if issues are to be pre-determined in this manner.

I would not agree at all with the views expressed by the hon. Member who preceded me, that we belong to the Congress Party and so we are not going to press any of the amendments. Sir, even in the case of such an important legislation like the Hindu Succession Bill, when this House had even passed it, when the Party's

Amendments Committee had also gone through the amendments, the hon. Minister for Legal Affairs—fortunately he is sitting over there, and I am sure, he will bear me out in what I say now—was pleased to accept amendments to several of the clauses. Sir, the very purpose or object of Parliamentary procedure is that in the common wisdom of all the hon. Members, we may perfect the Bills in such a manner that they may serve the best interests of society for a long time. Yesterday, the hon. Minister gave the House assurances that all that was said on the floor of the House she would bear in mind, and things would be carried out. In that case, there is no reason or need for bringing in any Bills at all, because the Government is there always to carry out anything necessary in the best interests of the country. But I would submit that Bills which become Acts last for a long time, though Ministers may change. For that reason, assurances given by a Minister should not be considered enough. If any one principle is accepted that a certain Bill is expected to apply only to certain items, then those who follow the principles according to that Act will not be prepared later on to consider other items to be included in it.

Therefore, I have brought forward this amendment that the term "medical sciences" should be defined. I do not understand why the expression "medical sciences" should have been put in here. It may perhaps be argued by the hon. Minister that this very word "sciences" shows that it was their intention to later on include the other services also. But I would invite attention to clause 14 of the Bill to show that that could not have been their intention, because physical and biological sciences are supposed to be included in this term "medical sciences." But I will come to that amendment later on. Here I am on the question of definition. I would request the hon. Minister to accept this amendment, and I would also point out to her that nothing would be lost if at

[Dr. Shrimati Seeta Parmanand.] the worst this Bill has to go back to the other House because of these few changes. After all, it has waited for about four years, and so nothing would be lost by postponing the passing of this Bill by a couple of months. After all, whatever has to be started has already been started. The appointment of the Director has also been made in anticipation of the consent or sanction of Parliament. So, in order to satisfy the wishes of not only one Member, but almost the unanimous wish of all the hon. Members of this House, I do hope that the hon. Minister, even at this stage, would kindly agree to accept the amendment which would give recognition to these medical sciences.

I would again request her to consider this fact that this is the country of the birth of these sciences, namely, Ayurveda and Unani, or rather it is the land of adoption of the latter. If this land does not do anything for them, does not, so to say, give them some special consideration, because they had remained behind, who will do it? We should say that within the meagre resources available, these sciences should be given an opportunity here in this Institute, so that the already existing inferiority complex that is there in the minds of the Vaidyas, on account of their not being educated in the western culture, may be removed. They feel that that is the reason why they are not given recognition by the Government and that is the reason why they are not able to come up to the standards required of them. Therefore, for these reasons, if these sciences are given recognition along with the other systems in the same Institute, and given a chance to develop from the very beginning in the same Institute, by our incorporating them in this Bill, by a definite definition, we will be doing justice not only to these sciences, but we will be meeting a very popular demand—and the hon. Minister knows it—that within the limited resources of the country, these two sciences have to be developed to meet our

demand, and to encourage, incidentally, our own pharmacopoeia and the allied industry that will be raised here.

It may be argued by the hon. Minister here that she was able to satisfy the hon. Members of the other House who had brought in several amendments. I do not know what exactly happened in the other House; but I may submit that even though the hon. Minister for Legal Affairs was able to satisfy this House with regard to several things, the other House did exercise its right to change whatever they thought fit to change in their own wisdom, in the clauses of the Hindu Succession Bill. Similarly, Sir, that should be no argument. It should not be that as the other House accepted the Bill as it was presented, this House should also do the same, especially when this House was not given an opportunity to examine the agreement, as to whether there were any conditions of grant. The hon. Minister said that there were no conditions attached. If we were not taken into confidence earlier, as Members of the House, in framing this scheme, I think, it is really necessary now that the hon. Minister should kindly accept these amendments. If she cannot forthwith start a research department in Ayurveda and Unani, in this Institute, if she cannot attach hospital accommodation immediately, she can do this later on, but once such a provision is incorporated in the Bill, Members will not have any objection, because they will get the assurance that it will be done.

SHRI P. N. SAPRU (Uttar Pradesh) : Mr. Deputy Chairman, I am rather surprised at the turn the discussion has taken. The Minister for Health made a very eloquent speech and a very conciliatory speech in which she fully recognised the contributions that Ayurveda and Unani systems may have to make to the pharmacopoeia of the future.

[MR. DEPUTY CHATKMAK in the Chair.]

Even after that eloquent speech, the quest for a solution which would destroy the character of the institution which is sought to be built by this Bill continues. This institution is the result of a major recommendation of the Bhore Committee. I think, the Bhore Committee was very fair to all systems of medicine; that Committee did not have any practitioner of the indigenous systems of medicine as its Member; it did not have any Homeopath as its Member. Nevertheless, it recommended—and I think, it was hinted at by Dr. Gilder—that there should be a Chair for the history of medicine and that the holder of that Chair should be a man who has had a liberal education. Liberal education in India would mean and include a profound study of the Sanskrit language and literature. It would be for the holder of that Chair to suggest new vistas of thought to those who were undergoing training in that institution. The institution was intended to be a sort of a teachers' college, a college for the training of teachers, in a certain system of medicine.

Now, that system of medicine rests on assumptions which are completely different from those which underlie Homeopathy, for example. If you recognise Homeopathy, I do not see any reason, why you should not recognise some other system of medicine also. I know of a treatment called "Abram's treatment" and I know of a cure which was regarded as a very wonderful cure. There used to be a gentleman who was occupying the position of the Chief Justice of my State. He was diagnosed by all the physicians as suffering from cancer of the stomach and he was given three weeks' time. He went to England, to Harley Street physicians. They all said that there was no doubt that he was having cancer. He went to a person called Abram. A dying man goes to quacks also, and he was completely cured by him. He is very nearly 90, and is still in the enjoyment of his pension.

DR. W. S. BURLINGAY: May I say something for the information of the

hon. Member? I am sorry to say that Mr. Sapru has entirely misunderstood the matter. The point is that homeopathy is a system and a scientific system of medicine. It is not a question of a drug here or a drug there, and it is not a question of giving a medicine here and a medicine there in a sporadic way.

SHRI P. N. SAPRU: Mr. Abram claimed that his was also a system and a scientific system. There are biochemists who claim that they have their system; there are the naturopaths who claim that they have a system. That way there are hundreds-of systems of medicine. This Bill contemplates, without prejudice to your establishing as many institutions as you like—you can establish as many institutions as you like, provided you have got money to throw about—that work shall be done in one particular branch of medicine which is recognised as the medical science-in the modern world.

Reference was made to the Soviet Union and to China. Now, we had a representative, a physician of eminence, from the Soviet Union to assist us on the Bhore Committee, and his testimony was that indigenous systems of medicine are not recognised in the Soviet Union, for the simple reason that the people of the Soviet Union have a scientific outlook on life, and that they do not feel themselves bound by the past. They had been feeling themselves divorced from the-past.

I do not say that our Ayurvedic and other systems of medicine, when they were evolved, had no contribution to-make to medical science. I was reading, Sir, the other day a book; I thought of bringing it here, but I have-forgotten to bring it. It is a book by a British Professor, Prof. Basham, called "the Wonder that was India". It contains a whole chapter devoted to* the contribution the ancient Hindus made to medicine and surgery, but it must be remembered that 2,000 years or 1,500 years have elapsed since those

[Shri P. N. Sapru.] contributions were made, and the world today does not stand where it did 2,000 or 1,500 or even hundred years ago. Therefore, it is only by the study, in a critical spirit, of the pharmacopoeia of this system, only by studying in a critical spirit the history of this system, that you can make advances in this system. To say that they stand on the same footing as medical science today is

DR. W. S. BARLINGAY: May I ask Mr. Sapru a question? Has he studied Tilak? Has he studied any book on Homeopathy?

SHRI P. N. SAPRU: I have glanced through the books of Tilak and I have seen something of Charak, but I do not think that dear old Charak, speaking with all respect to him, knew enough about physiology, anatomy and bacteriology.

SHRI M. GOVINDA REDDY (Mysore): May I know how these remarks are relevant at all? This is quite unnecessary; he is not answering the amendments. The hon. Member is advancing controversial arguments which necessarily other Members of the House should take up in order to refute them. He does not know that even modern authorities are disputed, and there are controversies even about Allopathy. Even in allopathy, there are controversies. Why should he now go into this question?

SHRI P. N. SAPRU: I would not withdraw one single word of what I have uttered, Mr. Deputy Chairman. My expressions are perfectly parliamentary. I am entitled to have my views. I may be ignorant, but I am entitled to be proud of my ignorance. I am entitled to have my views on our ancient systems of medicine. I am entitled to have my views on the contribution that Charak has made to the advancement of surgery in the modern world, or to the advancement of medicine in the modern world.

SHRI KISHEN CHAND (Hyderabad) : Will you allow irrelevant matter also to be stated, Sir?

SHRI P. N. SAPRU: Irrelevant matter was not introduced by me. Irrelevant matter was also introduced by speakers who did not confine themselves to what this Bill was intended for, who went beyond the scope of this Bill and talked of this All-India Institute assuming to itself functions which it could never discharge. Where do the Homeopaths, Vaidya, Hakims and Naturopaths come in here?

SHRI BISWANATH DAS (Orissa): On a point of order, Sir. With all respect to my friend, I feel, that what he has uttered just now is a reflection on the Chair, namely, that the discussion that has taken place in this House was not to the point covered by the Bill. That means they are irrelevant. Is it a congratulation to the Chair, that we honour? It means that the Chair allowed irrelevant things.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I suggest that the hon. Member leave the Chair alone.

SHRI P. N. SAPRU: The Chair is quite competent to take care of itself. Now, Sir, the question is whether to this institution, which was meant to promote one particular branch, one particular science of medicine, other systems.....

DR. W. S. BARLINGAY: Medical science is not a particular branch of medicine.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Let him go on.

SHRI P. N. SAPRU: The singular can also include the plural and the plural can also include the singular in law. I wish my friend would study some legal terminology and he would find that sometimes plural includes the singular and the singular includes the plural. That is a well known method of interpretation.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: By the same argument, if you concede that,

Mr. Sapru, they say that medical science includes Ayurveda and Unani systems. They say that medical science includes those systems also, I mean, that is the other side of the picture.

SHRI H. P. SAKSENA (Uttar Pradesh) : Exactly.

SHRI P. N. SAPRU: If they wish to claim for their systems the name of science, I have no dispute with them, but I would say that, so far as this Bill is concerned, its scope is limited to one particular form of medical science, the science of modern medicine.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: But where is it made clear?

SHRI M. GOVINDA REDDY: The Bill does not say that.

SHRI JASPAT ROY KAPOOR (Uttar Pradesh): In the body of the Bill only, it does say 'the science of modern medicine'.

SHRI H. P. SAKSENA: We are talking about the title of the Bill, not the body of the Bill.

SHRI P. N. SAPRU: When we use the word 'medicai science', in modern parlance we mean, the Allopathic system of medicine. When my friends fall ill and the illness is of an acute character, they do not

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Suppose tomorrow Dr. Barlingay becomes the Health Minister in the Central Government, what is there to prevent him from including Unani and Ayurveda medicines through this Bill, I want to know.

SHRI P. N. SAPRU: Through this Bill?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Through the operation of this Bill. Even when the Bill is passed as it is, what is there to prevent him from bringing in Unani and Ayurvedic systems through the operation of this Bill.

SHRI P. N. SAPRU: We are a sovereign legislature. One legislature cannot bind.....

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I am afraid the wording of the Bill is not so clear. Fortunately, the Law Minister is here and if he would elucidate the matter, I would be very much obliged.

DR. RADHA KUMUD MOOKERJI (Nominated): Besides, the word 'research' certainly brings within its ambit all systems of medicine.

SHRI P. N. SAPRU: I am bound to respect your views and in fact, I have said what I wanted to.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The 'science of modern medicine' comes only in clause 14, and there are the several items which this Institute can take up, but the main clause, I think, is clause 13 which describes the objects of the Institute, namely, "to develop patterns of teaching in undergraduate and postgraduate medical education" etc. 'Medicai education' may mean any system of medicine.

SHRI JASPAT ROY KAPOOR: In all its branches.

SHRI BISWANATH DAS: May I know what is 'modern medicine'? Is 'Allopathy' modern medicine?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Well, that is the doubt that is in my mind also. The Law Minister can make it clear. I shall be very much obliged and the House also would be very much obliged.

SHRI P. N. SAPRU: I have not looked at the Bill from a draftsman's point of view, but I should have thought that the word 'medicai science' has a definite connotation when it is used to-day: Without any qualification, you can speak of the Homeopathic system of medicine or Homeopathic science, or you can speak of the Ayurvedic science. But when you talk of medical science, and you qualify the word

[Shri P. N. Sapru.] 'medicai science' by the word 'modern' the feeling can only be one and that is that you have the Allopathic system of medicine in mind. Maybe that if the word were merely 'sciences', it could mean them equally, but I do not see that the word 'medicai science' can have reference to any science other than the science of Allopathic medicine.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: That is where the difference lies.

DR. W. S. BARLINGAY: We respectfully agree with your interpretation.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I am expressing my doubt; that is all—not that I am correct.

SHRI P. N. SAPRU: In the Report of the Bhole Committee, in Chapter XX it is stated, "In this country, we believe that the historian of medicine can also perform the eminently useful function of investigating the indigenous systems of medicine 'not only for their ideological content, not only as aspects of India's ancient and mediaeval civilisations, and as end products of a long development, but also for the purpose of assisting in the evaluation of their practical achievements.'" In another place, in Chapter XXIII, they wound up that chapter by saying, "We have recommended the establishment of a Chair of History of Medicine in the proposed All-India Medical Institute, and have suggested that one of its functions should be the study of these systems in view of the importance of investigating the extent to which they can contribute to the sum total of medical knowledge."

Now, all this is not excluded from the scope of the All-India Institute, as visualized or contemplated.....

DR. W. S. BARLINGAY: Nothing is excluded.

SHRI P. N. SAPRU: And therefore, if nothing is excluded, I do not see why

the words 'Homeopathy', 'Unani' and 'Ayurveda' should be inserted.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: That is a suggestion that the hon. the mover of the amendment should take note of.

SHRI P. N. SAPRU: If the term 'medicai sciences' is of an all-embracing character, then the mover should have no fear that Ayurveda, Unani and Homeopathy are excluded from the purview of investigation by this Institute.

DR. W. S. BARLINGAY: If you accept the interpretation, it is perfectly all right.

SHRI H. P. SAKSENA: Incorporate it in the Bill. Mere acceptance will not do.

DR. W. S. BARLINGAY: Let the hon. Minister make a statement on the floor of the House that that is the' meaning.

SHRI H. P. SAKSENA: Even then, it will have to be incorporated.

SHRI P. N. SAPRU: What I say is that so far as the research aspect is concerned, this Institute will conduct research in the indigenous systems of medicine also, see what indigenous drugs are in current use, which have been handed down to us from the past, and what utility they have, and so on. That, I think, would certainly be one of the functions of this Institute. So far as the Professor of History of Medicine is concerned, he will review the development in the various countries of the world, give his own evaluation of our system of medicine.....

DR. W. S. BARLINGAY: I am sorry Mr. Sapru is again wrong. A person who deals with history will deal only with dead historical facts and.....

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Let him finish, Dr. Barlingay.

SHRI P. N. SAPRU: Often a historian has to pass verdicts. Dr. Radha

Kumud Mookerji is a historian of eminence, and I have read some of his books on ancient history, and he is fairly dogmatic in his views on the various characters in history. Sir, if you are to write a history of law, you will have naturally to understand the social, philosophic and other background of the age in which a particular system of law was developed.

DR. RADHA KUMUD MOOKERJI: May I say a word, Sir?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Not necessary.

DR. RADHA KUMUD MOOKERJI: Just one minute, Sir. As a historian, I simply placed before the House certain facts about the medical treatment undertaken with reference to specific cases. I did not go beyond facts.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: May I suggest to Mr. Sapru that this Chair for the History of Medicine and the Bhore Committee Report are all there. Nobody disputes those things. We are only concerned with the wording of the Bill now—the wording in the several clauses of the Bill.

SHRI H. P. SAKSENA: Rather the amendment only just now.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Yes; only the amendment. So let us confine ourselves to that.

SHRI P. N. SAPRU: The explanation that has been given by the hon. Minister makes it hardly necessary for us to emphasize our differences too much with regard to this matter. I think that the Bill as it stands needs no amendment and no change. So we should be satisfied with the Bill as it is. Of course, there are parts of the Bill, which I myself criticised. As I said, in my opening speech, we have to get a full picture of how this Institute will function. Then, I thought, that too much power had been delegated to the Executive. They are all there; but I see no reason why members of the stature of Dr. Barlingay

and Dr. Seeta Parmanand should ask for changes which would lead to confusion, so far as this Bill is concerned. That is all that I have to say.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I do not think long speeches on this amendment are necessary. We shall ask the Law Minister to explain the position.

श्री राम सहाय (मध्य भारत) : मैं ज़रा यह चाहता था कि, इसके पहले कि लॉ मिनिस्टर साहब बोलें, मैं दो मिनट में उनको तबज़्जह इस तरफ़ दिलाऊँ, कि इंटरप्रिटेशन करने में वे

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I think it is not necessary. He knows the position

THE MINISTER FOR LEGAL AFFAIRS (SHRI H. V. PATASKAR) : Sir, the point is, there is an amendment suggested to clause 2 that 'medical sciences' should include Allopathic, Ayurvedic, Unani and Homeopathic systems of medicine. So far as I am concerned, I would say straightway that probably those systems of medicine are as important as what is known as the modern science of medicine. That apart, the only question is what is the purpose for which this Bill has been brought forward, and whether, looking to all the provisions that find a place in this Bill, we should try to include in this a reference to Ayurvedic, Unani and other matters.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I hope you have understood the position. The hon. Minister's view, if I am right, is that this Bill excludes Ayurvedic, Unani and other systems, because this Bill is meant only for the modern system of medicine, and that is the recommendation of the Bhore Committee, as mentioned by the hon. Minister and also by Mr. Sapru, whereas the Members who have moved this amendment want the inclusion of these other systems. My doubt that is even if we pass the Bill as it is, it may not exclude Ayurvedic,

[Mr. Deputy Chairman.] Unani and other systems. Whether that is the position or not is the problem. If the hon. Minister wants to carry out her intentions under this Bill, the title probably should be 'The All-India Institute of Modern Medical Sciences Bill, 1956'. As to whether that position is correct or not, I want your opinion.

DR. SHRIMATI SEETA PARMANAND: The hon. Minister may also look at the provisions in clause 13 which is the relevant portion.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Yes; the relevant portions are the Statement of Objects and Reasons, clauses 13 and 14 and clauses 23 and 24. You may kindly go through them and let us have your views.

SHRI H. V. PATASKAR: Yes; the only important clauses are clauses 13 and 14 and also the Statement of Objects and Reasons. These are the really important portions which should guide us in arriving at a proper conclusion.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I may also say that it is conceded, I believe, that the Ayurvedic and Unani systems are systems of scientific medicine. I suppose that is conceded.

THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH (RAJ-KUMARI AMRIT KAUR) : Certainly.

SHRI H. V. PATASKAR: Not only that; but I understand from the information given to me by the hon. Minister in charge that, as a matter of fact, there is already an Institute for the Ayurvedic system.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Yes; different institutions have been established and every encouragement is being given.

SHRI H. V. PATASKAR: There is no desire to discriminate between one system and the other.

DR. SHRIMATI SEETA PARMA NAND: That is not the point. If I may explain my amendment.....

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You have already spoken.

DR. SHRIMATI SEETA PARMANAND: The hon. Minister who is going to give his opinion has not heard my point of view.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: He was here.

DR. SHRIMATI SEETA PARMANAND: Not from the beginning.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: He was here throughout.

DR. SHRIMATI SEETA PARMANAND: Because this Institute is to be here in the capital of the country, we are keen that it should include these other systems.

SHRI H. V. PATASKAR: That is a question of the location of the Institute. That is a different matter on which I would not say anything. So far as I can see, clauses 13 and 14 and what is mentioned in the Statement of Objects and Reasons should be sufficient for us to determine as to what really is intended by the provisions that are contained in the Bill. And I believe, my colleague, the Health Minister, stated yesterday that her own idea is that she wants to have this All-India Institute of Medical Sciences for a definite and particular purpose, and that it relates only to modern medical sciences. Clause 13 says that the objects of the Institute shall be to develop patterns of teaching in undergraduate and postgraduate medical education, in all its branches, so as to demonstrate a high standard of medical education to all medical colleges and other allied institutions in India and secondly, to bring together in one place educational facilities of the highest order for the training of personnel in all important branches of health activity and to attain selfsufficiency in postgraduate

medical education. That is what clause 13 says but clause 13 is followed by clause 14.

MR DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Clause 14 contains several directions by which the objectives mentioned in clause 13 may be promoted.

SHRI H. V. PATASKAR: Therefore, I am going to request you to have a look at all these together, for determining as to what was really intended by the hon. Minister when bringing forward this Bill. Clause 14 says:—

"With a view to the promotion of the object specified in section 13, the Institute may—

(a) provide for undergraduate and postgraduate teaching in the science of modern medicine and other allied sciences, including physical and biological sciences; etc."

So, clause 14 is really intended to carry out what has been mentioned in clause 13. Though, therefore, the language of clause 13 may be regarded independently as something which admits of

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: But are they not illustrative?

SHRI H. V. PATASKAR: There are (a) to (f) and several other sub clauses.....

SHRI M. GOVINDA REDDY: Clause 14 restricts clause 13.

SHRI H. V. PATASKAR: What I mean to point out is that it is not entirely a legal thing, though I am standing here as the Minister for Law. Again, I appeal to you and to the Members of this House, let us look to all these clauses 13 and 14 and the Statement of Objects and Reasons, and come to a conclusion.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I am only anxious that the hon. Minister's wishes should be carried out by this,

and there should not be any scope for any other interpretation.

SHRI H. V. PATASKAR: I think, it is further clear from what is mentioned in clause 14, and also by what is mentioned in the Statement of Objects and Reasons. It says: "The Institute will have the power to grant medical degrees, diplomas and other academic distinctions which would be recognised medical degrees for the purpose of the Indian Medical Council Act, 1933."

DR. P. SUBBARAYAN (Madras): May I point out to the hon. Minister that what is stated in the Statement of Objects and Reasons will not be the language for consideration and decision by any court of law and, therefore, what is intended must be specifically incorporated in the body of the Bill?

SHRI H. V. PATASKAR: I believe, I am not quite new to this. But at the same time, what I was going to point out to you, Sir, and the Members of this House is that looking to the Statement of Objects and Reasons, as well as the provisions here, and what has already been stated by the hon. Minister concerned, her intention is that, so far as this Bill is concerned, it should be confined to an Institute which will be in Delhi, only for what may be called modern medical science.

(Interruptions)

SHRI M. GOVINDA REDDY: The intention should be clearly put in the Bill.

DR. SHRIMATI SEETA PARMANAND: It should be done in plain words, not "modern medicine".

DR. RAGHUBIR SINH: (Madhya Bharat): When you speak of 'modern medical sciences', can it not be made to include Homeopathy also. Homeopathy is a distinct medical system. It was only discovered and propagated in the latter half of the eighteenth century-

SHRI H. V. PATASKAR: The fundamental distinction as to whether

[Shri H. V. Pataskar.] Homeopathy is also part of modern medicine is a different matter, but, I think, looking to the general trend- of the Bill, and what the hon. Health Minister has stated, I think, it won't be proper to raise an issue of modern medicine versus Ayurveda and Unani. That is not the point at all.

SHRI M. GOVINDA REDDY: We are going to enact a law, it is a question of legal action. Tomorrow, anybody may go to a court of law and say that this Institute is discriminating. What is medical education? Medical education in Ayurveda and Unani? Suppose anybody tomorrow goes to a court of law. If we pass this Bill as it is, what will be the position?

SHRI H. V. PATASKAR: The real point, as you pointed out, is whether it would not be open to some other Health Minister later on, after the Bill is passed, to have included some other branches of medicine. It may be. But I think, for the purpose of passing this Bill, when the hon. Health Minister has made her intention clear, I do not understand how it can be discriminating. Anybody can go to a court of law

SHRI M. GOVINDA REDDY: Let it be amended to make it clear that this Bill applies only to Allopathy. (*Interruption.*) We would like the Bill to be clear on it.

SHRI H. V. PATASKAR: The Health Minister's present intentions have been made clear. There is something in the fact that, if it is not amended, it will enable either this or some future Health Minister to include something, then why should Members object to it and thrust their point of view. What her object is, she has made it clear, and that also we can gather from all the provisions made in this Bill. Therefore, I think, even in regard to Ayurveda, her present intentions are clear. And if this is capable of—as you have rightly pointed out that it may be that a subsequent Health Minister may change— this we need not, at any rate, trouble

those who are in favour of these other systems of medicine. Therefore, no amendment should be moved. I have already said that.

SHRI M. GOVINDA REDDY: We are anxious that there should be no room for ambiguity.

श्री राम सहाय : मैं सिर्फ इतना ला मिनिस्टर से कहना चाहता हूँ कि.....

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: No speech.

श्री राम सहाय : मैं सिर्फ इतना मानुस करना चाहता हूँ कि जिस प्रकार लीगल इंटरप्रिटेशन आपने किया है, क्या यही एक ला मिनिस्टर को हैमियत से आपको करना उचित प्रतीत होता है। यह बिल्कुल बलौयर है कि सेक्शन १३ बिल्कुल इन्डिपेंडेंट है और सेक्शन १४(ए) पूरे ऐक्ट को गवर्न नहीं करता। वह सिर्फ माडर्न मेडिसिन के संबंध में सेक्शन १४ के सबसेक्शंस (बी) से (एम) तक अलहदा है, और (एम) में सेक्शन १३ के मुताबिक रूल बनाने की इजाजत है। जब सेक्शन ३ के मुताबिक रूल बनेगा, तब क्या पोजीशन होगी ? क्या वह माडर्न मेडिसिन तक सीमित रह सकेगी ? जो लीगल इंटरप्रिटेशन हो वह लीगल ही होना चाहिये, यही मेरा कहना है।

SHRI H. V. PATASKAR: If it is capable of a different interpretation subsequently, by some other Health Minister, or if the present Health Minister changes her mind, if she wants to include them, then where is the necessity of any amendment? Let the Bill be passed.

SHRI H. P. SAKSENA: Sir, I rise to support the amendment and I give it my wholehearted support.

(Interruptions)

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Saksena is on his legs. No long speeches.

SHRI H. P. SAKSENA: Sir, I appeal to the sense of justice, equity

and good conscience of the hon. Members of this House to see if this Bill has got anything of national importance in it. A Bill which excludes a very great majority of the people of the country from its purview is said to be a Bill of all-India, national importance. The words are "All-India Institute of Medical Sciences Bill, 1956." We on our part can never compromise with truth. Here the truth is being concealed. Here the truth is being murdered, it is being killed. There is no question of giving words one meaning and putting the words in another form. If you want to have an All-India Institute of Allopathy, which you now call, modern science—I do not know who has given this blessed name of modern science—simply say, science of medicine known as Allopathy. But I would like to see the face of the gentleman or lady who has given this term 'modern medicine' to the science of medicine known as Allopathy. You call it by that name, we shall have no quarrel. But if you say the All-India Institute of Medical Sciences Bill, 1956, in a country like India, where the majority of the people are—I again reiterate the allegation that they are not being treated under the Ayurvedic and Unani systems—being treated by these systems of medicine, where is the necessity of calling this Bill an Institute of Medical Sciences Bill? If it relates only to Allopathy, call it by that name. We shall have no quarrel. But if you retain the title of the Bill as it is—"All-India Institute of Medical Sciences Bill", then our position is quite clear. We want to remove the ambiguity. We want to make the Bill applicable to all the sections of the citizens of India, whether they have faith in Homeopathy, in Allopathy, in Ayurveda or in Unani. These are the four prevalent systems of medicine in our country and, therefore, in fairness, justice and in good conscience, I appeal also to the Health Minister to change the title of the Bill or accept the amendment. Of course, acceptance of the amendment would change the pattern of the Bill.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: We shall resume the debate after lunch. The House stands adjourned till 4.30 P.M.

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

The House reassembled after lunch dt 2.30 P.M., MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN in the Chair.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Jaspat Roy Kapoor. Two minutes.

SHRI JASPAT ROY KAPOOR: Sir, the whole House must feel extremely grateful to the Chair for having come to its rescue and I wish the hon. Minister in charge of the Bill should have taken a serious note of the remarks from the Chair and should have been guided by those remarks. This Bill certainly needs to be amended, either by this amendment proposed by Dr. Barlingay being accepted, or by clause 13 being amended. Even if Rajkumariji's intentions are to be clearly incorporated in this measure, it has got to be amended. Otherwise, in view of the fact that Rajkumariji has said that her intention is to confine the scope of this measure only to what she calls 'modern sciences', it is necessary to accept the amendment suggested by Dr. Barlingay, because what the House, as is now obvious by this time, wants is that Ayurvedic and Unani institutions must also be brought within the purview of this Bill, which institutions, according to our view which, it appears, is shared by the Chair, do come within the purview of this measure. But then.....

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: That was the doubt I expressed.

SHRI JASPAT ROY KAPOOR: Doubt, Sir, and a very valid doubt and that was, of course, a humble, courteous way of putting the thing before the hon. Minister. To us, it appears to be an absolute certainty that the scope of this Bill is wide enough. According, of course to the

[Shri Jaspat Roy Kapoor.] phraseology, whatever may have been the original intentions—even may be the present intentions—of the hon. Minister in charge of the Bill, that is entirely a different affair. The hon. Mr. Pataskar said, "Well, if we are clear in our minds that the scope of this measure is wide enough to include Ayurveda and Unani, where is the necessity for pressing this amendment?" The necessity arises, firstly and primarily, because of this fact that the hon. Mover of the Bill says that it does not come within the scope. If she is prepared to accept our interpretation and view-point that Ayurveda and Unani do come within the scope of this Bill, of course, there would not seem to be then, a very great necessity for accepting this amendment. But then, she does not; she is not expressing the view

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: It is the wording of the Act that will be interpreted, not what the Mover said or did not say.

SHRI JASPAT ROY KAPOOR: Exactly. Therefore, it is all the more necessary, even to make the obvious interpretations of this Bill very clear. I would then submit that this amendment should be accepted more particularly in view of the fact that Raj-kumariji yesterday read out a very important Cabinet decision on this subject, the credit for which she claims to herself, and we are happy that it was so. She said of the Cabinet decision to this effect:—

"facilities for research on scientific lines into the Ayurvedic and Unani systems of medicine should be promoted on as broad a basis as possible, on the lines recommended by the Chopra Committee's Report and the results of such research when they are of proved value....."

The following words are of considerable importance:—

".....will not only enrich the Ayurvedic and Unani systems, but will also be incorporated in modern

medicine, so that eventually, there will emerge only one system of medicine."

Now, I respectfully beg to submit that in order to carry out the purpose of this very good decision of the Cabinet, it is necessary that in this very big national institution, we must carry on experiment and research both in Ayurveda and Unani systems of medicine. There must be coordination between these various systems. Now, how can you have co-ordination and co-relation, unless all these systems are experimented upon and research is carried on in one institution?

Then again, Rajkumariji went on to say that Ayurvedic experiment

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: That is enough, Mr. Kapoor.

SHRI JASPAT ROY KAPOOR: should be carried on by doctors who are very well versed in modern medicine. She said that she would like to have here, in Ayurvedic Colleges,

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: It is all on record.

SHRI JASPAT ROY KAPOOR: Yes.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Why repeat all those things?

SHRI JASPAT ROY KAPOOR: I am not reading them out. I am only basing my submission on the very fact which she mentioned.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: That will do.

SHRI JASPAT ROY KAPOOR: She said that she would like M.B.B.S. doctors to carry on research in Ayurveda. Now, where is the place where these M.B.B.S. doctors would carry on research, if this institute is not to be made available to M.B.B.S. doctors? Surely, these doctors cannot carry on research in the Gurukul Ayurvedic College, or even in the Jamnagar

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Jamnagar is already there.

SHRI JASPAT ROY KAPOOR: That is exactly my difficulty, Sir, that in Jamnagar, you are carrying on experiment only in Ayurveda with the help of vaidyas. What Rajkumariji said was that she would like Allopathic-trained doctors to carry on experiment

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I do not think so.

SHRI JASPAT ROY KAPOOR: There is no scope for M.B.,B.S. doctors to carry on

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: There are fully qualified men there, in Jamnagar, to do research work.

SHRI JASPAT ROY KAPOOR: But fully qualified in what? Fully qualified in Ayurveda? My point on the Cabinet decision is to this effect.

RAJKUMARI AMRIT KAUR: May I intervene? There are pathologists; there are pharmacologists there. They are fully qualified M.B.B.S. men to help on these sides. There are M.B.B.S. men to help in the curative side and to do research. In fact there, all the research that is being done is done by modern medical men, aided by vaidyas and professors in Ayurveda.

SHRI JASPAT ROY KAPOOR: There Rajkumariji seems to think, according to her information, that it is a very big institution. Yesterday, she even went to the length of saying that there were students there. I would not like to contradict it. But facts are facts. I have made enquiries from some members in her Ministry only this morning. I have been told that there are no students there.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member read certificates from the Prime Minister and by foreign scientists who have visited the Institute.

SHRI JASPAT ROY KAPOOR: But that would not make something a fact which is not a fact. There are no students. I repeat that there are no students.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: All right.

SHRI JASPAT ROY KAPOOR: Hardly any research work is going on. Even if it is the intention of the hon. Minister in charge of the Bill to carry on research there, my point is that, in view of the Cabinet decision to co-ordinate, correlate and carry on this research through the aid and assistance and experience of highly trained persons in modern science, it is necessary that research on Ayurveda and Unani should be carried on in this Institute on a large scale. It is necessary in order to implement the Cabinet decision itself. That was my point, Sir.

Then, the other point is, as Rajkumariji said yesterday, that a lot of money has been allotted for the promotion of Ayurveda which they have not spent. An amount of Rs. 1 crore is being allotted under the Second Five Year Plan, and she herself said that she did not know whether this would be spent. My submission is that she should incorporate Ayurvedic study and research in this Institute and have that Rs. 1 crore also for this institution and make it really and truly a great institution. We are helping you to make it a very great institution. I would submit, therefore, that this amendment should be accepted.

RAJKUMARI AMRIT KAUR: Sir, I would like again to repeat what I said yesterday and perhaps add to it, as all the arguments that had been put forward yesterday are again being put forward today. Judging by that, I am afraid that perhaps they have not quite understood what I have been trying to get across to them. First of all, I want to make it absolutely clear that I have never said that Ayurveda or Unani or Homeo-

[Rajkumari Amrit Kaur.] pathy are not scientific medicines. I have never said so. Time and again I have said that Ayurveda was a great science, but it has unfortunately remained static. It needs to be revived. It needs all that is good in it to be taken out of it and put into the broad stream of modern medicine in order to enrich it, in order also to revive it. To that end, no one is more keen than I am. I think that research in Ayurveda, in Unani and also in Homeopathy should be carried on. I said that, in this Institute, it is only an undergraduate college that is first going to be started.

I made it quite clear that it was my intention, and always has been, to promote studies of the highest order in modern medicine. Further, even though this Bill was introduced only in September last year, actually the Budget for it has been for four years before both the Houi*3. The intention was that those of our students of modern medicine, especially our practising physicians and surgeons, who are teaching in our medical institutions—we have today 42 collages for whom I am finding it difficult to provide teaching personnel—should have the chance of doing research and get training for post-graduate studies in our own country, in our own environment, that they should be able to go to the villages and carry out research there, that they would understand better, than they do by going abroad, what the needs of our country are, that they should be able to do research in those special diseases that this country has. That was the intention. I think this fills a very great need, and I put this suggestion before the Prime Minister, before the Cabinet and they accepted it. But I could not do it straightway, because I did not have the money. When the Colombo Plan gave us money, this Institute was sought to be brought into being. Now, as I have said, this is for the purpose of teaching modern medicine primarily and therefore, I cannot mix the teaching of Ayurveda or Unani or Homeopathy in this Institute. I beg of the Members not to

I try to amend this Bill and narrow down its scope.

SHRI JASPAT ROY KAPOOR:
Narrow down?

RAJKUMARI AMRIT KAUR: I put it to you that, if there is any ambiguity, it only helps Members who want later on to have fundamental research in Ayurveda here. I would like to go further than drugs research. I say you can have not only drugs research, but fundamental research in Ayurveda, Unani and Homeopathy in this Institute but that must come later on, as it develops. There is nothing to ban it. I have already said that one of the things that I am going to do—let the College begin—is to have a Chair for the History of Medicine, which will include the history of Ayurveda, so that our students may understand what Ayurveda stood for, what it was, what it gave in the past, what it might give in the future, or indeed should give. The same with Unanj. As I have said, there will be no objection to this whatsoever later on, when the Institute has developed. After all, a teaching institute cannot develop overnight. It takes at least five years to send our undergraduates out, it will take 7 years to send our post-graduate students out. I also said that as the post-graduate studies in Jamnagar develop, there will be no objection whatsoever to have fundamental research, and even a professor for Ayurveda to teach our students the therapeutics of Ayurveda and Unani in this Institution as well.

I have given an assurance to the House that I shall do all that lies in my power to give to Ayurveda and Unani all the help that they need for strengthening for renovation, for rejuvenation, whatever you may like to call it, and for research. Having said that much, I do hope that the Members will withdraw their amendments and help me to help Ayurveda. I have never said that these are systems beyond the pale of medical science, but I think that this Bill, as far as its intention is concerned, is limited by the very words that have been used, "in order to give degrees and

diplomas under the Medical Council Act." If we give our people degrees and diplomas, who knows that later on we may not prescribe for these degrees and diplomas a certain amount of knowledge of Ayurveda, also. It all depends on how these sciences develop. Let them develop properly and then, we will see what we can do. Let Jamnagar develop. I am saying to you, that you cannot have research anywhere unless you have the students to do that research. That research will have to be done "by those trained in modern medicine. I want it. I want our medical men to go in for research in Ayurveda, and to make themselves familiar with the therapeutics of Ayurveda and Unani, so that later on we may make this Institute a really wonderful Institute. In the first instance, let us see to it that our teachers for our medical colleges are produced here, in our own country, in our own background, that they study what there is to be studied in the dynamic achievements of modern medicine and to add to it all the knowledge that we get from our own systems. So, with these few words here, I would plead with the Members here. After all, I am no less Indian than they are: I am as proud of our country as they are. I have been a humble servant of the masses of this country for a number of years, but I do want this great dream, not only mine but the dream of the Cabinet, of the entire medical world, including those who are students of Ayurveda and Unani, come true in the first instance. I do beg of the Members of the House to withdraw their amendments and let me go ahead with this Institute.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Dr. Seeta Parmanand. No speech. Do you withdraw it, or shall I put it to the vote?

1

DR. SHRIMATI SEETA PARMANAND: I would like it to be put to the vote. Let it be thrown out.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You do not withdraw it.

DR. SHRIMATI SEETA PARMANAND: I would have withdrawn it, if I had been allowed to say a few words.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: At the time of withdrawal, no speech is made. That is the rule.

DR. W. S. BARLINGAY: Sir, I have moved this amendment.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: It is in both names.

DR. SHRIMATI SEETA PARMANAND: It is my amendment. He has only signed it. He knows that it is my amendment only. There is no use going back. He has himself said that it is my amendment.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Let there be no quarrel between you two.

DR. W. S. BARLINGAY: Since I have moved the amendment, I have got a right to say a few words about it.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: But no speech. You can only say whether you withdraw it or not.

DR. W. S. BARLINGAY: I assure you that I will not inflict any speech on you and waste the time of the House.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: But no speech is allowed. Let us not break the rule.

DR. W. S. BARLINGAY: I won't make a speech. I only want to make clear what my position is.

So far as I am concerned I am willing to withdraw this in view of the very good assurance that has been given by Rajkumariji on the floor of this House.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Dr. Parmanand, you are not willing to withdraw?

DR. SHRIMATI SEETA PARMANAND: I would like to make some remarks.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You have already made them.

DR. SHRIMATI SEETA PARMANAND: Then I will withdraw this, but I will say what I have to say in reply to her at a later stage.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: There cannot be any reply.

DR. SHRIMATI SEETA PARMANAND: There is another amendment and I will be allowed to move that later.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: That is a different matter. I am concerned with clause 2 here.

* Amendment No. 4 was, by leave, withdrawn.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

"That clause 2 stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Clause 2 was added to the Bill.

Clause 3 was added to the Bill.

Clause 4—Composition of the Institute

DR. W. S. BARLINGAY: Sir, I move:

5. "That at page 2, after line 23, the following proviso be inserted, namely:—

'Provided that if in any of the categories mentioned in clauses (a) to (g) above, there is no member who is an Ayurveda Vaidya, Yunani Hakim or Homeopath doctor, the Central Government shall nominate one member each to represent these three systems of medicine.'"

*For text of amendment, *vide* col. 1683 *supra*.

DR. SHRIMATI SEETA PARMANAND: This is my amendment. It is in my name first. So I move it.

SHRI BISWANATH DAS: In view of the assurances given, I don't propose to move my amendment.

SHRI NAWAB SINGH CHAUHAN (Uttar Pradesh): Sir, after this assurance, I don't propose to move my amendment.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The clause and the amendment are before the House.

DR. SHRIMATI SEETA PARMANAND: Mr. Deputy Chairman, this amendment, though it has the words 'Ayurveda Vaidya, Yunani Hakim, or Homeopath doctor' and may look somewhat similar to the other amendment, still it has greater significance in it than would appear on the surface, otherwise it would not be necessary to press it, in view of the assurance given. This amendment says clearly that if from the people who are already on this Board of management in that Institute, there are no representatives of the Ayurvedic, Yunani and Homeopathic systems, there should be, in addition, three others who should represent these systems. I don't think there should be any difficulty for the Health Minister to accept this amendment. If by that she is afraid of the Bill being delayed by a couple of months—I don't know how Heavens are going to fall if this Bill is passed after three* months, but apparently that is the attitude—in that case, I would like her to give an assurance here that she will see to it that three of these people are representatives of Yunani, Ayurvedic and Homeopathic systems of medicine. If she later on intends to give encouragement to make it possible for the students not only to study these systems of medicine—and she has promised, I think, to institute a Chair for Ayurveda in this very Institute—it is necessary that from now on, representatives of these systems of medicines should be there to see how this beginning is to be made.

What I wanted to say—and which refers to the previous amendment, and which is equally applicable to this also—is, it is no use saying that all encouragement would be given to Ayurvedic system of medicine in Jamnagar. I don't know where she is going to provide for Yunani and there has not been any reply to that. It is no use saying that Jamnagar alone should be the place where this should be done. I don't understand why there need be such water-tight compartments. If we have to bring about integration of the courses in the three systems, the word of which Dr. Bar-lingay is very fond, there should be integration of the different systems, translated as *samanvaya*, there is no reason why the Health Minister should have any objection to a beginning being made, as far as practicable, in this very Institute. Certainly, the country will spend money on other institutions and that is hardly an argument, or hardly it will give any satisfaction. No Government today can hold back money for these popular systems, and we need not, for that reason, ask for an assurance from the Health Minister. That is inherent in the country's requirement. What is more important is an assurance that, if this amendment is to be withdrawn, she will agree, and she will see to it, that three systems of medicine are represented in this Institute straightaway.

DR. W. S. BARLINGAY: Sir, I just want to add one word. I can assure the hon. Minister that although I have moved this amendment, I am not going to press it, but I want this much assurance that at this stage, or at any later stage, if it is possible to do so, she should see her way to appoint an Ayurvedic Vaidya or Homeopath, as the case may be, in this Institution and that for the very simple reason that so far as she is concerned, she has announced her policy. She has made a policy statement and it will help her policy, if my amendment is accepted, or even if it

is not accepted, an assurance is given that at any rate, in spirit if not in words, effect is given to it.

RAJKUMARI AMRIT KAUR: Sir, as I have said before, there is plenty of latitude in this Bill. This Governing Body has been constituted purely in order to evaluate the present position of undergraduate and post-graduate study in modern medicine, but you will see? that in clause 4(e) there are five persons to be nominated by the Government of India of whom one shall be a non-medical scientist, representing the Indian Science Congress. The moment we begin research in Ayurveda, or research in Yunani, or research in Homeopathy, it will always be open to the Government, in addition perhaps to those already there, to coopt somebody to have the necessary help. I will give the assurance that we will always listen to advice. I have got today three Vaidas advising me. There is nothing to prevent either the Director of the Institute at any time calling in a Vaid to advise on anything in regard to Ayurveda or Yunani, and the same applies to any other science, but primarily, this is for education in the modern system of medicine.

DR. SHRIMATI SEETA PARMANAND: That is not a reply. I press my amendment.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

5. "That at page 2, after line 28, the following proviso be inserted, namely:—

'Provided that if in any of the categories mentioned in clauses (a) to (g) above, there is no member who is an Ayurved Vaidya, Yunani Hakim or Homeopath doctor, the Central Government shall nominate one member each to represent these three systems of medicine.'

The motion was negatived.

MH. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The I reason also, this Institute should not be in question is: New Delhi.

"That clause 4 stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Clause 4 was added to the Bill.

Clauses 5 to 11 were added to the Bill.

3 P.M. Clause 12—*Location of the Institute*

DR. SHRIMATI SEETA PARMANAND: Sir, I move:

6. "That at page 4, line 39, for the word 'New Delhi' the word 'Bombay' be substituted."

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The clause and the amendment are open for discussion.

DR. SHRIMATI SEETA PARMANAND: Sir, while commending my amendment to the House, I would like to point out that New Delhi is hardly the place for starting an institute on which so much money is going to be spent, because, even all this money would not yield all the results that would be yielded if the Institute were located either at Bombay or at Calcutta, in some big city like either of these two* and the reasons why I say so are as follows.

Sir, for medical research, hospitals are required, and also, if this Institute is going to give equal opportunities to graduates from the medical colleges from all the States, it would be better to have that Institute in a place where there are several medical colleges, and which is also a cosmopolitan city. The hospitals here in Delhi are very few, and as has been pointed out, the number and types of diseases that would be there for examination and study would also be few. On the other hand, there are already very well developed colleges in Bombay, or even in Calcutta, and for that matter, so many colleges are not there in any other place. For that

It seems that the only reason why this Institute is being located in New Delhi is that Delhi being the capital of the country, perhaps, it will have more limelight and it would be a kind of a show-place. But that, I submit, could hardly be the reason for the expenditure of such vast sums of money. Why expenditure on such a vast scale should be incurred on everything new here, and why the expenditure that has already been incurred on hospitals, should not be taken advantage of, in a place like Bombay or Calcutta? For that reason, though I know that the amendment may not be accepted, I wanted to give expression to this view.

I would also like to add, that it seems hardly correct that such an important decision as the starting of a pioneer institute of this kind should have been taken without any reference to either Houses of Parliament, and when expenditure had already been incurred to a great extent this Bill in its present form should have been brought here. If it had to be brought in, then, it should not have been mentioned that the place would be Delhi. And if that clause had to be there, that it should be in Delhi, then it was necessary that the opinions of hon. Members should have been obtained. If the opinion of the House did not matter much, then this clause need not be there.

RAJKUMARI AMRIT KAUR: Sir, I can only submit that this Institute has been talked about for ages and this scheme has been before practically all the Members of this House and the other House. It was not without very great consideration that the Cabinet agreed, or rather decided, I should say, to have it in Delhi. There is plenty of clinical material available in Delhi. Only day before yesterday, there was a professor, an F.R.C.S. from London, who came over to see our hospitals. He went round the

Irwin Hospital, where we have about 1,200 beds. Then, there is the Safdarjang hospital which, including the new hospital which will come up, will have another 1,200 beds. Then there is the Lady Hardinge Women's Hospital, a paediatric hospital and there are any number of hospitals here and enough clinical material. The undergraduate college is going to be a very small college. As a matter of fact, even for students from all over India, Delhi is a far more central place than either Bombay or Calcutta, which are already terribly overcrowded. I want this Institute to have the latitude to grow into something away from the stereotyped medical colleges. Therefore, Sir, in view of the fact that some amount of money has already been spent in Delhi, to accept an amendment, now at this stage, to move it to Bombay will be quite impossible.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Do you want me to put your amendment to vote?

DR. SHRIMATI SEETA PARMANAND: No, Sir. I request permission of the House to withdraw it.

*Amendment No. 6 was, by leave, withdrawn.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

"That clause 12 stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Clause 12 was added to the Bill.

Clause 13—'Objects of the Institute

SHRI JASPAT ROY KAPOOR: Sir, I move:

9. "That at page 5, line 2, the words 'under-graduattand' be deleted."

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The clause and the amendment are open for discussion.

SHRI JASPAT ROY KAPOOR: Sir, I have only one or two observations to make in support of my amendment and no speech.

*For text of amendment, *vide* col. 1721 *supra*.

Sir, the only object of this amendment, as also the one to clause 14, is that in this Institute, we should have only post-graduate studies and research, and not any training for undergraduates. Our anxiety is to give this Institute a really effective status of national importance. When, we propose to have in this Institute the awarding of degrees and diplomas of the same status as the L.R.C.P. and F.R.C.S, as we see in some of the foreign countries, it is only meet and desirable that we should keep the standards of teaching and research in* this Institute at a very very high level. By moving this amendment, and by giving this suggestion, we are only trying to give this Institute a yet greater dignity than would perhaps come to it, if the original Bill remained in its present form. This is to help the hon. Minister in charge of the Bill and I hope that this amendment will be accepted.

RAJKUMARI AMRIT KAUR: Sir, in my speech yesterday, I explained the position fully and I had hoped that my arguments had gone home—but apparently, they have not—as to why the undergraduate college was absolutely necessary for the basic idea of developing post-graduate studies. If the hon. the mover of the amendment had had a medical education at all, he would have known, or he should know, that post-graduate studies are now no longer to be kept apart in water-tight compartments, that you have got to keep undergraduate study linked up with post-graduate studies. Further, the post-graduate students are being taught how to teach and for that, they have got to have a practising school. Further again, if I want to reorientate the existing undergraduate medical education, which is one of the main purposes of this Bill, I must have an undergraduate college.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Do you press your amendment?

SHRI JASPAT ROY KAPOOR: Nev Sir. I request permission of the House to withdraw it.

'Amendment No. 9 was, by leave, withdrawn.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

"That clause 13 stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted. Clause 13 was added to the Bill.

Clause 14—The Institute

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Shri Biswanath Das, Kazi Karimuddin and Shri Nawab Singh Chauhan who had given notice of amendments are not present.

DR. SHRIMATI SEETA PARMANAND: I would like to move my amendment to clause 14.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: But that is for deletion of the word "undergraduate" and Mr. Kapoor's amendment to clause 13, which was similar, has been thrown out.

DR. SHRIMATI SEETA PARMANAND: No, Sir. It was not put to vote. The hon. Member had withdrawn his amendment. Because he has withdrawn it, it does not mean that I too should withdraw mine.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You need not withdraw it because I rule it as barred by the decision taken on the previous amendment.

DR. SHRIMATI SEETA PARMANAND: But how can that be?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Because the House has accepted the principle that the undergraduate courses are necessary.

DR. SHRIMATI SEETA PARMANAND: May I point out and ask you on a point of order, Sir, how my amendment is barred, when that amendment of the hon. Member was not put to vote. The mover did not press it. That is what happened.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: What I am saying is: this amendment you

•For text of amendment, *vide* col. 1723 *supra*.

propose is corollary to the one moved to clause 13, and since the House has thrown out the amendment to clause 13, this amendment is also barred.

DR. SHRIMATI SEETA PARMANAND: May I point out, Sir, that that amendment was never put to the vote of the House? The mover had only withdrawn it.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Yes, at the instance of the hon. Minister.

DR. SHRIMATI SEETA PARMANAND: Only that particular amendment.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: And so this amendment is also barred. And the amendment proposed by Mr. Kapoor to this clause is also barred. Therefore, there is no amendment to clause 14.

The question is:

"That clause 14 stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Clause 14 was added to the Bill.

Clauses 15 to 19 were added to the Bill.

Clause 20—Pension and Provident Funds

SHRI JASPAT ROY KAPOOR: Sir, I beg to move:

14. "That at page 7, lines 38-39, the words 'officers, teachers and other' be deleted."

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The clause and the amendment are open for discussion.

SHRI JASPAT ROY KAPOOR: I have only one or two words to say. My object in moving this amendment is to bring our legislation in line with the socialistic pattern of society which we propose to have, and which we have in fact decided to have. We are reducing classes everywhere, and we

are removing the class distinction. Even in the railways, we are reducing the classes. Must you then have different class designations of Government employees? You should not, I submit, and we must make a definite beginning in this direction. The clause as it stands reads:

"The Institute shall constitute, for the benefit of its officers, teachers and other employees in such manner and subject to such conditions as may be prescribed by regulations, such pension and provident funds as it may deem fit".

The object of this clause is to provide for pension and provident fund for the Institute employees. Will not the general term "employee" cover all sorts of employees, be they big officers, humble teachers, or still humbler subordinate servants? This is a matter of fundamental principle. Let us not only pay lip homage and lip sympathy to the socialistic pattern of society. Let us take active steps in that direction. The clause in its present form certainly strikes at the very root of the socialistic pattern of society. We should not have class designations of employees; all the servants of the Government must be called employees just as in the Indian Penal Code, even a humble police constable is a police officer. So, let us call all as officers, or call everybody as employee. I emphatically move this amendment of mine, Sir.

SHRI H. V. PATASKAR: There is nothing of this sort in the socialistic pattern of society, because even that pattern envisages the appointment of administrative officers for an institution like this. We have already mentioned teachers in an earlier clause and I do not know how the socialistic pattern of society is going to be affected by officers and teachers being specifically mentioned. We know that there must be administrative and other officers. It is much better to leave the clause as it is; it has got nothing to do with the socialistic pattern, and" I

34 RSD^4

think, the analogy that because classes are being removed from the railways, therefore, we should have an institution where there will be no officers, no teachers and no different classes of people, is something which passes imagination. So, I think this amendment is unnecessary.

RAJKUMARI AMRIT KAUR: I have nothing to add to what my colleague has said.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

14. "That at page 7, lines 38-39, the words 'officers, teachers and other' be deleted."

The motion was negatived.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

"That clause 20 stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Clause 20 was added to the Bill.

Clauses 21 to 27 were added to the Bill.

Clause 28—Power to make rules

SHRI JASPAT ROY KAPOOR: I would like to move my amendment No. 16, but if you would accord permission, Sir, I would like to adopt Dr. Subbarayan's phraseology, as that is in better form, and is in accordance with the phraseology which we have adopted in many other Bills.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Is that acceptable to the hon. Minister?

RAJKUMARI AMRIT KAUR: No, Sir. May I say that an amendment of this nature came up in the other House also, but I did not accept it. If you turn to page 9, you will find that "All rules made under this section shall, as soon as may be after they are made, be laid before both Houses of Parliament". Most likely, that will always be even before the fourteen days. I do not wish to put any further limit in this regard.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Power has to be given to Parliament to change them.

RAJKUMARI AMRIT KAUR: I explained in the House yesterday also. Power is given to the Central Government to make rules, and power is also given to the Institute to make rules, and I think, the House should trust the Central Government to trust those who are in charge of the Institute to frame such rules and regulations as will promote the autonomy of this body and as will give it that elasticity that we need. After all, there are scientists on the Governing Body and are they not likely to make rules? They do know what their job is, and I am not willing to delegate that power to the Parliament in this technical institution.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Dr. Subbarayan's amendment is not before the House.

SHRI JASPAT ROY KAPOOR: I can move an amendment to my amendment. After all, it is not an original amendment; it is an amendment to my amendment.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: All right, but it is not acceptable to the hon. Minister.

SHRI JASPAT ROY KAPOOR: Sir, I beg to move:

16. "That at page 9, line 28, for the words 'laid before both Houses of Parliament' the words 'laid for not less than fourteen days before both Houses of Parliament and shall be subject to such modifications as Parliament may make during the session in which they are so laid' be inserted."

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The clause and the amendment are open for discussion.

SHRI JASPAT ROY KAPOOR: The hon. Minister in charge of the Bill has not understood the implication of

the suggestion in the slightest measure. She said just now that she was not prepared to delegate any authority to Parliament. That is an astounding proposition; the Minister saying that she does not want to delegate authority to Parliament. Parliament does not derive any authority from any Minister nor, for the matter of that, from anybody. Parliament's authority is inherent in itself; it is a sovereign body. The question is whether Parliament should delegate its authority to the Minister, or the Ministry, or to the Institute, which we do not propose to do in an unrestricted manner. The hon. Minister wants this House to give her a blank cheque, without any restriction whatsoever, and wants that we should delegate all our rule making authority to the Government.

A bogey of the autonomy being interfered with has been raised here. Where is the autonomy being conferred on this Institute? Not at all; on the one hand, this Government wants our authority to be delegated to it, while on the other hand, it does not want to give to the Institute rule making authority at all. Only regulations can be framed by the Institute and they too only with the prior consent or approval of the Central Government. In these circumstances, where is the autonomy at all? There is not the slightest measure of it, not even a shadow of it. The main question is, whether we should allow this Bill to be passed in this skeleton form, giving a blank cheque to the Central Government to do whatsoever it likes, without subjecting those rules to be modified, or amended, even in the slightest measure by this House. The mere fact that these rules would be placed before the two Houses of Parliament will not help very much. The Parliament will not be seized of them automatically. We may, of course, by Resolution or even by a Private Bill, do anything we like, but the question is, should we not have the facility of making our suggestions with regard to amendment of these rules soon after they are framed and

placed before this House? Sir, yesterday in a very unhappy mood, which smacked almost of a little arrogance, if I may be permitted to use that phrase, she said that Parliament should not think that it has the sole monopoly of wisdom. We have never claimed that. I hope that that sole monopoly of wisdom will not be claimed even for the Institution, not even for the Health Ministry, and surely not so after the publication of the Water Pollution Report. Nobody claims, Sir, the sole monopoly of wisdom, but certainly, our views should be taken into consideration and we should have the final say in any important matter, particularly in the matter of the appointment of the Director and all that.

This Bill, as you will find, does not at all say in what way even the financial memorandum has been drawn up. I beg of you, Sir, as the custodian of the rights and privileges of this House, you could say that such financial memoranda, when they are presented before us, should be based on certain definite data. We have not been told what will be the pay of the Director, what will be the allowances given to any one, all these being left to the rule-making of Government. We have not been given any indication with regard to these matters. If some indication had been given to us, perhaps I might not have insisted on this present amendment. We are absolutely in the dark about all these things. I would like to know how the Government has come to the conclusion that the recurring expenses will be Rs. 42-68 lakhs. In the body of the Bill we have not been told what the salaries and allowances will be, and even in the matter of rules, we are told that we shall not have any say in the matter subject, of course, naturally, to the overall power that we have with regard to everything that is being done in this country. I do submit, Sir, that this amendment of mine, which has been further supported by the views, as expressed openly in the House by Dr. Subba-

rayan, whose words, I hope, will carry considerable weight with the Minister in-charge of the Bill, because she had had the privilege of having his support at the last moment.

DR. RAGHUBIR SINH: Mr. Deputy Chairman, the point raised by Shri Jaspat Roy Kapoor is very right, for we have seen so many cases in this House when the rules that were made by the Ministries were not placed on the Table of the House, sometimes for more than a year. Such cases have occurred. That is No. 1. Secondly, as was pointed out by me and Dr. . Gilder previously, the power delegated in this particular case goes to a much further extent than is desirable and here, I can only refer to our hon. Minister for Legal Affairs, who must be remembering all his fights with the British Government in the Bombay Legislature some decades ago on similar provisions. Sir, the conditions may have changed, but I believe, it is very necessary that Parliament should have a voice and should have something to say in this respect and therefore, Sir, the proposal made by Shri Jaspat Roy Kapoor, as amended by Dr. P. Suhbarayan, is one which needs our earnest attention, and I would earnestly plead with the hon. the Health Minister that she would be democratic enough to follow the traditions of the British parliamentarians and accept what we ask for only as our legal and real right.

Thank you, Sir.

SHRI P. N. SAPRU: Mr. Deputy Chairman, I confess that in this matter I am at one with Mr. Jaspat Roy Kapoor and Dr. Raghbir Sinh.

In my opening remarks I pointed out that one of the features of this Bill was that vast rule-making powers have been given and that we had not been supplied with material which would enable us to judge for ourselves what the constitution of this All-India Medical Institute will be. The Bhole Committee went into the question of the constitution of the All-India Medical Institute closely,

[Shri P. N. Sapru.] and it came to the conclusion—quite rightly, I think—that it should not be run as a departmental institution without adequate autonomous powers. It was also the view of some Members that it should keep contact with the academic bodies and the universities. I don't have a copy of the Report just now, it has been taken away, but it was the view of the Committee that the institution should be of an autonomous character. Of course it does not mean that there will be no Central control whatever, but it was not intended that it should function as a department of the Central Government.

Now, let us just try to see for ourselves what these rule-making powers are going to be. They vest the Institute, with the approval of the Governing Body—the Legislature coming nowhere in the picture—with the power of constituting the Governing Body and standing committees and ad hoc committees, laying down their terms of office, manner of filling vacancies, etc. They assign to the Institute the power of making rules, regulating the functions to be exercised by the President of the Institute as the Chairman of the Governing Body. The President was intended, by the Bhole Committee, to be an independent person like the Chief Justice of India, or the Speaker of the Lok Sabha in the constitution as visualized by them. Now that is not going to be the case; he is going to be some departmental officer. Then, they will determine the allowances to be paid to the Chairman. They will determine the procedure to be followed by the Governing Body and its *ad hoc* committees. The tenure of office, salary and other conditions of service of the Director will be regulated by these rules. The powers and duties of the Chairman of the Governing Body will also be regulated by these rules.

Now, 'degrees' is a very important matter, because the degrees and

diplomas that you give should be degrees and diplomas which carry weight in the world of science, and which carry weight with the universities outside, and it is to the rule-making power that the function has been assigned of laying down the conditions under which diplomas and degrees will be given. Now obviously, there is far too much delegation of authority in this matter to the executive Government. Delegation of authority under modern conditions is inevitable, in the interests of the State some delegation is inevitable, but there are limits to this delegation, and surely, it should have struck the legal advisers of the Health Ministry, it should have struck the Health Ministry itself, that they were going far too far in asking us to supply them with a blank cheque.

Now, Mr. Deputy Chairman, there is no way of getting over this difficulty, but possibly, our views can be met by an assurance of the Health Minister that the rules framed by her will be placed on the Table of this House, or that she will take care to supply us

Mn. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: That clause is there and they will be placed before this House. Clause 28 is there which says, "All rules made under this section shall, as soon as may be after they are made, be laid before both Houses of Parliament." The amendment seeks to add at the end of this clause the following: "for fourteen days, during which period, the Parliament may modify the same in such manner as it may like."

SHRI P. N. SAPRU: And she can give an assurance that, if there is a general desire that they should be discussed, an opportunity will be given.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Clause 28(3) says that all rules made under this section shall, as soon as may be
j after they are made, be laid before
i both Houses of Parliament.

Incc

DR. M. D. D. GILDER (Bombay): On a point of information, Sir, I should like to know the meaning of this clause.

SHRI P. N. SAPRU: It is true that they shall be laid before both Houses of Parliament, but an assurance should be given that before they are brought into force, they will be allowed to be discussed by Parliament.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: No such assurance will be of any avail, unless it is incorporated in the Act.

SHRI JASPAT ROY KAPOOR: And hence my amendment.

SHRI P. N. SAPRU: That is true. No assurance can be of avail.

DR. SHRIMATI SEETA PARMA NAND: But is it not within the power of the House.....

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Sapru is still on his legs.

DR. SHRIMATI SEETA PARMA NAND: I am asking a question. Is it not within the power of the House after the rules are laid before the House to bring forward and pass a Resolution as has been done.....

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I am afraid not.

SHRI P. N. SAPRU: The rules may be laid before both Houses of Parliament, but we may get no opportunity of discussing them. Where is the guarantee that we will have an opportunity to discuss them? If some way could be discovered of giving this guarantee, it might be possible not to insist upon a formal amendment. Otherwise, I think Dr. Subbarayan's amendment is a right one and I think, it should be supported by the House.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I think the position is, a Resolution may be moved suggesting modifications and the Government may or may not accept them.

DR. M. D. D. GILDER: Sir, I want to know this. The rules after they are made will be placed on the Table. But will they come into force before they are placed on the Table? They do not come into force till they are placed on the Table; I think, that is the parliamentary procedure.

DR. W. S. BARLINGAY: That is exactly the amendment of Mr. Kapoor.

SHRI P. N. SAPRU: The position is that the rules come into force even before they are laid on the Table.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: These are all things which are to be provided by the Act.

SHRI B. K. P. SINHA (Bihar): Sir, I feel.....

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please be very brief.

SHRI B. K. P. SINHA: Yes, Sir. I feel that in theory there is much to be said for the point of view of Mr. Kapoor which has been so ably supported by my predecessor, Mr. Sapru. But I feel that in practice, the provisions which they seek to introduce would not make any difference. Such provisions have been introduced in many legislations in this country as well as in the United Kingdom. I remember to have read a book entitled 'Law and Order'. I forget the name of the author, but he is a very famous author, who is an authority on such matters.

SHRI P. N. SAPRU: Allen is the name.

SHRI B. K. P. SINHA: Yes; Law and Order by Allen. His opinion is that if you want to consign a thing to oblivion, make a provision that it shall be placed on the Table of the House, because in that case, nobody takes the trouble to look into that. So in practice, it does not make much of a difference. I could very well understand if they had sought to introduce an amendment to the effect that unless a period of fourteen days

[Shri B. K. P. Sinha.] elapses after the rules are laid on the Table, they shall not come into force.

DR. RAGHUBIR SINH: That is what is sought to be done by Dr. Subba-ryan's amendment.

SHRI B. K. P. SINHA: No; the rules would come into force as soon as they are promulgated. After the rules are placed on the Table of the House, we can discuss and introduce amendments, but the rules would be effective from the date of promulgation. I feel, however, that Government should be prompt in placing the rules on the Table of the House. The language used is 'as soon as may be after they are made'. The term 'as soon as may be' is a very elastic term; it may mean one month; it may mean six months; it may mean one year. I remember that during the war, some rules which had to be placed on the Table of the House of Commons, were not placed for nearabout seven years. When this mistake was discovered, it was realised that this expression 'as soon as may be' may mean one month or six months or one year even, but in no case would it mean seven years. It was realised, therefore that there had been a contempt of the House and an Act of Indemnity had to be passed indemnifying the Minister responsible for laying them on the Table. I, therefore, feel that it would be better to prescribe some period within which, after promulgation, the rules must be placed before Parliament. In any case, perhaps it cannot be done now. I would therefore request the hon. Minister to see that Government is prompt in laying the rules before the House.

SHRI H. V. PATASKAR: Sir, as is well known, this question of delegated legislation is certainly an important one. So far as the sovereignty of Parliament is concerned, there is no question of abridging that in any way. That power can be delegated, subject to any condition. Now, there is some history behind this. I know a little

about it because I was the Chairman —before I was Minister—of the Delegated Legislation Committee and at that time, I had occasion to study this question. Even in England, it is true that all this came to the forefront when during the war it was found necessary to have all kinds of rules which, in spite of the provision in the Acts that they were to be laid on the Table of the House, somehow or other —not deliberately, because that was war time, and lots of ordinances and other things were issued from time to time and they had to be revised and changed quite often—were not placed on the Table. Subsequently, they appointed a Committee and they have passed an Act, but we have not got such an Act here. There are three different methods by which this power of delegating legislation can be exercised. For instance, there may be cases in which the rules shall come into force only after they are laid on the Table. There may be cases—in England too there are—involving financial and other matters in which the power of Parliament is there to change them, and in such cases, there is a provision that the rules shall come into force only if they are laid on the Table of the House for a certain definite period, at the end of which r:L;tomatically they come into force. And the third category is like the present one, that they shall be placed on the Table of the House.

There is nothing wrong. It all depends on the condition that you impose when delegating the power of legislation. It is for you to decide whether you should have any restriction of the first, second or the third kind. Here, as I said, I was the Chairman of that Committee, and I have submitted a report to the other House on this question. The point is, what is the proper thing to be done in each case. There is absolutely no question of Parliament having no powers to deal with it. We need not deal with this issue from that point of view. It is true that the amendment that has been proposed now has become more or less a standard form and it

is put in many of the Acts, but in substance, that and the present position do not make much difference. I could have understood, as was pointed out just now, if the intention was that in a matter like this the rules should not come into force unless they are kept on the Table for a certain period. That is a different matter, but that is not what the amendment seeks to do. The amendment says that the rules shall be 'laid for not less than fourteen days before both Houses of Parliament and shall be subject to such modifications as Parliament may make.....'. This is more or less the form which is generally used in all Acts. This difficulty, that the rules come into force when they are promulgated, is there not only with our Parliament, but everywhere the same difficulty is there. What it means here is, that the rules shall be laid on the Table of the House, but they may come into force even before that. That is what the amendment says. Let us look at the matter from the point of view of whether there should be such a provision or not.

Now, we are trying to establish an All-India Institute. There will be so many experts, etc. there, if you read the composition of the Institute. One thing to be noted in clause 28 is this. The rules are more or less to be prescribed not merely by Government machinery, but in the very nature of the Institute which we are setting up, it is to be after consulting them that the rules will be framed. Therefore, clause 28(1) is very important for considering as to whether the delegation of power proposed is proper or not proper. Therefore, the wording is: "The Central Government, after consultation with the Institute.....". We have not the clear picture before us at the moment. The Institute is going to function for the first time. It goes on to say: ".....make rules to carry out the purposes of this Act". So, primarily this Institute will more or less be guided by those who are in charge of this Institute. We have included also three Members of Parliament as

member? of the Institute. There is also a proviso:

"Provided that consultation with the Institute shall not be necessary on the first occasion of the making of rules under this section, but the Central Government shall take into consideration any suggestion which the Institute may make in relation to the amendment of such rules after they are made."

Therefore, it is significant. So far as the first rules are concerned, naturally those members are not there. They will become members. But we have laid down a condition that the Central Government shall take into consideration, etc. This is a special provision made in respect of this Bill, because the original idea is, that all these rules must not be dictated by somebody in the office of the Ministry here in the Secretariat, but more or less, at the instance of, and in consultation with, and for the purpose of properly carrying out the work of the Institute. Therefore, there is already an imposition that the rules can only be framed by Government after proper consultation with those who are to run the Institute. Therefore, it becomes more or less hypothetical.

But even in respect of this power of delegation, it must come before Parliament, whatever Government does. Therefore, sub-clause (3) of clause 28 says:

"All rules made under this section shall, as soon as may be after they are made, be laid before both Houses of Parliament."

I would only suggest that probably nothing much would have happened, but in this particular case, we need not insist on it for the simple reason that, as I have said, and as was pointed out by Dr. Seeta Parmanand, even if the present wording, "all rules made under this section shall, as soon as may be after they are made, be

IQRfi

[Shri H. V. Pataskar.]
laid before both Houses of Parliament" is not there, it would be open to Parliament at any time, if they so choose, to change them. As was pointed out by my other friend, whether you put it in this form or not, it would be open to Parliament.....

SHRI JASPAT ROY KAPOOR: It would be open to Parliament even if this sub-clause (3) was not there. Parliament has always the power even without this sub-clause (3).

SHRI H. V. PATASKAR: That is true. But unless they are laid on the Table of the House, how is Parliament to know.

(Interruptions.)

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: No interruptions please.

SHRI H. V. PATASKAR: So, in a matter of technical importance, no important principle is being violated. But in respect of this particular Institute, we say, we have laid down a first restriction, that it shall be done only after consultation with the Institute concerned. Then, we can see that Members of Parliament, of both Houses, are represented there. There is not much of a difference. If the rules are made, they can come into force even before they are laid on the Table of the House. The only additional words are that Parliament may make such modifications as it may like. That right is already there, but in a different form. The wording is "modify the same in such manner as it may like", as proposed in the amendment. But I think, the hon. Minister will be consistent with the democratic principles. She will naturally be guided—if at all such an occasion arises which will be very remote—by the wishes of the Parliament. After all, in a matter like this, where it is the technical people who give advice, there is not the remotest chance of Parliament changing the rule, but even if it comes to that, that there is a recommendation, I am sure, such a recommendation will be duly

taken into account by any Minister of a responsible Government.

DR. RADHA KUMUD MOOKERJI: Sir, I strongly support the Government's point of view on academic and educational grounds. I think, we should not grudge the autonomy that is granted to centralised educational institutions. Practically, this Institute will be run like a Centralised University, like Aligarh, Benares, Visva-bharati and also I can point out the case of the Bangalore Institute of Science, where that institution has been justly granted a complete measure of autonomy in regard to matters of research and other academic matters. I, therefore, think, that we are already used to this system by which the Central Government must grant a proper measure of autonomy in order that the institutions concerned may work with a considerable degree of harmony and freedom from interference from outside. I, therefore, think, it is extremely necessary that this kind of autonomy should be granted to these All-India institutions which stand mainly for research and advancement of knowledge. Already, as I have said, you have the National Physical Laboratory here, you have got the National Chemical Laboratory in Poona, you have got many other Centralised institutions which are not at all troubled by any kind of unreasonable interference from outside.

I should, therefore, think, just as the Universities have been rightly granted by law their measure of autonomy, similarly this institution, which is really planned as a University of research, is certainly entitled to have the principle of autonomy which has been so liberally granted to all the Universities of the country, especially to the Centralised Universities. I do not know whether my esteemed friend, Mr. P. N. Saprú, who is also very much connected with the administration of Universities, will sound a different note there. There he will stand up most wholeheartedly

for the autonomy of the Universities.....

SHRI P. N. SAPRU: On a point of personal explanation, my point with regard to the clause, as it is, is that it leaves far too much to be filled up by the rule making powers. I don't happen to have the rules before me, and I do not know what is the exact measure of internal autonomy that the Institute will enjoy. I am not opposed to autonomy being given to Centralised institutions.

DR. RADHA KUMUD MOOKERJI: The point that I am urging is very simple, because we are already used to this system, under which we have granted a very large measure of autonomy to all these institutions that are working for the advancement of learning in the country. Therefore, I do not see why we should grudge the same kind of academic autonomy.....

SHRI JASPAT ROY KAPOOR: Have you got a shadow of autonomy in this Bill?

DR. RADHA KUMUD MOOKERJI: You want that, the Governing Body must lay before Parliament all their regulations.....

SHRI JASPAT ROY KAPOOR: No, no. Only that rules made by Government be laid before us.

DR. RADHA KUMUD MOOKERJI: As regards the details of the work, not even finance, I do not think any University is submitting its budget to the Central Government. Even the Aligarh and Benares Universities which are Centrally governed, are not called upon to submit their budgets to the Central Government. When you are launching this institution, which contains so much of promise in the sphere of advancement of medical learning, why should you grudge this? Why should you not leave the Institute to develop its own traditions and precedents so that it may work in perfect independence, because sometimes, Parliamentary

control is not that kind of control which may advance educational interests. It may amount more to interference than really independence. Therefore, I think, that on academic grounds, it is far better to leave to this institution as much measure of independence as it is necessary for its own work. Their own work justifies this grant of autonomy.

RAJKUMARI AMRIT KAUR: Sir I think, the last speaker has voiced my opinion too very ably, and my colleague, the Minister here, has also put the matter very clearly before this House. I do beg of this House to trust this Governing Body of scientific personnel. They are not going to be hasty in making rules and regulations that will in any way cramp this Institution. They will be working wholeheartedly for its growth, and I wish to assure the House that I will see that they put the rules and regulations as quickly as ever they can, before this House. Moreover.....

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: It is the Central Government that makes the rules.

RAJKUMARI AMRIT KAUR: Yes,, the Central Government, but the Central Government will, of course, be all the time making the rules according as the Governing Body—the technical personnel—advises them to make rules, and the same will be placed here as quickly as possible. And if the House wishes to make recommendations, I shall always consider their suggestions with the consideration that they merit.

One hon. Member said that I had talked about delegating powers to Parliament. Of course, I did not mean that. If that word slipped out of my mouth, I take it back. No Minister can delegate powers to Parliament. Parliament is the supreme body. What I meant was, that in this particular case, I wanted the Government to take powers of making rules. Besides there will be representation for this hon. House on the Governing

[Rajkumari Amrit Kaur.] Body. There will also be two representatives of the Lok Sabha on that Body, so that Parliament's views will not go wholly unrepresented. Therefore, I would plead with the mover of this amendment to withdraw it.

SHRI JASPAT ROY KAPOOR: Did I understand the hon. Minister to say that the suggestions that are made by the Institute will be placed before us and we shall have our.....

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The rules framed by the Government will be placed before Parliament.

SHRI JASPAT ROY KAPOOR: That is obvious. I thought she.....

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Any suggestion that Parliament may make will be duly considered by the Government.

SHRI JASPAT ROY KAPOOR: Of course, they will be. But I thought that the suggestions made by the Institute.....

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: What about your amendment now?

SHRI JASPAT ROY KAPOOR: Well, my amendment is there?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Do you press it to vote?

SHRI JASPAT ROY KAPOOR: If she does not accept it, I may please be allowed to withdraw it.

•Amendment No. 16 was, by leave, withdrawn.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

"That clause 28 stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Clause 28 was added to the Bill. Clause 29 was added to the Bill.

•For text of amendment, *vide* col. 1729 supra.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mi-
Kapoor, your amendments are belated and further, they are also out of order. The question is:

"That clause 1, the Title and the Enacting Formula stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Clause 1, the Title and the Enacting Formula were added to the Bill.

RAJKUMARI AMRIT KAUR: Sir, I beg to move:

"That the Bill be passed."

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Motion moved:

"That the Bill be passed."

Only one speech on Ayurveda and one on modern sciences.

DR. SHRIMATI SEETA PARMANAND: Sir, those who have moved amendments and have not been allowed to speak should be allowed to say something in summing up.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: It is time. You may choose between yourselves one speech.

DR. SHRIMATI SEETA PARMANAND: As I am the only woman Member to speak.....

SHRI JASPAT ROY KAPOOR: One to a male Member and one to a female Member. Equitable distribution.

DR. SHRIMATI SEETA PARMANAND: Mr. Deputy Chairman, the Bill to which 3 J days have been devoted is about to be passed, and let us hope that all the criticisms that have been offered here will be borne in mind by the Minister and the promises given by her will be carried out. It was indeed fortunate that this House had so much time to devote to this important subject, on which the country feels so strongly. But it was equally unfortunate that, in spite of the clear way in which Members put their views before the House, she should have thought that the House did not understand her. I thought, in humility, that one could have said that perhaps she

was not able to make herself clear to the House. I would have appreciated that better.

However, I would like just to deal with one or two points and refer to the promises made by the hon. Minister with regard to giving the first chance to Ayurveda in this college by teaching history of medicine, as she said, she would do in that college. I do not want to dilate on this point. "But I feel that mere teaching of history of medicine is not giving Ayurveda its real place in this college in the sense in which this House wants it, and in which Ayurveda really would benefit. After all, if teaching of history or the knowing of the history of Ayurveda is going to be enough, most of us could be called doctors. Because we are quite conversant ourselves with the history of Ayurveda. "What is required is—I think, even at this stage, the hon. Minister will excuse me for again referring to it—that Ayurveda should be given a greater chance to bring up all its old store of knowledge for being put through clinical experiments, tests, etc., and get rid of its inferiority complex. The reason why we were anxious from the beginning, that Ayurveda—when I say Ayurveda, I am referring to the other two systems—should get a chance, right from the beginning, if possible—if not as soon as may be—of being given the same treatment as Allopathy was that this inferiority complex in the minds of vaidyas should be removed. There was also another reason that, because of continued neglect the vaidas had been feeling despondent. Even after the attainment of independence, they had not got any impetus to show their knowledge and come forward. The class of really learned vaidyas would die down and there would not be people who would be able, as people who already knew the science, to deliver the goods. Secondly, by putting the Ayurveda and other branches along with Allopathy, the superiority complex of these people would have gone.

Sir, I want to refer to one more point about the undergraduate college being located in Delhi, in spite of all the arguments advanced about congestion in other places and so on. The hon. Minister even now said that she would like to make it the finest "Undergraduate college in the country. That is a very good ambition. Nobody would have anything to say against it. But it is hoped that it would not happen that, while giving admission to postgraduate students, those students coming from the finest college, would bar admission to other students from other colleges who would not be considered on a par with them. So, it is necessary, that in the rules that would be made, there should be some Statewise quota reserved, so that students from all over the country can get enough facilities.

Lastly, I would like here to refer to a matter that fell from the lips of the hon. Minister when she was speaking during the first reading. She made a reference to the remarks with regard to some officers in the Secretariat that fell from the lips of some Members of this House. I wish she had quoted what the remarks were. Her statement was made in an irritating tone and was equally irritating to hear. Sir, after all, it is the right of this House, if at all they feel that something should be done by the Ministry, to criticise the Ministry. It does not mean that no remark is to be made. I do not know who made that remark. Some other Members also felt that. We had a discussion about that. But this House has every right to criticise anybody if they consider that a thing has not been done in the way it should be done, and it need not be argued that the officers are not here to defend. They cannot be here to defend, when the Minister is here. The Minister is their representative. She called herself the 'chief servant of her Ministry'. She is there to reply. Let no blame be put in that manner on Members, and they need not be reprimanded in the manner that was done. Everybody felt a little annoyed about it.

[Dr. Shreemati Seeta Parmanand] Lastly, Sir, we wish the Institute all good luck, and we would like to see it the best in the world, because the hon. Minister said—I think it was in her speech—that students from the East would also be perhaps attracted. We like others also to benefit. But we hope that if the impetus that we expect to be given to Ayurveda and Unani systems of medicine is not possible to come within the scope of this Bill, she would come forward with an amending Bill if necessary, in a short time.

4 P.M.

SHRI H. P. SAKSENA: Sir, I have seen during the last four days the heart-rending spectacle of democracy being converted into totalitarianism. The entire Bill which we are going to pass very soon was pre-planned pre-determined, and all the clauses were pre-decided. There was no room, no scope for any amendment, or addition or subtraction from the Bill. No amendments of any name or nature were accepted.

Sir, I am wedded to the indigenous systems of medicine. I look upon Ayurveda and Unani as the proud heritage of our country, but what I have been seeing during the last four days is the cruel banishment of these systems of medicine from our land. I have taken it in that light, but I may be wrong. I cannot be a party to stepmotherly treatment being given to the indigenous systems of medicine in our own country, which are akin to our traditions, our usage and our custom. We are wedded to these systems of medicine. I still hold that the system of medicine, which I persist in calling 'Allopathy', was imposed upon us by our British rulers. Otherwise, it would have had no place in this country, and it would never have grown to be such a powerful opponent of the indigenous systems of medicine, as it has been during the last two centuries. Sir, it was time now, in our independent state of things, to undo the wrong that was done to our country, by

reviving the indigenous systems of medicine, but I am sorry to find that no steps are taken to start even that process of revival of the indigenous systems of medicine, and I see no bright future for their revival. It is a very painful sight for me. I only hope and pray that better times will come when things will change and take a different form and the indigenous systems of medicine, which have been banished from their own home, in favour of a system of medicine which is entirely alien to our way of life, will be restored to their old and pristine glory. To say that sufficient and due care is being taken, and will be taken in future to revive research in the science of Ayurveda, is to beg the question. Even today, there is no research needed in the realm of Ayurveda. It has withstood the test of research over thousands and thousands of years, and even today, it can beat the other systems of medicine hollow, provided it is given encouragement at the hands of the State, but it does not get that encouragement. Sir, I cannot give my support to this measure. The reason is obvious. I only hope and pray that a time will come when these things, which are unpleasant to the majority of the people of this country, will change, and things will be done in a manner which befits the conditions of life of our poor people here.

SHRI JASPAT ROY KAPOOR: Would you not like something said in favour of the hon. Minister? I would finish in two minutes.

DR. W. S. BARLINGAY: I am not going to take more than three minutes.

Mr. Deputy Chairman, now that we are about to pass this Bill, it is necessary to make a few observations. One of the observations which I want to make, and make emphatically on the floor of this House, is that I at any rate am thoroughly dissatisfied with the policy, not only of this Government, but also of the State Governments in respect of both Ayurveda and Homeopathy. I will not repeat why I am so dissatisfied. I tell you that, if

this present policy continues for another ten years, Ayurveda and Homeopathy will have vanished entirely from this country. Of course, I do not want to dilate on this point further. Now that the hon. Minister has assured us—and I believe her—that she is a friend of Ayurveda and Homeopathy, I hope that this policy will be suitably revised. That is one point. The second observation which I want to make is this: today, our health is in the hands of the Allopaths. I am very sorry to say that the Allopaths of today have not got an open and receptive mind with regard to the other systems of medicine, but unfortunately, the future of Ayurveda and Homeopathy is today in their hands.

Today, ask an Allopath, "Do you know Homeopathy"? He says, "No". "Have you studied Ayurveda"? He says, "No". He is not ashamed of himself for his ignorance. On the other hand, he is proud in his heart of hearts. He thinks that these are inferior systems. This is really a disgraceful feeling. Therefore, the point which I wish to urge—and very humbly and respectfully urge—before the hon. Minister is, that the future of Ayurveda and Homeopathy should never "be entrusted to people who have no faith in these systems. We must immediately have in the Centre, and in the States, people in charge of these systems, who are themselves versed in them. For instance, in the case of Homeopathy, it should be in charge of a Homeopath. There should be a Deputy Director of Health Services who is a Homeopath, and so also for Ayurveda, to be in charge of these systems. I think, this suggestion should be carried out as soon as possible.

Then the last thing I will say, and then I will have finished. I said in my original speech that today, why are the Homeopaths and Vaidyas suffering? What is the disease from which they are suffering? That is the main point to which I wish to draw the attention of the House. The disease is,

that they do not have the same status, the same emoluments, the same opportunities for their well-being and development. That is the main thing. Today, ask an ordinary Vaidya what he earns in the villages. While an Allopath will immediately become an Assistant Surgeon getting about Rs. 350 a month, an Ayurvedic Vaidya will get about Rs. 40 a month. When this is the state of things, does the hon. Minister imagine that the intellect in this country will ever flow into these channels? I ask her, who will take to Ayurveda and Homeopathy after she has destroyed it?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: It is all beside the point.

DR. W. S. BARLINGAY: These are the main points that I wanted to make in the last stage of the Bill.

SHRI JASPAT ROY KAPOOR: Sir, at the closing part of the debate, which has served a useful purpose of bringing home to the Government, and particularly to the hon. Minister in charge of the Bill, how keenly we feel about the Indian system of medicine, I have been able to persuade myself to strike an appreciative note about this measure read along with the assurances given by the hon. Minister in charge of the Bill. I would like to offer her my sincere congratulations for the great change that has taken place in her views, ever since her election campaign and now. She started her election campaign by refusing to her voters a promise that she would support Ayurveda and Unani systems. We are happy to find that, during the course of her Minister-ship, she has to her credit the Cabinet decision which she read out, and today, she has gone to the length of assuring us that she will be making all-out efforts to give help to Ayurveda and Unani systems of medicine.

This Bill originally intended to cover only Allopathic system of medicine, but so worded, unintentionally or

[Shri Jaspal Roy Kapoor.] intentionally, I don't know, as to cover Ayurveda and Unani systems and all other systems of medicine, and ultimately interpreted even by the hon. Minister herself to include these systems of medicine, because, only under that interpretation could she persuade herself to offer us a promise that she will have a Chair of Ayurveda also in this institution, and also she would allow research in Ayurvedic system in this Institute, is a happy end to this measure. I hope and trust that, under clause 14, the hon. Minister would be able to do a good deal for the Indian systems of medicine. For, clause 14 as you yourself were pleased to remark Mr. Deputy Chairman, is not an exhaustive clause, but it is only illustrative in some measure as to what should be done to implement the aims and objects of this Bill. The amendment relating to the inclusion in the Institute of representatives of Indian medicines has not been accepted by her, but then, I would appeal to hon. Members of Parliament, that since they will now have the opportunity of electing three Members out of them, they will see to it that these Members of Parliament are such as properly represent these three systems of medicine, unless of course, the other members who are nominated by the Government are competent to do the same.

Sir, we wish this institution good luck and prosperity, and we hope and trust, that before long, it will be one of the finest institutions in this country, and it will turn out graduates and postgraduates with efficiency, which is equal to that which experienced doctors acquire, by going over to England and other countries. We hope and trust, that in due course, we shall be proud of this institution, not only because it will be the greatest institution for the training of Allopathic students, but also for Ayurveda and Unani. The hon. Minister need not bring a new measure for Homeopathic, Unani or Ayurvedic systems, but since the scope of this is wide enough, she should make fullest use of this measure, and give the greatest possi-

ble support to the Unani and Ayurvedic systems under the cover of this Bill itself.

RAJKUMARI AMRIT KAUR: Sir, I don't want to detain the House any more. We have talked practically for four days on what I consider is an extremely simple measure, the intention of which measure has been known to the Members of this House for ages. But as I say, the opportunity was taken to make it into a regular battle for Ayurveda. I have said that I am doing what I can for Ayurveda. I will continue to do what I can for it, and I hope that research in Ayurveda and Unani, and even in Homeopathy, will yield results, and people will be able to derive benefit from them, and that it will flow into the broad stream of modern medicine, but in this teaching and training institution, as I have said, the intention was that it shall be there for modern medicine, because after all, there are 42 medical colleges in this country. The demands that come to me from the States are not for Ayurvedic colleges. They are always for colleges for Modern Medicine. India cannot remain behind in any science, and particularly not in this vital science. We have got to push ahead in this science. Whatever Ayurveda has got to give, whatever Unani has got to give, we shall try to get all that we can from them, and I want this Institute to be a unique institute, and to be able to give to our people—the young men and women doctors—the opportunities for study for postgraduate education that they have not until now been able to have in their own country. Not only that. It will, I hope, draw students from the whole of the South East Asia zone, and even from abroad. I want this to be something wonderful, of which India can be proud, and I want India to be proud of it, but I don't want this Institute to be cramped in any way. Sir, I am grateful to the House for having supported the measure.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

"That the Bill be passed."

The motion was adopted.