

THE UNIVERSITY GRANTS COMMISSION BILL, 1955

THE DEPUTY MINISTER FOR EDUCATION (DR. K. L. SHRIMALI): Sir, I move:

"That the Bill to make provision for the co-ordination and determination of standards in Universities and for that purpose, to establish a University Grants Commission, as passed by the Lok Sabha, be taken into consideration."

Sir, the House has had an opportunity to discuss the general principles and the purposes for which the University Grants Commission was being set up by the Government. During the course of that discussion several suggestions were made by hon. Members and there was also a lot of criticism regarding the various clauses of the Bill. The Select Committee examined all the criticisms very carefully and they have considerably modified the Bill. Sir, the general feeling of this House as well as of the Members of the Select Committee was that the autonomy of the Universities would be seriously affected through the setting up of the University Grants Commission in the way in which it was originally envisaged in the original Bill.

12 NOON.

Before I come to the various clauses, I would like to tell the House that that feeling was very strongly expressed in the Select Committee also. In our country, there are at present, two extreme views with regard to the relationship between the Universities and the Government. There are some people who believe that the Universities should have absolute autonomy, that they should be allowed to function in the way in which they like and that Government should not interfere in any way with their working. There is then another school of thought which believes that Governmental control and direction is necessary in order that the Universities might serve the

national purpose. The general feeling in this House as well as in the Select Committee was that the Bill as it was originally drafted would seriously affect the relationship between Government and the Universities and that it would be detrimental to the natural development of the Universities thus affecting seriously the autonomy of the Universities. In view of that various amendments were incorporated in the Bill now before the House. I am glad to inform the House that the Government accepted all the amendments moved in the Select Committee. There was only one amendment which we had to move and that will be explained later by me.

SHRI JASPAT ROY KAPOOR (Uttar Pradesh): I hope he will continue to do so here also.

DR. K. L. SHRIMALI: Sir, we believe that we have to create a kind of partnership between the Government and the Universities. There is no rivalry between the Universities and the Government. They both have a social purpose and the Universities work for the realisation of that social purpose as much as the Government does. There is, however, one thing which I should like to make clear on this occasion. In an age of planning, when we are planning our national life, some kind of planning in regard to the Universities is also inevitable. I do not subscribe to the view that the Universities should have absolute autonomy. I do not believe that any social institution could have absolute autonomy. All the social institutions have to work within a certain social framework and our Universities should also realise that they must adjust to the major social needs and be responsive to the changes that are taking place in our society. If they do not do this, I do not think they serve the purpose for which they have been set up.

Secondly, I would also like to say that though Government are anxious to maintain the autonomy of the Universities, Government are also vitally interested that the development of the

[Dr. K. L. Shrimali.] Universities should go forward and that it should be responsive to national needs. Government cannot be completely indifferent to what is happening in the Universities. We know through various reports that all is not well with the Universities and that there are all kinds of factions and groups and intrigues. In such circumstances, I do not think that Government can be completely indifferent to what is happening in the Universities. So, some kind of planning will have to be necessary but, as I said, Sir, there need not be any kind of an opposition between State control and University autonomy. In a planned society, we have to ensure the freedom of the Universities and, at the same time, we have to bring about some kind of planning and synthesis between these two. We have to realise the broad objectives which are laid down in the Constitution. In your Report, Sir, you have very clearly laid out that the Universities must realise that broad democratic objective. So, Government cannot be indifferent as regards those broad objectives and national purposes are concerned but, within that framework, we are anxious to see that the Universities maintain their autonomy, that the Universities are allowed to develop in their own way, that there should be healthy relationship between Government and the Universities and that there should not be day to day interference from the side of the Government in regard to the working of the Universities. We hope, Sir, that the setting up of the University Grants Commission will bring about that kind of a healthy relationship between Government and the Universities. Our whole purpose is that while we wish to combine freedom and planning, we wish to ensure that vital freedom for the Universities which is essential for the healthy development.

After this general statement, I would like to come to the main clauses which have been amended by the Select Committee which have been now approved by the Lok Sabha. On

clause 2, there was a good deal of discussion. There was a general feeling that an attempt should be made to bring the various kinds of colleges affiliated as well as constituted under the purview of the Commission. Now, at this stage, Government are not in a position to bring all the affiliated colleges under the purview of the Commission. Not that Government does not want to do it but our funds are limited. However, some amendments have been made in clause 2 which will empower the Commission to recognise such institutions as it thinks proper, on the recommendations of the University and in accordance with the regulations to be made in this behalf. Now, that leaves the gate open and if there are funds available, it will be possible for the Commission to recognise such institutions for the purpose of grants.

SHRI H. P. SAKSENA (Uttar Pradesh) : On its own initiative or on the sanction of the Government?

DR. K. L. SHRIMALI: The University Grants Commission will have to recognise. The recommendations will be made by the Universities and the University Grants Commission will recognise those institutions for the purposes of grants.

There was a good deal of discussion with regard to the composition of the Commission. As I said, there was a kind of general distrust and suspicion regarding the motives of the Government.

PROF. G. RANGA (Andhra): Of the authorities, not of Government.

DR. K. L. SHRIMALI: There was a general feeling that the Commission is being appointed to control the Universities and that a body was being set up which will not allow the Universities to function in a free manner. Sir, in order to create a spirit of trust I accepted all the amendments which were made by the Select Committee and as a result of that discussion and as a result of those recommendations, we shall

now have a non-official Chairman. In the original Bill it was clearly specified that the Chairman might be an official or a non-official, but the Select Committee was keen that the Chairman should be non-official and we have accepted that recommendation. We have also accepted that the majority of the members should be non-officials. As we read this clause we will find that out of the nine members, five members will be non-officials and four would be officials. I may here again

SHRI H. N. KUNZRU (Uttar Pradesh) : Is it necessary that all the four should be officials?

DR. K. L. SHRIMALI: I may make this point clear. It is never the intention of the Government to have too many official members on this commission. As far as possible we shall try to find non-official members. The Government are delegating certain responsibilities to an independent body and Government have no intention that through its members to be nominated, official members, it should control the policies, it should control the day to day working of the Commission in any way. Sir, as I said, the original clause, if the Members would look at it, was very elastic; in fact we had not laid down any rigid constitution; we had mentioned that there will be only two official representatives one from the Ministry of Education, and we expected one from the Ministry of Finance, but the Select Committee was keen that the quota should be fixed up, that out of the nine members there must be at least five non-official members, and I am glad to say that the Government have accepted that recommendation. As I said, Sir, the four members also need not be officials. If the Government can find more competent people outside the officials, they would certainly welcome these members on the Commission. The Government are only keen that the Commission should be manned by a man of ability, by a man of character, by people who

98 RSD.—3

understand the working of the Universities.

SHRI H. C. DASAPPA (Mysore): Two at least will be officers. The Commission shall have a minimum of two officers.

DR. K. L. SHRIMALI: Yes, two at least, that is, out of the four educationists two may be officials.

Then I come to clause 6. There was certain reference to the termination of the appointment of members. Power was given in the original Bill, but the Select Committee felt that that power should not be given to the Government and they laid down that Government should not have any discretion to terminate the appointment of a member of the Commission. I am glad to say that the Government have also accepted that recommendation.

Then, Sir, in clause 13 there was a good deal of discussion and it was felt that the scope of inspection of the Universities by the University Grants Commission should not be unlimited, that it should be limited only to certain specific purposes. Here again the whole attitude of the Government is to create a kind of trust among the Universities and among the people that we really wish the Universities to develop on right lines. Therefore we have accepted that amendment also.

Then, Sir, about clause 18, the Select Committee felt that the annual reports should be placed before the Houses of Parliament. Firstly I was not very keen about this, but since it was the desire of the members I have accepted this recommendation also. Sir, there is a convention in the British Parliament that ordinarily questions are not asked regarding the grants given to the Universities by the University Grants Commission. I think it a healthy convention.

PROF G. RANGA: I do not think so.

DR. K. L. SHRIMALI: They wish to keep the Universities out of politics. They have such a great trust in the University Grants Commission that

[Dr. K. L. Shrimali.] once grants are made by the University Grants Commission, nobody questions the integrity or nobody questions the sense of justice of the members who are working on that Commission. Though we shall place the reports before the Parliament, I do hope that we shall learn from the practices of the British Parliament in this respect.

SHRI H. P. SAKSENA: But we know our functions; we do not need any sermon on that score.

DR. K. L. SHRIMALI: I am not giving any sermon. I am only quoting what is being done in another country and since the reference was made in this House to the University Grants Committee of the United Kingdom I am only saying what is being done in England.

SHRI R. P. N. SINHA (Bihar): The circumstances are different in the two countries.

DR. K. L. SHRIMALI: It is quite true that our University Grants Commission is very different from the University Grants Committee of England. There it is a body appointed by the Treasury. Ours is going to be a statutory body and naturally there are certain basic differences. But there are certain healthy practices which the University Grants Committee of U.K. has developed and I think we can benefit by the experience of this University Grants Committee. I do not think there is any harm in making a reference to the good work that that Committee has done.

Then, Sir, with regard to clause 20, there was a good deal of discussion and many people felt that there should be no reference to national purposes. In the first place some people objected to the fact that Government should in any way direct the Commission as far as policies are concerned, but I am glad that the Select Committee ultimately agreed that Government have a right to draw the attention of the Commission to what the national policies are and I think it is the duty

of the Commission to see that the national policies are realised in practice by the Universities. But, Sir, it is very difficult to say what the national policy is. There cannot be an absolute national policy at all times. National policies differ from time to time. We have accepted a certain pattern of society in our country. Now all the social institutions including the Universities will have to work within that particular social framework, and it was felt that as far as broad national policies are concerned, it is the duty of the Government to tell the Commission what the broad national policies are, and I think the Universities also should try to realise those social objectives which have been laid down in our Constitution.

Sir, these are the main amendments which have been made by the Select Committee and the Lok Sabha has accepted and passed this Bill with that one amendment which, in fact, the Government moved in the Select Committee also but then the chairman there gave a ruling and said it was out of order.

Sir, the Bill makes it quite clear that the grants may be given for general or specific purposes and we felt that the maintenance of the Central Universities could easily come under the purview of that clause. Since some doubt was raised, the Government moved an amendment that the maintenance of Central Universities should also be the function of the University Grants Commission and I am glad to say that the Lok Sabha has passed that amendment and I hope that would be approved by this House also.

Sir, there has been a repeated doubt and suspicion about our motives, but the way in which the Government has approached this Bill, the way in which all the recommendations have been accepted by the Government, I do hope that the suspicion and distrust would be removed.

Sir, in this connection, as regards the relations of the Government and

the University Grants Commission I cannot do better than quote a few sentences from the book 'Crisis in the Universities' written by Sir Charles Moberly, who was Chairman of the University Grants Committee for a long time. He says that "proper relations between Government in all its grades and universities is not that of master and servant, still less that of artificer and tool. It is not even that of superior and subordinate officer. It is that of partners in a common enterprise." It is that kind of partnership which we wish to establish in our country. "They do not meet as diplomats representing rival powers each striving to extort as much and to make as little concession as possible. They meet as allies for consultation rather than debate, as Churchill and Roosevelt used to meet in war time rather than as Bevin and Molotov meet today. Except in a physical sense they are not on the opposite sides of the table. They are united by a common purpose though they have different angles of approach, different intellectual contributions to make and hence are likely to do a better job by pooling their ideas. The technique of such contact is not only to eliminate but often to capitalise friction."

Sir, it is with that attitude that we approach this question and I hope that by setting up this Commission we are setting up a kind of agency which will create a partnership between the Government and the Universities. I move, Sir, that the Bill be taken into consideration.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Motion moved:

"That the Bill to make provision for the co-ordination and determination of standards in Universities and for that purpose, to establish a University Grants Commission, as passed by the Lok Sabha, be taken into consideration."

SHRI H. P. SAKSENA: May I avail myself, Sir, of this opportunity of enquiring about the health of the hon.

Minister for Education? Was it indisposition that prevented him from coming to this House and presenting this important Bill or was it something else?

DR. K. L. SHRIMALI: Sir, this should be ruled out of order because the Deputy Minister is here and I do not see any reason why hon. Members should raise that question at all.

SHRI H. P. SAKSENA: I simply wanted to know that in order to satisfy my own anxiety about his health. I do not think I was out of order, Sir.

SHRI S. N. MAZUMDAR (West Bengal): Mr. Chairman, Dr. Shrimali has referred to the criticism made about the Bill which was referred to the Joint Select Committee and he said that the Government had tried to meet some of the criticisms in the light of the recommendations of this committee. But I must say, Sir, that his statement is not convincing at all. The apprehensions which were expressed still exist and they have reason to exist. Now, Sir, the constitution of the University Grants Commission is a very necessary thing. We all welcome it and we all want that it should work in a proper manner. But certain very pertinent doubts were raised and the main doubt related to the question of university autonomy. Sir, I agree with Dr. Shrimali that there cannot be any absolute autonomy. That is true, but while going through the report of the University Education Commission it can be seen that there also the scope of autonomy has been properly defined. After going through all the relevant factors the University Education Commission had found it necessary to sound a note of warning that standards should not be equated with State control. Now, it is true that Universities should be responsive to changes; it is true that there are factions inside Universities. All these things should be changed but they cannot be changed by Government action. In order to change much of the undesirable things that exist in Universities, in my opinion other measures should be adopted.

[Shri S. N. Mazumdar.]

Firstly, in connection with university education today there are two things. One is that the whole system of education is lopsided and the other is in order to change that and to make improvements money is necessary. It is in accordance with the recommendations of the University Education Commission that this is going to be set up but the manner in which the Board is to be set up, the manner in which the powers and functions of the Board are defined leaves it open to doubt that the grant of money may lead in many cases to the infringement of university autonomy.

As regards the removal of factions inside Universities, I think the best means is to democratise Universities. Formerly, the Universities were the preserves of a narrow group of people. I do not know whether the word 'coterie' could be properly used because it cannot be universally used with regard to all the Universities. If the method of election to the governing bodies of Universities are widened, then new blood can be injected into them and fresh breath and wider vision can be brought to bear. Sir, in the University Education Commission it has been emphasized more and more that educational system should be responsive. The system of education should be responsive to social changes; there should be fresh vision and there should be responsiveness to the changing course of life. In order to do that the governing bodies of Universities should be constituted in such a way that new people who are in touch with the current of progressive thought, who are in touch with the changing pattern of life today may find a place there. Experience and at the same time this new outlook should be combined. In the recommendations of the University Education Commission it has been particularly emphasized that these two things should be combined in all matters; that is, past heritage or experience along with responsiveness to the current social changes. These two should be properly combined and integrated. In the personnel of the

governing bodies of the Universities also they should be combined. I have in mind the particular example of the Calcutta University. In the last elections to the Senate and the Syndicate, some new blood, some new people could be elected though their number was not very large. Those people who were in touch with the progressive current of thought, though few in number were able to make their influence felt there in suggesting certain changes. If it is broadened then much can be done. In the constitution of the governing bodies of the Universities, the teaching staff, research scholars and others should also find their way.

In order to avoid factions something more should be done. I do not know whether I can place it as a general proposition but I think it is better that generally the Rajyapals should cease to be automatically Chancellors of Universities. There are complaints—in connection with one University I remember—that the wrong handling of the Chancellory had much to do, and one of the Ministers of that State had also much to do, with the wrongs in that University.

Then, Sir, the hon. Deputy Minister has said that the Government has accepted some of the recommendations of the Select Committee as regards the constitution of the Board. But that does not go far to meet the criticisms or to allay the doubts which were raised. Firstly, it is necessary for the proper functioning of the Universities to create a proper climate for education in our country and to create that proper climate for education one of the most necessary things is the constitution of this Commission itself. The Government has said that it has accepted the recommendation that the Chairman will be a non-official. The Government has also accepted that the majority of the members of the Commission will be non-officials. But still the principle of nomination is there. Why is it necessary to have all the members nominated by the Govern-

ment? It is true that the Government will provide the funds but it is also true that those persons who are outstanding in the field of education or research are the best persons to carry out the necessary reforms in the Universities. And these persons should come there in a democratic manner. That is my personal point of view

PROF. O. RANGA: Again, factions will come in.

SHRI S. N. MAZUMDAR: Why should there be faction? Prof. Ranga will explain it later on. I do not accept the proposition of Prof. Ranga that Government nomination will eliminate factionalism. We know that if there are only one or two officials on the Commission, they may not influence it by their number. But one who pays calls the tune and here the Government is paying the money. As the officials will be there they will be calling the tune. And here also we have reasons for apprehension, because instances have happened where the officials of the Education Ministry have behaved in a highhanded manner with the Vice-Chancellor of a University who was a distinguished educationist. So, I have suggested in the amendments which I have given notice of that the composition of the Commission should be widened and they should come through some form of election. The Vice-Chancellors may elect from among themselves a certain number; then from different faculties they may elect a certain number. In this way they should come. Then, the number of members of the Commission should also be increased, because in such a vast country as India with so much variety, I think, the number nine for a Commission is not very big. Rather it is too small and the number should be increased.

Secondly, the hon. Deputy Minister has said that the Chairman will be a non-official, but the Chairman will be nominated. Here, we have two-fold nomination—first, the members will be nominated, then the Chairman will

be nominated. Why is it necessary for the Chairman to be nominated? What principle is violated if the members of the Commission elect the Chairman from among themselves. I do not understand why the Government cannot accept this important principle in this connection.

Then, Sir, as regards the powers of the Commission also, some doubts were expressed and the doubts are there. The doubts are there because it cannot be claimed from the side of the Government that the Government will be the repository of all wisdom and all knowledge. As I have said before, first the proper climate for the proper functioning of the Universities should be created and we have a good guide, for the work of creating that climate, in the recommendations of the University Education Commission. If all powers are left to the Government, these powers may be misused. Here, the hon. Deputy Minister gave certain assurances, but then we know that in our country today many institutions require overhauling—not only the Universities but the Administration also requires overhauling

PROF. G. RANGA: That is true.

SHRI S. N. MAZUMDAR: And in the Administration also, it is necessary to inject new life, men with fresh outlook, men with fresh vision. And then, in the Administration, if people who are placed there—with all respect to their integrity and to their honesty—have absolute power in their hands, that may lead to petty tyrannies, to the exercise of this power in an undesirable way. Therefore, even as regards the functions of this Commission, these doubts arise.

Then, another doubt which was expressed, when we discussed this for reference to the Select Committee was in connection with the question of standardization. What we require today as regards our educational system and as regards the functioning of the Universities is expansion,

[Shri S. N. Mazumdar.] improvement, renovation and even coordination of teaching and research, because, as I have already said—it is not my saying, it is the authoritative finding of the University Education Commission—our educational system is lopsided. It should be changed, it should be overhauled. Now, if, without giving proper attention to those matters, we simply get hold of a certain formula', this formula may often infiltrate through different layers of officialdom, and it may come to a stage where they will act in a way which is quite contrary to what was intended by the Legislature in passing this Bill. Standardization is a very vague term and in connection with this it should be borne in mind that India is a unity in diversity. And here our emphasis and our desire should be to bring about a united Indian culture—not to bring about but to develop this united Indian culture. But that united Indian culture, which we are going to develop, rests on the contribution of diverse factors—diversity of different regions, different languages, and different regional cultures. These do not Contradict each other. That is an accepted principle. But in the name of standardization, this may be interfered with.

This, again, may lead to the doubt which has been expressed and which was expressed in the Select Committee also, that there may be interference as regards the medium of instruction in the different Universities. Now, these apprehensions or reasons for the apprehensions exist and that cannot be ignored. Now, Sir, as I have said on a previous occasion also, as regards this medium of instruction, as regards the question of federal language—as regards the question of the relation of the federal language and the regional languages,—we have a very good direction for action in the report of the University Education Commission. But that is not always followed. Proper attention is not always paid to that. Even in connection with the development of the federal language

I am fully in agreement with the suggestion of the University Education Commission that the federal language should be developed on the basis of a living language. It should not lose touch with the living language of the people. But we find that in developing the federal language, these things are not always followed. It is a mistake, it is a matter of regret that this word "federal language" has not been popularised. Whenever any apprehensions about Hindi arise, it arises mostly because of certain misconceptions among the non-Hindi speaking people, that Hindi is going to replace their language. We have studied this problem and we know that it is not the case. Sir, the University Education Commission has stated in certain clear terms and if these are popularised and publicised, much of the doubts can be removed. It is that Hindi has been accepted as the federal language, not as the national language. If Hindi is the national language, then all the other languages are as much national language as Hindi. It is a federal language. There are regional languages. There should be proper relation between the two.

Then, as regards the medium of higher education in different Universities, this is a matter which is very controversial, on which till now most of our educationists have not been able to come to a unanimous or agreed conclusion. I remember that in 1953 there was a conference of oriental scholars in Poona. Perhaps, Dr. Kane who is a Member of this House also attended that conference. They discussed various questions and among them was this question of the medium of instruction for higher education in the different Universities. I agree broadly with the conclusions of that conference, but it is not a question of nay agreeing or disagreeing. It is a question that these apprehensions do exist here. Therefore, taking the things as they exist today into consideration, a proper attempt should be made to remove the grounds for this misapprehension or doubt.

Again, I say in connection with this Bill that the composition of the Board assumes importance because there is scope for further apprehension that the Board which is going to be constituted is going to work more or less like a department of the Government, and that is why it is necessary to pay all our attention to this matter. The Government have accepted certain recommendations of the Select Committee. Tuen, neither the Government nor the majority of the members of the Select Committee could say that the apprehensions expressed in the Select Committee were baseless. The principle in connection with this Bill is not controversial. But the proper thing for the Government should be to show, even at this stage, some response to the criticisms expressed in this House. And then only the constitution of the University Grants Commission which is a very necessary thing and which we all want to come into existence with the sanction of the Legislature as soon as possible will serve the purpose.

:[MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN in the Chair.]

"There are some other points and I shall deal with them when coming to amendments.

THE PARLIAMENTARY SECRETARY TO THE MINISTER FOR EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRIMATI LAKSHMI MENON) : Mr. Deputy Chairman, I welcome this Bill, but I also share the apprehensions expressed by the previous speaker. I must admit that the statement made by the hon. Deputy Minister tried to reconcile two absolutely irreconcilable things. In one breath he said that the Bill tried to recognize the need for autonomy for the University, although he himself does not believe that any social institution or educational institution should be absolutely autonomous. On the other hand, he said that there must be a certain amount of control. But that control itself is not properly denned. This is really due to the fact that we think in terms of autonomous British Universities and act in a way that is

not in conformity with those principles. So, on the eve of what he referred to as a meeting of Churchill and Roosevelt—he quoted Moberly—we have a deal which is not going to produce the same result as the meeting of Churchill and Roosevelt. The much alluded partnership between the State and a University is not possible under this Bill. For instance, this Bill is supposed to make an attempt to co-ordinate university education and also determine standards. If we read the various clauses of this Bill, the impression we get is that it is an attempt to impose government control over Universities. The Deputy Minister did not conceal the deep concern that the Government feels in regard to the recent deterioration in the standards of Universities and the group politics which has been corrupting university life. Speaking from my experience of two Universities and the changes that have taken place during the last 25 years, I agree and I also share that concern and the fear that unless something is done to improve matters or change the constitution or standards of the Universities, we are on a wrong path altogether. But the question is whether this Bill meets the situation. My belief is that it does not. It is all well and good to say that we must have men of integrity and that the members of the Commission will all be honest men and above board *and* therefore the advice that they give will not be a source of interest for the Members of Parliament and others who vote for the money and that the Parliament could give complete autonomy to the Commission to do things as it likes. But at the same time, the fear is genuine when we say that the control will not encourage the development of Universities, but will also kill whatever autonomy Universities have today.

SHRI H. N. KUNZRU: Which control does the hon. Member mean—the control of the Government over the University Grants Commission or the control of the University Grant? Commission over the Universities?

SHRIMATI LAKSHMI MENON: The control of the University Grants Commission over the Universities. I will answer you, because the constitution of the Commission itself is open to doubt as to its ability to grant perfect autonomy to Universities. You have two representatives of Government and there is also a class of educational experts or people with academic distinctions. It is quite possible that the only people of academic distinction that the Government might know are from their own service. It is quite possible; I am not going to say that it is going to be like that

SHRI JASPAT ROY KAPOOR: Such nominees may even probably be Parliamentary Secretaries.

SHRIMATI LAKSHMI MENON: Apart from personal matters, I am just saying that it is quite likely. After all, the Education Ministry consists of expert and educationists. It consists of men of academic distinction. We are driving the Government to nominate a few people from the Education Ministry, that is the control that I was referring to. After all, we are human beings and we have got our own traditional way of looking at things and doing them. It is no use looking to Great Britain. The entire tradition of the British university system is absolutely different from that of our university system in this country. Therefore, it is no good comparing two dissimilar things to produce a common result.

PROF. N. R. MALKANI (Nominated): The words "or who have experience in administrative or financial matters" have now been deleted.

SHRIMATI LAKSHMI MENON: But the difficulty is with the nominees. You may be thinking differently.

Another very essential thing is the policy relating to 'national purposes'. It is true that Universities everywhere

are responsive to any change—change in outlook, change in ideals and change in everything. Have we not in our own life-time witnessed the changes that have taken place in the British university education? The old University of Oxford and Cambridge have changed. There have been changes in syllabus, in attitudes and in standards. All these are due to their responsiveness to the changing needs of the society. We cannot bring out these changes by legislation or by appointing a University Grants Commission. These changes take place unknown to ourselves as a result of the impact of social needs. These things will be recognized and are being recognized by Universities. When we have measures for expansion of courses or concentrate on certain subjects, we are recognizing these changes and for that, I do not think that this Bill is necessary nor are we going to control it by means of this Bill.

Sir, we are told that there will be complete autonomy within the particular democratic objectives. In my opinion no University can develop independently unless there is complete autonomy, and the grant that you give, should not be subject to any kind of restriction at all. What happens in this Bill? If as a result of an inspection the Commission finds that the University is not maintaining standards, it can cut down the grant. After all, considering what the Universities are today, even with the amount of money that you give, it will take time before the University can bring itself to a certain standard. In the meantime if you find the conditions on which the grant is made are not fulfilled there will be a withdrawal of the grant and everything will go back perhaps to its original stage. Autonomy in University does not mean that the University should be tied down by the Government. However much the Government may be concerned about the University education, autonomy means the freedom of an institution to develop along the lines it thinks it should develop.

SHRI H. N. KUNZRU: If I may j Interrupt the hon. Member, where does the Government come in here?

SHRIMATI LAKSHMI MENON: Giving the grants and their withdrawal.

SHRI H. N. KUNZRU: Withdrawal of grants will be at the discretion of the U.G.C. The Government will not do it.

SHRIMATI LAKSHMI MENON: The U.G.C. itself is part of the Government by the complexion of its composition.

DR. K. L. SHRIMALI: We are establishing an independent statutory body with full powers to disburse the grants. I am rather surprised that my hon. friend, Mrs. Lakshmi Menon, thinks that Government is controlling those grants. Once the Government places the money at the disposal of the Commission it is the Commission that disburses that money.

SHRIMATI LAKSHMI MENON: The only way to answer the hon. Deputy Minister is to say that Athens is ruled by Pericles and Pericles is ruled by Aspasia and, therefore, Athens is ruled by Aspasia. This is exactly what I want to say. The Commission is appointed by the Government and then you sfty that the Commission has nothing to do with the Government and, therefore, whatever the Commission does is independent of the Government. This kind of logic needs a lot of intelligence which I do not possess.

SHRI J. S. BISHT (Uttar Pradesh): No, no. The commission is appointed for a period of six years.

SHRIMATI LAKSHMI MENON: Every time you are appointing it for a certain period. They have not understood my basic argument, namely that the Commission itself is a creation of the Government, and as such it will have the control which is really the control of the Government.

Now you say policy relating to "national purposes". What do you mean by "national purposes" to which the university should conform? You ms^ say that it should be such that it means certain "national purposes". But which is the body that is going to define the term "national purposes" To confuse it further the hon. Deputy Minister said that in planned society there must be planning, which obviously means control, i.e. bringing everything under the direct control of the Government. Why don't you say that? I am not talking about the rights and wrongs of planning. Let us sav clearly the extent of control that the Government is going to exert over the Universities, namely for standardisation or for converting it into institutions for national purposes or let us say that we believe that university education is not national education; the meaning of university education is quite different, efs it is understood right through the ages, Universities are institutions which foster knowledge, which widen our horizon of thinking and which pursue knowledge for the sake of knowledge. Let us say that. But I can't understand this kind of mingling of the essential and the non-essential, national and universal. That is my complaint about this Bill.

Of course, nobody will question that university education in India has not gone on right lines, that there has been unrestricted growth of institutions, badly financed, badly managed, ill-equipped and much of the indiscipline that we complain of today is due to the fact that adequate attention has not been paid to the financial resources of the Universities or for its developing on right lines. Sir, sometime ago when we were referring this Bill to the Select Committee, I did not mention the horrid conditions under which students live. The salaries which university teachers receive today have driven university education into a sort of mean commercial business, and to think that we can

[Shrimati Lakshmi Menon.] change the entire set-up of the Universities and bring up their morale by means of this legislation is to imagine too much or to give credence to our ability to achieve wonders within a short time.

Sir, at the same time there is need for some kind of co-ordination but how are we going to co-ordinate university education if we believe in absolute autonomy. That is one thing which I cannot understand. Mr. Mazumdar has already referred to the scant attention paid to the development of a federal language. Sir, one of the co-ordinating elements in university education in a country, so vast as India, is to develop a medium of instruction which will be the same for all Universities. Unless we do that we will be only encouraging the dissimilar tendencies which are already showing themselves in the various departments of our existence, in our struggle for linguistic units, in our struggle to have a medium of instruction in regional languages. Now, how are we going to develop a federal language

SHRI S. N. MAZUMDAR: Are you objecting to the regional language being used as medium of instruction in Universities?

SHRIMATI LAKSHMI MENON: I want to know how we are going to co-ordinate standards. According to this Bill we are going to determine university standards. If we are going to have higher education in the regional languages, some means must be evolved.

SHRI R. P. N. SINHA: May I point out to the hon. Member that even in countries like Russia there is one language as the medium of instruction for all the Universities?

SHRI N. D. M. PRASADARAO (Andhra): No, no.

SHRI SATYAPRIYA BANERJEE (West Bengal): It is not so in the Soviet.

SHRIMATI LAKSHMI MENON: In the Soviet Union, Russian is taught as a compulsory language in all the schools and colleges. In India too we must have a system like that otherwise we will never be able to take up higher education or advanced research. Let it be in the federal language. But there must be *et* purpose and impetus must be given to the development of federal language. It is not done. Now every University has its own medium of instruction. Sir, during the last 25 years I have seen that a change in the medium of instruction has brought about a complete fall in the standard of instruction. For instance, in the B.A. and M.A. classes students read books in English but they give their answers in Hindi. What they understand or what they express nobody understands. It is not my purpose to say what language we should have. That is for the hon. Deputy Minister for Education who is here. What I am saying is that we cannot have determination of standards or co-ordination of education when there is chaos in the country as far as university education is concerned. In one State the medium of instruction is English, in another State it is Hindi and in a third State it is their regional language. As I said once before, the only co-ordinating agency was the Union Public Service Commission examinations and we will have perfect pandemonium in the country.

I think "inspection and withdrawal of grants" is a thing which should not be there. Sir, you give grant to a University when after an inspection you are convinced that the University requires that kind of financial aid for expansion, development and for raising the standards. Now what is the point in giving the grant and then withdrawing it. This is a sort of punishment which confirms my original theory that this is not an independent statutory body, although on the face of it it might be so, but a department of Government which tries to tell the people, "if you do this, we will give you so much, if you do not do this

you won't have any money at all". So, let the hon. Deputy Minister tell us that the object of this Bill is to tighten the control of the Government on the Universities because the Government is deeply distressed about the deterioration of standards, fall in standards of discipline and therefore, you want better control. I can understand that. Let him say that "national purposes" means that we have got certain policies which we want to implement through the Universities, I understand that. Let him not say "we are going to have some kind of autonomy in the Universities that will conform to certain 'national purposes'". These are contradictory things. That is why I say that the hon. Minister was trying to reconcile the irreconcilable. And the wonderful speech in which he tried to justify the University Grants Commission has produced probably only a little monster.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The House stands adjourned till 2-30 P.M.

The House then adjourned for lunch at one of the clock till half past two of the clock.

The House reassembled after lunch at half past two of the clock, MR. CHAIRMAN in the Chair.

SHRI H. C. MATHUR (Rajasthan): Mr. Chairman, I regret to observe the absence of the hon. Education Minister even on such an occasion. It is unfortunate that we do not have him here during the Question Hour and not even when such important measures are being discussed in this House. I raise this point particularly, Sir, because when I was discussing the other day my Resolution, the hon. Deputy Minister raised an objection that I should not refer to the Minister's speech and make any observations, though that objection was not considered valid. But again I find myself in the same difficult, because I will have to refer to the observa-

tions made by the Education Minister, particularly concerning this measure. And it would have been much better if the Education Minister was himself here.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That will do. The Deputy Minister is here.

SHRI H. C. MATHUR: But Sir, May I know on what ceremonious occasion we may expect the hon. Minister for Education to visit this House? Now, Sir, I would like to start making some observations regarding this Bill.

Sir, this Bill may be good in certain ways. It is quite possible, Sir, that through this agency we may be able to grant certain financial assistance to this University or that University. But it is my definite feeling that this University Grants Commission Bill does not face the problem of university education as we wish it to do. I do not know the conclusion to which the Education Ministry has arrived after these eight years of freedom, and after these eight years of experience. I do not know whether it is in a position, with the present state of things and with the present scheme of things, to give effect to any national policy which we want to adopt for the development of our university education. I wish to know, Sir, the responsibility which the Central Ministry of Education is prepared to take. What is the responsibility that it is going to take, particularly in this matter of university education? Whenever any questions are raised here, we are referred to the State Governments, education being the State subject. We wish that the hon. Minister for Education is able to enlighten the House with regard to their conception of responsibility in this matter. I would like to know whether they wish to have more powers in order to give effect to the recommendations made by the University Education Commission with regard to the national plan and other matters. I would like to know whether they are in a position, with the present scheme of things, to do it, and whether they are

[Shri H. C. Mathur.]

in a position to co-ordinate the work in different Universities, and to reorientate the educational system and to control the expansion of the educational system particularly at the university stage. Sir, when this particular question was raised in the other House, the hon. Education Minister said that the question could not be brought forward when the House was discussing the University Grants Commission Bill. The question of bringing forward an amendment to the Constitution to make 'Education' a Central subject was a different matter. It is quite obvious to all of us, Sir, that we are not amending the Constitution. But we should know whether we are taking up this University Grants Commission Bill just to be able to give effect to certain schemes which we have got in our hands. This question is fundamental and basic, and it becomes relevant in this context, whether we can, in a real sense, implement those recommendations, and whether the Central Ministry of Education is in a position to do that or not. If they think that they are able to do it, then let them say so here on the floor of this House, and let us know what they feel their responsibility is, and how they are going to do it. We would like to know the steps that they propose to take in order to see that our education bears a sound relation to the social structure of our country, to the reoriented education system which we want to have. I feel, Sir, that we are being carried away by certain things unnecessarily. In the present state of affairs when we have got to recast and reshape our educational system, and when we have to bring about a certain co-ordination, I think it is extremely necessary that the Central Government should be vested with all the necessary powers. I feel that the Central Government should take over the entire responsibility for the university education in this country, at least for another ten years to come. After we have evolved a system which we think will suit the future needs of this country, after we have

evolved our plan of educational reconstruction, after we have been able to take necessary steps to co-ordinate it with our national development as such, and when it is put on proper lines, it may be possible for the State Governments to do it. Otherwise, I do not see, Sir, how we are going to achieve it, when the Universities are autonomous bodies and when the States are responsible, each working in its own sphere, in its own way, without having the full picture. Who is going to prepare that picture? We have not got before us the entire picture. That picture can only be prepared by the Central Government—the Central Ministry of Education. If the Central Ministry of Education does not take that responsibility, it has no purpose in its existence at all. It would be better not to waste any money on the Ministry of Education in the Central Government, unless they take the entire responsibility and concern themselves with this major issue, and give us a plan and put that plan into action.

Sir, I do not believe in autonomy, as my hon. friend here was talking about. Autonomy is good. Even the State Governments are not autonomous to the extent that many of our friends want the Universities to be autonomous. The universities can be autonomous and they should be autonomous, so far as their internal working is concerned. But at the present moment we are considering much wider issues. We are wanting to co-ordinate the efforts of the various Universities. How is it possible for a particular University to take an overall view of the entire country with regard to development. Every University today is developing a medical college and an engineering college, and certain types of professional colleges, three, four or five. But we do not know. Sir, how we are to apportion certain specialised knowledge to be taken up by a particular University. We have not got, say for instance, any railway engineering college in the entire country. Each of the Universities is to have that railway engineering college. We will

have to prepare a co-ordinate plan and take into consideration all the Universities of this country.

So, it is very necessary that we make it absolutely clear that Universities should develop according to the policy and plan which the nation prepares. No doubt, they will be allowed perfect autonomy so far as the working out of this plan and policy is concerned. There is no question about money being made available through the University Grants Commission, but quite apart from money being made available through the University Grants Commission, the Central Government should have power and it should take the responsibility in its own hands.

Sir, I find that this covers hardly the most significant part of the Universities, *viz.* the affiliated colleges. The affiliated colleges are completely left out of it, but it is the affiliated colleges that matter very much. It is the affiliated colleges where standards are going down every day. It is the affiliated colleges which are completely neglected, which are suffering for want of funds, and it is these affiliated colleges which have been completely left out of the scope of this Bill. The explanation given is that we have no money. Sir, I do not think that we can, with any reason on our side, argue about funds - where this vital question is concerned. I would even be prepared to say that one of the major projects be delayed for another live years and funds made available at least for university education in this country, for our reshaping it, for co-ordinating it according to the national plan and according to the national scheme of things. No doubt dams are important, no doubt river valley schemes are important, but this is much more important. The remaking of the mind of the nation is no less important than all these dams. We have covered a lot of ground on the agricultural and industrial sides. Is it not possible for us to find funds in our Second Five Year Plan to be able to give at least a new shape to our university education

and to put the Universities on the proper road so that they are in a position to go ahead? We have not even touched this problem. The affiliated colleges must be included. If necessary, the States must be asked to make funds available for the University Grants Commission. Why should we feel that it should be the responsibility of the Central Government alone? After all, in the present scheme of things, it is the States who owe all the responsibility. There is no reason why we should not devise ways and means to supplement the funds of the University Grants Commission. The States must take their own responsibility and must make their contributions. We can also devise other ways and means to augment the funds of the University Grants Commission.

Then, Sir, another matter to which I would like to invite your special attention is the medium of instruction. When this matter was being discussed in the other House, a very apologetic speech was made by the Minister for Parliamentary Affairs, assuring the House.....

PROF. G. RANGA: Did he make a speech?

SHRI H. C. MATHUR: I am sorry; it was the Parliamentary Secretary.

He assured the House that the Universities would be left absolutely free to adopt any medium of instruction which they chose, that there was absolutely no intention on the part of the Central or State Governments to interfere. I do not know why we should think in these terms. I have not been able to get to the bottom of it. Why should not the Central Government concern itself with the best interests of the nation? Is it the contention of any Member here that the Central Government has got certain anti-national approach to the Universities and the latter have got a very different approach in this matter? The most important thing is that we must make it absolutely clear that we must have only one

[Shri H. C. Mathur.] common medium of instruction in all the Universities of this country. You will bear me out when I say that I have not got any madness for Hindi, any phobia for Hindi. I can speak in Hindi as fluently as I can speak in English, if I start after about four month's time. We must have one common medium of instruction in all our Universities. Let it be Hindi. Let it be English, if you like. Let it be Sanskrit if you like. But since we have adopted Hindi as the federal language, we must have Hindi as the medium of instruction in all the Universities.

SHRI S. N. MAZUMDAR: That does not necessarily follow?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Let him give his own views.

SHRI H. C. MATHUR: I must express my own views, especially after the view which has been expressed by many Members who are carried away by certain sentiments and by certain feelings. I do not want to mention that, but I do feel that I must give expression to my own feeling in this matter, because I consider that this is absolutely vital in the interests of the national unity and our national progress as well. It would be very unfortunate if we start imparting university education in the different languages of the different regions. It is because of a common medium of instruction that today we are able to send boys from Rajasthan to Bengal. I find many boys from Madras reading in the Pilani College in Rajasthan, simply because the medium of instruction is English. What will happen tomorrow when in the present scheme of things each University has got its own medium of instruction?

SHRI N. D. M. PRASADARAO: Why should Madras boys come to Pilani? Why not they should have colleges in their own place?

SHRI H. C. MATHUR: But the fact is there. Why should they not come?

My own son is reading in Bangalore. I have despatched 50 students from Jodhpur to Bangalore. How bad it would be if students of the different regions confine themselves to their own Universities? *(Interruption)* There must be mental integration of the nation. This is much more important. If English has done any good to us, it is that it has brought us all together.

PROF. N. R. MALKANP. Not, all of us.

SHRI H. C. MATHUR: At least most of us. It is necessary that all of us should come together.

PROF. N. R. MALKANI: That is better.

SHRI H. C. MATHUR: We are talking of casteism, of parochialism and all other isms, but linguism will be more dangerous than any of the other isms. *(Interruption)* There is absolutely no necessity for any of the regional languages to suffer. We want to give them all facilities to grow. We want that all these languages should be given every opportunity and help to develop. Other ways and means can be found for it. I won't mind if one of these languages is made compulsory for every student, if every student is compulsorily made to study one of these 14 languages. There are several ways in which these languages can develop. We can have Chairs in all the languages in all the Universities. It is not necessary that we should develop them only through making them the medium of instruction in the Universities. I would wish that the University Grants Commission should make it a condition precedent that all the grants flowing from it should be in accordance with the national plan and policy. We should sit calmly and carefully and think what should be our policy and programme in this matter.

Now, about the composition of the Commission. I am thoroughly satisfied with it as it stands. It appears to me that out of the nine members.

five are bound to be non-officials. Another two may also be non-officials and the Chairman is going to be a permanent person, and he is left to be nominated by the Government. I think it is the only correct procedure. I do not believe in election as suggested here. If election is resorted to, the Commission will come to have only certain groups and will develop the most unhealthy tendencies in that small body, and the Chairman will not be able to discharge his duties and responsibilities as he should be able to do. What I would like to say here is that the Chairman must be an educationist, but much more important than that is that he must be a person with drive and imagination, must be a person who can bring about dynamism into the whole matter, must be a person who will be able to do some thing. If an educationist has that dynamic personality to make things move, it will be better to have an educationist, but if we cannot find an educationist who fulfils this qualification, I would certainly prefer another who has got that energy, enthusiasm and ability to administer things in a sound manner. This is much more important. This is one of the things that we are lacking that our Ministry today is lacking.

The other matters I will take up when the clause by clause consideration is taken up.

SHRI H. N. KUNZRU: Mr. Chairman, there are some preliminary matters that require attention before we deal with the clauses of the Bill. The Central Government is already incurring considerable expenditure or is going to incur considerable expenditure in making grants for secondary education and higher education. So far as I remember, it has agreed to carry out many of the recommendations of the Secondary Education Commission at a fairly heavy cost and obviously the object of carrying out the recommendations of the Commission is to raise the standard of secondary education. It is with that purpose that help is going to be given

to the secondary schools. Large sums of money are going to be spent also on university education with the same object in view. We have to see that this expenditure brings about the expected improvement. If, in spite of all the money that is spent, the standards remain where they are or deteriorate, obviously the entire expenditure will be wasted. I do not know what Government proposes to do in order to ensure, so far as human efforts can, that the grants given to secondary schools result in raising the standard of secondary education but I am glad that this problem has been kept in view in connection with university education and that the University Grants Commission is going to be set up generally speaking, in accordance with the recommendations of the University Education Commission which had the distinction, Sir, of having you as its Chairman. It should however be noted that whatever our expenditure on higher education may be, the Universities can work only with the material that comes to them from the secondary schools. One can therefore hardly discuss the question of higher education without at the same time, having the circumstances of our schools in mind. Some hon. Members, particularly my hon. friend Mrs. Lakshmi Menon, to whose remarks I listened with great attention because she is an educationist, have regretted the establishment of the University Grants Commission. I shall deal with their arguments on this subject very soon.....

SHRIMATI LAKSHMI MENON: I never regretted the establishment of this Commission.

SHRI H. N. KUNZRU: I thought she said that in spite of the fine speech that the Deputy Minister for Education had delivered, he had produced a Bill that was a monster.

SHRI J. A. S. AT ROY KAPOOR: She would be happy to forget what she has said.

SHRI H. N. KUNZRU: Well, I thought, therefore, that she was not very happy that the University Grants Commission was going to be set up. I would like to remind her further that she said that as the members of the U.G.C. would be nominated by the Government, the U.G.C. is bound to be under the control of the Government and that the control of the U.G.C. over the Universities therefore meant the tightening of official control over the Universities. She was not happy with the establishment of such a University Grants Commission. Let us consider secondary education for a while. There is no commission appointed by the Central Government to see that the grants given to the secondary schools are used for the purpose for which they are given and produce the desired result. Are the secondary schools, for that reason, more free than the Universities? Is anybody more satisfied with the products of our secondary schools than he is with the products of our Universities? I think if the matter is impartially examined, one would feel that the necessary corollary of the establishment of the U.G.C. is the establishment of an agency for giving guidance and financial assistance to the secondary schools. I do not mean that the Central Government should take over the responsibility for running secondary schools but I think that central guidance in the matter of standards and courses will, in course of time, come to be welcomed even by those States which are extremely jealous of their independence. If any Committee is appointed, it will be appointed with the consent of the State Governments and if this Committee works wisely, works in such a way as to gain the confidence of the State Governments and the secondary schools, I am sure that its existence will be welcomed not merely by the schools but by the public at large.

SHRI H. C. MATHUR: Have we not already appointed a Council for secondary education?

SHRI H. N. KUNZRU: I don't know if it has started the work and I don't know whether that will serve the purpose. But I cannot discuss that matter now. I am somewhat doubtful about the ability of the Council that has been set up to work in the way that the University Grants Commission is expected to work.

Now we come to the question of the composition of the U.G.C. I listened very carefully to those who expressed their dissatisfaction and strong dissatisfaction with the method proposed in the Bill of appointing its Members. Unfortunately, those who criticised the method—not all those who criticised the method—suggested any alternative method of appointment. One method, I think, was suggested by my hon. friend Mr. Mazumdar and that was election. How is election to take place? Is the election to be made by the registered graduates of the 32 Universities that exist? Is it to be made by the governing bodies of these 32 Universities? Or is it to be made by the Vice-Chancellors of these Universities?

3 P.M.

SHRI S. N. MAZUMDAR: I have given some indication in my amendment.

SHRI H. N. KUNZRU: Well, we shall consider the amendments later on.

(Interruption by Shrimati Lakshmi Menon)

SHRI H. N. KUNZRU: I think Mrs. Lakshmi Menon made some remarks.

SHRIMATI LAKSHMI MENON: I said the three Vice-Chancellors will be elected from among the Vice-Chancellors. That I think, is Mr. Mazumdar's amendment.

SHRI H. N. KUNZRU: My hon. friend has much more confidence in the method of election than I unfortunately have, because of my close contact with a number of Universities.

I started as a great champion of elections in the Universities. I was one of the 125 members of the U.P. Legislative Council who supported the Allahabad University Act. We were enthusiastic and thought that election at every stage would eliminate control of the Government and make the University not merely autonomous, but harmonious and wholeheartedly devoted to raising the standards of education. But my experience since that Act was passed, in I think, 1921, has made me sadder and wiser. One finds that as a result of the multiplicity of elections in the Universities, a number of University Acts have had to be amended. Now, in this state of things, it is difficult for one who has experience of the running of Universities and inside knowledge of what is happening there, to think that the choice of the members of the Commission by the registered graduates or any portion of them, by the Vice-Chancellors will lead to a much better result than appointment by Government will. In the present state of things, unfortunately, there seems to me to be no alternative method of securing impartiality and efficiency.

There is just one thing more that I would like to say with regard to what fell from Mrs. Lakshmi Menon. She thought that the Commission would be subservient to the Central Government. I wondered why she thought so. Was it only because the members of the Commission would be nominated by the Government? There are plenty of committees appointed by Government; but I have never heard that their members were suspect on that score. There are commissions appointed by Government and they are expected to work with a full sense of their responsibility for the recommendations that they make. There are official members on them and they may have to work in accordance with the official views, but not all of them consider themselves bound to respect either the views or the feelings of the Government which appoints them. 98 RSD—
4

Sir, I was recently a member of a committee to which a very responsible task was allotted, but I did not feel even for a moment, that any of the members of that body considered himself, or even knew what the wishes of the Government were or thought that he was bound in the slightest degree to pay the least attention to those views.

SHRIMATI LAKSHMI MENON: May I refer the hon. Member to clause 20 in Chapter IV which says:

"In the discharge of its functions under this Act, the Commission shall be guided by such directions on questions of policy relating to national purposes as may be given to it by the Central Government."

PROF. G. RANGA: See part (2) also, I mean sub-clause (2) of the same clause.

SHRI H. N. KUNZRU: It is a perfectly pertinent question to ask. The objection is perfectly legitimate. But I was sometime ago the chairman of the U.P. Universities Grants Committee and there too the Committee was asked to pay heed to such directions as it might receive on question of policy.

SHRI J. ASPAT ROY KAPOOR: But how can you help it if Mrs. Lakshmi Menon, if she is in that position, feels otherwise?

SHRI H. N. KUNZRU: Mrs. Lakshmi Menon is an educationist and I respect her opinion. She has not spoken for the sake of effect.

SHRIMATI LAKSHMI MENON: That is my feeling.

SHRI H. N. KUNZRU: She has given expression to her independent and genuine feelings. I never felt that those words limited the independence of the U.P. Universities Grants Committee. Here again, when the Bill was under consideration, it was found that the policy directions that would be given by the Government would be

[Shri H. N. Kunzru.] such as related to national purposes. This phrase—"related to national purposes"—has not been invented by the Government of India. It has really been taken from the terms of reference of the University Grants Committee in England. Some years ago they were given new terms of reference and it was said there that one of the duties of the committee would be to "assist in consultation with the universities and other bodies concerned, the preparation and execution of such plans for the development of the universities as may, from time to time, be required in order to ensure that they are fully adequate to national needs." These words figured also in the terms of reference of the U.P. Universities Grants Committee, and I for one welcomed them, because.....

SI-IRI N. D. M. PRASADARAO: It may also be a Government which is not the Government of India.

SHRI H. N. KUNZRU: If my hon. friend will only be a little patient, he will see what I am driving at. The members of the Committee were glad that these words were included in the terms of reference, because otherwise, they would have to be content with making recommendations for the grant of small sums of money. Since they were to take national needs into consideration, it was hoped that the State Government would take their recommendations seriously into consideration and increase appreciably the sum devoted by it for university education. Our expectations were, unfortunately, not realised. But the words complained of, really enabled the Committee to consider large schemes and to make the necessary recommendations to the U.P. Government. Here, when I saw in this Bill the words "national needs" being used, I for one was very happy, because I thought that Government really meant business, that it desired that the University Grants Commission should not content itself with making recommendations for the

grants of a lakh or two to this University or to that University, but its function should be to consider what place Universities should occupy in our national life and to fit them to occupy that position.

I think, Sir, that the terms of reference of the Commission are wide and such as they should be at a time when we are trying to think of our national life as a whole.

Now, Sir, I come to the steps that should be taken in order to improve education. I agree with those speakers who feel that grants to Central Universities or even to State Universities will not be sufficient to attain the object that we all have in view. If we look at the figures, we find that the vast majority of students receiving higher education are being educated in colleges. I believe that at the present time there are about 900 colleges and 32 Universities with a total enrolment of about 5 lakhs. The teaching and residential Universities taken together account, I think, for only about 35,000 students. It is obvious, therefore, that unless adequate assistance can be given to the colleges, we cannot claim to have taken any serious step in order to improve higher education. The amendment that the Select Committee has made in clause 2(f) should be welcomed from that point of view. My hon. friend, Shri Mathur, said that the colleges had been forgotten in this Bill. I think he did not read clause 2 with his customary care. If he had done so, he would have seen that the University Grants Commission would be able to give grants to the colleges on the recommendation of the Universities concerned. I have proposed an amendment to this clause which I shall not deal with now but its object is to give greater freedom to the University Grants Commission than the present definition of a University in clause 2(f) will give.

SHRI H. C. MATHUR: I would invite the hon. Member's attention to what the Minister himself said in this parti-

cular respect, especially about the affiliated colleges.

SHRI H. N. KUNZRU: It is the affiliated colleges that are going to be helped.

SHRI H. C. MATHUR: In a restricted manner.

SHRI H. N. KUNZRU: Yes, but it is obvious that at the present time only a limited number of colleges can be helped. I think I am disclosing no secret when I say that at the last two meetings of the University Grants Commission this question has been very seriously considered but the funds at the disposal of the Commission are not adequate to enable it to help all the colleges. I shall be very happy if the Commission is liberally helped. It is all a question of the total funds at the disposal of the Government and their distribution among the different objectives of national importance. I must, however, say that while the number of colleges that have to be helped is great, the ability of the Commission to help them will be limited. I think, therefore, that when annual grants are made to the University Grants Commission, the need for giving help to a fairly large number of colleges should be borne in mind.

Now, Sir, I come to the question of division of responsibilities between the Centre and the States in respect of higher education, both undergraduate and post-graduate. The University Education Commission recommended that the Central Government should make itself responsible for 50 per cent, of the expenditure on post-graduate education. I am not averse to that recommendation at all but I do not think that that by itself will enable us to bring about a general improvement in the standards of higher education. I think that under-graduate education also has to be helped, and I quite agree with Mrs. Lakshmi Menon that the colleges are inefficient to no small extent because their teachers get

I miserable salaries and have, therefore, to eke out their incomes by undertaking tuitions but we cannot go so far as to agree with Shri H. C. Mathur that the entire responsibility for higher education should be taken over by the Central Government. This question was considered when our Constitution was in the making and, whether wisely or unwisely, in the Union List only "Co-ordination and determination of standards in institutions for higher education or research" found a place. This Bill, therefore, has to be limited by the language of entry 66 of the Union List but even without any change in the Constitution, colleges can be given a great deal of help so that the products of the Universities may be such as to serve the national needs. I cannot say what the definition should be but I think this is a matter that requires the serious attention of the Central Government. Perhaps consultation with the State Governments will be necessary but it will be good if the Central Government decides this matter in friendly consultation with the Education Ministers of the States instead of leaving it to be handled solely by the University Grants Commission. Whatever the University Grants Commission may do, its capacity to help institutions for higher education will be limited by the funds that it receives from the Central Government.

Just one word more, Sir, before I pass on to the various clauses and that is regarding fellowships and scholarships. If we want our standards of education to rise, then I think liberal provision will have to be made for scholarships and both the Central and the State Governments will have to bear the ensuing responsibilities. As regards fellowships, that is somewhat new. It is meant to give assistance to scholars in their research work, to promising men to devote their time to research so that they may be able to produce work that will bear comparison with the literature that are being produced elsewhere.

Now, Sir, I shall say a few words on the Bill that is before us. I have

[Shri H. N. Kunzra] already referred to clause 2(f) of the Bill. It defines a "University" as including not merely a University established by a Central or State Act but also such institutions as may be recommended by the Universities for help.

SHRI H. P. SAKSENA: By the Commission.

SHRI H. N. KUNZRU: By the Universities concerned, for help. I think, Sir, that these words show that the University is not bound to accept the recommendations that are made, but I think it should also have the freedom to go outside the recommendations made by the Commission in cases where it thinks that it can promote the general good by helping a college not recommended by the University concerned.

Now, Sir, with regard to the composition of the Commission I shall not say much because I have already given notice of two or three amendments to that clause. My object is to ensure that the recommendation of the University Education Commission that it should have a definite non-official majority should be carried out. I do not think that the clause, as it stands, fully serves that purpose. I shall explain my meaning further when the discussion of that clause is taken up.

Then I come to the terms and conditions of service of members. Well, that has been happily changed by the Select Committee in such a way as not to make the term of membership dependent on the sweet will of the Central Government. Rules will have to be made with regard to what will constitute such conduct on the part of a member as will make him unfit for membership of the Commission. Well, these rules will be of general application, of the same kind as the rules that apply, for instance, to members of municipal boards or other bodies and there could be no objection to such rules because the members will

not be under the thumb of the Central Government. I shall deal with the functions of the Commission also when the clause is discussed, but before I sit down I should like to say a word about the funds of the Commission. Clause 16 deals with this matter. I have not been able to understand what the language of clause 16 means. Does it mean that a grant made by the University Grants Commission will not lapse or does it only mean that all the money that is received is put into a certain fund and should be taken out of it only in accordance with a certain procedure? If this is all that is meant, I do not think this is of any value. I should like the Government to assure us, in accordance with the recommendations of your Commission—virtually it was the sense of those recommendations—that if any money that is given to the University Grants Commission in the course of a year is not spent by it during the course of that year, it should not lapse to the treasury. This is the rule in England, Sir, that a grant given to the University Grants Committee does not lapse. It remains with the University Grants Committee, and I should like the same method to be followed here for this reason that if we want the Universities to work in accordance with a plan prepared by them, then they must be given block grants for a certain period, for a period, say, of 3 to 5 years. The Commission itself therefore should have an assurance from Government that it would receive a certain amount of money only over a certain period and that if a portion of the funds granted for a particular year is not fully spent in that year because of the imperfect character of the schemes placed before it by the Universities; then it should remain with the Commission so that it might be available later when better schemes were prepared to be used for their execution. I hope, Sir, that my hon. friend, the Deputy Minister for Education, will be able to give us a satisfactory assurance on this subject. Let me say before I sit down that the Government should pay the fullest

attention they can to the recommendations of the University Education Commission. They, in many respects, accept those recommendations, but in one or two respects it does not seem to me that they have attached that importance to some recommendations that some of us do. I hope that by the time this discussion is over, Government will be able to tell us that it means to carry out fully both in the letter and in spirit the recommendations of the University Education Commission.

DR. P. SUBBARAYAN (Madras): Mr. Chairman, I welcome this measure to a very large extent, but I think there is something in what Mrs. Lakshmi Menon has said. I feel that the Universities' autonomy should not be interfered with, and you know very well, Sir, when the U.K. University Commission was appointed under the chairmanship of Mr. Asquith with regard to both Oxford and Cambridge one of the terms of reference was that the autonomy of the University should not be interfered with, and the Universities were given the freedom, if you remember, Sir, either to accept or refuse the grant if they felt that it would in any way affect their policy.

PROF. G. RANGA: That was in 1922.

DR. P. SUBBARAYAN: I would therefore like the Government to see that the same power is given to the Universities, because I do feel that there are Universities and Universities whose standards are of such a kind that any interference may lead to deterioration in the standard of the University. I specially feel this after the utterance that was made by my friend, Mr. Mathur, who said that there should be a universal language for all the Universities as the medium of instruction. The tendency—I have seen—in most parts of our country has been to adopt the regional language as the medium of instruction, because there is this feeling in most of the people in this country that their own language is better than the

other. But I know the difficulty that might occur and I entirely sympathise with Mr. Mathur when he says that it will lead to linguism and division in this country. That is quite true But you are not going to achieve this if you are going to force down a particular language on the people of those parts of the country who feel very sincerely and seriously that their language is the best medium that they could adopt at every stage of education. I heard some Members say during the debate that the standard of education has gone down. It is true but I think it is really due to the fact that most institutions do not yet clearly understand what is the policy of the Government with regard to language. Most State Governments have adopted as the medium of instruction in secondary schools the regional language and the Universities still keep to English. And the result has been, because of want of adequate knowledge of the medium of instruction in the Universities, when a student comes up to the college, he finds himself really in difficulty in understanding the medium through which he is taught. This is due, I think, to the steps that have been taken without due consideration of what the medium of instruction in the University should be. If sufficient thought had been given, I think the standards would not have become lower. I admit, for instance, in my own State of which I am more acquainted than other States, the Minister of Education in 1946 after the second Congress Ministry came into power wanted English to be taught only from the third form stage onwards. That is, the student began to learn English at the third form stage and he went to the University class after he passed the Secondary School Leaving Certificate which is the sixth form. So all the knowledge he learnt was for three years and how do you expect to keep the standards in Universities if he is going to be taught through a medium which he has hardly taken to learn properly because he had taken to it only for three years. Fortunately, the present Government in Madras

[Dr. P. Subbarayan.J has made it from the first form which I think in many ways fulfils v/hat is wanted. But even that, if I know correctly, really is not enough. During my and your days, Sir. we began to learn English from the fourth standard which meant another three years and therefore—whatever anybody may say, that we were being forced to learn a language foreign to us —we did have a standard. We did understand the language and we had enough grasp over the language to follow what was taught at the Universities. Therefore I undoubtedly agree with Mr. Mathur when he says that there must be a definite conclusion and decision by both the Central and the State Governments as to what the language of the University is going to be and once that is decided upon, I feel strongly that that language should be taught from the fourth standard onwards. Then only you can keep up the standard that you are aiming at. There is no use of talking of standards if we really do not know where we stand. That has been the whole trouble. There are the State Governments; there is the Central Government and there are the Universities, each claiming autonomy for itself. The result has been this. Take for instance our University, the University of Madras. They still think that English should be the medium. That is the decision of the University but what happens? The student who comes up to the University is not in a position to really follow what is being taught him because of this language difficulty. Therefore I would like to commend to the Deputy Minister for Education that the Government of India should now begin to think over this matter and divide into two well-known categories the humanities and the sciences. And I feel that for a long time to come we cannot avoid the English medium with regard to the sciences because terminology, technical terms and all these are understood all over the world by having English as the medium for this purpose. The students can get akin with the scientists of the world and they

will begin to understand that they have to learn through a medium which will get them into touch with the scientists of the world. You will have to consider the post-graduate educations as well as education in the secondary and university stages.

Now, Dr. Kunzru talked of the affiliated colleges and so did Mr. Mathur. But my opinion vastly differs from theirs for the simple reason that the funds at the disposal of the Central Government will not be sufficient if you are to give grants and go down to the colleges. What the Central Government can do in my opinion is that they should cater for post graduate education so that research and scientific knowledge may grow. If that is the consideration, then I do not think that they could go down below the Universities. As Dr. Kunzru pointed out, there are as many as 900 colleges and if you are going to contribute to all of them, you are going to dissipate your funds in such a manner that you will not be able to help post-graduate research. That is why Dr. Kunzru has pointed out in sub-clause (f) of clause 2.....

SHRI H. C. MATHUR: The State Governments are also going to contribute to this fund.

DR. P. SUBBARAYAN: You cannot compel them. They may; but there is no question of compulsion. You cannot compel a State Government to contribute to the fund. It may be a pious wish on our part. If they like they can; if they do not, they need not. That is the position under the Constitution as it stands today. That is why I claim that it is the function of the State Governments to help the various affiliated colleges in their region and leave the Central Government to contribute to institutions which devote themselves to post-graduate research. Then only can adequate funds be found by Parliament and the Central Government to cater to the needs of the people.

SHRI N. D. M. PRASADARAO: Some Universities have reserved these post-graduate courses for only constituent colleges, denying them to the affiliated colleges.

DK. P. SUBBARAYAN: That is why clause 2(f) has been put. In such cases, naturally grants will be given because there will be post-graduate courses but grants will not be given to colleges as such just for providing day to day expenses. After all, there is the income from fee; there is the grant from the State Government. As far as I know, in my own State the colleges are able to manage with these funds and they are also able to keep up—I am proud to say—certain standards which even today can bear comparison with other Universities. Therefore I feel that the best course has been adopted in the matter of appointment of the Commission. I think this is the best that could be adopted because I do not think that it will be possible for the Government to have election through the various Vice-Chancellors, as has been suggested. But I hope, as Dr. Kunzru said, the majority of those who are independent of the Government will be kept because I think this University Grants Commission should be composed of such members as would be able to devote their attention to the interests of university education and not be guided by the Central Government.

PROF. N. R. MALKANI: Sir, I welcome this Bill, more especially after the amendments which have been introduced by the Select Committee. But I am not quite happy about the title of the Bill. It is called the University Grants Commission. There are many commissions. All commissions administer some funds but that word 'funds' or 'grants' is never mentioned in the title. It puts a rather wrong emphasis. The emphasis should be upon improvement, co-ordination or development as the case may be, not on the grants. We do not create a commission because it has to give grants. We create this commission

because it has to do a great deal about education, especially higher education. Sir, to my mind, there is very heavy work waiting for the commission. It will be of two kinds. One will be to rehabilitate higher education and another will be to improve and raise its standards. To my mind, even the immediate task of rehabilitation is a stupendous task. The case of affiliated colleges is an important one and a challenging one. I understand that the Universities wish to help them but they have not enough funds; nor has the Commission. To my mind, the first duty of the Commission will be to see to it that these affiliated colleges are looked after well and put on a sound financial basis, before anything else is done. The prior duty of the Commission will be to rehabilitate the* affiliated colleges which have poor staff, little equipment and hardly any good buildings. And the next thing will be—perhaps more important still—to look after the teachers and the staff, to pay them well. It is only when you pay them well that we will be able to choose them and put the right people in the right places. Today, there are wrong people in these places, because these places are not respected and the persons there are not properly paid. To my mind, the soul of education is the individual, the person, the man in charge, the teacher—not the buildings, not the hostels, not the commissions, not the grants—but the personality of the teacher. And to my mind, the person in education, up till now, has been very much neglected. Mere money will not do, but money is the beginning, the first step and an important step.

Sir, after doing the work of rehabilitation so far as teachers are concerned, buildings are concerned, hostels are concerned, and the affiliated colleges are concerned, a much larger and much bigger task awaits the Commission. Perhaps I am unfortunate in my belief that other things are moving in the country, but not much so far as education is concerned. Quantitatively we have more railways, better airways and what not,

[Prof. N. R. Malkani.] but when we come to look at the students, the teachers and the atmosphere in these educational institutions, one feels very sad. It is a tragedy. We all go on crying that this educational structure is wrong. The house is toppling on our heads. The roof is falling. There is trouble here and there is trouble there. And there is indiscipline and rioting amongst the students. In my days, riot was not to be thought of. Today rioting passes off as something normal, ordinary. Perhaps we wait until the whole thing will crash on our heads! We are doing next to nothing about improving our educational institutions. Of course, the University Grants Commission is coming and we look up to it. We want to make it free, independent. I have tried to have an assessment of this demand for independence, this autonomy of Universities. In my days, of course, there was subservience, but they never showed the least intention to resist the subservience. They were willingly servile, willingly slavish. But even today I am not aware of a University which is unwillingly servile. They make no effort to be independent. Whenever I read anything in the papers about Universities, about Vice-Chancellors—I might say, professional educationists—I feel very despondent. I say that they do not want to be free. I say, if you want to be free, have great ideals, do something noble, do the best, then you are bound to be free. But at present you are hugging the past and you are in chains. You say that Government should not control—hands off so far as Government is concerned. But why is it you say hands off so far as the public are concerned, so far as the people are concerned, so far as the nation is concerned?

Sir, I am very happy about that clause 20 where the national needs have been put in. It is just the thing by which hopes are raised in me that they will take up the national tasks and then they will be looked up to with respect. Then, the pro-

fession will become noble. And that is why I said that the composition of the Commission should be of the proper character. It is quite good that it is nominated. It should be a small body of nine members. It is a very good thing, good for advice, good also for execution and implementation, with the Chairman, a whole-timer. But very much will depend upon the selection of these nine individuals and very much more upon the selection of the Chairman. He will make or mar the thing. That is why I have been bold enough to suggest that the Commission may be nominated by the Government, but the Chairman by the President. The best man that we have got has to select the best man for the Commission. It may or may not go down the throat of my hon. friend, the Deputy Minister, but my suggestion was based on the.....

SHRI S. N. MAZUMDAR: The President is advised by the Government.

PROP. N. R. MALKANI: It is always so, because I am very anxious that the right type of men should be there. Sir, what do I mean by the 'right type of man'—not the administrator. He may be there. He too is necessary, sometimes a necessary evil, but there he is and today he is ubiquitous, he is everywhere. He has got to be there. The Vice-Chancellors, let them be there. They are called educationists, they are known to be professionally so. They should be there, but not more than three. I welcome them. But the other four members should be educationists in human sense, in the living sense—not in the technical, not in the professional sense. Men of affairs, *men* who have seen life, who have made a mark in life, men who have started some living movement—they should be there. Mr. C. Rajagopalachari (Rajaji) is such an educationist. Very much so. Gandhiji was an educationist—tremendously so. Sir, you yourself, who adorns the Chair, you began life as a great educationist and so here you are. We all respect you because you are real,

good living educationist. We want educationists of your type at the moment. You may perhaps be more useful in the Commission. It needs you very much more. I want that the four people should be of the living nature, who have a real touch with public affairs, with life. Because today it is the task of the educated class, the intelligentsia, to cater to the masses, because the rural people, the peasants are up and awake. What shall we do for them? The Universities formerly were meant only for a selected few graduate and post-graduate studies. I do not think it is so today. I think it will take ten years more before Universities really do research and postgraduate studies in the proper sense of the word and do some real original work. But they can do a great deal so far as the extension services are concerned. Everywhere, in the town the poor man and the workers; everywhere in the village the poor man, the peasant, the agricultural labourer, looks out, yearning for education, extension services. Why cannot the University do something in this direction? It can easily organise them for it has so many teachers. It has holidays by the score. I myself was a professor and I know something about it, for about two hundred days in a year we were working. The rest of the days of the year were more or less holidays. Why cannot these holidays be utilised for educating the men who are hungering for education? The Universities can find out courses—short, relevant, living, which have a touch of life—for the common man, the poor man. It is their duty to educate them and thereby they will be serving a real national need. Let them not look to nuclear research and so on where we are like babies, talking the language of a baby and things which do not exist with us. Let us do a thing which we can do with a good deal of success, and that is, help the poor man, the common man, who wants education.

I have been to many villages. I find that next to food their need is

education for their children. But we are giving them the wrong education. The cry today is for expansion. But I would call a halt. I am not for indiscriminate expansion. Fortunately that word is not mentioned here in this Bill. I do not want expansion so far as I am concerned. I want consolidation and then real progress, but I do want rehabilitation first and then progress. And the progress must be on sound lines, not mere expansion. It is no use flinging a big report at my face and saying, so many colleges, so many students, so much money has been spent. And if you will permit me to say so, Sir, much of the money is wasted. Much money is wasted because it has got no relation to real life, to the things outside the Chamber here. You are manufacturing degrees and diplomas which are not wanted, which are a drag. Even though diploma holders come in procession and shout slogans outside the Chamber, you just wake up and just soothe them, you try to pacify them, and ultimately evade them. That does not solve the problem. That creates a problem. That will set a crisis before us and it may explode at any time unless we take care in due course. I am glad, therefore, that the "national interest" is there. The national interest will be served by looking after the needs of the masses by having rural institutes and rural Universities. Sir, your report on the rural institutions—I have read it—was published 12 months ago. What has been done about it? Next to nothing. It is a very valuable report. We have valuable reports everywhere lying around us. We have got to deal with them.

DR. K. L. SHRIMALI: May I inform him that the Government have already accepted the recommendations of the report and an All India Conference on Rural Education is being convened

PROF. N. R. MALKANI: Why are you speaking so low? Why can't you shout so that everybody may hear?

DR. K. L. SHRIMALI: The Ministry of Education believes in silent work.

PROF. N. R. MALKANI: Sir, I submitted a resolution here. But, unfortunately, through a technical mistake, it was not accepted. So far as I know nothing has been done in this respect to the country and I am a part of the country. I think that there is a small committee on basic education running about the country. I am not aware of what it is doing. What is the pattern of education? I do not know what the committee is doing.

Now it will be up to the Commission to tell us not only about the pattern of education, but also about the structure of our education. Our structure today is 50 years old. I am 66. What do I see? I see not much of a change except more science courses, more technical courses. There is the same atmosphere; the professors are the same and the desks are the same. The examination is nearing....

AN HON. MEMBER: The students are not the same.

PROF. N. R. MALKANI: They are only more numerous. I almost feel that I am living perpetually; my education and my ways are perpetuated. And let me say with great humility that I really was reborn, as I might say, only at the age of 33. I discovered myself at the age of 33. I do not know how much learning I have been throwing away as a sort of burden which I could not carry. And I am carrying newer burdens which are real, which are having a bearing on my life.

I would say that it is the duty of the Commission to see that the structure of education—the foundation of education—is well laid and today some at the top command the bottom. The top percolates and permeates to the bottom. Therefore, the responsibility of the universities is much greater.

Other friends have said a great deal about the Bill and nothing remains for me to add. But I have tabled a very few amendments after much consideration and I hope that the Deputy Minister will pay due attention and if possible, accept them. I am only anxious about the composition of the Commission. He has already taken a step in the right line. I congratulate him. Let me take one more step in that line because I do* believe that the proper selection and composition of the Commission is very important. Therefore, when that body is nominated by the Government, there should be no hesitation whatever in giving non-officials an important place in the Commission. I also wish that a few other small things necessary should be done. Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We have allotted five hours. We have now taken 2½ hours. Half the time is over. I have twelve names before me.

SHRI KISHEN CHAND: May I submit, Sir, that one hour was saved yesterday from this time and if we are going to save.....

MR. CHAIRMAN: Listen to me. You may sit till six. It will give you two hours and twelve people can speak if they exercise restraint and limit their speeches to a maximum of ten minutes. The reply will be given by Mr. Shrimali first thing, tomorrow morning.

SHRI KISHEN CHAND (Hyderabad) Mr. Chairman, Sir, I have listened with rapt attention to the many speeches made on the

SHRI J ASP AT ROY KAPOOR: Shall we not continue to have the* privilege of your guidance over the deliberations on this Bill thffcuirhout, Mr. Chairman? "

MR. CHAIRMAN: I do not guide you from the chair. I simply s;t and look on.

AN HOW. MEMBER: You inspire us.

TMR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN in the Chair.]

SHRI KISHEN CHAND: I have listened to the speeches so far made with very great attention. But I am sorry to note that many of the remarks have been made from a little misconception of this Bill. I submit that the hon. Minister when he was moving for consideration of this Bill ended with the words of Moberley and I could see that throughout his speech, he was impressed by the University Grants Commission as it works in the United Kingdom. As has been pointed out, conditions in India are different from those in the United Kingdom and blind imitation of the University Grants Commission in the United Kingdom will not suit us. The hon. Member who has now sat down asked what is meant by University autonomy. I will try and begin my speech by answering that question. This Bill says that it is for making provision for the co-ordination and determining of standards in Universities. University education is a State subject and Parliament will have no powers to interfere in it and it is normally followed. The State Governments have not interfered in the Universities about curriculum, the syllabus, the standards of education for the B.A. or M.A. Degrees or the hours of teaching. But here a departure is made under entry 66 of the Union List. The hon. Minister tries to bring it in and he wants to control the Universities not only in their academic matters, not only in their financial matters, but in their whole programme of education and in their programme of higher education. I maintain that by autonomy we mean the right of the academic people to fix the standards of education. India is a big country. There are different needs in different States in our country.

Nowadays, it has become a fashion for everybody to talk of education, but nobody suggests any new method. There are 33 Universities and there are 33 convocation addresses every year, and in every convocation address, the learned lecturer gets

up to say that the university education is bad, the system of education is not suited to the country. But no alternative method is suggested. After all, the administrators, the professors and the lecturers of the University are racking their brains, trying to think out methods of improving university education. After great thought and consideration, they come to certain conclusions and they prescribe certain standards. Now, the Deputy Minister wants to come forward with this Bill and take away what little autonomy the Universities possess because after all, the Universities are under the State Legislatures. The State Legislature through the Chancellor has some form of control over the University. Now over and above that, the Central Government will be controlling under the guise of co-ordination and determining the standards. I will come a little later to clause 12 where the restrictions imposed on the Universities are much greater. The net result will be that the University will be entirely subservient to the University Grants Commission consisting of nine people. They will, of course, be educationists—I do not deny it and I am sure that they will be working in the best interests of the country. But India is a great country. Why do you suppose that these nine people are much abler than others who guide the standards of education of the Universities? Well, of course, Parliament is supreme; the Legislatures are supreme. But it is a convention that in academic matters, the State Legislatures and the Parliament should not interfere. They have full rights to interfere; but they do not. Now, by means of this University Grants Commission, we want to control the Universities. 4 P.M.

Sir, I would like to know from the hon. Deputy Minister of Education and the hon. Mr. Kunzru, when they quote the example of U.K., if the Oxford University or the Cambridge University under the garb of 'determination and maintenance of standards' will permit the U.K.'s University Grants Commission to interfere

[Shn Kishen Chand.] to the slightest degree in the matters of standard of education? While copying the Bill from the U.K. we have forgotten this thing. I say, Sir, this is a type of Bill which is most atrocious, very wrong and a very bad Bill, because it is going to take away from the Universities their control over various things.

Then, Sir, I come down to clause 12. Certain hon. Members are under the misconception that if the Universities do not take the grants from the University Grants Commission they are at liberty to carry on. This is a wrong notion. Clause 12 says:

"It shall be the general duty of the Commission to take, in consultation with the Universities or other bodies concerned, all such steps as it may think fit for the promotion and co-ordination of University education" "

So far I have no objection. Further it says:

"and for the determination and maintenance of standards of teaching, examination and research in Universities"

I have quarrel with "for the determination and maintenance of standards of teaching, examination and research in Universities." After all what are the University bodies doing? You impose a small body to interfere in their autonomy to this extent.

DR. K. L. SHRIMALI: May I submit that this "co-ordination and determination of standards" has actually been literally taken from the Constitution.

SHRI KISHEN CHAND: I am very thankful to the hon. Deputy Minister. I am going to explain what has been taken from the Constitution and how it has been wrongly interpreted by the hon. Deputy Minister. I am very glad that he has noted that and has drawn my attention to it. He has followed the letter of the Constitution

but not its spirit. The underlying meaning of that clause is that India is a large country; there are so many Universities and in the carrying on of research there may not be duplication. For instance, if one is carrying on research in nuclear physics in the Madras University, there is no need for carrying on similar research in Bombay as it is an expensive item. It is quite easy for the students of Bombay to go to Madras and learn there. That is the underlying idea in the Constitution.

Then I come to the co-ordination of research, its guidance and direction. There is a great difference in our B.A. degree and the B.A. degree of Cambridge or Oxford. There it is the final degree, as far as examinations are concerned. There M.A. degree is only a residential qualification, and there is no examination for it.

SHRI H. N. KUNZRU: It is B.A. (Hons.).

SHRI KISHEN CHAND: There is no B.A. (Hons.) there; there is Tripos which is called B.A. degree. They do not write Hons. after the name.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN (Hyderabad) : It is Tripos.

SHRI KISHEN CHAND: Tripos is the name of the examination. For a Pass degree, they also get the qualification of B.A., but the examinations are different. So I was saying that in our Universities M.A. is the final thing. I do not want to compare the B.A. of our Universities with the B.A. or Tripos of Oxford or Cambridge Universities. There is no comparison. Our M.A. is equivalent to that. To say that what has been put in the Bill is literally taken from the Constitution is not correct. We have used the word of "co-ordination", but it relates to the co-ordination of research and post-graduate teaching. So I have inserted certain amendment and I would request the hon. Education Minister to study them carefully and understand them. If we interfere with the standard of examinations we

interfering in their internal management. The University will have no autonomy. The University will be simply looking to the Grants Commission to determine standards for them.

Further, sub-clause (a) of clause 12 says that "the Commission may inquire into the financial needs of Universities". There is a "may". They may inquire or may not inquire into the financial needs of Universities. Their sole and main purpose is "determination and maintenance of standards of teaching, examination and research". For that purpose they can recommend to any University the measures for the improvement of University education.

Sir, this Bill is going to form a super-Inspectorate body

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Kishen Chand, ten minutes are over.

SHRI KISHEN CHAND: I have taken only ten minutes while other Members have been given half-an-hour or three-quarters of an hour to speak.

Then I come to clause 13 pertaining to inspection. Of course, it is put in * a very polite language. This body of super-Inspectors nominated or appointed by the Grants Commission will ask the Universities to behave themselves, to improve their methods of education, methods of teaching and examination. The question of grants does not come in.

Sir, it has already been pointed out that there is difference in the pattern of education of North and South and East and West. Bombay has got only an examining University. Madras has got examining University with Colleges affiliated to it. Andhra has an examining University. Calcutta is an examining University. All the teaching Universities are mostly concentrated in Uttar Pradesh. The hon. Member from Uttar Pradesh gave only the example of Uttar Pradesh and he was really influenced by Uttar Pra-

desh. If you see the pattern of education in Bombay, Madras, Andhra and Bengal, which have got affiliated colleges, and if the University Grants Commission is going to give grants on the basis of the requirements of the Universities the Central Universities and the teaching Universities will get all the funds. In Uttar Pradesh there is no examining University except Agra. All affiliating Universities, even though research work is being carried on in them, will not get anything until and unless we bring in affiliated colleges. The hon. Deputy Minister under the University Grants Commission Act will say, "we haven't got funds; we have only a limited fund". Do you know that all the States of India spend nearly 18 crores of rupees on university education and this University Grants Commission with a total grant of Rs. 1J crores or Rs. 2 crores is going to control all the Universities? Is it fair, is it right that the University Grants Commission should interfere in the autonomy of Universities like Madras, Bombay and Calcutta when their methods of affiliation are quite different than what is prevailing in Uttar Pradesh? This whole Bill would have been much better if it had adopted the good points of the University Grants Commission in U.K. That body has no written constitution; it is only a gentleman's agreement. The Chancellor of the Exchequer gives lump sums to the University Grants Commission. The Commission in its turn, after making its own enquiries—when it finds that a particular University can carry on research work and can really advance knowledge—gives grants to that particular University. It never sends a body of Inspectors to see that the University is carrying on its work. If the University Grants Commission is not satisfied with the work of a particular University, in a subsequent year they may not give it the grant. Do you want to convert the status of our Universities into that of Higher Secondary schools where Inspectors go, examine and make remarks? I submit, Sir, that the hon. Education Minister has been

[Shri Kishen Chand.] misled by the University Grants Commission in the U.K. He has not adopted the spirit of that model and has introduced certain other elements into our Bill which are detrimental to the advancement of university education. When the amendments come in—I have also sent in some amendments—I will be able to explain my point of view in a better way.

DR. RAGHUBIR SINH (Madhya Bharat): Mr. Deputy Chairman, I must admit in the beginning that the Bill, as has come to us now, is much better than what it was. But I do feel, Sir, that the Bill, as it is, does not even touch the fringe of the problem. The other day when the question about the indiscipline of students was before the House, it was mentioned here, Sir, that in a symposium the students said that much of the indiscipline was there because the education system itself was wrong. My hon. colleague, the Deputy Minister for Education, smugly remarked here that he did not agree with everything that the students said. I am inclined to agree with him, Sir, but I am sure that the persons who have dealt with students will realise that this feeling among the students does go a long way to undermine the very system of education itself, because if we are imposing a system on the students who do not believe in its utility, they are accepting it because they have no other alternative. That is a very sorry state of affairs.

Sir, the very first thing that I would like to be done is that we should not only improve the system, but we should try to convert the students to the point of view that the Government at the Centre and the Universities are doing their best to help them. The reasons why they have been disappointed or why they have lost their hopes are quite obvious. Firstly, Sir, there is the problem of unemployment. The Universities are producing every year hundreds and thousands of graduates. The problem is there for those students who have passed in

third class. They are not wanted anywhere. If they are not wanted, the question is whether a University should go on producing these third class graduates. And therefore, Sir, this problem of finding ways and means to utilise the services of these third class graduates is a very major problem, and the University Grants Commission should carefully look into that problem. Otherwise, there will be more and more difficulties, more and more problems, and more and more frustration.

Another problem that is there is this. In the matter of technical training, there is not sufficient provision for practical training. We have, time and again, heard here during the question hour that many foreigners are employed because there is dearth of engineers and such other technical personnel in the country. On the other hand, Sir, we find that hundreds and hundreds of engineers after passing their examination in the training colleges remain unemployed just because they have not received the necessary practical training and have not the requisite experience. The first and foremost thing that the University Grants Commission will have to do is to see that there is a proper arrangement and sufficient scope for * the students to receive practical training and requisite experience in respect of such technical training, because that is very important and most essential.

Then, Sir, my friend, Prof. Malkani, has already referred to the need of rural Universities. That question is already there, and I would not like to repeat it. There is, however, one other point which needs to be mentioned. I would, Sir, like to bring it to the notice of the Ministry that in Dr. Radhakrishnan's report it has been stated that in all cases of research work done in humanities, no provision is made to bring out all those things in print and thus make known to the public. The benefit of the efforts put in by hundreds and hundreds of students to expand the bounds of knowledge is thus not made available to

the Indian students and scholars further difficulties come in, and whatever effort is put in is thus wasted. Therefore, Sir, while the Commission goes on doing other things, it should take a very particular care to see that the results of all such research work carried on in the Universities are brought to light for the enlightenment of other students and scholars.

Now, Sir, coming to the Bill itself, I find that there are quite a few lacunae in the Bill which need to be set right, and I do hope that the hon. Deputy Minister will look into those things.

Now they have provided that there should be three Vice-Chancellors of the Universities. But we find that the terms of the Vice-Chancellors in different Universities are different. In some cases it is two years, and in some other cases it is three to five years. Now the question that would arise is this. What would happen about the Vice-Chancellor of, say, the Bombay University, where the appointment is only for two years? Either he will never be appointed, or if he is appointed, there will be no continuity. I had hoped that the Minister would have taken note of these things and would have provided for them. But they have not been attended to, and I am afraid, if no provision is made with regard to these things, there will be very serious lacunae in the Bill. I must say that all these things should be provided for in the Bill itself, and not in the rules, and unless these things are provided for in the Bill itself, there is likely to be some trouble about them later.

Then, Sir, there is quite a few varieties of Universities. We have got, for example, unitary Universities we have got affiliating Universities, and we have got Universities which are teaching as well as examining. I do hope, Sir, that as a convention, at least one of the Vice-Chancellors will be from one of these unitary Universities.

Now, Sir, coming to clause 20, I must admit that I am not very happy about it. It is with regard to the controlling authority. I find that the Committee itself was unable to strike a better formula. I am afraid I cannot suggest a better one.

[THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI H. C. MATHUR) in the Chair.]

So, for the present, I would not press for its being changed. But I do hope that the Ministry will make it a rule not to interfere unnecessarily in the affairs of the Commission. In the recent past, we know that there have been certain cases where there have been some troubles in such matters.

Then, Sir, coming to clause 12(b), I find that the Central Universities are going to be under the control of this Commission. I would like to know whether these Universities, administratively, will be under the dual control of the Ministry and the Commission, or they will be under the control of only one authority. If they are going to be under the dual control, then there is going to be.....

DR. K. L. SHRIMALI: There is no question of dual control. The hon. Member probably knows that the Universities are autonomous bodies, and as far as the grants are concerned, we are anxious that there should be only one body which should deal with the Central Universities. And therefore we have moved this amendment to make it clear that both for the maintenance as well as for the development of the Central Universities, the University Grants Commission will be there. Then I would like to know whether the sums of money now being spent over these three or four Central Universities will be handed over to the Grants Commission and the maintenance charges will not be merely out of the funds of the Commission as they are now allocated.

Then about clauses 22 to 24, I know that our Ministry does not think in terms of Indian language names and

[Dr. K. L. Shrimali.]

so they are trying to provide only for Universities but a time will be there soon when we shall have so many Vishwa Vidyalayas and Vidya Piths. I do hope that the Minister will take note of this and will provide for them also so that these Vishwa Vidyalayas are not allowed to distribute bogus degrees. There are quite a few of that kind in the country even now. Thank you.

श्रीमती चन्नाबती लखनपाल (उत्तर प्रदेश) : श्री उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं इस विधेयक का अभिनन्दन करने के लिये खड़ी हुई हूँ। सेलेक्ट कमेटी और लोक सभा से गुजर कर यह विधेयक हमारे सदन में आया है और पहले से बहुत अधिक सुधर रूप में यहां आया है, परन्तु फिर भी इसके अन्दर अभी सुधार की बहुत काफी गुंजाइश रहती है।

विश्वविद्यालयों के लिये आटोनामी, स्वतंत्रता, एक बड़ा महत्व की चीज है, एक बहुत पवित्र वस्तु है और उसको सुरक्षित रखने का जो प्रयास इस बिल में किया गया है वह वास्तव में प्रशंसनीय है। अभी डाक्टर श्रीमाली जी ने बताया था कि इस दिशा में सेलेक्ट कमेटी के और लोक सभा के करीब करीब सभी सुझावों को उन्होंने स्वीकार कर लिया है। मुझे पूर्ण आशा है कि इस सदन में भी इस प्रकार के जो सुझाव दिये जायेंगे उन्हें भी वे उदारतापूर्वक स्वीकार कर लेंगे।

इस सम्बन्ध में मेरा यही निवेदन है कि विश्वविद्यालयों की आटोनामी को, स्वतंत्रता को, सुरक्षित रखने का पूरा प्रयत्न होना चाहिये और यदि कमीशन में नानआफीशियल शिक्षाविज्ञों का बहुमत कर दिया जाय तो आज आटोनामी के सम्बन्ध में जो शंकाएँ बहुत से सदस्यों के हृदय में हैं वे निश्चय ही दूर हो जायेंगी। मेरा संकेत इस समय श्री मलकानी जी के उस संशोधन की ओर है जिसमें उन्होंने कहा है कि नानआफीशियल मيم्बरों की संख्या कम से कम दो तिहाई कर दी जाय। मुझे पूर्ण आशा है

कि हमारे शिक्षा उपमंत्री जी इसको स्वीकार कर लेंगे।

श्रीमन्, जो दूसरी बात मुझे कहनी है वह यह है कि इस समय उच्च शिक्षा के क्षेत्र में केवल पुरुष ही नहीं बल्कि स्त्रियाँ भी बहुत बड़े तादाद में हैं। हमने अक्सर देखा है कि कालेजों के अन्दर, यदि ५० प्रतिशत नहीं तो कम से कम ४० प्रतिशत, उच्च शिक्षा प्राप्त करने के लिए महिलाओं की, लड़कियों की संख्या होती है। ऐसी परिस्थिति में यह आवश्यक हो जाता है कि कमीशन के अन्दर कम से कम एक स्त्री सदस्या अवश्य हो। यदि हम चाहते हैं कि स्त्री-शिक्षा का विकास हो, स्त्रियों के विशिष्ट हितों को ध्यान में रखते हुये स्त्री-शिक्षा का विकास किया जाय और उसका विस्तार किया जाय तो हमें कमीशन में अवश्य ही एक स्त्री सदस्या को रखना चाहिये।

इसके अतिरिक्त मैं यह कहना चाहती हूँ कि जलाज १२६ में, जहां पर युनिवर्सिटी ग्रांट कमीशन के ध्येयों का वर्णन किया गया है, वहां पर यह भी बताया गया है कि कमीशन का उद्देश्य यह होगा कि वह देखे कि उच्च शिक्षा कहाँ तक राष्ट्रीय हितों की, नेशनल परपज की, अभिवृद्धि करती है। इस सम्बन्ध में काफी कंट्रोलसी है और काफी विरोधी विचार इस सदन में प्रकट किये गये हैं, लेकिन कोई चाहे जो कुछ भी कहे, मैं तो इसे बहुत ही महत्वपूर्ण समझती हूँ। मैं समझती हूँ कि आज जब हम उच्च शिक्षा का पुनर्गठन करने जा रहे हैं तब हमें यह देखना चाहिये कि हमारे विश्व-विद्यालयों की शिक्षा ऐसी हो जिससे कि हमारे राष्ट्रीय ध्येयों और राष्ट्रीय हितों का संरक्षण हो सके, उनकी अभिवृद्धि हो सके। मैं यह कहना चाहती हूँ कि आज हमारे विश्वविद्यालयों को जो शिक्षा है वह राष्ट्रीय हितों की अभिवृद्धि नहीं कर रही है, वह उनकी साधक बनने के बजाय उनके रास्ते में बाधक बन रही है। आज शिक्षा के क्षेत्र में एक ओर शिक्षित बंकारों की संख्या का प्रश्न है और यह प्रश्न इतना भीषण रूप लेता जा रहा है कि हमारे देश के नेताओं

के लिये एक चिन्ता का विषय बन गया है तो दूसरी ओर विद्यार्थियों की इनिशिएसिएन, अनुशासनहीनता, का प्रश्न है और वह भी हमारे लिये चिन्ता पैदा कर रहा है। हम देखते हैं कि हमारे विश्वविद्यालयों की जो शिक्षा है वह हमारी राष्ट्रीय समस्याओं को हल करने के बजाय हमारे सामने नित्य नई समस्याएँ खड़ी कर रही है। इसी स्थिति में यह और भी आवश्यक हो जा रहा है कि यह कमिशन यह देखे कि विश्व-विद्यालयों की शिक्षा का भविष्य में जो नक्शा बनने वाला हो जो कि राष्ट्रीय हितों का संवर्धन करने वाला हो और उन्हें आगे बढ़ाने वाला हो। शिक्षा, प्रशिक्षण कर उच्च शिक्षा, ही तो एक ऐसी चीज है जिसके द्वारा राष्ट्रीय हितों का संवर्धन हो सकता है और उनकी उन्नति हो सकती है। आज भारत के स्वतंत्र हो जाने पर हमें सब संवर्धन जरूरत चरित्रवान नवयुवकों की है लेकिन आज हमारी युनिवर्सिटी की जो शिक्षा है वह क्या कैरेक्टर बिल्डिंग का, चरित्र निर्माण का, कार्य करने की क्षमता रखती है? कहना होगा कि नहीं। यदि हम चाहते हैं कि हमारे देश का भविष्य उज्ज्वल हो तब हमें इस ओर ध्यान देना होगा क्योंकि हमारे देश का शासन, हमारे देश का नेतृत्व, हमारे युवकों के ऊपर ही आश्रित है, थोड़े दिनों में देश की बागडोर उन्हीं के हाथ में जाने वाली है। तो क्या यह आवश्यक नहीं है कि हमारी शिक्षा ऐसी हो जो कि हमारे नवयुवकों और नवयुवतियों का चरित्र निर्माण करने वाली हो लेकिन आज खेद के साथ कहना पड़ता है कि हमारी शिक्षा चरित्र निर्माण के पास तक नहीं जाती है। आज तो शिक्षक और शिष्य का कोई सम्पर्क ही स्थापित नहीं हो सकता है। इस ओर हमें ध्यान देना है।

इसके अतिरिक्त हमें यह भी देखना है कि आज जो युनिवर्सिटीज के अन्दर ओवरक्राउडिंग है, अनुशासनहीनता है, और जो अनइम्प्लायमेंट है, इन सब का कारण क्या है? मेरी दृष्टि में इन सब का कारण यह है कि हमने डिग्रीज पर, उपाधियों पर, एग्जामिनेशंस पर, परीक्षाओं पर, बहुत अधिक बल दिया है। यदि हम चाहते

हैं कि हमारे देश के नवयुवक सीधे रास्ते पर चल सकें, उनका समय, उनकी शक्ति बर्बाद न हो, उन्हें निराशा न हो, वे अनुशासनहीनता की तरफ न जायें तो जो नौकरियों का उपाधियों के साथ सम्बन्ध जोड़ रखा है उसे हटाना पड़ेगा। आज हमने यह व्यवस्था बना रखी है कि जितनी ऊँची नौकरियाँ हैं उनमें लिये बी० ए० की डिग्री एक पासपोर्ट बनी हुई है। हम देखते हैं कि पब्लिक सर्विस कमिशन के जितने एग्जामिनेशंस हैं, आई० ए० एस०, आई० पी० एस०, पी० सी० एस० आदि, इन सब के लिये बी० ए० की डिग्री की कौद रखी गई है। इसलिये डिग्री के साथ नौकरियों का सम्बन्ध जोड़ कर जो हमने उनके ऊपर अनावश्यक बल दिया है, जो हमने उन्हें अनावश्यक महत्व दिया है, इसी कारण से आज युनिवर्सिटीयों के अन्दर विद्यार्थियों की भरमार है और हम उन्हें कंट्रोल नहीं कर सकते, उन्हें काम नहीं दे सकते। नतीजा क्या होता है? बंकारी होती है, प्रस्टेशन होता है, अनुशासनहीनता बढ़ती है। यदि हम डिग्रीज को, उपाधियों को, पासपोर्ट न बनायें, उन्हें इम्प्लायमेंट के लिये, नौकरियों के लिये, एक शर्त न बनायें तो हम देखेंगे कि हमारे विश्वविद्यालयों के जीवन पर इसका बहुत अच्छा प्रभाव पड़ेगा। इसलिये पक्ष का कहना जो हमें उठाना चाहिये वह यह है कि पब्लिक सर्विस कमिशन के जो एग्जामिनेशंस हैं उन सब को अंदरगैजुएट्स के लिये भी खोल दें, उनके लिये बी० ए० की डिग्री की कोई शर्त नहीं होनी चाहिये।

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI H. C. MATHUR): It is time.

श्रीमती चन्नाबती लखनपाल : मुझे कहना तो बहुत था। मैं यह कहना चाह रही थी कि हमारे विश्वविद्यालयों की सारी शिक्षा इस प्रकार की होनी चाहिये कि उसके द्वारा राष्ट्रीय हितों का संवर्धन हो सके, उसके द्वारा देश के नवयुवकों का चरित्रगठन हो सके और हमारे देश की एकता की रक्षा हो सके। श्रीमन्, इसी दृष्टि से हमें अपनी शिक्षा का पुनर्गठन करना चाहिये।

[श्रीमती चन्द्रावती लखनपाल]

कोऑर्डिनेशन और मीडियम आफ इंस्ट्रक्शन का यहां जिक्र किया गया है। सब पर इसी दृष्टि से सोचना चाहिये कि हमारे देश में एकता का सम्पादन हो। हमारे देश के लिये एकता एक बड़ी आवश्यक चीज है। एकता के ऊपर ही हमारी स्वतंत्रता आश्रित है और मैं यह कहना चाहती हूं कि कम से कम विश्वविद्यालयों में और सेना में ऐसा होना ही चाहिये कि हम भाषावाद, प्रान्तवाद और सम्प्रदायवाद से ऊपर उठ कर विचार कर सकें। आज जो विश्व-विद्यालयों में शिक्षा के माध्यम का प्रश्न है उस पर बड़ी तंगदिली से, एक रीजनल दृष्टि से विचार किया जा रहा है। हमें इस पर ठंडे दिल से देश की एकता और देश के विशाल हितों का ध्यान में रख कर विचार करना चाहिये। इन शब्दों के साथ मैं इस बिल का समर्थन करती हूं।

SHRI N. D. M. PRASADARAO: Sir, as the time at my disposal is short, I will limit my remarks to "one or two points. I quite agree with my hon. friend Mrs. Menon when she said that the university education has greatly deteriorated. I quite agree with her but she^pirt the finger at the wrong point. She thought that it is the lack of common medium of instruction that was the cause. I should like to say how this deterioration has taken place. I will give some examples only to drive the point which I will narrate later. Recently the Andhra Public Service Commission has examined certain persons for the posts of Assistant Lecturers in the Andhra Subordinate Educational Service. They examined them and they were astounded at the answers given by those persons and all those persons that have appeared before them had got double degrees or are M.As. and B.As. (Hons.) and most of them passed in first class and some of them, in second class. The answers they have given are astounding. I am only giving these examples in order to draw some conclusions from that and our House BUC should be interested in them as

to what general knowledge is being imparted by our Universities. It seems they have said, when they were asked what Lok Sabha is that the Lok Sabha is a political party in India. Similarly another has said that war is going on between China and Russia. When someone was asked 'What is a single-member constituency?', he said that it is a Legislature with one Chamber only. Similarly they were asked 'What is quorum'? Of course thesef^an concerning us. Somebody said Quorum is another name of Babar'. Another said that it is a religious book of the Muslims. Another said that it is a new medicine for T.B. discovered by Madame Curie. These are the answers. Of course there are any number of such answers with me. But how is this that those persons who have double degrees or who have passed M.A. or B.A. (Hans.) examinations in first class should fail so miserably in answering such simple questions. For this it is not any medium of instruction that is responsible. I quite agree with Prof. Malkani when he said that it is the structure of education that is being imparted today in our Universities, that is responsible for such deterioration in the standards of education. As Prof. Malkani has said, the same educational pattern that we found under the British is still continuing, with only slight modifications. That is-one of the main reasons why the educational standards are falling and though they have got some academic degrees like M.A. and B.A. (Hons.) as simple human beings they are not developed in general knowledge. That is the type of education that we are getting. Secondly the persons who are imparting this education, the teachers, how-much they are interested in promoting education? With what zeal they are teaching their students? That is also a very important consideration which has to be borne in mind. About this, I will only quote Dr. S. S. Bhatnagar of the University Grants Commission. In the first meeting of this Commission he has said—I don't have the official copy but I have only the quotation from a newspaper which has

given this report—it is the Amrita Bazaar Patrika and it has reported:

"That the Chairman of the Commission Dr. Bhatnagar observed that it was the quality of teachers that determine the discipline among the students and University men. It would be the aim of the Commission to see that monies were not spent merely on construction of buildings but that the Universities were run with excellent teachers having genuine interests and real contact with boys and that the standards of education are raised to a high level."

This is a very important point which we should bear in mind while discussing this Bill. The University has been defined as a University or those institutions which have been recognised by the University. Of course that is a welcome step but still it is not quite sufficient and many Members have spoken on that as to how the affiliated colleges are left out or most of the affiliated colleges. I can speak from the experience in my province. In our State of Andhra there are 31 affiliated colleges for only 4 constituent colleges in the University. Now what is the standard of teaching in these 31 affiliated colleges? Most of these affiliated Colleges are run by some College Committees. The College teachers are paid very miserable salaries and the starting in most of the colleges is Rs. 150 and I know that some lecturers under whom I have studied about 25 years ago are still serving in the colleges and are not getting even Rs. 300, and it is not because they are inefficient. *One* is the foremost Telugu Scholar living in Andhra today but still he is getting less than Rs. 300 even after serving for 25 years. This is the state of things in the affiliated colleges and if the University Grants Commission is not going to help such colleges, how can the teachers' position be improved. The second thing is, now that the University education itself is being reorganised and the degree course is going to be only for 3 years, so these

colleges will, to a certain extent, suffer financially because the strength of the colleges will be a little bit decreased because the first year class of the Intermediate will be now treated as the Seventh Standard of the High Schools. Therefore the strength may be decreased. Thereby the financial condition also will go down. In Andhra we have estimated that it may be upto 20 per cent, cut in the financial resources. How can they make up unless the Government comes to their help? Unless the Government comes to their help, they will fall upon these college teachers and their salaries will be further reduced. There is another factor also. It is not only confined to colleges but it applies to high schools and the elementary schools also.

Then when they are run by the Committees, generally even though some salaries are shown as being given to these college or high school teachers, or elementary school teachers, a certain deduction will be made. Actually those salaries will not be given to them because the resources of the colleges are very little. Therefore it should be the duty of the University Grants Commission to go to the help of such colleges also which form the greatest majority of the colleges existing today. Therefore I would urge that the definition of 'University' should be changed so that all affiliated colleges would be brought in for assistance. Thank you.

SHRIMATI MONA HENSMAN CMad-nO:
Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I thank you for this opportunity of welcoming the Bill and I will indeed endeavour to keep to the ten minutes that are allotted to me. I wish to say that far from thinking that the Bill is not going to do much good, I feel that with the right guidance by Government and by those who implement it there will be a good deal of hope in the future from the implementations of the Bill and may I hope that from time to time it may even be improved. Due amendments may be made as and when its weaknesses become evident.

[Shrimati Mona Hensman.] As even a constitutional amendment can be made, so this Bill also, would I take it, be open to amendment later on. Even as deficiencies occur, so also amendments might also occur in due course.

Sir, after the cataract of words and the torrent of sentences that have been poured out today on this subject in this House, I need not say anything further to prove that the Bill has come at a time when it is needed. But, Sir, I was wondering why the hon. the Deputy Minister in charge of Education was so apprehensive that the public or non-officials would not welcome or cooperate with this Bill. Sir, I feel that the Government should more and more nominate non-officials, showing their trust in them, on this University Grants Commission. Government knows that it has their allegiance, their loyalty, their complete control. They have their good reports and their own virtues. Surely Members of this House who are Vice-Chancellors in their own right and who have held other high positions in Universities and the State, were nothing but non-officials to start with. And, Sir, of the 49 Ministers who adorn the Treasury Benches there are many who have come from among non-officials, and they have been the best right-hands of the Government in the planning of the first and second Five Year Plans. Therefore, I would ask the hon. Dr. Shrimali to keep in mind that there is a very strong hope in the country that non-officials will be included as much as possible in this little group of nine persons. Some of them cannot be non-officials. Two of them at least must be officials; but surely the rest of them can be nominated and they can be nominated non-officials who will bring forward their personal courage and convictions to strengthen public opinion in this body.

Sir, the time at my disposal is very short, and so I shall just say a few words on the subject of the annual report which is to be presented to

Parliament. The hon. Deputy Minister today was putting it to us very firmly that he felt that even though the Annual Report is to be presented according to this Bill, to Parliament each year, it may not be made the subject of discussion or dissension or of undue criticism. He asked that time may be given for the due digesting of all that the Commission is going to do and that for a period of two or three years, perhaps, Parliament will hold its hand and not say anything by way of criticism that may be destructive. Sir, what he said is very well meant and his time was well spent. But I would also draw attention to the fact that the British University Grants Commission has not only a clause like this, that the Annual Report should be brought before Parliament, but they also have ensured that certain dignitaries be there as well. Vice-Chancellors as members, members of Parliament elected by the big Universities of England to serve in Parliament and such like. I remember myself being a very humble member of the London University, once voting for Dr. Eleanor Rathbone from London University to get a seat in Parliament, and I also remember with others who in 1938 attended the International Council of Women how we rejoiced in her powers and in her virtues and at the way she put forward the points that the Universities demanded should be put forward. Then what is the point of Parliament criticising the Annual Report when it has the very members themselves working at those reports in the Universities, in its own group? These things can be talked over quietly and at leisure and so misunderstandings need never arise and misinterpretations need never enter the Press. Therefore, I say that that advice was well meant and that all that time of explanation was well spent, but we have to keep in mind that we have not that British privilege or rather that privilege of the British Universities here.

I would also like to say that the final sub-clause of the last clause «rf

this Bill is going to be a source of great discussion and even of recrimination if the provision is allowed to stand as it is. I would not suggest bringing in an amendment, because probably the amendment itself would not go through. But I would ask Dr. Shrimali, our Deputy Minister for Education, to have some sort of a change made in this clause. By all means we would welcome the Commission regulating its meetings, its regulating the manner and purposes of the association of persons connected with the Commission, its specifying the terms and conditions of service of its own employees, and specifying the institutions to be recognised by the Commission. But, Sir, is the University Grants Commission to say and have the final word as to what minimum standards and qualifications the teaching staff of the Universities should have? Or is it for them to define the minimum standards of instruction for the grant of a university degree or to regulate the maintenance of standards and the co-ordination of work or facilities in Universities? Sir, the difficulty arises here, if nowhere else. We have hitherto relegated this work to the Inter-Universities Board. This is a younger brother, or older sister, call it what you like of the Universities in general. But it is an unregistered body and therefore cannot be recognised for government purposes. Accepted. It is a floating unit, kept between heaven and earth, received not here by the Universities, necessarily, and not there certainly, by the future University Grants Commission. Therefore, I would say that since the Inter-University Board cannot do this each University should be permitted to have its own autonomy about the minimum qualifications of the staff it employs, about the standards it sets and the minimum qualifications for and maintenance of those standards. If the University applies—as surely it will—for a share in the University Grants Commission's grants, then, Sir, the Commission can examine the position and put them right, if they are wrong. They can always, I maintain, put them right and

S3y, such and such a thing does not come up to the standard we feel it should. But let them not take out of the hands of the Universities the responsibilities that they have today. This is a very definite right that the public, the parent and the student look upon as the right of the University, namely the maintenance of standards, the qualifications of the staff and the minimum requirements of the University.

Finally, Sir, I would just say that if you would look at the convocation addresses that have been broadcast in the last few weeks, I am proud to state that the Governor of our State has probably made the most reasonable and sensible address at Muzaffar-pur, and Shri C. Rajagopalachari on the 26th of November—also from my State—has now come up to the expectations of the students in pointing out to them that first and foremost, the student looks upon the University as a training ground, as a training ground for unity, as a place where he and she must learn to live with others and to work for the country, whatever they may do and whatever subject they may learn. This is in accord with the spirit of this Bill.

Sir, one last word. If the Central Universities are going to keep and claim as much money as they already do, and there is only that much of money in the Bill, and then the future of the University Grants Commission is going to be very limited and unsafe, I do trust that more and more money will be given, budgetted and allotted so that the whole plan may grow as it is meant to grow. And if all the members of the Commission were going to be men like Dr. Shrimali here, I would—to use a good old English fighting phrase—hand over to them, lock stock and barrel, all the Universities and their interests confident that they will be in safe keeping. But are they all and will they be all like him? I wonder.

श्रीमती सावित्री दंबी निगम (उत्तर प्रदेश) :
उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, जहाँ तक मैंने इस विधेयक
के उद्देश्य को समझा है, वह है यूनीवर्सिटी

[श्रीमती सावित्री दैवी निगम]

ग्रान्ट्स कमिशन के निर्माण द्वारा युनिवर्सिटीज को उच्च कोर्ट का बनाना, शिक्षा के उच्च स्तरीय उपयोगिता के महत्व का इस प्रकार संतुलन करना और बढ़ाना ताकि शिक्षा एक और सर्वसुलभ बन जाय और दूसरी ओर शिक्षा द्वारा उत्पन्न होने वाले सुशिक्षित वर्गों की जनसंख्या धीरे-धीरे कम होती जाय। इस लिए मैं इस विधेयक का हार्दिक समर्थन करती हूँ।

जहाँ तक शिक्षा की बुराइयाँ, कमियाँ और खामियाँ का प्रश्न है, मेरा यह मत है कि उन्हें बजट स्पीच के लिए ही सुरक्षित रखना उचित होगा। यदि ऐसा ही सभी ने समझा होता तो शायद समय की भी काफी बचत हो गई होती और रीलबेंस भी बढ़ गई होती।

श्रीमन्, युनिवर्सिटी ग्रान्ट्स कमिशन के फंक्शन्स और पावर्स को देखते हुये यह बात बिलकुल निश्चित हो जाती है कि कमिशन के ऊपर बड़ी जबरदस्त और कॉम्प्लेक्टेंट किस्म का जिम्मेदारियाँ हैं। कमिशन का काम इतना बड़ा है कि उच्च शिक्षा का बिलकुल काया कल्प करना है। इस लिए मेरा मत है कि सदस्यों की जो संख्या रखी गई है और जो केवल ६ हैं वह बहुत ही थोड़ी हैं। इस में संदेह नहीं है कि जो नान ऑफिशल सदस्यों की संख्या बढ़ाने का अमेंडमेंट सरकार ने सिलेक्ट कमेटी में स्वीकार कर लिया है वह बहुत ही प्रशंसनीय और श्लाघ्य है। किन्तु आप ही यह सोचें कि इतने सीमित सदस्यों के द्वारा, इतने थोड़े स्टाफ के द्वारा, जैसा कि इस विधेयक में उल्लेख किया गया है, इतनी बड़ी जिम्मेदारी भला कैसे निभाई जा सकेंगी। श्रीमन्, कमिशन के स्टाफ को देखते हुये कि केवल उसमें एक सेंट्रलरी है जब कि इतनी बहुमुखी जिम्मेदारियाँ होंगी, ऐसा प्रतीत होता है कि जिन बड़ी उम्मीदों को लेकर कमिशन का निर्माण किया गया है वे शायद पूरी न हो सकें। यह बड़ी ही अच्छी बात है कि चेंबरमैन की तरह सदस्य भी हॉल टाइमर रखें गये हैं, लेकिन कहीं अच्छा होता यदि सदस्यों की संख्या और अधिक बढ़ा दी जाती और इन्हें

भागों में विभाजित करके प्रत्येक भाग का एक डिप्टी चेंबरमैन बना दिया गया होता। जैसा कि एक फाइनेंशल इम्प्लीकेशन को ही ले लीजिये, इतनी जबरदस्त उसकी जिम्मेदारी और इतनी छान बीन की आवश्यकता है कि जब तक एक अलग विभाग स्थापित न हो, एक अलग सेंट्रलरी सिर्फ इसी काम के लिए न रखा जाय और एक डिप्टी चेंबरमैन और कम से कम तीन सदस्यों की एक कमेटी न हो, यह काम कभी पूरी तरह से हो ही नहीं सकता। इसी प्रकार, श्रीमन्, मौजूदा और नई खुलने वाली युनिवर्सिटीयों में शिक्षा के स्तर को ऊँचा और सुलभ बनाने के लिए जो कार्य हैं जिसमें रिसर्च का भी बहुत अधिक काम करना पड़ेगा, यदि उसके विषय में अलग एक विभाग खोल कर अलग एक सेंट्रलरी की नियुक्ति न की गई तो इस काम के साथ भी कोई जस्टिफिकेशन न हो सकेगा। इसी प्रकार, श्रीमन्, रिसर्च का ही काम ले लीजिये। सारांश की जितनी भी शिक्षा संस्थाएँ हैं उनका डेटा कलेक्ट करना और उनकी पूरी जानकारी प्राप्त करना यह बड़ी भारी कालासल जिम्मेदारी का काम है और इसके लिए मैं चाहती हूँ कि पुनः अमेंडमेंट द्वारा एक अलग कमेटी इन्हीं सदस्यों में से बना कर और अलग स्टाफ रख कर उसको यह काम सौंपा जाय।

श्रीमन्, युनिवर्सिटी में मीडियम आफ इंस्ट्रक्शन को लेकर बड़ी बड़ी बहसें हुईं। मेरी समझ में नहीं आता कि इस स्टैंड पर इस दंगलबाजी की क्या आवश्यकता है। हमारी राष्ट्रभाषा हिन्दी अभी अपने शैशवकाल में है। इसी लिए आप सभी को विदित है कि कहीं अंग्रेजी धाक जमाये बैठी है, वहाँ रीजनल भाषाएँ अपना सिक्का जमाये बैठी हैं, पर हम सभी को यह न भूलना चाहिये कि यह केवल ट्रांज़ीशनल पीरियड के लिए उस अवधि के लिये है जब तक कि हिन्दी राष्ट्रभाषा अपना पूरा स्थान प्राप्त नहीं कर लेती है। इस सम्बन्ध में केवल सदस्यों को ही चिन्ता नहीं है बल्कि एजुकेशन मिनिस्ट्री के एक साधारण सेंट्रलरी से कई महीने पहले एक बार मेरी बात चीत हुई थी और उसने स्वयं

इस बात पर बड़ी चिन्ता प्रकट की थी कि एक प्रकार से जब तक मीडियम आफ इन्स्ट्रक्शन में यूनिवर्सिटी न आयेगी तब तक न शिक्षा का स्तर तेजी से बढ़ सकेगा और न देश की एजुका में ही या कोऑर्डिनेशन में ही सफलता मिल सकेगी। श्रीमान्, रीजनल भाषाओं की उन्नति और रीजनल भाषाओं की जो बढ़ोत्तरी का प्रश्न है वह भी एक अहम प्रश्न है, पर उस प्रश्न का मीडियम आफ इन्स्ट्रक्शन वाले प्रश्न पर कोई भी असर नहीं पड़ता। जो आज यूनिवर्सिटीयों की स्थिति है उसके लिए न एजुकेशन मिनिस्ट्री ही जिम्मेदार है और न यूनिवर्सिटीयों ही जिम्मेदार हैं क्योंकि ऐसी स्थिति ही है कि उस स्थिति से मजबूर हो कर ऐसा हो रहा है। आप ५० पी० को ही ले लीजिये। ५० पी० में यद्यपि मीडियम आफ इन्स्ट्रक्शन हिन्दी मान लिया गया है, लेकिन बहुत से ऐसे विषय हैं जिन में उच्च पुस्तकें न होने के कारण या उच्च स्टाफ न होने के कारण अब भी अंग्रेजी में उनको पढ़ाया जा रहा है। इसीलिए वह ऐसा प्रश्न है जिसकी हम लोग बड़े धीरे-धीरे के साथ और बड़ी संतुलित भाषा में आलाचना करें तभी हम लोग एजुकेशन मिनिस्ट्री के साथ भी और यूनिवर्सिटीयों के साथ भी न्याय कर सकेंगे।

श्रीमान्, शिक्षित बंकारी को किस प्रकार रोका जाय इस बात पर कमीशन को बहुत ही गंभीरता से विचार करना होगा।

(MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN in the Chair.)

यहां तक कि यह भली-भांति जानते हुये भी कि शिक्षा का प्रसार देश की उन्नति के साथ बंधा हुआ है, जितनी देश की उन्नति होगी उतना ही शिक्षा का प्रसार होगा और शिक्षितों की संख्या भी बढ़ती जायेगी और शिक्षा की मांग भी बढ़ती जायेगी, यह बात हमें कभी न भूलनी चाहिये कि आज भी यूनिवर्सिटी एजुकेशन का प्रभाव दंख कर और आज भी शिक्षित बंकारों की बढ़ती हुई संख्या दंख कर बहुत से लोग घबड़ा कर कह उठते हैं कि इस स्थिति से यही अच्छा है कि यूनिवर्सिटीयों ही बन्द कर दी जायें, यूनिवर्सिटी की शिक्षा ही बिलकुल समाप्त क

दी जाय। इस लिए यह बड़ा ही अहम प्रश्न है। क्लाज २० को लेकर बहुत से सदस्यों ने जो एतद्गत और चिन्ताएं प्रकट की हैं मैं सोचती हूं कि वे बिलकुल निराधार और निमूल हैं। किसी भी देशभक्त के लिए राष्ट्रीय महत्व की बातों को सर्वोच्च और सर्वोपरि स्थान देना एक बड़ी साधारण सी बात है। जब हम लोगों ने देश की स्थिति को दंख कर, देश की मांग को दंख कर अपने कॉन्स्टिट्यूशन तक को अमेंड किया है और जो सम्पत्ति पर निजी स्वामित्व है उस तक मैं हमने यह अमेंडमेंट किया है कि किसी भी व्यक्ति की कोई भी सम्पत्ति राष्ट्रीय महत्व के कामों के लिए किसी समय भी थोड़ा सा मुआविजा देकर ली जा सकेगी। तो आप ही बतायें कि यूनिवर्सिटी ग्रांट्स कमीशन के नेशनल इम्पाटर्न्स के मामले को केंद्रीय सरकार के अनुशासन में और गार्डरूम में रखने की अगर मांग की गई है तो क्या बंजा बात है। मैं सोचती हूं कि इससे किसी प्रकार भी यूनिवर्सिटी की स्वतंत्रता पर कोई भी प्रभाव पड़ने वाला नहीं है। देश की स्थिति को दंखकर क्लाज १२ पर श्री कृष्ण चन्द की आलाचना को सुनकर मुझे बड़ा आश्चर्य हुआ। श्रीमान्, आप ही दंखें कि शिक्षा के क्षेत्र में भी व्यवसायी प्रवृत्ति के लोगों ने किस प्रकार शोषण करना प्रारम्भ किया है, किस प्रकार पंजाब यूनिवर्सिटी और इलाहाबाद विद्यापीठ की डिग्रीयों का धड़ाधड़ सर आम व्यापार होता है, विक्री होती है, और किस प्रकार एक धानधली सी मची हुई है। यदि ऐसी स्थिति में थोड़ा सा कंट्रोल न किया गया जैसा कि क्लाज १२ के द्वारा किया गया है, तो आप निश्चित समझिये कि शिक्षा के स्तर का पतन अवश्यम्भावी हो जायेगा। श्रीमान्, कोऑर्डिनेशन को लेकर जिस संकीर्ण मनोवृत्ति का प्रदर्शन किया गया है वह भी बड़ा ही निन्दनीय और त्याज्य है। जहां तक कोऑर्डिनेशन के सम्बन्ध में रीजनल भाषाओं का और प्राक्वैशियलीज्म का प्रश्न है, ऐसे महत्वपूर्ण प्रश्नों में तो इन बातों को लाना एक प्रकार से देशद्रोह करना है।

इसके अतिरिक्त मैं चाहती हूं कि यूनिवर्सिटी ग्रांट्स कमीशन में जो स्वी सदस्य

[श्रीमती सावित्री दश्री निगम]

रखने की मांग की गई है वह अवश्य स्वीकार कर ली जाय क्योंकि शिक्षा के क्षेत्र में स्थिरता इतनी तेजी से आगे बढ़ रही है कि यूनिवर्सिटी एजुकेशन के मामले में यदि इस कमीशन में एक स्त्री सदस्य न रखी गई तो समस्त स्त्री जाति के साथ ही एक बड़ा अन्याय होगा। श्रीमन्, आप यह स्वयं समझते हैं कि शिक्षा का चाहे जो भी क्षेत्र हो लेकिन स्त्रियों के शिक्षा के सम्बन्ध में कहीं न कहीं जाकर कुछ न कुछ अन्तर और विभेद आ ही जाता है। इस लिए उस अन्तर और उस विभेद को सन्तुलित और संयोजित करने के लिए इस कमीशन में स्त्री सदस्य का होना अत्यधिक आवश्यक है। धन्यवाद।

SHRI B. M. GUPTE (Bombay): Sir, as the time at my disposal is short, I shall confine myself to one or two points only. I shall refer to a point which, I feel, is of general importance, that is, of importance not only for this Bill but of importance to all Bills generally. During the last session I had the misfortune to raise my voice of protest against a provision in a Bill—I do not remember which Bill it was, but that is immaterial for my present purpose but I did raise my voice of protest against a provision in the Bill—which sought to authorise the Central Government to amend the Schedule without reference to Parliament, that is, without bringing in an amending Bill before Parliament. I objected to that provision as an encroachment on the sphere of Parliament and I am sorry, again the same tendency is displayed in this Bill. I refer to clause 6. That clause 6 authorises the Central Government to prescribe the disqualifications of members. I submit, Sir, to determine the disqualification of a body which is to superintend the working of all the Universities of the country is not a trifling matter. It is an important matter and therefore it should have been laid down in the Bill itself and not relegated to the rule-making power of the Government. If we com-

pare other Acts where disqualifications have to be provided for, we will find that they are all laid down in the Acts themselves. Take for instance the disqualifications about the members of the Grom *Panchayats*, members of local boards, members of municipalities, members of Legislatures, everywhere you will find that all these disqualifications have been embodied in the Acts themselves and not entrusted to the Government, to their rule-making power and therefore I submit, Sir, there is no reason why this should not be done in this case also. If the disqualifications are on the usual lines, namely, insolvency, conviction in a criminal court, etc., then they can be embodied in this Bill itself. If they are of an unusual type, then it is all the more necessary that they should be discussed by Parliament and Parliament should determine them. I therefore submit that either way they ought to be embodied in the Bill and not entrusted to the Central Government. Of course I know that this Government which has very strong popular support and which is headed by a Prime Minister who has stubborn democratic instincts and convictions will not abuse this power. But at the same time the Government ought to take care that they do not lay down precedents which may be abused by Governments which are not so well placed or which are not so well intentioned. I would therefore request the Minister to see if it is possible to make suitable amendments here. If the Government is not in a great hurry, it can be done here and the Bill taken to that House. But, in any event, Government should avoid this tendency to have very wide rule-making power because, that kind of tendency is likely to be exploited by Governments which are not so well placed and well-intentioned.

Then coming to the Bill as a whole, I welcome it no doubt as a step in the right direction, but it must be remembered that it is only a step. Our Universities have been suffering from so many ills, inadequacy of funds.

indiscipline among students, faction- | alism and group politics among the teachers and deterioration of standards, etc. and one Bill is not likely to cure them all. I therefore submit that other steps have to be taken. But even as far as this Bill is concerned, even if this one measure is to succeed, then the Government should do two things. First they must place sufficient funds at the disposal of the Commission and secondly they must make proper selection of the members of the Commission. I have no quarrel about nomination, but I expect that the Government will exercise this power of nomination in a proper way and the selection must be such as would inspire people's confidence in the impartiality and independence of a member and of the Commission. Sir, this power of sanctioning grants and withholding grants is a very great power and it cannot be usefully exercised unless the Commission has got sufficient prestige, which can be acquired only by integrity and independence. I therefore hope, Sir, that the Government will make such selection as would inspire the confidence of all, and endowed with this confidence and endowed with sufficient funds I hope the Commission will contribute substantially to the development of our Universities on the right lines, and to patterns which are in consonance with our great and ancient traditions.

SHRI JASPAT ROY KAPOOR: Mr. Deputy Chairman. I welcome this Bill for it has been brought before us not a day too early. I particularly appreciate the labours of the Select Committee which scrutinised this Bill very carefully and chiselled it finally in the bracing atmosphere of Poona where four meetings of the Select Committee were held. Sir, I am glad that a new precedent has been established that Select Committees can meet away from Delhi also and I hope that this precedent will be followed in the case of disposing of other business. As a matter of fact, Sir, I would very much wish that in the interests of the unity of the country, some session of the

Parliament also may be held, one session of the Parliament each year may be held in the South or at intervals in different parts of the country.

Sir, I welcome this Bill in spite of some of the defects which I still find in it and which I hope will be rectified by accepting the amendments notices whereof I have already given and in respect of which I do not propose to take the time of the House at this late hour. I will deal with them as and when they are taken up.

Sir, a good deal has been said against this Bill and it has been said that it is intended to impose the control of the Central Government firstly on the Commission itself and through it on the Universities. It is nothing like it. It is amazing to find such a criticism being levelled against it by my hon. friend, Mr. Mazumdar, who belongs to a party whose creed is that the Central Government should take control over everything, over every sphere of activity of the nation, but then every stick with them is good enough to beat the Government with even though it might amount to inconsistency with their own creed. But what is still more amazing to find is that my hon. friend, Mrs. Lakshmi Menon should have supported Mr. Mazumdar in this respect. Truly they say politics make strange bed-fellows. I do not know. Mrs. Lakshmi Menon is not here though I found that she has practically made up with my hon. friend, Dr. Shrimali, for, during his absence, she had affectionately adopted this Bill on behalf of the Government and was looking after this monster which she hated when she was on the benches behind Dr. Shrimali.

Being in a very great hurry I may point out to five or six things which specially go to show that it is none of the intentions of the Government or this Bill to dominate either over the Commission or over the Universities. May I at the very outset point to clause 12 which specifically lays down that in discharging its functions the Commission shall do nothing

[Shri Jaspat Roy Kapoor.] without consulting the Universities? In Chapter III which deals with the powers and functions of the Commission this great limitation has been imposed on the Commission.

> DR. W. S. BARLINGAY (Madhya Pradesh): Which clause is it?

SHRI JASPAT ROY KAPOOR: It is clause 12. It says here:

"It shall be the general duty of the Commission to take, in consultation with the Universities or other bodies concerned, all such steps...."

Not only the Universities shall be consulted but all other institutions which are likely to be affected by any action of the Commission will be consulted. This is how this Chapter relating to the powers and functions of the Commission begins with this great limitation.

Then so far as inspection of the Universities is concerned, it has been specifically laid down in clause 13 that in the matter of inspection the University will be consulted, not only

consulted but will be definitely associated with the inspection when it is carried out by the Commission. We find that the Select Committee has

deleted the provision which originally authorised the Commission to enquire into the affairs of the University. That provision has been deleted and the Commission can now only inspect and that too in consultation and association with the University. Again, the Chairman is to be a non-official, absolutely out of the jurisdiction and influence of the Government.

DR. W. S. BARLINGAY: He will be paid by the Government.

SHRI JASPAT ROY KAPOOR: Yes; everybody is paid by the Government. Even we are paid by the Government and we vote for the payment ourselves. Similarly we shall be voting for the salary of the Chairman also. Is it seriously contended that everyone who is paid out of the

Consolidated Funds of India will lose all independence and everybody associated with Parliament or the Government will be subservient to the Government?

Then we find that the term has been fixed as six years and thereafter I suppose he will not be reappointed. For, if it were open to him to be reappointed, it would have been specifically laid down in the Bill. As such all these six years or during the reduced term if my amendment is accepted, he will have absolutely no inducement to act subserviently because after the expiry of the term he is not going to be reappointed. So far as the other members are concerned, I find that they are not to be salaried members. Perhaps they will be paid only some allowances and I think that even this objection of my friend Dr. Barlingay that if a person is paid a salary he may not be independent goes away so far as the other members are concerned. For, they are not to be salaried members and they will perhaps be paid only some travelling allowance or daily allowance, whatever that may be.

Then I find to my great satisfaction—as I am sure other hon. Members must also have been satisfied—that no member of the Commission shall be removed by the Government. He can be asked to leave only if he is subject to any disqualification which is going to be prescribed under the rules. I entirely agree with my hon. friend Mr. Gupte who always makes very valuable and substantial suggestions that it is not very proper that the Government should under its rulemaking power have the right to prescribe disqualifications but then I submit that it is something good that the Select Committee has embodied in this Bill that all the rules which the Government makes from time to time shall be placed before both Houses of Parliament. But of course merely placing anything on the Table of Parliament does not take us very far unless it is specifically provided that Parliament shall have

the power to amend or to modify reject those rules, i the therefore submitted

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: That is why it is placed on the Table of Parliament.

SHRI JASPAT ROY KAPOOR: No, Sir. May I respectfully submit that—I will be glad if I am wrong in this respect—merely if a paper is laid on the Table of the House it does not necessarily authorise Parliament by the mere fact of its having been laid on the Table to amend it. Of course, Parliament is a sovereign body and can do anything it likes by a resolution or by a Bill but then, ordinarily, if it is the intention it may specifically be provided that within a definite period after being laid on the Table

"MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Within 30 days of laying on the Table of Parliament any Member of Parliament can give notice of amendments and get them amended.

SHRI JASPAT ROY KAPOOR: I am glad to be corrected like that. But I was going to make such a suggestion because in the case of certain other Bills, in the case of the Companies Bill which we passed and in the case of the Citizenship Bill which will come before us, it has been specifically provided that within a period of 14 days from the date on which the rules are laid on the Table of the House Parliament can amend, modify or reject them. Well, if such a specific provision is not necessary, if it was redundant in the case of the Companies Bill and may be redundant in the case of the Citizenship Bill, it is all good for us. It means that merely with the rules that we have in operation it is always open to us within 30 days to amend such things. I am very much obliged to you, Sir, for enlightening me on this point.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Your time is up, Mr. Kapoor.

SHRI JASPAT ROY KAPOOR: One point more, Sir. And that is with regard to the question of co-ordinating the activities of the Universities and on this occasion I would crave your indulgence for a couple of minutes.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: No; no. You must wind up.

SHRI JASPAT ROY KAPOOR: Al? right; one minute, Sir. When I raise that point I hope those sixty seconds would not run away very quickly. I am raising a question which is of an all-India importance and that is with regard to Hindi. I submit that this Commission and the educational system in the country will hardly be of much avail to us unless we are in a position to bring about the unity of the country through a common language and that language, I submit, can only be Hindi. And what is that Hindi? I want to remove the misapprehension that is

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The Constitution defines it all right.

SHRI JASPAT ROY KAPOOR: Exactly, Sir. You have so very clearly grasped what I had in mind. I was going to submit that that is not the Hindi of the Uttar Pradesh, that it is not the Hindi of the Hindi-speaking areas but the Hindi as it has been defined in the Constitution, the Hindi against which an unnecessary prejudice is being created in several parts of the country because of the simple reason that they have not had the benefit of the enlightenment which you have been pleased to give us at this moment.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: It is time. You have taken three minutes more. Dr. Barlingay.

SHRI JASPAT ROY KAPOOR: Then the last sentence, Sir. Let me "toe coherent at least. I would earnestly request my hon. friends here and outside in the country to clearly understand that this is not the Hindi of the Uttar Pradesh which has been prescribed in the Constitution but a Hindi

[Shri Jaspal Roy Kapoor.]
which will be more easily understood
by Members from the South because
its basis has to be Sanskrit. And then
only one last point, Sir.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I am
sorry. Dr. Barlingay.

डा० इरुलू० एस० बालिंगे : उपसभापति
महोदय,.....

श्री हि० च० शासणा : अरु भाई, अंगूजी में
बोलिए।

डा० इरुलू० एस० बालिंगे : यद्यपि मेरे कुछ
मित्रों के मन में हैं कि मैं अंगूजी में बोलूँ,
लेकिन मैं आज हिन्दी में बोलने के मूढ़ नहीं हूँ।
मैं आपका ज्यादा समय नहीं लूंगा क्योंकि मैं
जानता हूँ कि समय बहुत थोड़ा है। अगर इस
सार्वभौमिक विचारण किया जाय तो आपको
यह पता चलना चाहिए कि इसमें जो सबसे
महत्व की धारा है वह पांचवीं धारा है।

जहां तक कर्तव्यों की बात है, कमीशन के जो
कर्तव्य बताये गये हैं, वह तो आज भी सरकार के
हाथ में हैं। आप धारा १६ देखिए, इसमें यह
बताया गया है कि आखिर इस कमीशन के पास
पैसा कहां से आएगा, वह पैसा पूरा का पूरा
स्टेट गवर्नमेंट की तरफ से आयेगा या सेंट्रल
गवर्नमेंट की तरफ से। वैसे ही, धारा १२ में जो
कर्तव्य दिए हुए हैं इस कमीशन के, उनमें एक
भी कर्तव्य ऐसा नहीं है जो सरकार के अधिकार
में न हो, या जो सरकार कर नहीं सकती। फिर
यह बिल यहां इस सभा के सामने किस लिए
लाया गया है? अगर आप फिर विश्लेषण करेंगे
तो आप देखेंगे कि एक ही बात उसमें है। उसमें
यह है कि आज जो चीजें सरकार कर सकती है,
उसके बदले वे सब बातें कमीशन करेगा जिसको
कि कांस्टिट्यूशन में दिया गया है। और
इसके द्वारा सरकार के जो पावर्स और जो कर्तव्य
आज हैं उनको यह कमीशन बाद में अपने ऊपर
ले लेगा। मैं वह नहीं समझता कि इसकी
सबसे मुख्य में क्या जरूरत है? अगर सरकार के पास
वे कर्तव्य रहें सब तो उसके ऊपर पार्लियामेंट का

भी कुछ दबाव रह सकता है, लेकिन यह जो
कमीशन नियुक्त किया गया है, इसके ऊपर
पार्लियामेंट का डाइरेक्टली कोई दबाव नहीं
रहेगा। यह दूसरी बात है कि उसको पैसा
सरकार देने वाली है और डाइरेक्टली नहीं तो
इंटरमिडियरी सरकार का उसके ऊपर दबाव
रहेगा। लेकिन ऐसा कमीशन नियुक्त करके
आपने क्या किया, उसको इंडिपेंडेंट बना कर
आपने क्या किया? अगर आप देखेंगे हैं कि आज
की जो सरकार है उसकी मैनीजरी ठीक नहीं
है, वह एजुकेशनल पोलिसी ठीक से तय नहीं कर
सकती तो फिर अगर आप एडवाइजर के तौर पर
फिली को एपॉइंट कर दें तो उसमें कोई
क्षमता नहीं है। लेकिन आपने कमीशन को
स्ट्रुक्चररी पावर्स दिये हैं जिसका अर्थ यह है
कि उनको आपने करीब करीब एक डिक्टरेटर
सा बना दिया है। अगर आप एक ऐसा
एजुकेशनल डिक्टरेटर पेंदा करें, तो हो सकता
है कि वह बहुत फायदा भी करेगा। मैं यह नहीं
कहता कि वह फायदा नहीं करेगा। लेकिन
सामान्यतया और खासकर एजुकेशन के बारे में
जहां की डिक्टोरियल पोलिसी होगी, वहां मुझे
संदेह है कि अगर यह कमीशन में आदमी ठीक
नहीं होंगे या वे अपना जो मार्ग है वह भूल गये
तो यह देश शायद खतरों में पड़ जायेगा। इसलिए
मैं आपसे यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि यद्यपि मैं
यह जानता हूँ कि इस बिल से कुछ फायदा भी
होगे लेकिन यह निश्चित रूप से कहना बड़ा
मूर्खतावादी बात है कि इससे नुकसान भी नहीं
लेगा।

मेरे मित्र श्री कपूर ने एक बात कही जिस पर
मैंने एतराज किया, वह है सैलरीज के बारे में।
यह जो कमीशन होगा और खासकर जो उसका
चेंबरमैन होगा वह होल टाइम और सैलरीड होगा,
यानी उसको सरकार की तरफ से एक तनख्वाह
मिलेगी। मैं इसको ठीक नहीं मानता। यद्यपि
मैं यह जानता हूँ कि इस देश में आनररी
सर्विस करना एक बड़ा कठिन काम है लेकिन
फिर भी मैं यह चाहूंगा कि अगर आप इस
आदमी को सरकार से इंडिपेंडेंट या स्वतंत्र

रखना चाहते हैं, सरकार का कोई भी असर उसके ऊपर नहीं चाहते हैं, और यही तो आखिर एजुकेशन पोलिसी की सब से बड़ी महत्व की बात है तो फिर उसको सैलरी देना उचित नहीं होगा, ऐसा मैं नम्रता से कहना चाहूंगा। इस देश के अन्दर आप सोशलिस्टिक पैटर्न आफ सोसाइटी उत्पन्न करने जा रहे हैं तो ऐसी सोसाइटी में आज एक इस तरह की स्ट्रिज आ जानी चाहिये कि उसमें जो सब से ऊंचे पद पर हैं, जैसे कि प्राइम मिनिस्टर हैं, प्रेजिडेंट हैं और भी दूसरे बड़े-से आह्वेदार लोग हैं, वे आपको ऐसे मिलने चाहिये कि वे सरकार से एक काँड़ी भी न लें। जिस दिन ऐसे आदमी इस देश में पैदा होंगे और ऐसी भावना लोगों के मन में आ जायेगी उस दिन से यह देश ज्यादा से ज्यादा उन्नति करेगा। जिस सोसाइटी के अन्दर पैसे पर ज्यादा से ज्यादा जोर (इम्फोसिस) दिया जाता है वह सोसाइटी कभी बढ़ नहीं सकती और जहाँ बड़े-से लोग पैसे के लालच से दूर नहीं हो सकते, उस सोसाइटी के बढ़ने की कभी आशा नहीं की जा सकती है, यह मैं बड़े अदब से कहना चाहता हूँ।

आखिर मैं, केवल एक बात आपके निदर्शन में लाना चाहता हूँ और वह यह है कि धारा २३ में यह बताया गया है कि जो यूनिवर्सिटी शब्द है, उसका इस्तेमाल आम तौर से नहीं हो सकेगा। मुझे ऐसा लगता है कि ऐसा करना और उसके बाद उसके ऊपर कुछ रोक लगाना, कुछ पब्लिशमेंट लगा देना, कुछ हार्श सी बात है। मुझे इतना ही कहना था और अगर जिन दोषों को मैंने बतलाने की कोशिश की है, वे न रहें तो मैं समझता हूँ यह बिल आन दी होल अच्छा है।

BEGAM AIZAZ RASUL (Uttar Pradesh) : Mr. Deputy Chairman, I welcome the institution of this University Grants Commission. I realise the great importance of this measure and its far reaching consequences. This Commission has very wide powers as well as great responsibilities. Universities are the greatest educational centres of the country upon whose

well being and development depends the future of India. Education and particularly higher education has assumed great importance and as we develop towards the goal of a socialistic pattern of society and increased industrialisation, it is a question which will assume greater importance. Both our Five Year Plans have been laying great stress upon the economic and industrial development of the country. But I have been very unhappy to find that attention to the human development of our country has not received the same attention and that is the reason why today we find in our country the unfortunate tendencies amongst students of indiscipline and rowdiness. I feel that we have to see that the future citizens of our country are brought up properly and are imbued with the highest principles of citizenship and that can only happen when we give our very great and very serious attention to the problems of education in this country. Speaking as a mother—I am afraid that I cannot claim to speak as an educationist—as a person who has had something to do with the public and political affairs of the country for the last seventeen or eighteen years and also having some experience of University working—because I have been closely associated with one or the other of the five Universities of our State—I find that one of the main causes for these tendencies are to be found in the overcrowding of our Universities and I hope that this University Grants Commission will give proper attention to this very, very important question.

Now, overcrowding of Universities naturally means that there is a paucity of teachers and when the principle has been accepted all over the world that a class should not have more than thirty or forty students, we find in our classes in the Universities students numbering 125, 150 and even up to 200. Then, how can we expect that these students will imbibe the principle of discipline and leadership when no personal attention can be paid to them by the teachers? There

[Begam Aizaz RasuL] is no doubt that the responsibility of the teachers is very great. There is also no doubt that the absence of personal contact between students and teachers and of the lack of individual attention is responsible to a very large extent for what is happening. Therefore, it is very necessary that more teachers should be provided for these large number of students who are increasing daily. Therefore, there will be the question of placing more funds at the disposal of the universities. The University Grants Commission will have to look into this question.

There is also the intricate problem of party politics and cliques created by elections in the Universities. This is also to a very great extent responsible for the present state of affairs and the Radhakrishnan Report also discouraged elections in the Universities. All these things will have to be looked into by the University-Grants Commission.

I would like to deal with one more important aspect. The Planning Commission in its First Five Year Plan said:

"Problems concerning women's education has received considerable attention in the Plan. It is recommended that while women should have educational opportunities with men in various fields of education, special attention should be given to those in which they have marked aptitudes. For advancing women's education, it is important that extensive opportunities should be afforded to them for private study and for taking the higher examination as private candidates. The organisation of short-term courses for women in general education and in crafts is also recommended."

Five years have elapsed since the above recommendations were made, but I do not see that these have been acted upon in any way in any of the States. I hope that this very important question also will be dealt with

by the Commission, because we find that large numbers of girls—and boys also—are going in for higher education for which they have neither any aptitude nor need. I certainly feel that those students should go in for higher education, who want jobs or want to do any research work or administrative work. But for the majority of the students especially girls, I think that these recommendations of the Planning Commission should be acted upon so that they may be given opportunities to learn crafts-and get general education.

It is stated in the same Report:

"Overcrowding in the universities is also a problem which causes considerable concern. The need to apply suitable tests for selecting those who should receive university education and to draw as large a proportion of students as possible into gainful occupations before they reach the university stage is stressed."

Therefore, this is a very necessary-thing and I hope that the Commission: will go into this problem.

Much has been said about the academic independence and the autonomous character of the University. I entirely agree with it and stress upon the point that the autonomy and the independent character of the Universities should be maintained. But at the same time, this can be worked out much more satisfactorily if there is complete cooperation between the Universities, the State Governments: and the University Grants Commission.

I hope that this Commission in which we all have the greatest faith and confidence will go a long way in solving the problems that are today before us as regards the educational policy of our Government as well as the future of our young men and women.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN (To *Shri Jaspat Roy Kapoor*): I And that there is no such general rule. It is a

mistake. Every Act empowers the Parliament to amend the rules. There is no general rule. That was a mistake. That information is not correct.

SHRI JASPAT ROY KAPOOR: So, I hope, Sir, that what you thought ought to be, will be incorporated in this Bill also.

श्री पद्मीराज कपूर (नाम-निर्दिष्ट) : माननीय उपसभापति महोदय, मैं इस बिल का समर्थन करता हूँ और इस कमीशन का स्वागत करता हूँ। इसके साथ ही मैं बधाई देना चाहता हूँ एजुकेशन मिनिस्ट्री को कि उसने इतने त्याग से काम लिया है। अपनी तमाम शक्तियों को एक कमीशन को सौंप देना एक बहुत बड़ी बात है।

यह बात चन्द भाइयों ने यहां कही कि पावर का सेंट्रलाइजेशन कर लिया जाय, यह गलत है। मैं समझता हूँ कि इस बिल के द्वारा एक बहुत बड़ा और सही कदम उठाया जा रहा है। और उसके दो रूप हैं। एक रूप यह है कि इस कमीशन का मुख्य काम केवल यही नहीं होगा कि वह गांट्स को तय करेगा, पैसे उठा कर दे देगा, बल्कि इसका सम्बन्ध तमाम एजुकेशन से होगा, एजुकेशन की पालिसी से होगा और यह तमाम एजुकेशन की पालिसी को तय करेगा। ऐसे काम के लिए एकान्त, पूरी शांति और पूरा ध्यान की जरूरत है। जहां इतनी दौड़ धूप करनी पड़ती है, इतने सवालों का जवाब देना पड़ता है, कभी उठना पड़ता है, कभी बैठना पड़ता है, तो एक आदमी किस तरह फोर्ड चीज सोच सकता है। यह बड़े धैर्य की चीज है कि ऐसी बातें सोची जायें कि देश के उत्थान में बच्चों को किस तरह लगाया जाय। इस लिहाज से कम से कम इस विषय में सब को स्वागत करना चाहिये। दूसरा रूप यह है कि सेंट्रलाइजेशन किया जा रहा है, तमाम शक्ति को एक जगह केंद्रित किया जा रहा है, इसके खिलाफ एक आवाज उठी, लेकिन हैरत है कि यह क्यों :

मन ची में सरायम,

व तम्बूरा मन ची में सरायद।

मैं क्या गा रहा हूँ और मंत्र तम्बूरा क्या गा रहा है। दोनों आवाजें जब अलग होती हैं तो एक बड़ी भाँड़ी सी आवाज पैदा होती है और वह बड़ी अशांति पैदा करती है। यही वजह है कि आज अलग अलग प्रान्तों में अलग अलग पालिसी चल रही है और सारा देश में एक स्वर नहीं पैदा हो सका है जो कि होना चाहिये। तो यह कमीशन इस लिए भी स्वागत का अधिकारी है कि यह एक पालिसी तमाम देश की एजुकेशन के लिए, तालीम के लिए, शिक्षा के लिए निश्चित करेगा। इस लिए जहां मैं बधाई देता हूँ वहां साथ ही यह भी प्रार्थना करूंगा कि कमीशन के ऊपर जो जिम्मेदारियां आती हैं उनकी ओर उसे खास ध्यान देना चाहिये। पावर आफ दि पर्स एक बहुत बड़ी शक्ति है और उसका उपयोग भी हो सकता है और दुरुपयोग भी हो सकता है। जिसके हाथ में पर्स होगा वह एक डूंगडूंगी के रूप में होगा और वह जिस तरह से चाहेगा, नचायेगा। इस लिए पर्स का सही इस्तेमाल होना चाहिये, उसका उपयोग होना चाहिये। मेरा ख्याल है कि यह बात हर एक के अनुभव में आई है कि आज जो गांट मिल रही है वह रिजल्ट के ऊपर मिल रही है। सॉ में से इतने लड़के पास होते हैं या इतने प्रतिशत लड़के पास होते हैं, इस लिए गांट मिल रही है चाहे मरियल से मरियल लड़के पास होकर निकलें और उनकी एक नंशन ही बन जाय। इस लिए मुझे पूरी आशा है कि यह कमीशन इस बात पर ध्यान देगा कि उन इंस्टीट्यूशन्स को गांट मिले जो पूरी तरह पूरी शिक्षा का ध्यान रखते हैं और शिक्षा के पूरे मान के समर्थक शिक्षा का प्रबन्ध करते हैं। इस तरह तमाम देश में एक लहर फैलेगी और शिक्षा का एक नया रूप पैदा होगा। हमें यह देखना है कि इंसान, इंसान बन, हमें उसको मनुष्य बनाना है, इंसान बनाना है और ऐसा इंसान बनाना है जो कि देश को ऊपर उठा सके। आज सैकड़ों बातें कालेज के बच्चों के लिये, देश के बच्चों के लिये कही जाती हैं उन बातों की जिम्मेदारी बच्चों पर ही क्यों ढाली जाती है ? उसकी

[श्री पृथ्वीराज कपूर]

जिम्मेदारी बहुत सी चीजों पर हैं। वर्षों तक हम गुलाम रहे और वर्षों से शिक्षा का एक रूप चला आया है, मकाले साहब ने केवल बलक बनाने के लिये शिक्षा की जो लकीर डाल दी थी उसी पर हम चलते चल गये और हम उससे हट नहीं। ये सब बातें हैं जिनकी वजह से आज यह हालत है। अब वक्त आ गया है कि हम उसको बदलें और यह कमीशन इसी लिये खड़ा किया गया है कि वह शिक्षा का एक नया रूप हमारे सामने लाये ताकि हम असली मानों में देश के बच्चों को तैयार कर सकें।

कुई देका यह देखने में आया है कि जिन लोगों को इम्तिहान में बैठने का मौका नहीं दिया गया वही आगे जा कर बहुत सफल हुये। चूंकि उनके नम्बर कम थे इसलिये उनको इम्तिहान में बैठने नहीं दिया गया लेकिन उन्होंने जिन्दगी में बड़े बड़े काम किये और बाद में उसी यूनिवर्सिटी ने, उसी कालेज ने और उसी इंस्टीट्यूशन ने बड़े फसू और गरूर से कहा कि यह हमारी यूनिवर्सिटी में, हमारे कालेज में, हमारी इंस्टीट्यूशन में रह चुके हैं, हालांकि वक्त पर उन्होंने शायद उनको फार्म नहीं दिया था कि वह इम्तिहान में बैठ सकें। अगर आप अच्छी तरह से विचारें तां आप देखेंगे कि बहुत से ऐसे लोग हैं जो कि दिन रात पढ़ते हैं और इम्तिहान पास कर लेते हैं लेकिन फिर भी केवल धाँट बन कर रह जाते हैं। जो चीजें लिखी हुई हैं उनको याद कर लिया और डिग्री ले ली लेकिन उनमें कोई ज्ञान नहीं थी और वह दुनिया में कुछ नहीं कर सके। मैं कोई जेनरलाइजेशन नहीं कर रहा हूँ। ऐसे केसेज हैं कि बिना डिग्री लिये वह दुनिया में डट लेकिन जिन्होंने डिग्रीयां लीं उनमें जिन्दगी नहीं थी। तो मेरा कहना है कि जब यह कमीशन किसी इंस्टीट्यूशन को गांट दे तां उनसे यह भी कहे कि आखिर तुम बच्चों को क्या शिक्षा देते हो और तुम्हारी क्या शिक्षा है। मुझे आशा है कि यह कमीशन जब शिक्षा के बारे में फैसला करेगा तां वह नये नये रास्ते और नये नये रूप उनके

सामने रखेगा और चरित्र निर्माण पर विशेष रूप से जोर दिया जायेगा। चरित्र के माने केवल यह न हों कि वह एक निर्गोटव टाइप का हो, यानी यह नहीं खाओ, यह नहीं पीओ बल्कि यह हो कि बच्चा जो करे वह सब की भलाई के लिये करे और उसमें ज्ञान हो, जिन्दगी हो। एक बच्चा कालेज को ऊपर उठाता है, कालेज के भंडे को ऊपर रखता है, स्पोर्ट्स के दिनों में उसके लिये बड़ी तालियां बजती हैं लेकिन इम्तिहान के वक्त में वह पीछे रह जाता है क्योंकि उसने अपने को सिर्फ उन १०, १५ सवालों तक ही महदूद नहीं रखा, उसने सिर्फ लिखने पढ़ने तक ही अपने को महदूद नहीं रखा और इसलिये पीछे रह गया। जिन्दगी सिर्फ लिखने पढ़ने से ही नहीं बनती है, जिन्दगी बहुत चीजों से बनती है। वह बच्चा चाहे संगीत में, ड्रामे में और दूसरे कामों में हिस्सा लेता हो, चाहे टैरीटोरियल ग्राप्स में, एन० सी० सी० में और ए० सी० सी० में जा कर सेवा का काम करता हो लेकिन ये तमाम चीजें इम्तिहान के वक्त पर नजरअंदाज कर दी जाती हैं और उन्हें पीछे डाल दिया जाता है। सिर्फ इम्तिहान के सात, आठ दिनों में लड़के की जिन्दगी का फैसला कर दिया जाता है। मेरा कहना है कि कैरिकुलम को बदल देना चाहिये और उसकी जिन्दगी का फैसला इस पर होना चाहिये कि उसने तमाम साल भर में, उसने तमाम उन वर्षों में जो कि उसने कालेज में और स्कूल में गुजारे हैं, क्या किया है। उसकी किस तरह की पढ़ाई रही है, उसका चरित्र किस तरह का रहा है, किस किस स्पोर्ट्स में उसने हिस्सा लिया है, इन सब चीजों के लिये मादर्स होने चाहिये और तब उसकी जिन्दगी का फैसला किया जाना चाहिये। जब ऐसा होगा तां बच्चा एक मुकम्मल इंसान बन कर निकलेगा और यह सब गड़बड़ी नहीं होगी जो कि आज कल हो रही है। इस तरह से बच्चे में, कालेज में और स्कूल में एक जिन्दगी आयेगी, एक ज्ञान आयेगी। बच्चा भी खुशी से ऐसे ऐसे काम करेगा जो कि उत्थान के हैं, उन्नति के हैं और आगे बढ़ने के लिये हैं।

(समय की घंटी)

श्रीमान, मैंने अभी थोड़ा ही समय लिया है। अभी मेरे तीन मिनट बाकी हैं।

श्री उपसभापति : एक मिनट और है।

श्री पृथ्वीराज कपूर : अच्छा, मैं बहुत जल्दी खत्म करता हूँ। वस मेरी यही प्रार्थना है कि शिक्षा ऐसी हो जिसका कि जिन्दगी से सम्बन्ध हो। केवल पुस्तकों तक ही उसको नहीं सीमित कर दिया जाय। पुस्तकों के अलावा भी जिन्दगी में और चीजें हैं, और बातें हैं। अगर बच्चा जिन्दगी की और बातों में हिस्सा लेता है और जिन्दगी को आगे बढ़ाने के लिये जो काम है उनको करता है, जो चीजें उसके चरित्र का निर्माण करती हैं उनको करता है तो वह एक बड़ा काम करता है और सब की भलाई के लिये करता है। किसी ने कहा है कि

“My days among the dead are past.”

तो हमें ऐसी शिक्षा देनी है कि बच्चे में एक जिन्दगी आये, एक जान आये। तो इस कमीशन को यह भी देखना है कि किसी यूनिवर्सिटी ने कैसे बच्चों को पैदा किया है, कैसे लांगों को निकाला है। कमीशन को उनसे यह भी हिसाब लेना चाहिये कि उन्होंने क्या किया है ताकि वह कह सकें कि ये ये लोग हैं, ये ये बच्चे हैं जिन्होंने कि देश का काम किया है और देश का काम कर रहे हैं। जब इस तरफ ध्यान जायेगा तो टीचर्स का और बच्चों का सम्बन्ध भी बहुत अच्छा हो जायेगा और जब बच्चे हर एक काम को करेंगे तो इस प्यार देश में सुख और शान्ति होगी और गुरु और शिष्य में अच्छा सम्बन्ध पैदा होंगे। उनका सम्बन्ध केवल मार्क्स और लफ्जों तक ही सीमित नहीं रह जायेगा बल्कि उससे बहुत आगे जायेगा। जब इस लिहाज से यह कमीशन देखेगा कि कौन कौन इंस्टीट्यूशंस चरित्र का निर्माण करते हैं, बच्चों की तमाम चीजों के लिये, जिन्दगी से लड़ाई के लिये, जिन्दगी से जुद्धोत्तम करने के लिये, जिन्दगी से जंग करने के लिये तैयार करते हैं तो वे इंस्टीट्यूशंस

बतायेंगे कि इस तरह से वे शिक्षा देते हैं और जब अच्छी शिक्षा देने वाले, जिन्दगी की शिक्षा देने वाले इंस्टीट्यूशंस आगे रखे जायेंगे तो दूसरे इंस्टीट्यूशंस भी उनकी नकल करेंगे और इस तरह से तमाम के तमाम इंस्टीट्यूशंस आगे बढ़ेंगे। इन इंस्टीट्यूशंस से ऐसे बच्चे निकलेंगे जो कि देश के काम में लगेंगे और देश के भाग्य को, देश के भविष्य को, आगे उठा कर ले सकेंगे। धन्यवाद।

SHRI H. C. DASAPPA: Mr. Deputy Chairman, I rise to welcome this measure especially in view of the fact that it has emerged from the Joint Select Committee in a greatly improved form, and without spending much time on the preliminary matters, I would like to enter straight into some of the points which I want to urge.

One of the fears expressed is that this Commission may be a kind of a body superimposed over the Universities which will greatly affect the free and autonomous functioning of the Universities. I do not think the fears of my hon. friend, Shrimati Lakshmi Menon, were well-founded. It is possible that any instrument meant for coordination or control, such as this may turn into a weapon of wickedness and misuse. But I can certainly see no reason why anybody should entertain such fears in the case of a body like this. Sir, when I say this, it does not mean that composed as it is, there is not a natural tendency on its part to assume more and more powers, much more than what is contemplated under the Bill, for the reason that it has got the tremendous power of allocating grants to the Universities. Therefore, it is just possible that in the hands of wrong persons it may be abused but with the right persons it will be a source of immense benefit to the nation.

I would just indicate one or two points where a certain amount of caution may be needed. It is not always that every University should conform to a set pattern or known standards. Each University has got its own

[Shri H. C. Dasappa.] ideology, its own way of serving the purposes of the nation. Each State lays down certain objectives and policies before itself. The University is helped by the State and is more or less a part of the State Administration. It conforms to those ideologies. In America, for instance, you have got Universities, some of which are mainly intended for research and postgraduate work, some are for popularisation of knowledge and so on. So, each University has a certain mission to fulfil. I would very earnestly appeal that this University Grants Commission should not think of flattening out everything to a known or a set pattern. It should allow large and free scope for the Universities to pursue their own particular ideologies. If this is done, I think, there will be less of grievance on the part of Universities. If on the other hand it adopts a kind of doctrinaire attitude and says, "Well, these are our ways and the Universities have got to be moulded like this", I am afraid, the Commission will be in for much criticism. And besides, Sir, our country is a wonderful pattern of variegated cultures. Though there is throughout a kind of synthesis where we discover common ideologies, still I feel that each particular part of our country has a distinctiveness of its own. And it is for this highly intellectual Commission to foster and develop those particular features which contribute to the enrichment of the culture of our nation. And therefore it is all the more necessary, I plead, that this University Grants Commission should not think of disturbing those particular pursuits of each University.

Then, Sir, I see that there are certain provisions in this Bill which may lead to too much interference with the working of the Universities. I would like to draw the attention of the hon. Minister particularly to subclause (e) of clause 12, wherein it is said that this Commission can advise not only the Central Government—which is certainly its function—but

also the State Governments on the allocation of grants to Universities for any general or specified purpose out of the Consolidated Fund of the State. Now I feel here that the Commission is being asked to do something which neither the University of a State nor the State Government may relish. I do not think, Sir, that that would be a proper field for the functioning of this Commission.

Then, Sir, I find in clause 16 of this Bill that the Fund of the Commission may be constituted not only from what may be paid to it by the Central Government, but also by any State Government. Now I wonder, Sir, whether there is any provision in this Bill to compel any State Government to contribute anything to the Fund of the Commission. But all the same, a State Government can be told "You must contribute so much to the Fund of this Commission, failing which you cannot expect any grant from the Commission." That is just possible. So I do not know how we here, legislating as we do, can ask the State Governments to contribute any funds to the Commission's Fund.

Then, Sir, I would just like to say only one word with regard to the composition of this Commission. I agree that the Vice-Chancellors of the Universities should be there, and the Government of India also must have its officers on this Commission, and there must be distinguished educationists. I do not deny that at all. But I do feel that since a University purports to serve the nation, to meet the demands and the requirements of the nation, the nation has a right to have its representatives on this Commission. I see no reason why men who have contributed to the enrichment of the public life of this country, who have got their fingers on the pulse of the country, should not find a place here. I ask whether it is possible for a friend like Dr. Kunzru to be on this Commission.

DR. K. L. SHRIMALI: Why not, as an educationist of repute?

SHRI H. C. DASAPPA: I do not know whether he is an educationist of repute. I cannot force that meaning into that word. I ask again my friend, Dr. Shrimali, whether it is possible for even one like Mahatma Gandhi, who has contributed so much to the educational research in this country, to find a place on this Commission—a man like Dr. M. R. Jayakar, a man like Dr. C. P. Ramaswami Ayyar—unless he is already a Vice-Chancellor? It would have been of immense benefit, if this Commission had also made provision for having men of such outstanding abilities who could have really and substantially contributed to the work of this Commission. My friend here of course, suggests men like Sir M. Visveswa-rayya or Sir Mirza Ismail. So I think Dr. Shrimali would be well-advised, if he can consider the incorporation of some provision so as to enable men of such outstanding abilities also to be on the Commission.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: Mr. Deputy Chairman, I congratulate the Government on at least implementing one recommendation of Dr. Radha-krishnan University Education Commission. And I do hope that other recommendations will also be implemented so that the many evils that have been spoken of regarding the university education may be removed, and we may have a healthy university education in conformity with the needs and the demands of the country.

It is true, Sir, that the foundation of university education was laid down long long ago for entirely a different purpose, *i.e.*, to get good servants for the foreign Government. But now the demand of the country is that there should be more and more scientific-minded people so that we may be able to have the industrial development of our country. The demand of the country at present is to create a national outlook for unifying purpose. Notwithstanding men of the calibre of Dr. Kunzru and his able colleagues, the S. R. C. yielded to linguism. Now my hon. friend,

Mr. Mathur, very rightly pointed out that it is imperative that we should co-ordinate the policy in such a way as to create that national outlook which we all so much desire. I was really surprised to see some of my University friends opposing the Bill and saying that this Bill is not at all needed. Do they not think that certain national policies—the way in which we want to build our country— have got to be implemented? Every University goes on in its own way. Do they not think that there should be some common co-ordinating agency? I quite agree, Sir, that these will not meet all the requirements, but certainly there will be some control over the Universities in the national interest. But I want to ask those who think of non-interference in the university autonomy: Can they name a single university which is not financed by the State or by the Central Government? And at the same time, can they say that there has been, on behalf of the State or the Central Government, such interference which is not befitting \diamond^* which is not becoming and which is not proper for the University's administration? I have also had to do something with the Universities. In academic matters I can say that the Governments, whether the State Government or the Central Government, never interfere, and most of these matters are left to the institutions, senates and councils of the Universities. So the main ground that has been asserted against this Bill is that the autonomy of the Universities will go away. I think it is absolutely a figment of imagination and lack of self-confidence and it has nothing to do with the reality of the situation. The colleges and the Universities with the help of the State and Central Governments are flourishing. The mere fact that a University Grants Commission is established will not interfere with their autonomy. Let us understand it, Sir. In fact, it reduces the officialdom, as also the control of the Government. If the Ministry had itself distributed this amount there would have been a lot of red-tapism

[Shri Akbar Ali Khan.] Now in order to avoid that red-tapism, as in the United Kingdom, we appoint a Commission, and we appoint some people, and we hope that they will be people commanding the confidence of the people. Certainly they would be educationists. I feel that the apprehensions of my learned friend, Mr. Dasappa, are not really well-founded because it is provided that there should be eminent people also, who would give the proper amount of attention to the proper institutions for the proper purpose. My submission is that we should all understand that the purpose of this is to give money with less difficulty, with less red-tapism and with less interference from the administration.

I will make only one submission more. In the changing circumstances of today, I am one of those who think that at this stage we cannot shut out the vernaculars coming into the Uni-

versities. It is practically impossible, but I would like to give one note of caution and advice. Let it be confined to arts. So far as science subjects are concerned, so far as our technical subjects are concerned, so far as professional subjects are concerned, let it be our definite policy that it would be either in English or Hindi. So long as we cannot develop Hindi, let English continue, and when we are able to develop Hindi, let the change-over take place. That is the only saving grace. That is the only way of salvation that I see for this country in the present linguistic fissiparous tendencies. Thank you.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Dr. Shrimali will reply tomorrow.

The House stands adjourned till 11 A.M. tomorrow.

The House then adjourned at three minutes past six of the clock till eleven of the clock on Wednesday, the 7th December 1955.