

[Mr. Deputy Chairman.]
further to amend the Drugs Act, 1940, be taken into consideration:

(1) That in the Enacting Formula, for 'Fifth Year' substitute 'Sixth Year'.

(2) That at page 1, line 4, for '1954' substitute '1955'."

The motion was adopted.

RAJKUMARI AMRIT KAUR: Sir, I move:

"That the amendments made by the Lok Sabha in the Bill be agreed to."

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

"That the amendments made by the Lok Sabha in the Bill be agreed to."

The motion was adopted.

THE DENTISTS (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1954.

THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH (RAJKUMARI AMRIT KAUR): Sir, I move:

"That the following amendments made by the Lok Sabha in the Bill further to amend the Dentists Act, 1948, be taken into consideration:

(1) That in the Enacting Formula, for 'Fifth Year' substitute 'Sixth Year'.

(2) That at page 1, line 4, for '1954' substitute '1955'."

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Motion moved:

"That the following amendments made by the Lok Sabha in the Bill further to amend the Dentists Act, 1948, be taken into consideration:

(1) That in the Enacting Formula, for 'Fifth Year' substitute 'Sixth Year'.

(2) That at page 1, line 4, for '1954' substitute '1955'."

There are no amendments.

The question is:

"That the following amendments made by the Lok Sabha in the Bill further to amend the Dentists Act, 1948, be taken into consideration:

(1) That in the Enacting Formula, for 'Fifth Year' substitute 'Sixth Year'.

(2) That at page 1, line 4, for '1954' substitute '1955'."

The motion was adopted.

RAJKUMARI AMRIT KAUR: Sir, I move:

"That the amendments made by the Lok Sabha in the Bill be agreed to."

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

"That the amendments made by the Lok Sabha in the Bill be agreed to."

The motion was adopted.

THE UNIVERSITY GRANTS COMMISSION BILL, 1954.

THE PARLIAMENTARY SECRETARY TO THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION (DR. K. L. SHRIMALI): Sir, I beg leave to move the following Motion:

"That this House concurs in the recommendation of the Lok Sabha that the Rajya Sabha do join in the Joint Committee of the Houses on the Bill to make provision for the co-ordination and determination of standards in Universities and for that purpose, to establish a Univer-

sity Grants Commission, and resolves that the following Members of the Rajya Sabha be nominated to serve on the said Joint Committee:—

1. Shri Indra Vidyavachaspati,
2. Dr. M. D. D. Gilder,
3. Dr. P. Subbarayan,
4. Dr. Radha Kumud Mookerji,
5. Dr. Raghu Vira,
6. Dr. P. V. Kane,
7. Maulana M. Tayyebulla,
8. Shrimati Mona Hensman,
9. Shri T. V. Kamalaswamy,
10. Shri Kishen Chand,
11. Shri J. V. K. Vallabharao,
12. Dr. A. Ramaswamy Mudaliar,
13. Dr. Zakir Hussain,
14. Shri C. C. Biswas, and the Mover."

Sir, in moving this motion I wish to submit to the House that this is one of the most important legislations as far as education is concerned. I am sure hon. Members realise the great importance of the University Grants Commission.

This question of the establishment of the University Grants Commission has been before the Government for a long time. A University Grants Committee was established in 1945 by the Government of India but that Committee dealt only with the Central Universities. That Committee had to be held in abeyance in 1950. Government had appointed the University Education Commission and we were awaiting the recommendations of this body. Hon. Members are aware that the University Education Commission had strongly recommended that a University Grants Commission should be established. That was, I feel, the most significant and most important recommendation of the University Education Commission. The Govern-

ment have already appointed a University Grants Commission but it has still to obtain statutory status. The purpose of this Bill is, as hon. Members would see, to co-ordinate and determine the standards of teaching. Since independence there has been great development in education. The number of students in the colleges has increased considerably and the colleges and Universities are multiplying. On the one hand, this is a very happy feature because we do wish to expand our University education. We cannot yet say that we have an adequate number of Universities for our country. We must however understand that we have to take into account the limited resources which the Government have before them. I think, Sir, in the next few years, the problem before our country is not so much expansion as that of consolidation of University education. We must co-ordinate the work that is already being done and consolidate it. In the field of higher education and research, the Universities can specialise only in a limited number of subjects. Research and higher education are expensive and there are certain subjects which cost an enormous amount if we wish to carry on research on proper lines. Take for example, aero-engineering and naval architecture. These are highly specialised subjects and it is not possible for all the Universities to make provision for subjects like these. Even in Great Britain, for an important subject like nuclear physics, there is provision only in six out of the seventeen Universities. Nuclear physics is a very important subject but no country can afford to establish unlimited number of laboratories and carry on scientific research in this subject. We shall, therefore, have to co-ordinate our work and distribute the subjects in such a way that the Universities can make real contribution to advance research.

I have already said, Sir, that in the coming years, the main task of the University Grants Commission which

[Dr. K. L. Shrimali.]

we propose to set up, would be to consolidate and not so much to expand the present activities. In this matter, I would like to say that there is a good deal of scope for improvement in the Universities themselves. The University Grants Commission will help the Universities indirectly. There is need for self-criticism and self-examination within the Universities themselves. I am not one of those persons who would run down our Universities; our Universities are doing a splendid job and they have done excellent work in the past. They have produced men of letters; men of science, men of arts, and leaders in all spheres of life of whom we can be proud. I would, therefore, not run down the Universities as is usually done but, at the same time, I do feel, Sir, that after independence the Universities have to adjust themselves to the needs of the changing times. They must be sensitive to the needs and demands of our changing society. The Universities, I think, have two essential functions : Research and teaching. They must encourage original work and carry on research not only to extend the frontiers of factual knowledge but also to find solutions for those problems for which there have not been any solutions so far. In our society today, in various fields, in science, in economics, in sociology, etc., there are problems which have to be tackled by the Universities in order that our society may advance towards our cherished goal. As regards teaching, society also requires of the University graduates that they must not merely possess a degree or expert knowledge of a particular subject but that they must develop a breadth of outlook. The graduates who go out of the Universities must be 'capable and cultivated human beings'. as Mill said, several years ago. It will be the function of the University Grants Commission to re-organise our Universities in such a way that the Universities can fulfil these two broad functions. I do not, even for a moment, wish to suggest that we

should make a stereo-typed uniformity. We do not wish to introduce that narrow regimentation in the Universities which would kill initiative and creative life in the Universities. There will be opportunity for local initiative and local interest which, I think, are essential for the proper development of the Universities. The main function of the University Grants Commission would be to bring about the co-ordination and to determine proper standards.

I might say^a a few words with regard to the relationship of the Government and the Universities. The main purpose of the University Grants Commission is that we should develop a technique—we should set up an agency—which might bring about a healthy relationship between the Universities and the State. The Universities and the State are mutually dependent. The Universities have to depend on Government funds; they cannot function effectively unless Government funds are forthcoming in abundance. The other sources, such as private charities and endowments, unfortunately are lacking in our country and Universities will have to depend in the future more and more on Government funds. It is true that Universities have to depend for their finances on the State but the State is also dependent on the Universities. Unless the Universities function effectively and properly, we shall not get men and women who are adequately trained and who may hold positions of responsibility in Government, industry and profession. What we are aiming at is to develop a healthy partnership between the State and the Universities. The University Grants Commission which is proposed to be set up is going to fulfil this function, that is, setting up a kind of a partnership between the State and the Universities which are mutually dependent.

There are certain conditions which must be fulfilled before that healthy partnership which I have referred to can be realised. In the first place, we shall have to develop very healthy conventions. It is very important that University grants should be kept out of party politics and they should not be the subject of any acrimonious party debate in Parliament. I am saying this because the Universities are above politics; the Universities are not expected to associate themselves with any political group. Their main function is to seek truth and knowledge, in an impartial manner and we hope that the University Grants Commission will help the Universities in realising that ideal. In order that they may realise this goal, it is very important that the Universities themselves must be generally responsive to public opinion and public needs. This means that the Universities themselves must be quick to put their house in order.

There has been a lot of criticism against the universities and university education. Some is intelligent criticism; some is unenlightened criticism. But whatever the position may be, the universities have a responsibility towards the society which they serve and therefore they cannot be completely irresponsible to public criticism. They must therefore be quick to examine their position, their work, their standards and to put their own house in order.

SHRI H. P. SAKSENA: How will the establishment of this Grants Commission introduce these reforms in the universities?

DR. K. L. SHRIMALI: If the hon. Member will have patience I will explain.

SHRI H. P. SAKSENA: I am holding my breath in patience.

DR. K. L. SHRIMALI: Now I am suggesting that in order that the

University Grants Commission may function effectively, it is necessary that these conditions must be fulfilled. Unless we realise and understand the true functions of the University Grants Commission and the conditions under which the University Grants Commission can function, the universities cannot work effectively. Now it would mean that public opinion will also have to be educated as regards the role of the universities. The Universities must on the one hand understand their responsibilities; the public on the other hand must understand the functions which the universities have to perform, and value the autonomy of Universities.

Now, Sir, there is another condition which I think must also be fulfilled in order that the universities may be able to maintain their autonomy and that condition is that the universities should not depend entirely on Government support. There must be a variety of support and the people themselves must contribute their share towards university finances.

Now these are the conditions under which healthy relationship can develop between the University Grants Commission and the universities on the one hand and the University Grants Commission and the State on the other. I am saying this because there has been a lot of apprehension in the minds of people that as soon as the University Grants Commission is set up, the universities will lose their autonomy. In this context I cannot do better than quote Sir Walter Moberley who has been the Chairman of the University Grants Commission in England for several years and has also been associated with the university.

At the Commonwealth Universities Conference held in Oxford in 1948 he made a very balanced statement, on the functions of the universities and the relationship between the universities and the State; if you permit me, Sir, I shall quote it—this is a

[Dr. K. L. Shrinimali.]

very brief statement which Sir Walter Moberley made at the Commonwealth Universities Conference. He starts with three assumptions. Firstly, "In any showing universities are powerful and influential corporations and they perform functions which are of high public importance, so that in no country can the supreme political authority be completely disinterested in the affairs of the universities. It does and it must exercise some measure of supervision over them. No where is university autonomy complete or unconditional."

The first assumption itself makes it very clear that to talk of absolute autonomy is meaningless. The universities function in a certain social medium. They have certain responsibilities towards the society and the society has a right to supervise that they are functioning effectively and are realising social purpose.

His second assumption is "A high degree of autonomy is absolutely necessary if the functions of universities are to be properly performed." Lastly he says: "Anything which threatens the autonomy of universities must be resisted, whatever form it takes. Demands may be made by the universities which are inconsistent with the carrying out of their function as they understand it. All these demands must be resisted."

Now the universities have, I think, seen the statement which Sir Walter Moberley made at the Commonwealth Universities Conference. I think he has made a very balanced statement. He has said on the one hand there is nothing like absolute autonomy; that the society which sets up universities has a right to supervise their work and to see that they work effectively. On the other hand it is very important for democratic society particularly to see that the universities enjoy autonomy and in an institution where the State or any private group or donors try to influence the universities and bring pres-

sure on them, the universities have a right to resist them. Now if the universities wish to enjoy freedom, they must realise that they have also a responsibility towards the society. In this connection I shall read another statement, a very important statement, which was made by an Association of American Universities.

SHRI H. P. SAKSENA: When was it made, may I know?

DR. K. L. SHRIMALI: In 1915.

SHRI H. P. SAKSENA: 1915?

DR. K. L. SHRIMALI: Yes, Sir, and this statement was examined by another commission in 1952. This was the Commission on Financing Higher Education (Nature and Needs of Higher Education) under the supervision of the Association of American Universities and this commission endorses the views of the Committee of the American Association of University Professors and this is the statement: "If the academic profession should prove itself unwilling to purge its rank of the incompetent and unworthy, or to prevent the freedom which it claims in the name of science from being used as a shelter for inefficiency, for superficiality or for uncritical and intemperate partisanship it is certain that the task will be performed by others—by others who lack certain essential qualifications for performing it, and whose action is sure to breed suspicion and recurrent controversies deeply injurious to the internal order and public standing of universities."

I hope that our professors in our country also will make a similar statement. Sir, as I said, I do not wish to run down the universities in any way. I have already said that they have done splendid work. But we should not have a sense of complacency. We have to do a great deal to raise the academic standards of our universities, to get rid of narrowness, parochialism, intrigues, nepotism which exist in the present universities.

In the end, I would like to submit that this Bill which is being introduced aims at setting up a University Grants Commission and I hope that this will be a technique, this will be an agency which will give the State the assurance to which it is entitled that the funds that the State provides are being wisely and effectively used by the Universities. At the same time it does that without sacrificing the independence of the Universities. In this matter the United Kingdom is an excellent example. If you look at the history of the Universities in the United Kingdom, 30 years ago the State financial support was negligible and now the Universities are getting six times the grant that they were getting in 1938. And still a very healthy relationship has existed between the Universities and the State. The State is assured through the University Grants Committee that the funds are properly utilised and the Universities have been able to maintain a full measure of freedom and autonomy. That is a very good example for us and we hope that in our country too the University Grants Commission will be able to give that assurance to the State that the funds are being utilised properly and also maintain that autonomy which is needed for the proper growth and development of the Universities. The University Grants Commission should be regarded by the Universities as the guardian of their liberties and by the Government as responsible for ensuring that the increasing sums placed at the disposal of the Universities are spent to best advantage in the national interests. Sir, the Bill is of a non-controversial nature and I feel it should not be debated in a party spirit. I would appeal to the House to let this measure pass in the best interests of the Universities themselves. It is very important that we establish healthy conventions. Sir, I move the motion.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Motion moved:

"That this House concurs in the recommendation of the Lok Sabha

that the Rajya Sabha do join in the Joint Committee of the Houses on 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, and resolves that the following members of the Rajya Sabha be nominated to serve on the said Joint Committee:—

Shri Indra Vidyavachaspati, Dr. M. D. D. Gilder, Dr. P. Subbarayan, Dr. Radha Kumud Mookerji, Dr. Raghu Vira, Dr. P. V. Kane, Maulana M. Tayyebulla, Shrimati, Mona Hensman, Shri T. V. Kamalaswamy, Shri Kishen Chand, Shri J. V. K. Vallabharao Dr. A. Ramaswamy Mudaliar, Dr. Zakir Hussain, Shri C. C. Biswas, and the Mover.

SHRI NANABHAI BHATT (Saurashtra): Mr. Deputy Chairman, I rise to support the motion moved by my friend Dr. Shrimali. It is no use at this stage going into the merits or demerits of the Universities in the country. It is no use also at this stage going into any lengthy discussion about the role of the Universities and students and the various problems connected with them.

[THE VICE-CHAIRMAN SHRI V. K. DHAGE
in the Chair]

But I would like to make one or two suggestions to the Government. All the best advice that we can give from open platforms, all the best advice that we can give from the pulpit is not going to change the mentality of the nation. We want a socialistic pattern; we want new men, but unless we create new minds, new men would not be available. So I would suggest to the Ministry of Education that instead of taking up legislation in education piecemeal, let there be one complete picture of education from bottom to the top so that one can get an integrated view of the whole thing. It is an old structure of education that we have got today. Walls are sometimes crumbling here, sometimes crumbling there. One day the stu-

[Shri Nanabhai Bhatt.]
dents strike at Lucknow; the next day there is indiscipline in Banaras; on the third day there is something in Delhi, on the fourth day there is something in Dwaraka and on the fifth day there is something in Travancore.

AN HON. MEMBER: At Allahabad.

SHRI NANABHAI BHATT: Yes, at Allahabad and in very many places. wherever there is a breach we rush there and patch up that breach; wherever there is some crash we rush and fill up that crash. When we want that secondary education should be improved, we appoint a Secondary Education Commission and get its Report. We have the University Commission's Report; we have Resolutions on Basic Education or Primary Education but we have not been able to co-ordinate the primary, secondary and collegiate education right through. Why? Because we are not clear within ourselves as to the goal we want to reach for the whole of the nation. The socialistic pattern of society is in the air but I have not sufficiently realised as yet what this socialistic pattern of education means in my practical life. If there is to be a socialistic pattern in life, shall we find it in any of the colleges? Shall we find it in any of the High Schools? Shall we find it in any of the basic schools? Shall we find it in any of the research institutions? Unless we go deep into the matter and mean to transform the whole life of the nation, I think the Universities even with the best of the Commissions will fail in the long run. Therefore it is that I would like just to make a suggestion to the Government to give to the University Grants Commission very definite terms of reference because it is after all a question of approach. Here we have equalising of standards. What is a standard? Is it simply the intellectual height of man or does it connote anything else, approach to life, approach to national problems or approach to society? I think that unless the University Grants Commission are given very very definite

reference, the Government will not have very great satisfaction in the long run.

Sir, one more point and I will finish. I think the people at the bottom are fast gaining consciousness but still education has not yet reached the vast masses in the villages. Whenever we talk of Universities, whenever we talk of High School and Secondary education, we are talking of urban people. All these big schemes touch only a fringe of the society but as far as the vast masses that live in the villages are concerned, you will find that no University Professor can solve their problems. In fact, they are not a problem at all to these higher institutions. Sir, on all sides we are helping backward classes. We are helping the Scheduled Castes; we are helping the aborigines. But though we help them, we do not take any cue from their lives as to what we should do. Has anybody approached the Adivasis and studied their culture? We go there, start schools and turn them into civilised citizens like myself. We go to the scheduled castes and turn them into citizens like myself. Have we ever studied their problems as they understand them? So, I say unless the Universities go down--not actually losing their standard--to the lowest strata of society and study their problems and unless a co-ordination of all the phases in education is realised, I think the purpose behind all these stray reforms of the Government would not be fulfilled. But with all that I thoroughly support the proposal and wish it might bear all the results that have been claimed for it by my friend.

SHRIMATI PARVATHI KRISHNAN (Madras): Mr. Vice-Chairman, I rise to welcome this move to establish the University Grants Commission. The University Education Commission suggested it some time ago and it is indeed a happy thing that now we are in the position where we are discussing the matter to refer it to a Joint Select Committee. Therefore, it is in that light that I should like to speak on

the draft as it stands before the House. I feel that certain changes are very necessary to this draft if the Bill is to be made effective and if the University Grants Commission is to be an effective body which will play a role in the great task of developing the system of education in our country to meet the requirements of a growing economy, to meet the requirements of a country that is going forward. Firstly, I would like to take the definition of the word "University" itself. It is indeed a welcome addition that now we see that constituent colleges are also to be included in this definition, because the Interim Grants Commission, in many cases on the purely technical ground of a college being a constituent college, had refused sometimes to consider claims that have been put forward. I will give one or two examples of this later. But at the same time, although the constituent colleges are recognised to be part of a University, the majority of colleges, that is, the affiliated colleges, that exist in our country are left out in this definition. And this, I feel, the Members of the Joint Committee should consider very seriously and see that the majority of the colleges do come under the purview of this Commission.

Here, Sir, I have before me certain revealing figures which will give hon. Members an idea of how the affiliated colleges that exist in our country are vast in number and of the number of students that are covered by those colleges. Take for instance, the Andhra University. In the Andhra University there are only four constituent colleges and 31 affiliated colleges. In Bombay, there are 3 teaching departments of the University and 22 affiliated colleges. In Calcutta University there are 35 teaching departments, with 104 affiliated colleges. In Madras University, there are 21 teaching departments, 20 constituent colleges and 58 affiliated colleges, and so on. The figures represent the same sort of proportion from State to State. Hon. Members will see thereby that the majority of students who are at

the University stage of education are those who are attached to, who are studying in the affiliated colleges. And in the country as a whole today while we have 137 constituent colleges, there are 558 affiliated colleges. Therefore, if the affiliated colleges are not included in this definition, the majority get left out and it affects the students in this manner. Of course, the figures quoted are for 1950-51, but though the total numbers may have changed the proportion remains more or less the same. In the teaching departments of the Universities, in 1950-51, there were 24,350 students; in the constituent colleges, 16,282 students; and in affiliated colleges, 3,03,213 students which means that the vast majority of students were those who were attending the affiliated colleges. And even more revealing than these figures are the figures of the expenditures of the various Universities. Agra University with an income of one crore and 32 and odd lakhs spent on its University and constituent colleges nine lakhs and fortyseven and odd thousand rupees and on the affiliated colleges

DR. RADHA KUMUD MOOKERJI: Are you quite sure of the income of the Agra University? It cannot be one crore.

SHRI J. V. K. VALLABHARAO: Including all the constituent colleges.

SHRIMATI PARAVATHI KRISHNAN: All the colleges and the University together—not the amount that accrues to the University alone. I am taking the whole University, that is constituent colleges, the University itself and the affiliated colleges, the total income. In Andhra University, 74 lakhs 82 thousands and odd is the income; 24 lakhs 97 thousand and odd spent on the University and the constituent colleges and 49 lakhs and odd on the affiliated colleges. In Bombay, one crore 38 and odd lakhs is the income—32 lakhs 81 and odd thousand spent on the University and the constituent colleges; one crore five lakhs and 29 thousand and odd spent on the affiliated colleges. And similarly, in all the

[Shrimati Parvathi Krishnan.]
Universities you will find that out of the total income accruing to the colleges and the Universities, the major part of the income is spent on the affiliated colleges and not on the University departments and the constituent colleges.....

SHRI J. S. BISHT: But the affiliated colleges can raise their own income and spend it.

SHRIMATI PARVATHI KRISHNAN: You will be able to reply when it comes to your turn. You can take up this point then. Earlier recommendations have been there—the recommendation that for University education in our country to develop, for it to really fulfil the needs of society, the affiliated colleges should be developed into unitary Universities or into constituent colleges. Such proposals have been put forward by various educationists, put forward by organisations representing University teachers and so on, but till now we see no reform in this direction. And I feel that it would be a great step forward if in this Bill the definition of University could be extended to cover also the affiliated colleges that exist in such a large number in this country.

The apprehensions that have arisen in the minds of people, apprehensions that Dr. Shrimali has referred to in his speech—regarding the working of the University Grants Commission—have risen because of certain experience accruing from the working of the Interim Grants Commission, where these differences between the various types of colleges, between the Universities have come into play and where certain requests or demands of certain sections have been turned down on purely technical grounds, for so-called technical reasons. One section after another has been ruled out on these technical grounds mainly the ground as to whether it is a University or not—the technical ground of the definition itself. The Interim Grants Commission came out with

proposals based on the recommendations of the University Education Commission with regard to the pay scales of University teachers. Now, when this was done, I want to put before hon. Members one particular example of how an anomaly arose because of this technical reason. Delhi University is the one federated University in our country. Here, there are the University teachers who are paid by the University; teachers who are paid by the colleges. And until such time as these proposals came into being, those teachers were enjoying the same benefits on the one hand, and were doing the same sort of work on the other. That is to say, very often lectures were delivered in various colleges by the staff attached to those colleges, or possibly lectures might also have been delivered in the university by the university staff. But when the Interim Grants Commission came forward with their pay scales, the University teachers came under these pay scales, and due to some technical reason, that the other staff were attached to the colleges, they were not given the same benefits. Because of this technical reason, such an anomaly could come into being in a place where formerly there were the same conditions of pay and work. You find these differences coming up again and again. Similarly, Sir, Travancore-Cochin—I am sure that all Members are aware of it—is a State where the lowest pay scales exist, as far as the university staff teachers are concerned. The Commission had allocated Rs. one lakhs and three thousand for technical equipment for research to the university. But when the teachers represented to the Government of India that their pay scales were far below par, and that an additional grant might be given to the university to enable it to give higher salaries to the university staff, then this question of technical differences and so on came up—that it was not an autonomous University. It is such examples that have given rise to these apprehensions in the minds of the university teachers throughout the

country, and in the minds of all those who are interested in university education, who are interested in the advancement of university education and its development. Sir, we cannot forget that pay scales play an important part in the matter of education. Today, we know that the university teachers are given a very negligible salary when compared to other professions. For instance, 6,034 teachers receive salaries between Rs. 100 and Rs. 150. This is taking an overall picture of the country as a whole. 7,369 teachers receive salaries between Rs. 151 and Rs. 250, 1,329 teachers receive salaries between Rs. 251 and Rs. 650, and 525 teachers receive salaries between Rs. 651 and Rs. 850. This is the position, Sir. And that is why I have also taken this opportunity of putting it before the House that this is also an aspect that must be considered, and that the majority of teachers who are in these affiliated colleges should also come within the purview of this measure so that they can also benefit from the new scales of pay that are being proposed. As we know, in the words of our Chairman himself, "the university teacher should be helped to live in comfort, if he is to devote himself to learning, teaching and research. I hope the university services will become as attractive as All India Services, because that is the only way to recruit and retain some of the ablest persons in the universities." So, when we are thinking of the University Grants Commission, and when the Joint Select Committee comes to discuss the matter, let them remember these words, and remember that this problem does exist, and this vast army of university teachers must also be provided for in the provisions of this Bill. That is why, Sir, I would emphasise again and again this particular point that the definition of the word 'University' is a very important one and will need revision, if the Bill is to be an effective one.

Secondly, Sir, I would like to come to the question of the functions of the Commission. The Constitution has enjoined upon Parliament to decide

the type of higher education and this sought to be done through the University Grants Commission. That is why we have, in this Bill, gone beyond the recommendations of the University Education Commission, and also added a new point, and that is, enjoining on the University Grants Commission not only the task of disbursing grants, but by going a step further enjoining on them the responsibility of co-ordinating and making suggestions for the improvement of university education in this country. Sir, the Statement of Objects and Reasons states as follows.

"It is therefore proposed to establish a University Grants Commission as a corporate body which will inquire into the financial needs of Universities and allocate and disburse grants to Universities for any general or specified purpose. The Commission will also have the power to recommend to any University the measures necessary for the reform and improvement of University education and to advise the University concerned upon the action to be taken for the purpose of implementing such recommendation. The Commission will act as an expert body to advise the Central Government on problems connected with the co-ordination of facilities and maintenance of standards in Universities. The Commission, in consultation with the University concerned, will also have the power to cause an inspection or inquiry to be made of any University established by law in India and to advise the University on any matter which has been the subject of an inquiry or inspection. The Commission shall also advise, whenever such advice is sought, on the establishment of new Universities."

This is what is stated in the Statement of Objects and Reasons. But the clauses, Sir, are so wide and so vague that any step can be interpreted as a "measure necessary for reform and improvement of the univer-

[Shrimati Parvathi Krishnan.]
sity education". While we do want co-ordination, while we do want some centralised policy in the matter of university education in this country, at the same time, there must be some line drawn, whereby the essential autonomy of the Universities can also be protected. The clauses which enjoin various tasks and responsibilities on the University Grants Commission are so vague that they can be interpreted in any way that may be chosen. And particularly, I would draw your attention to clause 14, when taken in the light of clauses 12 and 13. Sir, clause 14 makes the apprehension in the minds of the people in the universities graver still, because it is a clause that makes one feel almost as though the University Grants Commission is being given the right to starve any university that might choose to disagree with them into submission. It is rather a reprehensible clause to my mind, and I seriously hope that attempts will be made to remove this very grave defect in this Bill. Sir, this is how the clause reads—

"Consequences of failure of Universities to comply with recommendations of the Commission.—If any University fails within a reasonable time to comply with any recommendation made by the Commission under section 12 or section 13, the Commission, after taking into consideration the cause, if any, shown by the University for its failure to comply with such recommendation, may withhold from the University the grants proposed to be made out of the Fund of the Commission, and also advise the Central Government or the State Government to withhold

its grants from that University or to take such other action in respect of that University as the Government may deem proper."

Sir, hon. members will be able to see that really there is a lot of reason for this feeling. Here is a stick to beat any University. It might be argued by the Commission "Well, this is the programme that we have got for you. If you follow it, well and good; otherwise you can go and starve." So, Sir, unless and until the work that is being given to the Commission, of co-ordinating and planning university development, is very clearly defined, there is always this danger that might arise, particularly when, Sir, we have already some examples where State Governments and Universities have been coming into conflict, whereby students and teachers have been suffering, and whereby finances are also being seriously affected. It is well-known how in Bombay State Universities have been having squabbles with the Bombay Government on the question of Hindi as the medium of instruction.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI V. K. DHAGE): Are you likely to take some more time?

SHRIMATI PARVATHI KRISHNAN: Yes.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI V. K. DHAGE): Then you can continue tomorrow.

The House stands adjourned till 11 A.M. tomorrow, the 16th instant.

The House then adjourned at five of the clock till eleven of the clock on Wednesday, the 16th March 1955.