

Houses consisting of 45 Members; 30 Members from this House, namely:

1. Shri T. T. Krishnamachari,
2. Shri Hari Vinayak Pataskar,
3. Shri Satya Narayan Sinha,
4. Shri Ghamandi Lal Bansal,
5. Shri Chimanlal Chakubhai Shah,
6. Shri Awadheshwar Prasad Sinha,
7. Shrimati B. Khongmen,
8. Shri Digvijaya Narain Singh,
9. Shri Tribhuan Narayan Singh,
10. Pandit Munishwar Dutt Upadhyay,
11. Shri Diwan Chand Sharma,
12. Shri Radheshyam Ramkumar Morarka,
13. Shri Ahmed Mohiuddin,
14. Shri Radhelal Vyas,
15. Shri Wasudeo Shridhar Kirolikar,
16. Shri Upendranath Barman,
17. Shri T. Sanganna,
18. Shri Kotha Raghuramaiah,
19. Shri Tekur Subrahmanyam,
20. Shri R. Venkataraman,
21. Shri C. P. Matthen,
22. Shri N. C. Chatterjee,
23. Shri Jaipal Singh,
24. Shri Uma Charan Patnaik,
25. Shri Shankar Shantaram More,
26. Shri Amjad Ali,
27. Shri Asoka Metha,
28. Shrimati Renu Chakravartty,
29. Shri Kamal Kumar Basu and
30. Shri Jawaharlal Nehru

and 15 Members from Rajya Sabha;

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

that the Committee shall make a report to this House by the 31st March, 1955;

that in other respects the Rules of Procedure of this House relating to Parliamentary Committees will apply with such variation and

modifications as the Speaker may make; and

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

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

The House adjourned for lunch at the three minutes past one of the clock.

The House re-assembled after lunch at half past two of the clock, Mr. Deputy Chairman in the Chair.

THE UNIVERSITY GRANTS COMMISSION BILL, 1954—continued.

SHRI M. GOVINDA REDDY (Mysore): Sir, the hon. Member who is in charge of this Bill.....

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Before you proceed, I would like to inform the House that this Bill has to be finished before this evening. We have got 2½ hours now and if each Member does not repeat and takes only 15 to 20 minutes, all will have a chance.

SHRI M. GOVINDA REDDY: Sir, I will be as brief as possible.

While moving the motion the hon. Member made a very fine speech giving us a clear picture of what the universities are today and what the universities should be. But, Sir, I was unable to follow the objects of this Bill. The aims of the Bill do not seem to be clear even to the framers of the Bill. In the Statement of Objects and Reasons it is said: "The Constitution of India vests Parliament with exclusive authority in regard to 'co-ordination and determination of standards in institutions for higher education or re-

[Shri Govinda Reddy.]

search and scientific and technical institutions.' It is obvious that neither co-ordination nor determination of standards is possible unless the Central Government has some voice in the determination of standards of teaching and examination in Universities, both old and new."

If we observe this statement, one can see that it is the intention of the framers of this Bill to have control over the universities at least with regard to co-ordination of standards and standards of examination. If that is the object with which this Motion is brought, then I wish to submit that they should have introduced a Bill for controlling the universities. If we go through this Bill my suspicion that the objects are not very clear to the framers of the Bill is confirmed because on the face of it the title of the Bill is University Grants Commission Bill. So the object that is intended is that a Commission should be established and the Commission should have control with regard to the utilisation of the funds that are given to the Universities. It means that the University Grants Commission would control the universities in respect of spending the grants that are made to the universities but if you look at the provisions of the Bill they go far beyond this. Several clauses are provided here not only for universities which receive grants but for all universities who have been asked to furnish particulars to the Commission and to observe certain other conditions. Then they will also be made liable to certain penalties in case they fail to submit returns. I could have understood if these clauses were made applicable only to universities which receive grants but it is not so. As per definition "University" means a university established or incorporated by or under a Central Act, a Provincial Act or a State Act, and includes any institution recognised as a constituent college of a university under any

such Act. So, it includes all universities, not merely those that apply for grants. Again, clauses 12, 13 and 14 are made applicable to all universities whether they are applicants for a grant or not. So I wish to know from the hon. Member what exactly is the object of this Bill. If it is the intention of this Bill to have some sort of control over universities, to regulate the universities, then I am afraid this Bill will not do. He must bring forward another Bill called the Universities Bill in which they can have any provision to assume control over universities to any extent. On the other hand, if the object of this Bill is only to exercise control over the spending of the grants made to the universities, if this to be made applicable only to such universities as are applicants to the Grants Commission, then I am afraid some of the provisions have to be deleted entirely or materially altered. This point, I wish, is to be made clear.

I will now take up the different clauses and then point out what are the changes that should be made. For instance, in the definition "University" includes all universities. Let us now see the next clause 3. It says: "The Central Government, may, on the advice of the Commission declare by notification in the Official Gazette, that any institution for higher education, other than a University, shall be deemed to be a University for the purposes of this Act....." If the intention is to include any institution which may not be a university then what is contained in clause 3 should be included in the definition. We define "University" in clause 2 and still in another clause we provide for other institutions, which do not come under the definition, to be included. This is a point to be clarified and I hope the Select Committee will take note of it.

Coming to the composition of the Commission, it has already been observed by some of the hon. Members.

that the number is either small or large. One lady Member said that the number is small while another hon. gentleman said that the number is large. The University Commission provides for a small number, that is five. And it should be so in order to make this Grants Commission effective. Sir, I wish to submit that the number should not be large. We all know by our experience in the working of Committees and Commissions that a large Commission or Committee means only procrastination or delay in working. If the Commission is large, the quorum will be also large and members may not come and therefore meetings will have to be postponed and delayed. In the interest of success of this University Grants Commission, it should be an efficient body. And if it is to be an efficient body, it must be a small body. I think five would do and I wish to direct the attention of the Select Committee to this aspect.

With regard to composition a provision is made for appointment of members from among the Vice-Chancellors of universities. That is provided in sub-clause (a) of clause 5. Sir, this is a matter which involves a very great principle. When universities are applicants for grants, would it be advisable to put the Vice-Chancellors of those universities on the Commission? We want this University Grants Commission to be an impartial body. We want the members of this Commission to be above all influences. Even the hon. the Parliamentary Secretary who moved this Motion has admitted that the University Grants Commission should be above politics, above all parochialism and above all favouritism. If we have to do it, there should be no subjective element in the composition of the Commission. Members of the Commission should objectively be able to come to a decision on the applications made. Would this be possible if Vice-Chancellors of applicant universities are made to sit on this Commission?

Respectfully I wish to say that impartial judgements cannot be expected since they themselves are concerned with the universities which make applications. This is a matter of principle which the Education Ministry should consider. The only care that they should take is to see that proper men are appointed and for that members should be persons who have got experience of Universities and who actually at one time or another were in charge of universities or had experience of the working of the universities.

That would do. That would meet the needs of making this body an effective and efficient body. If we should provide for sitting Vice-Chancellors of universities, it means that we will be introducing a subjective element and then not only will they not be able to come to objective decisions, but they will not be able to avoid complaints which come later. So, hereafter when Vice-Chancellors sit, the universities which are not represented, whose Vice-Chancellors are not represented on the Commission, will certainly have much to complain against the universities whose representatives are on the Commission. Therefore, in my opinion, this clause should be altered. I would like this sub-clause (a) to be omitted altogether. Then, with regard to clause 6, the term provided is for six years. The term of the members of this University Grants Commission is six years. Now, as I was referring, under sub-clause 5(2)(a), they provide for including Vice-Chancellors on the Commission. Supposing a member ceases to be a Vice-Chancellor within the expiry of these six years, what will be the position? We make it obligatory in clause 6 that a member's term should be six years and we also say in clause 5 that he must be a Vice-Chancellor with regard to this provision. If he is a Vice-Chancellor, if he is on the Commission as a member, and if his term expires before six years, what is his position? It would be unfair that ever

[Shri M. Govinda Reddy.]

though he may not be a Vice-Chancellor, his term will continue for six years by virtue of clause 6. But then it offends against clause 5. It offends against clause 5, sub-clause (2) (a), because he will not be a Vice-Chancellor and as soon as he ceases to be a Vice-Chancellor, he will be disentitled to sit on the Commission. So, there is this anomaly. This anomaly must be remedied.

Now, with regard to the functions of the Commissions, clause 12 lays down:—

"It shall be the general duty of the Commission to take all such steps as it may think fit for the co-ordination and determination of standards of teaching and examination....."

and so forth. Well, Sir, if that is the function which this University Grants Commission should be entrusted with, then we should take care to see what authority the Members of this Commission will have over other universities. Universities are autonomous bodies. Even the State Government have no powers to interfere. Some have powers while some have no powers for prescribing the standards of university education. If that is so, how can this Commission impose upon other universities standards which they do not like to concede? Maybe, by virtue of the position of the Government of India and this University Grants Commission being a statutory body if this Bill is passed, they may obey. But supposing they do not obey, then what will be the prestige and position of the University Grants Commission? It is not obligatory on the part of these universities to accede to the conditions that may be imposed upon by this Grants Commission. There is another thing. If this is to be conceded, then the whole calendar of the universities has to be changed. All the calendars of the universities must be toned to

the direction that would be given by the Grants Commission. Supposing they prescribe certain co-ordinated standards, then all the universities—because this will be obligatory on their part—will have to change. Well, is that the idea? So, this is not the place, even if we have to empower the University Grants Commission with some control.....

SHRI JASPAT ROY KAPOOR (Uttar Pradesh): Clause 14 is there.

SHRI M. GOVINDA REDDY: Clause 14 is for imposing penalty. But what right have you to impose a penalty on a university which does not agree to apply for your grant? So, that is why I said this is not a University Control Bill. If you bring in university institutions under the governance of such an Act, then, of course any provisions which you provide there will be applicable. Then, every university will be answerable, but here you are only providing for a University Grants Commission and this Grants Commission will have power only as provided for in the Bill—that is, in respect of only such universities which apply for grants. Suppose I do not care to apply, then how is clause 14 obligatory on my part?

SHRI JASPAT ROY KAPOOR: Other clauses may also be taken.

SHRI M. GOVINDA REDDY: I quite concede the point, but I am questioning the legal propriety. Is it legal propriety to make university institutions which do not apply for grants to be liable to the provisions in this Bill? I humbly submit that it is not. So, Sir, it would be better if some specification is made here; or, in the alternative, clause 12 is made applicable only to such universities as apply for grants.

Similarly, with regard to sub-clause (d):

"advise the Central Government or any State Government on the

allocation of any grants to Universities for any general of specified purpose out of the Consolidated Fund of India.....”.

what right have we to ask the States to do a certain thing, to ask the States to deny the grant? I can understand that the University Grants Commission can deny the grant if a university does not comply with the provisions of the Bill. But what right has the Union Education Ministry to ask the States to deny grants to the universities? The States have absolute powers to give grants. Unless we bring in, as I was submitting, a Bill to control the universities, this will not do. This will also offend against legal propriety. Similar is the case with regard to sub-clause (f). I am not going into details, because the same argument applies there also.

And, then, coming to clause 13, Inspection, inspection is provided not only for universities which apply for grants. Inspection is provided for all the universities. So, any university will come under this clause 13 and if it fails to conform to provisions in clause 12, then this Commission will have power to impose penalties. Well, that is also a clause which offends against legal propriety. Similarly, with regard to consequences of failure of universities to comply with recommendations of the Commission (clause 14).

And then with regard to clause 18, I have to submit that providing for the Commission to make a report once in six months is not a convenient provision for the University Grants Commission. It would be hard on them to make a report once in six months. It is for this reason. By the time the university's application for grants is examined, sanction is made and the funds are disbursed—certainly in the way we are working—it takes six months for the university to receive the grant. Then, what has the University Grants Commission to report? Only the Government should be interested

in seeing how the grants are disbursed and how they are made use of and what progress the Grants Commission has made. For this purpose it would be sufficient if the University Grants Commission makes a report once a year. Making a report every six months, although we may provide here, will not be possible.

Then, with regard to the right of conferring degrees. We are also imposing a restriction on that. Well, this is a provision which should not come under the University Grants Commission Bill, but it should come under the Universities Control Bill if we want to provide for this at all. Here we should make it applicable only to universities which apply for grants.

Sir, these are the suggestions which I want to make with regard to the Bill. I am in favour of the Central Government exercising control over universities. This question has received very great attention from the University Education Commission. They have gone into this question in detail and they say a large majority of the members were in favour of making this a Concurrent subject, whereas although a minority, with very important members were in favour of making it a Central subject. Some members were for making it only a State subject. Sir, if we visualise the objective we have in view—either take our State as a Welfare State or a state with a socialistic pattern of society—we want the entire population to move culturally, to move intellectually in a particular way. I do not mean to say that we should lead them only in the way the totalitarian States are leading the masses. That is not my object. But we should have one standard of education for the whole country.

Now, Sir, if we examine the present standards, it does not need much argument. We have confusion in education; I should say that I am not exaggerating when I say that we have

[Shri M. Govinda Reddy.]

confusion in education. I may even say that there is chaos. Nobody knows what is the place of our basic education, or what is its future in our country. We have other educational institutions. Each State has its own methods, each State has its own principles, each State has its own standards of teachers, its own standards of salaries, and so on and so forth. All these things land us in confusion. Sir, if our State has to progress, as the University Education Commission has rightly pointed out, we have to evolve a common pattern of education for the whole country, and if we have to evolve a common pattern of education, just as the mover of this motion was observing yesterday, we have to have some sort of control over all education, and over our universities in particular. I want to make it very clear that I do not want any stereotyped or any regimented pattern. What I want the Government to understand by this statement of mine is that they must frame the framework of the university education. There should be, for instance, broad principles laid down with regard to the pattern of education, with regard to the qualifications of teachers, with regard to the salaries of teachers and professors, with regard to the libraries that should be provided, with regard to the laboratories that should be provided, and with regard to the place that sports should get in the sphere of education. We should also lay down broad principles with regard to the relations that should exist between the teachers and the staff and with regard to the relations that should exist between the students and the society. The whole framework consistent with these things must be prepared by the Centre, and within this framework every university should have the liberty to follow its own course as it likes. Well, to that extent, control by the Central Government is very necessary, and unless we have that control, we will not be able to make any progress in educa-

tion. I would, therefore, like the Education Ministry to bring forward a Bill prescribing this framework which the universities have to follow, and thus control and regulate the universities in that manner.

Since, Sir, you were pleased to draw my attention to want of time, I do not wish to go to further points, but I would request the Select Committee—if the Bill had not been referred to the Select Committee, I would have requested the hon. Minister to withdraw this Bill, and instead of it, to bring in two Bills; but since it is going to the Select Committee, I would humbly request it—substantially to alter the provisions in order to make these provisions applicable only to the universities which receive grants.

With these few words, Sir, I wish to commend my suggestions to the Select Committee.

SHRIMATI LAKSHMI MENON (Bihar). Mr. Deputy Chairman, when Tacitus, one of the ablest Roman historians, was referring to the Germans of his days, he said that when the Germans created a wilderness, they called it peace. Sir, as far as our educational activities are concerned, the moment we have created confusion, we have called it progress. Now, in the sphere of university education this is more obvious than in any other department.

Let us make, for instance, an analysis of the kind of the universities that we have today. The other day, I came across a list of 30 universities. They were divided into five categories. We have, for instance, teaching and residential universities, then teaching and affiliating universities, and then affiliating and teaching universities, and then affiliating universities. The 30 universities that we have today come under these categories. And it is very hard to find out what the differences are, except that each of these universities has its own programme,

has its own curriculum, has its own method of electing the Vice-Chancellor, and has its own methods of constituting the other university bodies. And the result is that there is utter confusion with regard to the courses of study, with regard to the departmental organisations, and with regard to everything connected with university education.

Under the circumstances, it is only natural, Sir, that we should have some measure by which the university education can be co-ordinated into something which will cater for national unity and for national recovery in the sphere of education. But unfortunately, this Bill, with all the fine things that the mover described yesterday, does not attempt to do anything. For instance, it has gone far beyond the terms of reference, if I might say so, of the University Education Commission with regard to the constitution of a University Grants Commission. From the very title it is obvious that the University Grants Commission will deal with the allocation of funds that will be permitted by Parliament for educational purposes. That is how it is done in other countries. In England, for instance, the British Parliament makes a grant, and the University Commission distributes it among the 19 universities. Here, this is not a compulsory measure; this is not an obligatory measure. I was just consulting the mover, and he said "Well, such of the universities as would like to ask for grants, would be given the grants, and such of the States as would like to make their contribution to the University Grants Commission Fund, would be allowed to do so."

Now, this is not the way to reorganise education even at the university level. Sir, I quite agree that universities should maintain their autonomy and they should be independent bodies, and their purpose in our society is that of, say, the Supreme Court or the independent judiciary in the

sphere of individual rights, i.e., they stand for academic freedom. All these things are essential for a university organisation, and all these things can be done by better co-ordination and better control by the Central Government.

But the question is: Does this Bill, as it has been presented to us now, make any attempt for or does it even make provision for attempting, these things? My humble opinion, Sir, is that it does not. To begin with, Sir, it has gone far beyond, as I said, the duties imposed on the University Grants Commission by the University Education Commission itself. And secondly, it has failed to understand the reasons why there is a fall in the standards of education, and the reasons why there should be a co-ordination of efforts and for determining the standards of teaching and examinations in our universities. Sir, the standards of teaching and examinations can be maintained only by the university itself. It is not legislation that determines the standards of a university. It is not the inspecting bodies that determine the standards of a university. The standards of a university are determined by the teaching staff, by the university authorities, by the academic bodies, and by the morale of students, which also depends upon these factors. Now there is nothing in this Bill, nor is this the kind of a Bill which is needed to ensure these things. Already in this country we have other educational bodies. We have, from time to time, our Vice-Chancellors' Conferences; we have the Inter-University Board, and we have the Central Advisory Board of Education. All these bodies deal with the problems arising in universities, the problems arising out of this amorphous growth without any rule or without order or without any plan or without any policy. Now, these things have not been dealt with by these advisory bodies. And therefore, if the Government thinks that a

[Shrimati Lakshmi Menon.]
statutory body should be created, then I should say that this is not the kind of Bill that should be produced.

Secondly, Sir, what is the means of control that the organisation will have, when it is constituted? The means of control is finance, and finance that it has is very, very inadequate indeed, as it is evident from the financial memoranda. Now, we may agree that the University Grants Commission is likely to get huge grants, as it should in my opinion, because one recalls the statement made by the Minister in the British Parliament. After distributing 12½ million pounds to 19 universities, he said "If there is a demand for university education, I will not hesitate to grant more funds." That should be the spirit in which our Parliament should work with regard to the encouragement of university education. Now, there is no obligation on the Government to supply funds, nor is there any on the universities to apply for funds. What kind of University Grants Commission is it going to be with these limited resources, with these limited funds and also without any national policy?

Another very important thing which has been brought to the attention of this House by previous speakers is the disastrous way in which university education is going on in our country. Day after day we come across news items in the newspapers about the low standards in our universities and the in-group politics that prevails in our universities. These are due to political factors. Even today, there is not a single mandate, as it were, from the Government as to what should be the medium of instruction in our universities. In one university the medium of instruction is English. In another, it is the local language, and the result is that in those universities where the medium of instruction is left to the choice of the State, there are no proper, standard text-books from which the students can learn,

and naturally there has been a fall in standards. If you ask me, the only thing that is co-ordinating university education in this country today is the all-India competitive examinations. That has given a certain standard for the universities to follow, because all the graduates or most of the graduates apply for these competitive examinations in various fields. The exigencies of these examinations have introduced a certain degree of uniformity of curriculum in our universities.

If we are going to leave it at that, I think it will be a great tragedy. This is an opportunity for our Government to produce a Bill which will aid the universities without controlling them. The reason why the Government may aid the universities and not control them is this. The universities, with the academic freedom that we want them to enjoy, are always, centrifugal forces. They are not forces which try to perpetuate or conserve social evils and social habits. They are organisms, agencies, which should change the social pattern into something different from what it is. As it is, we have a university education which makes our university students believe in all the discarded social evils. Only recently we saw how in the Calcutta University there were certain restrictions or bans placed on extra-curricular activities by boys and girls. It is a tendency to go backwards. If a university is functioning only to conserve or preserve these social evils which we want to discard, then that university is not fulfilling any social function at all. On the other hand, like every other movement in society, it should bring about changes—changes not only in our mental horizon but also in our social attitudes. If you go to the university graduates and talk to them about the Hindu Code, you will find that a majority of the students do not want the same rights to be extended to women. Why? Because they are living in the university in an atmosphere which

is conservative, reactionary and backward in its thoughts.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Dr. Seeta Parmanand will not agree with you.

SHRIMATI LAKSHMI MENON: It does not matter.

If the hon. the mover would see these things, as he should as an educationist, then he would realise that there must be a measure by which university education can be standardised without destroying academic freedom. Sir, the universities should be like good deeds in a naughty world. We are in an age when regimentation in life and thought is aimed at in every sphere. This regimentation should be counteracted, and while social regimentation goes on, there must be more and more intellectual freedom. And, that is the fundamental purpose of university education.

Quite a number of speakers referred to the conditions in England and in India. In India the conditions are different because the universities here were established by Government originally, and they were established to fulfil a certain purpose. Well, they were fulfilling that purpose, that of producing officers for the Government, pretty well indeed. Since then there has been a great demand for higher education and the Government have not played their part by establishing more universities. They have left it completely in the hands of private agencies. Except for the fact that they prescribed certain restrictions and some financial arrangements, they did nothing to supervise the standards, the equipment or the finance. Only the other day, I visited a college which was housed in a

godown.

AN HON. MEMBER: Where?

SHRIMATI LAKSHMI MENON: In Bihar, in Hajipur. It was housed in

3 RSD—4.

a godown. It is not affiliated to any university. The Bihar University is still waiting to recognise it and the demand that is being made is that they should find Rs. 50,000. I asked the Minister for Education as to why this college was not recognised, and he said that the moment it was recognised, the person who had contributed Rs. 50,000, would withdraw it and that the college would go bankrupt. If this is the way we allow our higher education to progress, I think somebody is responsible for it and that responsibility should be taken over by the Central Government who should see that such institutions do not flourish.

The State does not pay adequate attention today to the higher education needs of the country. In India, one out of every 2,500 of the population is a university student. That is far too low. What happens in other countries? In England, one out of every 850 persons is a university student, whereas in the U. S. A. one out of every 60 of the population is a university student. We have to increase the facilities for university education and this facility should not be mere proliferation of colleges but universities based on certain standards, which will conform to the social needs of our country and which will enable us to have national recovery. The very fact that today we have got unemployment among the educated classes shows how university education has failed to subserve the needs of society. Daily we hear of engineers, doctors and professors registering at the Employment Exchanges. Why? Because university education has grown up without any plan or programme, and all these things have to be dealt with, and I think it is the duty of the Mover, when he is sponsoring a Bill in the name of co-ordination of university education, to bring all the universities within the ambit of such a legislative measure so that university education can be really co-ordinated

[Shrimati Lakshmi Menon.]

and made into something worth possessing and something which will make us proud of possessing it.

One more thing I would like to say and that is this. The allocation of grant from the various funds to a university should not be left to the Commission alone or to any individual associated with the Commission. The suggestion that a panel should be established to advise the Commission on these things should have been followed by the framers of this Bill.

Sir, an organisation which is meant only for the allocation of funds should not be made responsible for establishing standards, etc. It is true that the allocation of funds itself will depend upon the question of standards that the university maintains and therefore the recommendation of the University Education Commission that panels of experts should be associated with the Commission should have been paid attention to by the Mover.

Lastly, I share the fears of Mrs. Parvathi Krishnan regarding the conditions under which these grants are made. A grant should be made to educational institutions not because they are in a position to find 50 per cent. or equal or matching grant from a local area. At that rate poorer areas will never have educational institutions. Grants should be made according to the educational needs of an area and I think any Government, especially our Government which is committed to a particular political ideology, should not have such rules laid down, i.e.; the educational grants should be given liberally and without conditions. The condition of grant should be very simple and we should not have complicated mathematical formulæ by which the grant would be extracted from the Government. The conditions of grant or the rules, when they are made for allocations, should be very liberal and the only condition should be that

the grant should be given liberally to those areas which are not in a position to find endowments or finances to have educational institutions.

With these few words, I request that the Mover may make the necessary changes and also bring all the universities in India under the same control and entitle them to receive the ample grants which our Parliament is going to grant to the University Grants Commission.

DR. SHRIMATI SEETA PARMANAND (Madhya Pradesh): Mr. Deputy Chairman, I have to begin with clarifying one or two remarks which fell just now. They were with reference to the younger generation being against the Hindu Succession Bill because I observed that I endorsed every word that Mrs. Menon said in this respect. And the explanation is, that human nature being selfish, as it is, the younger generation, which is also being taught mostly by men, naturally is against any change in succession especially when it has to part with a share to the sister. When the Hindu Code is connected with liberalisation with regard to the existing conservative marriage law and making reforms in that law, it is not opposed. With these few words, I begin the subject under consideration.

I feel that this particular Bill—the University Grants Commission Bill—with the object it has set before it, if really reported on by the Select Committee, without material change, is going to make the present confusion in education worse confounded and I will explain my reasons for making these remarks.

To begin with, the Bill itself has so many confusions in whatever is stated there; it looks as if the Government is afraid to call a spade a spade and the nomenclature itself sets out something which alone the Bill does not intend doing but intends going beyond. It is called the University Grants Commission Bill when

ordinarily its functions should be limited to giving grants for helping universities with their education. It extends its scope as mentioned in the Statement of Objects and Reasons, also to recommending to any university the measures necessary for reform and improvement in university education! Similarly, it also states about co-ordination and determination of standards of universities and for that purpose, to establish a University Grants Commission. But it does not say that it intends, with the same object of co-ordination, bringing about a uniformity in the salaries of professors and also uniformity in their equipment and establishments because on that will depend to a great deal the uniformity in teaching.

Secondly, another example of the confusion that will be created is that the Radhakrishnan Commission's report recommends 50 per cent. to be given by the University Grants Commission and as such this could have been done even if this Grants Commission came under some other name. While dealing with that, I should suggest that it should really be called the University Education Commission Bill or the University Education Bill. Then all these aspects which are intended to be included in it, viz., the co-ordination of standards along with paying of money will come under it and the nomenclature would be correct otherwise it would be seen really—again if I may repeat that remark of mine—to amount to a fear of calling a spade a spade, and creating confusion. So, if that recommendation of the Radhakrishnan Commission's in regard to giving 50 per cent. grant were to be taken, then only for that purpose this Bill was not necessary but what is happening is that the Central Education Ministry and everybody else do realise that there is something seriously wrong with the university education but they have not the courage to handle it in a manner that they should, because once for all they are committed to

the situation that universities are autonomous and university education is a State subject. Now, they don't know how they are going to direct the States to have certain uniform standards for university education. If only the question of standards were to be what we were really concerned with, I would submit that there is at present adequate machinery to deal with that, viz., the Inter-University Board. It is their function to bring about co-ordination of standards but the Government ought to admit that that is not the only thing that is worrying them and they want to bring about certain standards with regard not only to academic education but discipline and other things that go with it to mould character. If that is so, I think at least for the time being the Centre can come forward, tell the country that till homogeneity or uniformity is established the Centre will control the entire university education rather than make this confusion worse confounded by making the universities depend on two sources for finances, viz., the States and the Centre. Let them say 'We will give whatever we want under education to all the universities and your resources which are available for university education had better be directed to other education, which is, up to university stage.'

Then there is another example of confusion because only recently it has been decided that High School education would be in all States raised to Intermediate standards. As such the universities will be left only with honours and post-graduate teaching. That being so, the scope for university education would be lessened and can be controlled for the sake of uniformity and co-ordination of standards by the Centre and the States could be left with education up to Intermediate Board for which their finances would be adequate. Therefore, instead of tinkering with this problem in this manner, it would

[Dr. Shrimati Seeta Parmanand.] have been better for the Government on the strength of the opinion it has at its disposal and the number it is able to gauge with the help of the University Education Commission Report as well as with the help of Secondary Education Commission Report which they have conveniently shelved on the top shelf after wasting valuable time and money—more important than that I shall say, money—and after raising the hopes of the people, they are not able to deliver the goods to the people—instead of doing that, it would have been better, I repeat, if they had taken in view both these reports and the needs of the country, had come forward with bold suggestions, and put them before the Parliament and then also had sent a letter, instead of appointing further Commissions, to the States to say that this was what they thought that should be done for the interim period and made necessary changes in the Constitution in that matter. I think it would have produced better results than going about in this manner of calling a commission a Grants Commission and then taking the powers to say that it will co-ordinate also standards of education. What kind of grant is this which includes standards? It may be that the person that pays the piper calls the tune but that is not the meaning of saying that universities are autonomous.

What is the meaning behind the principle which has been adopted, when you say that university education is autonomous and has nothing to do with the grant you pay? A short sentence is put in here—I am referring to Chapter IV, Miscellaneous, clause 20 (2):

"If any dispute arises between the Central Government and the Commission as to whether a question is or is not a question of policy, the decision of the Central Government shall be final."

What does it mean? If in the interest of the country, for the sake of its unity and in the larger interests at stake, it is necessary—it has been realised and nobody doubts that it is necessary—to have a higher and uniform standard of university education than is prevailing today, they should make up their mind and Parliament will support them wholeheartedly and raise within a short time the standard of university education. But everybody feels that the Education Ministry has been sleeping, sleeping for a long time. People have been expecting much more of the Education Ministry, not merely paying, a little money here for a cultural activity, a little money there for organising a scout camp or some teachers' conference or another conference or another commission. People have been expecting to see big measures which would show that there is a change in the attitude and the stature of the people. But what has happened? Sir, five years is not a very short time. Soon it will be ten years. This Parliament, the life of the present Parliament, will come to an end, at the end of 1956 as far as the Lok Sabha is concerned and what will be the results to be shown to the people? What is the actual change produced by the Education Ministry?

Sir, having thus pointed out the confusion that is existing behind the aims and ideals that are put forward and the courage that is lacking to face issues boldly and squarely so as to show results, I would deal with some of the obvious lacunae that are there, so that in case the Committee does not recommend that this Bill in the larger and real interests of the country should be withdrawn and a better Bill brought forward, then my observations might be useful.

Sir, I would like to point out first of all, that in the Statement of Objects and Reasons it has been mentioned that the Bill seeks "to restrict the use of the word 'University' or

the power to confer degrees, etc., to institutions established as such by law". The idea, of course, is that no body or institution not recognised, except through the post office or some other correspondence medium, confer degrees, not send out degrees, diplomas, etc., etc. But it does not seem to have been envisaged that such degrees are "conferred" through foreign post offices, etc. These should be included because even in the text of the clause, it has not been clearly stated which degrees are meant. So I would suggest to the hon. Member in charge that, as in the case of the various foreign qualifications conferred by foreign Mining Boards and other faculties like medical, engineering, etc., where equivalent certificates are issued, in case of universities abroad which are not bodies put on the list of recognised universities, it should be possible to issue equivalent certificates which would make the candidates eligible for appointments in a country. This little thing should have been inserted.

Now, I come to the clause dealing with representations of the universities against whom an enquiry may be made for not conforming with the rules and orders passed by the Commission. This is mentioned in clause 13 (2). It says:

"The Commission shall, before causing any inspection or inquiry to be made under sub-section (1), give notice to the University through the executive authority of the University of its intention of causing an inspection or inquiry to be made and the University shall be entitled to be represented at such inspection or inquiry."

I would invite special attention to the term "represented" in the statement "the University shall be entitled to be represented at such inspection or inquiry." The representative will be there, but it has to be made clear whether he will be able to take part

in the discussions or whether he will be merely an observer. This should be put beyond doubt.

Similarly, in dealing with the responsibilities of universities which have affiliated colleges and constituent colleges, it should be clearly defined what their responsibilities are. We do not know what is the meaning or the definition that is put in here. What degree is exactly granted by the constituent colleges which are dealing with honours and post-graduate courses and what is granted by the affiliated colleges? Only then will it be possible for the universities to administer the grants without any confusion and show the accounts clearly.

Sir, I do not understand why, when autonomous powers are given to universities for education, the power is here intended to be taken by this Commission. You call it "recommendation". I am referring to sub-clause (c) of clause 12 under Chapter III where you say the Commission will have the power to "recommend to any University the measures necessary for the reform and improvement of University education". This occurs in two or three other places also. What is the meaning of this word "recommend"? Either you take the power to direct the working, and say so, or you say these are autonomous bodies and so you do not interfere with them. After all, every university has got a court or other academic bodies which are, from the State, comprised of the best educated people and elected people and they will be able to follow the best policy. If it is considered that in some backward States these people are not competent enough to carry out these policies of university education in a special manner, then perhaps the University Grants Commission has got to direct them.

Then again, if there is any conflict between the Commission and the

[Dr. Shrimati Seeta Parmanand.] Government, the Government is the final authority. So, where is the autonomous nature of that body and where is the question of giving freedom to the people as far as university education is concerned, to function in the way they think best? Where is the non-interference by the Central Government? So, I feel that the time has come when the Central Education Ministry need not be there. I would maintain that the Central Education Ministry has no definite purpose at all to be here. If it has got to be here, then I feel it must take upon itself more duties than it has done today and not function in a negative way as it does today, in a sort of nervous manner and in the Elizabethan words say "Essex, when I command thee, I request thee; and Sussex, when I request thee, I command thee." When they say "recommend", there should be no doubt about it. But if their word is to be final, then they must say so. Taking the ultimate objective which they themselves have put in the Bill, if their views and policies should prevail, they should, in fairness, in the best interests of the country, take full control of university education and put it in a new Bill, leaving to the States intermediate education which is not going to be included in university education.

PROF. N. R. MALKANI (Nominated): Sir, I welcome the University Grants Commission Bill which is placed before the House.

There are a few provisions in this Bill which are more important than the rest. For instance, the section about the composition of the Commission is important. The section dealing with the powers of the Commission is also important so also that relating to the funds placed at the disposal of the Commission.

With regard to the composition of the Commission, there are certain matters which I like. The Commission is to consist of not more than

nine members. I think that is a very sound provision for, to my mind, that gives us a small and efficient body. I am not in favour of having some fifteen members on the Commission, which is to consist of experts, and which will, in a sense, be the executive, that will have to frame the policy clearly and implement it effectively.

So also about the tenure of the members. It is to be six years so that there is continuity and security. And it gives us freshness of outlook also, because half will be retiring every three years. It is also to be based on selection which, to my mind, is much better than election, considering that elections lead us to factions, quarrels and disputes. In educational institutions especially, selection is much better. But—and here comes the 'but'—it is very important who are selected. Selection is important, but who are selected is far more important than that they are selected. Clause 5(2) (b) says, "not less than two members shall be chosen from among the officers of the Central Government to represent that Government". I would say, Sir, that it should be "not more than two members". Officials have no business to be there except to safeguard the interests of the Government. One auditor may be there and one person who knows particularly what is called the administrative business which may mean anything or which may be nothing—and very often it means little. You may have a person with 'great' administrative experience, whatever that may mean and, of course, an auditor to see that the money is properly spent and properly accounted for. I do not see why it should be "not less than two" instead of "not more than two".

So also, Sir, in 5(2) (c) it is stated "the remaining number shall be chosen from among persons who are educationists....."—I hope it is educationists who are outside the services because we do not want men of the

services—".....or who have obtained high academic distinctions.....". I do not see the necessity of this sub-clause because very often men with high academic distinction mean nothing at all. The words ".....or who have experience in administrative or financial matters" should be deleted because it is provided in sub-clause (2) (b). 5(2) (b) is essentially for men who have experience in administration or in financial matters.

Coming next to clause 6(4), we find that "The office of the Chairman shall be a whole-time and salaried one and subject thereto, the terms and conditions of service of the Chairman and other members shall be such as may be prescribed." Sir, in my opinion, the selection of the Chairman is the crux of the whole thing. The other eight may be all right but if the Chairman is worthless, the work of the Commission will be valueless. If the Chairman is a mere administrator or a mere auditor, he will not do justice to his office. The Chairman's selection must be made very carefully and I suggest, Sir, that he should not be from category (b) but that the convention should grow, that the Chairman should be selected from category (c). He should be an educationist of distinction. Very much depends upon that. Therefore, Sir, either a convention or a provision in this Bill is very necessary to see that the selection is well made.

So far as the powers of the Commission are concerned they are wide and extensive and these powers are necessary. There is one thing in the powers which I like especially. It is in Chapter III, clause 12. It is said ".....that in making any such grant to a University, the Commission shall give due consideration to the development of the university concerned, its financial needs, the standard attained by it and the national purpose which it may be called upon to serve;". I consider this a very important provision because the universities up till now have lived a segregated and iso-

lated life which has no bearing, no relation to what is happening in the country. Sometimes one feels aghast about what university men say when they meet together as specialists. Year before last some of these educationists—and they were professors of English selected from all over India, about thirty in number—met on the 23rd January 1953, to find out to what extent English should be taught in colleges and one of the recommendations that they made—they made a number of recommendations running to about six foolscap pages—appears to me as having no bearing, no relation to the India we are living in but to the India we were living in ten years ago, an India they were living in ten years ago and from which they refuse to come out. They said—those Professors of English—that English should be taught as a compulsory subject in secondary schools. Supposing I agree to it, they wanted this to be done for six years out of seven. I am 65. There was a time when I was younger and was only 12 and these people speak to me as if I am 12 years old, as if nothing has been done during the last 50 years. If you make English compulsory for six years, then a child at the age of 10 or 11 years, must read this till about 17 years. We are talking of basic education for eight years but it does not make any sense to me at all because in basic education there is no place, there can be no place for English. They are talking of six years of compulsory English education in the secondary schools. This has no bearing to the present-day conditions at all; they are also talking of six periods of fifty minutes each. Other subjects may have two or three periods of thirty minutes only but in the case of English it must be six periods of fifty minutes each per week.

With regard to the medium of instruction, they said that they must have an assurance that for the next five years no change will be made in the medium of instruction which must be and shall be English. And further still, they advise all the universities

[Prof. N. R. Malkani.]

in a gratuitous manner that they must make no change in the medium of instruction, that this is an all-India question and that they must wait and go about it slowly and gradually. They said that this must wait till they are ready and I know that they will never be ready at all. They also said that even if five years had passed, they must receive sufficient notice after that. Even after five years, they say that English can be dropped provided ample and adequate provision is made for text-books. Sir, this will mean the year two thousand and odd, about 50 years hence. This was a committee of selected Professors of English, all experts, thirty in number, gathered from all over India and talking on a subject which we at least do not understand and which has no bearing to present conditions.

SHRI M. SATYANARAYANA (Nominated): They are all English Professors.

PROF. N. R. MALKANI: English Professors! Then let them go to England; there is no place in India.

This is the kind of expert opinion which over-rides public opinion and national need in India which has been developing and forcibly, for the last fifteen or twenty years. These experts are living in a world of their own; it is not a real world; it is a dreamy world.

Therefore I say that there should be such a Commission as this which should be able to tell the universities that they have a responsibility, a growing responsibility, to the nation as such and they must do certain things in education which the nation requires of them for instance, Sir, today social education is talked of but very few understand what it means. Teachers have come to me and asked, "What does it mean?" It may mean anything; it may mean only adult literacy or it may be everything and so many more things put into social education but it is quite clear that we do

want a kind of a new system known as social education which we have been talking about for the last so many years.

Similarly, Sir, most of the hon. Members will agree that we have completely neglected the rural areas which require a special kind of education suited to the environment, with a bias which is rural, especially agricultural. We have no such institution at present at all; we are just playing with the idea of rural universities. This is a kind of idea which is not clear to me at all but I am quite clear that we do want a rural university or institute with an agricultural bias very different from the one which prevails now.

We do feel that India has got to be industrialised. Either for big industries or for small industries, we want technical skill of a high order. In my opinion, we are very deficient and very backward in these skills. We must see to it that the University Grants Commission issues directives to the universities to make ample and adequate provision for the acquisition of skills for big industries as well as small industries, for all kinds of skill and not only for skills required for the big industries. These are important national problems which have been completely neglected and, therefore, the need for this Commission.

I now come to clause 20 which, I might say, has been criticised rather severely. It is about "Directions by the Central Government". Sir, I have read the whole of the Bill several times and find that this is the only clause which gives powers to the Government to give directions; this clause gives control to the Government over the Commission. It reads: "*Directions by the Central Government.*—(1) In the discharge of its functions under this Act, the Commission shall be guided by such directions on questions of policy as may be given to it by the Central Government." Sir, it does not say that the

Government will control the administration of the universities. It does not say that the Government will control the standards of education; it does not say that Government will regulate the human relationship between the teacher and the pupil, between the pupil and the public and the university and the teachers; it does not say that at all. It simply says that so far as the policy is concerned—the questions of broad policy are concerned—the Government will give directions. These are questions of high policy, whether the medium of instruction should be English or the mother-tongue or Hindi, whatever that may be, is a question of high policy. That in higher education, social education or social service should be provided and compulsorily for some time, maybe for six months, or twelve months is a matter of high policy. These questions cannot be left even to the Commission, much less to the universities. We do know, Sir, that the universities are living in a very conservative and orthodox fashion. It is saddening to see the university men and Vice-Chancellors meeting and talking about education in a manner which I cannot understand, much less digest. Therefore, this power which is given to Government is very necessary.

Sir, having said all this, it appears to me—and also, I think, to most of the friends present here—that we are thoroughly dissatisfied with the present system of education and, if you will excuse my saying so, with the achievements of the Ministry of Education. Most of us feel that very little has been done by this Ministry of Education when other Ministries have done much more than this Ministry, though this Ministry of Education is a very important Ministry. As a matter of fact, Sir, I am sorry to say, that whenever I have ventilated my views about it, they simply say that this is not for the Central Ministry of Education but that it pertains to the States and to the State Ministries of Education.

Perhaps the States will say "It is not pertaining to us; it pertains to the Directors of Instruction." Perhaps they, in their turn, will say: "Nothing doing, it pertains to the Principals", and so forth. It seems that nobody wants to take up any responsibility with regard to education, and the Central Ministry of Education, as far as I know, takes the least responsibility, which is rather very unfair.

Sir, I do believe that the most important and the most pressing problem before us to-day is what is to be the structure of the educational system. Others talk of the pattern of education, and I am talking of the structure of the system but both mean the same thing. I find a great confusion about this subject. It is a very fundamental matter. For instance, if we are having basic education, then we must plump for it and say, "we are having basic education; we will introduce it completely within ten years and its course will be 8 years or 7 years as the case may be."

As a matter of fact, Sir, only in 1954, in November or December, there was a small committee appointed by the Central Advisory Board of Education to report on this structure and they said that basic education will be the pattern and it will be for 8 years. Then they said "Higher Education for three or four years". Then they said "collegiate education for three years." But only yesterday I read in the papers that in the Vice-Chancellors' meeting in Madras, they said something quite contrary. We are not told anything about basic education; they do not seem to be aware of it. Perhaps Vice-Chancellors need not be aware of a thing like basic education. All Vice-Chancellors seem to live in the air, in the clouds and they don't think of basic education; they only think of higher education. They think of collegiate education and post-collegiate education and immediately they say that there will be one year pre-university education.

[Prof. N. R. Malkani.]

They call it pre-university education for one year, probably thinking that this is a short route preparatory for university education. They want to give pupils one year's preparation and let them then have university education. They further say that later on if anybody wants to take up any technical course or professional course "give him one additional year for the pre-professional course." Now, this is going round the thing and increasing the period of education indirectly. Thus we do not know where we stand and these were Vice-Chancellors from all over India who met in Madras only yesterday, not in 1950 or 1952. So, we do not know where we stand. There is nobody to tell them "what are you talking about? We do not understand." But if it is 8 years, 3 years and 3 years full course we can understand, and the Central Ministry of Education should tell us— it is our own committee which made that important recommendation—"We accept it." If it says so the Vice-Chancellors will not be playing with the approved structure and suggesting a pre-university education for 1 year; and for professional education, another year; and so on.

So, Sir, I say it is important that, whatever be the content of education, whatever be the human element involved in that education, at least we should know how many years the course will last; that basic education is coming and will be for eight years; that higher secondary education is coming, with multipurpose schools and it is for three years; and university education will be for three years and two years for post-collegiate education. Then we will know where we stand. Immediately we know that we can decide the content which will be put into basic education; the content which will go into secondary education; and so forth. And then we can go further and say: This will be the human element. This to my mind and to all our

minds is the most important matter that we must attend to. But to-day we do not know where we stand and my friend there must tell me. We do not know where we are; we do not know what is the exact basic education, what is the period of basic education, whether it is going to be introduced, when it will be completely introduced. I know nothing of it at all. We cannot talk in the air and there is an amount of despondency.....

DR. K. L. SHRIMALI: We are discussing the University Grants Commission and not basic education.

PROF. N. R. MALKANI: I am not discussing basic education at all. Don't treat this as a fad of mine but I am discussing the structure of the system.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: University education is reached from the basic and secondary stages.

PROF. N. R. MALKANI: I would give a challenge to my friend there. Can he tell me finally on behalf of the Central Ministry of Education what is to be the structure? What is in his mind? Has the Ministry decided about it? All this talk is on nothing but university education. But what has happened to secondary education? Much more, what has happened to basic education? We have not settled the base. How can you put up any structure? Nobody can build from above. We are talking of university education but the base is neglected. It is important. There is a great deal of frustration, there is a great deal of confusion in our minds and I request you to take it away by telling us: "This is to be the structure of the educational system and this must be introduced and shall be introduced within a particular period." If we know that, we know where we stand and we can proceed further.

SHRI M. SATYANARAYANA: Mr. Deputy Chairman, I rise to welcome the University Grants Commission

Bill mainly for the reason that the Government has come forward with a measure to help the universities. Education has been one of those subjects on which there does not seem to be any kind of satisfaction anywhere because we have been carrying on a kind of agitation during the last fifty years that our education is merely a copy of the western education and that there must be a thorough change. Great leaders like Mahatma Gandhi suggested that there must be a revolutionary approach to education. We have not been able to find out what that revolutionary approach should be. And so, yet we are groping in the dark. But for the first time the Ministry of Education has come forward with a Bill saying that there must be some standardisation and coordination and I suppose there is also an idea behind it, to integrate the education on university level.

At present we have got 31 universities in the country distributed all over, and certain States have universities and certain States have not. It is said that the subject of education is a State subject the Central Ministry is there only to aid. I do not know whether the Central Education Ministry takes sufficient interest to see that this subject of education is given proper attention in the States also.

I have a few figures with me of how money is spent in different States for different types of education, namely, elementary, secondary and university education. These figures are very revealing. I have taken these figures from the literature supplied by the Education Ministry itself. On primary education in India we spend for all the students, whom we admit into schools, Rs. 2/6 per head. For secondary education, we spend Rs. 6/4 per head. For university education, we spend Rs. 450 per head. In the university education also, for the science and arts subjects we spend Rs. 434 while for professional courses we spend Rs. 521 per head. This

shows how costly university education is. It must be costly because it is spread over, but on the whole in India we spend Rs. 3 *per capita* for our education and that is a very small sum. Taking again, for example, some of the Part 'A' States, on elementary education Bombay spends Rs. 3 *per capita*. On secondary education, they spend Re. 1, and on university education Re. 1. Madras spends Rs. 2 on elementary education, Re. 1 on secondary education and 8 annas on university education. U.P. spends 13 annas on elementary education, Re. 1 for secondary and 8 annas for university education. I am giving these figures for the reason that there are certain States which neglect completely elementary and secondary education and concentrate on higher education, that is, university education. There are also certain States that make a very equitable contribution to all sides of education and this aspect has to be taken into account when the University Grants Commission sanctions grants—whether a particular State is concentrating on higher education alone or it is paying sufficient attention to all types of education, namely, elementary, secondary and university education. The State of U.P. with a population of 63 millions spends only Rs. 5 crores while Bombay with a population of 35 millions spends Rs. 10 crores. This is really an anomaly and this has also to be gone into while giving grants to education. That is as far as grants are concerned.

But that does not stop there. Today the universities are spread over. There is a kind of competition between one State and another State to start more universities. There is no check. Whether they have sufficient finances or not, if there is any kind of local urge, immediately a Bill is sponsored and a university is started. That should not be the case.

Sir, my feeling is that the Central Government must pay serious attention to the question of bifurcation of

[Shri M. Satyanarayana.]
the professional or technical education and education pertaining to humanities, that is, arts. So far as arts education is concerned, it should be made exclusively the concern of the States. But the Central Government must take complete responsibility for providing technical education, professional education. Otherwise, it will not be possible for smaller States to develop any kind of technical education. In these days of competition for entry into the services, especially in those domains where competition is becoming very acute, where people can get jobs only when they are educated, if a particular State is backward, under these circumstances it will be very difficult if we only concentrate on the universities alone as they are today in different States, especially when these universities are not a natural growth. They are growing not according to the needs but they are growing only according to circumstances. Most of the universities are accidental. Therefore the Government must come forward with a Bill of an integrated character.

As far as professional education is concerned, as far as technical education is concerned, they must develop four or six centres in different regions and these centres should be thrown open to everybody, whoever goes there, from any part of India. There ought not to be any kind of distinction between State and State. Today if a boy who belongs to one State wants to get admission into an engineering college it is impossible. Whether the boy is brilliant or not is not taken into consideration at all, but he is asked to what caste he belongs, to what region or State he belongs, whether there are sufficient engineers in his community or not. Only after all these things are satisfied, he can get admission. It is really anomalous. In a democracy such things should not happen. Everybody who is educationally qualified must be able to get admission without his being asked all these

questions as to which place he belongs to, which caste he belongs to, what he is and what his parent is. Therefore, my own feeling is that the Central Government must bring forward immediately a Bill which will satisfy the educational needs of the country as far as the technical or professional education is concerned.

As far as this Bill is concerned, there are a number of things which my predecessors have said. It is very halting and it is very apologetic and the hon. the Mover in the beginning itself said that we should not interfere with the autonomy of the universities. The autonomy of the universities, as every autonomy, is really sacred and we should not touch that but that does not mean that if there is a necessity for the Government to interfere, they ought not to interfere. We need not quote examples of international institutions where universities are kept sacred. There the people have come into their own. We must also grow to that stature and help the universities to become autonomous. It is, therefore, necessary that the Central Government must interfere. As my predecessor has said, we must have a complete picture of the entire integrated education. As far as the standards are concerned, very revolutionary ways have been suggested for the purpose of testing the educational standards of the people and some of those recommendations have to be given effect to. If this Commission itself can evolve itself into a body which can undertake such kind of responsibilities and also discharge such duties to the people of the various States, it will be a nice thing. I hope the Education Ministry will come forward, if not immediately at least within six months or a year, to amend this Act and make it as elaborate as possible and as comprehensive as possible so that they can go through all the aspects of education, higher and technical. The whole thing should be integrated on an all-India basis and the small and the big States ought not to be asked to

foster a kind of education which is really job-centered, where job alone is taken into consideration and not the real education. It must be the duty of the Central Government to see that the student is qualified for the job for which he applies. With these words, I support the Motion and I hope that an amending Bill will come soon wherein these ideas will have been given a concrete shape.

SHRI S. N. MAZUMDAR (West Bengal): Sir, this Bill has been welcomed from all sides. From our side also it has been welcomed. As on previous occasions, when measures of this nature come before the House, they get the support of all sections of the House, this Bill has also been supported by all sides.

I hope that in the Select Committee stage and even after that the Government will also show that amount of responsiveness to the constructive suggestions and criticisms that were offered by different sections as was shown in connection with the two Marriage Bills—the social reform measures. Sir, this is actually a non-controversial measure. The points which have been made here are not actually made out as controversies but only attention has been focussed upon the different aspects of the Bill which, in the opinion of many of the speakers, required improvement. Particular attention has been drawn to the sections which deal with the composition of the University Grants Commission, its powers, its functions and also the power of direction of the Government.

Now, it is admitted on every side that our university education is inadequate; not only inadequate—but its development was rather lopsided. Its development was to a great extent, if I may be permitted to say so, unnatural because the universities developed under an alien rule and under circumstances

and in an atmosphere in which those who went to the universities had no connection or had no teaching about the life that was surging forward outside the university enclosures. A reorientation is necessary and that is admitted by all.

For this reorientation one of the things necessary is adequate finance. Now, this Bill setting up a University Grants Commission lays more stress—as the Bill is here now—on providing adequate finance to the universities, but the other questions, the question of reorientating university education, the pattern of university education and the co-ordination of education among different universities and different stages of education, all these questions cannot be kept in abeyance. These things cannot be considered or discussed in isolation, and that is why these questions have come up here.

In this connection several apprehensions have been expressed not only from this or that side, but from many speakers, if not a majority of the speakers, who have taken part in this discussion. The apprehensions are naturally concerned with the autonomy of the universities and the nature of the control which the Commission will exercise upon them.

The problem is two-fold. On the one side, there must be co-ordination among universities in different parts of the country and there must be a common pattern of education with a common outlook. At the same time it is very necessary to guard strictly against certain dangers. While evolving a common pattern, it should not be lost sight of that India is a unity in diversity. If in the name of evolving a common pattern, these factors are neglected, then that will actually lead us into quite the opposite results. Sir, the University Education Commission has pointed out all these things and the recommendations of the University Education

[Shri S. N. Mazumdar.]

Commission, I think, give a fairly correct direction about the steps which should be taken in this connection. And I think the 4 P.M. recommendations of the University Education Commission, in its various aspects, should be popularised to a greater extent than these have been popularised up till now.

For example, we have discussed here the question of the medium of instruction. Now, Sir, as regards this question of medium of instruction—the question of federal language, the question of the relation of the federal language to regional languages, the question of developing scientific terminology—on all these questions, the University Education Commission has given certain directions with which I substantially agree. And in my opinion, if these directions were followed and popularised, then much of the controversy which is raging in the country today as regards Hindi could have been obviated. But I find that it has not been done. The recommendations are there in the Report. It may have been gone through by some who are interested in it. But these recommendations have not been popularised to the extent to which they should have been popularised. These have not been discussed. I do not know how far exchange of information has taken place in this matter. The University Education Commission's recommendations as well as the recommendations of the Conference which was held, I think, in 1953 in Poona on the same subject are almost the same. There not only the question of the relation of the federal language and the regional language has been discussed, but the whole question of Indian culture. The pattern of Indian culture has also been discussed in a very brief form, but in a fairly good outline. Now, that is one question which we should bear in mind: on the one hand, we should have a common pattern of education; on the other hand, we should guard against the danger of

forgetting that India is a unity in diversity. And if these diversities are developed, with unity clearly in sight, then our Indian culture will be all the richer and will be all the more glorious.

Now, Sir, coming to other questions, I agree with my friend, Mr. Malkani, in his remarks made in connection with the composition of the University Grants Commission. Actually, the number of officials in the Commission should be reduced and I also fully agree with him that while appointing educationists we should, the Government should, look more outside the educational services. Sir, when I say this, it is not my intention to cast any reflection on those gentlemen who are in the educational services. But taking into account the whole history of the educational services and the whole history of the system of education through which the gentlemen who are in the services have passed, I think it is better to lay more stress on finding men from outside the services. Why? Because it is necessary today to have men with a fresh mind, men whose line of thinking, pattern of thinking, has not been stereotyped in particular directions or within particular sectors. I have found from my experience in many places that our specialists, many eminent professors, when they come out of their particular field of specialisation into the wider field of life, into the wider field of questions confronting life, feel helpless. I might add that they blunder or feel at sea. But that is not their fault. They have specialised, but have specialised in such a manner as to cut them off from the life at large. And in India, the question of educational reform, the question of reforming and reshaping the pattern of education in universities had been given more thought by people who are outside the services, people with fresher outlook. On many occasions, we shall find many men who had very little university education but who were self-taught. The reason is that being more in touch

with reality, more in touch with the problems of life which confront them, they had an integrated, comprehensive outlook on the questions. That is very necessary.

Now, I shall come to some other clauses. Apprehension has been expressed rightly by various speakers that the various clauses of this Bill, as they stand at present, may give rise to the danger of the autonomy of the universities being curtailed. In the Bill we find that it may give direction to the universities as regards the standards of education. And, then the University Grants Commission has been given the power to wield the big stick if the occasion may arise—the big stick in a very clever way. Mr. Satyanarayana said that the Government should have control over education. Sir, there is the necessity of supervision or control in the right sense. Co-ordination would be the proper word, but at the same time that must not be exercised in a way which may curtail the autonomy of the universities.

Now, the autonomy of the universities is too wide a concept. It may be twisted in many ways. Still we have some common understanding about it when we speak of the autonomy of the universities, that there should not be Governmental interference with them. In the field of education, the guidance or supervision or co-ordination should come more by way of giving the proper lead. And in order to give the proper lead, it is necessary that the composition of the body should be such that a proper lead can be given. Otherwise, there is that danger. The defect in this Bill is that it deals only with a particular aspect of university education—finances. But as I said earlier, this particular aspect cannot be discussed in isolation from other aspects. So, in the discussions, the other aspects have naturally come in.

Similarly, in the Bill there is the question of the standards, inspection

and all these things, but these have not been defined. It may be argued that in the scope of the Bill it cannot be defined. Sir, I am not here insisting on a rigid definition. I am not insisting here that these definitions should be there in so many terms, but the spirit should be such that the apprehension or the danger of curtailing the rights or the autonomy of universities should be removed. And this apprehension is all the more justified, because as I have said earlier, the University Education Commission made so many recommendations, but still we find that all these recommendations have not been thoroughly gone through by the educationists of the country as a whole in a thorough going and comprehensive manner. So, about the standard of university education, there may be different interpretations, there may be different angles—different angles from the Government side, from the officials who are represented on the Commission and the educationists who will be there. And there were instances before where the officials differed, not correctly but wrongly with educationists. Now, here the Commission is being given, as I said, a big stick to wield. At the same time, the Government is also getting the overall control in its hands in the sense that it may have some over-riding powers. Now, about all these things we must have a thorough idea and a common understanding, not only in terms of some general observations, but in terms of the actual implementation of these things. Therefore, Sir, I submit that these things do give rise to serious apprehensions. And that is why I hope that when the Select Committee discusses all these things, it will go into them thoroughly and will consider all these suggestions in a responsive way.

Sir, I would also like to give another suggestion. I do not know what the Select Committee would do, because the Select Committee is not bound by any suggestions that are given on the floor of this House. But I hope it would consider all these sug-

[Shri S. N. Mazumdar.]
 gestions. I think it would be fruitful if the Select Committee gets into contact with eminent educationists in connection with its work. The work of the University Education Commission is before us, but after that some changes have taken place, in the sense that these questions have been given more thought by some people in several quarters. There may be fresh suggestions, fresh problems, fresh light, and there may be a new angle or a new outlook brought to bear on these questions. So, if the Select Committee decides to get into contact with eminent educationists in respect of all these questions, questions which have been raised in the Bill itself, and questions which have been raised on the floor of the House in the course of this discussion, then, I think, its work would be more fruitful. With these few words, Sir, I welcome the Bill.

SHRI JASPAT ROY KAPOOR (Uttar Pradesh): Mr. Deputy Chairman, subject to a few modifications and changes in the provisions of this measure, which I am presently going to suggest for the consideration and examination of the Joint Select Committee, I welcome this Bill and support the motion of its being referred to the Select Committee, wherefrom, I hope, it will emerge after thorough examination and scrutiny in a form which will be readily acceptable to all the Members of this House, as also of the other House.

Sir, in a vast country like India, which has already more than 25 universities—and still more universities are springing up every now and then, it is very necessary and very desirable that we should have a body like the University Grants Commission, as envisaged in this Bill, with the object of having a sort of co-ordination between the various universities, and with the object of setting a uniform standard of education in the university sphere in the country, and also with the object of examining the financial position of the various universities

and deciding as to how much amount should be allocated to the various universities out of the funds allotted to the Commission by the Central Government.

Sir, some of the hon. Members have criticised the scope and function of this Bill. In particular, Dr. Seeta Parmanand, Mr. Reddy and Mrs. Lakshmi Menon have offered criticism to the effect that the scope and function of the University Grants Commission is much wider than the scope suggested by the University Education Commission. They seem to presume that the Central Government, in the task of framing this measure, is to be guided merely by the recommendations of the University Education Commission. They forget one important fact, that in our Constitution it has been specifically laid down that it is the duty and the responsibility, and even the privilege of Parliament and the Central Government to frame legislation with regard to bringing about co-ordination and bringing about uniformity of standard in the university education sphere. And the Government, while framing this Bill, had this thing in view, I am sure. I might Sir, refer to item No. 66 of List I in the Seventh Schedule of the Constitution wherein it has specifically been laid down that in accordance with article 246 of the Constitution, it is the exclusive duty and privilege of the Central Government to legislate with regard to co-ordination and determination of standards in institutions for higher education or research and scientific and technical institutions. It was absolutely necessary, therefore, that while framing a Bill of the nature that we are considering, the University Grants Commission, which is to be established under the provisions of this Bill, should also look to the subject of co-ordination between various universities, and also to the subject of setting a uniformity of standard in the matter of education in the various universities.

The Central Ministry of Education, Sir, has also been criticised to the

effect that it has not done much in the sphere of education. No doubt it is a fact that it has not been able to do much, but the question is: Who is to blame for it? To me it appears, Sir, that it is futile on our part to blame the Education Ministry for this, because nothing can be done without money, and the money that has been placed at the disposal of the Central Education Ministry is very meagre. It is only a little less than Rs. 2 crores, Sir. In the year 1954-55, the total amount placed at the disposal of the Education Ministry was Rs. 1,81,12,000. With this meagre amount it is idle on our part to expect the Education Ministry to achieve anything very substantial. I would, therefore, submit that we must bring to bear upon the Ministry of Finance as much pressure as we can, so that it may allot a very substantial amount to the Education Ministry. The University Education Commission has suggested, Sir, that at least about Rs. 20 crores must be spent over university education in the country, and about 60 per cent. of it must be contributed by the Central Government. Now, 60 per cent. of it comes to Rs. 12 crores. Therefore, the Finance Ministry must provide at least Rs. 10 crores more to the Education Ministry in order to enable it to perform its duties properly to the satisfaction of the country.

With regard to the provisions of this Bill, I have to make certain observations. It is a matter of satisfaction to me that the framers of this Bill, though they have performed a very delicate task, have performed it very ably and with very great consideration for the self-respect and sentiment of the universities because I find that in clause 13 of this measure, where they have empowered the Commission to inspect universities, they have said so in very courteous terms. They have taken jolly good care to say that the Commission must consult any person or authority responsible for the inspection of a university before commencing inspection. Therefore, before the Commission appoints

anybody to inspect a university, they shall consult the person who has already been empowered and authorised by the university concerned to carry on inspection. This is a very courteous way of doing things. Then, in sub-clause (2) of this clause I find that it is provided that, when the enquiry is being held, firstly due notice shall be given to the university, and, secondly, the university shall be entitled to be represented at such inspection or enquiry so that this enquiry will not be carried on without the participation of a responsible person of the university concerned. Ultimately, I find in sub-clause (3) that before giving any direction to a university as a result of an enquiry, the University Grants Commission shall ascertain the opinion of the university. This is the language used; "after ascertaining the opinion of the University recommend to the University the action to be taken as a result of such inspection or enquiry." That is, before giving final directions to the university, the opinion of the university concerned will be taken into consideration. This is a very courteous and very gentle way of dealing with a university. I would like to congratulate the framers of this Bill on the great consideration they have shown for the feelings and self-respect of the universities.

With regard to the composition of the University Grants Commission, I have some observations to make. Firstly, I am entirely in agreement with the provision to the effect that the Commission shall consist of nine members. I do not agree with my hon. friend, Mr. Reddy, that it should consist of only five persons, because it is much better that this Commission, which has very responsible duties to perform, has the representatives of various interests. It is well and good that a specific provision has been made to the effect that at least one-third of the members must be Vice-Chancellors. My hon. friend, Mr. Reddy, objects to the Vice-Chancellors being on the Commission on the ground that the Vice-Chancellors themselves would

[Shri Jaspat Roy Kapoor.]
be interested in the matter of the allocation of funds, and therefore, being interested persons, they should not be there. I do not agree with him, because I have absolutely no doubt in my own mind that when the rules are being framed under another clause of this Bill, it will be specifically provided that, when there is a question of any particular amount being allotted to any particular university, then the Vice-Chancellor of that university, if he is on the Commission, shall not vote in respect of that matter. A provision like this is always to be found in the articles of association of joint stock companies, viz., when a particular Director is interested in any transaction, he should not participate in the discussion and should not vote in that matter. Similarly, a provision to that effect can be made in the rules under this Bill. I would suggest that the three Vice-Chancellors should be elected and the Chairman should be a non-official.

Then, I find that no provision has been made here for the representation of the State Governments in the Commission. State Governments are very much interested in the affairs of the universities within their jurisdiction, and I would very much wish that the Select Committee should seriously take this question into consideration and make a provision for the representation of the States concerned when any question affecting any university situated in any particular State is under consideration by the Commission.

I find that, if the provision with regard to the composition of the Commission is allowed to remain as it is, Government servants and Central Government interests will be over-represented. I, therefore, think that the Select Committee should see to it that, in the composition of this Commission, while there are Vice-Chancellors, while there are eminent educationists, Government servants are not over-represented there. I would also very much wish that, when Government servants are nominated by the Central Government, one of them

should be with administrative experience and another with experience of finance and auditing. Persons with such qualifications would be assets to the Commission. I would also like to say that the term of these members should not be so long as six years. It should be only three years. If the Government finds it necessary to re-nominate any person after the expiration of his first term of office, he can be re-nominated, but his initial term should not be for more than three years.

I would like to record my appreciation of clause 22 of the Bill in which it is provided that degrees shall not be conferred by any institution except those which are specifically designated by law as universities. I must also record my agreement with clause 23 of the Bill which provides that no institution should be allowed to designate itself as a university unless it has been specifically so provided in the legislation on the subject.

Coming to clause 25, I find that it runs like this:

"Nothing contained in this Act shall be deemed to render it obligatory on the part of the Central Government to consult the Commission respecting grants-in-aid from the Consolidated Fund of India to institutions whose annual budgets do not form an integral part of the budget of any University."

I do not see the reason why such an institution should not have the benefit of the advice and guidance of the University Grants Commission. The University Grants Commission should be an all-pervading institution so far as university education is concerned. It must guide all the universities in the country, it must guide all the institutions in the country, irrespective of the fact whether they receive financial aid or not.

Sir, coming to clause 26, which provides for the framing of the rules, I

would very much wish that the Joint Select Committee should seriously consider as to whether it should not be necessary for the rules that may be framed, to be placed on the Table of the Parliament so that it may be open to the Parliament to discuss them if it so chooses. Similarly I would like that the reports which the Commission submits to the Central Government should also be placed on the Table of both the Houses of Parliament so that we may be seized of them. While speaking about the reports, I am in agreement with the suggestion of his hon. friend Mr. Govinda Reddy that there should be only one report in the year and not two. Two reports are a little too much and I do not know what there shall be for the University Grants Commission to report every six months. One report in 12 months should be enough but that report must be placed on the Table of both the Houses of Parliament so that we may have an opportunity to discuss it if we so choose.

Sir, these are the various remarks which I wanted to make and I hope the Joint Select Committee will take all these points that I have submitted into consideration and accept them if it finds its way to doing so.

श्री गांधीकृष्ण विजयवर्गीय (मध्य भारत) : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, बहुत थोड़ा समय ले कर के ही मैं इस प्रस्ताव का समर्थन करूंगा कि यह बिल ज्वाइंट सेलेक्ट कमेटी के सुपुर्द किया जाय। इसमें कोई शक नहीं कि सब यूनिवर्सिटीयों की हालत एक ही तरह की नहीं हैं और काफी कंप्यूजन या कँऑस हैं, एक तरह की गड़बड़ी हैं और कोई एक व्यवस्था नहीं है। इसलिये ऐसे कानून के आने की सख्त जरूरत थी और यह बहुत उचित हुआ है कि यह यूनिवर्सिटी ग्रांट्स कमीशन बिल पेश किया जा रहा है।

मेरे ख्याल से जहाँ इसमें यह व्यवस्था है कि इस कमीशन का कम्पोजीशन ६ मॅम्बर्स से ज्यादा का न हो, वह उचित है। श्री रंडूडी ने

५ मॅम्बर्सों का सुझाव दिया, वह मेरे ख्याल में बहुत ही कम होगा। ६ मॅम्बर्स का होना ठीक है। इसमें यूनिवर्सिटीयों के वाइसचांसलर्स को भी रखा गया है। यह बात सही है कि इससे कुछ पेंचीदागियां पैदा होंगी जब कि उनकी यूनिवर्सिटी का मसला कमीशन के सामने आयगा। जब उनकी यूनिवर्सिटी का मसला कमीशन के सामने रहे तब उनकी हैसियत अगर नानवॉटिंग रहे, तब मेरे ख्याल से इसमें कोई कीठनाई नहीं होगी और इस कमीशन का कम्पोजीशन ठीक हो जायगा।

इस बिल के अन्दर और जो प्राविजंस हैं वे ठीक हैं। हाँ, एक बात की तरफ मैं आपका ध्यान दिलाना चाहता हूँ कि कुछ प्रान्तों में अभी यूनिवर्सिटी ही नहीं है, जैसे कि मध्य भारत में ही यूनिवर्सिटी बिल अभी अंडर कंसिडरेशन है। इसी तरह और जगहों की भी लोकल आवश्यकतायें हैं कि वहाँ यूनिवर्सिटी बने या वहाँ की यूनिवर्सिटीयों को ज्यादा सहायता दी जाय। अभी श्रीमती लक्ष्मी मंनन ने भी इस तरफ ध्यान खींचा था कि गांट्स दते समय प्रदश की हालत और वहाँ की आवश्यकता को भी ध्यान में रखना चाहिये और ऐसी व्यवस्था होनी चाहिये कि जो प्रदश पिछड़े हैं और जहाँ यूनिवर्सिटीयों को ज्यादा मदद देने की आवश्यकता है, जहाँ यूनिवर्सिटीयों की आर्थिक स्थिति अच्छी नहीं है वहाँ कमीशन उनको ज्यादा मदद दे सके। जैसे कि मध्य भारत में अभी यूनिवर्सिटी बनने वाली है तो उसके लिये ऐसी परिस्थितियां हो सकती हैं कि कमीशन को वहाँ की हालत को देखते हुये कुछ ज्यादा मदद देनी पड़े। तो मेरा निवेदन है कि स्थानीय आवश्यकताओं को देखते हुये कमीशन को यह क्षमता रहे कि वह उन आवश्यकताओं को पूरा कर सके और ज्यादा मदद दे सके।

बस इसी तरफ मैं आपका ध्यान खींचना चाहता था। मैं चाहता हूँ कि जहाँ पिछड़े हुये इलाके हैं उनकी ओर ज्यादा ध्यान दिया जाय। मेरा ख्याल है कि इस बिल पर भी ज़ादः

[श्री गोपीकृष्ण विजयवर्गीय]
सेलेक्ट कमेटी ध्यान देंगी। मैं इस प्रस्ताव का समर्थन करता हूँ।

SHRI H. C. DASAPPA (Mysore): Mr. Deputy Chairman, while I am very grateful to the hon. the Parliamentary Secretary for having brought this motion before the House with regard to the grants to be made to the universities and appreciating the underlying principles therein, I am tempted to say a word or two as to why specially they are showing so much of a consideration for higher education and also for secondary education and why they are not evincing the same keen interest with regard to the implementation of one of the Directive Principles laid down by the Constitution and that is, with regard to the introduction of free and compulsory education all over the Union. Sir, that is a matter which is enjoined by the Constitution. It is an obligatory part of the functions of the Government of the day that they must see that there is free and universal education all over the land but I see that the Education Ministry is doing everything except that. Not that I, in the least, say that this attention to universities is a function which they should not attend to—not by any means. Let me not be misunderstood as saying that the Government at the Centre should not take interest, active interest, in the development of secondary education and university education and higher technological education. This morning we had an answer to a question that they have already formed or are going to form a Council for Secondary Education. Now, they are bringing this Bill to constitute a University Grants Commission. It is all very good but how is it that they are so oblivious to the obligatory function which the Constitution enjoins on them.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: We are now confined to this Bill.

SHRI H. C. DASAPPA: Yes, I am aware of that. I don't know whether I am not within my rights to say....

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You have to take some other occasion.

SHRI H. C. DASAPPA: No, I cannot get another occasion unless they introduce a Bill with regard to spreading of mass education in the land.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Anyway, we are now concerned with this Bill.

SHRI H. C. DASAPPA: Of course, but this is one of the ways in which I can bring home—drive this point home to their mind about their duties. It may be a rather rude reminder of their obligations.

Now with regard to the Bill I must say that the hon. the Parliamentary Secretary referred to the statement of Sir Walter Moberley to the effect that there should be no question of absolute autonomy for any university but at the same time the universities must enjoy a high degree of autonomy and thirdly, that the universities should resist any inroads into their autonomy. Now, if this is a principle which he has accepted and which he lays down for us to follow or for the Parliament to follow, I would like to test the Bill that is before us from the stand-point of that principle which has been enunciated.

Sir, supposing we regard that they should enjoy a large measure of autonomy, does this Bill secure that object? Does it safeguard that privilege to the universities, namely, they should enjoy a large measure of autonomy? I am not now dealing with the question whether the principle laid down is an unalterable principle which we should follow in all circumstances. To that I will come presently. But granting that the principle laid down is worthy of acceptance by us, does this Bill secure to the universities that amount of autonomy which my hon. friend would like them to enjoy? On the other hand, as has been criticised by Member after Member, you take away all autonomy from the universities and you have concentrated it in the University

Grants Commission which is the same thing as concentrating it in the Central Government because of the provisions of this Bill, namely, those in clause 20 and the subsequent clauses. Therefore, I feel that it is not right for us to rely upon any of these so-called principles to which my hon. friend the mover referred. It is much better that we judge these clauses and the provisions on their own merit. I am afraid I have got to take a line of reasoning which may be somewhat at variance with what many of the hon. Members have taken.

Sir, these universities in the past were the outcome of various endowments, especially in England, by various churches, bishoprics, and so on. They were largely financed by various public spirited and charitably disposed persons or institutions. They were also working under certain charters. But here in India, the development of our universities has been somewhat different. Although certain of the universities were the outcome of charters they are largely dependent as has been shown by the Radhakrishnan Commission, on the grants that they receive from the State Governments or in the case of a few universities, from the Central Government. So the question arises whether, having chosen to provide these grants to the universities and having made themselves answerable to the electorate and their representatives, the Governments should not exercise some measure of control and whether the universities should enjoy that kind of autonomy which my hon. friend the mover was referring to. That is one argument, namely, that a large portion of the funds was found not through endowments but through government grants. The second argument is even more important than that from my point of view. Sir, the days when we had built up our economy on *laissez faire* theory, the days when we had lifted up the universities to a very high place, and placed them on a pedestal of their own, when they were not instruments for the popularisation of

knowledge, for the dissemination of knowledge, well those days are gone. Today, they have got to subserve an interest which is much wider than they ever had in the past. If the universities had functioned in the proper manner, I don't think there would have been such an amount of illiteracy in the land, and there would have been no need for us to feel sorry over the present state of affairs. That, Sir, is another reason which I feel must weigh with us in seeing that the universities do not enjoy that kind of absolute autonomy which they are now speaking about.

Sir, there is also something of a danger in allowing these universities to have all that large autonomy which was claimed for them by my hon. friend. We are thinking of creating a welfare State and aiming at a socialistic pattern of society. There should be no branch of our activities in the whole land, throughout the length and breadth of it, which does not subserve that main function. Now I ask my hon. friend whether the universities are not going to play a great and effective part in ushering in this socialistic pattern of society. Suppose for a moment that the Vice-Chancellor and the rest of the Syndicate or the Executive Council—whatever they be—are pro-capitalist minded, and they try to infiltrate these ideas of extreme capitalism into the minds of the youth, I would ask, should the Government sit with folded hands, saying that it is autonomy and the entire province of instruction is their own? Sir, let me take another instance, from the other side. Supposing they turn out to be mere handmaids of the communist elements that are now in the land. We are thinking of democratic socialism, more or less, in any case, of evolving a society through democratic channels and means. Are we to allow this poison of communism, and more than the poison of communism, of the communistic methods, to be imbibed by our youth? Those methods of violence, of sabotage, of doing anything in order to gain the objective.....

SHRI S. N. MAZUMDAR: Sir, the hon. Member is committing violence in thus distorting realities.

SHRI H. C. DASAPPA: Sir, I must then say they have not read their own history properly. I can only refer them to their own books.....

SHRI S. N. MAZUMDAR: And my hon. friend is committing violence on the Bill also.

SHRI H. C. DASAPPA: Well, it may be, but the whole world knows how they rose to power through bloodshed, through murders, through a hundred other deeds of that type. There is no use hiding that patent and obvious fact. I did not want to say all that.

Now that we have adopted this objective of a socialistic pattern of society and decided to attain it through democratic means, through peaceful and non-violent means, supposing this kind of violent ideology, the ideology of the communists, takes possession of universities and their organisations, are we, again I ask, to sit with folded hands?

Sir, these are the negative aspects. But as I said, the real consideration is that these universities must subserve the great ideal of ushering in the socialistic pattern of society.

I have got to add one more idea. I believe that India has a certain particular mission to play in this world. It has a culture, a great culture of its own. It has always stood for toleration. It has always given a high place for spiritual values. These grand things which are our noble heritage, are also things which we must foster and foster zealously in our universities. Now, who can assure me, who can assure anybody that these universities are going to subserve these grand interests of the land? Therefore, Sir, I feel that a certain measure of regulatory control, not meddling or interfering with their day-to-day routine, but a certain measure of regulatory control, a direction towards

which the minds and hearts of our country, of our boys and girls, should move, is absolutely necessary. Therefore I say that there must after all be some amount of vigilance over the working of these universities.

When I say this much, I cannot say that I subscribe to those clauses 13 and 14. The University Education Commission of Dr. Radhakrishnan has very rightly envisaged what the function of this University Grants Commission should be. I wish the hon. Mover had, during the course of his speech, taken us through these provisions, taken us into confidence in regard to the *raison d'etre* for most of them in which case possibly we could have contributed something more valuable to the debate. Now, we have got to assume what the underlying reasons are for the various provisions of the Bill. If the Bill had confined itself to the recommendation of the Radhakrishnan Commission and said that the main function of this Commission would be to make over the grants, have a kind of an over-all vigilance over the working and confine themselves to influencing the course of events and not to the policing as is said in the Report, it would have been good. This is a kind of policing, more or less, that the Bill contemplates and not one of guiding and advising as and when occasion demands. Therefore, I feel that that should be the main part of the function of this University Grants Commission.

I must also refer to another fact and that is the place of research in the universities. It is an absolute truth, an incontrovertible truth, that in India universities have not so far taken real interest in the field of research. Possibly Calcutta is one of our best universities in that direction but even that came at a much later stage. As I see it, it is not possible for any university, with its slender resources today, to do anything by way of research and I would, therefore, very much plead that large grants be given for research in the

various universities. At the same time I must say, Sir, that I do not agree with some of my hon. friends who say that there must be some kind of a standardisation in the courses and subjects of studies in the various universities. Even in the modern universities in the United Kingdom, all of them are not like Cambridge and Oxford; even in America, some stand for research and others are popularising knowledge and so on. It is not the same universal, uniform pattern in all the universities. So, I am not anxious that each university in India must be like the other universities; a certain amount of variation is also necessitated by the geographical circumstances that exist. You cannot expect the Mysore University, for instance, or possibly the Madras University, to interest itself in coal mining whereas Calcutta can be very much interested in mining. A certain amount of individuality for the universities is permissible and I am not very much eager about uniformity, and I would be glad if each university has its own distinct feature. Then, Sir, there is some idea in our land that the moment a professor is 55 years of age, he must be retired. This is a thing which does not happen anywhere in any part of the world. Here, automatically, when a man reaches the age of 55, when he is in full possession of his powers, when he has gained so much of knowledge, he is removed from the university. Take, for instance, those great professors in the West. They continue to serve in their universities even after they reach the age of superannuation. Even if somebody else takes their seats, the professors are given some place there to conduct their research and help the students. Sir Alfred Egerton, the head of the Chemical Section of the Imperial Science Institute in London, the brother-in-law of Sir Stafford Cripps, is an old gentleman. He still continues. Even, Dr. P. C. Ray and Dr. J. C. Bose continued to carry on their researches long after they were 55 and they were able to do so much. I think that in respect of research, it would be well not to

dispense with the services of the real servants of knowledge and science.

Sir, there is no doubt that the University Grants Commission Bill now before us seeks to implement the obligatory duties laid down by the Constitution itself. I find in the Union List item 66, "Co-ordination and determination of standards in institutions for higher education or research and scientific and technical institutions." I do not know whether it has been read before.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Yes, it has been read.

SHRI H. C. DASAPPA: We also find item 11 in the State List which reads as follows: "Education including universities, subject to the provisions of entries 63, 64, 65 and 66.....". So, it is not as though the Central Government is trying to arrogate to itself a Power which the Constitution did not contemplate. In fact, it did contemplate it. They should have come much sooner with a Bill like this but now that they have come, let us welcome it.

I quite agree with my hon. friends Shri Govinda Reddy and Shrimati Lakshmi Menon that it would have been better if they had called this a "University Bill", not merely a "University Grants Commission Bill".

I do not think, Sir, that I should take very much more time, but these are certain points which I hope the Joint Committee will bear in mind and will be able to incorporate. All that I plead for, in the end, is that the Committee must be given as much Powers to make any changes which they choose to make, including the nomenclature, if they so choose, so that it may be of real help to the universities and enable the Centre to be effective for good. That is all that I am pleading for now; of course, the grants that they have provided for are too meagre and they must be very substantial.

[Shri H. C. Dasappa.]

Once again, before I sit down, may I express the hope that the hon. the Parliamentary Secretary will see to it that mass education is not ignored in this scheme of things?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Saksena, you wanted to speak?

SHRI H. P. SAKSENA (Uttar Pradesh): Are we continuing after five, Sir?

SHRI S. N. MAZUMDAR: You start now.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: What time do you want?

SHRI H. P. SAKSENA: I am asked, at the fag end of the debate, to contribute towards the Bill known as the University Grants Commission Bill which we have discussed for about two days. The definition of the Bill is not to my liking and it is not liked by so many other friends who have spoken before me. "University Grants Commission" confines its limits to a very narrow region; it appears that this Bill is being brought simply for granting financial aid to the universities. It does not appear in the open. Maybe, something has been kept hidden because when you read the Bill, it appears that the autonomy that the universities enjoy to-day is being, to a very great extent, restricted in the future. Now, Sir, so far as these present-day universities of ours are concerned, I owe the product of those universities a considerable debt and I must discharge it just now and I must discharge it at this opportunity by telling the House that we got a large number of fighters for the freedom movement from the universities. Young men and young women put

down their books, jeopardised their careers and joined us in the struggle for freedom. I bow to them and I take off my hat to these young men and young women who did it. It is the university.....

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: That is all beyond the point. If you have got anything to say on the Bill please let us have it.

SHRI H. P. SAKSENA: This is the University Grants Commission Bill and I am speaking on the university product. I do not, for the very life of me, understand how this reference becomes irrelevant. I am prepared to learn even today the science of relevancy and irrelevancy and if I am convinced that the reference to the university product in the University Grants Commission Bill is irrelevant, I will abide by that decision. Now, Sir, mention has been made.....

SHRI V. K. DHAGE: It is already time to adjourn, Sir.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: He is going to finish in two minutes' time. Mr. Saksena, you are going to finish in two minutes, I think.

SHRI H. P. SAKSENA: I am not going to finish in two minutes.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Then you will continue on the next day.

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

The House then adjourned at two minutes past five of the clock till eleven of the clock on Thursday, the 17th March 1955.